

TUESDAY, 5 AUGUST 2025

ESTIMATES—JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE— ATTORNEY-GENERAL; JUSTICE; INTEGRITY

Mr Speaker (Hon. Pat Weir, Condamine)

Committee Members

Mr MA Hunt MP—Chair

Mr RD Field MP

Ms ND Marr MP

Mr PS Russo MP

Hon. MAJ Scanlon MP

Hon. MC de Brenni MP

Ms NA Boyd MP

Members in Attendance

Dr CAC Rowan MP

Hon. LM Enoch MP

Hon. GJ Butcher MP

In Attendance

Hon. DK Frecklington, Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity

Mr Ben Murphy, Chief of Staff

Department of Justice

Ms Sarah Cruickshank, Director-General

Mr Ben Armstrong, Acting Executive Director

Office of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner

Ms Linda Waugh, Queensland Integrity Commissioner

Electoral Commission of Queensland

Mr. Wade Lewis, Assistant Electoral Commissioner

Office of the Queensland Ombudsman

Mr Anthony Reilly, Queensland Ombudsman and Inspector of Detention Services

The committee met at 8.59 am.



Mr SPEAKER: Good morning. I declare this hearing of estimates for the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee open. I acknowledge the Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islander people of this state and their elders past, present and emerging. I also acknowledge the former members of this parliament who have participated in and nourished the democratic institutions of this state. Finally, I acknowledge the people of this state, whether they have been born here or have chosen to make this state their home and whom we represent to make laws and conduct other business for the peace, welfare and good government of this state.

I am Pat Weir, the member for Condamine and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. I and Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim and Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, will be chairing this meeting. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over today's hearing. The members of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee are Marty Hunt, member for Nicklin, who is the chair; Peter Russo, member for Toohey, who is the deputy chair; Russell Field, member for Capalaba; Natalie Marr, member for Thuringowa; the Hon. Mick de Brenni, member for Springwood, who is substituting for Michael Berkman, member for Maiwar; and the Hon. Meaghan Scanlon, member for Gaven, who is substituting for Melissa McMahon, member for Macalister, until 2.45 pm. The committee is joined by other members who have been granted leave to attend and ask questions at the hearing today.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at the Speaker's discretion or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised its hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcasters of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure that phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use. Please note that the first three rows of the gallery are reserved for department and ministerial staff supporting the minister. Members and others who are attending to observe are welcome to sit in the remaining rows or in the gallery upstairs. I also remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in this chamber.

The House has determined the program for the committee's estimates hearing. Today the committee will examine the proposed expenditure contained in the Appropriation Bill 2025 for the portfolios of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the times specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage.

This first session will examine the proposed expenditure of the portfolios of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity until 12.15 pm. We will suspend proceedings for an intermission from 10.30 am to 10.45 am. I remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly. In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides that a member may ask any question that the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant Appropriation Bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the minister, director-general, officials and departmental officers and members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general. Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished. I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio areas of the Attorney-General, Department of Justice and associated statutory bodies open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

I have a couple of notes to make before we start this week's proceedings. Honourable members, I wish to make a statement about the conduct of estimates hearings and the standards of behaviour that I expect. With regard to statements and points of order, firstly, if members are not asking questions or making a point of order, there should be no running commentary or interjections. In doing so, members are simply being disorderly. Members should not include argumentative statements in their questions or ask a question that contains an imputation. I remind members that an imputation is a phrase impugning, attributing, ascribing or charging somebody with a personal motive, crime, misconduct, negligence or other fault. I will generally not intervene where the imputation is directed to philosophy, viewpoint or policy. Ministers should also refrain from making statements from the witness table unless answering a question or taking a point of order. Secondly, if a member makes a point of order, I will generally hear another point of order about the same issue. However, I will not tolerate persistent, repetitive points of order that offer nothing other than further arguments. Such frivolous points of order are also disorderly.

With regard to the tabling of documents, I remind all members that committee members and members who have been formally substituted in accordance with standing order 202 can table documents without seeking leave. Members who have been granted leave to participate in the hearing under standing order 181(e) and witnesses require leave of the committee to table a document.

With regard to authentication, members should be ready to authenticate the basis for their questions if called upon by myself or the Deputy Speaker. Members should ensure that any authentication provided is genuine and does not seek to perpetuate debate on irrelevant matters. Doing so is purely disorderly and, in some cases, potentially misleading.

Lastly, with regard to motions, there are only a limited number of motions that can be moved during these hearings. Under standing order 180, there is a question before the committee at all times—that is, that the proposed expenditure be agreed to. Substantive motions are out of order. Motions moved when the time has expired in accordance with the order of the House are also out of order, regardless of whether the Speaker has formally adjourned the hearing. Attorney-General, if you wish, you may make an opening statement of no more than five minutes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and thank you to you, to Mr Laurie and to the committee. Firstly, I would also like to acknowledge everyone in the Department of Justice who has been involved in the diligent preparation of this budget. I would also like to thank my staff as well. It is a lot of work and an important part of our democratic process, so thank you all very much for your efforts.

It is a pleasure to be here today to talk about the Crisafulli government's first budget and how it is laying the foundation for a fresh start for Queensland. Since the moment we were elected, we have been focused on delivering the promises we made to Queenslanders. After a decade of crime and chaos under Labor, Queenslanders now have a government that is listening. Adult Crime, Adult Time is now law. We have a long way to go, but we are headed in the right direction and the 2025-26 budget is helping us deliver that vision, including \$48.8 million over five years and \$2.2 million per annum ongoing to support the implementation of our Making Queensland Safer Laws; \$5.6 million to deliver infrastructure upgrades, including an additional courtroom in Townsville and courtroom expansion works in Brisbane; \$23.7 million for enhanced security across priority courthouses in Queensland; and \$12 million for urgent security infrastructure upgrades after years of underinvestment. We have also allocated \$11.6 million for the DPP's Victim Liaison Service and an \$18.8 million uplift for the Domestic and Family Violence Courthouse Improvement Program to ensure upgrades at Maroochydore, Rockhampton and Mackay courthouses can actually go ahead.

We are also addressing Labor's DNA debacle. We have put \$6.3 million to the DPP to fast-track preparation for backlogged DNA cases for court; \$50 million for the QPS to deliver a two-year outsourcing program to help eliminate Labor's DNA backlog; and \$18.1 million in 2025-26 to maintain operational capacity to address backlogs and conduct historical case reviews.

Labor's DNA debacle is one of the greatest failures of the justice system in the world. It has rocked our courts, our police and victims. Those tremors are still being felt. Yesterday the Premier and I released Dr Kirsty Wright's review into Forensic Science Queensland. This review commenced in our first week in office because, like so many Queenslanders, we had no confidence that Labor had fixed the mess. We were justified with our concerns. Dr Wright's report makes damning findings of contamination, unreliable results and testing delays. It shows we are at a point of critical system failure due to Labor's forensic failures, with systemic contamination at the lab including some crime scene samples. An expert team headed by former New South Wales police commissioner Mick Fuller, and with ongoing involvement by Dr Wright, will now lead FSQ through a major change period with the Crisafulli government committed to delivering effective DNA testing services for Queensland.

This morning I am pleased to have tabled with the Clerk a second report in our review from Dr Bruce Budowle, who will also play a key role in our expert team. Dr Budowle's report describes FSQ as a laboratory that remains in a state of sustained crisis, with failures of leadership, systemic failures in foundational areas like quality assurance and a toxic workplace culture. I want to thank Dr Budowle's review team for bringing issues of kinship and paternity testing data to my attention, an issue that incredibly was first identified by FSQ in April 2024 but went unaddressed. Dr Budowle's review also brought contamination concerns to the fore, which led to a pause in all routine testing at the lab.

I know these reports will make sobering reading for those who work so passionately across our justice system, but spare a thought for the victims. It will be incredibly difficult reading for those victims who have been let down by the former Labor government. Those failures are simply unforgivable. The Crisafulli government is committed to delivering the world-class DNA testing services that our state needs, and our budget provides the foundation for the fresh start that Queensland deserves.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to the opposition for the first question and I will go to the member for Gaven.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, on Tuesday the Premier at his estimates said—

I want a Public Service that is free from political interference. I want a Public Service that is led by someone who is truly independent.

Director-General, is it correct that you were a political staff member of former Liberal premier Gladys Berejiklian?

Ms Cruickshank: No, that is not quite correct. I took a secondment to then premier Berejiklian's office from the department of premier and cabinet. I was, in fact, in the department of premier and cabinet for eight years and during that time I did the secondment to the premier's office.

Ms SCANLON: It is the case, though, you still worked as a chief of staff in Gladys Berejiklian's office?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, on secondment from the department of premier and cabinet.

Ms SCANLON: Is it correct that you worked in the office of former Liberal politicians Joe Hockey, Brendan Nelson and Helen Coonan?

Ms Cruickshank: Not quite correct, no. I did not work for the honourable Joe Hockey. I did, straight out of university, work in the electorate office of Dr Brendan Nelson back in 1996 and I worked for Helen Coonan for a year in the Senate when she was a backbencher in 1998.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I refer to the role of the Electoral Commission of Queensland, in particular page 60 of the SDS, which outlines their objective to promote and enforcement compliance with the electoral laws, which I note includes the political donation scheme. Speaker, I table a political donation form from a donor called Sarah-Jane Cruickshank declaring a \$1,000 donation to the Liberal candidate for Penrith, Stuart Ayres. Can you confirm that you are the Sarah-Jane Cruickshank who donated those funds?

Ms Cruickshank: I do need to have a look. Yes, I can confirm that was a donation that I gave. It was actually at the time that I worked in a public affairs company which was based in Sydney and worked in Sydney and Canberra.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I refer to the protocol for judicial appointments in Queensland, and I table a copy of the former policy and the revised LNP copy. Director-General, is it the case that the new policy allows the Attorney-General an additional individual, therefore making it three people who in their opinion should be appointed? I refer specifically to section (d) of the two policies, page 1.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Is the member seeking an opinion?

Mr SPEAKER: You have a point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Yes, I have a point of order. Is the member seeking an opinion?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question. I will allow the director-general to have a look at the document before she responds. Are you referring to a specific page of this document?

Ms SCANLON: I refer to section (d) of the two policies. My question to the director-general was: is it the case that the new policy allows the Attorney-General an additional individual, therefore making it three people who in their opinion should be appointed?

Ms Cruickshank: My understanding is that it is laid out in the protocol and that that protocol was updated earlier this year.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: If the member wants to try, she could go to the website.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my question was to the director-general. I have a follow-up question for the director-general. Is it the case that the new LNP policy requires the consent of the Attorney-General in respect of proxies for the president of the Bar Association and the Law Society?

Ms Cruickshank: I am afraid I suspect my answer to that would be—it is a broader one to the honourable member—that all matters that relate to appointments are a matter for the Attorney and for cabinet. I think the protocol, which was updated prior to my commencing in this role, outlines the process. That is the best I can do.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: with respect to the questioning as asked, some of this relates to policy decisions, as I hear it, and would be more appropriately directed to the Attorney-General.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the SDS clearly lays out the expenditure of judicial appointments and all expenditure relating to the courts. I think it is entirely appropriate that we are able to ask questions about the manner in which people are appointed.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Point of order: if the member was actually asking about the budget then her point of order might stand.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, you would be well aware where it crosses into policy and as far as things affect the budget. The question is to you, but if you think it is straying into policy it is up to you then to answer or not.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the new policy expressly states the recommendations shall be subject to approval by the Premier as the case may be. Those words were not in the previous policy, were they?

Ms Cruickshank: My understanding is that the new process was updated, as I said, prior to my commencing here, so I am working a little bit off what I have been advised, but it was updated in part as a request of the judiciary because it had actually not been updated for, I think, eight or nine years.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Ten years.

Ms Cruickshank: Ten years, thank you, Attorney. It had not been updated for a considerable period of time and, from the department's point of view, it was updated; it was placed on the website. Anything beyond that, I am afraid, really is the domain of cabinet and ministers.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order again, Mr Speaker: in relation to the continued questioning, again I would raise the issue of this being related to policy. Whilst the director-general has answered that question, I would submit to you again in relation to the line of questioning that these policy questions that are being asked should be directed to the Attorney-General.

Mr SPEAKER: If the director-general thinks that these are policy questions, she does not need to answer.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, it is the case that the new protocol removed the examples from the former policy of the anti-discrimination commissioner or a representative of the Women Lawyers Association of Queensland who could be appointed; is that correct?

Ms Cruickshank: I would have to check that because, as I said, the policy unfortunately was updated prior to my commencing. I will have to check and come back to you.

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, point of order: on this line of questioning around policy, the director-general has already been clear that the policy was changed prior to her commencing and they keep persisting with argumentative questions around that policy.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Speaker: just because the question relates to policy, the policy is directly relevant to expenditure. This is entirely relevant to the expenditure of this portfolio.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my understanding is—and never has been—the members of the panel do not get paid.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I ask the member for Gaven to reference the relevant SDS section from which she is asking her questions.

Mr SPEAKER: There are two things. It is not a requirement to quote the page of the SDS despite a widely held belief. It is really up to the member for Gaven how she uses her time for questions.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, it is the case that after the examples that I just referenced were in fact removed that the new policy now expressly includes the reference 'current or former Executive in the Justice portfolio', which was not in the former policy; correct?

Ms Cruickshank: I cannot speak to what was in the former policy, I am afraid. I do now have a copy of what is on the website, which I am just looking at.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I put it to you that that is the case and I have provided you with two copies of both the former policy and the current policy.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, the director-general has provided an answer. You are now bordering on being argumentative. Do you have another question?

Ms SCANLON: I do, thank you, Speaker. Director-General, has there ever been a serving director-general who has sat on the panel?

Ms Cruickshank: I cannot answer that, I am sorry.

Ms SCANLON: Are you able to come back to the committee with that information?

Ms Cruickshank: I suspect it predates not only my time but also previous administrations so I am not sure I can, actually.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the protocol states, 'The panel shall be supported by a Secretariat within the Department of Justice'. Can you advise the committee how many meetings John Sosso has attended?

Ms Cruickshank: I actually cannot. I am afraid I have to refer the honourable member to my previous answer, which is that all these matters relating to appointments and who sits on what panels all sit very much at a ministerial or a cabinet level, not at my level.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, did the Department of Justice recommend any other directors-general to sit on the panel, including long-term public servant David Mackie or any other former or current DDG in the justice portfolio?

Ms Cruickshank: I am not aware of any recommendations to that effect, no.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order: you have ruled on this matter if not once then twice and the member is blatantly ignoring your ruling.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Speaker: I submit to you that the Attorney's commentary there is exactly the type of commentary that you instructed ministers and witnesses and members to avoid.

Mr SPEAKER: I will chair, thank you very much, member for Springwood. Do you have a point of relevance about the question? No. Member for Nanango, this question is just a little different so it is close to repetitive but it is not. As I have said, it is up to the member for Gaven as to what questions she wants to pursue.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the Attorney-General said in parliament that your department advised the appointment of the director-general of planning or the director-general of justice regarding the composition of the Redistribution Commission. Director-General, how many individuals or positions did the Department of Justice recommend for the position that was ultimately filled by John Sosso?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, I think I can help there. Again, obviously on that briefing process, whilst I am conscious it is probably straying into many areas around decisions that cabinet makes, I did take the time to actually look at that brief. I can confirm that the briefing advice that was provided to the Attorney-General back in, I think, mid-December last year, whilst it listed that there was the opportunity for the Attorney to consider either the director-general of the Department of Justice or the director-general of the department of planning, the only one we actually recommended in the brief was the head of the department of planning.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, was the department aware that Mr Sosso was involved in the Fitzgerald inquiry, comments made by Tony Fitzgerald himself that Mr Sosso was 'susceptible to influence' and that Mr Sosso was a member of the LNP and, for a short period before that, a member of the Labor Party?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I really question the line of questioning that is being provided and the relevance to this year's estimates process. Again, I would ask the member to outline how this is relevant to the budgetary process that we are here for today in relation to the estimates and if there is a reference again to the relevant SDS to provide some substantiation to the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: The Redistribution Commission comes under this portfolio so I ask the director-general to respond to the question, please.

Ms Cruickshank: Would it be okay if I ask the honourable member to repeat the question?

Ms SCANLON: Certainly. Director-General, was the department aware that Mr Sosso was involved in the Fitzgerald inquiry, comments made by Tony Fitzgerald himself that Mr Sosso was 'susceptible to influence' and that Mr Sosso was a member of the LNP and, for a short period before that, a member of the Labor Party?

Ms Cruickshank: I say this with the greatest of respect: I think that question is straying into you asking for some personal commentary on an individual, which is not the norm for anybody in the Public Service to provide so I certainly will not and my assumption is the people in the department who prepared that brief likewise would not have. I think they would have taken very seriously the advice that was being given to the Attorney-General about what would be the appropriate position that should sit on the electoral Redistribution Commission. Therefore, they looked at that and said, 'We recommend that the head of the department of planning be appointed.'

Ms SCANLON: I want to clarify that, Director-General. Are you telling me that it is the case that your department was not aware of that information?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is a disgraceful attack on a public servant. The member is asking the director-general for an opinion about what the department knew. It is not an appropriate question. This line of questioning attacking a public servant is disgraceful and disorderly.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the director-general has answered that question. Member for Gaven, next question please.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, as the director-general for the Minister for Integrity, has the department provided advice on the potential conflicts of interest that now arise with Mr John Sosso holding multiple positions within government, including being the director-general of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and being on the Judicial Appointment Advisory Panel, the redistribution panel, recruitment panels for jobs and any other panels that I have not specified?

Ms Cruickshank: I think the honourable member would be aware that I am not able to comment on the nature of advice that we provide to our ministers and every single one of those issues I think that you just listed would have been matters for cabinet—all those appointments.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, has Dr Linzi Wilson-Wilde been paid a termination benefit or payout?

Ms Cruickshank: I would refer you to the press release which announced that Dr Linzi Wilson-Wilde resigned from FSQ.

Ms SCANLON: I am aware of the media release. My question was: has Dr Wilson-Wilde been paid a termination benefit or payout? That information is not in the media release.

Ms Cruickshank: I am not at liberty to comment on something beyond what is in the press release.

Ms SCANLON: If you cannot say how much, can you please advise if Dr Wilson-Wilde has been paid more or less than she was entitled to under her contract?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the director-general is being harassed here. She has answered that question.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point of order. The director-general just answered that question. Member for Gaven, do you have another question?

Ms SCANLON: Yes, thank you, Speaker. Director-General, I table three documents. I want to take the director-general through some of those.

Mr SPEAKER: We will pause to let the director-general have a look at them before we ask questions.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, the first is an article in the *Courier-Mail* dated 28 April. This article contains the number of children charged, the number of matters lodged over a specific time period and a reference to sentences imposed by the court. Can you see that?

Ms Cruickshank: I am not being funny, but my eyesight is not that great. Would you be able to tell me roughly where in that article that is?

Ms SCANLON: Certainly, Director-General. Paragraph 2 outlines the number of individuals who were charged and, as I said, the number of matters that have been lodged. You can see the last half of that article refers to matters before the court and sentencing; correct?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, I think so. Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I ask you to look at the Facebook post by the Attorney-General, which was also on 28 April. It provides a percentage reduction in cases before our courts. That is what that says, isn't it?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You can read that.

Ms SCANLON: I did not ask the Attorney-General; I asked the director-general.

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, I can read that post. I would note that, coincidentally, this was the very first day I started at the Department of Justice. I did not notice any of these at the time, so thank you.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, this will be the last question before we do the swap-over.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I now take you to the transcript of a public briefing for the inquiry on 28 April. I have highlighted where the director-general of the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support said—

Frankly, if people ask questions we try to provide as much data as we can.

I note even today's *Courier-Mail* has data that has been released, presumably by the Attorney-General, so the director-general of the Department of Justice would be the appropriate officer.

That is what that says, isn't it?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, that is what I am reading in front of me.

Mr SPEAKER: We will swap over and come back. I will go to the member for Nicklin for the first question from the government.

Mr HUNT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I note there was no mention of Mike Kaiser in that little session, but we will move on. Attorney-General, I refer to your opening statement and the two reports you have tabled in the House about the operation of the Forensic Science Queensland laboratory. Noting the department's strategic objectives and key deliverables, can you provide more information about the government's next step?

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, I remind members there is to be no commentary or preamble before questions.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: This is such an important question. As I said in my opening statement, Labor's DNA debacle is one of the greatest failures of the justice system in the world. This is the mess that our government has inherited from Labor. Let's remember the victims: each and every one of them has been let down by the former government. Nothing underscores this more than the DNA review report of Dr Kirsty Wright, which was released yesterday, and the new report by world-renowned former FBI expert and geneticist Dr Bruce Budowle which I have tabled today. I want to start by thanking Dr Wright for the hard work and dedication she has put into this issue, at much personal sacrifice, for many years. I thank Dr Budowle and his team for their efforts in this space. Both reviewers were supported by their experienced teams, who have made extremely valuable contributions throughout this process.

The approach that our government has taken to this issue is in stark contrast to that of the former government. That is evidenced by the fact that 10 business days after receiving the reports I have already tabled them, I have begun to consider the recommendations and, indeed, I have already acted upon some of the recommendations. We are serious about the next steps required to clean up Labor's mess. As you will see from the reports, both reviewers have recommended the ongoing involvement of a special advisers team of experts to lead FSQ through this period of major change and oversee the implementation of the review recommendations going forward. The government has accepted this recommendation as a priority, and we have already acted and appointed former New South Wales police commissioner Mick Fuller AO to lead the team. In his time as commissioner, Mr Fuller transformed the New South Wales Police and led over 20,000 employees with distinction. He brings immense leadership experience to this role, with an understanding of the important role that forensic science plays in our criminal justice system. I am also pleased that both Dr Wright and Dr Budowle will continue to provide their expert scientific support and advice as part of the team. The team will ensure the needs of stakeholders and, in particular, victims—who were completely left out by the former government—as well as the needs of the Queensland Police Service and the Office of the DPP are met and heard throughout this entire process.

The importance of Dr Budowle's report, which has been tabled today, is that it has shone a light on the organisational problems and toxic culture which have plagued FSQ for years. The Budowle review has uncovered: a troubling amount of environmental contamination within the lab, along with sample contamination that, once raised by the review team, led to a full pause in routine testing at FSQ; calculation errors with kinship and paternity tests dating back several years, with errors never disclosed by the former government; evidence from police that FSQ's significant delays and backlogs are having a considerable negative impact on active investigations and public safety; and a workplace culture at FSQ that appeared to the review team to be 'quite toxic', with management at all levels appearing to operate in a reactive, crisis management mode.

There are 32 recommendations between the two reports which the Crisafulli government will consider in the coming weeks and months, and they will be prioritised in consultation with the expert team. Since coming to office, we have exposed more and more concerning problems in the wake of Labor's DNA debacle, but I want Queenslanders to know we will fix the mess we have inherited so confidence in our DNA testing services can be restored.

Mr HUNT: I have a follow-up question for the Attorney-General. Can you provide more information about the history of these failures at the FSQ lab? How did these concerns come to light, and how were they handled at the time?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is important that we get to the bottom of where the fault lies. It lies squarely and firmly at the feet of the former Labor government. It was their denial and distrust of experts. Former health ministers and former attorneys-general all denied the facts and believed that the opposition and experts were scaremongering.

We engaged Dr Kirsty Wright—a very well respected forensic scientist—within the first seven days of coming to office to conduct this review. It was Dr Wright who first raised the alarm on the significant failures at the lab through the tragic story of Shandee Blackburn. She was brave enough to speak up because she understood the impact they would have on victims. Here, I want to acknowledge Vicki Blackburn and her family for what they have been through. When these reports were first published, they alarmed everyone. They alarmed us. We were in opposition at the time, so we pressed the then government to act immediately on the concerns Dr Wright had raised and to let victims know how they were responding. At the end of 2021 we were asking questions of the then government in question time. That was when they responded that we were politically scaremongering. In fact, the first time we raised this in parliament, the former premier had the hide to blame the former LNP government from seven years earlier. No responsibility was ever taken by the former Labor government. No serious action was taken. It took six months of us and other brave victims and advocates like Vicki Blackburn urging action before they even bothered to set up an inquiry.

When we were elected on a promise to fix Labor's DNA debacle it had been three years and two inquiries after the concerns about FSQ were first raised. My incoming government brief confirmed to me that we were no closer to having these serious issues at the lab resolved. That is why we immediately commissioned the FSQ review. Throughout this process we have been open and transparent with Queenslanders with what we have found. What these reports tell us is that Labor's reforms only pushed out testing delays even further. As every victim of crime knows, justice delayed is justice denied. Queenslanders now know that they have a government that cares about victims and cares about faster access to justice. Our actions speak louder than words.

Ms MARR: My question is to the Attorney-General. I note on page 25 of Budget Paper 4 that the 2025-26 budget includes \$48.8 million over five years and \$2.2 million ongoing to deliver extra resourcing for Queensland's justice system to support the implementation of the Making Queensland Safer Laws. Can you please provide the committee with an update on the implementation of these laws?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The member for Thuringowa is someone who is living and breathing Labor's crime crisis in Townsville. I want to thank the member for Thuringowa for her hard work and advocacy, along with other members around Townsville and in Townsville, and for what they have had to put up with after a decade of Labor's crime crisis. It is pleasing to know that you are interested in making Queensland safer. We are a government that is not playing politics with victims but ensuring that we do what we said we were going to do, and that is make Queensland safer. Member for Thuringowa, I know we have a lot more work to do. As a government we are well aware of that each and every day, but we cannot and will not sit by and let Labor's crime crisis continue.

This budget does lay the foundation for a fresh start. That means putting significant investment into the issues that have been left behind by the former Labor government. We need to provide our justice system with the resources they deserve—those long overdue resources for our courts—and, in particular, more support for victims.

We all know that Labor watered down the Youth Justice Act in 2015. They reinstated the principle of detention as a last resort for dangerous young offenders. It sent a message to not just the member's community but all communities. I acknowledge the member for Capalaba, who sits beside you. There is no greater advocate of victims in this parliament. Everyone has their own story, but there is no greater advocate for victims than the member for Capalaba who has the wherewithal to stand up, speak and make change. Thank you for that, member for Capalaba. You know that it has triggered a generation of young criminals who knew that when they fronted up before a magistrate there would be no consequences for actions and they would be back on the streets in no time to terrorise communities across Queensland, just like what is happening in Townsville.

We have delivered on one of our key election commitments. That is having the first tranche of the Making Queensland Safer Laws in place by Christmas. We did what we said we were going to do. We have moved on to the second tranche. Detention as a last resort has been removed. Children who commit these offences are liable to the same maximum and minimum mandatory penalties as adults for those 33 Adult Crime, Adult Time offences.

I am pleased to share with the committee some early insights. Just six months after the first tranche became law, firstly and perhaps most importantly, the reforms are targeting prolific offenders just as we intended them to do. Of the 1,050 young people with ACAT offences in court, around one-third of them were charged with 70 per cent of all ACAT offences lodged. Nearly half of all juveniles sentenced for an Adult Crime, Adult Time offence are now spending time remanded in custody before their case is finalised, with detention orders being handed down more frequently and for longer periods. There has been a 28 per cent reduction in the number of charges lodged for Adult Crime, Adult Time offences, showing that young offenders are getting the message and are being kept off our streets.

Since detention as a last resort was removed we are starting to see more young people sentenced to more intensive sentences like detention and probation, with a corresponding drop in less intensive sentences like good behaviour orders and community service orders. The first six months of data has also revealed a significant drop for the most prevalent offences, including enter premises with intent, unlawful use of motor vehicle and burglary.

We always knew it would be a huge job. As I keep saying, there is more work to be done. It is important Queenslanders know that is not the end. There is more work to do and we will continue to do that work.

Mr FIELD: My question is to the Attorney-General. Page 27 of Budget Paper 4 notes that the funding for the victim liaison service is being provided to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions as part of a \$25 million package to enhance service delivery and bolster support for victims of crime. Could you elaborate on what this budget measure is about?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The Leader of the Opposition could not even mention victims of crime in his budget reply speech. As I said before, there is no greater advocate for victims than the member. I am quite sure that, had that support been bolstered, the member for Capalaba would have loved to have had the support of the victim liaison service through the DPP when going through his matters that have been well articulated in this parliament.

The other day I was up in Cairns and it was lovely to meet two of the victim liaison officers at the Cairns DPP. I thank the Cairns DPP for welcoming me so nicely when I visited. It was great. I met two young women. I hope one of them is listening because she is probably about my age and she would laugh if she thought, like me, she was being called young. She has worked in the system for a long time in the Department of Justice. I am finding across the state that so many people spend a great deal of their working life working for the Department of Justice.

I met two victim liaison officers at the Cairns DPP office. They remarked that the role is extremely challenging but extremely rewarding. The extra funding that the member talks about to victim liaison officers was one of our first announcements. We understand—and no-one greater than the member—the issues that you are confronted with such as delays in the justice system and problems with getting your matter heard. It is important to have that victim liaison. I also note that it helps them navigate the justice system.

When we came to government, the victim liaison service was facing a huge funding cliff due to the former Labor government. In fact, because of the former Labor government and how they left the budget in absolute dire straits, 18 FTEs were set to lose their jobs if Labor got in again, if you can believe that. They would have lost their jobs on 30 June if we had not stepped in and funded that victim liaison service—a much needed service, I would suggest to you. We are a government that is focused on victims. We are a government that is focused on faster access to justice. We are a government that is ensuring that we can put building blocks back in place so the justice system can be restored in this place.

Under the former Labor government, 18 frontline staff would not have been able to support vulnerable victims of crime. We have taken the decision to reprioritise and make sure that the victim liaison service remains on foot. Victims are a priority for our government. The funding cliff that this vital service was faced with shows the clear difference between the way the Crisafulli government treats victims and how victims were treated—not just in the DNA debacle; of course, I have been talking about the DNA debacle—by the former government. They did not bother to have extended funding for the

victim liaison service. It would take your breath away. I note that the hardworking victim liaison service officers were also explaining that if they are overworked with the number of victims they are now trying to assist there is a hotline they can call, and they said that that was very helpful.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go back to non-government questions.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I want to take you back to those three documents tabled where you confirmed that the *Courier-Mail* had access to the number of children charged, matters lodged and reference to sentences imposed and that the percentage reduction in cases was in fact published by the Attorney-General on her Facebook page. Director-General, given advice by Mr Gee in that last document I tabled, will you provide this committee with the figures asked for in questions on notice 3, 4 and 5?

Ms Cruickshank: I am double-checking what it was that Mr Gee referred to. Yes, I believe I can. I do have the latest figures from our courts data. I would probably offer one caveat, which is that there are obviously a number of cases still working their way through the system. To the extent that this data that I am sharing is at a point in time, I think that is a helpful context for people to have.

I can give you the updated figures as at 30 June 2025. There have been more than 5,800 charges under the Making Queensland Safer Laws that have been lodged with the Childrens Court. The top three offence categories, which represent 85 per cent of those Making Queensland Safer charges, are, in order, unlawful use of a motor vehicle, entering premises and burglary. More than 30 per cent of all of the cases going through the Childrens Court contain at least one of the Making Queensland Safer offences. Compared to the same period in the previous year, there has been a 26 per cent reduction in the number of charges for Adult Crime, Adult Time offences lodged with the courts.

Of the approximately 1,250 individual young people charged with Making Queensland Safer offences in court, around one-third of these individuals were charged with 70 per cent of all Making Queensland Safer offences lodged. I share that because it is relevant in that our observation, notwithstanding my earlier comments about it being still early days yet, is that it would appear that the reforms are working to target prolific offenders. That is a positive sign.

Young people charged with relevant offences are more likely to be refused bail than young people charged with other offences. DoJ also have identified that police are diverting fewer offences committed by young people as compared to the previous year. Broadly, my observation would be consistent with the government's policy intent.

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the Attorney-General. You can understand my confusion, clearly, given court information in fact was available to the Attorney-General when the opposition asked those questions on notice yet it was not provided to the opposition. What does the data say that the Crisafulli government does not want to tell Queenslanders, given you refused to answer those questions?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: that is argumentative.

Mr SPEAKER: That is valid. Member for Gaven, you were going well but there was a clear imputation towards the end of that question. It is argumentative as well. I ask you to rephrase the question.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy to rephrase. My question is to the Attorney-General. Why did the Attorney-General not provide that information to the opposition when we asked questions on notice when clearly that data was available to her?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I do understand the confusion by the shadow attorney-general, who appears quite confused around the fact that victims of crime in this state are now being listened to and about the fact that crime, whilst it has a long way to go, is going down. Victims of crime are down across the state 5.7 per cent; stolen cars down 6.4 per cent; robberies down 13.2 per cent; break-ins per population down 12 per cent. I understand the confusion because it is not working in the way that the former Labor government wanted it to work. They were happy for more and more victims. They were happy for these kids not to be looked after through the education system.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker, on relevance: I asked why that information had not been provided.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Attorney-General is being responsive to the question as asked by the member. She is barely into her response. I submit to you that she be allowed to finish. The member for Gaven might not like the answer, but the answer is being given.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister is being relevant. Attorney-General, you clearly heard the question.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I did. I should have asked the member what question on notice she refers to.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, can you give some clarity around that?

Ms SCANLON: I am more than happy to provide that clarification—questions on notice 3, 4 and 5.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The other confusion that the former minister would have—if you were part of a government that did not work together and provided silos, I could understand the confusion. It is important to note that the Crisafulli government is focused on victims of crime.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker, on relevance: I take the question as answered and am happy to move on.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would like to finish the answer because I am getting to the point of the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I would ask you to be relevant to the question.

Mr HUNT: They do not like the answer.

Mr SPEAKER: I will do the chairing. Thank you, member for Nicklin. I will go back to the Attorney-General to round out her reply.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about this. Clearly, the former minister heard my answers where I talked about the Youth Justice Act sitting under the Minister for Youth Justice. The Crisafulli government are working very well together. I am meeting with the Minister for Police, the Minister for Youth Justice and the Minister for Communities. Of course, there are important issues that have arisen around the health system and the education system. I can understand the confusion about working together—

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker, on relevance.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—but I really look forward to those meetings that we have together to discuss the increase in crime under the former government and the decrease under us.

Mr SPEAKER: We have a point of order. Member for Gaven?

Ms SCANLON: Mr Speaker, my question was very clear. I will take that question as being answered and I will be writing to the committee about this matter of the Attorney-General misleading the House.

Mr SPEAKER: That is your right. Do you have anything more to add?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am happy to add. I am just having a quick look at these questions on notice. I do not want the member to have misled. It is tough in opposition. It is really clear that the answer to question on notice No. 4 states—

These statistics are reported on an annual basis in the *Childrens Court of Queensland Annual Report*. The Childrens Court of Queensland Annual Report 2024-25 will be tabled in Parliament according to legislated timeframes.

That is normal practice. That is question on notice No. 4. The answer to question on notice No. 3 states—

These statistics are reported on an annual basis in the *Childrens Court of Queensland Annual Report*.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker, on relevance: I take the question as answered.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I am taking a point of order at the moment.

Mr HUNT: My point of order is on the point of order.

Ms SCANLON: I take the question as answered. The Attorney-General is now reading questions on notice we have all read and I would like us to move on.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, the member said she was going to write to the committee. I would like to help the committee.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the question was quite broad and referenced questions on notice. The Attorney is being responsive. I am interested to hear her answer. The member may not like the answer because it is embarrassing the former government; however, she asked it and I am wanting to hear it.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the Attorney has answered it, so I think we will move on.

Ms SCANLON: My next question is to the Queensland Ombudsman. I refer to page 73 of the SDS with respect to inspectorate staff. In your publicly funded role as Inspector of Detention Services, can you advise if your office received any modelling in relation to youth justice detention centre capacity since the passing of the Adult Crime, Adult Time laws?

Mr Reilly: No.

Ms SCANLON: Ombudsman, on 19 February 2025 you stated to this committee in relation to the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre—

... it is often harder for the children to access the school and other programs at Cleveland because the staffing problems mean they cannot get out of their cells as often as the young people in Brisbane do.

Ombudsman, in your role as Inspector of Detention Services, paid for by the budget, are you aware if there have been staffing shortages this year when night mode has been activated?

Mr Reilly: I do not have current information about that that I am able to provide at this hearing. We are currently completing our report on the three youth detention centres and it will be published later this year.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order: I would like to refer to the member that that sits in the corrections portfolio and that will be heard by this committee this afternoon.

Mr SPEAKER: Mr Reilly, in your role as Ombudsman I am sure you know what comes under your corrections portfolio. I will allow you to navigate your way through there. You will be conscious of that.

Mr RUSSO: My question is to the director-general. Director-General, how much money was spent on the Queensland Law Reform Commission's review of mining lease objections that commenced on 5 June 2023?

Mr Cruickshank: I may need to look that up. I am sorry, I do not have the answer but I am sure I can get it for you.

Mr SPEAKER: Will you come back before the end of the hearing with that?

Ms Cruickshank: I am sure I can. I am assuming it is staff related.

Mr RUSSO: My next question is to the director-general. Director-General, with respect to page 9 of the SDS regarding staffing, have any public servants in your department been asked to sign non-disclosure agreements on the termination of their employment?

Ms Cruickshank: Not that I am aware of at all. May I add one extra thing, if it is okay? I also have not had any ongoing staff terminated. I might be missing something, but I have not had anybody whom we have terminated who is ongoing.

Mr de BRENNI: I refer to schedule 8, section 10 of the standing rules and orders. It states—

If public service employees are unable or unwilling to answer questions or provide information, they should advise the committee accordingly and provide reasons.

With that in mind, I ask: did Linzi Wilson-Wilde receive a termination benefit or any other payment upon her departure from FSQ?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: I believe the question that is being asked by the member for Springwood has already been answered by the member earlier in this session.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, point of order: the code of practice for Public Service employees appearing before these hearings and other hearings clearly indicates that if the Public Service employee, in this case the director-general, is unable or unwilling to answer questions or provide information they should advise us accordingly—I accept she has done that—but must also provide reasons.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: I would submit to you that in the point of order that has just been raised there is a supposition with respect to some of the content in the question. Again I would submit to you there was an earlier response to the question as asked and the director-general provided a response.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, I think you stated earlier that the person resigned. I think you have answered this, have you not?

Ms Cruickshank: I did.

Mr de BRENNI: Director-General, I ask why you are not at liberty to comment on what Dr Wilson-Wilde was paid at the end of her employment at FSQ.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: I would submit to you that, with respect to the question from the member for Springwood, there is a question that is being asked of the director-general—

Mr de BRENNI: That is what we are here for. Asking questions is the job.

Dr ROWAN:—an opinion is being sought, and perhaps it may need to be rephrased.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, point of order: I am not disputing what the director-general has said. What I asked was why she is not at liberty to comment on what Dr Wilson-Wilde was paid at the end of her employment with FSQ. I am not asking about the reasons. I am asking about why she is not at liberty to comment about it.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, you can answer this as you will.

Ms Cruickshank: I will do my best. I am not sure what else I can add. The reality is Dr Linzi Wilson-Wilde resigned. I am sure she would have been paid whatever she was eligible for as a public servant upon her resignation. I will say two things to the member. I am obviously very, very aware of what my obligations are in front of this committee, and I do not want anybody to think I am deliberately trying to mislead them. I am not. These are matters related to employer/employee. They are not the sorts of things that would be aired here. Dr Linzi Wilson-Wilde resigned from FSQ.

Mr de BRENNI: Director-General, is that because you have signed a non-disclosure agreement preventing you from confirming a termination payment?

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, point of order.

Ms Cruickshank: No. I also have nothing further to add to this line of questioning.

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, this line of questioning is harassing the director-general. It is disrespectful. The director-general is being responsive. I think this is bordering on disorderly.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, point of order: that is not a point of order.

Mr HUNT: He is being argumentative; that is my point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: You are both being argumentative. I will chair this. Member for Gaven, do you have another question?

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the minister. Minister, can you advise how much money has been spent by the state in legal proceedings relating to the pause on the use of stage 1 and stage 2 hormone therapies on children in Queensland Health facilities?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am quite sure that the member would be well aware that, first of all, any matters that go to a legal proceeding before the courts I am not going to be commenting on. The other thing is that it is very clear that this question is for the health minister.

Ms SCANLON: I refer to page 1 of the SDS: the functions of the department are to deliver 'government services that work for Queensland'. Minister, Crown Law would have access to that information given they are involved in proceedings. The opposition can lodge an RTI and wait a matter of weeks, but my question to you is—and I appreciate you may not have that information to hand—are you able to get that information for the committee before the end of the hearing or, if not, take that on notice?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I would again submit that the member has just gone to the front page of the SDS to try to grapple with the reason why her question is even relevant to this portfolio. The member refers to Crown Law. I want to thank the hardworking staff at Crown Law for what they do. I know that they do difficult work. They are incredible public servants. The Crisafulli government is very pleased to say that we are doing exactly what we said we were going to do, and that is respect our public servants.

It is really interesting. I have had the opportunity to have a look at how the former Labor government treated public servants, and we are seeing that again on display today. I would say to the honourable member to ask the health minister.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, it was revealed by the opposition at estimates last week that the husband of Assistant Minister Amanda Stoker is the company secretary of two companies linked with the Queen's Wharf project. Has your department had any communication with Assistant Minister Amanda Stoker about Star casino or the Queen's Wharf precinct?

Ms Cruickshank: I do not believe we have, no.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to government members for questions.

Mr HUNT: Attorney-General, in relation to page 104 of Budget Paper 4, could you please provide information on what the \$18.8 million funding uplift will deliver for courthouses across Queensland and what this means for domestic and family violence victims?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am glad to have been asked this question because this is something that is very close to my heart and close to a lot of people's hearts. It is very important to have this in place that helps victims of domestic and family violence navigate their way through the extraordinarily difficult time in the court system. In a past life, I certainly appreciated the angst they went through and I enjoyed being able to assist those people through the system.

I note for the committee's benefit that my charter letter from the Premier asked me to continue the rollout of DV courts and work with my colleagues, including Minister Camm, to continue the implementation of the outstanding recommendations from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. Mr Speaker, I would put it to you that, even if it was not in my charter letter, the rolling out of those courts is something I would have done.

Back in the 2022-23 budget, the former government announced that they were going to accommodate DFV courthouse improvements, but then—here is the thing—they just forgot to put the money in the budget. Shortly after being sworn in as Attorney-General, I was briefed on many funding cliffs, and I have already mentioned a few to the committee here today. How distressing is it to think that the former government put out a public press release and would have stood up in parliament and gone out around the state saying, 'This is what we're going to do for DFV victims,' but then they just did not do it. I was briefed about the serious funding cliff the DFV Courthouse Improvement Program faced because the former government simply did not allocate enough money in the budget to deliver the program. This is just astounding.

I was told that Labor's funding shortfall meant that the Maroochydore, Rockhampton and Mackay courthouses would not receive any of those service upgrades as promised. It is yet another example of poor budget management and historic underinvestment in the justice system that has characterised the 'Labornomics' from 10 years on the treasury benches. Magistrates courts are a significant touchpoint for many domestic and family violence victims. Between July 2024 and May this year alone, these three magistrates courts have seen: in the Maroochydore Magistrates Court, 787 DVO applications and more than 1,410 charges of contravening a DVO; in the Rockhampton Magistrates Court, 786 DVO applications and, distressingly, 2,286 charges of contravening a DVO; and in the Mackay Magistrates Court, 755 DVO applications and almost 1,000 charges of contravening a DVO.

It is unacceptable to me that the former government could go out there and say something but then not follow up. Imagine if you were a DFV victim in Maroochydore, Rockhampton or Mackay. How would you feel? It is quite gobsmacking. In our first budget, we are delivering an \$18.8 million funding uplift to the DFV Courthouse Improvement Program. It will also guarantee that upgrades in the Cairns courthouse, the Toowoomba courthouse and the Brisbane Magistrates Court can be delivered as promised.

I had the pleasure of being in Mackay recently and was able to tour the Mackay courthouse. I had a great time—they had such a beautiful morning tea—so I thank the incredibly hardworking staff in Mackay whom I was able to talk to. I met the new registrar who was heading out to Longreach, I think, but he was doing his training in Mackay. I hope to get out there and see him soon. I also got to talk to the judiciary, particularly the magistrates, about what those safety upgrades will mean for victims when they are attending court. Our government's funding will deliver: a new dedicated DFV safe room with direct access to an existing courtroom; reconfiguration of the registry to accommodate the safe room due to limited space; and security entry upgrades to improve traffic flow and overall safety across the site. Designs for the project are currently being developed, with construction scheduled to hopefully be completed by early 2027.

Domestic and family violence victims should feel safe when fronting their abusers in court. The Crisafulli government said we would be putting victims first, and that is exactly what this funding uplift will be doing.

Ms MARR: Attorney-General, I am interested in some more information about the Department of Justice's capital program, specifically the measures on pages 104 and 105 of Budget Paper 4 in relation to strategic land acquisition and the infrastructure upgrades in Townsville and Brisbane. Could you please provide some more details on these measures?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am not sure there is enough time for me to get all of this out. I am really pleased about our first budget, with the \$43.5 million increase to the department's capital expenditure. In total, \$74.8 million has been budgeted for upgraded court infrastructure. I have really enjoyed getting

around the state and going into our courthouses and visiting with the staff and the judiciary. It has been incredible. I think on last count I am up to 18 courthouses and, member for Thuringowa, I have visited yours a couple of times.

We know that the former government historically underinvested in the justice system, and courthouses across Queensland have been operating at an overcapacity for too long. Very little strategic planning was undertaken by the former government. My incoming government briefings from the department and early budget prep meetings highlighted to me that this was a justice system that was struggling to cope with the increased demand it was facing due to Labor's crime crisis.

Despite many budgetary pressures and Labor's funding cliffs that we have inherited, we have prioritised initiatives that really do put victims at the heart of the justice system. We are also respecting and treating the courthouse staff with the decency they deserve with safe workplaces. On that I will say that as I get around I always make an effort to ensure I thank the security staff as well. The increase in security issues at courthouses is quite distressing for staff. Those security men and women do an incredible job and I thank them for that.

Importantly, this budget includes \$15 million over two years for land acquisition in Townsville—I know it is much needed—and Beenleigh. Go figure. You would have thought a former attorney-general—maybe the member for Waterford—would have considered investing in that important part of Brisbane. I went to that courthouse and it is quite incredible. It is like a rabbit warren; I think that is the best way to describe it. I thank all of the staff there. Talk about a nice morning tea; it was pretty amazing there, too. I am going to have to stop with the morning teas.

I want to give a quick shout-out. I visited three courthouses in my first week. One of them was Beenleigh, but the first was Kingaroy in the mighty electorate of Nanango. It would not be an estimates if I did not give my electorate of Nanango a good shout-out.

There is so much more I could say to you about the capital infrastructure uplifts that we are giving to the courts in this great state. It has been long overdue. It all goes to prioritising our victims' faster access for justice, and that is exactly what the Crisafulli government is aiming to achieve.

Mr FIELD: Attorney-General, in relation to page 24 of Budget Paper No. 4, can you explain the agreement Queensland has with the Commonwealth to fund the legal assistance sector, including how much Commonwealth funding Queensland receives?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Talk about coming in as a new minister and getting briefed about funding cliffs! I tell this story—I told it at the conference—I talk about this all the time because I still cannot believe it—I actually cannot believe it—and thank goodness the Crisafulli government came to government at the end of last year. This question goes to the heart of talking about the National Access to Justice Partnership and the incredibly important role that the legal assistance sector plays in our justice system in Queensland. I am so proud of this funding uplift that our government delivered for the legal assistance sector, particularly because of what it has meant for the sector and what it has meant for victims—what it has meant for that end of the sector that do such hard, grunt work.

I want to give a little bit of context here first for the three people who are probably listening online to this estimates—and I know one of them is not my daughter, Lucy, because she just tried to call me—they have a habit of doing that; I have to tell them about parliament. One of the first briefings I had was about this issue, and one of the terms of the agreement under the National Access to Justice Partnership negotiations that the former government signed Queensland up for was that the state of Queensland must maintain the current level of effort and investment in real terms over the life of the agreement, including any specific subsector.

The problem for Queensland was that the former government did not keep up to that agreement. They did not maintain that current funding. In fact, I had to immediately pick up the phone to the Premier. For me to go to my first SCAG—Standing Council of Attorneys-General—and ensure that we could unlock the \$800 million of federal government funding, we needed to find an extra \$142 million immediately. So, one of my first calls—I think I had a few more on this—to the Premier was to say, 'You will not believe what the former government has done. Talk about budget black holes!' The former Labor government just did not fund the people who require the most amount of assistance in the legal sector.

I had to call the Premier. We had to have an urgent CBRC meeting with the Treasurer and the Premier, to talk about the importance of community legal centres, Legal Aid Services, and domestic and family violence legal services. All of those people are already stretched. The former government was so out of touch and forgot that end of the sector. Even with this funding, I can tell you they will still say they are chronically underfunded, which is what happens in that sector. The Crisafulli government values them. We ensured that that funding was secured so we could reach that agreement.

I have travelled across the state. I have spoken with many community legal centres, I have spoken with Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander legal services and legal officers, and I have heard from them directly what this funding certainty has meant for the frontline workers.

I shared a few of those stories when I spoke at this year's Community Legal Centres Conference. Importantly, it has meant that these vitally important services from across our state that are already stretched can plan services, they can reach more vulnerable clients and they can offer employment certainty for their workers. This is the certainty that they needed, but they just did not get it from the former Labor government. We will never shy away from our responsibility to ensure essential legal services have support, the resources and, importantly, the funding they need to operate and help those vulnerable Queenslanders.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to non-government members. Member for Gaven.

Ms SCANLON: Director General, given the cabinet document has not been proactively released regarding the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, can you advise when your department provided drafting instructions to OQPC regarding the bill, was it before or after I raised it in the media?

Ms Cruickshank: Unfortunately, honourable member, I cannot provide that kind of advice to you. Any advice that we gave within the department would have been given for the purposes of cabinet consideration and would have been related to that.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Speaker.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am more than happy to answer that, Mr Speaker, given how long it takes to get a brief up to cabinet. Maybe the former minister did it differently.

Mr SPEAKER: No, the question was not for you, Attorney-General. Member for Moggill, did you have something?

Dr ROWAN: My point of order is the member for Gaven has been a longstanding member and a former minister, so she would understand the processes in relation to—

Mr SPEAKER: No.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, in respect of your department's role in advising the first law officer of the state, have you or your department seen the advice from the Expert Legal Panel?

Ms Cruickshank: Again, I probably would refer to my previous answer, but the extra I would add to that for the honourable member is that my understanding is the Expert Legal Panel sits in a different portfolio these days.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Has always.

Ms Cruickshank: Has always. Apologies, I have forgotten whether or not it is Minister Camm or Minister Gerber.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Minister Gerber will be here this afternoon.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I appreciate your response. I do want to draw your attention, though, to SDS page 1 which outlines the department's strategic objectives, including community safety, faster access to justice, support and transparency for victims of crime. The Attorney-General also just referred to the Making Queensland Safer laws in her opening remarks. I want to be really clear, my previous question was not asking you to disclose the expert legal advice. I simply ask can you inform the committee whether or not you have witnessed any of that advice from the Expert Legal Panel?

Ms Cruickshank: No, I have not because it is an issue for Minister Gerber.

Ms SCANLON: My next question is for the Electoral Commission. Assistant Commissioner, over the last year, have you or anyone in the ECQ been in discussion, briefed or advised with the minister, her office, any member of the Crisafulli government or the department about the consideration of changes to Queensland electoral laws?

Mr Lewis: It is a matter of common discussion between our department and the Department of Justice and the Department of Local Government as well to talk about potential changes to electoral legislation, so, yes, we do have those officer-level discussions frequently.

Ms SCANLON: I appreciate that, Assistant Commissioner. Were any of those conversations in respect of the current cap on donations?

Mr Lewis: Not to my knowledge, member.

Ms SCANLON: Were any of those conversations in relation to the disclosure threshold?

Mr Lewis: Not that I am aware of either.

Ms SCANLON: Assistant Commissioner, how about in relation to photo ID requirements?

Mr Lewis: No conversations around that, member.

Ms SCANLON: Assistant Commissioner, were any conversations had in respect of any changes to the prohibition of developer donations?

Mr Lewis: We have not had any conversations around those either.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, has the Department of Justice provided any advice to the Attorney-General regarding changes to the electoral laws and, if so, what?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will defer to Dr Rowan.

Dr ROWAN: I raise a point of order in relation to these policy questions and whether they should be directed to the Attorney-General.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: We only have seconds left. I will allow the director-general to answer the question.

Ms Cruickshank: I will be mercifully short. As with the previous questions that I have been asked, it obviously falls into the category of advice we may have provided to the Attorney-General for the purpose of cabinet consideration.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, since the election of the Crisafulli government, can you advise how much the department spent on briefing women barristers and what percentage of the value of all brief fees that represents?

Ms Cruickshank: I actually cannot off the top of my head, but I will find some information for you.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you.

Mr SPEAKER: The committee will now adjourn for a short break. The hearing will resume at 10.45 am.

Proceedings suspended from 10.30 am to 10.45 am.



Mr SPEAKER: Welcome back, Attorney-General and officials. The committee will now resume its examination of the proposed expenditure of portfolio areas of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity until 12.15 pm. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

I will go back to non-government members for questions.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, the Coaldrake review stated—

It is a commonsense proposition that citizens are likely to have more trust in their governments if they know that decisions that use taxpayers' funds, and that may affect their lives quite directly, are made in the open, and are subject to scrutiny.

Given there are a number of cabinet submissions which have not been publicly released—including the final ATI submission for the Making Queensland Safer Laws introduced by the Attorney-General—can the director-general advise why these final decision documents of cabinet have not been released?

Dr ROWAN: I raise a point of order, Mr Speaker, in relation to those processes. The member for Algester, as a former minister, would understand the processes that are undertaken by cabinet and the release of information and, therefore, I would submit to you that this question is not in order.

Ms ENOCH: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the director-general is more than capable of giving a response to the question.

Ms Cruickshank: Thank you, Speaker. I am not quite sure I can add very much—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I thank the shadow minister very much for her question to the director-general; however, that question should have been asked of the director-general of DPC on Tuesday.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: to the Attorney's point of order, the SDS clearly outlines the role of the Department of Justice to maintain confidence and integrity in our system of government and, therefore, the question is relevant to these proceedings today.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, I asked you for a response and you have provided a response, but do you have anything further to add?

Ms Cruickshank: I was simply going to add that matters relating to cabinet, particularly around proactive release, are all matters for cabinet—not for me.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, so you confirm that it is the minister who determines whether a cabinet document should be classed as secret or restricted—yes?

Ms Cruickshank: No, I do not think so. Consistent with the Attorney-General's comment, I suspect that is done by the cabinet secretary in DPC.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Algeester, I would ask you to make your questions relevant to the director-general's role.

Ms ENOCH: Minister, I am advised that, of the 27 bills introduced, there have only been about 13 final cabinet submissions released. I table the list of final cabinet documents not released. Why is the government not releasing final cabinet submissions, particularly for bills such as the Making Queensland Safer Bill or the Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, both led by you? Minister, don't Queenslanders have a right to know?

Mr SPEAKER: Firstly, you will have to seek leave to table those documents.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I table those documents.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Springwood, you have sought leave. Leave is granted. Do you have one of those documents, Minister?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: No, I do not.

Mr SPEAKER: Can we get one to the Attorney-General, please?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am reviewing the document that I have just seen. I am not sure who that has been written by, but I will take it as read. I thank the member for the question, Mr Cabinet—Mr Speaker. Mr Cabinet? I say that probably because cabinet confidentiality is something we hold very highly, as we do integrity. Of course, the guidelines for the proactive release scheme are in the Cabinet Handbook. The guidelines have not changed since the former Miles government. Cabinet material released within a period of 30 business days is available on the public website. I am assuming that is where the minister got this from, but it is interesting. I note that the former Labor government did not release the Queensland Community Safety Bill 2024; they did not release the progressive coal royalties—that would have been an interesting one; and, fascinatingly, they also did not release the Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill 2024. It is incredible—

Ms ENOCH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: relevance. I was referring to a particular set of ATIs.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Attorney-General is being responsive; however, again, this questioning should have been prosecuted last Tuesday in relation to those matters that relate to the Cabinet Handbook and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. The Attorney-General is being responsive to the question as asked. There has been some latitude given; however, the question should have been posed last Tuesday.

Ms ENOCH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member is the Minister for Integrity. She referred to the Coaldrake report in her statement—she has it in front of her, actually—and her charter letter is very clear about driving a culture of accountability. I think this is entirely relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to allow the Attorney to continue. Is there anything you would like to add to your response before we go on?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for her question because I do have this incredible report that was commissioned by the former government into their own integrity scandals. It is called *Let the sunshine in: review of culture and accountability in the Queensland public sector* handed down on 28 June 2022 by Professor Peter Coaldrake AO. My goodness, I could have used lots of paragraphs but I was trying to find the one. I will read this one instead—

The unsteadiness of the public sector, and particularly the public service within it, has contributed to an atmosphere of fear. That fear has been—

Ms ENOCH: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I am happy to move on, due to the fact that the minister is unwilling to answer the question about why those submissions are not open.

Mr SPEAKER: I think in the interests of keeping the proceedings moving we will move on.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I have been asked a question. My understanding is that, as the minister, I am able to answer the question. Is that correct, Mr Speaker?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes. Do you have anything to add to round that out quickly?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I just was in the middle of a quote from Professor Coaldrake.

Mr SPEAKER: Finish that quote.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you. It said—

That fear has been of the unwanted impacts and loss of employment status for unwelcome advice. It has been contributed to by pressure from ministerial advisers—

this is referring to the former government—

that minimise problems, and discouragement from providing written advice about difficult topics. These are manifested in allegations of bullying and belittling, and the resulting or perceived isolation of 'difficult' people in the workplace.

Mr SPEAKER: Thanks, Attorney-General. I think we have strayed a bit. I am going to go to the member for Algeester for a question.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, I am just confirming that the security classifications on cabinet submissions outlines that the decision is made by a minister in consultation with the cabinet secretary regarding class A and class B secrets with class B being restricted. Of course, it is also clear in the Cabinet Handbook that it is the minister who decides it is class A. That is correct, isn't it?

Mr SPEAKER: Excuse me, member for Algeester. I am making a ruling here. Member for Algeester, so far I cannot see a question. That is a very, very long preamble. If you have a question would you please ask your question?

Ms ENOCH: Thank you, Mr Speaker for your guidance. That is correct, is it not?

Ms Cruickshank: My reference would have been the Cabinet Handbook, so if, as I understand, you are reading from the Cabinet Handbook, then yes.

Ms ENOCH: My next question is to the Integrity Commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: I will make the member for Algeester aware that we probably will have time for only one more question and then we will do the changeover.

Ms ENOCH: Integrity Commissioner, your functions are outlined in section 7 of the Integrity Act to provide advice to designated persons and to maintain the lobbying register. The Attorney-General's charter letter states—

Work closely with the Integrity Commissioner to set standards and procedures for respectful conduct between Members of Parliament, the Executive Government and the Public Service.

Integrity Commissioner, can you advise if your functions or scope of work has changed to now provide advice regarding procedures of how the public service and MPs engage with each other?

Ms Waugh: Yes, that is a particular responsibility the minister has in the charter letter. It does connect to me and that she is required to work closely with me. In relation to that particular responsibility I have indicated to her that I am doing some preliminary work on what that may look like.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go now to government members. I think the member for Moggill has a question.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the Attorney-General. Noting that your department will be assisting the upcoming commissions of inquiry including through the provision of legal advice as per page 5 of the Service Delivery Statements, could you provide the committee with some information about why the commission of inquiry into the CFMEU is so important for Queensland?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the honourable member for that very important question. As the member is aware, both of the commissions of inquiry that have been instigated by the Crisafulli government sit under the Department of Justice. This is an important question because for too long the CFMEU have been able to operate in the state with a blatant disregard for the law, undermining workplace safety, intimidating, bullying and harassing victims without consequences. That is why the Crisafulli government is undertaking the landmark commission of inquiry into the CFMEU Queensland branch.

This follows the scathing *Violence in the Queensland CFMEU* report led by Geoffrey Watson SC, which exposed the systemic violence, intimidation, misogyny and bullying tactics used by the CFMEU that have no place in Queensland, particularly on our building sites. The inquiry is being chaired by Mr Stuart John Wood AM KC, who will conduct a thorough and independent inquiry into the CFMEU over the course of 12 months delving into how this toxic culture within the CFMEU was allowed to fester and go unchecked for so long.

The inquiry formally commenced on 1 August 2025 and its final report will be presented to government by July 2026. Alarming, the Watson report highlighted that critical witnesses and victims of the CFMEU were too scared to come forward over the course of the three-month investigation and had a fear of retribution from the CFMEU. That is why this inquiry is so important. Under the Commissions of Inquiry Act 1950 the commissioner will have the full powers to expose the matters identified by Mr Watson in his report and delve into just how toxic the CFMEU's culture had become. This includes powers to compel documents and the attendance of witnesses but also to deliver necessary protections for witnesses and victims.

Under broad terms of reference the commissioner is empowered to explore evidence of, and allegations concerning, instances of misconduct making workplaces unsafe or uncomfortable for women; the systemic nature of the misconduct involving current and former leadership figures within the CFMEU; the involvement of organised crime and other criminal elements or identities with the CFMEU and the construction industry; and financial dealings by the CFMEU, including cash transfers and contracts. For almost a decade the CFMEU repeatedly demonstrated their contempt of our laws, flouting court orders and safety regulations, and what did the former Labor government do? I would put to the member they did very little, if nothing at all.

To me it is unacceptable that the former government failed to act, allowing the CFMEU to go unchecked for almost a decade, standing by whilst victims were silenced out of fear of retribution. The former Labor government's ties with the CFMEU are well documented. The member for Gaven's diary disclosures show that she met with former CFMEU state secretary Michael Ravbar on 24 January 2024. I wonder what they discussed. The member for Murrumba, the Leader of the Opposition, met with Michael Ravbar and Jade Ingham on numerous occasions, including on 11 December 2020—around the same time as when the public servant referred to in the Watson report had been locked in a CFMEU office during the delegation. What is more, in 2015 when the Labor government won the state election, the CFMEU said, 'We own the government. We run the state.' This is unsurprising given the member for Waterford and former minister for women not only met with the CFMEU on multiple occasions but even thanked Michael Ravbar and the CFMEU in her maiden speech. The former minister for women endorsed, thanked and met with the very union officials who have been shown to denigrate and abuse women. These are the people that the member for Gaven so happily welcomed into her office. I wonder what they discussed. As Mr Watson said—

I fear this investigation only scratched the surface of the violence in the Queensland CFMEU.

That is why this inquiry is necessary: to put under the spotlight the allegations about criminality, organised crime links and financial matters and to ensure important protections are provided to enable victims and whistleblowers to tell their stories. The Crisafulli government will not stand by and tolerate this culture of fear and bullying and intimidation that has been dictated on our construction sites. We are putting victims first. We are putting the people of Queensland first, and Queenslanders have a right to know the full extent of what has been allowed to fester under the CFMEU and the former Labor government.

Mr HUNT: Attorney, with reference to page 29 of the Budget Measures paper with regard to the funding enabling the independence of the Integrity Commissioner, how critical is this budget measure to allowing the Integrity Commissioner to function as an independent statutory body?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am pleased to take this question as it especially relates to one of the Crisafulli government's election commitments, and that is to strengthen—not take away, like the former government, but to strengthen—the independence of the Integrity Commissioner. I thank the Integrity Commissioner for her short stint so far on the committee—she may get called up again, but thank you so far—and note that our budget includes unprecedented funding of \$7.1 million over four years for the Office of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner. In line with the findings of the Coaldrake report, this year's budget was the first to adopt the new process in relation to our core integrity bodies. Under the new arrangements, the relevant parliamentary committee—yourselves—is required to consider those proposals put forward by the integrity bodies for any additional funding for the financial year and provide a report on the committee's decision.

I was grateful for the committee's involvement—and thank you—and the useful observations it made on the funding proposal that was put forward. The Crisafulli government accepted the committee's recommendation that the proposal from the Integrity Commissioner be fully funded in this 2025-26 budget. The \$7.1 million over four years and the \$1.9 million ongoing will enable the Office of the Integrity Commissioner to effectively operate as an independent statutory body, meet increased demand for services and ensure statutory functions are being properly discharged. This funding increases the Office of the Integrity Commissioner FTE from nine to 17, converting six temporary positions to two permanent and two additional new permanent positions. Work has commenced with the Integrity Commissioner to ensure they are able to remain fully independent from government and are able to perform their duties without interference.

We are here today talking about strengthening the independence of the Integrity Commissioner, quite frankly, because over the last 10 years Queenslanders had an opportunity to watch the Palaszczuk government and then the Miles government trash the integrity and transparency of government that they rightfully expected. Let us remember that this is the government that commissioned a review into its own integrity scandals. It is scathing. When the former integrity commissioner raised concerns about interference in the workings of her office, it was that government that referred the integrity commissioner to the former Economics and Governance Committee for investigation.

Is it any wonder, after the laundry list of integrity scandals that we saw from both the Palaszczuk government and then the Miles government, that they were forced to accept the former opposition's calls for an independent inquiry into the government's culture, integrity and accountability? That review found that public servants felt pressured to moderate advice that did not align with their minister's preference. It found that ministers and ministerial staff engaged with the Public Service in a way that could be disrespectful, belittling or bullying. Maybe some of those meetings they had were like that as well. Who knows? That report encouraged the former government to lead a culture of openness from the top and to prevent the serious integrity and transparency issues that had crept into its government. In stark contrast, the Crisafulli government is delivering on our promise to lead a government with openness and transparency, and the funding that we have delivered in the budget for the Office of the Integrity Commissioner is proof of that.

Ms MARR: Attorney, I refer to page 17 of the Department of Justice Service Delivery Statements which states that one of the objectives of the CCC is to 'reduce the incidence of major crime and corruption and improve the integrity of the public sector in Queensland'. How do the Crisafulli government's recent reforms to the CCC's corruption reporting powers assist the CCC to achieve this?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for Thuringowa for this really important question. Working with the CCC to restore reporting powers was one of my key deliverables in the first 100 days of our Crisafulli government and setting out to do what we said we were going to do. This was an absolute priority for me and the Premier, because it had been well over a year since the CCC chair had called for an urgent legal change after the ruling by the High Court in 2023. That ruling rendered the CCC powerless to publicly report on corruption matters. Labor unsurprisingly, once again, failed to act. Labor took 12 months to introduce any legislation, finally tabling a bill in the dying days of the Miles government, just weeks before the election was due to be called.

As soon as I was sworn in as Attorney-General and Minister for Integrity, I got straight to work and met with the CCC chair within my first week to discuss the government's plan to restore the CCC's reporting powers—just like we said we would do. It was important that we listened to the CCC and worked closely with them in drafting the legislation to ensure it accurately delivered the reporting powers the CCC felt were essential to their independence. The Crisafulli government's reforms not only empower the CCC to publish future reports; they retrospectively validated the preparation and publication of all past public reports and statements, including 32 investigation reports and 256 media releases that had to be removed from the CCC's website under Labor.

To provide further transparency and accountability for decisions under the new reporting framework, the amendments also included additional safeguards and expanded procedural fairness requirements. When releasing information publicly, the CCC are now required to consider specific criteria, including the need for accountability and transparency in government and the seriousness of the matter. Importantly, the CCC must now table reports directly through you, Mr Speaker, and continue to provide copies to the PCCC and myself.

Restoring the CCC's reporting powers was an important election commitment we delivered for Queenslanders, but we also delivered another key commitment and promise and that was to release the CCC investigations into the former Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad, and the report into the former Public Trustee, Peter Carne. The Miles-Palaszczuk government were determined—they spent a lot of taxpayers money—on keeping those reports hidden from Queenslanders. What is worse, they just continued to fight their release. Those two reports are now public and Queenslanders can read for themselves. When they did they knew quite clearly, as I know the members of the committee did, why the former government tried to bury them. Jackie Trad's aggressive advocacy to appoint her chosen candidate as the Under Treasurer revealed the inner workings of the Miles-Palaszczuk government. It revealed the lengths that the former Labor cabinet ministers—all of them, still on the Labor front bench now—would go to protect their mate, the former deputy premier. That is a shameful chapter in Queensland's political history and I am proud to be part of the Crisafulli government that has put an end to it.

Dr ROWAN: Attorney-General, how will the extra resourcing for Queensland's justice system, which is referenced on page 24 of Budget Paper 4, deliver on the Crisafulli LNP state government's election commitment to faster access to justice for Queenslanders?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That is a great question from the member for Moggill. I thank him very much for his interest in boosting capacity in our justice system in Queensland. To meet the impacts of the Making Queensland Safer Laws, reducing victims in this state and providing a safer workplace for our court staff, it is important that this budget does the boost that we need to the system: providing \$19.4 million over four years in new funding to ensure our courts have appropriate facilities and judicial resourcing.

One of those key areas is Townsville. I note your committee colleague, the member for Thuringowa, is well aware of this. In Townsville over successive years they have recorded significant and sustained increases in the workload across all criminal matters that were fronting up to the court because of the rolling back of the laws and the decade-long Labor youth crime crisis that was left to fester in Townsville. Despite that, only two permanent judges were allocated to service Townsville. For those members of the committee who are not from regional Queensland, I think it is important to understand that regional Queensland goes a lot further than outside of Townsville. It goes a long way out, not only in Townsville but also that increased district that they were servicing for the other regional courts. The Crisafulli government went to the election committing to the people of North Queensland that we would commit to another District Court judge for not just the Townsville court but for that circuit as well. We are going to resource it properly because that is what good governments do. In Townsville we have now appointed His Honour Judge Christopher Kahler who commenced on 5 May to strengthen the region's access to justice. It did meet a very important election commitment to the people of North Queensland to boost that capacity for the courts there in Townsville.

Another regional courthouse that faces significant demand is Mount Isa. I was out in Mount Isa just a couple of weeks ago and had an opportunity to speak to not only the local community but also ATSILS, Legal Aid, the DPP staff who were there and, importantly, local courthouse staff and the magistrates. It was great to be able to talk about what we are doing to support them. We are taking a very different approach to our predecessors. We are getting out in the regions, we are talking to these courthouse staff. I did pop out to Cloncurry as well. Bob was on his first day working for the Department of Justice in the Cloncurry court. He only does one day a week. Bob, it was great to meet you on your first day of work. He was probably not expecting me to walk in the door.

I want to talk about the difference between us and the former government. Interestingly, the former government made an announcement to appoint another magistrate in Mount Isa. So credit where credit is due—excellent, another magistrate, much needed for Mount Isa—but the magistrate needs some staff. The court needs staff to go with the magistrate. It was another funding cliff I was met with—a bit like the press release that the former Labor government would put out. They would just put out a press release, say they are going to do something but then on the back end forget to fund it. I walked in and I had these briefs and I was like, 'Okay, guys, how about we just put the funding cliff piles over there.' Then I said, 'How about we draw the funding cliff on the white board,' and it was funding cliffs for no matter what brief I was asking for, it seemed. How can you put a magistrate into the circuit around Mount Isa and not give him or her any staff? It does beggar belief. These people have to get in a little plane. They have to fly to Mornington Island, as one example. I think the Mount Isa circuit—I am probably going to get this wrong; if it is not the Mount Isa circuit it is the lower circuit—does Dajarra and those places. What did the former government expect? That the magistrate was going to hop in his car and cruise out for hours on end by himself, sit in a court with no extra staff? I do not know. Maybe that

is what they would do. What we did was sort out that mess. We have put the extra funding in the budget. We have made sure the magistrate for Mount Isa is there and he is funded, but importantly I got to meet some of those new staff out there in Mount Isa thanks to the Crisafulli government funding them properly.

We need to ensure that we are reducing the delays in the court. There are very complex Childrens Court matters which, with the relevant and proper funding, can proceed to the higher courts more swiftly. This goes to the heart of doing what we said we were going to do and that is to ensure that we get people faster access to justice, whether it is cleaning up Labor's DNA debacle, whether it is funding our courthouses properly, whether it is giving our support staff in our courts the support that they need, whether it is stopping Labor's funding cliffs. Victims are our priority in this government. We know the former government with their underinvestment did not prioritise victims. It does not matter where you are in this great state of Queensland, the Crisafulli government and this budget is delivering the foundations for the fresh start that we need to fix up the justice system here in Queensland.

Mr SPEAKER: I will now go to a non-government question from the member for Algerie.

Ms ENOCH: My question is to the Integrity Commissioner. Can you confirm that whilst your advice to members of parliament, including cabinet ministers, is confidential, there is nothing stopping a minister from releasing integrity advice that they have obtained from you?

Ms Waugh: That is correct. The secrecy provisions apply to myself and my staff, not to the designated person.

Ms ENOCH: At what point does a relationship between colleagues of the cabinet become a matter of public relevance that should be disclosed?

Ms Waugh: In terms of the threshold question, I would think that ministers would be guided by the conduct standards and behavioural standards in the Ministerial Handbook and the Ministerial Code of Conduct. I guess, more broadly, if it raised an integrity or ethics question or issue or if it gives rise to a conflict of interest then it would meet that threshold.

Ms ENOCH: Just to confirm, Integrity Commissioner, the threshold for relationships between colleagues in the cabinet is dictated by the handbook and by public perception?

Ms Waugh: There is a general public interest test and there are behavioural standards in both the code and the Ministerial Handbook.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, did the Department of Justice provide advice to executive government on who should be the commissioner for the CFMEU commission of inquiry?

Ms Cruickshank: I apologise for the repetition, but I need to again repeat that matters relating to the appointment of any of the commissioners are cabinet matters, not ones for the department.

Ms ENOCH: Further then, Director-General, with regard to that advice, were there any probity checks on the individual announced including any political links that could present a potential or actual conflict of interest?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Like Mr Kaiser?

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: No.

Ms Cruickshank: Possibly this is a matter for the Public Service Commissioner. My understanding is that the standard checks that the Public Service Commission does were done, but I cannot speak to the detail of those.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, I refer to page 1 of the SDS where it states 'maintain confidence and integrity in our system of government'. I also refer to the Attorney-General's charter letter that states 'ensure the estimates process is a genuine opportunity for transparency and accountability in government'. Director-General, what advice did the Department of Justice provide in relation to the running of estimates this year?

Ms Cruickshank: I really do apologise for the repetition but, again, those were matters that were considered by cabinet so I cannot speak to that.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I know it is tough, but questions referring to a charter letter would obviously come to me as the minister. On the line of questioning of the former minister, she could have just lent next door and asked her former cabinet colleague.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Speaker: the member for Algeester clearly made a reference to the SDS and the Attorney's charter letter. I refer you to question on notice No. 1129 tabled by the Premier and Minister for Veterans where he clearly indicates that each director-general's goals are as set out in the ministerial charter letter and directors-general are responsible for working with their minister to deliver on charter letter commitments. Given the commitments in the charter letter go to ensuring the estimates process is a genuine opportunity—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Springwood, you have been going for a long time.

Mr de BRENNI: I think it is an appropriate question to the director-general.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: under standing order 115, that was a very lengthy preamble in relation to questions asked. I know you provided some guidance at the beginning of the day, but I ask for that to be further considered—and maybe a rephrasing of the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General? I am losing track of where we are up to.

Ms Cruickshank: I am losing track too, but if I heard the question correctly I think my response to the member would be: yes, it is true that directors-general, consistent with the Premier's comments, work very closely with their ministers. That does not mean that where there is a charter letter with a series of election commitments attached to it we are involved in every single discussion. Clearly, decisions that the government of the day make based on commitments that they took to an election will sometimes mean that they make the decisions that they do in the confines and the usual discussions that would be had within cabinet. It does not necessitate that there would have been advice given by the department.

Ms ENOCH: Director-General, what advice did the Department of Justice provide in relation to the running of estimates this year?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: she keeps asking about the advice given and the director-general has answered that. I fear she will be repetitious again this time in terms of what she can and cannot answer. I ask you to direct the member to stop this line of questioning.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order. Do you have anything to add, Director-General?

Ms Cruickshank: No, I do not, Mr Speaker. I feel I did answer it before.

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the Queensland Ombudsman. In respect of your role as Inspector of Detention Services, you said earlier that you were undertaking a report into Queensland's youth detention centres. Can you advise what facilities that includes and how many times you have visited Cleveland Youth Detention Centre?

Mr Reilly: The current report we are preparing is a report about all three current youth detention centres. The three youth detention centres are Cleveland Youth Detention Centre, Brisbane Youth Detention Centre and West Moreton Youth Detention Centre. In terms of the dates of our visits, it may be better if I provide those subsequent to the hearing so that it is completely accurate, because we have a number of visits. For example, I do an initial briefing, our engagement staff visit to do engagement with children and staff, and then we do what you might call a formal inspection as well. There are quite a few days over the period of each inspection in which staff from the office, often including me, will be attending the centre. I wonder if it is better if I pin them all down and send them through.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, are you happy for that?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I want to clarify: is the member asking how many staff or how many times Mr Ombudsman has attended those facilities? As has been clearly articulated, many staff go.

Mr SPEAKER: Can we have some clarification from the member for Gaven?

Ms SCANLON: I would appreciate any information you may have, acknowledging it may not be complete. If you are able to provide on notice the number of times you or staff from your office have visited that detention centre, that would be appreciated.

Mr SPEAKER: Are you happy to take that on notice?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Do you want it by the end of the session or on notice?

Mr Reilly: I have some dates I can provide.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Maybe by the end of the session we will get some dates.

Mr SPEAKER: Are you happy with that?

Ms SCANLON: My request was if the Ombudsman can provide the information he has to hand, noting that a comprehensive list will be provided at the end of the session.

Mr Reilly: For West Moreton Youth Detention Centre, for the 2024-25 inspection the onsite dates were 25 February 2025 to 26 February 2025 and also 1 March 2025. These are dates for 2025. For the Brisbane Youth Detention Centre, the dates were 24 June 2025, 26 June 2025 and 28 to 29 June 2025. For Cleveland Youth Detention Centre, I am heading up there the week after next for three days, with the team. That will be in late August, not one we have done. We have also commenced an inspection of the Wacol Youth Remand Centre. We have sent out the letters to commence that process as it is a new youth detention centre. I will still provide further written information about all those dates because I want to double-check that the dates when other members of the team were there and so on are covered off.

Ms SCANLON: Ombudsman, is it your understanding that night mode is when children are locked in their cells for a period of time? That is correct, is it not?

Mr Reilly: Night mode is a term that is used in the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. It is a local term, if you like. It refers to a type of separation of children in their cells that is caused by staff shortages. They use the term 'night mode' to actually describe separation that occurs during the day. Each night, from 7.30 pm to 7.30 am, children are placed in their cells to sleep. They will go into their cells each night for 12 hours. If the child is then separated during the day before the 12 hours—in the daytime hours—that may be referred to as night mode. It is a local term that staff use there.

Ms SCANLON: Ombudsman, when a facility is in night mode, as you described, is it correct that young people cannot leave their cells to attend the youth justice education centre?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I seek your guidance, or clarification, as to whether that particular question should be directed to the Minister for Corrective Services at the session that is occurring later on today.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven?

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Ombudsman was able to clarify what night mode is and how it applies to the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre. It is entirely within the remit of the Ombudsman to provide advice on how that is occurring and whether youth justice education programs are available when that scenario occurs.

Dr ROWAN: A further point of order, Mr Speaker: I heard the member for Gaven provide some information in her point of order; however, it sounds to me that this is an operational matter and the information that she is seeking relates to operational aspects of elements that are under the Minister for Corrective Services. As such, the question should be directed to the Minister for Corrective Services at the session later on today.

Mr SPEAKER: Mr Reilly, you would be aware of where this policy area sits probably more than most. I will allow you to answer that question at your discretion.

Mr Reilly: Thank you. In preparing for these hearings, I had anticipated that I would need to seek guidance from the chair about, if you like, crossover issues, so thank you for your guidance. I will proceed. My apologies, what was the question again?

Ms SCANLON: My question was: is it correct that when a facility is in night mode young people cannot leave their cells to attend the youth justice education centre?

Mr Reilly: I think that might be too black and white. Night mode will often impact that, but arrangements are sometimes made for children to be escorted out of their cells to go to programs. For example, the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre has always had a good practice of ensuring children are able to be escorted out of their cells for health services. It can impact on their access to programs and schooling. It often does, but the centre and its staff do endeavour to make arrangements to escort children to some of those activities and processes.

Ms SCANLON: In relation to the report you mentioned earlier, can you provide the committee with a date on which that will be made public?

Mr Reilly: I cannot provide an exact date. We have completed what we call our fact-checking process with the department. There are a lot of numbers involved in some of these reports, so we have a fact-checking process. We are currently finalising the draft that will be provided to the department shortly. There is then a process of obtaining feedback from the department. That process can vary—the minimum would be four weeks but it can take longer if there are complex and difficult issues that the department wants to work through with us. I welcome that sort of feedback. I welcome that lengthy

engagement because it means that the report is tested fully and that we have engaged properly with the department before it is finalised. That can take a longer period. Shortly after that has been finished we will be able to send it to the Speaker for tabling.

Ms SCANLON: Ombudsman, could you clarify: if there are staff shortages, can that escorting to education still occur under night mode?

Mr Reilly: If there are staff shortages can—

Ms SCANLON: Can that escorting to education still occur if a facility is in night mode?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Ombudsman has already answered that. He referred to young people being able to be escorted out of their cells. They are asking the same question again. I believe that has been answered. Strained operational matters are the remit of corrective services.

Mr SPEAKER: It is very close. I will allow one more question before we swap over to government questions. Do you have another question?

Ms SCANLON: Sorry, we are going to the next question?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms SCANLON: Ombudsman, you also said you have not seen modelling on youth detention capacity following the introduction of Adult Crime, Adult Time.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order: this question is clearly going to operational matters and should be asked of the corrections minister this afternoon. Surely the member can attend this afternoon and ask the questions of the minister.

Mr SPEAKER: I will get some advice. Could I request that points of order not be raised until the question has been asked. The question was not asked in full, so I am not sure what the question was. I will go back to the member for Gaven.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you, Speaker. You are correct: I had not asked the question yet; I had simply outlined what the Ombudsman said earlier. My question to the Ombudsman is: is it your understanding that long-term modelling has been undertaken?

Mr Reilly: No, I have no such understanding. I am not aware of whether the department has undertaken modelling.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go now to government questions. Member for Nicklin.

Mr HUNT: Attorney-General, in relation to the funding for remediation works at the Maryborough and Bowen courthouses, which is referenced on page 104 of Budget Paper 4, what is the scope of these works and why is it necessary?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for the question because he is someone who gets up early and does the hard work, as does the member for Maryborough, I must say, and the member for Burdekin, who looks after Bowen—the honourable Dale Last, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. This is really important. I have visited both of these aged courthouses, met with the staff and looked at the problems—problems that were overlooked by former governments.

I have spoken at length about this, but it is important for us to talk about the chronic underfunding of the court system, particularly of our beautiful old courthouses, that we have been left with. At the end of the day, I as the Attorney-General do not care whether you live in Bowen, in Collinsville, in Maryborough or in Kingaroy because you deserve to have the same access to justice. It is not lost on me that we have an aging portfolio of courthouses. One brief that was provided to me in the pile of briefs that was funding cliffs outlined a major concern. It noted that we have an—

... aging courthouse portfolio with insufficient capacity to meet expectations and lacking functionality to support contemporary justice service delivery.

One of the victims of Labor's negligent of our justice system is the courthouse maintenance program. It was unfunded over successive years to the point where courthouses were literally left to crumble. I would encourage anyone on the committee if they are ever around Bowen or Maryborough to have a look at two of Queensland's most beautiful historic courthouses. The little Nanango courthouse is also an historic courthouse. It is beautiful. When I was first appointed, I made sure it had an upgrade. That has happened. I used to work in there. It is a beautiful little courthouse.

I headed out to Bowen with local MP Dale Last to check out the Bowen courthouse. Conditions inside the courthouse are quite simply pretty horrendous. Inside the courthouse there is rising damp, rust, mould, structural shifting and rotten floors ridden with termites. Finally, the Bowen courthouse and the Whitsunday region will get the attention they deserve.

The Crisafulli government's first budget includes \$12.5 million to restore the Bowen courthouse. I know that there are some minor works that need to be done on other courthouses in that region. That is something we will be looking at. If I have not mentioned it, I apologise, but we have funding for the general maintenance of courthouses. As I tell young people all the time, if you can afford to buy a house you have to be able to afford to put money in the bank for its upkeep and maintenance. Quite simply, that is what we have to do in the Department of Justice.

Our first budget includes \$12.5 million to restore the beautiful Bowen courthouse—'blowin' in Bowen'. I also made sure that I headed out to the Maryborough courthouse with our new member for Maryborough, the gentleman of the Queensland parliament, Mr John Barounis. We were honestly quite shocked to see paint peeling off walls just metres away from courthouse staff, mouldy carpets and crumbling stairs. I appreciate that these old buildings take a lot of work and that they are, in some cases, heritage listed. It will be expensive to upkeep them, but we need to provide a workplace that is workable.

People should not have to go down to Woolies and buy a \$10 blower heater and put it under their desk. Let us give these people the respect they deserve. They work in trying circumstances. People who attend court are quite often angst-ridden and have issues. In regional towns where there is no local member's office, quite often court staff are the first ones people engage with. In the Cloncurry courthouse there are people who do not just do court work. There are people who work for the Department of Primary Industries and people who work for the department of natural resources and mines. They all deserve to go to work and be respected. That is why we need to do these upgrades.

In Maryborough, the works will include urgent remediation work to the courtrooms, the registry office, the stairwell, the safe room and, importantly, the remote witness room. In Bowen we have to attend to the roof, the gutters, the downpipes and the stormwater system. They will be replaced to ensure the courthouse can better manage future weather conditions. I did just mention 'blowin' in Bowen', Mr Speaker. I know that you know it gets very windy in Bowen. Rising damp is a huge issue. The one courtroom I went into actually stinks because of rising damp. We have to provide people with better conditions.

In this budget we have also provided basic uplift to the maintenance budget of \$4 million so that we can undertake some basic maintenance and upkeep across the state. Ultimately, this is to ensure that our courthouses stop crumbling into disrepair. It is disappointing that the former government did not do a little of that maintenance. As I tell young people who want to buy houses, 'You just have to save for it.' 'Labornomics' does not seem to go that far.

Again, I thank the hardworking staff of the Department of Justice—and I will give a plug to those from the other departments who work within our beautiful courthouses, like the one in Cloncurry. I thank the hardworking staff at more senior levels within the Department of Justice who have been pleading for funds. They pleaded with former attorneys-general for funds to be spent on our aging infrastructure, even just to provide safe places for victims of crime when they attend court. Who knows what was said?

I have lost count of the number of times I have heard staff in regional courthouses or in regional ATSILS, Legal Aid offices or DPP offices say to me, 'This is the first time we have met or seen an attorney-general.' That surprises me. Wherever I go across the state, I always make sure—I check with the Chief Magistrate; someone up the back is going to be smiling as I say this—to extend the courtesy to the Chief Magistrate to request to pop into the local courthouse, the community legal centre or the Legal Aid office to ask them how we can do things better for them.

Mr Speaker, I know you would be pleased—it is just outside of your patch, but I know you spend a lot of time in and around the Dalby region—with the upgrades to the Dalby courthouse. I give the Dalby courthouse staff a shout-out. The work that they do is amazing. There are upgrades to the courthouse happening there. Ultimately, that is what we promised Queenslanders and that is exactly what we are doing.

Ms MARR: My question is to the Attorney-General. I refer to pages 26 and 105 of Budget Paper 4 and the funding being provided in this budget for enhanced security measures and infrastructure upgrades. Can the Attorney provide more information about this funding and why it is a priority for the Crisafulli government's first budget?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Whilst I have just talked about the Maryborough, Bowen and a few other courthouses, this question goes to something that is very close to my heart—that is, security in our courthouses. We know that many of these regional courthouses just cannot have it all. We get that. In communities and areas where there has been an increase in extremist groups entering the justice system, it has made it more difficult for our court staff. It has made it more difficult for the people attending court.

We have to remember that for a lot of people who attend court it is quite often the first time they have attended court. Often the duty lawyer is overstretched and there is a huge court list. We need to make sure those people are kept safe. That is why we need to make sure we have money in the budget each year to continue the work to try to secure our courthouses.

I will give a summary of the Queensland justice system over the last decade under the Palaszczuk-Miles government. The summary states—

Baseline funding in courts did not keep pace with demand and service cost increases. This particularly impacted courthouse security, where suboptimal security arrangements in place put staff and community at risk.

These are not my words. These are the words of the officials who briefed me about the state of the Department of Justice budget. In contrast to the Palaszczuk-Miles government, the Crisafulli government is committed to delivering a justice system that Queenslanders deserve and does—I keep saying it but it is important—prioritise the rights of victims and the people who attend our courthouses. This is difficult as they navigate the court system.

Sustained investment in security enables this commitment to be delivered through the improved management of security risks. Security in courts ensures that Queenslanders who are victims of crime and domestic violence can safely access justice through the court system. Courthouse security is also an essential component of Queensland courts' frontline service delivery and has a proven positive impact on the perceived safety of court users.

In this budget our government is providing \$23.7 million over four years for the delivery of enhanced security across priority courthouses in Queensland and \$12 million over four years to undertake urgent security infrastructure upgrades at courthouses. The security threat and risk profiles across Queensland courthouses, as I have said, have increased in recent years. The presence of dedicated security guards to monitor and to respond to behaviour is the most effective control measure to mitigate security risks posed by individuals and keeping people attending our courthouses safe.

I again want to give a quick shout-out to the security guards. When I was in Gladstone I got to meet that security guard—I wish I could recall his name. Anyway, I always like to have a chat to them because they are very important people. Just because they are there in their black clothes does not mean you should not say hello to them. I have heard a few stories about that and it is disappointing.

Recently I was really pleased to be able to meet the staff and the security guard at the Thursday Island courthouse. I want to say this about the security guard. He came onboard because of our new funding. Had that new funding not been in the budget that security guard would not have a job. I was really pleased to have a chat. It was wonderful to see him there. When you talk about Thursday Island you have to talk about it with a smile on your face because it is such a beautiful community. When I spoke to some of the court users on Thursday Island—it was court day: I was there on circuit day—basically they told me that the increased security meant that they felt safer coming to court.

For Brisbane, Southport, Cairns and Townsville, where most Childrens Court matters in the state are heard and the victims must navigate those very busy structures, two new security officers per courthouse have been funded. Medium-volume locations of Beenleigh, Ipswich, Maroochydore, Toowoomba, Caboolture, Richlands, Rockhampton and Mount Isa have each received one additional security officer to ensure there is a dedicated security focus on prioritising the safety of victims. We are also delivering a rolling program of infrastructure improvements as part of the department's maintenance and minor works program. These improvements include work to upgrade court entry and security-screening points. That is also really important.

Secure court facilities are essential. By continuing to invest in our courthouse security infrastructure, the Crisafulli government is delivering on its commitment to provide fit-for-purpose court facilities and its commitment to ensure victims of crime can safely access the justice system safely.

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to go back to non-government questions.

Ms ENOCH: In respect of the two commissions of inquiry—the one for child safety and the one for the CFMEU—can the director-general advise what remuneration the secretary of the commissions of the inquiry will be paid?

Ms Cruickshank: Matters relating to both the appointment and their remuneration were matters determined by cabinet.

Ms SCANLON: I refer to page 3 of the SDS and court data which the Attorney-General has referenced in previous media statements and today. Director-General, can you confirm that the Department of Justice has access to court statistics and does not have to wait for the annual report at the end of the year to source that information?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order: I understand that question has been asked. If the member is running out of questions, we can help.

Mr SPEAKER: No. That is a frivolous point of order, Attorney-General. I caution you not to raise frivolous points of order.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Ms Cruickshank: We do have the data. I suspect though that the data comes intermittently throughout the year. I will check how many times we get it throughout the year, but that was why I was able to speak to data as at 30 June, because it does take some time to—this is the wrong phrase—wash through the system. I am happy to check how many times per year we have it. I do not think it is standardised as in one quarter, one quarter, one quarter. It is literally as information comes through. You may recall I made some comments before that there are a number of cases that are still working their way through the system. Whilst we are aware of charges, we do not yet know what the outcomes are. There is a little bit that is iterative on that front. I hope that helps.

Ms SCANLON: I appreciate that. I appreciate that the normal protocol when a question on notice comes in is that the department would witness that information and provide advice accordingly to the Attorney-General. Is that the case?

Ms Cruickshank: Usually, yes, that would be the case. I am not sure if there is a particular question on notice that you are referring to there, but it is usually limited somewhat by whatever the latest information is that we have. It is usually not contemporaneous with the actual asking of the question, but it is as recent as is possible.

Ms SCANLON: In relation to those three questions on notice that I referenced earlier, can you advise: did your department provide that information to the Attorney-General's office?

Ms Cruickshank: I just need to check the questions. By way of clarification, was it questions on notice 3, 4 and 5 from memory?

Ms SCANLON: Yes. Mr Speaker, point of order: I am happy for the director-general to come back at the end of the session if she does not have that information to hand.

Ms Cruickshank: I am literally checking the last one.

Mr SPEAKER: Are you able to answer that now or are you going to come back?

Ms Cruickshank: I think I can answer that now. You asked did we help prepare those answers.

Ms SCANLON: I asked whether the figures asked for were provided to the Attorney-General's office.

Ms Cruickshank: I believe these are the answers that we provided to the Attorney's office.

Ms SCANLON: I refer my question to the director-general. I refer to the estimates sessions today. Can you advise did you participate in any mock estimates or practice estimates with the Attorney-General?

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, I am going to allow you to answer that as you will.

Ms Cruickshank: I think I might say that I, as you would appreciate, as director-general do have a number of meetings with my minister and also my colleagues.

Ms SCANLON: In respect of any practice estimates, were there any other government members of parliament present and, if so, who?

Ms Cruickshank: In terms of meetings that I have, no, there are not very many meetings that I have been in that have involved other ministers. There were a handful but they were not related to estimates.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: we are examining the budget here. My point of order is on relevance under standing order 118(b).

Mr SPEAKER: I have heard your point of order. Member for Gaven, it is a valid point of order. You need to explain to us how this is relevant to the budget.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the preparation of estimates I would imagine is relevant to estimates. My question is: was there a government member in attendance at any mock estimates?

Ms Cruickshank: I do not believe there was, no.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you very much, Director-General. I appreciate that. Director-General, I believe you said earlier no permanent staff had been terminated. Can you advise have any contracted staff been terminated?

Ms Cruickshank: I think I would probably put a slight nuance on that for the honourable member. No-one has been terminated per se. There were a number of programs though, because they did not have funding past 30 June or had come to their own natural end, those staff—I do not actually know if they were temporary or contractors—came to the end of their time working in the department, yes. It was not a large number, I might add. It was a very small number directly related to programs.

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the director-general. Has anyone in government asked you to terminate, dismiss or move on any person in the department because of the person's previous employment history?

Ms Cruickshank: No. They have not. I might just add to that: that is not how I operate.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, I want to draw your attention to question on notice 6, specifically in relation to the legal and prosecutions section. I will give you a moment to get that document. My question is in relation to the legal and prosecutions division and branch. You will note that in the 2024-25 financial year the estimated actual of full-time equivalents was 1,324, yet this budget only allocates funding for 1,294. On my estimation, that is around 30 staff who are now no longer funded. Could you provide advice about what positions have been cut because of insufficient funding?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will pre-empt you. There was an imputation in that question. I will ask you to rephrase the question.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You have to fund them.

Ms SCANLON: I take the Attorney-General's interjection. You are the government. You have the ability to fund positions—

Mr SPEAKER: We are not having backwards and forwards. I have asked you to re-ask the question. Attorney-General, I do not need your help.

Ms SCANLON: Director-General, can you advise what full-time-equivalent positions are now no longer funded?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, I can. As I said before, they are not funded because they came to the end of the work that was required of them. The vast bulk of those are 29 FTE that were connected to the ODPP, which related to the historical case review process that arose from the Sofronoff inquiry. Some of that work obviously is still ongoing, so there are still staff who are working on it. The 29 difference is that. I hope that answers the question.

Ms SCANLON: Just to confirm, that is the 29 staff in relation to ODPP?

Ms Cruickshank: Correct, 29.

Ms SCANLON: My next question is to the director-general in relation to that same question on notice, specifically to the section that states 'safety and regulation'. You will see, Director-General, again there is a difference in the numbers provided between 2024 and 2025. The estimated actual was 1,549 whereas the budget now provides only 1,501. Can you outline what positions are no longer funded?

Ms Cruickshank: Yes, I can. Bear with me for one moment while I compare my notes, but I do have that info. The first one relates to the dispute resolution branch that was in place which ran the expanded adult restorative justice program. As you may be aware, that is a program that has been running since about 2007. For the vast bulk of that time, it has run across four centres. The previous administration gave funding for two years, which concluded 30 June this year. That two-year funding had seen an expansion to some other centres across Queensland, but when that funding ran out the temporary staff that were allocated there have now left as well. I am just double-checking the other ones.

The other one that I have relates to some funding that, likewise, had an expiry date of 30 June 2025. It related to Blue Card Services screening. There was a large number of staff who were attached to that who were not funded beyond 30 June, based on previous budgets. This budget topped up that funding, put an extra \$4.3 million in, but there were some staff that we are carrying at risk within the department. Technically, the FTE funded positions have changed but the people have not, so we are just carrying them at risk in the department. Does that make sense? The question you are asking

me relates to funded FTE, which is slightly different to actual headcount. We have people who come in and go out of the department as each year goes on. In the reality of blue card, for obvious reasons, given the broader environment, we were not keen to let any of the people go, but the funded positions are less than previously because the whole program came to an end in June.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you; I appreciate that, Director-General. My next question is also in relation to question on notice 6. Can you confirm it is the case that there are 57 less full-time-equivalent staff funded in this budget—the estimated actual in 2024-25 compared to the 2025-26 budget?

Ms Cruickshank: I think I can, with the nuance that, as I say, they are funded FTE positions as opposed to individuals. No-one has actually been let go, per se.

Ms SCANLON: My question is also to the director-general in respect of the department's strategic objective of community safety. Can the director-general please advise which Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations the Department of Justice remains specifically responsible for and the status of those recommendations?

Ms Cruickshank: We will be able to. Just let me find my note.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, point of order: while the director-general is finding that, I am happy to let the committee know in relation to this that there were also 120 people set to lose their jobs because they had not been funded—

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Director-General, do you have that information?

Ms Cruickshank: Not quite, because I think the question was which specific ones we were retaining; is that correct?

Ms SCANLON: Which specific recommendations the Department of Justice has retained responsibility for and the status of those recommendations.

Ms Cruickshank: I am not sure that what I have will fully answer your question, I am sorry. There are 136 of the 277 recommendations from WSJT 1 and 2 that are led by the Department of Justice: 62 of those recommendations have already been delivered under previous reporting; 17 recommendations have been considered delivered; 52 recommendations are still open; and five have not yet commenced. I was in discussion only a couple of days ago with my colleague who is leading the WSJT response now. We were discussing how we will continue to report against all of the metrics that we had responsibility for. From memory, as I look at my colleague Kate, I think it was every six months we continue to report. The short answer to your question is that we are still responsible for those and we are still working on those, but I am conscious that some of the responsibility and carriage of it has now gone to Minister Camm's department.

Mr SPEAKER: I am conscious of the time. Before I go back to government members, we might see if we have responses to those questions that were taken on notice. The first one was how much money was spent on—

Ms Cruickshank: I think the first one related to the Queensland Law Reform Commission. The question was: how much money was spent on that review of mining lease objections? I can confirm that \$2.8 million has been used by the Queensland Law Reform Commission, which, for the purposes of clarity, obviously means staff who are working on this work. The work they have done has also been provided directly to the Minister for Natural Resources for his consideration.

The second question was: how much has your department spent briefing women barristers, and what percentage of the value of all briefs does that represent? The quick information I have been given is that, according to the department's financial data, the Department of Justice, including the ODP, the Legal Services Commission and the Office of the Public Guardian, has spent \$2.196 million on barristers, with \$1.085 million—I am rounding here—spent on women barristers, which represents 49.41 per cent of total fees, which I believe is above the target that was set.

Mr SPEAKER: The Ombudsman was going to come back with a response around visits.

Mr Reilly: At Cleveland Youth Detention Centre: in 2024, it was 24 to 25 September, and 5 to 9 November; and in 2025, it was 30 to 31 July, and 27 to 30 August—sorry, that is the upcoming one. At Brisbane Youth Detention Centre: in 2024, it was 19 June and 5 July, and 29 July to 1 August, and 6 August; and in 2025, it was 15 May, 3 June, 14 July and 15 July; and 24 June, 26 June, 28 to 29 June and 15 July. At West Moreton Youth Detention Centre: in 2024, it was 26 to 28 February and 2 March; and in 2025, it was 12 February, 18 February and 20 February, an inspection, and then 25 to 26 February and 1 March.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. We will go to government members.

Mr FIELD: Attorney, could you please give us some more information on what has been found by Dr Budowle in his review report, which you have tabled today, and the recommendations he has made?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am pleased to talk to this because Dr Bruce Budowle's report makes for damning reading. It is shocking, but thankfully it provides some solid recommendations for us to go forward. The key observation of the Budowle report is that, despite efforts since the commission of inquiry, FSQ remains an organisation in a state of sustained crisis. FSQ's challenges lie over a multiple of areas, including leadership and organisational failures, and systemic failures in quality assurance and operational capacity and capability.

The demands on FSQ simply have not been listened to by the former government and that is why we are getting to work. The report does a call to action in which it explained the transformation that is needed. The conclusions of the Budowle report reiterate that FSQ remains in crisis. FSQ continues to attempt to rebuild itself, implement recommendations of the COIs and deal with backlogs, but it is not adequately prepared or resourced to address the extensive problems. Hence, the Crisafulli government has had to step in with that extra resourcing. Current frameworks to implement change will be happening.

One of the main recommendations by Dr Bruce Budowle was to appoint that independent adviser, and that is exactly what we have done. The second recommendation is that management and staff should proactively seek and implement alternative, pragmatic and viable solutions to enable a more expeditious and effective implementation of those operations. Make no mistake, the report is damning. Dr Budowle has done a huge volume of work to outline major crises at FSQ. The Crisafulli government is stepping in to fix it, while the Labor opposition are still pretending that nothing is happening.

Dr ROWAN: Attorney-General, the Crisafulli state government has long held concerns about the failures of the blue card and child protection systems under the former Labor government. Since being elected in October last year, what has the Crisafulli state government done to help protect our most vulnerable children here in Queensland?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: This is a very important question. When we first got into government, we said we were going to have a review into the child safety system. We also commissioned a report into the blue card system after what happened with that vile person, Ashley Paul Griffith. I would like to acknowledge the QFCC principal commissioner for the work they are doing. Importantly, when it comes to the blue card system in Queensland, what we have heard from the director-general is in and around the budget. What we have done to boost and support the blue card system in Queensland is providing an extra \$4.3 million over two years and an extra 10 FTEs to implement and embed the working with children and other legislation act reforms, with the substantive reforms due to commence next week.

We made an election commitment to deliver a review of the blue card system, and I made it an immediate priority to attend to that. In my first meeting at the Standing Council of Attorneys-General back in February, I ensured that I could put the issues around the blue card and the blue card system on the agenda, and that is exactly what we have done. I will continue to push the federal government to bridge those gaps within the blue card system for keeping children safe.

Mr SPEAKER: We have now reached the end of the time allocated for consideration of the proposed expenditure for the areas of responsibility administered by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. Thank you, Minister, officials and departmental officers for your attendance. The committee will now adjourn until 1 pm when we will examine the estimates for the portfolio areas of the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you everyone.

Proceedings suspended from 12.15 pm to 1.00 pm.

ESTIMATES—JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE— POLICE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

In Attendance

Hon. DG Purdie, Minister for Police and Emergency Services

Ms Bianca Stone, Chief of Staff

Mr James Turner, Senior Policy Advisor

Queensland Police Service

Acting Commissioner Mr Shane Chelepy

Ms Deb Paterson, Acting Deputy Chief Executive, Strategy and Corporate Services

Inspector Tania Nelson, Ministerial Services Unit

Acting Deputy Commissioner Mr Chris Stream, Disaster and Emergency Management

Mr Alistair Dawson, Inspector General of Emergency Management

Mr Mark Armstrong, Chief Officer, State Emergency Service



Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Good afternoon. We will now resume proceedings. For the benefit of those who have just joined us, I am Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim and Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over today's hearing.

The members of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee are: Marty Hunt, member for Nicklin and chair; Peter Russo, member for Toohey and deputy chair; Russell Field, member for Capalaba; Natalie Marr, member for Thuringowa; Hon. Mick de Brenni, member for Springwood, who is substituting for Michael Berkman, member for Maiwar; and Hon. Meaghan Scanlon, member for Gaven, who is substituting for Melissa McMahon, member for Macalister, until 2.45 pm and then Ms Nikki Boyd, member for Pine Rivers, who will substitute from 2.45 pm until 4.20 pm. The committee is joined by other members who have been granted leave to attend and ask questions at the hearing today.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at my discretion or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised its hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcasters of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure that phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use, and that includes all members.

Please note that the first three rows of the gallery are reserved for department and ministerial staff supporting the minister. Members and others who are attending to observe are welcome to sit in the remaining rows or in the gallery upstairs. I also remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in this chamber.

The committee will now examine the proposed expenditure in the Appropriation Bill 2025 for the police portfolio until 2.30 pm. We will then adjourn for a short break until 2.45 pm before examining the portfolio area of emergency services until 4.15 pm.

I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the time specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House, available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage. I also remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly.

In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides that a member may ask any question that the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant appropriation bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the minister, commissioner, officials and departmental officers and members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials and advisers to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or commissioner. Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished.

I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of the police open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister for Police and Emergency Services, if you wish, you may make an opening statement to the committee of no more than five minutes for this portfolio area.

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, chair and committee members. Thank you for the opportunity to speak to the work of the Queensland Police and State Emergency Service and to the significant achievements being delivered under the government's strong focus on making Queenslanders safer.

Since becoming Minister for Police and Emergency Services I have travelled extensively: to the northernmost police station in the Torres Strait and to stations on our border and out west, the likes of Quilpie and Adavale—to stations that have not seen a police minister in over two decades. In these visits it was all too clear how tirelessly our officers work to prevent crime, protect lives and hold offenders to account. We are committed to being tough on crime and restoring community safety where you live, and we are delivering on that commitment.

While Labor's youth crime crisis remains a serious problem, created from a decade of watered-down laws, we are seeing encouraging signs in key crime categories across Queensland, particularly across offences typically committed by juveniles. Queensland reported offences since January have decreased by two per cent, with robberies reducing by 12 per cent, stolen cars by nine per cent, and break and enter by almost 10 per cent. That is 2,332 fewer homes broken into.

This is not by chance. It is the result of targeted police operations, stronger laws and strategic investment in realigning police to their core responsibility of fighting crime and community safety and ensuring police have the tools and resources to get that job done. A cornerstone of that strategy has been the funding, establishment and permanency of a number of key police operational teams: the Youth Crime Group, the State Flying Squad and Operation Marshall. We have seen the Flying Squad deliver outstanding results in the last six months, arresting 1,100 offenders on more than 3,300 offences, including 802 juveniles.

Our government has also delivered on our promise to tackle the youth crime crisis by introducing our Making Queensland Safer Laws, both tranche 1 and tranche 2. Juveniles committing crime across the 33 different offences now face adult consequences. Our laws give the courts clearer pathways to deal with the generation of untouchables and finally give them consequences for their actions. As we know, harsher penalties act as a strong deterrent.

To do the job safely and effectively, police need more than just laws; they need the right gear, the right resources and the right support. We have provided \$147.9 million in the budget to invest in vital frontline equipment including more than 6,500 Taser 10s, new ballistic vests, new body worn cameras and new roadside breath-testing devices. Up to \$100 million has been funded to expand Polair across Cairns, Townsville, the Sunshine Coast and Moreton Bay.

Under the former government, police were leaving in droves, sick of fighting a youth crime crisis with both hands tied behind their backs, but we are seeing signs our investment and the support of frontline officers is working. We are stemming attrition and stabilising the front line, with unplanned attrition levels reaching as low as 2.9 per cent during our first nine months in office.

Labor promised at the 2020 election 1,450 more police to bolster the front line but failed to send the backup our police were calling for. They fell 1,272 short and only delivered 174 across four years. Today we have announced we have already doubled that number of police on the front line, growing by 350 new officers since the election.

Community safety does not happen by accident and it certainly does not get better by denying the problem exists. It takes smart policy, sustained investment and an unwavering commitment to those who do the job every day. Our officers are stepping up to the challenge and the Crisafulli government is backing them every step of the way.

I would like to thank the acting commissioner, the deputy commissioners, chief officers and all of the senior staff who not only have made themselves available today but also have prepared for this estimates process. We look forward to answering the committee's questions to assist in their deliberation of the budget.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. We will move to questions. I turn to the non-government side first. Member for Toohey, I am guessing we are going to the member for Gladstone.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, have you practised for this estimates hearing with the minister and other personnel?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes, I have sat with the minister and briefed the minister on the portfolio.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, at those practice sessions, were any government MPs on this committee in attendance with the minister?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: there was a ruling in the last session in relation to the relevance of this to budget estimates and examining the budget. It was ruled that it was not relevant at the last session, I believe.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I refer to the consideration of this matter by the Speaker in the previous session. The Speaker ruled that this question was in order and directed in that session that the director-general answer it. I would ask that you direct the acting commissioner to answer it, consistent with that ruling by the Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice. One moment, please. I have sought some advice. Acting Commissioner?

Commissioner Chelepy: Thank you again for the question. Yes, during those sessions Mr Marty Hunt was present.

Mr BUTCHER: To be clear: that was the member for Nicklin?

Commissioner Chelepy: Correct.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, did you raise any concerns with the minister about the appropriateness of the member for Nicklin joining you and other commission officers at that practice session?

Commissioner Chelepy: No, I did not.

Mr BUTCHER: Do you think that having a member of parliament that is the chair of the committee was relevant during that practice session?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are seeking an opinion, member for Gladstone. I would ask you to rephrase that question or ask another question.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, I will move on. Acting Commissioner, the Premier has said he personally negotiated the proposed police EBA. I will ask the member for Springwood to table those documents—

Mr de BRENNI: I table the documents.

Mr BUTCHER:—showing interjurisdictional offers and finalised agreements across the nation. Acting Commissioner, under this offer, Queensland police will have the lowest base wage increase in the nation; that is correct, isn't it?

Commissioner Chelepy: Thank you for the question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Acting Commissioner, take some time to examine the document if you need to.

Dr ROWAN: I am waiting for a copy of the document to be circulated; if we could have some additional time until it is circulated.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, could you restate your question, please?

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, under this offer, Queensland police will have the lowest base wage increase in the nation; that is correct, isn't it?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: there is an inference with respect to the question and also in relation to the documents that have been circulated. I accept that these are documents from other jurisdictions interstate; however, the question as it was framed contained an inference.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: the question asked by the shadow minister is a question in relation to a matter of fact. I ask that you rule it in order and direct the acting commissioner to answer it accordingly.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, members, for your points of order. The question does contain an inference. Member for Springwood, you are correct, it does also contain a matter of fact. The question is about facts but the facts are not related to the commissioner's responsibilities in Queensland as it relates to other jurisdictions. Member for Gladstone—

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Springwood?

Mr de BRENNI: The question that the member for Gladstone asked was in relation to the Premier's personally negotiated police EBA which is clearly within the acting commissioner's remit—that was the preamble to the question—the other jurisdiction's comparisons were provided to give context. I would submit to you that it is well within the acting commissioner's remit and the question is relevant to this examination.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: whilst it might be within the commissioner's remit to take part in that; it is not within the commissioner's remit to inquire into the packages provided by other states and territories.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is the point I was making, member for Springwood. Yes, of course, wage negotiations around EBAs and so forth are within the commission's remit. The question contained an inference about comparing Queensland wages with other jurisdictions. Wages in those other jurisdictions are not in the commission's remit. I ask the member for Gladstone to please ask a question without the inference that was contained in that question.

Mr BUTCHER: For your benefit, Mr Deputy Speaker I am referring to page 1 of the SDS about support, attraction and retention. Under this offer, is it true—from what you see in the documents in front of you from other jurisdictions—that this is the lowest base wage increase in the nation?

Dr ROWAN: Again, point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I would submit to you that the member for Gladstone is seeking an opinion. I am looking through the documents for some authentication in relation to the comments referring to the Premier of Queensland because I cannot find those specific comments in the documents that have been circulated.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Moggill. There are two points of order there. Member for Moggill, are you requesting that the member authenticate the stated claims of the Premier?

Dr ROWAN: That is right. I was just looking for those in the documents that were circulated and I could not find that particular reference.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the other point of order, member for Gladstone: there is some validity to the point of order that you are seeking the commissioner's opinion. If you could ask a question which does not seek the commissioner's opinion about wage rises compared to other jurisdictions that would assist the process.

Mr BUTCHER: A very simple question to you, Acting Commissioner: is this the lowest paid wage offer in Australia?

Mr HUNT: A point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: again, on relevance. He has flooded the commissioner with a whole bunch of media releases from around the country. It is not relevant to commissioner's portfolio to be investigating other state's wages and to able to report on that at an estimates hearing after being provided some 100 pages worth of tabled documents.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Nicklin. Member for Gladstone—

Mr BUTCHER: I am happy to move on, Mr Deputy Speaker, this is getting a bit much. Acting Commissioner, is it correct that only some officers are eligible for the retention payment—not all?

Commissioner Chelepy: As part of the pay offer, all officers will get a base uplift and some officers will get benefits from a pay scale restructure. Our general duties officers will get an incentive allowance, as will our rural areas, because both our 100-day review and attraction retention data show that those areas are hard-to-fill and hard-to-retain areas.

Mr BUTCHER: Secondary to that, Acting Commissioner: given that community safety is so important, why aren't all officers included in that retention payment? What was the decision made on—other than remoteness?

Commissioner Chelepy: All officers within the organisation will get a benefit from the EB negotiation. Some officers will get a benefit from a pay scale restructure that others will not. Officers on our general duties who are working 24/7, 365 days a year, attending our frontline jobs of over 200,000 domestic violence jobs a year, over 60,000 mental health jobs a year, over 1.3 million calls for service—we want to retain those officers in those spots. Our 100-day review found that just over 33 per cent of our organisation is visible to the community. We have been very open and clear about needing to rebalance our organisation back to the front line, making sure we provide incentive payments that encourage officers to not only stay in general duties but also see general duties as a career and see them valued.

In our rural and remote areas we know there is a range of issues that require attraction. One of them is good quality housing—and the 100-day review found that—and another is the challenge of working in rural and remote areas. Those officers have retained additional flights out of those areas for them and their family. Also in order to attract people into those areas we have provided a retention bonus into those areas, particularly our one- and two-person stations.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, might this low-ball offer have an impact on police well into the future including their superannuation?

Mr HUNT: Point of order under 115(b). That contains an inference, the use of the term 'low-ball'.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Nicklin. Member for Gladstone, could you ask your question without an inference or argument contained in it, please.

Mr BUTCHER: I am happy to move on. My next question is to the acting commissioner. How many witch's hats were reported stolen last year and how much time was spent by your detectives investigating those crimes?

Commissioner Chelepy: The theft of witch's hats that the member is referring to would come under a category of 'steal, other' that we look into. Under the category of 'steal, other' there are four subcategories, and the theft the member is referring to would come under 'other stealing'. Within 'other stealing' there is another whole range of subcategories—16, in fact. To find the data that the member is requesting around stealing of witch's hats would require us to manually examine every 'steal, other' and 'other stealing' complaint that the organisation has had in the last year to identify which piece of property was stolen under those categories. I am unable to do that and I do not think it would be appropriate for my staff to do that.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you. I will move on. Acting Commissioner, we know there were about 143,000 victims of other thefts last year. How many victims of other theft have there been this year?

Commissioner Chelepy: Could I ask a clarification? Did you say how many in numbers?

Mr BUTCHER: How many victims of other thefts have there been this year?

Commissioner Chelepy: As indicated, under 'other theft' there are four broad categories, so I will need to give you those categories, if that is okay. In terms of other theft excluding unlawful entry, so stealing from dwellings, from 1 January 2025 to 30 June 2025—I have it in a six-month block, if you are happy with that, and I can give you the one before that—we had 3,474 steal from dwellings; we had 19,340 shop-stealing offences; we had 14,681 steal from enter with intent, other vehicles; and we had 33,133 other stealing. I need to reiterate that underneath those four broad categories there are 16 subcategories that those relate to. When you break up those 16 categories, they include things like stealing cattle, stealing equine equipment, unlawful use or suspicion of stealing of stock, stealing things by post, stealing goods in transit, stealing by conversion or by trick, and there is a range of other categories in there. While I give you the four main subheadings, each one of those subheadings is broken down by category.

Mr BUTCHER: Are you able to table those stats today?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes. They are publicly available stats on our website.

Mr BUTCHER: This one is also to—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment, member for Gladstone. Commissioner, if you want to table them you need to seek leave of the committee, but I understand they are publicly available?

Commissioner Chelepy: They are publicly available on our Open Data website.

Mr BUTCHER: I am happy with that answer. Acting Commissioner, you have just said you have as many as 16 subcategories, so you have the ability to filter out which of those has stealing that has a victim and which does not. Are you able to tell us how they can be broken down and which ones involve a victim?

Commissioner Chelepy: That is exactly the work that our stats area is doing at the moment. To go through the 'stealing, other' categories it takes a substantial amount of interrogation. There are four subcategories and 16 categories subbed underneath that again, so it actually does take time to do that. To give you an example, when we are talking about stealing by post and some of these other categories, we are looking at whether or not the complainant—as we call them—resides in Queensland, resides in Australia, is overseas, is a corporation or is a government entity. That is the work that our chief statistician is working through at the moment and it will take some time to do that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, we will move to government members' questions now.

Mr HUNT: My first question is to the minister. Minister, in relation to Labor's DNA debacle, what has been allocated in this year's budget to clear the backlog and bring justice to victims of crime who have been left languishing?

Mr PURDIE: It was back in 2022, when the QPS blew the whistle on the DNA lab in its submission to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce stating they had serious concerns about the validity of the DNA results and urgently sought retesting of a number of samples. I do not think anyone was quite prepared for the sheer scale of the debacle and knew that it would become one of the greatest failures of a justice system in the world. It happened under Labor's watch. The former government not only failed to act; they denied there was a problem.

The 2022 police submission to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce stated that, during 2021, 583 samples relating to sex offences were initially reported as 'DNA insufficient for further processing'. Investigators requested for testing to continue for 47 of these samples. Upon the continuation of testing, 31 samples yielded an unusable profile. This equates to a success rate of 66 per cent when samples below the threshold progressed through the full testing process. Today's *Courier-Mail* outlines the report by Dr Wright which found delays in reporting DNA results have now grown since early 2023, with courts relying on DNA evidence now at a point of critical system failure due to the former Labor government's inadequate action. The average wait for DNA is 412 days, which is 398 days slower than required by the Queensland Police. This is a disgrace. This means that there are potentially offenders still in our community posing a serious threat to safety. The report went on to say—

As a result of FSQ service capacity, from April 2023 QPS reduced the number of samples submitted to FSQ by 38.7%. Major crime samples reduced by 31.6% and volume crime by 45.7%.

The report goes on—

Police require DNA results within 24 hours for some major crimes and 5 to 10 business days for volume crimes to effectively resolve cases and disrupt offending cycles. Court statements are required 8 weeks from request.

The backlog of cases since 1 May 2023 includes 'not started cases' representing 641 rape kits. Of these, 121 relate to child victims or victims with an impairment and cold case homicides across 73 high-priority cases. FSQ is only allowing 11 cases to be submitted at a time and there has been little progress in those 11 homicides over the last two years. In response to the increasing untested rape kits, the QPS has sought to have 15 of its most urgent rape kits outsourced to an overseas lab. FSQ intervened without the knowledge of QPS and requested the overseas lab only perform the first step of the testing on the basis that there were technical differences between the labs. Ultimately, this intervention just delayed the testing of the rape kits by at least three months. The reality of these delays is bleak. Justice delayed is justice denied. What we have committed to in this budget is \$50 million to assist in the outstanding DNA in an attempt to clear the backlog of DNA testing. We commit to those victims that justice will be served and we will do everything it takes to make sure that we can restore confidence and faith in the justice system in Queensland.

Mr HUNT: Acting Commissioner, have police processes changed in the wake of the DNA debacle and how is this impacting the QPS's ability to solve crime?

Commissioner Chelepy: There are a couple of steps to police procedures. Our collection procedures at crime scenes—at offence locations—remain unchanged for our frontline officers to collect samples. However, due to the backlog in processing, we have had to change our procedures at the back end, and that is primarily because of the substantial delays in terms of receiving and getting

back any testing, so I have placed seven QPS officers embedded at the FSG location. Their job is to now triage and prioritise our samples of the most important cases so that we can get them tested as a priority. Their job is to liaise with the DPP, our prosecutors and our investigators to try to make sure that we are getting those highly critical samples back as quickly as possible, particularly if they are impacting a major crime investigation.

We have also changed our procedures with a plan to send our sexual assault kits now overseas again for testing because we are aware that we have over 1,000 SAI kits that have not even been opened yet on major crimes, so we need to get them overseas. Up until the pause, the reason we put the triage in place at FSG is we are waiting over a year, I am advised, for samples to come back in relation to our major crime cases. So we have changed our procedures at FSG. At Forensic Services we also prioritise the samples that are going in so that we can get as quick a result as possible.

The impact of the delay that you asked about is twofold. DNA is the new fingerprints and we know—our officers and our investigators know—that when we do speak to offenders around DNA it generally gives us the opportunity to clear multiple crimes at the one time. In the absence of the DNA at multiple crime scenes, we will regularly clear one crime and then have to clear another crime at a later time when a later sample comes through which means that that offender remains in the community and we are not able to do that clear-up or, worse, we have a delay in getting our results back so we are not able to identify the offender, and we know that the longer an offender remains in the community the more opportunity there is for recidivist offenders to commit crime.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, my question relates to the commitment for an additional 1,600 recruits by the end of the term as outlined in question on notice No. 4. Will the minister please update the committee on this commitment, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr PURDIE: We know that under those opposite over the last 10 years the thin blue line has never been thinner. Not only did the former Labor government water down the laws but they also failed to provide the backup that our police had been calling for right across the state. It was actually leading up to the election in 2017 when the then Labor government promised 565 more police across Queensland. They failed to deliver on that but doubled down in 2020 promising 1,450 extra police. At least year's estimates my predecessor, the former Labor minister for police, presented a glossy brochure, which I will not necessarily table—the committee has access to it—who by that stage was still trying to fudge the figures and convince police that they were sending the backup that our police had been calling for but had failed to materialise.

That is why it was with great pride today that I was able to announce that in the short term the Crisafulli government on this side of the ledger has increased the number of police across Queensland by 350. That is more than double what the Labor government were able to deliver in the last four years of government, only delivering 174 more police, and we are sending those police to the four corners of the state because we know that, whether it is from Cooktown to Coolangatta or to Cunnamulla, right across Queensland people are in the grip of a youth crime crisis thanks to the former Labor government. Not only will we equip those police with tough laws, the Making Queensland Safer Laws; we are sending the backup that they have been calling for.

We made a clear election commitment to the Police Union, that wrote to us prior to the election requesting that we produce or we deliver 1,600 more police recruits. I replied in my reply to them that I think we can do better than that and I am confident that we will, and we will continue to do that because I know firsthand how badly our police need the backup they need coupled with the resources they need, and I am hoping to get a chance to talk about that in another question. We appreciate the work that they do, we appreciate how tough the job got for them over the last 10 years and we are sending the backup coupled with the resources and the laws that they need to do that job and restore community safety to Queensland.

Ms MARR: Minister, with reference to pre-hearing question on notice No. 13 regarding the expansion of the State Flying Squad by the Crisafulli government, can the minister outline any specific outcomes already achieved for Queensland and Townsville, in particular addressing youth crime?

Mr PURDIE: As I have acknowledged in the House before, I know the member's history with Crime Stoppers and how passionate you are about community safety and your community up there in Townsville. Unfortunately, Townsville did become the epicentre of Labor's youth crime crisis and we saw crime figures across the board—whether it was other theft or crimes such as unlawful entry, break and enters or robberies—soar in places like Townsville, and I appreciate how strongly you have advocated for tougher laws and more police. We are not only sending frontline police, as I alluded to in

my previous answer, but earlier this year I was proud to stand with the Premier when we announced a tripling of the State Flying Squad in Queensland—the largest rapid response action group ever in the history of this state—and we did that off the back of a briefing by the police when we came into power.

We know that our frontline police around the state—our permanent frontline police—are doing an amazing job, but they need specialist detective support over the long term to provide that backup. That is why the State Flying Squad has recruited and advertised for more specialist detectives to go into those areas and target those serious repeat offenders.

To your question, I am happy to report on some of the amazing stats and results that they have been able to get in the short time that they have been in existence. I am happy to report to the member and to the committee that in six months the enhanced State Flying Squad has charged 328 adult offenders with over 1,029 offences and charged 848 young offenders with 2,482 offences. In Townsville alone the squad has deployed eight times since January, charged 195 young offenders with 709 offences and diverted 95 of these young people away from the justice system into early intervention programs.

These are real results and it is action on the ground. I do know that crime in places like Townsville is still too high. We have a lot of work to do and we will continue to do it. We will continue to send the State Flying Squad. We will continue to give our police on the ground the resources they need. I do not want to throw a hospital pass to the acting commissioner but, Acting Commissioner, do you want to add any more details about the Flying Squad and how you have been able to deploy them to those areas?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will just affirm that the Flying Squad is able to deploy statewide and is able to be supplemented by our other uniformed units such as our Public Safety Response Team and our tactical crime squads. We have seen not only the impact the Flying Squad has when it does deploy into those areas but also the pressure the Flying Squad takes off our regional and district detectives and uniformed staff in those areas. In particular, while the State Flying Squad operates from headquarters, it gives us the ability to move our resources in rapid response into areas that we identify need an immediate injection of staff to deal with what we see as spikes of crime or spikes of calls for service.

Ms MARR: Minister, Jack's Law has been made permanent and expanded under the new government. What impact is this legislation already having to make Queensland safer?

Mr PURDIE: I am happy to report to the committee that I think one of the greatest honours I have had in the short time I have had this job was passing that legislation to not only make Jack's Law permanent but also expand it to areas right across Queensland in the presence of the Beasley family. I do not need to remind anyone on the committee about the story and the legacy of Jack Beasley. I was also honoured shortly after getting this job back in November to go on a night shift during schoolies with the Surfers Paradise police and, again, the Beasleys and the Beasley Foundation where I got to see firsthand the amazing work that that life-saving legislation can do.

I spoke to the Beasleys personally and spoke to the police, and they informed me about the trial that was initially conducted at Surfers Paradise and how successful that was—how many people were wanded and how many weapons it took off the street. I also got to hear firsthand from those police about the onerous requirements that police had to undertake when authorising a wandering operation in the prescribed locations. You will remember that it was originally announced as a trial by the former Labor government in safe night precincts and then as other tragedy unfolded they expanded it to other prescribed locations, but every time they did that, in the Labor way, they added more onerous requirements on police to use that power and that authorisation. We heard stories about how it could take the senior sergeant down there days of work just to get that authorisation approved for schoolies, and outside of those prescribed locations there needed to unfortunately have been a knife crime or a knife incident before police could authorise the issue of that power. We took that on board and spoke with the police who had always been calling for that power to be expanded. As I said in my opening, I was proud to have the Beasleys present, along with some of the Surfers Paradise police who started the trial shortly after Jack was tragically killed.

I want to report to the committee the amazing work resulting from that permanency and that expanded law by our police who have been able to use that power. Since the expansion of the legislation commenced and was proclaimed on 18 July—and I was happy to spend that night with the Beasley family and the police on the Gold Coast at a wandering operation—I am happy to report to the committee that 11½ thousand people have been scanned—11,426, to be exact; 77 weapons have been seized; and 135 people have been charged with a total of 236 offences. There is obviously no way of

knowing how many injuries have been prevented or how many lives have been saved by taking 77 weapons off the street right across Queensland, but I think it is an example of what we can do when we listen to victims of crime and support them and we listen to the police and give them the tough laws they need to keep people safe. We know that we have a knife culture in Queensland, particularly with young people. Too many people have lost their lives at the hands of that culture, so we will continue to support and give our police what they need.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will move to non-government questions.

Mr BUTCHER: Going back to victim numbers, Acting Commissioner, have you or any member of the Queensland Police Service implemented any changes to how victims of crime are counted or reported, internally or externally, since the start of this term of government?

Commissioner Chelepy: Could I clarify a slight nuance in one of my previous answers?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, you may.

Commissioner Chelepy: I did advise that the victims for offences against property for 'other theft' were on our website. I am advised that I need to correct that to say the offences against property for 'other theft' are on our website, not victims. We do not list victims on our website. It is the offence numbers, not victims. I just wanted to clarify that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you need the member to restate the next question?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes, please.

Mr BUTCHER: Have you or any member of the Queensland Police Service implemented any changes to how victims of crime are counted or reported, internally or externally, since the start of this term of government?

Commissioner Chelepy: I can advise that the way we count our victims for offences has remained. We have had to provide a clarifying point on our open website because we have added property offences to that website. We had person offences there. For person offences the victim is listed as the individual. As we have added property offences—unlawful use of motor vehicle, unlawful entry to houses—the victim is the location of the offence. We have always counted our victims that way: for property offences it is the location of the offence. It is the location, not the individual. It has always been counted that way. The way we count our statistics is in line with the Queensland Government Statistician's Office, it is the way we have always counted them and it is the same statistics that we provide to the ABS.

Mr BUTCHER: Basically, you can guarantee that there have been no changes and there will be no changes in this term of government?

Mr HUNT: Point of order: that is what he just said. He was asked and answered.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Nicklin. There is some validity to that point of order that the question has been answered. The second part of your question is a hypothetical question. You could rephrase, member for Gladstone.

Mr BUTCHER: Can you guarantee there have been no changes and there will be no changes?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is a hypothetical question.

Mr HUNT: They do not like the fact victim numbers are down. That is what it is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nicklin, that is disorderly. Member for Gladstone, you are asking about a future action. It is hypothetical. Could you rephrase or move on, please.

Mr BUTCHER: Very simply, can you guarantee that there have been no changes?

Commissioner Chelepy: We have not changed the way we record our data or count our data.

Ms SCANLON: Acting Commissioner, last year there were 69,439 DVO breaches recorded; is that correct?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will seek that data.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: that data is from the Queensland crime stats website, but I am happy for the acting commissioner to come back to us at the end of the session, if useful.

Commissioner Chelepy: I will grab my brief. I appreciate the data, but I am being asked to validate a number that I do not have in front of me at the moment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: If you think you have it in the bundle of documents there, we can wait a short while for that.

Commissioner Chelepy: I do. Can I please clarify exactly what was asked?

Ms SCANLON: Last year there were 69,439 DVO breaches recorded; that is correct, is it not?

Commissioner Chelepy: The data I have in front of me for 2024-25, from July 2024 to June 2025, the last data I have for total breach of domestic violence—I am just grabbing it here—I have it as contravene a domestic and family violence protection—contravene—would be 70,759.

Ms SCANLON: Acting Commissioner, I appreciate that information. My question was in relation to the calendar year so you may be able to provide that information to the committee later. I appreciate you may not have it in front of you. Deputy Speaker, I am happy to move on to the next question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: In that case, we will seek that and maybe come back to that particular line.

Ms SCANLON: Acting Commissioner, is an aggrieved who is subject to a breach of a DVO a victim?

Commissioner Chelepy: Within our crime stats, they have never been counted in our stats as a crime. They are not counted in the ABS data and never have been counted and have never been counted by us in that area. When we talk about our crime victims, other offences DV related are counted so assaults, wilful damage, strangulation, criminal offences but breach of DV has never been counted in that data.

Ms SCANLON: It is the case that, with breach of a DVO, those victims were not included in the Premier's victim data; correct?

Commissioner Chelepy: Correct.

Ms SCANLON: Assistant Commissioner, the ABS Recorded Crime—Victims 2024 is due for release on 3 September. Has the QPS provided data to the ABS for that release?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes, we regularly provide our data through to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Not all of QPS data will be included in that release. The reason I say that is the ABS's role is to do an interjurisdictional comparison. Each jurisdiction collects data slightly nuanced and if the ABS, for instance, cannot harmonise those nuances it will not be included. An example of that is coercive control. Not every state and territory has coercive control so that would not be included in the ABS data.

Ms SCANLON: Acting Commissioner, if you do have that information and you have provided that to the ABS, can you please table a copy of that data today for the committee?

Commissioner Chelepy: I am sorry but I do not have that data with me. The data is regularly provided through normal chains through our statistician's office. I will have to seek some advice as to how that data is provided and in what format. My understanding is that it is raw data and it may be provided electronically.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy for that to be taken on notice as well, thank you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, only you can take questions on notice. Are you happy for the Acting Commissioner to consider what can be provided to the committee?

Mr PURDIE: I am happy for the commissioner to make those inquiries and, if available, to make it available to the committee.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, I table the letter I provided to you over a week ago to give you notice of this question.

Mr de BRENNI: Deputy Speaker, I table that correspondence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could all members and witnesses see the tabled correspondence?

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, can you please advise how many QGAir or QGAir contracted flights have been used by the current Premier and ministers?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will provide the data that I am able to provide, noting the letter asked if I could please have available the Premier's flights and the Deputy Premier's flights. I would have to interrogate every other minister's flights, but I do have some of that data that I am able to provide to you. The Premier has flown on a total of 24 flights, which consisted of 58 individual legs. What was the next part of the question?

Mr BUTCHER: Can you please advise how many QGAir or QGAir contracted flights have been used by the current Premier and ministers including the now Deputy Premier?

Commissioner Chelepy: There were 24 for the Premier since that time. I am able to advise that the Deputy Premier has flown on two flights in that time. I am able to advise of one minister, my minister, who has flown on one flight during that time. I can seek the other ministers' data should you require it.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, can I ask you to get that information for us today or will it have to be taken on notice?

Commissioner Chelepy: I should be able to get that data for you today.

Mr BUTCHER: Can that include all other ministers as well as your minister?

Commissioner Chelepy: Our minister has flown on one flight.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Only the minister can take a question on notice. Minister, are you okay for the Acting Commissioner to seek that data?

Mr PURDIE: We will try to get that data during the session.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, with the data and the information that you have today, what is the cost incurred for those trips?

Commissioner Chelepy: I can advise that the total cost for the 58 legs and 24 flights that the Premier took was \$544,538.

Mr BUTCHER: Can I also ask for the cost incurred for each trip for each minister as part of the information that you are getting back to us with?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will point out that some of the costings and the way we collect our costings will include multiple ministers. We collect the cost of the flight and the legs of the flight, but we do not attribute cost to individuals. I will give you an example. We may have one flight that contains the Premier and two other ministers. That flight is costed as a flight; it is not attributed to individual ministers. I can provide a breakdown of each flight if you wish me to do that.

I can advise the following: you will have to bear with me on this one. On 3 November 2024, there was a flight that involved two legs for \$19,600. On 4 November 2024, there was a flight that involved four legs at a cost of \$24,381.85. On 4 December, there was a flight that involved four legs for a cost of \$26,000.28. On 13 December, there was a flight that incurred two legs for a cost of \$1,870.

On 14 January, there was a flight that involved three legs at a cost of \$27,335.77. On 16 January, there was a flight that incurred three legs at a cost of \$19,596.39. On 23 January, there was a flight that incurred two legs at a cost of \$16,726.76. On 25 January, there was a flight that incurred two legs at a cost of \$19,646.83. On 3 February, there was a flight that incurred one leg at a cost of \$23,227.56. On 4 February, there was a flight that incurred four legs at a cost of \$15,872.73. On 15 February, there was a flight that incurred two legs at a cost of \$29,464.47.

Mr BUTCHER: Mr Deputy Speaker, can I ask the acting commissioner if he will table the flight manifests, the itineraries and the cost per trip for those flights today?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the acting commissioner is being responsive to the question asked and giving a very detailed and fulsome response. I would like to hear the rest of it. They asked the question, so they need to listen to the answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Acting Commissioner, it is my impression you do not have far to go.

Commissioner Chelepy: I have probably another dozen.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are halfway there. The answer is relevant to the question. I am going to seek some advice about the point of order. In the meantime, Acting Commissioner, could you continue, please?

Commissioner Chelepy: On 26 February there was a flight that incurred two legs for a cost of \$31,020.31. On 13 March there was a flight that incurred two legs for a cost of \$30,242.39. On 26 March there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$24,388.74. On 27 March there was a flight that incurred four legs for \$50,937.60. On 2 April 2025 there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$27,419.49. On 2 April there was a flight of one leg for \$5,423. On 24 April there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$21,123.83. On 30 April there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$17,154.14. On 12 May there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$16,384.53. On 29 May there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$18,231.02. On 11 June there was a flight that incurred two legs for \$14,132.87. On 13 June there was a flight that incurred three legs for \$37,930.67. On 17 June there was a flight that incurred three legs for \$26,426.73.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, can you confirm that all of the flights you have mentioned were for the Premier and Deputy Premier only?

Commissioner Chelepy: They were the flights that involved the Premier and may have had other ministers on board. They did not include the Deputy Premier.

Mr PURDIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I might be able to assist the member with this question.

Mr BUTCHER: No, I am fine with the answer. Thank you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order?

Mr PURDIE: No. I just wanted to assist the member with the question.

Mr BUTCHER: I am fine with the answer the acting commissioner gave, thank you. Acting Commissioner, will you be able to table the flight manifests, the itineraries and the cost per trip for those flights today?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I would seek some guidance with respect to the privacy provisions and aspects related to that. Could that be considered in relation to the question as asked by the member for Gladstone?

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: we assert that there is a clear public interest in the provision of this information. In accordance with that, I move that those documents—the manifests, the itineraries and the cost per trip—be produced and tabled to the committee.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could you clarify: you are seeking to move a motion, member for Springwood?

Mr de BRENNI: That is correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we proceed any further, I need to seek some advice from the Deputy Clerk. Member for Springwood, I have sought advice from the Deputy Clerk about the motion you are seeking to move. I am advised that standing order 30 does not apply in estimates proceedings, so the motion you have sought to move to compel the acting commissioner to table a document is considered out of order. In addition, I have reflected on the ruling made by the Speaker this morning. I draw your attention to the ruling made by the Speaker this morning that substantive motions are out of order during this session provided for estimates. The Speaker was quite clear in that ruling. With those two factors combined, I consider the motion you are seeking to move is out of order. I invite you to ask another question.

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, did you practise your answer to this line of questioning with the minister and the member for Nicklin?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, could you repeat that question, please?

Mr BUTCHER: Acting Commissioner, did you practise your answer to this line of questioning with the minister and the member for Nicklin?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a moment, please. I will allow the question. Acting Commissioner, you have some latitude.

Commissioner Chelepy: I discussed this matter with the minister while we were doing estimates preparation. I do not believe I practised this question with the minister or the member for Nicklin. I discussed it with the minister as we were going through estimates preparation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will move now to government members' questions. I call the member for Nicklin.

Mr HUNT: Acting Commissioner, in relation to the use of QGAir, how does the previous premier's use of the Government Air Wing compare with the current Premier's use, specifically the number of legs and cost?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will provide the comparison. For the eight-month period, the current Premier flew 58 legs on 24 flights for a cost of \$544,538, as I have previously indicated. For the period 9 July 2024 through to 21 October 2024, which is approximately a four-month period, the previous premier flew 35 legs on nine flights for a total cost of \$279,834. On my basic maths, I would say the total for the four-month period is about half of the total for the Premier's eight-month period. There is no discernible difference.

Mr HUNT: Acting Commissioner, what is the percentage of the total number of QGAir flights that were taken by ministers or members of the government?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I ask you to consider the relevance of this question in isolation to this estimates consideration and whether or not the question is relevant to these proceedings?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: the question is very relevant and the response is very relevant, particularly given the previous question that was asked and the response that was provided. I would submit to you that this question is very relevant. I would like to hear the answer.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your points of order, members. I have sought some advice. The question is relevant. That is my advice and my ruling.

Commissioner Chelepy: To give you a perspective, I can advise that QGAir total legs flown is 2,210. In a prioritised manner, QGAir provide DonateLife flights, emergent police response flights, police operations flights—the moving of prisoners and police and other investigative matters—and then ministerial travel. Those flights are provided in that order of priority. I can advise that the percentage of wet lease charter by the Premier and ministers makes up 4.5 per cent of our work.

Mr HUNT: So 4.5 per cent only?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes.

Mr HUNT: Acting Commissioner, did any Crisafulli government minister who travelled on QGAir services deliver any birthday cakes to your knowledge?

Commissioner Chelepy: I am going to have to say that the purpose of flight is determined by the government and not by me. I was not on board, but not to my knowledge.

Mr HUNT: Finally, in relation to QGAir, Acting Commissioner, did any members of the Crisafulli government ever take two jets to travel the state together?

Commissioner Chelepy: I can answer that by reviewing the flights as I have run through them today and you can see that there were no flights on the same day.

Mr FIELD: My question is to the minister. Members of the previous Labor government either referred to youth crime as a media beat-up or did not consider it a cause for concern. Can the minister please advise of any data that identifies what impact the Crisafulli government's Adult Crime, Adult Time laws have had on crime rates in my electorate of Capalaba, the South Brisbane district and Queensland as a whole?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: with respect, the question contained an imputation in relation to not having concern and I would ask that you request that the member rephrase the question so that it is in accordance with standing order 115.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Capalaba, could you put the last part of your question again, please.

Mr FIELD: I will re-ask the question. My question is to the minister. Members of the previous Labor government referred to youth crime as a media beat-up. Can the minister please advise of any data that identifies what impact the Crisafulli government's Adult Crime, Adult Time laws have had on crime rates in my electorate of Capalaba, the South Brisbane district and Queensland as a whole?

Mr PURDIE: We all know the path that led the member to be here. I acknowledge the journey you have been on. Thank you for the work you have done since being here to advocate for your community and for victims of crime in your electorate and right across Queensland.

To your point, crime did spiral out of control over the last 10 years. That was not just the rate of crime and the number of victims but the perception of crime and people's concern about their safety. There were senior members of the Labor government, like the former member for Capalaba, who did attribute it to a media beat-up. That is at a time when unlawful use of motor vehicle was over 100 per cent and other theft had risen by 50 per cent over the last 10 years.

We know that is unacceptable. Before the election we committed to fixing the youth crime crisis. We have gone a long way to doing that. We committed to passing the Making Queensland Safer Laws before Christmas, coupled with more boots on the ground. On both of those fronts, today, as we have announced, we have 350 more police—double the number that the former government was able to increase numbers by in a full time term of government.

Crime numbers are down and the number of victims right across the state are down. It goes to show that when you have more police with better resources and tougher laws and you embed consequences for actions, like our Making Queensland Safer Laws, a harsh penalty does act as a strong deterrent. Right across Queensland we have seen a two per cent drop in all offences, a 13 per cent drop in robberies, a four per cent drop in the unlawful use of a motor vehicle and a 10 per cent drop in unlawful entries.

Those opposite asking questions—members of the former government—are the only people in Queensland desperate for the number of victims of crime in Queensland to continue to rise. They continue to point to made up metrics like they did before the election when the former Labor government police minister said that the youth crime crisis was akin to kids stealing Kit Kats. We knew that that was not the case. That is why we will continue to give our police tougher laws.

They are a small step in the right direction. We are not popping the champagne and it is certainly not mission accomplished. We appreciate that not just the crime data but the perception of crime is too high and community safety is still impacted as well. What we saw under those opposite in 2015—and this is data that anyone can pull from the QPS webpage; I refreshed my memory on this this morning—was almost 10,000 unlawful use of a motor vehicle offences committed across Queensland, 9,359 to be exact. Fast-forward to 2024-25 and for both of those years it was either side of 20,000. Similarly with other theft, in 2015 there were almost 100,000 of those offences committed—98,127 to be exact. By 2024, after a decade of those opposite proudly watering down the laws and failing to swear in more police, that figure had increased to just under 150,000. Those opposite who are now trying to cherry-pick data and talk about other theft were silent on that issue for 10 years—unlawful use of a motor, robbery and break and enters skyrocketed.

I remind them that victim numbers are going down. There is a lot of work to do and we are not celebrating that fact. The Crisafulli government has a clear mandate and made a commitment to Queenslanders that we will continue to give our police everything they need to continue to restore community safety across Queensland and reduce the number of victims. My focus every day—and I talk to the commissioner on most days and certainly every Monday morning when he briefs me about crime—is making sure that our police have everything they need to stop crime in Queensland and protect victims of crime.

Mr HUNT: My question is to the minister. Can the minister outline how the new Nambour police beat shopfront in the CBD will enhance community safety?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member for the question. Again, I want to acknowledge that most of your adult life has been devoted to fighting crime and to community safety, and the majority of that has been in your electorate at Nambour where not only were you a frontline police officer but you spent a lot of time in crime prevention and community safety. You have always been a passionate advocate for that. I want to put on the record the work that you did previously to deliver a brand new police station to the police and the community at Nambour. I want to thank you for doing that.

Also, I want to put on the record how passionately you advocated for more of a police presence in Nambour around the CBD leading up to the last election. I know you lodged a petition, which was well supported by thousands of people. I was proud to stand with you and the Premier before the election to make that commitment to establish a police shopfront in Nambour, because we know about the perception of crime and how essential the presence of police is, particularly local and community-based police. That was coupled with a commitment we made during the election campaign for better CCTV to prevent crime and help police identify, detect and solve crime through that.

I want to put on the record that we have put a stop to Labor's overt campaign of shutting police beats. Over the last term of government, in the last four years of the Labor government, they went on an aggressive campaign to close police beats around the state, closing 25 police beats. We have put a stop to that. The 100-day review—and I want to thank Acting Commissioner Chelepy and the Police Commissioner, Steve Gollschewski, for conducting that review—has reinforced our commitment to local, community-based police stations, police beats and shopfronts.

Not only have we put a stop to the regime of those opposite, who aggressively and rapidly closed police beats across Queensland; I was proud to announce the police beat that we will be establishing in Nambour off the back of your advocacy and your support of your constituents but also one in Burleigh. I was proud during the election campaign to stand with the now member for Burleigh—unfortunately, that came after a tragedy that had occurred at a late-night hotspot—to announce that we will also be expanding a police beat to there. We appreciate that local police stations and local police beats are the cornerstone of policing. I was happy to see that as one of the recommendations in the commissioner's 100-day review.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, the Crisafulli state government has funded Operation Marshall. What is the purpose of this operation?

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, member. I have already given you a shout-out. I know how hardworking you are in your electorate. Community safety right across Queensland, even in your electorate in Brisbane, is of concern. One great concern of mine and the government when we came into government

was that a lot of the policing initiatives by the former government had not been funded into the forwards. That goes back to the member for Capalaba's point. I think that end-of-life funding, which was due to expire not long after we came to government, was proof that the former government thought crime was a short-term political issue that they needed to change the narrative on. It was not necessarily something that needed a long-term, strategic investment.

Whether it is the State Flying Squad or the Youth Crime Group but also more recently Operation Marshall, which the Premier announced recently, to the tune of \$31.3 million, which will be invested in our frontline police, detectives and specialist police right across the state to make sure they are at the forefront of fighting crime, that money will be invested in crime hotspots and intelligence-led policing. I know that operational policing responses are well and truly in the acting commissioner's wheelhouse. I might give him a heads-up now that I might even be throwing to him soon about that. With intelligence-led policing—whether it is Jack's Law, high-visibility patrols on curfew checks or myriad other operational work that police do—we have funded into the forwards Operation Marshall, which is a big bucket of money that police can use to support their ordinary, business-as-usual operational activities.

I have just been passed some of the amazing statistics that this operation has been able to achieve just in the first weeks since it has been announced. In the last two weeks the results include 393 charges laid against 250 offenders, including 76 charges against 48 juveniles. Figures up until 4 August reveal the operation has recorded more than 600 offenders on 100 charges, conducted over 10,000 proactive activities and logged nearly 4,000 proactive policing hours. Officers have also completed more than 6,500 street checks and carried out upwards of 2,200 random breath tests, RBTs, across the state. These results demonstrate that the combined impact of Operation Marshall, coupled with the expanded Jack's Law framework, is enhancing public safety, deterring crime and reinforcing community trust across Queensland. Acting Commissioner, is there anything I have missed that you would like to value-add to that?

Commissioner Chelepy: No. Thank you, Minister.

Mr HUNT: Can the minister please update the committee on the development of a public child sex offender register, noting the \$10 million budget commitment?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member for the question. Once again, I want to acknowledge the work that you have done over a long period of time, not just in this place but in your former role, with the Morcombe family. I know you were a police officer at the location where this heinous crime took place. You followed that journey and you have worked closely with the family. I want to update you and the committee about the work we are doing with the Morcombe family.

I had the privilege of meeting with them, Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon and other senior police just last week to consult them further on our commitment to establish a public child sex offender register in Queensland. This is something that we announced before the election in 2017. We also committed to it in 2020. It was awfully disappointing, off the back of the Morcombes' fierce calls for it, that the former Labor government refused to listen to that. The Crisafulli government does appreciate that every parent or every guardian deserves the right to know whether someone who might have unsupervised contact with their child is a registered child sex offender. We will be introducing legislation to enact that.

Further to that, member, you would know what has been announced and what other states have done. The Morcombes' ultimate goal is to see a national public child sex offender register. Other states have done that. Unfortunately, it was Queensland that was a spanner in the works of that being rolled out across the country. As has been done in other states, we are looking at implementing a three-tier public child sex offender register.

The first tier is that police will have the ability to broadcast the identity, a picture, of a registered child sex offender who is at large in the community—that is, a registered child sex offender who is failing to abide by their reporting obligations. That will be made public to the community. The second tier, as has been done in other states, is about serious repeat sex offenders—the worst of the worst sex offenders—who are on the register. Members of the public will be able to make application to the register to find out how many of those serious repeat offenders are living in their community. The third tier, as I alluded to earlier, is that parents and caregivers will have the ability to make an application to the register to find out if someone who has unsupervised contact with their child is a registered child sex offender.

In contrast to those opposite, who failed to listen to the Morcombes and follow the lead of other states over two terms of government, we do trust parents with that information. We do think that parents should be armed with the information that someone who has unsupervised contact with their child is a registered child sex offender. Coupled with that, there will be training. If someone makes application to that, that person will also be advised about protective strategies they should put in place with their child. We do know that other offenders outside those who are registered on the child sex offender register could potentially be offenders as well. There is a big training component to ensure parents and guardians of children are armed with those protective strategies that they can talk to their children about.

Member, back to your question, I know that you have been a fierce advocate of this for a long time. You have been a big supporter of the Morcombe family and their foundation. I know how passionate you are about this. I am proud in this position now to be furthering that for the Morcombe family and the community to be tabling this in parliament sometime soon.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, Minister and Acting Commissioner, there were a couple of matters which you were looking for further information about. Given the time, I wanted to inquire whether it would be appropriate for that information to be brought back to the committee now. Yes, you have some information for us, Acting Commissioner?

Commissioner Chelepy: In relation to the member for Gaven's question, I can confirm that for the calendar year of 2024 contravention of DV order was 69,438 offences.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There were a couple of other questions too, I believe.

Commissioner Chelepy: I was also asked to look at flight costs associated for all members. If I could provide some clarity on this, I am able to provide that data for the organiser of the flight, if that is sufficient. We record the organiser of the flight. For us to work it out for every other minister, we would have to manually process every one. I can inform the committee that, for the organiser of the flight, Minister Leahy had one flight as the organiser and, as I have previously briefed, three where she was on the jet with the Premier. Minister Camm has had one flight as the organiser. Minister Nicholls has had one flight as the organiser. Minister Powell has had one. Minister Mander has had one. Minister Last has had one. Minister Perrett has had one as the organiser. For full transparency as briefed, my minister has had one where the Premier was the organiser. Minister O'Connor has had one where the Premier was the organiser. Assistant Minister Dillon has had three. The Treasurer has had two. That is that data. Just for your records, in all of those flights, as indicated previously, we do not attribute costs to the individual. We attribute costs to the flight.

Mr BUTCHER: Just quickly, does that include the manifest?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, no. We are at the end of the session. Acting Commissioner, there is another issue that you wanted to come back to the committee about. I will ask you to do that, please.

Commissioner Chelepy: I was asked to provide the data that was provided to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. From our Chief Statistician I am advised that once a year we provide the ABS with a CSV file, which is a comma separated values file. To us it is unintelligible data but it is very important for the ABS to import the CSV file. The file we provide is over 45 megabytes in size. This year we provided the information to the ABS in May. I do not have the file here. It is 45 megabytes in size. I can advise the member that the file in the way that we provide it to the ABS would be of no value.

Ms SCANLON: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I appreciate the response from the acting commissioner. If he is not able to provide that to the committee, will the minister take that on notice?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, your point of order is out of order at this point of proceedings because the session for examination of estimates expired at 2.30 pm. Acting Commissioner, thank you for coming back to the committee with the information that you said you would. Minister, I know that you would like to thank everyone in attendance here. Would you like to do that now or at the end of the next session?

Mr PURDIE: Just very quickly for all the police—I am mindful we have chief officers about to come into the room. I want to thank every member of the committee and the visiting members for the process. This is an important process. Although I did not get asked a question from those opposite, it is a prudent exercise for us to make sure that we are across the budget and across the detail. I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and everyone for the opportunity.

Mr BUTCHER: With indulgence, I thank everyone for turning up today and I thank the staff for the work they do prior to estimates. I know it is a lot.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The session has expired. The committee will now break until 2.45 pm, at which time we will resume and examine the portfolio area of emergency services.

Proceedings suspended from 2.33 pm to 2.45 pm.



Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Welcome back, Minister and officials. I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of emergency services open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish you may make an opening statement of no more than five minutes for this portfolio area.

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker and committee members. I want to take a moment to acknowledge the extraordinary work of our state emergency services. The last nine months has tested our emergency response capacity like few others. The State Disaster Coordination Centre was activated three times throughout the season, including when Tropical Cyclone Alfred battered the south-east when it crossed the coast as a category 1 system north of Brisbane.

The SES responded to 21,304 tasks across three severe weather events, including when Northern and Western Queensland flooded, surpassing 1974 flood levels. After their response to Queensland's weather events, 59 SES members went on to three different regions in New South Wales to assist with the east coast weather event. Our SES, VMR, MRQ and coastguard volunteers stood strong and we saw the very best of our government services, our volunteer organisations and our communities. They responded to those calls for help—from sandbagging operations and tarping roofs to assisting in critical rescues of Queenslanders stranded in isolated parts of our state.

Our MRQ and VMR crews predeployed assets early in multiple regions before the storms hit, allowing for quicker response and recovery of Queenslanders in need of help. At the recent National Emergency Management Ministers' Meeting, Commonwealth and other state ministers remarked on how we, as Queenslanders, are the gold standard when it comes to emergency services and disaster management.

We are proud to deliver a record SES budget of \$63 million—a five per cent increase on last year—to assist in continuing the vital work of these organisations. I am pleased to also report a turning point for our SES: for the first time in six years the number of volunteers has grown to 5,400, an increase of 400 volunteers in the last financial year. It is a clear sign that the community recognises not just the importance of the SES but also wants to be part of something bigger than themselves.

The Crisafulli government is proud to stand up for our emergency services personnel and backs them every step of the way with continued investment in fleet upgrades and better equipment and facilities. SES groups across Queensland have shared in \$2 million in grants to boost disaster response capabilities since the election. In total, 32 SES groups from areas as far west as Doomadgee to the south at the Gold Coast have benefited from the SES Support Grant initiative. That includes funds for new vehicles, sandpit structures to aid in sandbagging, upgrades to facilities, and the establishment of a new SES facility in Doomadgee. Our SES groups play a critical role in natural disasters, and our government is pleased to boost capability ahead of the next major weather event.

I also acknowledge the work of the Inspector-General of Emergency Management, whose team has assisted in the important task of reviewing and analysing our approach to disaster management. It is vital that we strive to do better and look at ways for continuous improvement.

Our state emergency services are the quiet strength behind our disaster response. I look forward to continuing to work collaboratively with the commissioner, the chief officers and the Inspector-General to ensure we are best prepared for the future.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will move to non-government members' questions. I remind newly attending officers that they should state their name and position the first time they speak for the record. I turn to the opposition and the member for Pine Rivers.

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Chief Officer of the SES.

Mr PURDIE: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: I am advised that the member opposite cannot directly ask that member to join the table. That request would have to go through me or the State Disaster Coordinator.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order, Minister. Let me seek some advice about that. Member for Pine Rivers, the person you referred to does not appear in schedule 7 of the standing orders as a person who can be directly questioned. You may, however, direct your question to the minister or the acting commissioner.

Ms BOYD: Thank you for your guidance. Acting Commissioner, whistleblowers have told the opposition that hundreds of 132500 calls for assistance were cancelled and never completed during Tropical Cyclone Alfred. Can you inform the committee how many calls for assistance to the SES have not been responded to since November last year?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will ask the Chief Officer of the SES to come to the table to answer the question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have a point of order while that is occurring. Can I get some clarity and guidance in relation to authentication or verification? I know the member for Pine Rivers referenced the whistleblowers, but I seek your guidance in relation to the committee hearing and whether there needs to be some authentication with respect to that matter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order, member for Moggill. I would ask, if possible, for the member to authenticate the basis of that question. However, the second part of that question can also be asked without the preamble, and in that respect I will go to the Chief Officer of the State Emergency Service. Member for Pine Rivers, in the meantime, if you do have anything to authenticate that, could you provide it to the committee?

Mr Armstrong: Could I ask for the question to be repeated, please?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, perhaps just the second part.

Ms BOYD: Certainly. Chief Officer, can you inform the committee how many calls for assistance to the SES have not been responded to since November last year?

Mr Armstrong: When you say 'since last year', could I clarify from a date point, please?

Ms BOYD: Let us say 1 November 2024.

Mr Armstrong: While we have responded to many thousands of tasks during that period, I do not have that information at hand. I will seek advice as to whether we can provide that information, noting that, typically, the requests for SES can be received directly or via our task management system, known as TAMS. There can be a variety of reasons that tasks can be cancelled—for example, assistance has been provided from elsewhere in the community or from other emergency services or the members making the request have been able to resolve the issue themselves. I will seek that information, if it is available.

Ms BOYD: Thank you. If somebody was in need of assistance and then got a call back from the SES saying their call for help would not have a member of the SES attend in person, under your methodology, would that count as being responded to?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: under standing order 115(b)(v) the question contains a hypothetical.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Nicklin. Member for Pine Rivers, the point of order has relevance. If you could ask the question in another way that does not contain a hypothetical question, that would be the way to go, and go through the acting commissioner, please.

Ms BOYD: Certainly. Acting Commissioner, if someone had not received an in-person response and had received a call back stating that their call for help would not have a member of the SES attend in person, under your methodology, does that count as that call having been responded to?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will ask the chief to clarify his methodology.

Mr Armstrong: I will need to clarify our protocol with regard to that specific question. I will provide that information later in the session.

Ms BOYD: Thank you. So the full details of both of those components will come by the end of the session?

Mr Armstrong: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, the officer has indicated he will seek further details. Do you have another question?

Ms BOYD: I do, indeed. Acting Commissioner, my question is of Chief Officer Armstrong. Excluding preparations for today, how many times this year have you formally met with the minister for the specific purpose of a briefing or update on the SES?

Commissioner Chelepy: As the question was directed to me, I can answer that. As the director-general of the organisation, I brief the minister nearly every single Monday morning. There may be exceptions to that. I brief across my entire portfolio of policing, SES and MRQ.

Ms BOYD: Just to clarify, the chief officer of the SES is not in attendance for those Monday morning meetings?

Commissioner Chelepy: That is correct.

Ms BOYD: Is it the same circumstance for Chief Officer Wulff from Marine Rescue Queensland?

Commissioner Chelepy: Correct. I provide the operational briefing. Depending on what the operational briefing is, I will bring the appropriate executive member of my organisation with me.

Ms BOYD: Thank you. Minister, is it then accurate that in the last six months you have not met directly with Chief Officer Wulff or Chief Officer Armstrong in relation to their respective duties for Marine Rescue Queensland and SES?

Mr PURDIE: That is not accurate. As I said in my opening address, the State Disaster Coordination Centre and QDMC were stood up on three occasions, and on all three of those occasions the members of QDMC, which includes the chief officers, met once a day, twice a day or maybe even more. I would have to go back through the minutes of the QDMC meetings. Every morning and every afternoon during those events I was often briefed personally by the chief officers. As is the protocol, as the acting commissioner is also the State Disaster Coordinator, the chain of command to brief me is through him. In those environments when the QDMC is stood up, it would have amounted to dozens of times that I have had personal briefings from the chief officers of both of those organisations.

Ms BOYD: Outside of disaster times, for clarity, Minister, there have not been instances where you have met individually with Chief Officer Wulff or Chief Officer Armstrong?

Mr PURDIE: Yes, I have. They have been to my office with the acting commissioner, the State Disaster Coordinator. I have also met Mr Armstrong onsite at Kedron outside of disaster areas. He has also briefed me verbally over the phone about some issues that have arisen, and I think the State Disaster Coordinator might have been on those phone briefings as well. I can assure you that I have met with them multiple times during events and I have also met with them and been briefed by them, as I have the State Disaster Coordinator, outside of those events.

Ms BOYD: Given you have met with the minister and have been briefed by them, I notice that those meetings are not specified in your ministerial diaries. Does this mean your ministerial diaries are not accurate?

Mr PURDIE: Every Monday morning I am briefed by the acting commissioner and the State Disaster Coordinator and, depending on the operational briefing at the time, as he has already advised the committee, he brings people to that meeting every Monday morning as they are required. Those are reflected in my diary. We get operational briefings from the commissioner and people that work for him every Monday morning, and that is reflected in my diary.

Ms BOYD: Can you point us to where they are reflected in your diary?

Mr PURDIE: If the member wants to go to every Monday on the calendar prior to cabinet, she will see that every Monday I get a briefing from the acting commissioner, who in this case is also the State Disaster Coordinator and his departmental staff. As I explained to the member prior to that, not every single person in their position, particularly being staff members and their capacity in the Queensland Police Service is not for public disclosure in my diary. However, those records are kept and my diary is disclosed. Every Monday morning, I have an operational briefing and, on occasions, I am sure that the chief officers have been there, as have deputy commissioners, as have assistant commissioners, right down to senior detectives and junior police, depending on the operational briefing at the time.

Ms BOYD: Minister, outside of disaster events and outside of Monday morning meetings, you mentioned that you had met and been briefed by the chief officers. Can you point us to where those occasions are in your diary, or are we just to assume that if there is departmental staff that that could be encapsulated?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: this is becoming repetitious now. The minister has provided an extensive response in his previous answer in relation to that matter and I would submit to you that it is perhaps time to move on.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: I would submit to you that the shadow minister's line of questioning follows the responses that are provided and is a properly forensic examination of the minister's exercise of his responsibilities. It is not repetitious and is entirely appropriate for the circumstances.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice. Thank you, members, for your points of order. Member for Pine Rivers, it is a similar question, but not the same question. I note it is quite a detailed question, but I will allow the question, Minister, and also some latitude in answering it, given your previous answers.

Mr PURDIE: As I think I have already explained, not only on Monday mornings and not only during QDMC meetings, I have met with the chief officers as I have with the State Disaster Coordinator at events. I did a press conference with the chief officer on a Sunday not that long ago at Kedron which was outside of a QDMC meeting. It was on the news, so it was for the public to see. My diary is kept accurately. It is released in accordance with the proper protocols, and I have met with the chief officers on numerous occasions.

Ms BOYD: Let's move on. Minister, has the EVAF met recently?

Mr PURDIE: I have been to a lot of disaster management meetings recently, whether it is the NEM in Darwin, QDMC or SCC meetings. I am happy to throw to the State Disaster Coordinator to provide more information about those meetings you have asked for.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Acting Commissioner?

Ms BOYD: Just on that point, Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order, member for Pine Rivers?

Ms BOYD: Yes, I do. There were a lot of acronyms and forums that the minister threw out. None was actually the EVAF. I was asking specifically about the EVAF.

Mr HUNT: That being an acronym itself.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, what does EVAF stand for, for my information?

Ms BOYD: Perhaps the minister can tell us.

Mr HUNT: No, perhaps you can ask the question properly.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Deputy Speaker: the Speaker ruled earlier this morning on the conduct of members on the committee, and I would ask you to remind the member for Nicklin about his running commentary when he does not have the call.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Springwood. Member for Nicklin, fair cop. Member for Pine Rivers, I do not know what EVAF means, but if you could ask the question again perhaps with the full name, that would be appreciated for my benefit, if no-one else's.

Ms BOYD: Minister, has the EVAF met recently?

Mr PURDIE: The EVAF only meets once a year and it is specifically in relation to volunteers. I have recently spoken to the minister responsible for volunteers about that. As I said, there are a lot of different meetings, a lot of different groups and a lot of different acronyms around the state when it comes to disaster management. I am happy to throw to the State Disaster Coordinator to talk more on this as he has a longer history of involvement with the EVAF and other groups around volunteers and State Emergency Services.

Commissioner Chelepy: In response to the question, as the minister indicated, it has been only meeting once a year. I have been speaking with the minister. I have also been engaging with the minister responsible for volunteers. I have also been engaging with the Queensland SES Volunteer Association around the future of EVAF and the structure of EVAF moving forward and the best way for EVAF to continue to meet and deliver outcomes.

Ms BOYD: Is it correct to say that the EVAF, prior to August 2024, met quarterly?

Commissioner Chelepy: The EVAF on occasion had met quarterly, but it also met as required if there were no agenda items. I am personally aware of EVAF meetings that were delayed. As I indicated, as the State Disaster Coordinator, I am working through with Volunteering Queensland, the minister responsible for volunteers and our minister for the best forum of EVAF moving forward. I have recently, only as late as last week, corresponded back with Volunteering Queensland around that.

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Minister. I table a media release on the new Marine Rescue Queensland vessels to be delivered by the end of this financial year.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can we all see a copy of that, please, and across the table as well.

Ms BOYD: Minister, are all of the highlighted vessels either delivered or on track for delivery, as planned, this financial year?

Mr PURDIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have just been passed this document. I have not previously had a chance to refresh my memory on it. If I could have a few seconds to read the document?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may.

Ms BOYD: Specifically, it is in relation to Noosa, Mornington Island, Weipa, Southport, Round Hill, Brisbane, Midge Point, Port Douglas, Cardwell, Tully, Sandy Straits and Yeppoon. Are these highlighted vessels either all delivered or on track for delivery, as planned, this financial year?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, have you had a moment?

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I would like to highlight, as a bit of background for the committee, the formation of MRQ which is a merger of VMR and coastguards across Queensland. It was legislation that the former government brought to the House which we supported early last year. Coming to government, like a lot of other areas, we are trying to do the former government's homework, and we are trying to smooth the wheels of this transition as best we can. There are some issues that we had to resolve. I want to thank the Chief Officer and the State Disaster Coordinator—the acting commissioner—for the work in doing that. It was only last week, I think, that I met with the National Board of the Coast Guard to talk about some issues that they had with the former government and the transition and why it is taking so long.

I can inform the member asking the question that we are continuing to transition all of those groups over to MRQ and we are hoping that will be done by the end of this year. I had a briefing about this only last week. We are looking at the last one being Cape York in December.

Ms BOYD: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker: my question was specifically around the status of the highlighted vessels and whether they have all been delivered or are on track for delivery by the end of this financial year.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is your point of order on relevance?

Ms BOYD: Indeed it is.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I just heard the minister say words to the effect that they think they are on track for towards the end of the year, which sounds highly relevant to me, but he was still adding more which was relevant. Minister, please continue.

Mr PURDIE: As I pointed to, this is another failed transition of the former government that we are working through. I want to thank the chief officer for the bespoke way he is dealing with every single one of those VMR or coastguard groups to design a transition for each group. In relation to the specific vessels, I do have some notes in front of me about that. We are trying to ensure that the vessels currently owned by those groups are transitioned across. The government in the budget has announced a considerable amount of money for new vessels and to bring older vessels up to speed. The State Disaster Coordinator and assistant commissioner has indicated to me that he can personally speak about that in a lot more detail. He could even throw to Acting Deputy Commissioner Stream or the chief officer, if need be, to help more fulsomely answer the member's question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Acting Commissioner, do you have further details to add?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will run through a number of vessels. Vessel group 5 includes nine vessel builds; three contracted vessels include one 11-metre flame-collared vessel, one 11-metre hard-collared vessel and one 10-metre hard-collared vessel, with expected deliveries in 2025. These vessels will go to and support MRQ Port Douglas, AVCGA QF11 Yeppoon and VMR Midge Point respectively.

Ms BOYD: Can you please repeat them, Acting Commissioner? It sounded a bit mumbled to me.

Commissioner Chelepy: MRQ Port Douglas, Yeppoon coastguard QF11 and VMR Midge Point respectively. At PD11MRQ Port Douglas, an 11.3-metre walkaround vessel has been completed. The hot-work milestone is due for delivery in late 2025. The Yeppoon vessel is expected in August 2025 and the Midge Point vessel is expected in November 2025.

I can also advise that out of vessel group 4 there were three 11-metre multihull vessels for Mornington Island, Weipa and Noosa. All builds are in the acceptance phase of their respective contracts. NS11 has been successfully delivered to QF5—that is Coast Guard Noosa. The MRQ team are currently working through the onboarding process as we speak. In addition, there are three fibreglass vessels due for delivery between 2025 and 2027. In particular SP21, which has been an accepted vessel, was delivered to VMR Southport on 5 June. The vessel is currently going through its

onboarding but is fully operational. Three nine-metre vessels have had contracts executed with three Queensland vessel manufacturers. These vessels will support marine rescue operations at Tully, Sandy Straits and Cardwell. The first of these builds is expected to be delivered to the Sandy Straits in August 2025. I am hoping I have covered off most of them.

Ms BOYD: There are two remaining, Acting Commissioner—Round Hill and Brisbane.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Acting Commissioner, for your response. We will go to government member questions now.

Mr HUNT: Minister, Queensland experienced three major weather events in the most recent severe weather season. As the Minister for Emergency Services, can you detail the first significant event and the response?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member for the question. As you are aware, this was my first severe weather season as the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I want to talk about the amazing work that not only our QPS first responders but also SES and Marine Rescue Queensland did right across the state. I remember going with the Premier to Ingham as the floodwaters were still rising there. You might remember seeing on my social media page or on the news that the only way we could get in there was to shimmy across a single-lane rail bridge. When I did get there—I went to the police station after visiting the fire station and some others—I saw police and fires at their respective stations sleeping on the floor as they had done for some days. A lot of them could not get back to their families or get back to their homes. As we often see across Queensland in disasters, volunteer and paid first responders put the community above their own safety. In fact, I met some water police officers who had been sleeping in the watch house at Ingham. They actually told me that they had not been out of their wetsuits for some days. I took a picture of them, put it on my social media page and gave them a shout-out. I wanted to take the opportunity to do that.

The first major event of the season was the severe flooding across North Queensland which began in late January and carried through into early February. It was a slow-moving and dangerous system that brought record rainfall and widespread damage. The Bureau of Meteorology reported more than a metre of rain in parts of Townsville and the Hinchinbrook shire. This weather event triggered a massive emergency response. Queensland SES volunteers completed more than 2,500 tasks—from flood rescues and evacuations to resupply missions and property protection. They responded to 225 formal agency support requests, providing essential assistance to Queensland police, local councils and other frontline agencies including flood boat rescues, community welfare checks and doorknocks.

Importantly, the response was not just what happened on the ground. SES members were embedded in the State Disaster Coordination Centre for 14 days and in the State Police Operations Centre for 13 days helping to steer the statewide operational response. In total, 401 Queensland SES volunteers were deployed to support flood-affected communities, backed up by 298 interstate SES who travelled to Queensland to lend a hand. An additional 40 SES personnel worked behind the scenes to supply the SES State Coordination Centre over 24 days, completing 395 shifts in one of the most coordinated and sustained emergency responses in recent years. I want to place on the record my thanks to every SES member, every agency and every community member who stepped up. Their tireless efforts ensured help reached where it was needed most when it mattered most.

Mr FIELD: Can the minister detail the response for the second major event—Tropical Cyclone Alfred—which followed the flooding in the north?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member for the question. I appreciate that not only was all of South-East Queensland impacted but his electorate was as well. I want to update and refresh the committee's memory in relation to Tropical Cyclone Alfred, which made landfall as a category 1 system north of Brisbane, in the vicinity of the Moreton Bay islands, at approximately 1 am on 8 March 2025. The system caused approximately 450,000 power outages, loss of telecommunications, the closure of 684 schools and early childhood centres, substantial beach erosion and impacts to tourism. The QPS was proactive in alerting the community about the impending impacts of TC Alfred.

At this point I reflect on a privilege I had. Obviously they are highly stressful and busy times when the State Disaster Coordination Centre is stood up, but I took the opportunity to go out to north Brisbane, south Brisbane and the Gold Coast, where I met firsthand some amazing police recruits, some of them in their first week at the academy. I want to thank the acting commissioner and others who had to send out an SOS to the supply store to make sure they had polo shirts, cargo pants and boots to come and help on the front line. There were some police who were in the final stage of their training and about to get sworn in. I also met police from other states who were out on the front line in the weather, doorknocking and warning residents across South-East Queensland of the impending disaster.

I thank them personally. I got to thank a few of them in a subsequent week at their swearing-in ceremony. I got to thank them in front of their friends and family for that work. I want to take the opportunity to report to the committee the amazing work of these recruits, some of them in their first week of training and some of them towards the end of training. That was part of 13,928 tasks received, mainly to assist with flooding, structural damage, trees down and resupply. There were 230 agency support requests received mainly to assist with doorknocking—and I spoke about the recruits who mobilised to help with that doorknocking—downed trees and flood boat rescues. Also 220 Queensland SES volunteers were deployed to support the response as well as 340 interstate SES volunteers. I want to thank all the volunteers who helped out Queenslanders in their time of need.

I have one closing story to close the loop on some of those recruits in their first week out on the front line. When I was on the Gold Coast, one of the sergeants was driving the bus and directing the new recruits on the front line. It was his last week in the job after 40 years of service. In front of the recruits and in front of all the people at the coordination centre on the Gold Coast I got the chance to thank him for his service. I thought it was fitting that in the twilight of his career after 40 years service he got to take a group of recruits out on the front line during an emergency situation, a severe weather event, which we had not seen in South-East Queensland for a long time. I want to thank him and all the recruits, all the police, all the SES and even Marine Rescue Queensland.

I am mindful that they do not have the flood boats that were deployed in Northern and Western Queensland and South-East Queensland but particularly during Cyclone Alfred Marine Rescue Queensland came to the fore. I am more than happy if the chief officer gets the time to relay this story. They were deployed to some of the islands in Moreton Bay for some young women who were about to become mothers. They medivaced them out of those islands to get them back to the shore to safely give birth. They also rescued people and were deployed on a number of different occasions, so I want to thank Marine Rescue Queensland as well.

Ms MARR: My question is to the minister. Northern and Western Queensland also experienced flooding during March and April. Can you please inform the committee how the government, including the SES, responded?

Mr PURDIE: Thank you for the question. As the member knows, turning to the floods in North Queensland, the Premier and I visited multiple times. After Cyclone Alfred in late February the state turned to another unfolding event which resulted in widespread extensive rainfall and erratic weather not only from the north but out to Western Queensland as well between 28 March and 26 April. This event caused widespread rain and flooding. The significance of this event is highlighted by the fact that several towns including Stonehenge, Jundah and Windorah surpassed flood heights from 1974. There were 289 tasks received mainly to assist with washouts, resupply and flooding; and 110 agency support requests were received to assist QPS and local government with reconnaissance, resupply and air field and transport support. A total of 178 Queensland SES volunteers were deployed to support the response.

I want to thank the acting Commissioner, the State Disaster Coordinator, who travelled out to those areas. I also got the chance to travel out to those areas after the disaster where I met the sole officer at Adavale. I heard firsthand about some of the amazing work he did personally to rescue people, save people and prevent lives being lost. He was able to point out to me on the high level Queenslander, which was not only the police station but his residence, where the water lapped the door. It was only the little door seal that stopped all his belongings being flooded. I also got a chance to visit Quilpie and the two-officer station there and speak to those police officers. At that police station the police officer had been there for a long time. He was happy to see a minister from the government and he reported to me that he had not seen one for well over a decade.

I want to thank all those local police in those small communities who, as they do all too often, rise to the fore to put their own safety behind that of the community, often people they do not know in those small, tight Queensland communities. I want to thank them and the SES for responding—not only the local SES, but also the SES from around Queensland. As they did in North Queensland and South-East Queensland, they travelled to those areas to help. Just like we sent SES volunteers and members down to New South Wales to help in their mid east coast flooding event, SES members from New South Wales and further afield came to help us as well. I want to take this opportunity to inform the committee of that and thank them for their help.

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the acting Commissioner. At the outset I acknowledge all emergency services personnel across Queensland including in the electorate of Moggill. Acting Commissioner, could you please detail how the pre-positioning of assets during the latest severe weather season assisted in the emergency response to the three major weather events in Queensland?

Commissioner Chelepy: As the State Disaster Coordinator, I can advise that it is an absolute priority for us to pre-position our assets and additional personnel because as the event moves around, we do not know where we are going to get cut off or where we will have restricted access. That is coordinated through a forum called the State Disaster Coordination Group, which sits underneath the Queensland Disaster Management Committee. The State Disaster Coordination Group is made up of all of our state response agencies and is coordinated through operational level staff at that location.

I can advise that the following resources were pre-positioned during the 2024-25 high-risk weather season disaster events. We pre-positioned additional SES and QPS officers to support local operations to ensure that BAU was maintained and to conduct doorknocks advising of impending events and potential impacts. In some of those instances we conducted those doorknocks on two to three occasions in the same location. This also enables the safe and continuous management of evacuation centres in the impacted areas pre, during and post events.

Our energy assets—and I really take my hat off to Energy Queensland; they staged generators, fuel pods, trucks, communication devices and auxiliary equipment to facilitate the prompt employment to impacted communities as well as significant resourcing, ultimately minimising our power outages and our communication disruptions. Energy also pre-positioned field crews with additional resources from regional depots. This included additional crews and Starlink communications being pre-positioned in potentially impacted areas not only to minimise the loss of power and communications but also to ensure the rapid restoration.

Our mobile telecommunications, both Telstra and Optus, part of our state disaster coordination group, conducted site preparations and predeployment of staff, generators, fuel pods and resources in our potentially impacted areas, again, not only to minimise the loss of communications but to enable the rapid restoration. The Queensland Fire Department, as they always do, were on the front foot and predeployed swiftwater rescue teams along with the SES flood boat operating teams to likely impacted areas to conduct rescues, support isolated communities and to support vulnerable communities. Of course, through the SES we predeployed hundreds of thousands of sandbags, which were prepared and provided to communities in preparation for the rising floodwaters. It was a mammoth effort by the chief officer and his team to deploy the number of sandbags we deployed around the state last year. I do not think we have ever deployed that number before. Due to that volume, federal government assistance was provided for that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will turn now to non-government questions.

Ms BOYD: My question is to the minister. Who is the chair of the Emergency Volunteers Advisory Forum?

Mr PURDIE: In terms of the volunteer group that you spoke about before coming under Ann Leahy and the work that we are doing in relation to those volunteers moving forward and the volunteer parliamentary inquiry in relation to people on the board and who the current chair is, I am happy to throw to the State Disaster Coordinator to give you that information.

Commissioner Chelepy: Thank you, Minister. Member, as per my previous response, the EVAF is currently under review as to where it most appropriately sits. I have personally briefed the minister, engaged with the Minister for Volunteers and engaged with Volunteering Queensland, and the question that we are trying to determine at the moment is where it is best sat. Is the ministerial level the best location for that to sit or is it best to be driven through high-level government officials? That has been under review pretty well post the minister coming in and me providing him the first briefing, and that is yet to be determined.

Ms BOYD: Am I to understand, then, Acting Commissioner, that the role of the chair is vacant or there is an incumbent in that role?

Commissioner Chelepy: The current committee have not met because it is under review, member. It has not been dissolved, but we have not actioned it because my briefings to the minister are that it is best to determine where it will provide the best effectiveness moving forward, given the change in our emergency volunteer landscape and, again, the work that we do with Volunteering Queensland. Is it best to be driven at ministerial level or is it best to be driven at senior official level?

Ms BOYD: Acting Commissioner, what is the name of the chair of the Emergency Volunteers Advisory Forum?

Mr HUNT: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: this is the third question on this subject. I think the acting commissioner has given a fulsome response and I am clear where that body sits at the moment. I think he has provided an answer to that question and it is bordering on repetitive at the moment.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: I would challenge the assertions made by the member for Nicklin and respectfully submit to you that the question was around whether or not there was an incumbent and whether or not the committee was still operating. The third and final question asked by the member for Pine Rivers was distinctly different to the others as to the name of that individual.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: the acting commissioner has provided a response. I heard him clearly say that the current committee is not meeting at this stage because it is under review and I think he has provided a response to the question as asked.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The same point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: No, Mr Deputy Speaker. I refer once again to the Speaker's ruling this morning where he indicated that he would take one point of order from the government and one from non-government members in relation to the same matter. I would submit to you that the Leader of the House is ignoring that ruling from this morning and I would ask you to remind him of the Speaker's instructions for the remainder of the hearings.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just a moment, member for Springwood, because I have the Speaker's ruling here in front of me. I would just like to see that again. Member for Springwood, to your final comments, the Speaker was stating that he would generally hear another point of order about the same issue. He also said he would not tolerate persistent or repetitive points of order. However, the points of order that I have heard so far are not, in my view, persistent or repetitive, so I would just go back to the member for Pine Rivers. I do believe her questions—her first and third question—were the same question, however to a different party—on this occasion, the acting commissioner. Acting Commissioner?

Commissioner Chelepy: Thank you; I am very happy to answer the question. The current chair of EVAF is Surf Life Saving Queensland, if my memory serves me right, which is David Whimpey, and that was delegated to him through the previous minister but, as I indicated, it is under review.

Ms BOYD: Acting Commissioner, I refer to page 90 of Budget Paper 4. Can you confirm that the \$3.8 million over three years for the Deception Bay SES facility is additional new funding appropriated from Treasury and not funding reprioritised from other projects or deferrals of existing allocated SES or QPS funding?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will just grab that detail for you, but I can confirm straight-up that it has not been allocated from QPS funding. I can confirm that while I am just getting that brief for you. While that is being found and to make most use of the time, I can fill in some of those previous questions where I did not have answers for you. In relation to the two vessels, you asked about Round Hill. I can inform you that it started on 2 February this year and the hull is currently laid up, with an expected completion date of February next year. In relation to the Brisbane vessel, I can inform you that it has commenced, with the fibreglass moulds being commenced, to be delivered in July 2026.

While we are just chasing the starter, I will also, if it is okay with you, close off that question that you asked the chief officer about the calls. I am advised that, for the period 1 November 2024 to 30 June 2025, 3,336 calls were listed as cancelled or rejected in TAMS, which is the Task and Management System. There were 293 rejected—and I will provide clarity on that in a minute—and there were 3,043 cancelled. TAMS requests for assistance can be listed as cancelled or rejected for a number of reasons, including cancelled by the initial caller calling up or via the mobile app, by SES where a call is made to the resident advising that that request for assistance is no longer required or if it is a duplicate request within the system. Rejected would be where it is not an SES task and it is referred to other agencies such as the Rural Fire Service, police or another support agency. If someone has not received an in-person response—SES attending the property—but they received a call back, in respect of that question as to whether it is considered a call being responded to I am advised that the SES may record the administrative effort for a call back rather than the operational effort and then mark this matter as complete.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Acting Commissioner. That ticks the three that were taken on notice and now you could probably go back to Deception Bay.

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes; thank you. With respect to Deception Bay, I can advise that it has not been taken off any other area.

Ms BOYD: Thank you very much. Acting Commissioner, I refer to pre-hearing question on notice No. 17 and the transition pathway for coastguard which has not been finalised. Has or will a payment be made to the coastguard national body in relation to the transfer of assets to allow the transition of their flotillas to MRQ?

Commissioner Chelepy: I can advise that our coastguard negotiations are still ongoing. I will just say that it is a complicated matter. As you can appreciate, we have a volunteer association that is registered as an incorporation in another state that we are dealing through with the national board. I can advise that we have not made a payment for the transfer of assets. We are negotiating with that agency in good faith and we believe that those assets, as we have always said, could be transferred and gifted to MRQ. We have clarified our position as an ability to receive charitable gifts through recent legislation that was passed in that we requested to provide absolute clarity to coastguard that they can fulfil their fiduciary duties as a board in transferring those assets to MRQ. That is the approach we are continuing to negotiate with the national coastguard board.

Ms BOYD: The question was specifically around has or will a payment be made to the coastguard national body. I am sorry, I must have missed that in your response. Can you highlight that bit for me again?

Commissioner Chelepy: We have not made a payment to the national body for the transfer of those assets and the approach that we continue to negotiate with the national body is for those matters to be gifted to MRQ.

Ms BOYD: Thank you so much for clarifying that for me. I refer to the response to the committee to question on notice 15. This increase in volunteers for the SES was made possible due to the work of specialised recruitment and retention staff along with additional SES support staff across the state; is that correct?

Commissioner Chelepy: Yes, it was. The SES have worked very hard with their recruitment and the recruitment officers on the ground have made a massive difference.

Ms BOYD: It is such a great result. These additional recruitment staff were allocated to the SES through the Emergency Services Reform Program; correct?

Commissioner Chelepy: They were allocated as part of the additional staffing through that program, correct. I will just clarify that the position numbers were allocated and the chief officer, through myself, determined what the best fit for those roles would be.

Ms BOYD: My next question is to the Inspector-General Emergency Management. I refer to page 17 of the SDS and the IGEM's purpose of providing independent and valued assurance and insights and the terms of reference for the 2025 disaster reviews. Following on from Tropical Cyclone Alfred which impacted the south-east, your terms of reference explicitly exclude land use planning, building design and construction codes. Under whose advice were these matters excluded and what was the rationale for their exclusion?

Mr Dawson: When we look at the terms of reference, again for the second year we have multiple events occurring. These were what I would call significant—I think the term is often used 'beyond imagination' for the size of the events. Part of that was really looking at the pre-season planning activities, the integration of preparedness and response and the opportunities to enhance community resilience to better prepare for and respond to the disasters. When we look at a review as such, there are certain things that we can do and there are a lot of things that we cannot do because there is obviously a space of time in which that has to occur. We get our terms of reference from the government and it is really around what we actually have the capacity to do.

When we look at the overall size of the event, out of the 77 government areas and one town authority, 73 were impacted—that is 95 per cent of the state—by three back-to-back disaster events between 29 January to 19 May. It included a tropical low across north and far northern Queensland, a tropical cyclone event in the south-east corner of Queensland and a rainfall and flood event across a large section of Western Queensland. A lot of the work that we are doing at the moment is in relation to engagement with councils and also communities as well, which we have done in the past. To date we have conducted one community forum at Hervey Bay. We still have community forums to conduct at Redlands, Quilpie and Cardwell.

Ms BOYD: I have a point of order, please, Deputy Speaker, in terms of relevance. While it is very interesting information that the inspector-general is providing, the question specifically went to the terms of reference and the exclusion of land use planning, building design and construction codes. I believe

he has said that he had advice from the government around terms. The question was: under whose advice were these matters excluded and what was the rationale for their exclusion? I ask you to bring him back to relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. Inspector-General, if you could address those questions. I realise it is a broad issue.

Mr Dawson: I can only comment on the actual terms themselves. What you will find also is, I understand, that these particular out-of-scope areas have been used in the past as well in other reviews, but it comes back to capacity. In my meeting with the minister we would be talking about the actual capacity of the office to be able to do this.

Ms BOYD: To include those would be beyond your capacity, if I am reading between the lines of your response?

Mr Dawson: Yes. If you look at an office of 22 full-time employees across 95 per cent of the state there is only so much that we can actually do. We still have people who need to have leave as well so we do surge and we are very grateful to the agencies that do help us surge, but it comes back to the capacity to be able to do what we do.

Ms BOYD: Thank you so much for that response. Acting Commissioner, pre-hearing question on notice 15 outlined operational funding for the SES. What is the total funding allocation for the SES, including capital and grants?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take a moment to find that if you need to, Acting Commissioner.

Commissioner Chelepy: I will just grab that information for you. I will just run through that, if that is okay. In 2025-26 we have a \$63 million operating budget to support our frontline volunteers and essential services provided to Queensland communities. Then we have the principal community partnership with Suncorp which supports community engagement and education and provides SES volunteers with resources and equipment to the value of \$1.44 million. We have a grants budget of \$12.28 million, which is included in that overall \$63.04 million. We do not have any specific government capital allocated. We also have other community partnerships that provide support to us, including Ergon Network and Powerlink Queensland, for another \$300,000 and we also have, obviously, our volunteer fundraising which still occurs and supports the SES.

Ms BOYD: Of that combined figure, does that include any deferrals from last year and, if so, how much?

Commissioner Chelepy: I can advise that the budget this year is \$63.043 million, excluding the stuff we get from our sponsorship. That is separate. That does not include any deferrals.

Ms BOYD: In terms of deferrals from the last financial year, is there a sum that was carried over?

Commissioner Chelepy: There is a sum of deferrals, and I would have to get that for you as it is not included in that budget. So that I can look at apples with apples, I have excluded deferrals out of my budget prices. I do have it here. The SES has requested a deferral of \$14.9 million, \$11.28 million operating and \$3.623 million capital, from 2024-25 to 25-26. That is still subject to the Treasury's approval.

Ms BOYD: Acting Commissioner, let us do it all again: similar to that question, pre-hearing question on notice No. 17 outlined operational funding for Marine Rescue Queensland. What is the total funding allocation for Marine Rescue Queensland, including capital and grants?

Commissioner Chelepy: I am advised that Marine Rescue Queensland's total budget is \$47,171,000, made up of \$35,312,000 operating and \$11,859,000 capital.

Ms BOYD: Does that combined figure include any deferrals from last year and, if so, how much?

Commissioner Chelepy: No. The figure that I provided to you then does not include deferrals. Again, I have kept deferrals separate. I am looking for the deferrals you requested. We have \$5.160 million capital expenditure for the Vessel Replacement Program. Excluded from the budget of 2025-26, pending approval by Treasury, is \$1.623 million in a capex deferral.

Ms BOYD: Acting Commissioner, has the QPS done any scoping work on renovations or expansions for the State Disaster Coordination Centre and, if so, how much is it anticipated that works would cost?

Commissioner Chelepy: To my knowledge, we have not done any scoping or renovation works to the State Disaster Coordination Centre. We have done some internal movement of desks.

Ms BOYD: Has the State Disaster Coordination Centre reached its capacity? Is it still fit for purpose?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order: that is really seeking an opinion. I would submit to you that perhaps the question should be rephrased.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Member for Pine Rivers, could you rephrase that?

Ms BOYD: Most certainly, thank you, Deputy Speaker. Acting Commissioner, have you received any advice on whether the State Disaster Coordination Centre has reached its capacity and is still fit for purpose?

Commissioner Chelepy: I will start by saying that we are always looking to improve. I think disaster management in Queensland is as strong as it is through a continual improvement approach. I have received no specific advice that we need to renovate the State Disaster Coordination Centre, but I can say that we delivered three major state events last year that saw well over 100 staff for each event deployed into the centre. We work a 24/7, three-shift roster in that facility. It is always tight.

Ms BOYD: Minister, have you met with Surf Life Saving Queensland, beyond attending their event here in parliament, since becoming minister?

Mr PURDIE: I would have to consult my diary, but, to your point, I obviously spoke at an event that Surf Life Saving Queensland hosted in the parliament only a few weeks ago. I am also a member of my local Coolum Surf Club and I was an active surf lifesaver and a competitive surf lifesaver as a junior. I have a lot to do with Shane Urban—

Ms BOYD: Thank you. I believe the minister has answered the question by saying that he would need to consult his diaries.

Mr PURDIE:—who is well known in my area of Coolum, although not as well known as his brother, Keith Urban.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Pine Rivers. We are going to government questions after this, but, Minister, is there anything further that you would like to add at this point?

Mr PURDIE: No, that is fine, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will go to government questions.

Ms MARR: Minister, you have made numerous trips to Townsville since becoming the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can you describe how the government assisted in responding to the disaster? I will let you finish your answer.

Mr PURDIE: As I alluded to in a previous answer, the Premier and I caught up with you and the other members from Townsville during that first weather event in North Queensland. From your role previously working for the Townsville City Council, you would know of the work the council does. You saw firsthand the work of the council and the Local Disaster Coordination Centre. I take this opportunity to acknowledge the State Recovery Coordinator, Andrew Cripps, whom we appointed, as well as the original deputy, Jay Nataro, who needed to be replaced under tragic circumstances. We visited a lot in North Queensland. We visited Townsville a lot. I spoke about the amazing work that we did when we arrived in Townsville shortly after that event started transpiring.

Only a few days after the State Disaster Coordination Centre stood up, the Premier and I met with you and the other members from Townsville. We made our way down to Ingham. We had to shimmy our way across a bridge to get into Ingham, where we saw firsthand the amazing response. I got to see the amazing work that the SES volunteers did up there. I know you were there at the local SES depot on more than one morning when we visited the local members. I was lucky enough, and I know you were as well, to go out with an SES crew. We visited the house of a young family who had lost their power thanks to a fallen tree. I saw firsthand the amazing work that they did and how professionally they did it. They rightly made sure that the minister and members of parliament who were at the scene stayed well back, outside their safe parameters, while they removed the tree from that house. It is during those tough times that we see the best in our communities. North Queensland, more so than most communities in the country, has experienced severe weather events. They pull together to prepare and respond. Along with the SES, our frontline responders played a significant role in the North Queensland floods. I was fortunate to see firsthand some of the great work they do, as you were, member.

As we know, dozens of localities were activated for DRA assistance, which is jointly funded by the Commonwealth and state governments for those hardest hit areas. Earlier this year, 401 SES volunteers were deployed north to assist the QPS and local government with rescues, community

information and resupply operations. Additionally, the SES received 2½ thousand tasks to assist with flooding, structural damage, washouts, resupply, evacuations and downed trees. After moving to the recovery phase, with my colleague the minister for recovery, Minister Ann Leahy, and the QRA team taking the lead, those communities are still front of mind. That is why we have tasked the IGEM team to do a review into the weather events so that continuous improvement is the norm and we can learn from those past events.

Mr FIELD: Minister, you might be aware that I am also a member of a surf club, at Point Lookout. Our family has been involved there for the best part of 25 years. Could you please detail the SES support grants that were recently awarded, including for Redland City Council, and if that program is still continuing?

Mr PURDIE: I did not know about your history in surf lifesaving. I thank you for that. I do not want to think about the days you once sported the uniform of a surf lifesaver and patrolled the beach! I do want to talk about the Crisafulli government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Minister!

Mr PURDIE: I withdraw. The Crisafulli government is backing our SES volunteers with the resources they need to protect Queenslanders during disasters. SES groups across Queensland have shared in \$2 million in grants to boost disaster response capabilities since the election. In total, 32 SES groups from areas as far west as Doomadgee to the south on the Gold Coast have benefited from the SES group grant initiative. Key SES initiatives nominated by local Queensland councils include: \$225,000 for vehicle replacements at the Atherton SES depot; \$150,000 for the establishment of an SES facility in Doomadgee Aboriginal Shire Council; more than \$123,000 for sandpit structures in Babinda, Edmonton, Machans Beach, Buchan Point, Gordonvale and Holloways Beach; more than \$123,000 for revitalising and reinforcement of the Ingham SES building; more than \$95,000 for vehicle replacements for the Yeppoon SES depot; nearly \$40,000 for an ATV and trailer for the Quilpie SES depot; and more than \$86,000 for automatic security gate upgrades at Goodna SES depot.

Our SES groups play a critical role in natural disasters and our government is pleased to be able to boost capability ahead of the next major weather event. Further to the member opposite's question about the depot at Deception Bay, I had the privilege of attending there not that long ago where with the local mayor of the Moreton Bay City council and the member for Redcliffe we turned the sod on that amazing facility. I look forward to visiting there with the chief officers and others to watch that unfold, and I look forward to it opening its doors.

Mr HUNT: Minister, has the Crisafulli government delivered on its election commitment to contribute to the construction of the new SES depot at Deception Bay?

Mr PURDIE: I just alluded to that at the end of my last answer, but I am happy to give a more fulsome answer. The Crisafulli government is delivering on its \$3.75 million election commitment towards a new state-of-the-art SES depot in Deception Bay. This pioneering facility will be six times larger than the existing depot and purpose built to support our award-winning SES volunteers. It includes dedicated training rooms, operational and storage areas and extra parking to support both SES and community needs. We are backing our frontline emergency volunteers with the resources and infrastructure they need to keep Queenslanders safe.

The Deception Bay SES group was named Queensland SES State Group of the Year in 2023, with Moreton Bay SES taking the honour in 2024. The unit spent 800 hours responding to more than 800 tasks during Cyclone Alfred, a clear example of their critical value in disasters. Multiple Deception Bay SES members even deployed to North Queensland during the devastating floods earlier this year, proving their reach goes far beyond their own backyard.

This investment is about building stronger, safer and more resilient communities across Queensland. When disaster strikes, Queenslanders rely on SES volunteers and they deserve the very best facilities to do their job safely and effectively. As I close my answer, it was a privilege to attend the turning of the sod event with the local mayor and the member for Redcliffe. I look forward to that progressing.

Ms MARR: Minister, you have travelled extensively to visit MRQ and SES facilities. Can you please detail the unique challenges faced by MRQ crew in the Torres Strait?

Mr PURDIE: I did have the great privilege of not only visiting the most northern police station in the state at Thursday Island but also getting to meet some of our amazing volunteers and staff from Marine Rescue Queensland while I was in the Torres Strait. I want to give a big shout-out to Roscoe, who captained the boat that took us out. He has been a member of Volunteer Marine Rescue up there and now MRQ for some time.

They took us out and gave us a tour of the islands and spoke about the unique challenges they have. They also had the opportunity to spruik about their amazing vessel that had been recently upgraded, which they were proud to show off. They even took us out to the rock and told us the history about the rock and how the vessel that we were on got its name. Roscoe's last name is Tindall and he is a lifetime member of VMR Queensland. Mr Tindall has lived in the Torres Strait for more than 25 years and is very well connected to community throughout the entire region.

In my time as minister, I have taken the opportunity to visit even the most northern parts of our state, as I have just said. Queensland has many communities. When the population is sparse, the safety standards and the role of our emergency service units are equally as critical. I was fortunate enough to meet dozens of PLOs and MRQ staff who told me of their experiences. Also, when I spoke with the officer in charge of TI's station, I was informed that the QPS offers the First Nations Recruit Preparation Pathway program to support First Nations people into policing roles. I also got to meet the PLO, who is one of the most qualified boat operators in the country. He also took us for a tour on the police vessel at the end of the day. I want to give him a shout-out as well. I met dozens of PLOs and VMRQ staff who told me about their experiences. I spoke to the officer in charge, as I said, about the pathway program.

The teams in this part of our state face unique challenges and we are determined to give them the support they deserve. The Thursday Island police, the MRQ and the SES cover a vast area of approximately 48,000 square kilometres, which includes 17 populated islands. MRQ advised me it can take longer than an eight-hour shift to support weather events on the outer islands where they need to consider tidal surges, fuel consumption and weather conditions when responding to incidents.

The isolated nature of the outer islands also encourages drug trafficking syndicates from Asia to pass through into Australia. The QPS, MRQ and SES partner with the Australian Border Force, the Australian Federal Police and the Australian Defence Force to ensure Queenslanders are protected and all our borders are secured.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, in relation to the State Emergency Service, how is the Crisafulli state government supporting this vital volunteer organisation to grow and support Queenslanders in their time of need? I know they do great work in the electorate of Moggill.

Mr PURDIE: I advise the committee that the commissioner has a few matters that he wants to bring to the committee's attention before we finish, and so do I. For those watching the clock, can you please allow a few minutes for us to do that?

You have asked about the SES and the amazing work they do and what we are doing to support them so they can continue the great work they do and continue to grow their membership. I want to, again, put on the record my acknowledgement of their ability to grow those volunteer numbers when we know across the board how hard it is to recruit and retain volunteers. That is one of the reasons the Crisafulli government has announced a parliamentary inquiry into that. We know how important it is, as I even said in my opening address, to support the volunteers, who are often the quiet heroes of our frontline response, not just here in South-East Queensland but right across Queensland. We have allocated \$63 million of funding in this budget to the SES, and I know that the state disaster coordinator gave a more fulsome and detailed breakdown of that budget and some of the grants.

As I just alluded to, the Crisafulli government has also delivered on its commitment to hold a parliamentary inquiry into volunteering. I have been working with Minister Leahy in relation to that. We have a regional network of seven community engagement and recruitment officers who support tailored, regional-specific recruitment and retention initiatives. There are ad campaigns that promote employers to support volunteers as well as recognition and reward programs. Partnerships with like-minded organisations like Girl Guides encourage members to consider joining. After five consecutive years of declining volunteer numbers, we are pleased to see that number turning around and growing.

Again, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge all the staff, all the volunteers and the chief officer in particular for rolling that out to promote the good work they do. We know that the value they provide to Queenslanders is impossible to put a dollar figure on. We would not be able to respond in the way we do right across Queensland, and I want to thank the chief officer and all of those involved in growing the volunteer numbers. Commissioner or Acting Deputy Commissioner Stream, is there anything you would like to add in relation to the great work that our SES volunteers have been doing across the state?

Commissioner Chelepy: I acknowledge the work that the volunteers have done and continue to do to support Queenslanders during disaster events. It is fantastic work and it shows true Queensland spirit.

Ms MARR: My question is to the minister. Why did it take so long for you to release the Inspector-General Emergency Management's 2023-24 severe weather season review report?

Mr PURDIE: I am mindful of the questions from those opposite directly to the IGEM earlier about the three reports they are currently conducting. I am looking forward to getting those reports, which we aim to release before the next severe weather season. It was disappointing, on coming into government, to find that the previous report that the former government commissioned the IGEM to do had been completed and tabled in cabinet but had not been released by the government. On coming into government and me getting this job in November last year, we took urgent steps to make sure we could get that report released to the community. When I travelled to Far North Queensland—I went to Cooktown, Wujal Wujal and Cairns—I found there was a lot of angst about what was in the report and why the former government had not released it. Due to the requirements of the Westminster system, we had to go through a process to get the former premier, the now opposition leader, to release it.

That is why in response to an earlier question the IGEM spoke about the timing of the current reviews and the capacity he has within his team of 22 people and what they can produce. We realise it is a big body of work to do three reviews into the three weather events we had. We want to make sure we get those reviews back in a timely manner—they are due back on 14 October—so we can consider them and allow time to ensure all first responders and volunteer organisations can make the improvements. We need to continually improve.

As I have said a number of times today, unfortunately Queensland is more experienced in responding to disasters than anywhere else in the country, and Far North Queensland more so again. This was acknowledged at the meeting of state ministers for disaster responses that I had the privilege to attend in Townsville the other week with Assistant Commissioner Stream. They acknowledged on the record that Queensland is the exemplar when it comes to responding to disasters across Queensland.

We are looking forward to getting those three reports and we look forward to actioning them in a timely manner. That is in stark contrast to the former government, which failed to release their report from cabinet before the last election.

Mr HUNT: My question is to the Inspector-General Emergency Management. With reference to pre-hearing question on notice No. 9, can you please detail the level of consultation that was undertaken in preparation for the 2024 severe weather season report and comment on the progress of the report?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Inspector-General, you have about one minute.

Mr Dawson: The report itself provides information in relation to the review that was undertaken. The recommendations arising from that report are now part of the monitoring, evaluation and reporting process that the IGEM currently has. There were nine recommendations, and we acknowledge that people are working through those nine recommendations.

Mr HUNT: My question is to the minister. Is there anyone you would like to thank?

Mr PURDIE: Before we get to the thank-yous, Mr Deputy Speaker, there is one thing about which I would like to correct the record while I have the chance. It has been brought to my attention that in an answer to a question in the first session of this estimates hearing I said that the former government, leading up to the 2017 election, made a commitment of 565 more police when in fact it was 535 more police. The acting commissioner has a few things that he wants to clarify or provide back to the committee as well.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order: in advance of the acting commissioner speaking and before the proceedings close, to ensure my recollection was correct, was the acting commissioner going to come back to us before the close of this session and provide flight manifests? I cannot quite remember whether that was properly dealt with at the time. I wanted to draw that to your attention before the hearing closed.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. I am advised—and it was my understanding too—that each of the items on which further information was sought in the previous session was provided in that session. I give the call to the acting commissioner as the minister indicated he wanted to provide clarification and it is important that that be done.

Commissioner Chelepy: For completeness in relation to my previous response to the member for Pine Rivers when asked regarding the deferrals for the MRQ budget, in addition to what I provided to you there is an additional \$3.501 million opex deferral in relation to day-to-day operations, resourcing,

vessel maintenance and refurbishments. There is an addition \$4.885 million capex deferral relating to expenditure items such as vehicles, vessels, tractors and trailers. Both those deferrals are excluded from the budget as indicated to you and are awaiting Treasury approval.

In relation to the upgrade at the State Disaster Coordination Centre, I have been advised that an upgrade planned by Queensland fire and emergency services, as it was called then, of a number of years ago in relation to ICT at SDCC is still ongoing, with screens being replaced and meeting rooms upgraded. My response to you is correct that I had not been briefed about the need, but I am aware that the ICT upgrade is underway as we speak.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your clarifications. Minister, if you would like to quickly thank everybody, that will be the close of the proceedings for today because the time has expired.

Mr PURDIE: Thank you for the opportunity, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thank you, the members of the committee, the visiting members who were here today and the secretariat staff. Most importantly, I thank the acting commissioner, the assistant commissioners, the deputy commissioners, the IGEM, the chief officers and all of the staff who are not only sitting behind me but also sitting in a room behind me and back at headquarters. This is a very important part of our democracy. A lot of work has gone into it. A lot of questions were not asked today, but going through the process and making sure that we do have answers for all those questions is very important in terms of scrutiny. I thank everyone involved for their hard work and their questions. I hope we were able to help the committee in its considerations.

Ms BOYD: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you Minister, Commissioner, officials and departmental officers for your attendance. Member for Pine Rivers, this estimates session has expired. In accordance with the Speaker's ruling this morning, no motions or other points of order can be put at this point.

Ms BOYD: I would just like to thank our emergency services staff. Thank you for your indulgence, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The committee will take a break until 4.45 pm, when we examine the estimates for the portfolio areas of the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services.

Proceedings suspended from 4.18 pm to 4.45 pm.

**ESTIMATES—JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE—
YOUTH JUSTICE AND VICTIM SUPPORT; CORRECTIVE SERVICES****In Attendance**

Hon. LJ Gerber, Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Ms Valeria Cheglov, Chief of Staff

Ms Fabiana Vitali, Head of Policy

Ms Bronte Mullane, Policy Advisor

Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support

Mr Bob Gee, Director-General, Youth Justice and Victim Support

Mr Michael Drane, Deputy Director-General, Youth Justice Services

Queensland Corrective Services

Commissioner Mr Paul Stewart APM

Superintendent Steven Scougall, Chief of Staff



Mr SPEAKER: Good afternoon. We will now resume proceedings. For the benefit of those who have just joined us, I am Pat Weir, the member for Condamine and Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. Under the provisions of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, I will preside over today's hearing.

The members of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee are: Marty Hunt, member for Nicklin, who is the chair; Peter Russo, member for Toohey, who is the deputy chair; Russell Field, member for Capalaba; Natalie Marr, member for Thuringowa; Hon. Mick de Brenni, member for Springwood, who is substituting for Michael Berkman, member for Maiwar; and Hon. Di Farmer, member for Bulimba, who is substituting for Melissa McMahon, member for Macalister, for the remainder of today's session. The committee is joined by other members who have been granted leave to attend and ask questions at the hearing today.

I remind everyone present that any person may be excluded from the proceedings at the Speaker's discretion or by order of the committee. The committee has authorised its hearing to be broadcast live, televised and photographed. Copies of the committee's conditions for broadcasters of proceedings are available from the secretariat. Staff who are assisting our witnesses here today are permitted to use personal electronic devices in the chamber. I ask all present to ensure that phones and other electronic devices are switched to silent mode or turned off if not in use.

Please note that the first three rows of the gallery are reserved for department and ministerial staff supporting the minister. Members and others who are attending to observe are welcome to sit in the remaining rows or in the gallery upstairs. I also remind everyone that food and drink is not permitted in this chamber.

The committee will examine the proposed expenditure contained in the Appropriation Bill 2025 for the youth justice and victim support portfolio area until 6.45 pm. We will adjourn for a short break until 7 pm, before examining the portfolio area of corrective services until 8 pm. I remind honourable members that matters relating to these portfolio areas can only be raised during the times specified for the area, as was agreed by the House. I refer members to the program set by the House available throughout the chamber and on the committee's webpage.

I also remind everyone that these proceedings are subject to the standing rules and orders of the Legislative Assembly. In respect of government owned corporations and statutory authorities, standing order 180(2) provides that a member may ask any question that the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant Appropriation Bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

On behalf of the committee, I welcome the minister, director-general, officials and departmental officers and members of the public. For the benefit of Hansard, I ask officials to identify themselves the first time they answer a question referred to them by the minister or director-general. Please remember to press your microphones on before you start speaking and off when you are finished. I now declare

the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of youth justice and victim support open for examination. The question before the committee is—

That the proposed expenditure be agreed to.

I now invite the minister to make a five-minute opening statement before we begin questions.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker and committee members. Good afternoon. The youth justice and victim support portfolio goes to the heart of community safety, and this budget delivers the foundations for a fresh start for Queensland, restoring safety where you live, putting victims first and backing the frontline offices that Labor left behind.

After almost a decade of the previous Labor government weakening the Youth Justice Act, putting the rights of offenders before the rights of victims and creating a generation of repeat youth offenders, the Crisafulli government is getting on with the job of restoring community safety. We are putting victims first, restoring consequences for action, and investing more than ever before in early intervention and rehabilitation to break the cycle of youth crime in this state.

We are delivering the largest youth justice and victim support budget in Queensland's history—\$770.2 million. Behind every dollar is a young person that needs help to break the cycle of crime, a family grieving a loss that never should have happened or a frontline worker continuing to show up to protect our community. Queenslanders told us they were fed up with a system that failed to prioritise victims. We listened, we acted and we have done exactly what we said we would do. Our landmark Making Queensland Safer Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, which were passed within months of forming government, are beginning to rebalance the system. We have set up an Expert Legal Panel to advise on further offences that should be Adult Crime, Adult Time and we are investing to stop the cycle of youth offending. This budget locks in a record \$560 million in rehabilitation and early intervention funding, but that is not all.

With Queensland's first minister for victims, the Crisafulli government is also delivering record support for victims of crime. With this budget we are acting for victims. We are making the change and investing a record \$4.58 million to ensure that victims of crime receive the support they deserve: a nation-leading victim advocate service; almost doubling the support for victims through Victim Assist Queensland; rolling out our community response for victims of crime and making that program statewide; and activating the youth justice victims' register. This budget lays the foundations for our Making Queensland Safer plan to see fewer victims of crime in this state. It is really pleasing to see new data released by Queensland police showing a 5.7 per cent drop in the number of victims of crime against population in the first six months of 2025. Yes, it is early days and there is a long way to go, but this is a step in the right direction.

Finally, I place on record my sincere thanks to the hardworking staff across the youth justice portfolio. You guys are the backbone of this system, and none of this would be possible without your dedication to safer communities and better outcomes. I especially acknowledge the leadership of my director-general and thank him for his outstanding contribution to this portfolio. Many of you know that Mr Gee has dedicated almost four decades to the Public Service across many different portfolios. Mr Gee is well respected. He is never afraid to make tough decisions. He always finds time for everyone. He knows the issues at ground level. He mentors those around him and he is famous for his favourite quote, 'It will take two minutes.' Now he takes on a challenging new role alongside the commissioner leading the inquiry into the militant CFMEU, tasked with lifting the lid on the CFMEU culture of systemic violence and intimidation. I can think of no better or more qualified public servant than Mr Gee to help advance this critical landmark commission of inquiry. I thank the committee and I look forward to the questions.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to opposition members for the first question. Member for Bulimba?

Ms FARMER: Director-General, it is great to see you here today after all of the reporting that you are moving on. I table one of those media reports. Is it correct that you specifically requested to move to literally any other senior government job other than the one you are currently in?

Mr Gee: That is totally incorrect. I think it is well known and it is a matter of public record that directors-general are contracted to the premier of the day. I have always responded to the premier of the day when they have asked me to take on a task. I have not—I have not—asked for a move from my current position. The Public Service Commissioner, Mr David Mackie, came to me and asked me if I would do a job on behalf of the Premier. I said that I serve at the pleasure of the Premier and the government of the day, and I look forward to serving in that capacity. I would say that it has been a privilege to work with various ministers, particularly Minister Gerber, on huge reforms in the youth justice sector and victim support. I look forward to continuing to support the government of the day.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, I understand your department now oversees the Office of the Victims' Commissioner. I note a LinkedIn post from the Victims' Commissioner last week in relation to victim numbers. I table that post now. I understand that last year there were 69,438 DVO breaches and there are 35,047 DVO breaches already this year. Is it correct that victims of those breaches were not counted in the victim data released by the Premier last Tuesday?

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow you to have a look at that, Director-General. What is your point of order?

Mr HUNT: My point of order is on relevance to the portfolio of this director-general. He is not in charge of domestic and family violence. The question is not relevant to his remit.

Ms FARMER: With respect, this is referring to a quote from the Victims' Commissioner, who talked about victims, which is in the department's remit.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sure the director-general is capable of responding to this question.

Mr Gee: No problem at all. Could I just ask the honourable member to repeat the specific question at the end, please?

Ms FARMER: I understand last year there were 69,438 DVO breaches and already this year there are 35,047 DVO breaches. It is correct that victims of these breaches were not counted in the victim data released by the Premier last Tuesday; true or false?

Mr Gee: I think the Police Commissioner already addressed that in earlier hearings today. I would note, though, that the role of the Victims' Commissioner is an independent role, so her statement is a matter for her, although I am the accountable officer under the act in terms of the budget, the staff and the resources there. Frankly, I think the public record is very clear. The commissioner made it very clear about data being reported. The data continues to be reported in the same way that it always has been. I look forward to seeing the ABS data soon. I am very pleased that there is more data out there publicly, and I look forward to more data being reported in the near future.

Ms FARMER: However, not data about DVO breaches. Director-General—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, we do not have commentary before you ask a question. Just ask questions, please.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, the post from the Victims' Commissioner appears to call for victims of domestic and family violence to be included in the government's reporting of victims data to include matters like DVO breaches; would you agree?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, point of order: that question is seeking an opinion based on the post of the director-general. I submit to you, Mr Speaker, that perhaps the question should be rephrased.

Mr SPEAKER: It was seeking an opinion at the end. I will ask you to re-ask the question, if you do not mind, member for Bulimba. The last section was asking for an opinion.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, the post from the Victims' Commissioner appears to call for victims of domestic and family violence to be included in the government's reporting of victims data to include matters such as DVO breaches. Does the data currently record those matters?

Mr Gee: I am not going to comment on what appears or does not appear around the Victims' Commissioner's comments. It is a matter for her what she meant by them. I can say that coercive control—the Police Commissioner went through this again; it is on the public record—is included in those statistics. The Police Service, as I understand it, has not changed the way it is reporting, nor has the Government Statistician's Office, nor has the Australian Bureau of Statistics. In my experience, there is publicly available data on various websites and in annual reports. I think the website that the Police Service put out many years ago and is there available for people is consistent. I cannot add any more than that.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, how many requests for support from victims has the Office of the Victims' Commissioner received since 1 January this year?

Mr Gee: I might take a couple of seconds to find that, if that is okay. Could I ask for the specific question again?

Ms FARMER: How many requests for support from victims has the Office of the Victims' Commissioner received since 1 January this year?

Mr Gee: I could talk to the number of complaints but—

Ms FARMER: Sorry, through you, Mr Speaker, I am after the requests for support.

Mr Gee: Can we come back at the end of the session with that? It is a really specific question. I want to check the legislation too, if that is okay, Mr Speaker, to make sure that is within the remit.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. You can come back before the end.

Mr Gee: The question though is support?

Ms FARMER: Yes, requests for support. Minister, is it correct that, when one or more units in a youth detention centre go into night mode, it means that the young offenders in those units are locked in their cells?

Mrs GERBER: 'Night mode' is a local term that is used specifically in relation to the detention centre in Townsville, to the Cleveland detention centre. The correct terminology is 'separations'. When the detention centre goes into separations, that can happen for a number of reasons. It can happen as a result of the behaviour of the youth to keep the staff and the other youth in that detention centre safe.

When separations occur, the youth offender who is in that detention centre is confined in their room. However, there are of course circumstances where the youth offender can be walked out of their room as well—even during what the member has referred to as 'night mode', which is correctly called 'separations'. The circumstances where a youth might be able to be walked out of their room or come out of their room during separations include, for example, if they need medical treatment or if they need to attend education. There are other circumstances where supports can be brought to the youth. For example, their education material can be brought to them in their rooms. There are a number of different operational details—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Speaker—

Mrs GERBER: Sorry, I am not finished answering the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take the point of order.

Ms FARMER: I had a very specific question and the minister has answered that.

Mr SPEAKER: I will ask the minister if she has anything to add. She was being specific to the question. Minister, do you have anything to add to round your answer out?

Mrs GERBER: I do. I want to round my answer out to say that the member has referred to these as 'night mode', which is a term that is very local to the Cleveland detention centre. There are a number of ways that are determined at an operational level as to whether or not the child who is in separation in their room might be able to leave the room during separation periods. They are operational matters and the director-general can speak to the operational matters that might happen in the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: with limited time, I do believe the minister answered my question and I do have a number of other questions to ask.

Mr SPEAKER: I am happy to move on, if you are happy to move on, Minister.

Mrs GERBER: Yes.

Ms FARMER: When in night mode—and if the minister is comfortable to refer to it as 'night mode'—the young person could be locked in their cell for up to 24 hours in the day: yes or no?

Mrs GERBER: I am not comfortable referring to it as 'night mode'.

Ms FARMER: I am sorry. I misheard.

Mrs GERBER: As I said, 'night mode' is a local term that is used in the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre so I will refer to it using the formal and appropriate term, which is 'separations'. During separations, a youth offender who is in the detention centre is separated in their room for the period of time that is required in order to either stabilise—

Ms FARMER: Speaker, point of order: I did ask for a yes or no response in the interests of time.

Mr SPEAKER: It is up to the minister to decide if she can respond with a yes or no answer. Minister, you have the call.

Mrs GERBER: It is not as simple as a yes or no answer. These are very technical operational matters that are determined based on a number of factors that happen in a detention centre. Separation mode might happen as a result of a youth's behaviour in that centre, and that might involve violence to staff. When that de-escalates, then separation as an operational level can change and it can be determined differently. It is not as simple as a yes or no answer. There are far more details, so the director-general might be able to speak to some of the more operational details that require separations because it is not a yes or no answer.

Ms FARMER: Thank you. I had a specific question—that is, when separations are occurring, the young person could be locked in their cell for up to 24 hours in the day. I do not believe I have had an answer to that yet, and I requested a yes or no answer. Is it correct that they could be locked in their cell for up to 24 hours?

Mr SPEAKER: Is the director-general able to provide an answer?

Mrs GERBER: I am happy to pass to the director-general, like I said at the end of my answer just then, to talk more specifically about some of the more operational details.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, can you provide some information on the question as asked by the member for Bulimba?

Ms FARMER: And for that really specific question, Director-General—that is, when separations are occurring, the young person could be locked in their cell for up to 24 hours in the day: yes or no?

Mr Gee: I think the minister has made it clear but I will reiterate: the act is clear as is the regulation. Separations are authorised depending on the delegations that are in place. You and I both know that they are recorded in a system: up to two hours, between two and 12 hours, and then 12 hours or more. I think it would be exceptional; I cannot think when a young person, even in natural disasters, has spent more than 24 hours in a cell. They are moved in and out where they can. For me, the important point here is about the reason for the separation, and they are all recorded according to law. The Ombudsman and Inspector of Detention Services gave evidence this morning. His report to you and I, when you were the minister, pointed out that the decoy system is a legacy system. What it does do is record—

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Director-General. I have the answer to my question.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the director-general and minister are giving a fulsome response to an important question which is not a yes or no question, as much as the member may want to sensationalise this. It is important to provide context and operational information, and I want to hear the rest of the director-general's answer.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, it does seem complicated. Can you round your response out, please?

Mr Gee: I will be very quick. Services and staff who are well trained—including psychologists, social workers, cultural support workers and the visitors program—have contact with these young people whilst they are separated in their cell. The overwhelming majority of separations—60 per cent—are because of a risk to individuals, including the child themselves.

Ms FARMER: Minister, is it correct that a centre may need to go into separations as a result of staff shortages?

Mrs GERBER: Separations can happen for a number of reasons. One of the reasons is what I canvassed earlier. Another reason can be as a result of staff being sick on that day. Also, the youth could have had a behavioural issue that meant they had to be separated. Separation mode is something that is used in our detention centres as a way of being able to make sure that the environment is safe. Separation mode allows for a detention centre to be able to ensure that it can be maintained in a safe way for youth as well as staff. The Crisafulli government has implemented its Detention with Purpose plan which works hand in hand with the operational measures that our hardworking detention centre staff have to deploy on a daily basis. Our Detention with Purpose plan means that education is compulsory, violence against staff is not tolerated and there are consequences for action in our detention centres.

Under the previous Labor government, separations happened all too often. The Inspector of Detention Services' report and the Auditor-General's report called out the number of separations that happened under the previous Labor government. They called it out and said that it happened because the previous Labor government failed to ensure that our detention centres had the staff that were needed. I suspect that is why the member is asking the question—because she appreciates that, under her government when she was the minister, separations happened all too often because there was a lack of staff.

Ms FARMER: Minister, is it correct that if a young person is locked in their cell in separation mode on the basis of staff shortages they cannot attend the Youth Justice education centre in the detention centre?

Mrs GERBER: I note that the Inspector of Detention Services also addressed part of this question in his reply. A youth, when they are in their cell during separation mode, is able to be walked out of their cell in certain circumstances and in those—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Speaker: if I could clarify the part of my question that is very specific, 'if a person is locked in their cell in separation mode on the basis of staff shortages'.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has just started responding to her question. I will allow the minister to respond.

Mrs GERBER: I took the question as asked and I am answering the question, Mr Speaker. There are circumstances where a youth might still be able to be escorted out of their cell, and that includes to the education facilities. There are also circumstances where a youth, whilst a detention centre is in separation mode, still receives education, of course, because our Detention with Purpose plan, which was not in place under the previous Labor government, ensures that every single youth in our detention centres gets education, whether that be delivered in their rooms by education material being provided to them or whether that be delivered in the education facilities that are there. The teachers who work in our detention centres are phenomenal teachers who do a phenomenal job of working with those young people with very complex needs—young people who perhaps need tailored education plans delivered to them.

There are a number of circumstances where, while a detention centre is in separation mode, a youth might still be able to leave their room. Of course, those are all operationally determined on the ground. A broad brush cannot be painted in respect of this. These are all operational matters and they are very specific to the operational environment of that day and the reason that separations might happen on that day.

Ms FARMER: Director-General, is it correct that one or more units at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre have been in separation mode every day of this financial year?

Mr Gee: I am advised that the number of separations at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre has reduced dramatically over the last six months in particular. Our staffing there has never been stronger. In fact, for the first time, we will have a record number of staff there since the riots. We will be overstrength in the next couple of weeks as 18 new graduates are inducted. I am advised that is incorrect.

Mr HUNT: Sounds like we are fixing your problems.

Mr SPEAKER: No commentary.

Ms FARMER: Speaker, may I clarify? My question was actually about this financial year.

Mr SPEAKER: Director-General, is that what you were referring to?

Mr Gee: Could the member repeat the question? I just do not want to get it wrong. I would never intentionally mislead. The question again?

Ms FARMER: Director-General, is it correct that one or more units at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre have been in separation mode every day of this financial year?

Mr Gee: So the question is a unit or every unit?

Ms FARMER: No, one or more units—

Mr Gee: One or more—

Ms FARMER:—at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre—

Mr Gee:—every day for this financial year.

Ms FARMER:—have been in separation mode every day of this financial year.

Mr Gee: Can we come back? I want to check the records, if I can.

Mr SPEAKER: You certainly can. We will go to government members.

Ms MARR: Could the minister please outline for the committee how the Crisafulli government's gold standard early intervention programs—namely Kickstarter—are delivering early intervention programs for the members of my electorate, Thuringowa—programs that will divert young people away from a potential life of crime and ultimately deliver a safer Queensland?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for her advocacy in relation to early intervention programs for her community. Of course, the first round of Kickstarter grants meant that Townsville Fire, who service the member's own electorate of Thuringowa, were able to receive a Kickstarter grant to kickstart

their amazing program to deliver for at-risk youths showing early signs of disengagement or antisocial or criminal behaviour. Townsville Fire are an institution in the member's region, and I know they have a very long track record of being able to deliver for her region. They have received a \$250,000 grant under our Kickstarter program.

Member, your advocacy was instrumental for me to be able to make the next announcement that I am making. I can announce today that our next round of Kickstarter grants is open. That means, member, that more gold standard early intervention programs in your own electorate have the chance of receiving Kickstarter funding. It is a huge step, and the Crisafulli government is committed to delivering the programs that restore safety to our communities and reduce the number of victims of crime in this state.

Of course, Kickstarter is a \$50 million investment to fund new, community-led early intervention programs right across Queensland that provide at-risk youth showing early signs of criminal behaviour with the education, life skills and support to divert them from a life of crime. Opening the second round of Kickstarter means that more of those early intervention programs will have the opportunity to deliver services to communities just like your own in Thuringowa.

The second round of grants is now open, and that means that a total of \$5 million is now available. I encourage applicants from all of your electorates to make submissions. If you have gold standard early intervention programs in your own electorates that are delivering for your communities, they can right now jump on the portal and make a submission in order to be eligible for the grant out of Kickstarter. It is one of our key programs in order to ensure we turn the tide of Labor's youth crime crisis. Out of the first round of Kickstarter we announced a number of organisations that received funding. I am really pleased, member, for your advocacy and able to say that as a result of that we are able to announce the next round of Kickstarter is open.

Mr FIELD: Minister, many people know my story and how I fought for victims' rights because my family and I fell through the cracks. Could you please outline how the Crisafulli government is ensuring that not only are victims' voices heard but also victims are supported in an effective manner as they navigate the justice system and provide the committee with an update on youth offending?

Mrs GERBER: I want to acknowledge what the member has been through. I want to acknowledge his journey into this House and I want to thank him for the voice that he has given this House in relation to victims of crime. I know of the member's advocacy before he put his hand up to run for the seat of Capalaba in relation to the laws that we now have in this state. The member galvanised his own personal trauma so that he could ensure other victims did not go through what he went through, to see Adult Crime, Adult Time law in this state.

I am pleased to update and provide the committee with some information on the way that the Crisafulli government is supporting victims of crime. We have committed in excess of \$458 million over five years in order to support victims of crime in this state. The first of those initiatives is our victims advocate service. The member referenced in his question how he and his family fell through the cracks, how he did not get the support he needed as a victim of crime. Our professional victims advocate service is designed to ensure that no victim falls through the cracks. Our professional victims advocate service sees \$50 million to deliver a nation-leading victims advocate service, a one-stop shop for victims of crime to support them throughout the whole justice process. It will be nation-leading. It will be the first. It is being delivered as a result of the advocacy of victims like yourself, member for Capalaba.

That victims advocate service is currently in the design phase. We have conducted a number of consultations in relation to that design phase with victims, with commissioners across the nation and with stakeholders in the victim support area. The project was launched at a stakeholder round table by the Premier and me on 12 February. A round table on 8 March was held with all of the national commissioners and Queensland commissioners and, of course, two regional consultations on that service have happened as well—one in Townsville and one in Cairns. Those consultation sessions are happening because we want to make sure that the victims advocate service delivers for victims. We want to make sure no victim is left behind.

One other aspect in relation to victim support is, of course, our community response for victims of crime. The budget provides \$12.9 million to roll out our community response for victims of crime and to make that statewide. That means when horrific crimes happen in communities there is a community response that can be rolled out statewide to support that community—communities like Yamanto, Toowoomba, Bundaberg and Warana. These are the communities that have received the community response so far.

The third measure under our budget is, of course, the money to activate the Victims Register in relation to youth offenders. This is around the opt-out provisions—an improvement to the Victims Register to make it easier for victims to get updates on the custody status of youth offenders who have committed violent crimes. There is \$2.6 million in the budget to establish a youth justice victims register.

The member also asked for an update on youth offending so I want to briefly give that update, as well. Early indicators show since our Adult Crime, Adult Time laws there has been a decrease in the types of offences that are Adult Crime, Adult Time. From 13 December 2024 to 31 June 2025—when compared to that same period last year—there has been a 31 per cent drop in the number of proven Adult Crime, Adult Time offences; there has been a 38 per cent drop in stolen cars; a 35 per cent drop in burglaries; a 25 per cent drop in robberies; a 25 per cent drop in break-ins; a 23 per cent drop in dangerous driving; and 17.5 per cent fewer serious repeat offenders. We promised we would reduce victim numbers and it is pleasing to see the police minister release data today to be able to give that to Queenslanders and for them to see that there has been a 5.7 per cent fall in victims across the state in the first six months of 2025 compared with the first six months of last year.

Dr ROWAN: Minister, as you have just mentioned, serious repeat offenders are of huge concern to Queenslanders, so could the minister please outline how the Crisafulli state government is delivering on its commitment to make Queensland safer and specifically, could the minister outline how Queenslanders will be made safe from serious repeat youth offenders?

Mrs GERBER: Yes, serious repeat offenders are responsible for around 55 per cent of all youth crime. It is a real concern. Under the previous Labor government, serious repeat offenders rose year on year. The Crisafulli government's Making Queensland Safer Laws are starting to turn the tide on youth crime. The first six months of data has revealed a 17.5 per cent drop in the average daily number of serious repeat offenders in Queensland. What that means is that there are fewer serious repeat offenders across the state in the first six months of the Making Queensland Safer Laws. Now we are coming off an extremely high bar because under the previous Labor government there was a 64 per cent increase in serious repeat offenders. The bar is really high. It is coming off a bar of 457. Under Labor, serious repeat offenders increased 64 per cent to 457 and in the first six months of Adult Crime, Adult Time, this number has dropped to 383. Now we know there is a long way to go, there is a lot more to do and the cycle of serious repeat offending in this state has been allowed to continue as a result of the weakening of our youth justice laws and as a result of the systemic failure over 10 years of the previous Labor government to invest in programs that rehabilitate.

When I talk about programs that rehabilitate, and the way we will not just prevent serious repeat offenders but turn those serious repeat offenders around, I am talking about the Crisafulli government's Staying on Track program. We know that under the previous Labor government youth released from detention were given not more than 72 hours of a plan—that was only for serious repeat offenders and even then, the auditor-general's report called out the fact that not all serious repeat offenders were given that 72-hour plan. The Crisafulli government is staying on track and the first of those providers has been announced. Life Without Barriers is the first provider for the Gold Coast and Staying on Track will provide every youth with 12 months of rehabilitative support, mentoring and working alongside that youth to ensure we break that cycle of crime, to ensure our detention centres do not breed better criminals and to ensure we can turn the tide on Labor's youth crime crisis and reverse some of the serious repeat offending we have seen rise year on year under the previous Labor government.

To round it out, I want to give some of the figures across the region in relation to serious repeat offending: in the Far North region between 13 December 2023 and 13 March 2024—when you compare that period with the current period between 13 December 2024 to 31 May 2025—there is an 8.5 per cent drop in serious repeat offenders. In the north, there is a 7.1 per cent drop. On the Sunshine Coast and central region, there is a 36.7 per cent drop. In Brisbane and Moreton Bay, which takes in the member's own electorate of Moggill, there is a 24.2 per cent drop. In the south-east region, there is a 17.2 per cent drop. In the south-west region, there is a 19.1 per cent drop. This means that overall there is a 17.5 per cent reduction in serious repeat offenders as a result of some of the changes that the Crisafulli government has made in the last six months—not just to the laws but to investment in early intervention and rehabilitation. I want to thank the member for his advocacy in that space. I know it is critically important for the member and for his community.

Mr HUNT: Minister, could you please outline how the Crisafulli government is supporting victims of crime by conducting a review into the operations of the Forensic Science Queensland laboratory?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for the question. Two reports have been unveiled outlining the critical—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: could we be clear on how that question relates to the minister's portfolio?

Mrs GERBER: I can. Victims of crime were left without justice as a result of Labor's DNA debacle. Victims of crime were left languishing. They were left without court outcomes and the reports that have been tabled outline the critical failings of Queensland's DNA lab testing operations that the Crisafulli government inherited from Labor. What is clear from these two expert reports is that victims of crime have been betrayed by a broken system. Labor's DNA lab debacle resulted—

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: consistent with the point of order raised by the member for Bulimba, the purpose of this committee is to examine the portfolio appropriations for this department. I appreciate—we all appreciate—everybody's interests in reducing the number of victims but the minister has not been able to establish the expenditure related to that particular review as I understand it.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order. We are examining youth justice and victims so this goes to both. I will allow the minister to continue with that in mind.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am getting to the support, if I am allowed to get through my response without interruption. We know that these reports have unveiled damning failures in relation to victims of crime. Labor's DNA debacle has potentially left murderers and rapists walking our streets, with those victims not receiving the outcomes that they deserve. As the victims minister my heart goes out to those Queenslanders who were left behind, who were not listened to and that is why our new expert team has been established.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is straying into the matter of the forensics lab. While we appreciate this is a serious matter, I do not believe that the expenditure in her portfolio relates to the forensic lab.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker, in relation to the point of order.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: There are two points of order.

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, it was my question and I am enjoying the minister's fulsome answer in terms of how she is supporting—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: You have made your point of order around relevance.

Ms FARMER: I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I did not hear.

Mr HUNT: I understand what a tough day it has been for them with this report—

Mr SPEAKER: No more commentary.

Mr HUNT:—but I am—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin. I have heard your point of order, member for Bulimba, but I am taking a point of order from the member for Nicklin.

Mr HUNT: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It was my question in relation to how the government is supporting victims by conducting this inquiry. The minister is providing a fulsome answer to my question and I would like to hear the end of it, please, without further interruption, despite their embarrassment about this report.

Mr SPEAKER: That is enough. Both points of order have relevance. We are talking about support for victims because the SDS talks about support for victims. So I would ask you to confine your contribution to that before we go to the next question.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I was saying, that is why a new expert team has been established. My department has had conversations with organisations we fund to provide trauma informed support to victims and their families and they stand ready right now to help the victims of Labor's DNA debacle. Victims do not need to have an eligible financial assistance claim to activate support. They can access medical and counselling expenses right now. The victims of Labor's DNA debacle have the supports they need right now activated within the department.

In relation to the additional funding, that is being provided. Additional funding to support victims impacted by the forensic DNA debacle under the previous Labor government is \$500,000 in 2025-26. I want to also address the support that is provided as a result of that money. That means that the services that we have spoken to and have engaged stand ready and willing right now to help the victims of

Labor's DNA debacle. They do not need to have an eligible financial assistance claim. They can reach out right now and get the support they need. Victim Assist Queensland stands ready and willing to support them because they deserve nothing less. The previous Labor government absolutely failed these victims. These victims were left without the justice they deserve. The Crisafulli government puts the rights of victims first. That is why we have invested this money. That is why we will continue with the new expert team that has been established, led by the former New South Wales commissioner Mick Fuller, to overhaul the forensic operations so that victims can finally get the justice they deserve.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to non-government members for the next question.

Ms FARMER: My question is to the director-general. Can you please tell us how many days of this calendar year—and today we are up to the 217th day of this calendar year—one or more units at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre have been in separation mode? I just require a figure.

Mr Gee: Can I seek clarification? Is that the exact same question I was asked?

Mr SPEAKER: I am wondering that myself. It seems very similar to the question you said you were going to take on notice.

Ms FARMER: The first question was about the financial year and my second question is about the calendar year.

Mr SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr Gee: I want to check the records. To be really specific it is just one—can you repeat the question please?

Ms FARMER: One or more units—

Mr Gee:—in separation mode?

Ms FARMER:—at Cleveland detention centre have been in separation mode. How many days of this calendar year has that been the case?

Mr Gee: Thanks.

Mrs GERBER: We will come back by the end of the session.

Ms FARMER: My question is to the minister. My understanding is that the answer to that question is well over 300. Why have you kept this information secret from Queenslanders?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there are some imputations and there are also some suppositions, particularly considering that the director-general has just indicated he is going to provide information back—accurate information in relation to the data that is sought—and so I would submit to you that that question is out of order. I do not think it can even be rephrased.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: There were a couple of things in there. Can you authenticate the number that you put forward, and the last bit was a little bit—

Mr de BRENNI: I had a point of order. The Leader of the House indicated that there was an imputation. I submit to you there is no imputation. He mentioned the word 'supposition'. I am not sure what that relates to. I have not seen that in the standing orders. It is very difficult, given that the director-general has not been able to answer that question. If he had been able to answer the question that would, in fact, authenticate our assertion and so—

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr de BRENNI: I would ask you to allow the question as is given that the information is coming later.

Mr SPEAKER: I am just asking, as I said, if the member can authenticate that figure that you quoted? We know the director-general is coming back with the information he has, but you quoted a figure. Can you authenticate that?

Ms FARMER: My specific phrase was 'I understand it is well over 300', but I will await the DG verifying that figure. I am happy to move on.

Mr SPEAKER: I think we will. Thank you, member for Bulimba. We will go to your next question, please.

Ms FARMER: Minister, in November last year, in reference to concerns about staffing at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre, you promised a workplace plan 'to fix that', and I table an article with your direct quotes in case you have forgotten that particular statement. We have just discussed

the fact that staff shortages at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre may have led to children being locked in their cells for up to 24 hours a day at the centre, possibly almost every day this year, including without access to the youth justice education centre. Why 10 months later, given the crisis at Cleveland Youth Detention Centre, have you not considered it a priority to develop a workforce plan?

Mrs GERBER: That was an extremely long question, but there were remarks in that question that are completely false. The workforce plan is well underway and I am really happy to talk about the workforce plan. The department's 2025 to 2028 strategic workforce plan focuses on building a resilient workforce capable of meeting future service demands. We know that in our detention centres our workforce is critically important. In fact, I have spent a full day in Cleveland detention centre. I went to that centre without giving notice to the detention centre so that I could sit with both the staff and the providers in that centre to understand exactly the work environment they are working in. This workforce plan directly addresses staffing pressures, strengthens cultural responsiveness and invests in role design, training and career pathways to improve staff safety, capability and retention. Our workforce plan is designed to ensure not just that we have detention centres that are appropriately staffed and that they have capability and retention; but it is also around ensuring the staff in our detention centres have training options.

One of the policies that we are implementing in our detention centres is detention with a purpose. Detention with a purpose ensures that there is compulsory education. It ensures we have consequences for action and a zero tolerance to violence against staff. Our strategic workforce plan focuses on ensuring that there is safety for our staff in our detention centres. We know it is a very difficult environment they can be working in, but a lot of them do it because they have heart; they do it because they genuinely care. I have spoken to so many of our frontline officers in our detention centres and they are there because they believe in hope. They are there because they believe they can make a difference in the life of youth who are in these detention centres. They are thrilled with some of the programs we are implementing, particularly Staying on Track, which provides 12 months of rehabilitative support to every kid in detention.

Our strategic workforce plan in relation to recruitment involves talking about those policies that we are implementing in the detention centre. That is the reason people put their hand up to be in our detention centres; it is because they value and they want to make a difference. Does the director-general want to speak to the strategic workforce plan?

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have the answer to my—

Mrs GERBER: There are probably a couple of issues that I have not canvassed, so I would just like to throw to the director-general.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, point of order: I understand that the purpose of the estimates hearings is for me to ask the questions and not for the minister to decide what she wants to tell us, regardless of the question. I had a specific question about this and I have some more. I think she has answered that question amply.

Mr SPEAKER: I am happy to move on.

Mrs GERBER: I am happy. The director-general said that I covered off on all of it, so that is okay.

Ms FARMER: Minister, when will the strategic workforce plan be produced or completed?

Mrs GERBER: As I said, the department's strategic workforce plan for 2025-2028 focuses on building a resilient workforce capable of meeting future service demands—

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Minister. When will it be completed?

Mrs GERBER: I have given the timeline for it. It is from 2025 to 2028. I will pass to the director-general and he can speak operationally about the—

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, point of order: if I could perhaps clarify my question. When will you provide a tabled copy of the strategic workforce plan?

Mr HUNT: That was not the question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Ms FARMER: My question was about the timing of when we would see that plan.

Mr SPEAKER: There is a point of order down the other end. Member for Moggill, you have a point of order?

Dr ROWAN: The point of order, Mr Speaker, is that the minister was answering the question. She had deferred to the director-general and now we have had an interruption that has taken place and a subsequent question, so the minister was responding to the original question and she should have been able to defer to the director-general for that additional information to the committee.

Mr SPEAKER: The question did ask when the plan was likely to be completed, so who do you—

Mrs GERBER: Yes, I was—

Ms FARMER: I am so sorry, Mr Speaker, but I just wanted to make sure that my question was clear, just in case there is any misunderstanding. I was not asking about the period that the plan covers; I was asking when will we see that plan—the actual document? Can you table the document? When will it be finalised?

Mr SPEAKER: Okay, so who is doing that—the minister or the director-general?

Ms FARMER: And I only require a short answer.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker; I am happy. The strategic workforce plan is available on the intranet and, as a lot of those issues do relate to operational matters, I am happy to pass to the director-general to canvass off the rest of those and specifically be able to provide details to the committee in relation to the strategic workforce plan.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but I do not need any more information about it.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, you are happy with the response you got?

Ms FARMER: Yes; thank you.

Mr SPEAKER: Okay. We will go to the next question.

Ms FARMER: Minister, if in fact it is correct—and we may not know this until the end of the hearing—that one or more units in the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre have been in separation mode for almost every day of this calendar year—

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just wait and I will hear the question in its entirety and then I will rule on it. Member for Bulimba, could you finish your question please?

Ms FARMER: If those numbers are correct—and we will have that verified by the director-general—does your workforce plan require some adjustment—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Ms FARMER:—and are you satisfied that the workforce plan is actually effective?

Mr SPEAKER: We have a couple of points of order here.

Mr HUNT: I will defer to Dr Rowan.

Dr ROWAN: My point of order, Mr Speaker, relates to the fact that, although I heard the Manager of Opposition Business reference suppositions before, there is a hypothetical contained within that question and there is also an opinion that has been submitted as well, so the question needs to be rephrased at the very minimum.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, and that is a fair point of order. It came to me as quite hypothetical, so if you could tighten the question up and rephrase your question or move to the next question.

Ms FARMER: Thank you so much, Mr Speaker, and of course it is problematic that we will not get those figures until the end of this particular hearing.

Dr ROWAN: It is commentary, Mr Speaker.

Ms FARMER: Can I ask the minister—

Mrs GERBER: Mr Speaker, point of order: with regard to the commentary from the member, the director-general is doing what he needs to do and we have given an assurance that we will come back at the end, and that is quite reasonable, and the commentary is very disrespectful to the work of the staff.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin, I do not need your help. Member for Bulimba, if you could just come to your question please, that would be much appreciated.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I mean no disrespect to the director-general. It is information that, because of the timing of when it is being given, we will not be able to ask particular questions. Minister, if you find that in fact Cleveland Youth Detention Centre has been in separation mode for most of this year, will you look again at the workforce plan?

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, member for Bulimba, but that is also a hypothetical question. We will go to your next question please.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, bearing in mind that it is a criminal offence to mislead an estimates hearing, is it correct that you are undertaking or you have undertaken long-term modelling on the workforce and detention centre capacity required to cater for the impact of the new Making Queensland Safer Laws, and I stress 'long-term modelling'?

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, point of order: the start of that question, under standing order 115(b), contained an inference with the comment regarding bearing in mind that it is a criminal offence. There is an inference that the minister may give a misleading answer and I think it should be reworded without the inference at the start of that question.

Mr SPEAKER: I think everybody here would be aware that we are under the standing orders of the parliament, so that was probably unnecessary, member for Bulimba. Saying that, let us go to the question. Minister, you have heard the question?

Mrs GERBER: I am going to need to ask the member just to repeat the end of the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, ask it again without the preamble at the beginning please.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Minister, is it correct that you are undertaking or you have undertaken long-term modelling on the workforce and detention centre capacity required to cater for the impact of the new Making Queensland Safer Laws?

Mrs GERBER: The impact of our Making Queensland Safer Laws that the member references is restoring safety to our communities. The impact of Adult Crime, Adult Time is ensuring that there are consequences for actions in relation to those serious offences that youths commit and it allows the courts to be able to impose adult sentences for those Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. In relation to the modelling that we have done, the Crisafulli government has consulted extensively with Queenslanders on Adult Crime, Adult Time. We took this to Queenslanders. We listened to victims of crime like the member for Capalaba. We spoke to Queenslanders who had had their house broken into multiple times by serious repeat offenders. We spoke to Queenslanders who, tragically, have lost loved ones and to Queenslanders who had suffered heinous injuries at the hands of youth offenders. We spoke to Queenslanders who had had their businesses broke into.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mrs GERBER: This is the modelling we have done.

Mr SPEAKER: Your point of order, member for Bulimba?

Ms FARMER: My question was quite specific—whether the minister has undertaken or is undertaking long-term modelling. With regard to workforce and detention centre capacity, what will be required for detention centre capacity? What workforce will be required? That was my question.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have heard the question.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In relation to the modelling that we did, we consulted with Queenslanders. If we are going to talk about our youth detention centres, including the Wacol remand centre that the Crisafulli government was able to open in April this year, the current FTEs are 93 over strength compared to 56 vacancies in June 2022 under the previous government. There are 305 new youth detention centre recruits who have completed training in 2024-25, and this is 59 more staff inducted than in 2023-24 under the previous Labor government.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Mrs GERBER: That is the workforce retention—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba?

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question, just to break it down so that we are really clear what I am asking, the first tranche of the Making Queensland Safer Laws was passed through parliament at the end of last year and inherent in that—

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, I raise a point of order.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, point of order: I have not finished my point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just finish hearing the point of order and I will come to you then, but get to your point of order please, member for Bulimba.

Ms FARMER: We are talking about impact in the future. The minister is referring to facilities already in place and staff already in place. I am asking about long-term modelling in the future for increased numbers of youth offenders who are in for a longer period of time. Has the minister or has the minister not undertaken or is the minister undertaking long-term modelling, which means in the future?

Mrs GERBER: Of course modelling is being undertaken on an ongoing basis by the department. Matters in relation to Adult Crime, Adult Time are, of course, cabinet-in-confidence. The work is ongoing in relation to our legislative reforms around Adult Crime, Adult Time. We have the Expert Legal Panel that is continuing to provide advice in relation to further tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time—further offending that should be included as Adult Crime, Adult Time—so modelling is ongoing in relation to that. What I would say in relation to the current status of recruitment of staff in our youth detention centres is that we have, as I previously said, 305 new youth detention centre recruits who have completed training. The work is happening right now, but the work is also ongoing and will continue to happen into the future.

Ms FARMER: Given the DG's previous evidence to this committee that it can take up to 3½ years to plan and build a new detention centre, can you reassure Queenslanders that you have done the modelling to respond to the impact of the Making Queensland Safer Laws in terms of workforce and detention centre capacity?

Mrs GERBER: The member's question infers that our Making Queensland Safer Laws will not reduce crime. We have seen a reduction of around 30 per cent in Adult Crime, Adult Time offences over the first six months of our Making Queensland Safer Laws. That is fewer victims of crime and that is a reduction in crime. The member's question has an inherently flawed argument in relation to detention centre capacity. Nevertheless, the Crisafulli government is delivering a budget to support youth justice infrastructure in this state. The Crisafulli government is delivering a \$343 million budget for 2025-26, representing a 69 per cent increase on Labor's 2024-25 budget, to deliver detention centre capacity in this state—that is, to deliver more beds. Labor overpromised and underdelivered. In fact, when we are talking about the detention centres that the Labor government promised, they promised that Woodford would be completed in 2026 and would cost \$627 million. We know that costs blew out almost \$1 million and under the previous Labor government the detention centre delay blew out to 2027.

The Crisafulli government is not only investing the funds needed in the budget to build youth detention centre capacity in this state but also delivering the laws to drive down crime to ensure we see a reduction in the number of offences in this state. I think I said a 30 per cent drop. I just want to clarify the record. It is actually a 31 per cent drop in the number of proven Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. Amongst that there is also a 38 per cent drop in stolen cars, a 35 per cent drop in burglaries, a 25 per cent drop in robberies, a 25 drop in break-ins, a 23 per cent drop—

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker—

Mrs GERBER: These are all Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. A 23 per cent drop—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker. My question was about whether the minister would be clear to Queenslanders about whether she has catered for the impact of these new laws.

Mrs GERBER: I believe I am answering the question. The member infers an impact. I know the member would like to see Adult Crime, Adult Time unwind, but the impact of our laws that we are seeing right now is a reduction.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, point of order: I take personal offence at the minister's statement. I ask her to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asks you to withdraw.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have anything to add?

Mrs GERBER: Yes. I would like to round out what I was saying. The impact of our laws, the impact of Adult Crime, Adult Time, that we are seeing right now is a 23 per cent drop in dangerous driving and 17½ per cent fewer serious repeat offenders.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to government members. I will go to the member for Capalaba for his question.

Mr FIELD: Minister, you mentioned the Staying on Track program earlier. Can you please provide more detail and advise further when these programs will be delivered?

Mrs GERBER: Our budget has \$225 million over five years to deliver the Staying on Track program. The first of those providers has been announced. Life Without Barriers is the first provider and they will deliver an intensive 12-month, post detention rehabilitation program for youth offenders in the Gold Coast region to put them back on track. Life Without Barriers will implement a service model aligned with the risk, needs and responsiveness framework. Intervention is tailored to the level of risk of offending and individual characteristics and learning styles in order to reduce recidivism. Our Staying on Track program is all about breaking that cycle of crime, ensuring that youth who are in our detention centres are given a shot at turning their lives around. The reports that were released by the Queensland Family and Child Commission demonstrated that 12 months is needed to effect that change. We know that under the previous Labor government youth in our detention centres, the serious offenders, were only given 72 hours of a support plan and even then the Auditor-General called out that many of those youth were not receiving a 72-hour plan at all. That is setting up those youth to fail. Releasing those youth straight back into our communities without any support, without any plan, sets them up to fail and sets our communities up for more victims.

Staying on Track will restore rehabilitation and deliver 12 months of rehabilitation support to youth integrating back into communities to avoid them falling back into a cycle of crime. Every plan will be tailored to the youth offender and designed to help them prepare for a productive future in employment and community with tasks including schooling or TAFE, driving lessons, professional mentoring, volunteering, sports and extracurricular activities. Staying on Track will work hand in hand with Adult Crime, Adult Time which will restore consequences for action and deter crime by sentencing youth offenders to adult time for serious offences and then providing them with the rehabilitation support they need through Staying on Track.

Ms MARR: Could the minister please advise the committee on how the Regional Reset program will deliver on the Crisafulli government's agenda to prevent youth crime before it happens and how the program will make Queensland safer?

Mrs GERBER: The Crisafulli government is delivering nine new Regional Reset programs across the state—specialised early intervention programs—to help tackle crime in our communities. There is \$50 million in the budget over four years. The Regional Reset programs will be delivered in Far North Queensland, North Queensland, Central Queensland, Gold Coast, Ipswich-Darling Downs—Kokoda is the provider for the Ipswich-Darling Downs region and I will get to a little bit about the Kokoda reset program in a minute—Moreton Bay, Sunshine Coast, Wide Bay and Western Queensland. Regional Reset is the short-stay residential component designed to address high-risk teens. It is the next step. We have Gold Standard Early Intervention and for those teens who require a little bit more of an intervention we have Regional Reset which provides a reset in the form of a short-stay camp, taking them out of the environment that might be causing the offending and giving them tools by way of a camp that will be specialised and tailored to each of the regions.

An example of that is Kokoda. Kokoda is the provider for the Regional Reset program for the Ipswich-Darling Downs region. Kokoda offer dormitory accommodation. Eligibility criteria for the youth going into the Kokoda program is young people aged 12 to 17 years at risk of disengagement from school, family or community and showing early signs of criminal or antisocial behaviour. The referral pathway could be from police, it could be from our co-responders, it could be from schools, it could be from parents themselves. The program will support six cohorts. We are talking about Kokoda here as an example of what the Regional Reset program could provide for communities.

Young people gain an understanding of their own behaviour and emotional patterns with a relationship with at least one trusted adult and an increased willingness to engage in the broader program. We know that the best way to intervene early and support these young people is to wrap those supports around them. The difference in what Kokoda is providing as part of their Regional Reset program is wrapping that support around the families. They are not just doing the short-stay camps for the youth to give them the tools they need to reset behaviour, but they are doing a 12-month program where they can also wrap supports around the family—give the family those supports and those tools. That is the difference.

That is the Gold Standard Early Intervention that the Crisafulli government is rolling out. We know that if we can give the tools not just to the youth but also to the family then we might really be able to prevent that youth from going into a life of crime and help that family support their own child. That is what families have been asking for. It is why we are delivering our Regional Reset programs across the state.

Ms MARR: Minister, I know that the Townsville region is earmarked for a crime prevention school. Could you please outline for the committee the functions of the crime prevention schools and how they will deliver the early intervention commitments of the Crisafulli government?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for her advocacy in relation to our crime prevention schools. I know that her community has suffered immensely under the previous Labor government's youth crime crisis, which they created. In fact, her community was one of the first to call it out. She has been a keen advocate for measures to turn that tide and our crime prevention schools are one of them.

There are four crime prevention schools being rolled out across the state, one of course in the member's own community of Townsville. Another is on the Gold Coast and Men of Business is the provider for the crime prevention school on the Gold Coast. Ipswich and Rockhampton are the others. These schools will provide capacity for up to 900 students across the state. They will deliver structured and supportive environments to help students reconnect with education, develop essential life skills and prepare for employment or other educational pathways. The schools themselves will operate under a special assistance school model.

I will use Men of Business as an example because, of course, they are the first crime prevention school to receive funding. They have \$10 million out of the budget to deliver their crime prevention school, which means they can deliver from grade 7 all the way to grade 12. The special assistance school model works with funding from the federal government. Eighty per cent of the special assistance model is funded by the federal government and 20 per cent is funded by the state. It delivers a tailored curriculum for the kids. It allows the school to deliver education a little bit differently. It allows them to take into account that there are youth who have fallen through the cracks and that perhaps do not fit into mainstream schooling. Perhaps they might need to go into grade 8 but they are at a grade 6 or grade 5 or grade 3 reading level. For those youth, disengagement is a real thing. No-one wants to turn up to school if you cannot catch up with the class. If you are not able to read with the rest of the class then you are not going to turn up. These crime prevention schools allow for a pathway for those kids so that they have hope and they have opportunity.

Member, kids in your own community of Thuringowa will have the opportunity to attend one of those schools so that they can get back on track and have a pathway to education, to training and to a job. Ultimately, this is so we can see fewer victims of crime in this state. This is so we can drive down crime because we know one of the best ways of seeing fewer victims of crime or reducing crime in the state is to intervene early and provide kids with a pathway to education, training and a job. Our crime prevention schools, particularly the one that is earmarked for Townsville, will deliver that for our communities.

Mr HUNT: Minister, could you please update the committee on the progress of the Crisafulli government's youth justice schools, how those schools are accredited and what support they will deliver to high-risk youth offenders?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for the opportunity to distinguish between the two different types of schools that we are delivering: our crime prevention schools and our youth justice schools. The youth justice schools are the next level up. They are targeted at youths who are on youth justice orders and who are already engaged in our criminal justice system. There is \$40 million to establish two new youth justice schools, one in Logan and one in Cairns. They are different, of course, to the crime prevention schools. The student cohort will comprise at-risk youth who are on youth justice orders. Whilst the crime prevention schools might take youth on youth justice orders, the youth justice schools are specifically targeted at youth on youth justice orders.

Ohana for Youth runs the successful Arcadia College on the Gold Coast. It is the service provider for the schools in Logan and in Cairns. They deliver highly specialised behavioural reform with individualised and dedicated case management, one-on-one mentoring, family support and parental coaching to provide wrap-around supports that lead to long-term change. We know that the previous government did not invest in these schools. We know how important they can be to give hope to youth so they can try to turn their lives around.

Under the special assistance school model, the schools focus on crime diversion, keeping at-risk youth offenders off the streets and out of crime and getting them into education and onto a pathway of hope. The curriculum will provide up to 12 hours of daily supervision, five days a week to support young people to re-engage with the community and education through project-based education with specialist teachers and extra curricula activities to engage those students in core subjects. Ohana for Youth, as the service provider, has a proven track record in successfully supporting vulnerable youth and helping them reconnect with education and develop life skills.

Ohana for Youth has been running established schools like this. The schools offer a structured supportive environment that is tailored to the needs of high-risk youth offenders. The campuses are programed to commence as soon as possible in 2026. Ohana for Youth is poised and ready and is starting their accreditation process. The department is working very closely with Ohana for Youth to ensure the program really does meet the needs of at-risk youth because it is specifically targeted at high-risk youth. We are delivering the necessary interventions to be able to deliver on our commitment to reduce youth offending in Queensland and have a comprehensive and coordinated plan to see fewer victims of crime in this state.

Mr HUNT: Minister, with reference to question on notice No. 11, could you please expand on the \$150 million funding cliff created by the previous administration and specifically the youth justice programs the Crisafulli government is funding across the forwards, programs such as intensive case management and the youth co-responder model?

Mrs GERBER: The Crisafulli government's budget does deliver the foundations for a fresh start for Queensland, restoring safety where you live, putting victims first and backing the frontline officers whom Labor left behind. It is delivering the largest youth justice and victim support budget in Queensland's history with \$770.9 million. Behind every single dollar is a young person who needs support to break the cycle of crime, a family grieving a loss that never should have happened or a frontline worker who is showing up day after day and facing too much pressure with too little support.

The former Labor government set up programs with no funding in the forwards and no funding beyond 2024-25. Intensive case management is an example of that. This is an initiative that works intensely with youth offenders to reduce recidivism. The Crisafulli government's budget commits \$38.8 million over four years to the program, saving 57 jobs. Under the previous Labor government, intensive case management was falling off a cliff. It was not funded into the forwards. The other programs that fell off a cliff and were not funded were conditional bail, bail support and electronic monitoring programs. The Crisafulli government is delivering \$24.4 million over four years and \$8.3 million ongoing for programs that provide practical assistance so that youth offenders can comply with bail conditions, reduce their risk of reoffending and access supports.

Of course, another funding cliff or black hole that Labor failed to fund was the youth co-responder model. The Crisafulli government is delivering \$75 million over four years to permanently fund the rapid response teams as part of the co-responder model, saving 91 jobs. Those 91 jobs would have fallen off a cliff under the previous Labor government. This investment ensures the continued delivery of this joint Queensland Police Service initiative.

Another initiative that is spoken about in the answer to that pre-hearing question on notice is the community response program to victims of crime, which will receive \$12.9 million. That was another program that was falling off a cliff under the previous Labor government, and our investment will save that.

The Crisafulli government's budget will save jobs and fund programs that the previous Labor government failed to fund. The total number of jobs will be 161 and the total amount of funding will be \$151.1 million for the programs highlighted above. In addition to ensuring these critical programs continue, the Crisafulli government has also delivered \$393 million over two years to the financial assistance for victims of crime program, delivered through Victim Assist Queensland, to help victims recover from the physical and psychological effects of crime.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to the member for Bulimba for the next question.

Ms FARMER: Minister, I table a copy of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's government bodies website, which states that the Expert Legal Panel, which reports to you, must produce an annual report. Will this report be tabled in parliament? If so, when?

Mrs GERBER: Of course, the Expert Legal Panel is a panel. It is a panel that was established to provide the Crisafulli government with advice in relation to Adult Crime, Adult Time. In relation to the next tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time, we promised Queenslanders that we would establish that panel and the Expert Legal Panel is set up and providing that advice. That advice is ongoing to me. The Expert Legal Panel obviously has a chair, so Ms April Freeman KC—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my question was specifically about the annual report, which is a requirement, as noted on the DPC website. My question was specifically: will the annual report be tabled in parliament? If so, when?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: can I just clarify with respect to that question whether the decision-making process for that is the responsibility of DPC, which is under their portfolio remit?

Ms FARMER: The Expert Legal Panel reports directly to this minister.

Mr SPEAKER: I think it is relevant to the minister.

Mrs GERBER: The Expert Legal Panel was set up to provide advice, not glossy brochures, not reports. It was set up to provide advice to the Crisafulli government in relation to the next tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time. Of course, we have not ruled out furnishing a report at the end of the Expert Legal Panel's advice, but its advice is ongoing. It has been set up to provide that advice. As it is ongoing, the Expert Legal Panel should be allowed to continue to do that. The department has an annual report—

Ms FARMER: Point of order on relevance, Mr Speaker: the document—and just make sure the minister has a copy of the document I tabled—is an official Department of the Premier and Cabinet document. There is a line item which says, 'Reporting requirements—annual report'. 'Annual' means 'at least once a year'. I am asking: will that annual report be tabled in parliament or be tabled at all? If so, when?

Mrs GERBER: Yes. As I said, if I can be allowed to finish, the Expert Legal Panel is set up to provide advice and its advice is ongoing. The department's annual report, of course, will be tabled and the department's annual report will address those matters, but the Expert Legal Panel has been set up to provide advice. I know those opposite would like to see the Expert Legal Panel wound up. I know those opposite do not support our Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. The Expert Legal Panel has been set up to provide advice—

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: We have time for a quick last question before we finish this session, member for Bulimba.

Mr HUNT: I think we are going until 6.45pm.

Mr SPEAKER: Sorry. Member for Bulimba you have the call.

Ms FARMER: Minister, Queensland taxpayers have paid the Expert Legal Panel \$34,000 for their advice. The answer to pre-hearing question on notice No. 5 states that the panel have met eight times in 2025. Do you believe Queenslanders have a right to see the advice that they have paid for?

Mrs GERBER: As I said previously, the Expert Legal Panel has been set up to provide advice to the Crisafulli government in relation to the Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. As I have previously said, that advice is ongoing. It has not finished. There is no end to that advice yet. As I previously said, we have not ruled out the option of the Expert Legal Panel providing a document at the end of that advice, but the advice is ongoing and it is currently considering other matters. As part of the Expert Legal Panel and the advice that it is giving to the Crisafulli government, it is considering other offending. That advice is yet to be received by the Crisafulli government in relation to further tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time. The Expert Legal Panel provided advice in relation to the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time, and that advice was taken by the Crisafulli government and has resulted in the 20 additional offences that we see in Adult Crime, Adult Time.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the minister has made it clear she will not answer my question. Could I move on to the next question, please?

Mr SPEAKER: It is your call.

Ms FARMER: Thank you. Minister, I table page 40 of the LNP's document titled 'The right priorities for Queensland's future'. It states—

Queenslanders have a right to know exactly how their government is operating.

That's why ending the culture of secrecy and cover-up in Government is a priority for Queenslanders.

Why will you not be transparent with Queenslanders about the recommendations of the Expert Legal Panel, about your workforce plan for the youth detention centres and about the long-term modelling you have done on detention centre capacity?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the phrase 'lack of transparency' is an inference, so I ask that the question be rephrased.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point of order. It would be appreciated if you could rephrase the question, member for Bulimba.

Ms FARMER: I will not restate what I have already said, but it relates to there being no secrecy, no cover-ups and absolute transparency so Queenslanders know exactly how their government is operating. Why then is the minister not willing to be open with Queenslanders about the recommendations of the Expert Legal Panel, about the long-term modelling of the workforce and the capacity as a result of the new laws and about the workforce plan for the detention centres?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: as much as the member tried, she still used an inference by saying 'not being open'. There is an implication there that the minister is not being open. I ask that she rephrase the question.

Ms FARMER: I am happy to rephrase.

Mr SPEAKER: If you could, member for Bulimba. The length of your question is the problem.

Ms FARMER: Will the minister be open with Queenslanders about the recommendations of the Expert Legal Panel?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for the question and the opportunity to reiterate my previous answer to the previous question. Of course, the Expert Legal Panel is set up to provide advice. That advice is ongoing. We have not ruled out the possibility of a report at the end of that advice, but the Expert Legal Panel has been set up to provide advice to the government on further tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time. As that advice is ongoing—

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Minister. I believe you have answered my question. May I go on to the next question, Mr Speaker?

Mrs GERBER: Mr Speaker, I have not finished answering the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have something more to add to that?

Mrs GERBER: Yes.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I believe the minister is being repetitious.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the minister to round out her response. Do you have something to add?

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I did just want to address the aspect of the question that speaks to openness and transparency because we are a government that is committed to openness and transparency. I think the data that has been released over the last couple of weeks in relation to victims demonstrates that. We have released data in an open and transparent way so that Queenslanders can see the data on victims of crime and measure that in a timely and more up-to-date way. We have done that because we are a government that is committed to openness and transparency. Throughout this whole process we have consulted with Queenslanders. We consulted with Queenslanders on Adult Crime, Adult Time. We consulted with Queenslanders on the Expert Legal Panel. That is the reason the Expert Legal Panel was set up to provide advice—Queenslanders voted for it—and that advice is ongoing.

Ms FARMER: Minister, we understand that the Expert Legal Panel reports directly to you. Have you taken all of the advice the panel has provided or have you used your ministerial authority to change any of its recommendations before progressing to legislation?

Mrs GERBER: As I said in my previous answer, the Expert Legal Panel has provided us with advice. In fact, that advice informed the last tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time. We took all of the Expert Legal Panel's advice in relation to the offences that should be included as Adult Crime, Adult Time. That is why 20 further offences were added to Adult Crime, Adult Time in the second tranche,

bringing the offences up to 33. The Expert Legal Panel provided that advice to government. We acted on it. We took the advice, and the 20 offences are now Adult Crime, Adult Time as part of the second tranche. Of course the Expert Legal Panel is providing ongoing advice. They are still considering matters like the whole of schedule 1 of the Penalties and Sentences Act.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister is straying from the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I think the minister is being relevant to the question. I will allow you to complete your answer. Then we will go to the next question.

Mrs GERBER: They are still considering a number of offences. They are considering all of the schedule 1 offences in the Penalties and Sentences Act. They are considering a number of offences in relation to serious offending, and that advice is ongoing. The Crisafulli government welcomes any further advice they might provide.

Ms FARMER: I have a further question for the minister. If you accepted the recommendations of the Expert Legal Panel without change, why did you not use your ministerial authority to include attempted murder, rape and sexual assault in the first tranche of the laws?

Mrs GERBER: Of course, the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time was made law before Christmas and the Expert Legal Panel was promised to be set up after that to inform the next tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time, in which case the Expert Legal Panel did recommend that attempted murder be included as an offence because we referred it to them for consideration. Ultimately, for the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time that the member is referring to, we took to the election five categories of offending: murder; manslaughter; wounding and serious assaults; breaking into homes and stealing cars; robberies; and breaking into businesses. We took those because we consulted with Queenslanders on them. Queenslanders said these were the offences that they were suffering the most under as a result of the Labor's youth crime crisis.

At the same time that we promised those offences would be law before Christmas, we promised that an expert legal panel would be set up to inform further tranches of offending. We did all of that. We made those offence categories—13 Adult Crime, Adult Time offences—law before Christmas. Then we set up the Expert Legal Panel to provide advice on further tranches. The first of those further tranches has been made Adult Crime, Adult Time and of course attempted murder was one of the offences included in the further tranche. The work of the Expert Legal Panel is very important and it is ongoing, but we have done exactly what we said we would do.

Ms FARMER: I take it from your response, Minister, that it was your decision to not include attempted murder, rape and sexual assault in the first tranche of the laws.

Mrs GERBER: I am really happy to answer that question. If it was not clear to the member in relation to my response previously, I will make it abundantly clear to the member. We took to the election five offence categories that would be Adult Crime, Adult Time. We promised Queenslanders that those offence categories would be Adult Crime, Adult Time before Christmas and that an expert panel would be set up to inform further offending that would need to be Adult Crime, Adult Time. The five offence categories that Queenslanders voted for—the five offence categories that we took to the election—were murder, manslaughter, breaking into homes and stealing cars, robberies, breaking into businesses, and serious harm like wounding.

We promised then that an Expert Legal Panel would be set up to be able to inform on further offences that should be Adult Crime, Adult Time. That included all of the attempted offences. We referred to the Expert Legal Panel all of the attempted offences for them to be able to consider as to whether or not they should be included in our Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. The Expert Legal Panel came back to us with advice. As I have previously stated, that advice was that attempted murder could be included as Adult Crime, Adult Time, and the Crisafulli government acted on that advice. We have done exactly what we said we would do. The reason this is being raised by those opposite is that ultimately we saw how they acted in the chamber when we introduced our laws. We saw how divided they were in relation to Adult Crime, Adult Time.

The Crisafulli government will not walk away from our tough new laws. Adult Crime, Adult Time has seen a reduction in those offending. In the first six months of Adult Crime, Adult Time being law, we have seen a 31 per cent reduction in those Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. That is significant. It shows that we are seeing some green shoots and we are heading in the right direction, but we know there is a lot more to be done.

We know that under the previous Labor government youth crime spiralled out of control. That is why Queenslanders voted for Adult Crime, Adult Time. That is why they voted for those five offence categories that make up Adult Crime, Adult Time in the first tranche. That is why they voted for an

expert legal panel to be able to consider further tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time. That is why the Crisafulli government will continue our work to restore safety where you live, to unwind the decade of Labor weakening our youth justice laws and to ensure we can turn the tide on the youth crime crisis that was left to rip through our state under the previous Labor government.

Ms FARMER: Minister, the member for Cook has labelled attempted murder a non-issue. I table that document. Is this a position of the government?

Mrs GERBER: I will wait for the document to be passed around.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there are a couple of things. The alleged quote in the question is incorrect. 'Non-issue' is not what the text says. Also, the minister is not in a position to provide an opinion of a comment by another member.

Ms FARMER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I was actually asking about the position of the government. I am happy to rephrase the question. The post is in front of the minister. It states, 'They are making a big deal over a non event.' Is this the position of the government?

Mrs GERBER: What a ridiculous question. Attempted murder is Adult Crime, Adult Time. It is the position of this government that attempted murder is a heinous and serious offence and it warrants inclusion in our Adult Crime, Adult Time provisions. I think many victims of crime would be quite offended hearing the way those members have spoken in relation to this. I think it is critically important that we bear in mind victims of crime when we are talking about matters that affect them. Of course attempted murder is part of our Adult Crime, Adult Time provisions. It is an extremely serious crime, and that is why it is Adult Crime, Adult Time.

I think it is critically important that as a government we continue to strengthen our laws. We know that under the previous Labor government we saw our youth justice laws weakened, we saw detention made a last resort, we saw breach of bail as an offence removed, and we saw the Childrens Court trigger removed so that effectively the family commissioner could not intervene early—

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, point of order: I was referring specifically to attempted murder. May I go on to the next question?

Mr HUNT: Mr Speaker, point of order: the member asked a question about the position of the government. It is quite a serious question about a serious offence. The minister is being responsive to that question and I would like to hear the end of the minister's answer. I do not want the minister to be rushed on this. If the member does not like the answer, that is a different thing. The minister is being responsive to the question the member asked, and I would like to hear the rest of the answer.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, do you have anything more to add to that?

Mrs GERBER: I do. The position of our government is to see fewer victims of crime in this state. The position of our government differs greatly from the position of the previous Labor government and their record. Their record is that 94 per cent of youth offenders released from detention reoffended within 12 months. Their record is an increase in the number of victims of crime. Their record is year-on-year increases. Their record has left victims of crime in their wake.

The position of our government in relation to offences that are Adult Crime, Adult Time such as attempted murder is that there should be consequences for actions. Youth offenders should be held to account for their serious crimes; that is why they are Adult Crime, Adult Time. That is why we have those strong new laws. That is why we did our Making Queensland Safer Laws. We will not resile from that position. We will not resile from those serious crimes that we have made Adult Crime, Adult Time so that there are consequences for actions, youth offenders can be held to account for their crimes, victims of crime can see justice and our communities can have safety restored where they live.

Mr SPEAKER: I will go to government members for questions.

Mr FIELD: Could the minister explain how detention with purpose will help rehabilitate youth criminals and reduce crime, and could the minister describe any alternative programs that were considered?

Mrs GERBER: The Crisafulli government's Detention with Purpose plan prioritises discipline, rehabilitation and accountability for youth offenders to stop the merry-go-round of Labor's serious repeat offenders. Under our government, compulsory education and attendance is in effect. I am working with the Minister for Education to embed education and ensure that every youth is receiving compulsory education.

We know that under Labor the rate of staff assaults in our youth detention centres jumped from 130 in 2022-23 to 168 in 2023-24. Detention with Purpose is not just about ensuring there is compulsory education; it is also about ensuring that violence against staff is not tolerated. It is about behavioural

management as well. I will step the member through those components, because they are really important in relation to reforming what is going on in our detention centres and to ensure that our detention centres do not breed better criminals.

Compulsory education is just one part of that plan. Ensuring that violence against staff is not tolerated is the second pillar. In our youth detention centres there are strengthened policies, enhanced intelligence capabilities, tailored risk management and clear consequences to ensure that staff safety and accountability is maintained. The third component, which I just spoke about, is behavioural management, which has been strengthened to ensure clear consequences for actions, frameworks to reinforce accountability and reward positive behaviour, and remove privileges for misconduct.

The progress and positive impacts of this to date, member—because it is really important to track some of that—is that we have seen immediate increases in relation to the engagement of kids in education because education is compulsory. In fact, I would like to let the member know what some of the youth offenders told me when I visited the detention centre. I went into the Cleveland Detention Centre and I spent a full day there so I could not only understand what our staff in those detention centres go through but also so I could observe our youth in youth detention going through compulsory education.

One of the girls of the cohort I was able to shadow throughout the day asked me, 'Did you do Adult Crime, Adult Time?' I said, 'Yes, we did.' She said, 'Did you do education too?' I said, 'Yes, we did.' She asked, 'Can I get more? I want more education. I want to go to school more.' For me, that really solidified why we are doing what we are doing. Those youth offenders need a chance to engage in education. Our Detention with Purpose plan ensures that happens in our detention centres.

We know that under the previous Labor government our detention centres were a breeding ground. Our detention centres meant that youth criminals were released back into our communities without support, without a plan. The previous Labor government had just 72-hour plans for serious offenders when they were released back into our communities. Just dumping offenders back into our communities and expecting them not to reoffend without any support and without a proper rehabilitation plan that wraps around them and wraps around their families not only set those youth up for failure but also meant that our communities continued to suffer under the scourge of Labor's youth crime crisis.

Our Detention with Purpose plan is starting to turn that around. We have had 10 years of failure by the previous government to do effective early intervention and rehabilitation. It is going to take some time for us to turn those numbers around. Staff in our youth detention centres are supported by these policy changes, which are now in effect. Staff safety is maintained by proactively identifying high-risk youth and utilising safeguards. The behavioural management processes are starting to have an impact across our centres.

Mr HUNT: My question is to the minister. Minister, could you please advise the committee how the government's new victims register for youth offenders announced in the first tranche of Making Queensland Safer Laws will improve the experience of victims of violent youth crime as they navigate the justice system.

Mrs GERBER: To help Queensland victims feel safe again, the Crisafulli government has made significant improvements to the victims register. We have \$2.6 million in funding to activate the victims register in relation to youth offending. This funding goes towards staffing and our youth offenders' team that has been established to create procedures, resources and information services to support victims and communities smoothly. The department is working with multiple agencies on this, including QPS, QCS and the DPP, so it is now easier for victims to get updates about the custody status of the youth offender who has committed a violent or sexual offence against them.

This is part of our Making Queensland Safer Laws, which were passed before Christmas. Not only did Adult Crime, Adult Time put the rights of victims before the rights of offenders by ensuring that a court has to prioritise the impact of the youth crime on the victim when sentencing our youth; they also created an opt-out provision which was proclaimed on 28 July 2025. That brought about changes to the victims register, enabling it to be opt-out. What this means for victims of youth crime is that they are less likely to fall through the cracks and not receive the information they need because they were not on the register.

What this means for victims of crime is that the onus is no longer on them to have to reach out, to have to make sure they are across all of those details and continue to retell their story. The register is now opt out. It means that those victims are on that register unless they choose not to be included. Being on the register means that the victim knows when the youth who has offended against them is in a secure detention facility and they get updated on court proceedings. It means they will get informed

if the youth is transferred to an adult prison. It means they can receive information about any further orders the youth might receive. It means they can receive information if, for instance, that youth is granted any leave from the detention centre so that they can be prepared for that as a victim.

This approach differs from when victims were required to opt in. That meant they were required to complete an application form and send it to the department, along with identifying documents. That process put the onus on victims. Our process means victims do not fall through the cracks. It means the onus is no longer on victims. It is just one way the Crisafulli government is prioritising victims and putting the rights of victims first. It builds on our government's commitment to continue to prioritise victims through our Making Queensland Safer Laws.

Mr SPEAKER: Before we go to the next question, we might tidy up the questions taken on notice.

Mr Gee: I think there are three things. In terms of separations, it is well-known that separations are a normal part of managing risk, particularly safety for young people and staff. CYDC is the fourth largest facility of its kind in Australia. It comprises 15 accommodation units, some of only four beds. There has been a remarkable reduction in the number of separations in the last six months at CYDC. It is 36 per cent less than it was for the same time last year. I am advised that only 11 per cent of separation incidents are staff shortage related, and that is a reduction of almost half compared to the same time last year. In fact the number of separations at CYDC are 50 per cent less than they were two years ago. I want to recognise the staff who have been incredible, continuing to work and also lead us to a position where we will be over-strengthened there. Last month in the middle of the flu season from 1 July to 4 August there have been two days with no separation occurring. There were three days between 1 January to 4 August where no unit was in separation.

Ms FARMER: Would you mind if I get that information again? Could you repeat that with how many days this financial year and then how many days this calendar year?

Mr SPEAKER: That is what he was answering.

Ms FARMER: That was my actual question. I just was not clear what the director-general said. In answer to my specific question—

Mr SPEAKER: The clock is ticking as well.

Ms FARMER: How many days have one or more units at the centre been in separation mode this financial year? Could you repeat what you said?

Mr Gee: For 1 July to 4 August there have been two days with no separation where it has occurred—

Ms FARMER: And this calendar year?

Mr Gee: There is a trend line where we are 50 per cent less than where we were two years ago. This calendar year, as I said, there were three days between 1 January and 4 August where no unit was in separation.

Can I go to the last question that was outstanding around the Victims' Commissioner. Section 9 of the act is clear about the functions. As I was saying earlier today, the Victims' Commissioner and her staff have attended to 517 complaints from victims of crime, as well as 203 inquiries and 51 feedback submissions from 493 members of the community. That is between the dates of 2 September 2024, but when they became operational, and up to and including 30 June 2025. I think they were all of the questions.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, would you mind if I clarify just so I am really clear on my second—

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member has asked the questions and the director-general has answered them. It is not an opportunity for her to now request during time for government questions, which we are losing quickly.

Mr SPEAKER: The director-general has responded to those three questions and they will all be in the *Hansard*.

Ms FARMER: So three out of 217 days not in separation mode.

Mr SPEAKER: We can have one last quick question from the member for Thuringowa.

Ms MARR: Could the minister please outline how the Crisafulli government is consulting with the Cairns community about the proposed youth detention centre in the region?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have less than a minute.

Mrs GERBER: I want to thank the member for Mulgrave who is doing a mountain of work and continuing to consult with his local community. The consultation that is underway and happening with the Cairns community in relation to the detention centre that Labor announced for Edmonton in Cairns is ongoing. The member for Mulgrave has done a petition and we have held round tables; in fact I did a community consultation round table with him recently. He has also done local events and letterboxing in the Edmonton area with brochures. As part of the round table last Friday, we heard directly from local community members in relation to Labor's announcement of a detention centre in that area. It is really clear that the community was not consulted. It is really clear that the Cairns community, particularly the community of Edmonton and the community of Mulgrave that the member for Mulgrave represents, was not consulted by the Labor government in relation to that announcement.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. We have reached the end of the time allocated to examine the proposed expenditure for the youth justice and victims portfolio area. The committee will now take a break and the hearing will resume at 7 pm with examination of estimates for the portfolio area of corrective services.

Proceedings suspended from 6.45 pm to 7.00 pm.



Mr SPEAKER: Welcome back, Minister and officials. I now declare the proposed expenditure for the portfolio area of Corrective Services open for examination. The question before the committee is that—

The proposed expenditure be agreed to.

Minister, if you wish, you may make an opening statement of no more than five minutes for this portfolio area.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Speaker and committee members. The Crisafulli government made a commitment to Queenslanders to restore safety where you live, and Queensland Corrective Services plays a critical role in delivering on that commitment. It starts by backing our frontline officers with the workforce, infrastructure and systems they need to do their jobs safely and effectively.

I want to take a moment to thank Commissioner Paul Stewart and the 9,109 QCS officers across the department, including both the custodial and community correction space, because no matter where you work, whether it is in corrections in our community or in our correctional facilities, you are critical to delivering a safer Queensland. Whether you are the custodial correction team, maintaining order and safety in high-risk environments or a part of our fantastic team of case managers, probation officers and electronic monitoring surveillance officers, upholding the conditions of orders and working on the front line to reduce offending, I want to acknowledge the extraordinary contribution you make to community safety and thank you for your work.

We inherited a system under enormous pressure. The secure correctional system was operating at 148 per cent capacity with six high-security centres over 150 per cent capacity, and two centres exceeding 160 per cent capacity. More than 6,500 prisoners were bunking up in cells built for one, and almost 600 were sleeping on mattresses on the floor. These conditions were not just unsustainable, they placed frontline officers at risk, undermined rehabilitation and threatened community safety. That is why the Crisafulli government's first budget includes a \$2.387 billion capital investment to rapidly increase capacity across the system. We are boosting capacity with 800 new beds in 2028. This includes a 400-bed injection at both Townsville Correctional Centre and Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre.

Further, I am excited to update the committee that just 10 days ago, we began operational commissioning at the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. This is a project more than a decade in the making. We are also delivering \$10 million in capital funding for additional capacity to support the management of dangerous individuals who have completed their sentence and cannot legally be held in prison but are subject to the Dangerous Prisoner (Sexual Offenders) Act. We have \$75 million to enhance infrastructure and security at low-security correctional centres, including fencing to securely manage the growing prisoner population and safeguard the community.

Infrastructure alone will not restore community safety. That is why we are also injecting \$30.5 million to secure 90 full-time-equivalent positions to support the Parole Board Queensland; \$14.4 million to upgrade the Integrated Offender Management System; \$87.9 million to safely operationalise the new low-custody beds; \$21.8 million to support the management of offenders under the Dangerous Prisoner (Sexual Offenders) Act; \$25 million for electronic monitoring of high-risk DV offenders to give authorities greater oversight, improve compliance with court orders and provide another layer of protection for those at risk; and \$2.6 million additional funding to support the QCS

Victims Register. Just as we promised, we are delivering an independent, victim focused review of the Parole Board Queensland, led by distinguished barrister, Mr Peter Hastie KC. This review will identify opportunities to strengthen the rights, participation and treatment of victims in the parole process and improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Parole Board Queensland in maintaining community safety. Unlike the two reviews under the former government conducted into the Parole Board, it will be released publicly.

Every decision we make in the Corrective Services portfolio reflects our commitment to make Queensland safer, because our officers deserve safe workplaces, victims deserve to be heard and supported, and Queenslanders deserve to have confidence in every part of the criminal justice system.

Mr Speaker, members of the committee, the Crisafulli government is getting on with the job of restoring safety, reducing reoffending and delivering a corrective services system that Queenslanders can have confidence in.

Mr SPEAKER: I turn to opposition members for questions.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, is it correct that the minister is now onto her third chief of staff, as the *Courier-Mail* reported last week?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: that is not a relevant question to the Commissioner of Corrective Services.

Commissioner Stewart: Point of order, Mr Speaker: in relation to that I would question as to whether that is relevant to the estimates process, our budget and our process moving forward.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, I cannot really see how that is, unless you can convince me otherwise.

Mr BUTCHER: I will ask it differently, Mr Speaker. How many chiefs of staff for Minister Gerber has your department had to work with?

Commissioner Stewart: Again, that would be a matter for the Premier to answer, I would suggest, under the standing orders.

Mr BUTCHER: So you cannot tell me how many chiefs of staff you have had to work with since—

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the commissioner has correctly said it is not relevant to the budget process. He has been responsive and the member is being disorderly.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, you have not yet convinced me how this is relevant to the scrutiny of the budget for this portfolio.

Mr BUTCHER: I will continue on, Mr Speaker. Commissioner, have you been present at any of the managerial training sessions that the minister is reported to have attended?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this line of questioning is more appropriate for the minister as opposed to the commissioner, and I would submit to you that the question should be redirected to the minister.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I submit to you that the question is appropriate, given that it is directly relevant to the commissioner's engagement with the minister and her office in the delivery of the expenditure outlined in the budget that we are here to examine, and I would ask you to ask the commissioner to—

Mr SPEAKER: Commissioner, I will let you answer that question.

Commissioner Stewart: The question was have I attended any?

Mr BUTCHER: Have you been present at any of the managerial training sessions that the minister is reported to have attended?

Commissioner Stewart: I am unaware of any sessions that the minister has attended, but I have not attended any with the minister.

Mr SPEAKER: The question is answered.

Mr HUNT: There was an imputation.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, is it correct that you have been present when the minister and staff from the minister's office have sworn at and have had heated exchanges with officers of your department?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there are clear imputations and inferences in that question. The member is an experienced former minister. He knows the standing orders, and the line of questioning is offensive.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: there is no imputation. The question is purely in relation to a matter of fact of whether or not the commissioner was present at those times.

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: my point of order relates to authentication. Can the member provide any evidence to authenticate the allegations put in the question as asked?

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point of order. Can you authenticate what you have just stated, member for Gladstone?

Mr BUTCHER: I am happy to move on, Mr Speaker.

Mr HUNT: A disgrace.

Ms MARR: How disgraceful.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need any more commentary.

Mr BUTCHER: Minister, can you unequivocally rule out the future privatisation of any Queensland prison?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for the opportunity to be able to talk about our state owned prisons in Queensland—the assets that are state owned and recently opened by the Crisafulli government. The Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, which will alleviate some of the capacity issues that our correctional centre is facing, is a state owned facility, and it is an operation that has been able to be achieved through the work of the Crisafulli government. We know that the original business case was funded in 2014 under an LNP government and that the previous Labor government promised it would be open in, I think it was, 2023. They failed to deliver on that commitment and it blew out in both cost and timeline.

When the Crisafulli government came to power, the briefs demonstrated that the previous Labor government had deceived Queenslanders in relation to that timeline and that the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre would, in fact, not be operational until the end of 2025. The Crisafulli government was able to fast track the commissioning of that. I am pleased that the commissioning has begun.

Mr BUTCHER: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the question was simply around the future privatisation of any prisons.

Mrs GERBER: I have answered the question. Our prisons are 100 per cent state-owned.

Mr SPEAKER: Very good. Thank you.

Mr BUTCHER: Minister, can you rule out the privatisation of prisoner transport?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for the question and for the opportunity to talk about our Escort and Security Branch that is used to escort and safely transport prisoners—not just to health services but also to and from court. It is run by QCS and our budget funds it into the forwards. Our budget ensures it will continue to be operated by our wonderful QCS department and that it continues to be operated in a way that ensures prisoners can be escorted safely and securely. In fact, there were 26,785 prisoner movements conducted by the Escort and Security Branch last financial year. That is an increase of 52 per cent. Our Escort and Security Branch is under immense pressure as a result of the critical overcrowding that the previous Labor government has left our correctional centre in. As a result of that critical overcrowding, our Escort and Security Branch often has to operate in conditions that would—

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, minister. I think I have heard enough of the answer to that question. I have plenty—

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I think you have answered the question but if you would like to round it out.

Mrs GERBER: To meet the operational pressures, the Crisafulli government has boosted the funding to the branch by \$3.58 million in this budget.

Mr BUTCHER: Minister, you said you were not going to privatise state-owned prisons. Can you rule out outsourcing the running of any of those centres separate to the infrastructure?

Mrs GERBER: The scare campaign those opposite are trying to run here is clear. It is clear that they are not satisfied with the fact that I have said that both our Escort and Security Branch is currently run and funded into the forwards by our budget and that service will continue to operate within QCS and will continue to happen, as well as my response in relation to our prisons—that they are state-owned and they will continue to be operated by our amazing correctional staff, our corrections officers who suit up, kit up and turn up day in, day out in very difficult circumstances. Often generations of families join. We have recently had a big recruitment drive to recruit more QCS officers—

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, minister.

Mrs GERBER:—but obviously they are not happy with that response and they are trying to run a scare campaign in relation to privatisation.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the members opposite are bullying this minister and stopping her from answering the question. She is giving fulsome answers to the questions they are asking. They might not like the answers but I would ask that they be given direction to allow the minister to finish answering the questions. They have pulled her up on most questions.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you for the lecture.

Mrs GERBER: Our plan, Mr Speaker, is in the budget. The budget makes our plan very clear. We have funded both the Corrections infrastructure as well as our Escort and Security Branch in the budget—

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, minister.

Mrs GERBER:—and those operations will be maintained and continued as our plan in the budget outlines.

Mr BUTCHER: Minister, former LNP shadow treasurer and now minister Tim Mander described the decision to bring prisons back into public hands and safeguard jobs as a ‘total waste’. I note that the published diary of his chief of staff shows a meeting with private prison operator Serco on 9 April. Has Minister Mander or his office made any representation to you or your office in relation to private prisons or prisoner workforce?

Mrs GERBER: Again, I note they are pursuing a line of questioning that has clearly already been answered by myself. Our plan is in the budget. Our plan demonstrates that we funded our correctional infrastructure in the budget. Our correctional infrastructure is owned by the state and our Escort and Security Branch is funded in the budget as a state-run organisation. In fact, I have also answered questions on notice in relation to this very matter advising the member himself, I think, that there has been no meetings from me or my ministerial office in relation to the Serco provider that he is talking about. I can refer the member to that question on notice and I can come back at the end and read that back out to him because that question has been asked and answered.

Mr BUTCHER: That is interesting. Minister, I note that the health minister, the finance minister, the chief of staff of the Treasurer and the chief of staff of the education minister have also met with Serco between January and April of this year. Have they, or any of their officers, made any representations to you or your office in relation to private prisons or the prisoner workforce?

Dr ROWAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: these questions could have been put to the relevant ministers who have already appeared before estimates and those who are still to come before estimates—I am thinking about the list—but most of those people have already appeared before estimates. It would have been more appropriate for those questions to be posed to those people at the time.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: it would be absurd to consider putting questions in relation to Corrections to the health minister or the finance minister. This is the appropriate forum to put the questions around whether or not those individuals have made representations to this minister. I submit to you that she should answer the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I am happy to let the minister answer it.

Mrs GERBER: I am happy to answer the question, thank you. Of course, none of those ministers that were referenced are the Corrective Services Minister. I am the Corrective Services Minister and, of course, none of those ministers have made representations to me in relation to privatisation. The fact is: our budget outlines our plan in relation to our QCS infrastructure as well as the programs that we are developing. The fact is: we are investing in our correctional system in a way that those opposite never did. Those opposite left our correctional system operating in some ways at over 150 per cent capacity. Two centres exceeded 160 per cent capacity. Our budget is funding the correctional

infrastructure that is needed to be able to address that critical overcrowding that the Labor government left us with. That is their record. They may not like this response, and they may like to continue with a scare campaign down this track, but our budget is clear and our plan is in the budget.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, the SDS on page 6 notes that \$2.387 billion has been allocated for bed capacity increases to meet project demand. When were the projections completed to inform that demand?

Commissioner Stewart: To clarify, that is the funding for Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre and Townsville Correctional Centre?

Mr BUTCHER: Yes, correct.

Commissioner Stewart: Yes, they are forecasting numbers. Queensland Corrective Services continues to forecast prisoner numbers into the future. That would have been part of the CBRC's submission in relation to those two centres. From a QCS perspective, the fact that the government has provided us with that infrastructure into the future is really positive. It will mean an additional 400 beds minimum in Arthur Gorrie and 400 beds minimum in Townsville within the existing infrastructure. There is also funding within that to address issues such as laundry, kitchens, medical facilities—so to upgrade the facilities—at the same time. From our perspective, for forecasting perspectives, those centres and that infill in relation to those centres are critical to us for the future.

Mr BUTCHER: It is great you have got that done for corrections but not in youth justice, unfortunately.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: that is commentary.

Mr SPEAKER: That is commentary. Member for Gladstone, I have made rulings about this all the way through estimates. We do not have commentary before questions. Go straight to your next question, please.

Mrs GERBER: Mr Speaker, I take personal offence at that and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and has asked you to withdraw.

Mr BUTCHER: I withdraw. Commissioner, was QCS consulted during the drafting of tranche 1 and tranche 2 of the Making Queensland Safer Laws regarding the likely operational impacts on the adult corrections system?

Commissioner Stewart: We were consulted during the process of the development of the legislation. From our perspective, in relation to our forecasting, we give consideration to a whole range of matters, particularly any legislative change or anything that may impact the adult correctional centres. From our perspective our determination was that our forecasts into the future stood with regard to the planning that we were making moving forward.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, has QCS engaged in any cross-agency modelling with QPS or the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support to estimate the impact of the Making Queensland Safer legislation on prisoner bed demand over the forward estimates?

Commissioner Stewart: We took that into consideration in our forward planning in relation to the prisoner numbers that we see forecasting into the future. Yes, we have.

Mr BUTCHER: My next question is to the commissioner. With reference to the capital program at page 6 of the SDS, can you advise the projected commissioning period for the minimum 400 new beds at Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre?

Commissioner Stewart: Specifically, that is Arthur Gorrie and the commissioning in relation to the rapid infill. The estimations in relation to that are that it would be in 2028 that we would be commissioning those cells.

Mr BUTCHER: Can you advise the projected commissioning period for the minimum 400 new beds at the Townsville Correctional Centre?

Commissioner Stewart: Indeed that will be 2028; that is when we plan for the total of 800 beds to come online in relation to those two centres.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, based on projected demand, has the department identified the need for an additional correctional centre in Queensland in the next 10 years?

Commissioner Stewart: Our focus at the moment is on commissioning and opening Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, which will have 1,536 beds when it comes online in the next number of months. The additional infrastructure around the 800 beds that will come online for Arthur Gorrie and Townsville will see us into that next period. We will continue to model into the future and make determinations in relation to what we would submit to government to consider into the future.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have one more before we do the changeover.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Is the department currently—and taking note of your last response—investigating or considering that there may be the need for a new correctional centre in Queensland?

Commissioner Stewart: Given the current state of the overcrowding that we have at this moment in time, that is critical to us in the future in relation to ensuring that we have the appropriate infrastructure. Again, given the work from the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre and the infill coming for Arthur Gorrie and Townsville, we will continue to monitor what that looks like into the future. From the provision of that immediate relief, the government has provided us with what we will need up until that period.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to government members now.

Ms MARR: My question is to the minister. We know the correctional system is at breaking point. Can you outline what capital investments the Crisafulli government is making to address the chronic overcrowding of Queensland's corrective service facilities, including at the Townsville Correctional Centre, and what was the previous government's approach to boosting capacity?

Mrs GERBER: I know the member for Thuringowa visited the Townsville Correctional Centre earlier this year and she has spoken with the officers who are working there and has seen firsthand the pressure that chronic overcrowding can place on our prisons and frontline officers who are working every day to keep our community safe. That is why addressing the critical overcrowding that the previous Labor government left us in our correctional centres is a key priority for the Crisafulli government. When we came to government we inherited a correctional system under enormous pressure. The secure system was operating at 148 per cent capacity with six high-security sectors operating above 150 per cent and two of those exceeding 160 per cent capacity. As a result, under the former government, triple-ups were an imminent risk, with more than 6,500 prisoners bunking up and sharing a cell built for one and almost 600 prisoners on a mattress on the floor. A system overcrowded does not just affect the prisoners; it places frontline officers at risk, it undermines rehabilitation and threatens community safety.

That is why the Crisafulli government is delivering \$2.387 billion to rapidly boost capacity at the Townsville and Arthur Gorrie correctional centres. This investment will increase prison bed capacity, ease pressure across the system and support a safer environment for our correctional staff. This will follow the delivery of the 1,500-bed Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre where, under the Crisafulli government, operational commissioning has commenced. We are also delivering \$10 million in capital funding for additional capacity to support the management of dangerous individuals who have completed their sentence and cannot legally be held in prison. Those are the ones who are subject to the DPSO Act. This will also be bolstered by \$21.8 million in operational funding.

We are also investing \$75 million to enhance infrastructure and security at low-security correctional centres including fencing to securely manage the growing prisoner population and to safeguard the community. We are delivering \$216.9 million in critical asset improvements, including accommodation, radio networks and electronic security. Also within weeks of coming to government, we funded 94 officers to operationalise low-custody beds at Townsville men's, Townsville women's, Numinbah and Lotus Glen correctional centres—beds the former government added without any funding for the staff needed to keep correctional officers and the community safe. Every dollar we invest in the correctional services system is about ensuring stability, reducing reoffending and restoring community safety. We are building the capacity, the services and the safeguards needed to deliver secure, functional and rehabilitative corrective services that keep the community safe.

The member asked about alternative approaches. The previous government's approach to boosting capacity was minimal at best. In fact, not a single new prison was delivered in Queensland under the previous Labor government in 10 years. The Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre is the first new prison to be delivered by a government in 10 years in Queensland. That is an absolute disgrace on the former Labor government in the way they treated our correctional centres and the way they dealt with capacity issues in this state, so the Crisafulli government is taking a different approach. We are investing in the infrastructure, the people and the systems needed to restore safety across the correctional system and in our communities.

Ms MARR: Minister, I am aware there have been a number of absconds from the low-security correctional centres. What is the Crisafulli government doing to strengthen security at these facilities?

Mrs GERBER: I really do appreciate the member's interest in this really important matter. Community safety is obviously very core to what she does, and her advocacy and our correctional centres play a vital role in community safety. In order for them to do that we need to strengthen security in our facilities.

The Crisafulli government takes the security of our correctional centres incredibly seriously, including at our low-security facilities, because Queenslanders deserve to have confidence that prisoners are securely and appropriately managed. We recognise that any abscond from a low-security facility is serious, and that is exactly how we treat it. When we came to government we inherited a correctional system that was under enormous pressure. As I have said, some of those high-security centres were operating at over 160 per cent capacity and in our low-security facilities this systemic overcrowding was putting enormous pressure on the system. When we came to government we uncovered that there were a number of prisoners inappropriately placed in our low-security facilities as a result of the previous Labor government pushing capacity issues—the overcrowding—in our high-security facilities on to our low-security facilities. QCS has subsequently reviewed the placement of these prisoners and ensured that the ones who are in low security are appropriately placed to be there.

Further, within weeks of forming government, we funded 94 officers to operationalise the low-custody beds at Townsville men's and Townsville women's, and that is just outside the member's own electorate. These officers have also been deployed to Numinbah Correctional Centre and at Lotus Glen Correctional Centre, but these 94 officers are staff that Labor forgot to fund and, without them, low-security beds could not have been safely brought online. It would have compromised the safety of our facilities and that of the community. In terms of security in our low-security facilities, QCS also conducts random patrols and prisoner headcounts as part of their security patrols.

I also just want to touch on fencing. The Crisafulli government is taking action to make our low-security correctional facilities more secure. Under the former government, only one low-security facility in Queensland—that being the Capricornia Correctional Centre—had security fencing to deter absconds and the introduction of contraband—just one prison. We are one of the only states in Australia to not have all of our low-security correctional facilities with fences around the accommodation units. The Crisafulli government is delivering \$75 million to enhance the infrastructure and security at low-security facilities, and this includes anticlimb razor wire fencing at four of our low-security sites—Palen Creek, Lotus Glen, Numinbah and Townsville men's. This fencing will help deter absconds and help secure these facilities. This fencing is a critical investment the Crisafulli government is making to secure not just the safety of our correctional centres and our low-security correctional facilities but the safety of our communities and it is an investment that the previous Labor government failed to make.

Mr HUNT: Minister, I understand that the business case for the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre was originally funded in 2015. Could you please provide the committee with an update on what progress the Crisafulli government has made in delivering this critical piece of infrastructure?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Nicklin for the question. As a highly decorated former police officer, he knows firsthand the critical importance of a strong correctional system in keeping the community safe and supporting the work of our frontline QCS officers. As the member noted, the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre is a critical piece of infrastructure and our frontline officers have been waiting for over a decade to have it up and running in our state. The business case for the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre was first funded by the former LNP government in 2014, but what followed under the previous Labor governments that succeeded was a decade of delays, of blowouts and of broken promises resulting in staff safety plummeting. In fact, in the 2015-16 financial year when correctional capacity was at 109.7 per cent, there were 269 assaults on officers by prisoners. In the last financial year, this has more than doubled. That is Labor's record: assaults on our correctional officers has more than doubled to 597 assaults on officers by prisoners. This is completely unacceptable and it is why the Crisafulli government is investing in boosting capacity in our prisons to secure them and to restore safety.

Sadly, the former government waited until 2019—five years after the business case—before they even announced the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre with a \$618 million budget and said that it would be completed in the 2022-23 financial year. By June that year, the cost had already blown out to \$654 million and by June 2022 under the previous Labor government, just before it was originally set to be complete—before they said it should be complete and up and running—the former Labor government changed the goalposts. The Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre would now cost \$861 million and they advised that the timeline had completely blown out and it would not be complete until the end of 2023. The very next month the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre had been pushed

back once again by the previous Labor government to April 2024, and then in February last year the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre had blown out to almost a billion dollars—\$885.3 million. That is a \$267 million blowout. Queenslanders were again told by the previous Labor government that it would not be ready until late 2027. When we came into government we discovered a further \$80 million blowout and we discovered that the previous Labor government had not kept Lockyer Valley on time and that it, due to the works that still needed to be completed, would not be ready until 2025. The previous government hid that from Queenslanders for more than a decade.

After the LNP government first funded the business case they were unable to open the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, and I just want to talk you through some of the things that were not complete as part of the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. The former government's failure to drive productivity meant that, despite the \$885.3 million already spent on the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, key infrastructure and critical systems were still significantly incomplete when we came to government. The electronic security was only 10 per cent complete. They had 10 years and 10 per cent complete. With regard to mechanical services, that was only 18 per cent complete. With regard to false fire services, that was only 20 per cent complete. With regard to electrical services, they were 69 per cent complete. With regard to hydraulics, they were 85 per cent complete—almost getting there. However, this critical failure by the previous Labor government and the deception involved by telling Queenslanders time and time again that it would be open when in fact they were failing to deliver on that commitment and failing to drive productivity and open it meant that our correctional system was left in a state of overcrowding and it meant that the previous Labor government failed to deliver the beds that were necessary to reduce that overcrowding.

The Crisafulli government is delivering the 1,500-bed Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre and just over 10 days ago I was joined by the member for Lockyer, Jim McDonald, and local mayor Tanya Milligan for the first day of the operational commissioning. This brings us one step closer to relieving pressure on the overcrowded system, restoring safety for our officers and providing a secure environment where rehabilitation is possible. I want to take a moment also to acknowledge the work of Queensland Corrective Services, the Department of Housing and Public Works and the on-site workers to be able to get this project finished. I have just been advised that I made a mistake in the dates. I said 2027 when I meant 2025.

Mr FIELD: Minister, can you please inform the committee how Queensland Corrective Services is working to restore safety where you live as part of the Crisafulli government's Making Queensland Safer plan and outline some of the achievements of our frontline Corrective Services staff?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Capalaba for his interest. I know community safety is also something that he has been advocating for and is something that he knows is critical to be able to restore safety where you live to our communities, and of course Queensland Corrective Services plays a critical role in delivering on that commitment. Our 9,109 officers from community corrections to custodial corrections are central to this, managing prisoners and officers, reducing reoffending and supporting victims of crime. Since we came to government we have wasted no time backing our QCS officers with the resources, the infrastructure and the support needed to do their jobs safely and effectively.

As part of the 2025-26 budget we are delivering \$2.387 billion to rapidly boost bed capacity at Townsville Correctional Centre and Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre; \$87.9 million to operationalise the new low-custody beds and fund the 94 officers the former government failed to fund or provide; \$216.9 million in critical infrastructure improvements, from emergency lighting to electronic security; \$25 million to roll out electronic monitoring of high-risk domestic and family violence offenders; \$2.6 million to expand support for victims of youth crime through the QCS victims register; and \$30.5 million to save 90 jobs supporting the Parole Board Queensland.

We are delivering on our commitment to review the Parole Board Queensland with Mr Peter Hastie KC leading an independent victim-centric review. We are also delivering for the QCS workforce. My ministerial charter letter focuses on staff safety and wellbeing. That is why we have fast tracked the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. That is why we have already seen 844 new officers graduate from the QCS Academy since we came to government and over 1,000 new custodial corrections officers and community corrections case managers by the end of the year.

I want to thank the member for asking about some of the achievements of our frontline officers because I want to thank them for their exemplary service. Our officers work in some of the most challenging environments in the public sector. When they are supervising dangerous prisoners, managing high-risk offenders, in the community responding to complex incidents or working to rehabilitate offenders, they execute their jobs with professionalism, with purpose and with pride.

It has been a great honour of mine to meet so many of our fantastic officers while visiting correctional centres and corrections officers around the state and at our awards ceremonies—people like Acting Chief Superintendent Megan Crossley, who was awarded leadership in custodial operations; Superintendent Colin Martin, for his commitment to operational excellence and innovation; Cultural Liaison Officer Beck Field, for her advocacy for First Nations communities; Correctional Manager Michael Czarnecki, whose program at Lotus Glen is changing outcomes for incarcerated veterans; Superintendent Hanah Walton, who is known for her adaptability; Tanya Guild, whose work embedding the culture and leadership program has left a lasting impact across the agency; and Monique from the Parole Board for being a transformational leader. These are some of the awards that our QCS officers have received. Dr Melanie Mitchell was awarded for her leadership in countering violent extremism and supporting complex case loads across QCS and QPS; Ronnie Little, whose 24 years of service at Townsville Correctional Centre are marked by professionalism with a deep respect from her peers; and Janeve Colliss for her outstanding performance and dedication to supporting victims of crime through the QCS victims register.

Of course, I am leaving someone out of this: Commissioner Paul Stewart, for his 40-plus years of experience across QPS and QCS and his commitment to supporting staff wellbeing, driving reform and delivering a safer Queensland. These are just a few of the examples of officers in our Corrective Services going above and beyond and doing extraordinary things in difficult circumstances. I am extremely proud of the work they do and feel extremely privileged and humbled to be part of that and to be at some of their award ceremonies to present some of those awards.

Mr SPEAKER: We will go to the opposition members and I will go to the member for Gladstone.

Mr BUTCHER: Just going back to the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, Minister, was the business case based on a continuation of the then private prison operations at the Southern Queensland Correctional Precinct by Serco?

Mrs GERBER: The member well knows that the business case was started under an LNP government in 2014. As we are talking about the business case, the previous Labor government failed to deliver the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. They promised it would be up and running in the 2022-23 financial year. They failed to deliver that. They also failed to deliver it on budget and on time. They promised that it would cost around \$618 million—

Mr BUTCHER: Point of order, Speaker: on relevance. The question was around was the business case done in relation to it being a privately operated prison at that time under the LNP.

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker. On that point of order, I think the minister is being relevant. She is referring to the business case and giving a fulsome answer and I ask that the minister be further heard.

Mrs GERBER: As the member was talking about decisions of former governments, I would like to address that question. The former Labor government failed to deliver the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre on time or on budget.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the minister did not give you an opportunity to rule on that point of order. I would be interested to know what your ruling is in relation to the point of order that the member for Gladstone brought to your attention before the minister continues.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, just to clarify for myself, are we talking about the same business case? Is the business case the minister is talking about the business case you were referring to?

Mr BUTCHER: The business case that was done on the Lockyer Valley—

Mr SPEAKER: When?

Mr BUTCHER: In 2014, as the minister has said.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have anything to add to that?

Mrs GERBER: As the member is aware, decisions of government are cabinet-in-confidence. I was not a member of the 2014 government. I would not know what the cabinet decisions were of that government because I was not a member of that government. Of course, decisions of cabinet are cabinet-in-confidence and so are the CBRC decisions. What I can speak about is our government's track record and decisions of our government. Our government was able to fast-track the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre because the previous government failed to get it up and running when they promised and for the price tag they promised. Our government was able to provide the funds as well as the fast tracking to ensure that the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre opened—the first prison to open in 10 years in Queensland; something the previous Labor government failed to do.

Mr BUTCHER: My next question is to the commissioner. About 20 minutes ago now you gave us a very straightforward response around undertaking projections of future demand for prisons. Can you confirm you undertook those same projections across your whole portfolio, including youth justice, and will you table those projections?

Commissioner Stewart: We did not conduct our forecasting with youth justice. We do our own forecasting for our own adult prison population into the future. That is a critical part of the work that we do given, again, the significant issues that we are having in relation to overcrowding and the significant risk that we faced in relation to three prisoners being in a cell. Our forecasting over the years has been found to be exceptionally accurate and has been able to inform, in particular, the requirements that we have as an agency for infrastructure into the future. We will continue to do that, obviously, as a part of the work that we do and to ensure that we have the infrastructure that we need and to give government the ability to make determinations in relation to that infrastructure.

Mr BUTCHER: Can you confirm whether the capital works funding in this budget guarantees the system will meet the national 95 per cent cell capacity targets within this term of government?

Commissioner Stewart: Again, the 95 per cent targets relate to cell occupation and that would be one prisoner per cell. Given that some of our prisons are operating at 160 per cent at the moment, Lockyer Valley coming online and the additional 800 beds will move us closer towards that target, but at that time we will not be in a position to be able to meet that target unless there is significant changes within the criminal justice system into the future. Given that we are at 160 per cent in centres at the moment, it would require significant infrastructure in a number of centres to bring us to that 95 per cent target.

Mr HUNT: Another mess we are fixing.

Mr SPEAKER: We do not need any commentary, thank you.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, the President of the QPUE, Shane Prior, told 9News, '... Queensland Corrective Services are simply not doing their job and picking up their prisoners'. Have you completed any workforce planning modelling to forecast the volume and frequency of prisoner transfers from watch houses to correctional centres if all transfers are to be completed by QCS staff, that is, 100 per cent collection?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the preamble to that question has an inference in it. Quoting the Queensland police union executive inferring that Corrective Services were not doing their job is an inference. I ask the member to reword the question without that preamble.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the reference simply provides context to why the question is important. There is no inference in the actual question that has been asked by the member. I ask that you put it to the commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question, Commissioner.

Commissioner Stewart: A part of the work that the Queensland Corrective Services does every day is to work extremely closely with the Queensland Police Service and with those involved in watch house management. We are very aware of the percentages and the numbers within Queensland Police Service watch houses. Our people in escort, security and sentence management do everything that we can do to support the Queensland Police Service to move prisoners as quickly and expeditiously as we can from Queensland watch houses. Under the legislative framework, we have 21 days in order to do that. However, the vast majority of prisoners are moved from watch houses within seven days.

Queensland Corrective Services actually does a significant amount of escorts in relation to watch houses. There has been a suggestion that the Queensland police are the only area that does prisoner transports. That is actually incorrect. Queensland Corrective Services conducts thousands of prisoner transports from watch houses to courts and, as the minister said earlier, in relation to medical transports and a whole range of transports. We established a capacity management group within Corrective Services when these issues were starting to be raised at the beginning of last year. We have done a significant amount of work in relation to capacity and opening up space within our correctional centres wherever we can in order to support the Queensland Police Service in the important work that they do and to move people as soon as we can. Critically, if watch houses have individuals who are at risk and the Queensland Police Service makes a request to us, we are in a position to be able to move individuals on a 24/7 basis as well.

We are doing a significant amount of work. I am in constant contact with Acting Commissioner Chelepy, looking at the percentages and the numbers within watch houses and doing everything we can. Again, we have Lockyer Valley coming online and the additional infrastructure that the government has provided us in Arthur Gorrie in Townsville will support us in that regard into the future as well.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, on page 10 of the SDS there are 170 full-time equivalents cut from the 2024-25 actuals against the 2025-26 budget. Can you confirm if this means frontline staffing ratios will decline?

Mr HUNT: Point of order, Mr Speaker and I am sorry to interrupt again: the use of the word 'cuts' has an inference and imputation. The member knows the standing orders. I ask that he rephrase the question without the use of the word 'cuts'.

Mr de BRENNI: Point of order, Speaker: there is no inference in that. The word specifically has an ordinary meaning. I ask that the question be put to the commissioner as is.

Mr SPEAKER: Commissioner, I will let you answer.

Commissioner Stewart: I note that in the SDS there is a full-time equivalent 8,448, which is an estimated actual figure so that is an estimated figure. In relation to FTEs, I can say that as of 30 June we actually had 8,258.99 FTEs. So in actual fact 8,274, which we have budgeted for this year, is an increase in relation to the number of FTEs—

Mr HUNT: It does not sound like a cut.

Mr BUTCHER: Speaker, the guy sitting next to you is relentless in his chatter across the table. I am not asking the chair of the committee; I am asking the commissioner. You have asked him multiple times. I ask you to take care of that.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take care of that.

Commissioner Stewart: In addition, as of 1 July 2024, we had 7,360.1 full-time equivalent positions so the SDS figure of 8,274 are approximately 900 more. The complexity in relation to some of this is that we have been recruiting a significant number of positions for Lockyer Valley over the last period as well. Those people have been in centres and will move to Lockyer Valley under the commissioning process that the minister talked about.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, yes or no: the prisoner-on-officer assault rate was higher in 2024-25 than in previous years; is that correct?

Commissioner Stewart: As the minister highlighted, assaults in correctional centres over the last 10 years have been increasing. Our staff, if I can say, do an exceptional job in very difficult and very complex circumstances. The way that we record assaults and in the SDS is that there are 'serious assaults', 'assaults' and 'assaults other' so each of those have separate categories.

In relation to the rates, I can say that from 2023-24 to 2024-25 for serious assaults—and these are assaults in which our officers are required to go to hospital and have ongoing treatment as a result of it—we had a rate of 0.1 in 2023-24 and a reduction to 0.07 in that year. There has been reduction in serious assaults. There has been an increase in assaults from 0.78 to 1.01. Again, given the significant overcrowding and the temperature within our centres, our people are doing remarkable work. For the member's information, we provide training to our people in relation to de-escalation techniques and that has been a significant focus of the work that we have done over the past years. From our indications, that de-escalation and the work is increasing. On assaults other, it is 4.29 to 4.34 so those rates are holding fairly steady. There is a reduction in serious assaults, a slight increase in relation to assaults and assaults other are fairly consistent numbers.

Mr BUTCHER: Commissioner, has the department briefed the minister on matters relating to officer fatigue, morale or burnout linked to staff shortages or higher prisoner-to-staff ratios?

Commissioner Stewart: I brief the minister in relation to our system on a regular basis. In particular, as I said previously, we have discussions in relation to the issues that we face around overcrowding. I cannot speak for the minister but I know she is extremely interested in our officer welfare in relation to assaults, in relation to making sure that they have the equipment that they need and making sure that they do have the fatigue breaks that they need to have. I know that, from the minister's perspective, she is extremely interested in the overall welfare of our officers. I do provide the minister with briefings in relation to the things that we are doing within our organisation to ensure that government has full and clear visibility of what we are doing from a correctional perspective.

Mr SPEAKER: We will quickly go to government members. There is only one minute left so it will have to be very quick.

Ms MARR: Minister, can you please update the committee on the role that Queensland Corrective Services have played in community safety particularly during the recent natural disasters, including the floods in my region earlier this year?

Mrs GERBER: This is such an important one. I will try to get through it because I have so many people from corrections I want to thank for doing an exceptional job.

Mr SPEAKER: You have one minute.

Mrs GERBER: During these events, Queensland Corrective Services staff went above and beyond to maintain safety in our community. More than 200 correctional officers stayed onsite during the cyclone and flooding to keep centres operating safely. I want to give some shout-outs. Officer Kenneth spent his birthday at Woodford Correctional Centre to secure the centre during that weather event, and trade instructors onsite even made him a cake to celebrate.

At Borallon Correctional Centre, the general manager, Sue, spent three nights sleeping in her office to ensure operations continued smoothly, sacrificing time with her husband and eight grandchildren. Similarly, at Numinbah Correctional Centre, Greg, Jolanta, Josh and Emma slept onsite to ensure the facility remained secure and to look after Nick. Nick, of course, is the centre's residential therapeutic horse who is much loved there. I was going to hand to the commissioner to give some thanks, but we have run out of time. I am sorry, Commissioner.

Mr SPEAKER: We have run out of time, indeed. We have reached the end of time allocated for consideration of the proposed expenditure for the areas of responsibility administered by the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. Thank you, Minister, Director-General, officials and departmental officers for your attendance. That concludes this hearing of estimates for the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee for 2025.

I would like to thank the committee members and the visiting members who participated in the hearing. Thank you also to Hansard and the parliamentary broadcast staff, together with all of the other parliamentary staff who assisted here today. I declare this hearing closed.

The committee adjourned at 8. 01 pm.