



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>

Email: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Phone (07) 3553 6344

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

### Tuesday, 5 March 2024

Subject	Page
<b>ASSENT TO BILLS</b> .....	<b>319</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 February 2024, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 February 2024 .....	319
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>319</b>
<b>Comments by Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs, Correction and Apology</b> .....	<b>319</b>
<b>Comments by Premier, Correction and Apology</b> .....	<b>320</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 4 March 2024, from the Premier, Hon. Steven Miles, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding a correction to the record in relation to his response to a question without notice on Wednesday, 14 February 2024. ....	320
<b>Alleged Contempt of Parliament</b> .....	<b>320</b>
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>Absence of Members</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>Parliamentary Information Management System</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>Sub Judice</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>Authentication of Facts</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>Ministerial Statements</b> .....	<b>321</b>
<b>School Group Tours</b> .....	<b>322</b>
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>322</b>
<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>322</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>325</b>
<b>Gender Equality</b> .....	<b>325</b>
<b>Women and Girls' Health Strategy</b> .....	<b>326</b>
<b>Housing and Homelessness</b> .....	<b>326</b>
<b>Women, Arts and Culture</b> .....	<b>327</b>
<b>Women and Girls</b> .....	<b>328</b>
<b>Victims of Crime, Legislation</b> .....	<b>328</b>

Women, Queensland Corrective Services .....	329
Women, Trade and Investment.....	330
Women and Girls.....	330
Housing and Homelessness.....	331
<b>ABSENCE OF MINISTER AND MEMBER.....</b>	<b>331</b>
<b>MOTIONS.....</b>	<b>331</b>
Order of Business .....	331
Suspension of Standing Orders .....	331
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	332
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.....</b>	<b>332</b>
Premier, Integrity.....	332
Premier, Right to Information .....	332
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 13 November 2023, from the Principal RTI Officer, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, Mr Matt Woodforth, to the Director of Strategy, Office of David Crisafulli MP, Leader of the Opposition, Mr Matt Tapsell, regarding an application under the Right to Information Act 2009. ....	333
Women and Girls, Health .....	333
Premier, Right to Information .....	334
Women, Workforce.....	334
Premier, Integrity.....	335
Women and Girls, Health .....	336
Premier, Integrity.....	337
Homes for Queenslanders.....	337
Premier, Integrity.....	338
Schoolteachers.....	339
Mi Hi Grove, Property Valuation .....	339
Multiculturalism.....	340
Residential Tenancies.....	341
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order .....	341
Child Safety Officers .....	341
Pomona King of the Mountain .....	342
Women, Health .....	342
Premier, Integrity.....	343
Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence.....	343
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....</b>	<b>344</b>
Same Question Rule.....	344
<b>MOTION .....</b>	<b>344</b>
Business Program.....	344
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to .....	345
Resolved in the affirmative. ....	345
<b>APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2).....</b>	<b>345</b>
Second Reading .....	345
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brochure from the Queensland government titled 'Satellite Hospitals—Bringing healthcare closer'.....	349
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of newspaper advertisements regarding Visy recycling factory.....	350
Consideration in Detail.....	361
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to. ....	361
Schedule, as read, agreed to. ....	361
Third Reading .....	361
Long Title.....	361
<b>CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL .....</b>	<b>361</b>
Second Reading (Cognate Debate) .....	362
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Affairs and Safety Committee Report No. 63, 57th Parliament—Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, government response. ....	362
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, statement of compatibility with human rights: Erratum. ....	362
<b>MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST .....</b>	<b>363</b>
Miles Labor Government, Performance .....	363
Women, Health .....	364
Premier, Integrity.....	365
Liberal National Party, Women.....	366
Miles Labor Government, Lobbyists .....	367
Women.....	368
Electricity Prices .....	369
Torres Strait, Marine Infrastructure.....	370
Member for Pumicestone; Cost of Living .....	371
Redland City Council, Weinam Creek .....	372
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 1 March 2024, from the Mayor of Redland City Council, Ms Karen Williams, to the member for Redlands, Ms Kim Richards MP, regarding the Weinam Creek redevelopment project. ....	373

<b>CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>373</b>
<b>Second Reading (Cognate Debate)</b> .....	<b>373</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, amendments to be moved by Mr Tim Nicholls MP, accompanying explanatory notes and statement of compatibility with human rights.....	377
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>399</b>
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee</b> .....	<b>399</b>
<b>CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>400</b>
<b>Second Reading (Cognate Debate)</b> .....	<b>400</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>406</b>
<b>Gladstone, Gas Pipeline</b> .....	<b>406</b>
<b>CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>407</b>
<b>Second Reading (Cognate Debate)</b> .....	<b>407</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, amendments to be moved by Dr Amy MacMahon MP.....	416
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b> .....	<b>418</b>
<b>Kawana Electorate</b> .....	<b>418</b>
<b>Jordan Electorate, Mater Chicks in Pink Springfield Walk</b> .....	<b>418</b>
<b>Unlicensed Tobacco Shops</b> .....	<b>419</b>
<b>Macalister Electorate, Small Business</b> .....	<b>420</b>
<b>Burns, Mr M; Smallacombe, Mr B</b> .....	<b>420</b>
<b>Women and Girls' Health Strategy</b> .....	<b>421</b>
<b>McCallum, Mr R; Benarkin State School</b> .....	<b>421</b>
<b>Mansfield Electorate, Education</b> .....	<b>422</b>
<b>Burdekin Electorate, Energy Supply</b> .....	<b>423</b>
<b>Bundamba Electorate, Community Cabinet; TAFE</b> .....	<b>423</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE</b> .....	<b>424</b>




## TUESDAY, 5 MARCH 2024


---

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Curtis Pitt, Mulgrave) read prayers and took the chair.

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge that we are sitting today on the land of Aboriginal people and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank them, as First Australians, for their careful custodianship of the land over countless generations. We are very fortunate in this country to have two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letter will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable C.W. Pitt MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of His Majesty The King on the date shown:

Date of assent: 19 February 2024

A bill for an Act to amend the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Summary Offences Act 2005 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Act 2016, the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012, the Maritime Safety Queensland Act 2002, the Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014, the Sustainable Ports Development Act 2015, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Road Rules) Regulation 2009, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Regulation 2021, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Standards and Safety) Regulation 2021, the Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994, the Transport Planning and Coordination Regulation 2017 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the Auditor-General Act 2009, the Crime and Corruption Act 2001, the Evidence Act 1977, the Integrity Act 2009, the Ombudsman Act 2001, the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001, the Right to Information Act 2009 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

These Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely


Governor

19 February 2024

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 19 February 2024, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 February 2024 [\[285\]](#).


### PRIVILEGE

#### Comments by Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs, Correction and Apology

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs) (9.32 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. In response to a question without notice from the member for Gympie asked during the last sitting week, I misheard the member and responded to the question about a renewable energy project with reference to another. To clarify, I indicated that the

detailed analytical report for the Pioneer-Burdekin project would be responded to when it is finished. Further, and for completeness, I can advise the House that the government has already responded to the detailed analytical report for the Gympie project as part of the 2023-24 budget and such advice to government could be released once delivery contracts for the two projects have been executed. I apologise to the House for any confusion.

### Comments by Premier, Correction and Apology


 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (9.32 am): I rise on a matter of privilege. I would like to update the record in relation to my response to a question posed by the member for Burleigh on Wednesday, 14 February.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Sorry, Premier. I have given very clear instructions in the past, Deputy Leader of the Opposition. You will get no quarter from me today if you do not follow the general procedures of the House. I need to hear matters of privilege in silence.

**Mr MILES:** I would like to update the record in relation to my response to a question posed by the member for Burleigh on Wednesday, 14 February. I understood the question related to compliance with right-to-information requirements and answered to the best of my recollection; however, last night it was brought to my attention that a photograph was taken in the chamber while the Legislative Assembly was sitting. I wish to update the House and advise that I, as the member for Murrumba, did text the member for Pumicestone during question time, which was the subject of the member's question. The text message was from sometime prior and I did not recall it at the time. I therefore wish to correct the record and apologise to the House for the error. I also table a copy of correspondence sent to the Speaker last night advising him of the update at the first available opportunity.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 4 March 2024, from the Premier, Hon. Steven Miles, to the Speaker, Hon. Curtis Pitt, regarding a correction to the record in relation to his response to a question without notice on Wednesday, 14 February 2024 [286].


 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (9.34 am): I do not accept the apology from the Premier, and the people of Queensland do not accept the apology of the Premier—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, your microphone is off. I find that completely disorderly. It is completely flouting the rules around a matter of privilege. You got up and rose to speak to a statement about an issue. You can leave the chamber under standing order 253A for one hour—no warning.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Burleigh withdrew from the chamber at 9.34 am.*

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, we have standing orders for a reason. That goes for all members of this House. They must be complied with—they are not to be used for grandstanding or for political purpose—for the dignity of the House.

### Alleged Contempt of Parliament

 **Ms KING** (Pumicestone—ALP) (9.35 am): I rise on a matter of privilege. Last night, a report on 9News showed an image of my mobile phone on my desk within the Legislative Assembly while the proceedings of the Queensland parliament were occurring, taken on 11 October 2023. The image was clearly taken from within the chamber by a member of parliament sitting behind me. This is a serious breach of the rights and privileges of a member of this House and a breach of trust by an elected official of the Queensland parliament.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my left, I will hear the matter of privilege. As I previously indicated to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I will hear the matter. It is important that we all hear the matter of privilege that is being presented.

**Ms KING:** I submit that the actions of the member of parliament who did this amount to a serious and deliberate contempt of this parliament and also that their actions amount to intimidation of a member of parliament in the discharge of the member's duties.


**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Ms KING:** Mr Speaker, I will be writing to you to ask that this matter be referred to the Ethics Committee for its careful consideration.


## SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

### Absence of Members


 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have received advice that the member for South Brisbane, Dr Amy MacMahon MP, has and will continue to be absent from 12 February until at least early April 2024. The member for Lytton, Ms Joan Pease MP, will be absent for the period 26 February to 8 April 2024 inclusive. The member for Southport, Mr Rob Molhoek MP, will be absent for the period 27 February to 27 April 2024 inclusive. The member for Hervey Bay, Mr Adrian Tantari MP, will be absent for the period 1 March to 3 April 2024. The member for Redcliffe, the Hon. Yvette D'Ath, will be absent for the period 4 to 10 March 2024. The member for Whitsunday, Ms Amanda Camm MP, will be absent for the period 5 to 7 March 2024. Each member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

As an aside to that, as members are aware, the member for South Brisbane was involved in a serious car accident. Medical evidence provided to me indicates that Dr MacMahon's length of absence may be such that a motion in accordance with standing order 263B may be required to grant leave of absence for Dr MacMahon. I am sure that all members of the House will join me in wishing her a speedy recovery.


### Parliamentary Information Management System

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, following the introduction of the new chamber audio system last sitting week, I am pleased to advise that as of today closed captions will be available on the Legislative Assembly chamber broadcast for the parliament's website. Some members may like that more than others! Website users are now able to select closed captions on the video player simply by clicking on an icon. The feature will significantly enhance the accessibility of the parliament's broadcast to all Queenslanders. The captioning text is produced by automatic speech recognition software and the size, font, font colour and background colour can be adapted for the user's needs. Today's launch represents the implementation of the first of a number of milestones in the project to deliver an integrated parliamentary information management system. Work is currently being undertaken to deliver, develop, refine and further test modules related to divisions, petitions, tabled papers and also Hansard. Updates will be provided as these additional modules are released over the coming months.


### Sub Judice

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, standing order 233 provides the rule against sub judice. I wish to emphasise the importance of this rule to the House which seeks to prevent any discussion in this House about matters the subject of criminal proceedings. It protects the criminal proceedings from being prejudiced by matters raised in this House. It works to prevent criminal proceedings from being delayed or stayed through any prejudice from statements in the House. The media are subject to rules relating to contempt of court and are answerable to the courts for any reports in the media. Members of this House are not accountable to the courts for statements made in this House; rather, members are accountable to the House itself. It is the responsibility of members to know and abide by this rule.

### Authentication of Facts


 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, members must be in a position to authenticate facts stated in their questions. Indeed, authentication may be required in respect of questions, notices of motions, motions and petitions. Members should not phrase questions to state as fact that which is not fact but assumption or supposition. Members should not exaggerate facts beyond that which they can authenticate. It is for the Speaker to determine whether authentication is required and determine whether the member has provided sufficient evidence of authentication. It is incumbent on members preparing questions to be prepared to provide authentication of the facts as stated immediately when called upon. It is in order to ask a minister whether an allegation or report is correct. It is also in order to ask a minister what action they will take in respect of an allegation or report and, if some allegation or report is proved correct, what action they will take.

### Ministerial Statements

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, standing order 62 provides ministers considerable latitude for ministerial statements both during preliminary business each day and in government business between business items during the sitting week. However, I wish to remind ministers that standing order

62 makes it clear that the purpose of ministerial statements is to make a statement relating to matters of government policy or public affairs. Speaker Mickel, in a ruling on 6 October 2010, described a ministerial statement as a statement where the executive is 'reporting back' on its actions to parliament. I am also of the opinion that it includes announcement of new policy or initiatives. In the context of the standing order, 'public affairs' does not include anything in the public domain. It must have a relationship to governing this state. I would ask ministers to ensure that they are respectful of the intent of the standing order.

### School Group Tours

 **Mr SPEAKER:** I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery today by students and teachers from McDowall State School in the electorate of Everton and Minimbah State School in the electorate of Morayfield.

## PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petitions, lodged and sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

### Amberley Interchange, Upgrade

**Mr Krause**, from 1,369 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure users of the Cunningham Highway see a long-term upgrade to the Amberley Interchange [\[273\]](#) [\[274\]](#).

### Curra, Power Supply

**Mr Perrett**, from 1,016 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade and establish infrastructure to ensure a sustainable and reliable power supply in Curra and surrounds [\[275\]](#) [\[276\]](#).

The Clerk presented the following e-petition, sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

### Gold Coast Fishermen's Co-operative

**Mr Langbroek**, from 2,975 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Gold Coast Fishermen's Co-operative retains its current site and current access to waterfront on the Southport Spit [\[277\]](#).

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the Clerk—

### Drivers' Licences, Medical Certification

1,231 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the Department of Transport of Main Road's requirement for people with autism and other neurotypes (eg. ADD) to provide a medical certificate in order to obtain their drivers licence [\[278\]](#).

### Public Transport, Fares

134 petitioners, requesting the House to implement a "Common Good Concession" Go-Card that charges a 50% higher rate than the standard fare as a convenient means by which generous citizens can voluntarily reduce the fare burden for the general public [\[279\]](#).

### Housing, Vacancy Levy

1,026 petitioners, requesting the House to address the housing crisis and homelessness by implementing a vacancy levy [\[280\]](#).

Petitions received.

## TABLED PAPERS

### PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

16 February 2024—

[216](#) Queensland Public Trustee: Report titled 'Systems and Practices Review: Undertaken by the Queensland Public Trustee's Customer Advocate'

[217](#) Department of Resources: Report titled 'Review of the *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land Holding Act 2013*', December 2023

19 February 2024—

[218](#) Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee: Report No. 1, 57th Parliament—Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023

[219](#) Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee: Report No. 2, 57th Parliament—Forensic Science Queensland Bill 2023

[220](#) Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws)(Other Gases) Act 2023 (SA) which received Royal Assent on 23 November 2023



- [221](#) Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal—Remuneration Determination: 2022-23 Review of Allowances—Determination 30/2024, 19 February 2024
- 20 February 2024—
- [222](#) Right to Information Act 2009 and Information Privacy Act 2009—Annual Report 2022-23
- [223](#) Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements—Queensland Government's Fifth Implementation progress report—January 2024
- 21 February 2024—
- [224](#) Queensland Ombudsman—Prison overcrowding and other matters report: An investigation in response to a reference by the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee of the Queensland Parliament, February 2024
- [225](#) Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 1, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 11 October 2023 and 24 October 2023
- [226](#) Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee: Report No. 1, 57th Parliament—The delivery of VET in regional, rural and remote Queensland
- 22 February 2024—
- [227](#) Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2022-23
- [228](#) Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee: Report No. 3, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 November 2023 and 28 November 2023
- [229](#) State Development and Regional Industries Committee: Report No. 51, 57th Parliament—Housing Availability and Affordability (Planning and Other Legislation Amendment) Bill 2023, interim government response
- 23 February 2024—
- [230](#) Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 1, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 11 October and 14 November 2023
- [231](#) Resources Safety & Health Queensland Board of Examiners—Annual Report 2022-2023
- [232](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2022-23
- [233](#) Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2022-23
- [234](#) Commissioner for Resources Safety & Health—Annual Report 2022-23
- [235](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 45, 57th Parliament—Inquiry into scrap metal theft, interim government response
- [236](#) Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee: Report No. 2, 57th Parliament—Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023
- [237](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 44, 57th Parliament—Land Valuation Amendment Bill 2023, interim government response
- 29 February 2024—
- [238](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 46, 57th Parliament—Public works inquiry into the state-controlled roads from Birdsville to Bedourie and Birdsville to Windorah, government response
- 1 March 2024—
- [239](#) Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 2, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 25 October 2023 and 14 November 2023
- [240](#) Clean Economy Jobs, Resources and Transport Committee: Report No. 1, 57th Parliament—Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023
- [241](#) Letter, dated 1 March 2024, from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Communities, Hon. Mark Furner, to the Chief Executive Officer of the Queensland Rural and Industry Development Authority, Mr Cameron MacMillan, regarding an extension notice for the Primary Producer Flood Management Grants Scheme under the Rural and Regional Adjustment Regulation 2011
- [242](#) Family Responsibilities Commission—Annual Report 2022-2023
- 4 March 2024—
- [243](#) Office of the Commissioner (Meriba Omasker Kaziw Kazipa)—Annual Report 2022-23
- [244](#) Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 3, 57th Parliament—Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2023
- [245](#) The Public Advocate—Annual Report 2022-23
- TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)
- STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS
- The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—
- Electoral Act 1992, Referendums Act 1997:
- [246](#) Electoral and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 3

- [247](#) Electoral and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 3, explanatory notes  
[248](#) Electoral and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 3, human rights certificate

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

- [249](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 4  
[250](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 4, explanatory notes  
[251](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 4, human rights certificate

Planning and Environment Court Act 2016:

- [252](#) Planning and Environment Court Amendment Rule 2024, No. 5  
[253](#) Planning and Environment Court Amendment Rule 2024, No. 5, explanatory notes  
[254](#) Planning and Environment Court Amendment Rule 2024, No. 5, human rights certificate

Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991:

- [255](#) Queensland Building and Construction Commission (Minimum Financial Requirements) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 6  
[256](#) Queensland Building and Construction Commission (Minimum Financial Requirements) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 6, explanatory notes  
[257](#) Queensland Building and Construction Commission (Minimum Financial Requirements) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 6, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992:

- [258](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas)(Omission of Lawn Hill (Creek) Resources Reserve) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 7  
[259](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas)(Omission of Lawn Hill (Creek) Resources Reserve) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 7, explanatory notes  
[260](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas)(Omission of Lawn Hill (Creek) Resources Reserve) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 7, human rights certificate

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971:

- [261](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas)(Mackay) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 8  
[262](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas)(Mackay) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 8, explanatory notes  
[263](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas)(Mackay) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 8, human rights certificate

Information Privacy and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2023:

- [264](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 9  
[265](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 9, explanatory notes  
[266](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 9, human rights certificate

Public Trustee Act 1978:

- [267](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 10  
[268](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 10, explanatory notes  
[269](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 10, human rights certificate

Police Service Administration Act 1990:

- [270](#) Police Service Administration (Oath and Affirmation) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 11  
[271](#) Police Service Administration (Oath and Affirmation) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 11, explanatory notes  
[272](#) Police Service Administration (Oath and Affirmation) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 11, human rights certificate

#### REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

- [281](#) Report pursuant to Standing Order 169 (Acts to be numbered by the Clerk) and Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by Her Excellency the Governor, viz—

#### **Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023**

Amendments made to Bill

**Short title and consequential references to short title—**

*Omit—*

'Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023'

*Insert—*

'Transport and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024'

### **Integrity and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023**

Amendments made to Bill

#### **Short title and consequential references to short title—**

*Omit—*

'Integrity and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023'

*Insert—*

'Integrity and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024'

### MINISTERIAL PAPERS

The following ministerial papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Acting Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence (Hon. Linard)—

[282](#) Electoral Commission Queensland: Procedure for Electronic Lodgement of Returns (Version 3.0) (Refer to subordinate legislation No. 3 of 2024)

[283](#) Electoral Commission Queensland: Procedure for Electronically Assisted Voting for State Elections (Version 4.0) (Refer to subordinate legislation No. 3 of 2024)

[284](#) Electoral Commission Queensland: Procedures for Counting of Absentee Votes for State Elections and Referendums (Version 2.1) (Refer to subordinate legislation No. 3 of 2024)

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Gender Equality




**Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (9.43 am): This week is Women's Week, and it is a wonderful opportunity to reflect on the significant advancements we have made towards gender equality in Queensland, whilst acknowledging there is always more to do. This government is rightly proud we have led the nation when it comes to supporting women at work. Queensland led the nation in 2016 by passing legislation to provide the first entitlement to 10 days paid domestic and family violence leave. We also established a new portable long service leave scheme for community service workers—an industry that predominantly employs women.

Every worker should have the fundamental right to earn a living without experiencing the scourge of sexual harassment, yet regrettably many workers, especially women, continue to be subject to this abhorrent conduct. That is why in 2022 we brought in nation-leading and contemporary industrial relations protections to protect workers subject to sexual, sex or gender-based harassment in the workplace under the Industrial Relations Act. We have also improved parental leave by removing traditionally gendered divisions of parental care and giving parents more flexibility when deciding how to allocate child-care responsibility to best fit their family circumstances and needs. These reforms also provided clarification that parental leave extends to both parents for stillbirths.

When it comes to pay equity in the Public Service, we have enhanced employment security through legislating the creation of permanent employment as the default; varied all public sector awards from hours-based incremental progression to years served for part-time employees—an incredible achievement; made significant improvements to superannuation so Queensland public sector workers, including women, are able to set aside more for their retirement; and ensured the promotion of gender pay equity in the bargaining process, including the appointment of Queensland's first Special Commissioner for Equity and Diversity.

Finally, after years of inaction at a national level from the LNP, we can now support what the federal government is doing to increase wages and penalty rates for low-paid workers—the majority of whom are women—and their publication of the gender pay gaps for nearly 5,000 Australian private sector employers for the first time this week, demonstrating there is still more work to be done. The Miles government will never rest on our laurels when it comes to fighting for women's equality. I am proud of all we have achieved and I am looking forward to continuing this vital work. The women of Queensland deserve nothing less.

## Women and Girls' Health Strategy

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (9.46 am): What a wonderful week it is—Queensland Women's Week. Not content with just one day, in Queensland we will celebrate and acknowledge women from 3 to 10 March. It is a good time to recognise our women health heroes—our doctors, surgeons, ambos, nurses and allied health professionals—who save lives and provide care every single day. I also want to particularly acknowledge the role of First Nations women who, for more than 3,000 generations, have provided wisdom, leadership and protection of two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples.

I was so pleased to join the Premier yesterday in launching the first ever Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy, backed by \$1 billion for women's health and wellbeing over the next five years. This strategy reflects the voices of over 12,000 women who shared their personal stories and experiences of our health system. Seventy per cent of the women and girls who responded told us that mental health and wellbeing were in their top three health issues, so we have launched an Australian-first dedicated women's health phone line to provide mental health and wellbeing support and are providing funding for 50 new social workers across the state.

Balveen and her daughter Viva, who feature on the cover of the Women and Girls' Health Strategy, told us about the importance of health education. She said, 'We need to normalise conversations about our bodies and wellbeing so that our girls have the right words to advocate for themselves.' We are providing more and better information on women's health issues. We heard that the most significant barriers to accessing health care were service availability and the cost of services, so we are opening new walk-in, nurse-led clinics so that people can access more health care closer to home.

**Mr Head** interjected.

**Mr Dick:** Stop shouting at women.

**Mr Head** interjected.


**Mr SPEAKER:** Members will come to order. Thank you, Deputy Premier. We do not need your assistance.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Mr Speaker, I would not have thought talking about women's pain and endometriosis would attract such criticism from those opposite, but women in Queensland absolutely deserve us to be listening to them and acting on what they have told us. Women experiencing endo and pelvic pain told us that they do not feel listened to. They told us that their concerns are sometimes dismissed by healthcare professionals, resulting in misdiagnosis and leading to years of persistent pain.

Some of the medical advice they received included the following: 'Maybe try swimming off the pain.' 'Don't worry, the pain is in your head.' 'There's nothing wrong with you.' My personal favourite is: 'Maybe peppermint tea is really the only viable option at this point.' This is why we will now be investing in better pathways to diagnosis, care and support for people experiencing these chronic conditions with an \$18 million boost for endo and pelvic pain.

These are just some of the dozens of initiatives being rolled out as part of this \$1 billion investment over five years. We will do more for women experiencing endo and pelvic pain, more for women experiencing reproductive challenges due to illness, and more for maternal health. I want to thank every woman and girl who shared their story. This strategy is our commitment to the women and girls of Queensland. We hear you, we believe you, and now we are taking action for you.


## Housing and Homelessness

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Public Works) (9.50 am): Happy Women's Week! The first night I was sworn into the role as Minister for Housing I joined Micah Projects, an organisation we provide funding to, to see the work they do in the darkest of hours to help those who are sleeping rough, particularly women and families in our community. In his first week after being sworn in, the Premier also joined our Critical Response Team to talk with people and hear their stories. It is where we met Munya, who was sleeping in a tent in Musgrave Park. He now has a permanent place to call home in Annerley. Last financial year our government provided \$171 million to 90 homelessness services like Vinnies, Salvos and many more. This provided 1.6 million nights of accommodation for Queenslanders who are experiencing homelessness.

Our government is ensuring that health is available for people when they fall on hard times. Our Homes for Queenslanders plan not only provides the biggest investment in social housing but also boosts support to homelessness services. The sector asked for a 20 per cent uplift in funding; we have delivered that. I want to recognise the incredible women in particular who work in the community services space. They do amazing work every day to help those who are vulnerable. This is part of a \$390 million shot in the arm to help Queenslanders who are doing it tough. It means more after-hours outreach services and more people working at the coalface. It means more emergency accommodation places across the state. We are rolling out our successful Critical Response Teams to Toowoomba, Gold Coast, Bundaberg, Cairns, Townsville, Mackay, Rockhampton, Sunshine Coast, Moreton Bay, Logan, Ipswich and Redlands. The team in Brisbane has already been in place for less than a year and it has helped 460 people into accommodation. Some of these people were long-term rough sleepers who now have a permanent place to call home.

We have also partnered with the Brisbane Youth Service to purchase a new building in Fortitude Valley to create a one-stop shop for young people at risk of homelessness. They will be able to get wraparound support not just for housing but also for health, mental health, addiction and issues around domestic and family violence. Jess, who could not find accommodation and had \$50 to her name for two weeks, was able to find a safe place to live and access to vital health services because of the support of this service. Shania, who linked up with another government funded service, inCommunity in Ipswich, was able to get accommodation and is now joining the Air Force. The member for Ipswich and our amazing candidate for Ipswich West, Wendy Bourne, visited Shania and inCommunity last week. We know that women are more likely to experience challenges to access housing. That is why we have launched our Homes for Queensland Plan so that every Queensland woman has a safe place to call home.

### Women, Arts and Culture


 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Treaty, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Minister for Communities and Minister for the Arts) (9.53 am): Queensland's thriving arts and cultural sector plays a pivotal role in shaping our state's unique identity and enriches our communities. Central to the success of this sector are the remarkable women artists, arts workers, executives and board members who contribute their talents and vision and make Queensland the place to be for creating and witnessing great art. This Women's Week we acknowledge the talented women from across the sector and celebrate their important contributions.

Arts funding in Queensland supports women creatives through various funding programs including the Queensland Arts Showcase Program, with women making up over two-thirds of the individuals supported through this fund since 2022. Their projects—ranging from Queensland First Nations and hip-hop showcases at the Australian Women in Music Awards to Georgina Pinn's immersive art installations and Liesel Zink's large-scale contemporary dance project *Us and All Of This*—show the diversity and creativity of female artists in Queensland. Additionally, our government is proud to support the \$15,000 Carol Lloyd Award through QMusic. This award commemorates the late Carol Lloyd's legacy to the Queensland music industry and provides support to an emerging female-identifying or non-binary singer/songwriter. Arts Queensland's Organisations Fund also supports Vulcana Circus with \$70,000 per annum. Vulcana is a feminist circus organisation that provides a creative space for women, trans and non-binary gendered people, diverse communities, and young people of all gender expressions. The First Nations Pathways—Performing Arts Emerging Organisations Fund 2022-25 is supporting First Nations fashion force Grace Lillian Lee with \$130,000 per annum to realise the sustainable development of First Nations representation, access and growth in the fashion and design sectors. These are just a few of the many projects and funds which have supported women and women-led works across Queensland.

As we continue to grow and develop our nation-leading arts and cultural sector, we are also supporting and building the capacity of women in arts leadership positions. We have a strong ensemble of talented women in leadership across the sector, including the appointment of Yarmila Alfonzetti as chief executive of the Queensland Symphony Orchestra; Louise Bezzina as artistic director of Brisbane Festival; Jacqui Feeney as CEO of Screen Queensland; Vicki McDonald as the State Librarian; and Criena Gehrke as executive director of Queensland Theatre, just to name a few. Just a few months ago Leanne Benjamin was appointed artistic director of Queensland Ballet, the company's first female artistic director since its establishment in 1960.

Our arts statutory bodies, including Queensland Theatre, QPAC, QAGoMA, Queensland Museum and the State Library of Queensland, have over 63 per cent female representation on their boards. This includes four First Nations women and three women chairs. Last week I was thrilled to present Suellen Maunder with the Gold Matilda Award, recognising her leadership over 32 years as co-founder, CEO and artistic director of JUTE Theatre Company in Far North Queensland which has championed regional theatre, including supporting women in theatre. Our ongoing investment in women artists, arts workers and sector leaders has led to fantastic outcomes in the sector. As we celebrate and support women creatives, we will continue to enrich our cultural landscape for generations to come.

### Women and Girls

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (9.57 am): Mr Speaker, happy Queensland Women's Week to you! This week is a great celebration of the achievements of women and girls across Queensland and an opportunity to encourage all of us to work together to ensure all Queensland women and girls have equal opportunities across the entire spectrum of life. Already here in the House today we have heard about some truly wonderful initiatives that are changing the lives of Queensland women and girls, and I am proud to add to those stories.

In 2021 the Queensland government partnered with Share the Dignity to pilot a program providing students with free access to period products at school. We did not want cost or perceived shame to be a barrier to young women who need sanitary products. Now, through two formal rounds of the Dignity Vending Machine program, our government has given every single state school, outdoor education centre and student residential facility across the state the opportunity to have a machine installed. Share the Dignity was very public in their praise for the Queensland government rolling out the machines into primary schools as well as secondary schools—a first in Australia. Their 2021 survey found that over 30,000 children had their first period at the age of 11 or younger, which is why it is incredibly important that primary school students in Queensland also have free and dignified access to period products in school.

The machines are installed in discreet but easily accessible locations so that all students who need period products can access them on demand free of charge to help manage their periods at school. We know that many families in our communities are struggling with cost-of-living pressures and that period products are expensive, but essential. Providing these machines at schools at no cost to students or their families eases the financial burden and makes sure that access to period products is not a barrier to students' wellbeing or engagement in learning.

Last month we reached the amazing milestone of 428 of the machines being installed in Queensland state school sites. By the end of the 2023 school year, over 130,000 free period product packs had been distributed to schools through this highly successful program. The feedback we hear from students and staff speaks to the difference providing these products at school makes, especially for students whose families are doing it tough. Last month I was at Bremer State High School with the member for Ipswich, and I thank Principal Ross Bailey for showing us around his wonderful school. One of the things I got to do when I was there was speak to school leaders Cassie, Ella and Stephanie about how important their dignity vending machine was. They said—

It helps the students feel comfortable when they don't have the products at home.

And—


The price of cost-of-living at the moment, it's the difference between being hygienic and not having a meal.

And—

It's a basic human right, everyone should be able to have them.

Registration has just closed for schools for the second round of machines, with 160 applications in. We want there to be no barriers for our girls and young women to thrive, and this initiative is just one of the many ways in which we can make sure that happens.

### Victims of Crime, Legislation

 **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (Minister for the Environment and the Great Barrier Reef and Minister for Science and Innovation) (10.00 am): Ensuring victims' voices are heard is a priority of the Miles government. That is why this week I will introduce the Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence


Review Board Bill. The bill will achieve the government's commitments to implement the recommendations of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce: to establish the permanent Victims' Commissioner to promote and protect victims of crime, and to establish the Sexual Violence Review Board to identify and review systemic issues in relation to the reporting, investigation and prosecution of sexual offences in Queensland. The establishment of a permanent Victims' Commissioner is another important step for Queensland in acknowledging the rights of victims of crime.

The Attorney-General will write to the Victims' Commissioner, once appointed, to request that they conduct a review of the Charter of Victims' Rights to consider whether additional rights should be recognised or if existing rights should be expanded. The establishment of an independent board will also provide greater support to victims of sexual violence through focusing on improvements that can be made to the criminal justice system to better understand potential barriers to reporting sexual violence and identify opportunities to continually improve investigation and prosecution processes.

In September 2023, the Queensland government appointed Mr Jon Rouse to the role of Interim Victims' Commissioner ahead of legislation to establish the permanent Queensland Victims' Commissioner. Since his appointment, Mr Rouse has met with over 150 stakeholders from victim support services and criminal justice agencies, as well as victim-survivors of crime and families of deceased victims. An online survey also received 470 responses from the community, including victim-survivors. This consultation is driving a program of work to promote the Charter of Victims' Rights and develop accessible resources for victims of crime to understand their rights, the criminal justice process and how to access support.

Consultation has identified that most victims are not aware of the Charter of Victims' Rights. A website, to be hosted by the Victims' Commissioner, is also being developed to help guide victims as they navigate through the criminal justice process. Mr Rouse and his team will continue to meet with victim-survivors of crime in the coming months ahead of the appointment of a permanent Victims' Commissioner. These reforms will have an indelible impact on ensuring that the systems we have in place provide the greatest possible support to victims of crime and that their voices are heard.

### **Women, Queensland Corrective Services**


 **Hon. N BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Disaster Recovery and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.03 am): Quite often it is our custodial officers and community corrections officers who are the unsung heroes when it comes to keeping our community safe. From dealing with dangerous prisoners to helping deliver programs that help reduce reoffending rates, QCS employees undertake very important work each and every day. During Queensland Women's Week, it is timely to reflect upon the achievements of women in keeping Queenslanders safe. As a new minister, I have had the opportunity to visit a number of Queensland Corrective Services facilities within both custodial and community corrections, and I have been so impressed with the number of women and the calibre of women working at all levels.

I am advised that within Queensland Corrective Services women make up 47 per cent of the workforce. Within Community Corrections and Specialist Operations branch, this soars to 80 per cent of the workforce. Fifty per cent of leadership roles are filled by women in QCS, including the majority of the executive leadership team. More than a third of all frontline custodial officers are women. In the past 12 months, 176 women have graduated as custodial correctional officers.

We have our fair share of trailblazers. Deputy Commissioner Ursula Roeder ACM led and managed the delivery of psychological and correctional services in custody for many years, as well as the delivery of probation and parole services in the North Coast region of Queensland. She began her career 29 years ago with Queensland Corrective Services in 1994. Her commitment to protecting the community and using innovation to ensure safety for women and children should be commended. Assistant Commissioner Eloise Hamlett is another trailblazing female leader who leads with pioneering, strategic and caring leadership. She began her career in 2000 as a psychologist in what is now called the Borallon Training and Correctional Centre. Over her 24 years of distinguished service, she has worked in a variety of positions.

The opportunities for women in a department like Queensland Corrective Services are endless, and they strive to inspire inclusion and to support women in a lifelong career path. I look forward to celebrating their achievements with them this International Women's Day.

## Women, Trade and Investment


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (10.06 am): It is wonderful to celebrate the contribution of women across Queensland this week. The Queensland Labor Party has a strong history of supporting women, and I am proud to highlight some of the female leaders who are driving our state's global trade agenda.

Take Dr Chamindika Konara, for example. Dr Konara won the Women in International Business category at last year's Queensland Export Awards. Dr Konara is general manager of Brisbane-based medical device company Qlicksmart. Qlicksmart's world-first single-handed scalpel blade removers provide a safe solution to removing potentially infectious blades. These devices are now used in more than 50 countries, up from 32 countries just five years ago.

Dr Melony Sellars shares an equally impressive story. Dr Sellars founded Queensland company Genics. Her company uses scientific solutions to solve a \$28 billion global problem for shrimp farmers. Genics currently helps shrimp farmers from 43 different countries to reduce disease and improve biosecurity.

Then there are our small businesses, with hundreds of women across the state orchestrating their global success stories. These are just two of the amazing female business leaders who, with the help of Trade and Investment Queensland, are putting our state on the world map.

## Women and Girls

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (10.07 am): This week is Women's Week, when Queenslanders come together to recognise the hard work and dedication of the women in our lives and our communities. It is recognition that women deserve this week and every week. Here in Queensland, we have over 2.6 million women and girls—that is 2.6 million mothers, grandmothers, wives, daughters, sisters, aunts, nieces and friends who have big dreams and who deserve a government that works hard to make those dreams a reality.

When I look around my cabinet and caucus, there are so many women who are leading by example—breaking down barriers and opening doors for the next generation of female leaders. I am proud of the progress this government has made empowering women, especially in health care. We decriminalised abortion. We are improving access to birth control and UTI treatments. We fund programs for young mothers and support for domestic, family and sexual violence. And it was our government that introduced the first ever paid domestic violence leave. This is why I am so proud of our new Women and Girls' Health Strategy—because I want Queensland's women and girls to get the best possible health care, to know their voices are heard—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my left!

**Mr MILES:** This is why I am so proud of our new Women and Girls' Health Strategy—because I want Queensland's women and girls to get the best possible health care and to know that their voices are heard when they are in pain and that they are supported through life's great milestones. This strategy is a \$1 billion plan to deliver better health care in our communities, tailored to the needs of women and girls, investing in 34 initiatives that deliver—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.


**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Nanango, you have been snipping all morning. You are warned under the standing orders.

**Mr MILES:**—the services women need, to fill the gaps women have told us exist in communities. Some \$250 million of this investment is new funding towards new initiatives, like: the new Women's Health Hub; new nurse-led clinics; new health and wellbeing programs, especially in schools; new publicly funded IVF for couples who have experienced infertility due to cancer or other complex health conditions; and new, improved access to care for pelvic pain like endometriosis. This strategy is the direct result of feedback from 12,000 women and girls right across the state—women who have told us their pain was dismissed or minimised and they were not being believed. To those women, your voices have been heard and your experiences have shaped the solutions of the future. Our priority is to make women's health care accessible and affordable, bringing it closer to home so that women can access specialist services sooner, because when women are healthy, they can participate fully at work, in the community and at home.




The Women and Girls' Health Strategy is another demonstration of my government's commitment to achieving gender equity. This Friday, people around the world will celebrate International Women's Day. The theme this year is 'Count Her In'. It is a focus on providing pathways to greater economic inclusion for women and girls to learn, earn and lead. The question for every member this week is: how are you supporting the women around you? What are you doing to back the women in your life at home, in the office and in your communities?

### Housing and Homelessness

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (10.12 am): I firmly believe every Queenslanders deserves a safe place to call home. It is why one of our first actions was to deliver the Homes for Queenslanders plan. It is a \$3 billion investment to deliver reform to the rental sector, build more homes, help first home owners, boost social housing and, importantly, work towards ending homelessness. Our plan has delivered a big uplift in funding for homelessness services to ensure our most vulnerable are supported. It is a \$390 million investment equating to a 20 per cent increase in funding to services. It is what service providers told us they needed to keep doing their important work. We listened and we delivered.

I am incredibly concerned to hear of people sleeping rough in my electorate of Murrumba. A tent is no place to live and certainly no place for children to live. I am advised the housing department's critical response team has visited McKillop Park in my electorate a number of times in the past month and offered emergency housing to all the people there. They attended the site as recently as yesterday and will visit again today. I understand some people have accepted emergency housing and others have declined. I am committing to visiting as soon as I can, alongside our hardworking critical response team. I want to hear their stories and deliver the support needed to get these vulnerable Queenslanders back on their feet. I want to acknowledge the work of Chris Whiting, the member for Bancroft, whose electorate office is across the road from that park. I also want to acknowledge my hardworking electorate office staff. Chris has been incredibly engaged on this matter, and his office has provided daily support to these vulnerable Queenslanders. My government is committed to delivering real change. We will continue to deliver our Homes for Queenslanders plan and seek to ensure every Queenslanders has a place to call home.


### ABSENCE OF MINISTER AND MEMBER

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.14 am): Mr Speaker, as advised by yourself this morning, the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence has provided advice to you that she will be absent for this week's sitting and it complies with standing orders. As such, I advise the House that the Premier has appointed the member for Nudgee as Acting Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Acting Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence which was gazetted yesterday.


I also wish to advise the House that, in the absence of the member for Lytton due to medical reasons, the member for Mundingburra will act as the senior government whip until the member for Lytton returns to duty.

### MOTIONS


#### Order of Business

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.15 am): I move—  
That general business order of the day No. 1 be postponed until the member for South Brisbane returns from her absence.  
Question put—That the motion be agreed to.  
Motion agreed to.

#### Suspension of Standing Orders

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.15 am), by leave, without notice: I move—  
That standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and any amendments circulated by the minister to be moved and considered.  
Question put—That the motion be agreed to.  
Motion agreed to.

### Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.16 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended this sitting week to suspend standing order 113(2) to enable all female members of this House the ability to ask up to two questions each sitting day.

On this side of the House, we have a proud record of supporting and listening to women to ensure they are represented in this chamber. Whilst I will not reflect too much, it is this side of the House—it is Labor—that has the strong track record of listening to and acting on behalf of women. This motion today, during Women's Week, will enable the women of this House to ask two questions in this House each day this week on behalf of their constituencies.


Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

### QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.17 am.

#### Premier, Integrity

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (10.17 am): My question is to the Premier. Why should Queenslanders trust any answer the Premier gives today?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I know that Queenslanders know that they can trust me and those on this side of the House to deliver on what they are concerned about. We will listen to them and deliver for them, as you see us doing. Just last week, the entire cabinet was in Cairns listening to the Cairns community. We held a great town hall meeting. Hundreds of Cairns locals came along. Our fantastic four Far North Queensland MPs helped host that event. We heard from the Cairns community that they are concerned about the cost of living. That is why we have said our budget this year will be all about the cost of living, and Queenslanders can trust in that. We have heard from Queenslanders that they want to see more housing, that they want to address homelessness, that they want support for renters, that they want to see more houses built, and that is why we have delivered the Homes for Queenslanders plan, and Queenslanders can trust in that.

Queenslanders can trust those on this side of the House to deliver for women and girls, as we are doing this week with our \$1 billion Women and Girls' Health Strategy. We are listening to the voices of those 12,000 women and changing our health service to suit their needs. Queenslanders can trust those on this side of the House to listen to them, deliver for them and work hard for them. Queenslanders can trust us to do that every single day. Every single day they can trust us to listen to them and to deliver for them the services they need, the houses they need, the health care they need and the education services they need. That is what we on this side of the House can be trusted to do.

Queenslanders know that they cannot trust those opposite at all. The one time they gave them a chance, they saw how they could not be trusted. Those opposite have still not learned their lesson after they betrayed the trust of public servants whom they promised had nothing to fear. Who could trust them again after they promised public servants they had nothing to fear? I will put my trust against that of the Leader of the Opposition any day.

*(Time expired)*

#### Premier, Right to Information

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** My question is to the Premier. A right-to-information officer has informed the opposition that the Premier and his office had to sign certifications proving that they thoroughly searched for messages on the Premier's phones. Given the Premier's office would have had to consider it, sign documents and decide that it was not required to be released, how does the Premier explain denying its existence weeks later in this House?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I can advise the House that when that search was conducted there were no documents considered in scope of the RTI. I table for the benefit of the House the RTI decision, which very clearly states that no document in scope was identified.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 13 November 2023, from the Principal RTI Officer, Department of State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, Mr Matt Woodforth, to the Director of Strategy, Office of David Crisafulli MP, Leader of the Opposition, Mr Matt Tapsell, regarding an application under the Right to Information Act 2009 [287].

I know that members opposite are a bit cock-a-hoop, but I explain to the House that the text message that was invasively photographed by a member opposite would not be considered in scope for the search. Today, on the first day of Queensland Women's Week, all 'da boys' over there can come up with is celebrating the invasion of privacy of a woman at work and celebrating the harassment of a woman at work. We have not seen a more outrageous misuse of a mobile phone by an LNP—

**Mr LANGBROEK:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This matter has been referred to the Ethics Committee already.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Members to my right, I need to hear the point of order.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** The member for Pumicestone indicated that she was referring this matter or sending it to you.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I am not in receipt of any matter, member for Surfers Paradise. As of right now, all of these matters are in scope of the House. I have not received a matter and the standing order does not apply until I have received such correspondence.

**Mr MILES:** It is just an excuse for the member for Surfers Paradise—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, please resume your seat. The Clerk makes a very good point. He has been here a while! Member for Surfers Paradise, I thank you for your point of order. As I said, I have not received any correspondence from any member regarding the matters that you have referred to, but, importantly, those matters are not referred to the Ethics Committee until I consider that they should be referred to the Ethics Committee. That is the most pertinent point regarding this. I thank you for your point of order. I hope that provides some guidance to the House.

**Mr MILES:** Excuse the member for Surfers Paradise. He is new here. We have not seen a more outrageous misuse of a mobile phone by an LNP bloke since the 'plonker'.

**Mr Lister** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Southern Downs is warned under the standing orders.

**Mr MILES:** There are a lot of important questions that we should be asking now in Women's Week. For example, how many photos of the member for Pumicestone has this LNP MP taken? How many other MPs have been photographed without their permission and against the standing orders of the parliament? How many other women have been harassed by those opposite? How many have had their privacy invaded by those opposite in Women's Week? This goes to the core of the disrespect that those opposite give women and always give women because the fact is: they do not have very many of them.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Maryborough and the member for Logan are both warned under the standing orders. It takes both sides of the House to have decorum.

### Women and Girls, Health

**Ms HOWARD:** My question is of the Premier. Would the Premier outline how the Miles government is listening to women and delivering better health care for women and girls, in particular in my community of Ipswich, and is the Premier aware of any alternatives?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for Ipswich for her question. I know that she is a big supporter of ensuring women and girls in her community of Ipswich—indeed, right across the state—receive the health care that they need and that they are listened to. We have heard that message. We have heard from more than 12,000 women and girls. It is the biggest and deepest public policy consultation we have ever done. The result is a historic investment of \$1 billion in the new Queensland Women and

Girls' Health Strategy that the health minister and I launched yesterday, at the beginning of Women's Week. Those 12,000 women said to us that they had difficulty accessing health care for a range of reasons. Sometimes it was cost, sometimes it was distance to clinics, sometimes it was wait times and sometimes they struggled to even get an appointment. More than half of the women who responded said that their symptoms and their pain had been dismissed. Two-thirds said that they had not accessed health care because of cost. That is not good enough.

Every Queensland woman deserves access to quality health care, every Queensland woman deserves to be listened to about her health care and every Queensland woman deserves to be believed. Women with endometriosis deserve to have the health care that they need. Women who have had cancer treatment deserve access to IVF. We on this side of the House support ensuring women have access to contraception and to abortion. It was this government, of course, that decriminalised abortion. We know that so many of those opposite would criminalise it again. The member for Everton has said so; the member for Kawana has said so; Amanda Stoker, who they hope to bring into this place, has said so. In fact, most of 'da boys' over there voted against decriminalising abortion. We on this side of the House believe that abortion is a right and that it is health care. That is why we will ensure women have access to that, including through our landmark Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy—\$1 billion backing Queensland women.

### Premier, Right to Information

**Mrs GERBER:** My question is to the Premier. When responding to a very specific RTI did the Premier check his phones to verify if a message was sent to the member for Pumicestone and does the message still exist on any of the Premier's phones?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for her question. I can advise the House, as I did earlier, that all in-scope documents were provided to the RTI officer.

**Ms Bates** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Mudgeeraba, I have already given you some guidance this morning. You are warned under the standing orders, particularly for not using the member's correct title.

### Women, Workforce

**Ms RICHARDS:** My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the minister update the House on how the Miles government is supporting Queensland women in the workplace and particularly the mighty women in my Redlands electorate, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

**Ms GRACE:** I thank the member for Pumicestone, who really has a passion to ensure that we advocate for gender equality and support women in the workplace. Mr Speaker, earlier you heard me talk about some of the government's achievements.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I am sorry, Minister. Members to my left, I have made it clear on a number of occasions that members from time to time are capable of making a slip of the tongue. To continue to make noise about those things is really unacceptable and it is not good for the dignity of the House.

**Ms GRACE:** I am so sorry, Mr Speaker. I should have said Redlands. I am very sorry. It was just an error that obviously those opposite found very bemusing at the time. We know that the women of Queensland can trust us to deliver what women in this state need. We were the first state to have paid domestic and family violence leave—and then it extended right throughout the rest of Australia—and portable long service leave for community sector workers. These were women who campaigned for many years for this and it has turned their life around. This was a group of women who could not get long service leave because of how their contracts worked and who now get portable long service leave. Then there is the protection from sexual and gender-based harassment and improved parental leave and pay equity in the Public Service.

I can honestly say that when it comes to the advancement of industrial rights in this state, in Queensland, it is this side of the House that the people of Queensland can trust, and they can trust this Premier to back them every step of the way. That is unlike the Leader of the Opposition and those opposite, who time and time again when we bring to this House fundamental changes to women's rights in the workplace and in community oppose them. What could be worse when we look at the scourge of harassment and we talk about alternative policies? There are none over there. They can trust us to always do the right thing.

When the people of Queensland are speaking to us, such as the women we met in Cairns, they do not talk about a text message to a member that was invasive of her privacy in this House. We should be able to operate without fear of being photographed by those sitting behind us. Many ministers in this House work on very sensitive information and the last thing—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Skelton** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Nicklin, you will take that statement back. I believe your language is unparliamentary. You will rise to your feet, member.

**Mr SKELTON:** I withdraw.

**Ms GRACE:** Let us look at the actions of those opposite—the alternative government. They have acted with serious contempt by invading the privacy of a member who should be able to conduct business without being photographed. Then they held on to that photograph for grubby political pointscoring. That is what we can expect from those opposite, but it is not what the people of Queensland are talking about. They are talking about their health, they are talking about their workplace rights and they are talking about cost of living and housing, not grubby political politics.

### Premier, Integrity

**Ms BATES:** My question is to the Premier. Since the Premier was first asked about a message to the member for Pumicestone in parliament on 15 November has the member contacted the Premier to correct his recollection of the message he sent her?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for her question. As I have advised the House, I became aware of my statement being misleading last night when I watched the Channel 9 news. I immediately wrote to you, Mr Speaker, as you would be aware, and at the earliest opportunity this morning I corrected the record and apologised to the House.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my left.

**Mr Powell** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, you are warned under the standing orders. I had just called the House to order. I would like to hear the answer to the question. I believe the Premier is trying to answer the question and I would hope that members would like to hear the answer.

**Mr MILES:** Those opposite, particularly the member for Kawana, know a thing or two about right-to-information access. I would like to draw the attention of the House to this RTI decision from 3 June 2014, which involved the member for Kawana as a minister. The document is titled 'document non-existent' and it is explained that emails received—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Kawana is warned under the standing orders.

**Mr MILES:**—in the office of the then attorney-general are most often simply deleted once they are received. That is another time when there were not any documents and the member for Kawana acknowledged that they just deleted them all. He acknowledged that they just deleted them all and that is why there were no documents in existence.

Again, I say in Women's Week all the boys over there have is this celebration of the invasion of the member for Pumicestone's privacy, this celebration of the harassment of women at work. They know no bounds when it comes to celebrating the mistreatment of women at work and indeed here in the parliament.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr MILES:** I take that interjection. It is a real shame that in Women's Week, instead of celebrating the contribution that women make to our parliament, which on this side of the House is very substantial, those opposite are celebrating the photos that they take of women members without their consent. That is what has happened here. It is about time they told us how many more photos they have taken of women members without their consent. We have to assume this was not the only time a photo was taken. How many photos are there? How many of them take photos against the standing orders and how many of our members on this side have been photographed?

### Women and Girls, Health

**Ms KING:** My question is of the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women. Can the minister update the House on how our Miles Labor government is supporting the health and wellbeing of Queensland women, including in my electorate of Pumicestone, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I thank the member for Pumicestone for the question and for her tremendous advocacy to bring health care closer to home for her constituents, particularly in regard to the new satellite hospital on Bribie Island, which will be opening very soon. Yesterday the Premier and I were incredibly proud, along with many of the women who contributed to the strategy, to launch our Women and Girls' Health Strategy. It is the culmination of listening to women and girls for two years to hear their stories and to make change. The fact that we now have a billion dollars over the next five years to really change how our health system responds to women is such a good thing because that is what the Miles government does: we listen and we deliver.

I have to wonder who the LNP have been listening to. I wonder who it was who told them when they were in government that they should cut funding to women's health. I wonder who it was who told them that they should get the voyeurs in their caucus to leer over the shoulders of women in this place and take photos of them without their consent. It is absolutely outrageous and you know what it is? It is 'da boys' club in action, thinking that they are entitled in a workplace to take photos of women without their consent. This boys' club—

**Ms Bates** interjected.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** This is 'da boys' club—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Mudgeeraba, you are on a warning. You are continuing to interject. I take no pleasure in ejecting you from the House, but you will leave the House under standing order 253A for one hour.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Mudgeeraba withdrew from the chamber at 10.39 am.*

**Ms FENTIMAN:** This is 'da boys' club led by the Leader of the Opposition, who, let us remember, took the seat off one of their young women so that he could advance his career and 'da boys' club with the likes of the member for Burleigh. Can we all remember when the member for Burleigh had to complain about how hard it was to work with women when he said, 'There are two women in my office'—

**Mr HART:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Resume your seat, Minister. What is your point of order, member?

**Mr HART:** Mr Speaker, I take personal offence at the member's statement and I ask that she withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister for Health, the member for Burleigh has taken offence. Will you withdraw?

**Dr Robinson:** Mean girl.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Which member contributed there? Thank you, member for Oodgeroo, for putting your hand up. You are warned under the standing orders. With regard to terms such as that—and I will, for the record, make sure that members of the House are aware—we must refer to members as members, not 'da boys'. There are male members and there are female members, but I will not be tolerating any further conversation around that. Member for Oodgeroo, you are warned under the standing orders and you should withdraw as well.

**Dr ROBINSON:** I withdraw.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** The member for Burleigh said, 'There are two young women in my office and I'm so mindful when I'm around them and I shouldn't have to think about that.' Who could forget the member for Everton, who clearly does not like working with too many women, when he complained about there being too many women on the Parole Board?

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Currumbin!

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Oh, and let us remember where the LNP decided to have its International Women's Day event several years ago. That is right: the Tatts Club, and that was before it let them join. None of us are surprised to learn, as disturbing as it is, that members of the LNP—male members of the LNP—have leered over the shoulder of one of our women MPs and taken a photo of her in her workplace without her consent. Shame on the LNP!

### Premier, Integrity

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question is to the Premier. On multiple occasions the Premier denied a message existed. The Premier only apologised after the revelation that the message did exist. Is the Premier sorry for misleading parliament and Queenslanders or sorry it came to light?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana and Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I might ask if you can rephrase the question without imputations included in the question.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Why did the Premier not correct the record in the many parliamentary sittings weeks since the Premier first denied the message ever existed?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for Kawana for his question. The custom in this House is for one to correct the record as soon as they are alerted to an error. I was alerted to this when the photograph that one of the LNP members over there took—

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Currumbin is warned under the standing orders.

**Mr MILES:** I was alerted when the photo taken in this House was broadcast on Channel 9 news last night. As soon as I saw that, I realised that I had erred. I think within an hour, Mr Speaker, I had written to you and at the first opportunity today I have corrected the record and apologised. I stand by that process, but again I say that this is Women's Week, and all those opposite have is this celebration of the harassment of a woman at work. Those opposite cannot even see why what they have done is wrong. How out of touch would you have to be with the experience of women getting harassed at work to not think it is a problem to be photographing them and their communications without consent? That is what is happening here. In Women's Week—of all weeks—those opposite cannot see that harassing women in the workplace is wrong, that women's privacy should be respected, that it is wrong to take photos of them without their consent.

How often does this happen? Clearly this was not the first time he had taken a photo, so how many photos are there? How many members have had their photos taken? Is it only women on this side of the House who get their photos taken, or have some of the women opposite had their photos taken as well without their consent, had their privacy breached, been harassed at work? We on this side of the House respect the role of women in the workplace, and that is why women continue to run for us, why we continue to put them forward in seats that we can win and why we continue to select them to serve in the ministry, because on this side of the House we believe that government is better for women and for men when women are in government.

### Homes for Queenslanders

**Ms LAUGA:** My question is of the Minister for Housing. Can the minister update the House on what Homes for Queenslanders will deliver for our state, including in Central Queensland in my community of Keppel, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

**Ms SCANLON:** I thank the member for Keppel for the question. I know that she is a big advocate for housing in her community and a powerful supporter of women working in the construction industry as well. To build the homes that we need across this state, we need a healthy workforce. In 2022 there were about 240,000 people working in the building and construction industry in this state. Only 36,000 of those people were women, which is about 15 per cent of the state's \$50 billion building industry. That is higher than the national average, which is only 12 per cent, but we know that there is still more to do, particularly when it comes to pay equity, and we need to be up-front about that.

Last week, data was released by the Workplace Gender Equality Agency which shows that the pay gap in the construction industry outstripped all other industries at 31.8 per cent, so it is on all of us to improve things in Queensland. We on this side of the House take that seriously. Unfortunately, not

all members of the Central Queensland community who are politicians take women's rights in the workplace as seriously as the member for Keppel does. There were comments from LNP Senator Matt Canavan this week around the gender equity report card that the data was 'useless'. He went on to say—

These types of reports are becoming annual Andrew Tate recruitment drives, all they do is spread division and resentment in our community ...

For those playing at home, Andrew Tate is a person who has said that women belong in the home, cannot drive and are a man's property. He is currently awaiting trial on allegations of rape and human trafficking. Senator Canavan went on to say that the data should not be published at all because 'people, young men in particular, feel like they are now being discriminated against'. What do members think the leader of the LNP, Peter Dutton, said about this? He has said nothing. We have also heard nothing from the Leader of the Opposition here in Queensland. These comments were made by a colleague of his in Queensland. Does he agree? All we see is that he sits back and lets all of the other men in the LNP go out there and disrespect and disregard women's rights and says nothing when they say disrespectful things in this parliament and outside of the parliament.

We have become accustomed to these sorts of views in the LNP. As the Minister for Health just said, the member for Everton had an issue with too many women being on the Parole Board. I am really pleased to update the shadow minister for housing—I know that this triggers him a bit—that in the department of housing 65 per cent of women are on government boards. That happened because our government made a deliberate decision to ensure we have women in positions of authority where decisions are being made. Those opposite cannot be trusted on women's rights. They have shown that at every opportunity. It is about time the Leader of the Opposition stopped being weak and stood up against some of the disgraceful comments made by his colleagues.

### Premier, Integrity

**Ms SIMPSON:** My question is to the Premier. In 2020, Anacta helped the Palaszczuk-Miles government get elected while also lobbying the government. Now Labor factional heavyweight Kate Jones is reported in the media as helping the Premier to get support for the top job while connected to a new lobbying firm. Why should Queenslanders trust that the Premier is acting in their interests rather than the best interests of Labor heavyweights and lobbyists who put the Premier in his job?

**Mr SPEAKER:** There are a few very broad imputations in that question. I will allow the Premier to answer in a very broad sense also.

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for Maroochydore for her question. On three occasions since the former member for Cooper left parliament, I have attended meetings where she was represented. All of those meetings were appropriately disclosed in my diary extracts. I have, however—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my left, as I hear it the Premier is attempting to answer the question. I would like to hear that answer.

**Mr MILES:** However, with the utmost of caution, I have written to the Integrity Commissioner since those reports at the weekend. I have asked her to confirm that the steps I have taken comply with all of the legal requirements. I look forward to receiving that advice. If there are any further steps that I should have taken in relation to those meetings then I will of course take them. I take my responsibilities under all of the acts very seriously. All appropriate business meetings are disclosed in my diary, but if there are other requirements that the Integrity Commissioner suggests to ensure that we are achieving the highest level of integrity expected of us then, of course, I will do so.

The member references the former member for Cooper's employment at a public affairs firm. The member, I believe, is aware that Ms Jones has made a statement this morning advising that she has resigned from that position. I would ask that future questions on this topic do not evade the knowledge that the opposition already have. If they know that a situation has changed then they should acknowledge that in asking their questions.

On the topic of interactions with the former member for Cooper, I have provided further details of those three meetings to the Integrity Commissioner. I will happily update the House if there is any further advice. I hope to have a response by tomorrow.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before calling the next questioner, member for Toowoomba South, I did not want to interrupt at the time but you are required to use members' correct titles. When referring to the member for McConnel, it will be 'member for McConnel' or 'Minister for State Development'.



### Schoolteachers

**Ms LUI:** My question is of the Minister for Education. Can the minister provide information to the House on how the Miles government is helping to boost teacher numbers in Queensland, including in my community in Far North Queensland, and can the minister advise if there are any alternative approaches?

**Ms FARMER:** I thank the member for her question. I know how passionate she is about giving all of our kids a good start in life, especially through a good education. It is no secret that education is a female dominated sector and none more so than amongst our teacher aides. In fact, 90 per cent of our teacher aides are women. We came to this term promising we would employ 1,139 teacher aides and we have actually employed 2,100. That is more women in the workforce.

To support teacher aides, in August last year we announced that we would give them leave with pay for any compulsory placements required as part of a teaching degree and 200 teacher aides have taken up that opportunity. Today I am pleased to announce that that opportunity will now be available to any state-based school employee. It is a way of supporting employees, many of whom need to financially support their families while they are doing their teaching degrees. In addition to employing all of those teacher aides, since 2015 we have hired 5,500 more teachers and 76 per cent of our teachers are women. Well done to all of them for taking up that noble profession.

Everyone on this side of the House knows that education is part of Labor's DNA. By placing such a huge focus on education we are showing our support for a highly feminised workforce. It is scary to think about what would happen if the LNP came to government. How could they possibly understand a highly feminised workforce when they have only six women in their own workforce? This is a week when we often talk about male-dominated industries. We have heard about the construction industry. We know about engineering and STEM. There are so many ways in which this government is encouraging women to enter those workforces. I suggest to the Minister for Women that we add the LNP to that list of workforces because it is a sector that really needs it.

One way to attract women to your workforce is to show respect. If ever there were a red flag for any young woman, or any woman at all, who is thinking about joining the workforce of the LNP, it is this week's example of some male LNP member leering over the shoulder of a female member of parliament in this House to try to catch any opportunity to bring them down, looking at what could have been private messages, personal messages or anything. It is none of their business. If ever there was a signal that this group of people have no respect for women and that they will go to any lengths to use politics! This is the LNP and it is why they will never have women joining their workforce.

*(Time expired)*

### Mi Hi Grove, Property Valuation

**Mr MANDER:** My question is to the Premier. Residents in the flood impacted Mi Hi Grove townhouses in Ipswich West were initially promised a fair go and generous valuations for their flood-affected properties. Now they have lost trust in the government, saying that they feel bullied into agreeing to low-ball offers before the deadline. Why will the Palaszczuk-Miles government not pay Ipswich flood victims what they were promised?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before calling the Premier, I make this very clear: we will not start getting into the habit of talking about governments under multiple leaders, premiers and other things. That also goes for those in government speaking about the opposition.

**Mr MILES:** I can confirm for the member that offers have been made to all of the property owners at Mi Hi Grove. This is a unique situation because some of the owners at Mi Hi Grove wanted to participate in the home buyback scheme and some did not. When in my previous portfolio, we worked with the Ipswich City Council to find a way to terminate the body corporate scheme and pay them all out. In recent weeks I have been made aware that some of those owners—I understand that they are not owner-occupiers—have disputed the valuation. There is an established process for valuing these properties, both in pre-flood and post-flood terms. There is then an opportunity for owners to challenge those valuations and a process is in place there. That was the last update I had on the matter. I am happy to get a further update from Minister Boyd as things may have moved on in the intervening period.

**Mr Mander** interjected.

**Ms Boyd** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Pine Rivers, that is not assisting. Member for Everton, you have asked the question. You will hear the answer.

**Mr MILES:** The Resilient Homes Fund, with its massive property buyback—as well as our raising and retrofitting programs—is a program that I am incredibly proud of. By some measures it is the biggest climate adaptation program delivered in an urban environment anywhere in the world. It has made sure that hundreds of people did not have to go back into houses that we knew would flood again and thousands of people have gone back into houses that are more resilient. They have been raised so that they can flood underneath or they can be hosed out and back in action quickly. It is a good program. I know those opposite never supported it. I know those opposite want to pick—

**Mr Mander** interjected.

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Resume your seat, Premier. Member for Everton, you are warned under the standing orders. Minister for Health, you are warned under the standing orders. Premier, you have 31 seconds remaining; do you have anything further to add?

**Mr MILES:** Only to say that the Resilient Homes Fund is a very good program and we will continue through the Queensland Reconstruction Authority to get to a suitable outcome for the property owners of Mi Hi Grove.

### Multiculturalism

**Ms PUGH:** My question is of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the Miles Labor government is supporting a diverse multicultural community in Queensland, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any other approaches?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Mount Ommaney for her question. I have the very great honour of representing in this parliament one of the most multicultural communities in Australia. When it comes to cultural diversity, Logan is pipped—just—by New York but, as everyone in this chamber and in Queensland knows, in every other respect Logan beats New York every day of the week. When migrants and refugees come to this country to share their culture, language, food, festivals and stories but, most importantly, their hard work, determination and aspiration, that makes Queensland a better and stronger place. One thing multicultural communities do not like and reject is being used as political props.

Last week we saw the Leader of the Opposition in Inala pretending to be a friend of the Vietnamese community. What did he do then? He jumped in the car, drove up the Ipswich Motorway to Ipswich West and did a dirty preference deal with One Nation. As the member for Clayfield so famously said, supporting an LNP candidate is supporting a One Nation candidate because a vote for the LNP is a vote for One Nation. That is absolutely true in this by-election. Queensland's Vietnamese community—

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the Treasurer's statement referring to me and I ask that he withdraw.

**Mr DICK:** I withdraw. Everybody knows what Pauline Hanson said about Asian Australians. She said that Australia was being 'swamped by Asians'. A member is creeping around taking photos of women's phones. You should be ashamed, Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Through the chair, Deputy Premier.

**Mr DICK:** That is where members of the LNP align themselves: that sort of horrible language and horrible sentiment. That is the sort of leadership we get from the member for Broadwater: aiding and abetting people in this chamber who are taking photos of women's phones without their consent. That is the sort of leadership that the member for Broadwater demonstrates every day: backing One Nation in a dirty preference deal. The people of Inala, Ipswich West and Queensland know what the member for Broadwater is made of.

**Mr Watts** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Toowoomba North.

**Mr DICK:** For any base political purpose, he will debase himself for a vote. That is his character. That is the sort of person he is—

**Mr Watts** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Toowoomba North is warned under the standing orders.

**Mr DICK:**—and don't they know it on the backbench? They are ashamed of their behaviour this week; they are ashamed of their leader—

**Mr Watts** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Toowoomba North, you may not have heard: you are warned under the standing orders. There was a lot of noise in the chamber and I thought I would give you the courtesy of making sure you understood that before you made any further contributions.

**Mr DICK:** We hear a lot of talk from the Leader of the Opposition, but it is all hollow, meaningless language. Every Queenslander knows that they cannot trust a single word the member for Broadwater says.

### Residential Tenancies

**Mr BERKMAN:** My question today is to the Premier. Is the Premier's ongoing support for unlimited rent increases and no-grounds evictions for Queensland renters influenced by the rental income he receives from his investment properties in West End, Yeronga and Alderley?

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Standing order 115 is quite clear in relation to inferences and imputations. I suggest that that question is laden with imputations in terms of the decision-making and the character of the minister to whom the question was asked.

### Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Maiwar, in terms of the way I heard that question, the Leader of the House is correct. To me, it appears that you are talking about potential conflicts of interest or misuse of office. I will rule the question out of order.

### Child Safety Officers

**Mrs GILBERT:** My question is of the Minister for Child Safety. Can the minister update the House on what the Miles Labor government is doing to recruit more child safety officers and ease the cost-of-living burden for Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

**Mrs MULLEN:** I thank the member for the question. I know that she agrees with me when I say that Queensland's child safety officers are remarkable people, including those in her region of Mackay. They are passionate, committed and all want to make meaningful changes in the lives of vulnerable children and young people. They understand the responsibility they have in walking alongside children and families, helping to keep them safe and build a better future. The role of a child safety officer is complex and at times very difficult. I have already seen firsthand the challenging and sometimes heartbreaking work of these officers. That is why I was so excited to announce a new pay deal which recognises this incredibly important frontline workforce. Almost 1,250 child safety officers will benefit from the new agreement, 86.5 per cent of whom are women—women who right now benefit from the significant progress this Miles Labor government has made in ensuring their economic security and access to health services.

The starting pay rate of Queensland's entry-level child safety officer is now the highest nationally. Starting salaries now range from nearly \$95,000 to \$103,000, with 12.75 per cent in superannuation, flexible working arrangements and up to five weeks annual leave in some regional and remote locations. Along with the cost-of-living adjustment payments, our existing child safety officers will receive an 11 per cent increase in base wages over three years. Child safety officers who remain committed to the department will also receive an additional three per cent wage continuance allowance. This is in recognition of their dedication in this critical frontline role.

There are job opportunities available throughout the state. We need more people with passion for helping families and children. Of course, this is all part of our record child safety budget of \$2.14 billion, which will help fund an additional 123 frontline officers and frontline support staff. This means that our government has over time created 435 new child safety roles since 2015. It is a record that shows our commitment to building the front line. It is progress that would be in jeopardy, of course, in the hands of the LNP. They cut \$200 million from the child and family services budget during their

term in government. More than 225 permanent child safety staff lost their jobs, most of those, of course, being women. They cut hundreds of thousands of dollars from services that care for, support and protect women and children. In my portfolio areas alone they decimated funding: \$250,000 cut from Young Women's Place in Toowoomba; \$290,000 slashed from the PPP parenting program; and nearly \$40,000 ripped out of the migrant women's emergency support services. Members opposite are a disgrace.

### **Pomona King of the Mountain**

**Ms BOLTON:** My question is to the Minister for the Environment and the Great Barrier Reef and Minister for Science and Innovation. The 44-year-old world renowned King of the Mountain race at Pomona has been cancelled this year due to unfeasible permit conditions issued by QPWS for this volunteer-run event. Will the minister review these conditions and assist our communities to retain this iconic event that brings social, physical and economic benefits to Noosa and beyond?

**Ms LINARD:** I thank the member for the question. Of course I am aware of the event. It is not an event that I have participated in, but I have participated in hiking that track. I am sure that the member is aware that Parks and Wildlife has an important responsibility in respect of not only protecting environmental values but also providing for the safety of those who go on that track or, indeed, to any of our parks.

My understanding and recollection of negotiations to date is that any decision to cancel that event is one for the organisers. My department and Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service have been consulting with the event organisers and are still willing to do so. I also saw the media piece last night about it. I note that a number of locals also commented on the degradation of the track. When you have 80 people travelling through that small track, it is causing some damage to the environment. There are also safety concerns about people going up the mountain and others coming down at the same time. My understanding is that my agency has indicated that, while the approval for 80 people—that is what was previously approved—to participate stands, they have requested a staggered approach. I would say again that it is matter for event organisers whether they go ahead, but it is the responsibility of my agency and I expect them to act in accordance with the safety of those going to these parks but also in accordance with the protection of environmental values.

### **Women, Health**

**Mrs McMAHON:** My question is to the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women. Can the minister update the House on how the Miles government is defending a woman's right to make health choices about her body, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I thank the member for Macalister for her question and for her advocacy around women and girls in her community in Logan being able to make health decisions about their body. As I have already said today, a Labor government will always defend a woman's right to make decisions about her own sexual and reproductive health. We took abortion out of the Criminal Code, and a Labor government will never let it be put back in.

On the weekend we announced over \$42 million to roll out for the first time publicly funded IVF for people with complex medical conditions like cancer because, in this day and age, governments should not stand in the way of women deciding when, if and how they have a child. Sadly, we know that there are still some people who are determined to stand in women's way on this. We only have to look in recent weeks at what is scarily happening in the United States. We have seen the Alabama Supreme Court, stacked with right-wing political judges, rule that frozen embryos now have personhood. That has meant a halt to IVF treatment for families reliant on IVF to start a family. We continue to see the effects of the US Supreme Court overturning *Roe v Wade*, where countless states are now ruling out abortion for women even if they have been raped.

Mr Speaker, you might think that would never happen here, but here is the truth: the rhetoric and the policies that we see from the LNP men on that side of the chamber are the same rhetoric and policies that we see now playing out in the United States. We know that the Leader of the Opposition did not even have the conviction to tell Queenslanders why he voted for abortion to remain in the Criminal Code, but his hand-picked deputy, the member for Kawana, certainly went on the record. He stood in this chamber and said that teenage girls who make the unimaginably difficult decision to

terminate a pregnancy are 'taking the easy way out' and that people who make this decision are 'weak'. These are the same attitudes of the extremists we are seeing each and every day in the US rolling back women's rights.

Now we see the Leader of the Opposition cutting a deal with One Nation. Everyone can remember One Nation at the last election, with their billboards promising to roll back women's reproductive rights. These are the people the Leader of the Opposition is standing with. He has no conviction and he is weak. He should stand up for women and girls in Queensland.

*(Time expired)*

### **Premier, Integrity**

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** My question is to the Premier. The Premier apologised for misleading the House only after being contacted by media. The Premier admitted Kate Jones had resigned only after media inquiries. Why does the Miles government only act on issues of integrity after being contacted by the media?

**Mr MILES:** I thank the member for Nanango. Her allegations are untrue.

### **Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence**

**Ms BUSH:** My question is to the Acting Attorney-General. Can the Acting Attorney-General advise the House how the Miles government is investing in domestic, family and sexual violence support services for Queenslanders, including in my electorate of Cooper, and is the Acting Attorney-General aware of any alternative approaches?

**Ms LINARD:** I thank the member for her question. The member for Cooper has been a strong supporter of services that both protect and advocate for victim-survivors. Indeed, I think it has been her life's work and I do honour her service to their voices.

As we know, it takes great courage for those who are impacted by domestic and family violence to take the brave step to come forward and have their voices heard. It is important that we ensure victim-survivors are supported when they reach out for help. In our first term of government we immediately got on with the job of rectifying the \$259 million of cuts to community sector organisations that were made under the former LNP government. Since 2015 our government has invested \$1.5 billion in domestic, family and sexual violence reforms. This includes the \$688 million to respond to the 355 recommendations across the landmark Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce reports 1 and 2 and the Independent Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service responses to domestic and family violence.

At the end of last year we announced an extra \$3 million per annum ongoing to be provided to 32 sexual violence women's health and wellbeing services across Queensland from the Torres Strait to the Gold Coast and out to Mount Isa, because on this side of the House we support and we believe women. We have invested because we support and believe women. Those opposite cut \$230,000 from domestic and family violence shelters. More than \$50,000 was cut from the Domestic Violence Action Centre, that will now deliver our pilot Housing Connectors program. There were more cuts: the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence—\$34,000 gone; the Wide Bay Sexual Assault Services—\$29,000 cut; and \$13,000 was cut to the state's only service at that time providing sexual assault support for women with a disability.


When domestic and violence services are cut, women and children cannot escape abuse. This is not just about dollar figures that the LNP cut from these important community organisations; it is absolutely about the lives of women in this state. This is about the lives that our government, the Miles government, is protecting by supporting women and children to escape domestic and family violence. The clear difference between our government and the opposition is that we will always listen and we will always act. The opposition will cut. They do not listen to the voices of women and children. Instead, what we have heard today is that they will absolutely impinge on the right to privacy in the workplace.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** The period for question time has expired.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### Same Question Rule

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, it was remiss of me earlier as part of my morning statements to not make a statement regarding the application of the same question rule. I apologise to the House. I will do so now.

Honourable members, I have considered the application of the same question rule to the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2023. In summary, the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 4, 16, 23 and 24 of the bill, contrary to standing order 87. A motion to suspend standing order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered. I seek leave to incorporate my full ruling circulated in my name. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

**SPEAKER'S RULING—APPLICATION OF SAME QUESTION RULE TO HEALTH AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)**

Honourable members, I have considered the application of the same question rule to the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2023 and various other Acts that were amended within the 57th Parliament.

The Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) was introduced on 30 November 2023 and seeks to amend provisions within Acts that have already been amended during this session of Parliament, including the Criminal Code, the Mental Health Act 2016 and the Termination of Pregnancy Act 2018.


Standing Order 87 provides the general rule of Westminster parliamentary practice that, once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative, the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session. Similarly, Standing Order 150 provides for the application of the same question rule in relation to amendments, new clauses or schedules of a Bill. As previous Speakers have noted, the matters do not have to be identical but merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form (Speaker Reynolds, Record of Proceedings, 9 September 2008, p. 2559).

Clauses 4, 16, 23 and 24 of the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) propose amendments to provisions that are substantially the same as amendments previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.

Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 4, 16, 23 and 24 of the Bill contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

## MOTION

### Business Program

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.18 am): I move—

1. That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:
  - (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
  - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
  - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.
2. That the following business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum times as specified:
  - (a) the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), a maximum of 1½ hours;
  - (b) the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill (cognate debate), a maximum of 5½ hours;
  - (c) the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2), a maximum of 4½ hours; and
  - (d) the ministerial notice of motion standing in the name of the Premier, a maximum of 60 minutes, each speaker a maximum of 2 minutes.
3. The following time limits for the bills listed in 2. apply:
  - (a) the minister to be called on in reply:
    - (i) for the Appropriation Bill (No. 2), 20 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours for that bill;
    - (ii) for the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill (cognate debate), 20 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours for those bills; and
    - (iii) for the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2), 20 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours for that bill.

4. If all stages of the bills listed in 2. have not been completed by the specified times in 3. respectively, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 7 March 2024, Mr Speaker:
- (a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes to their circulated amendments, any statement of compatibility with human rights or any statement relating to an override declaration
  - (b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill without further debate
  - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion
  - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

**Mr SPEAKER:** A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

**AYES, 46:**

**ALP, 46**—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Rourke, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Walker, Whiting.

**NOES, 33:**

**LNP, 30**—Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir.

**Grn, 1**—Berkman.

**KAP, 2**—Dametto, Knuth.


Pairs: D'Ath, Crandon; Pease, Molhoek; Tantari, Camm.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2)

Resumed from 10 October 2023 (see p. 2812).

### Second Reading

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (11.22 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I would like to begin by thanking the Economics and Governance Committee for its report tabled on 24 November 2023 regarding this bill. I would also like to thank all of those witnesses who appeared as part of the committee's inquiry. I note that the committee made one recommendation to the Legislative Assembly, and that was that the bill be passed. Nevertheless, I am sure that as part of this debate we will hear the usual whingeing and whining from the LNP, because deep down they do not support the fair pay and conditions for frontline health staff that are funded by this bill.

**Mr Janetzki** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** I take the interjection from the member for Toowoomba South. The whingeing and whining has already commenced. We know that the LNP wants to 'break the back' of 'unrealistic employee entitlements' in Queensland Health. Fundamentally, the LNP hates government spending because it means service delivery, and the LNP does not think the working people of this state deserve better services. Let me make this clear: the Labor government will always invest in the front line, and that is exactly what this bill does.

In particular, the purpose of this bill is to provide for additional supplementary appropriation for unforeseen expenditure that occurred in the 2022-23 financial year. 'Unforeseen expenditure' is the term used to describe payments from the Consolidated Fund to a department which are above the amounts approved in prior appropriation acts. For example, a department may need supplementary appropriation to respond to emergent issues or implement government policy, including new government policy; for example, fair pay to workers. In other cases, there may be a change in the timing of Commonwealth payments or project delivery; therefore, unforeseen expenditure is not 'overspend' as the LNP would try to say it is. Importantly, the bill is only concerned with unforeseen expenditure for 2022-23. Some agencies may have underspends, which are not considered in this process.

Section 35 of the Financial Accountability Act 2009 provides that should expenditure from the Consolidated Fund exceed the amount approved by annual appropriation, the Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the Treasurer, may authorise the expenditure. This amount comprises unforeseen expenditure and must be approved by the Governor in Council within four weeks of the end of the financial year. On 6 July 2023 the Governor in Council authorised unforeseen expenditure incurred during the 2022-23 financial year of \$1,243,941,000. These amounts of unforeseen expenditure for 2022-23 are in addition to the unforeseen expenditure amounts previously approved by the Governor in Council and contained in the Appropriation Act 2023.

This year the 2023-24 annual Appropriation Act for departments—the Appropriation Act 2023 introduced on budget day—included additional appropriation relating to unforeseen expenditure for 2022-23 as estimated at the end of April 2023. This new process, of course, increases transparency and accountability. Given the act formed part of the 2023-24 budget material, it went through the estimates process, where questions can be asked of the relevant ministers about the amounts contained in the act. Importantly, the Consolidated Fund Financial Report contains explanations of all unforeseen expenditure incurred by departments for the full 2022-23 financial year, and this informs parliament's understanding and debate of the bills.

Pursuant to sections 23 and 24 of the Financial Accountability Act, the Consolidated Fund Financial Report must be audited by the Auditor-General by 30 September and tabled in parliament. The Consolidated Fund Financial Report was tabled on 11 September 2023. The payment of unforeseen expenditure is also to be formally authorised under an act of parliament, in accordance with section 66 of the Constitution of Queensland 2001.

Through this bill, parliamentary approval for the additional unforeseen expenditure is now being sought of \$1,243,941,000 incurred by 10 departments and agencies. The majority, 92.4 per cent of the additional unforeseen expenditure contained in this bill, arises from four departments. Queensland Health had additional unforeseen expenditure of \$697,524,000, which included additional funding to implement new certified agreements and the new public sector wages policy. Funding was also provided for new superannuation arrangements. There was also equity funding for LifeFlight Australia Ltd emergency helicopter services as a part of additional funding for the new 10-year agreement between Queensland Health and LifeFlight Australia Ltd.

Queensland Treasury had additional unforeseen expenditure of \$194,102,000, which related to additional equity funding for CleanCo as well as additional funding to place downward pressure on electricity prices. The Department of Environment and Science had additional unforeseen expenditure of \$85,548,000, which included funding for the Recycling and Jobs Fund, including payments to councils.

For the year as a whole it is also noted that 12 departments had lapsed appropriation totalling \$957,893,000. The net impact of unforeseen expenditure and lapses was that total appropriation in 2022-23 was \$1,626,049,000 more than originally approved.

Meanwhile, the strong coal prices being enjoyed by mining companies are delivering for Queenslanders through our new progressive coal royalty tiers. As recently reported, we had a record general government sector surplus of \$13.93 billion in 2022-23. This was underpinned by the strong performance of our labour market and the exceptionally high prices received by coal producers in Queensland. The government is putting this surplus to work by delivering nation-leading cost-of-living support to Queensland families and businesses through our Big Build capital program over the next four years.

Our strong fiscal position also means that general government sector borrowings at the end of 2022-23 were nearly \$1 billion lower than the estimate in the 2023-24 budget released in June last year. Compared to the 2022-23 budget, this means a full reduction in borrowings of more than \$12.7 billion. The reduction in net debt is the sharpest net debt decline year on year since accrual accounting began in the late 1990s and the third consecutive net debt decline year on year. Our progressive coal royalty tiers are delivering for Queenslanders right across the state, as they rightfully should, at a time when coal producers are benefiting from extraordinary prices.

Given everything that I have just said that this bill addresses, I cannot imagine how anyone could possibly have a problem with it, but sadly this will not stop the leader of the LNP or his frontbenchers from whingeing and whining about it. Every single complaint that the leader or the shadow Treasurer make in this debate should be seen for what it is—a threat to the people of Queensland that they will cut. The LNP will cut services, like when they cut police, nurses and midwives. They will cut



infrastructure, because the only infrastructure they will deliver will be new offices for themselves, just like 1 William Street. They will cut progressive coal royalties, blowing a \$9 billion hole in our budget. Every single complaint is another reason the LNP should not be trusted with government.

I conclude by taking this opportunity once again to thank the committee members, including the chair, the member for Logan, and of course the parliamentary secretariat for the hard work that they put in to consider and analyse this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (11.31 am): Supplementary appropriations are required where expenditure from the Consolidated Fund for a department moves beyond the amount approved for that department as annual appropriation at budget time. This bill, which will be supported by the opposition, may be just a few pages but it is important. It is important to good government that the opposition scrutinise the allocation of the public's money expended by the government of the day. Every dollar must be spent towards the delivery of services, goods or infrastructure that offer the best economic dividend, thereby honouring the Queenslander or business from whom it is appropriated.

Although debated late this year, in March, the very reason these unforeseen expenditure bills are being considered ahead of June's appropriation bills is as a result of financial accountability measures introduced by the last Liberal National government. It was the Labor government under former treasurer Andrew Fraser that would only introduce the supplementary appropriation bills with the next year's appropriation bills. For example, the Appropriation Bill for the 2011-12 budget year included unforeseen expenditure from the 2009-10 budget year. That is at least a year's delay from the end of the financial year and parliamentary scrutiny of unforeseen expenditure for that particular year.

It is typical of a Labor Party that avoids scrutiny and breaks promises. It was then treasurer Andrew Fraser who stared down the barrel of a camera before the 2009 election promising no asset sales, as it is now when the member for Woodridge stares down the camera and promises that there will be no new taxes.

**Mr Dick:** A promise I kept.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am going to take the interjection. Let's wheel in the Treasurer. That is the most remarkable doubling down of a broken promise I have ever seen. Of all the numbers that the Treasurer fudges, that one is particularly galling to the people of Queensland. The Treasurer stared down the barrel of the camera 26 times, and the promise was broken. The trust was broken with the people of Queensland in that very moment and the Treasurer has never been able to regain it—ever. There was the renters tax. Who could forget the Premier abandoning the Treasurer in Canberra and leaving him high and grounded with his renters tax? Then there was the patients tax, where the Treasurer again had the balloon popped with his little tax thought bubble.

We saw that trust issue again today. Whether it is the Treasurer breaking promises on taxes or the Premier unable to tell the truth in relation to messages and RTI processes, misleading the House and offering apologies, it does not matter. This is a Labor Party that cannot be trusted under any circumstances. It was forever thus. I wanted to use the broad remit of this appropriation bill to push back on a regular attack from the Treasurer on those on this side. I am going to use this opportunity in the appropriation bill to speak a little more about that. Pre poll has opened in Inala and Ipswich West, and don't we have some great candidates out there.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Bush): Member, are you going to table that document you are holding?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am going to make sure it is relevant. I can read your mind, Madam Deputy Speaker.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And are you going to table the document?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am onto it. On the how-to-vote card, it says that the opposition 'tried to privatise our power stations and prisons'. That is what the Labor Party is continuing to peddle, even in the by-elections in Ipswich West and Inala. It is time that the record is corrected because I am sick of hearing it and I am not going to leave it unchallenged anymore. What is the truth when it comes to this? The monotonously repetitive attacks on asset sales are particularly galling because there is only one party that has sold assets in Queensland, and it is the Labor Party. I want to run through the assets sold by the Labor Party and the enabling legislation that enabled them to be sold over the last 15 years.

The Energy Assets (Restructuring and Disposal) Bill 2006 facilitated the sale of Energex's electricity retail business, Ergon's electricity retail business, Energex's gas distribution business, Stanwell's and Tarong's wind farms and Enertrade's merchant gas and transportation business. In 2008

we had the Airport Assets (Restructuring and Disposal) Bill and those opposite sold the Cairns Airport, the Mackay Airport and the Port of Brisbane Corporation's interest in the Brisbane Airport. That is the truth. They are the facts. I will continue.

In 2009 there was the all-out sale of Queensland assets. The Labor Party introduced the Infrastructure Investment (Asset Restructuring and Disposal) Bill where they sold Forestry Plantations Queensland, and Queensland Motorways, and the Port of Brisbane, and Queensland Rail's above and below rail coal businesses, and Queensland Rail's commercial rail services, such as bulk freight and retail and regional freight, and the Ports Corporation of Queensland's Abbot Point Coal Terminal. That is the Labor Party, and I have had enough. I have had enough of those opposite badgering us about asset sales because there is only one party that has sold assets here in Queensland. Let us not forget that in 2010 when Forestry Plantations Queensland was finally disposed of—

**Mr Perrett:** Yes.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I hear the affirmation from the member for Gympie. That was actually disposed of for \$600 million. With 204,000 hectares of plantation, if I am right, member for Gympie—

**Mr Perrett:** Yes, that is correct.

**Mr JANETZKI:** That 204,000 hectares of plantation was sold for \$600 million, but what was the book value in the annual report?

**Mr Perrett:** \$1.3 billion.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I think it was \$1.2 billion, but I will take the interjection.

**Mr O'Connor:** He's rounded it up.

**Mr JANETZKI:** We are rounding it up. The value of Forestry Plantations Queensland was \$1.2 billion, but what did the Labor Party sell it for? It was \$600 million. They sell the assets, then they tell mistruths about it and then they pretend that we were the ones that sold the assets. We are not going to take it anymore. This how-to-vote card in Ipswich West is fundamentally misleading and it has to be called out. I have had enough of this government talking about asset sales because they are the only party in Queensland to sell assets. They sold \$15 billion of Queensland assets without a mandate.

Queenslanders used to own airports, forests, rail networks, ports and energy companies, and then Labor sold them. That is what the Labor Party did; they sold them. Who was there? We know the big names. Bligh, Palaszczuk and Fraser were the big names. Anastacia Palaszczuk was in fact the minister when Queensland Motorways and QR National were disposed of in May 2011 and November 2010.

**Mr Stevens:** 'Queensland Rail not for sale'.

**Mr JANETZKI:** 'Queensland Rail not for sale'; I will take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. Who was sitting in the cabinet with her? Who was sitting in the cabinet with Anastacia Palaszczuk when she was the disposing minister in November 2010 and May 2011? It was the Treasurer and Deputy Premier. The leader of the attack on asset sales in this House, the misleading attack, the Treasurer was there for it all. I am guessing he had his hand up. I am guessing he had his hand up for all of it, because it was all sold while he was there.

The Liberal National Party sold nothing, not a single asset, so I am sick of hearing the fabrication that is being perpetrated by this Labor government—and their apparatchiks, too, because it is not just the MPs in the House. They have openly run campaigns on it for a very long time—Chisholm, Moorhead and even that noted independent Mike Kaiser. When he was with UMR they ran Labor Party market research on asset sales.

**Mr Stevens:** What is it with Woodridge?

**Mr JANETZKI:** There is a common theme with the members for Woodridge. Notably, from memory—I am sure the member for Mermaid Beach will correct me if I am wrong—there were only two Labor MPs who opposed the asset sales. One was the 'tiger in the grass', the member for Bundamba. I believe that Evan Moorhead also opposed them. It was just the two Labor MPs. Set against the asset sales of the Labor Party—the party that sell Queensland assets—at the same time they were wasting the rivers of revenue gold that had come through, and they lost the AAA credit rating. They lost it in the middle of a mining boom. They blew it all! They set increased debts and credit rating downgrades all the way. The Deputy Premier and Treasurer was there all the way through. That is asset sales.

I want to dig a little more deeply into the supplementary appropriations that are on display in this bill. There is \$1.2 billion in supplementary expenditure—unforeseen expenditure—and that is down from last year. It was \$2.4 billion last year.

**Mr Stevens:** \$2.44 billion.

**Mr JANETZKI:** \$2.44 billion, and we are down to \$1.2 billion this year. Do members know what is extraordinary? We are not allowed to debate the business program motion anymore; that has been curtailed. We have just voted against it, but one of the reasons we voted against it was that there is \$1.2 billion in unforeseen expenditure yet we were given only 90 minutes to debate the supplementary appropriation bill. If this debate proves anything it is that this government treats the taxpayer dollar of Queenslanders with such disdain that we will debate the appropriation bill for only 90 minutes in this House. I am planning on taking a fair bit of that time, too, because there is a lot to prosecute.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** You will get your turn, member for Mermaid Beach. It says everything about the disdain the government feels for this House that we get 90 minutes to debate this most important bill. I want to turn to some of the key departments in which we have seen unforeseen expenditure. The largest departmental overspend was in Queensland Health, and it was \$700 million or thereabouts.

**Mr Stevens:** 697.

**Mr JANETZKI:** \$697 million—so \$700 million. It is \$700 million over budget. That is a big number. I can understand why the health minister has probably been distracted by numbers. The health minister has had good reason to be distracted by numbers. We just need to go back to last December to see why the health minister might be a bit distracted. We saw the shortest leadership challenge of all time, with the front-page headline ‘I can win this’. Interestingly, inside we had some talk. It is not surprising that the health minister would struggle. The article states—

“Fentiman is working on numbers but she doesn’t have the numbers,” the MP said.

Tellingly, the Treasurer, when he should have been getting ready—

**Mrs MULLEN:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe that the member is straying from the long title of the bill and I would ask for some guidance to bring him back.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Bush): Member for Toowoomba South, I appreciate that there is a lot of latitude in this debate, but now I would bring you back to the bill. I am also going to get some advice. I will give you the call, but I will caution you to come back to the bill.

**Mr JANETZKI:** There is \$697 million in unforeseen spending. As I said, the health minister has taken her eye off the ball. We know why: she was too busy doing numbers in a leadership challenge that did not get off the ground. The Treasurer, at the time when he should have been preparing his half-year budget review, which is entirely about appropriations, was focused on the numbers, too. As we know, he did not bring the numbers either. It sounds like Kate Jones had a fair bit to do with bringing the numbers.

**Mrs MULLEN:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Once again, I seek your guidance on returning the member to the long title of the bill, given your previous guidance to him.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Toowoomba South, I do agree with the point of order. Whilst there is latitude, I will bring you back to the substance of the bill that we are debating today. Noting that the time is counting down now, if you could come back to the bill that would be great.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I want to turn to the appropriations, which this bill is all about—how the government is spending Queensland taxpayers’ money. What is it delivering? What services is this government delivering for the appropriations? I want to turn to another health spend. I live in the south of Toowoomba, and last weekend I received in my letterbox a brochure about satellite hospitals.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I hear some interjections from those opposite. What value for money is the Queensland taxpayer getting? The nearest satellite hospital to Toowoomba is 100 kilometres away. This is taxpayer money. This brochure is taxpayer money. I table it for the House.

*Tabled paper:* Brochure from the Queensland government titled ‘Satellite Hospitals—Bringing healthcare closer’ [288].

We talk about value for money. In terms of delivering health services and informing Queenslanders as to what health services they deserve, how much is being wasted by this government on advertising services hundreds of kilometres away from where they should be? What conceivable reason is there to see where that particular spending is?

The \$697 million overspend is still not solving the health crisis in front of us. Ambulance ramping, at 43 per cent, is the highest in the country. It was 15 per cent when the Liberal Nationals last took office and left office under Lawrence Springborg, the then health minister. It was 30 per cent when Anna Bligh said that Queensland Health was a basket case. Those opposite, the Labor Party, have shut 37 maternity services in regional Queensland over the last 25 years. With regard to the hospitals plan, they have committed only five per cent of spending in the first two years, and we have seen in the last week that there will be significant cost overruns on those hospital projects—

**Ms Bates:** That we know of.

**Mr JANETZKI:** That we know of; I take the interjection from the shadow health minister. Fifty-fifty funding has been abandoned. If we recall, that was pretty much the entire premise of their economic case under the Morrison government. As soon as Albo gets elected, they all go quiet.

**Mr Stevens:** Crickets!

**Mr JANETZKI:** Absolute crickets! This government have abandoned significant Queensland infrastructure projects. All of the dams—Emu Swamp, Urannah, Hughenden Irrigation Project—have been abandoned by this government because they have the wrong priorities.

I want to pose a question to the Treasurer. Part of the additional capital spend in relation to the \$697 million overspend is due to the funding reclassification between operating and capital and timing adjustments for the Satellite Hospitals Program. I would appreciate it if the Treasurer could clarify for the House, with respect to that Satellite Hospitals Program, why these funding reclassifications were necessary and whether the timing adjustments reflect the delayed opening of the facilities from what the government originally promised. I would appreciate that clarification.

I turn now to the next largest overspend, which comes from the Treasurer's own department. Queensland Treasury has an overspend of \$552 million. Additional administered items were attributed to additional funding for CleanCo, for Energy and Jobs Plan projects and the capping on the price of coal used for electricity generation in Queensland. Again, it would be appreciated if the Treasurer could advise the House how much of the Treasury overspend was attributable to the coal price caps and how much they cost the state in total for 2022-23.

I am also intrigued to identify what the Treasurer spends Treasury money on. One particular area where the Treasurer has spent a lot of money has been Visy. We have seen millions and millions of dollars go to Visy to support their activities in return for what seems to be full-page newspaper advertisements. It looks like the Treasurer hands out millions of dollars of hard-earned taxpayers' dime and in reply receives full-page advertisements across national newspapers—that is what it looks like. The perception is that hard-earned taxpayers' dime is given to billionaires and in return they get full-page advertisements in national newspapers—and not just one, member for Sandgate. It is not just one.

In the *Financial Review* we have former premier Anastacia with Visy—that is one ad in return for millions of dollars. This is one of my favourites. Jim Chalmers must not have had time to rewrite capitalism over Christmas this year. He kept a bit quiet this summer. This one is 'Swanny'—'the first of four surpluses I announced tonight'—with Jim, Paul Keating and Visy. There is another one where the Treasurer is very happy. There is a big smiley face from the Treasurer who is handing out hard-earned taxpayers' dime to billionaires in return for full-page advertisements in national newspapers. There is big smile from the Treasurer in that one. Then, of course, we have Chris Bowen as well. I will table all of those articles, Madam Deputy Speaker.

*Tabled paper:* Bundle of newspaper advertisements regarding Visy recycling factory [\[289\]](#).

The perception this raises is that the government gives out money in return for political advertising—that is the concern. I believe it has happened far too often. When the Treasurer is handing out millions of dollars in this way, as the Treasurer is distracted by petty attacks on asset sales and other issues, he is not focused on the numbers that matter to Queenslanders. The Treasurer is not focused on the right priorities for Queensland. We see that through the continuing deterioration in the cost-of-living numbers here in Queensland. I note the efforts of the shadow minister for cost of living, the member for Nanango, in prosecuting these issues. It is clear that Queenslanders are suffering the most when it comes to the big bills on the kitchen table. Whether it is power prices up 19.9 per cent over the last 12 months, insurance costs up 18.8 per cent over the last 12 months, groceries costs up 4.3 per cent over the last 12 months, transport costs up 4.2 per cent or health costs up seven per cent, Queenslanders are suffering when it comes to the cost of living.

I want to refer briefly to insurance costs. We held shadow cabinet up in Cairns a couple of weeks ago—before cabinet; it is good to see the government is following our ideas again. It is very good to see them reacting. Boy, do we have some great candidates up in Cairns. I look at Bree in Barron River. Her connection to community is so good and so deep. They are talking about the issues that matter. We have Yolonde in Cairns—an outstanding candidate who is listening to the community on the ground.

**Mr KELLY:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Bush): I will agree with the member for Greenslopes and ask you to return to the bill. The line that you are running is clearly outside of the bill.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am focused on the appropriate spending of taxpayers' money on cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders. If those members opposite do not want to have that debate, they should just give up—if they do not want to be in this House and debate cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders who are struggling in the Far North. We have seen insurance costs go up 18.8 per cent in the last 12 months. Our candidates on the ground in Cairns and in the tropical Far North are listening. They are listening and they are hearing the concerns.

While I was at a street booth with Yolonde outside the IGA in Edge Hill, I had a business owner come—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am not allowed to talk about businesses now? Is that where we are at? Insurance costs in the Far North are at market failure level and those opposite do not want to debate that. I met Gary outside the IGA and he was talking to me about strata title insurance costs. The difference in insurance premiums in the Far North to elsewhere for his particular strata title block was over 30 grand. Some in the Far North cannot even find insurance. He had a comparator in regional New South Wales: the same building type and block was under \$4,000 for the same insurance, so from over 30 grand to under four grand. We are seeing significant insurance challenges in the Far North. We will keep talking about it because it matters.

You know the best way, member for Gladstone, to put downward pressure on the cost of living? You can properly maintain your power assets to put downward pressure on power prices. You do not let building and lot approvals fall by 30 per cent, pushing up housing prices. You do not introduce a renters tax in the middle of a housing crisis that drives down investment and pushes up rents—that is what you don't do. You do not let a crime crisis get so out of control that people are living in fear in their homes, on the streets and in their businesses. That is what you do to put downward pressure on cost of living. That is what we will do. That is what we will do if we are elected in October. That is the kind of pressure that we will put on the cost of living. We will put that pressure on the cost of living.

I want to move to the next department, which is the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Perhaps the only surprise about the \$173 million overspend by the Department of Transport and Main Roads is the fact that we know about it. I am sure the former minister would have tried to find a way to weave his way through so we would not know about the overspend. Anyway, we do know about the overspend.

**Mr O'Connor** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** We do miss him; I will take the interjection from the member for Bonney. He was the gift who gave an awful lot and he will keep giving, member for Mudgeeraba, I know it.

There was talk about what this has been spent on. I would appreciate it if the Treasurer could clarify some of the timing adjustments in relation to the rolling stock expansion project and whether the Queensland Train Manufacturing Program—already blown out by \$2.4 billion—is still on time.

I want to raise two other key road issues in relation to my region. I am glad that the member for Lockyer is sitting beside me because he has been campaigning for a very long time for the intersection at Glenore Grove and Forest Hill Fernvale roads because again, over summer, it was cut. We need Transport and Main Roads to listen to the calls from the member for Lockyer and from businesses in the Lockyer and west to deliver a solution. There is not only an inconvenience for residents trying to travel to and from Brisbane; we need to stop the crashes and make it safer to ensure our produce, goods and commodities get to and from port.

I also want to raise a growing problem at the Bremer bridge—it is becoming serious now. My fear is that this government is not giving a full and honest answer in relation to the Bremer bridge closures because of the by-election in Ipswich West. I am concerned that this government is not being honest with the people of Ipswich West about the true impacts of the closure of that road. We know that for

some time 42.5 tonne vehicles—that is the tonnage limit—travelling at 80 kilometres per hour have been diverted to the Cunningham Highway. We know that, and we know worse is to come. We know that the westbound lanes will be closed at the end of this month. Funny that—straight after the by-election. Is it any wonder that people are cynical in relation to this government?

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member, I will again remind you of relevance. I understand the point that you are making, but you have now strayed from the bill a number of times. I will ask you to return to the bill for the remainder of your speech.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am calling for TMR spending of the precious taxpayer dollar to be allocated where it is most needed. That is why this government needs to be honest about the Bremer bridge closures. The impacts need to be made clear. We have a massive grain crop coming from the Darling Downs very shortly. The sorghum crop across the Central Downs and across the northern Darling Downs is extraordinary. We have significant road movements between the port and the Darling Downs coming right now. We cannot afford for this government to be hiding the truth immediately before the Ipswich West by-election. We need them to front up and tell people what will be the impact of these closures. We cannot have a temporary solution. We need a permanent solution, and right now this government is failing.

I want to quickly move on. I am down to two minutes remaining. That 30 minutes has just flown by. I want to finish—

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I will take up the full 90 minutes from this pathetic government that will not let this side of the House talk about the appropriations that matter to their communities. They allow only 90 minutes for debate; it is a disgrace.

**Mr O'Connor:** Can I move that you be further heard?


**Mr JANETZKI:** I would love that. I will finish with a few remarks about the things that will not change until we change the government. The Treasurer was counting his numbers in December at the time of the budget update, not the numbers that matter to Queenslanders. The number 26 is a number that counts to Queenslanders. That is the number of times the Treasurer said that there would be no new taxes, and then we saw everything unfold.

CommSec has Queensland as the worst performing economy in the country. Queensland has the highest unemployment rate in the country. Queensland's growth per capita flatlined at zero per cent last year while every other state's improved. Queensland's economy shrank last quarter while every other state's grew. Labor's debt, taxes and interest costs have never been higher. The Treasurer has collected \$66 billion more than he forecast in his first budget less than four years ago. Despite these revenue rivers of gold, household budgets have never been under more pressure and services have never been worse.

Labor is oblivious to the lived experience of struggling Queenslanders, the communities living in terror and those living in tents. Even the Premier admitted today that he has not been to see the latest tent community in his electorate, eight kilometres from his electorate office. Nothing will change until Queenslanders change the government.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Before I call the next member to speak, I remind the House of those members on a warning. They are the members for Burleigh, Nanango, Southern Downs, Logan, Maryborough, Mudgeeraba, Glass House, Kawana, Oodgeroo, Currumbin, Waterford, Everton and Toowoomba North.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (12.02 pm): That was a full half-hour in which the member who just spoke managed to desperately avoid actually talking about the appropriation bill before us. I was the chair of the then Economics and Governance Committee that examined Appropriation Bill (No. 2). I want to thank the Treasurer and especially the Deputy Under Treasurer, Mr Dennis Molloy. In his evidence he said—and I think this was directed at the member for Toowoomba South, because he seems completely confused about what we are doing in the appropriation bill—

The term 'unforeseen expenditure' does at times seem to cause some confusion ...

That was directed at the member for Toowoomba South, who seems totally confused about the entire process of the bill.

Having seen previous debates, this was a question asked for the benefit of the member for Toowoomba South. We had been told that most of the expenditure had previously been put into the budget in the first Appropriation Bill in the aggregates. I said—

... often we do foresee this expenditure but we are putting it in budget aggregates because it does not reach the standards of certainty that Treasury requires to be legislated at that point.

Mr Molloy said—

Unforeseen expenditure has a very technical meaning that relates to when you are actually making that appropriation, so it is triggered at that point. What Treasury attempts to do is, where you have expenses that have been identified—so government policy is clear but the details have not been, which you would require to roll out a payment to an agency—we will hold those funds centrally so they will be reflected in our budget aggregates.

At the point of appropriation, most of this expenditure was there for examination for the LNP; it was there for examination at estimates by the member for Toowoomba South, but he has zero understanding of the process. I want to thank the deputy chair, who now knows more about this process and understands, unlike the member for Toowoomba South, how the budgetary process works. We on our committee commented—

The committee recognises there are a variety of reasons supplementary funding is required, making the payment of unforeseen expenditure an inherent part of the appropriations process.

One important thing—and this is something that, again, the member for Toowoomba South made no mention of—is the example of funding for the new public sector wages policy and new superannuation arrangements for Queensland Health. It was flagged in the aggregates and asked about at estimates but not understood by the opposition—or do they deliberately choose not to understand it because their intention is to cut the wages that were flagged in the bill and are appropriated through Appropriation Bill (No. 2)? We know that they seek to cut ordinary wages at a time when families are under pressure in the cost-of-living crisis that we are acutely aware of. Indeed, our committee is now called the Cost of Living and Economics Committee. We are deeply aware of it. We know that the LNP would seek to cut and so would the member for Toowoomba South.

I will continue to speak purely on appropriations, but I have to respond to the member for Toowoomba South, who spoke so proudly of the former Newman government. He spoke so proudly of the cuts, the sackings and the sales.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Member for Logan, I remind you of the Speaker's ruling earlier today that we will not refer to previous government iterations. That was a ruling the Speaker made earlier today, that we should not be talking about previous leaders of government and how those governments are described—Newman and Palaszczuk. That was the ruling the Speaker gave this morning. I will stand corrected if that is not the case, but that is what I heard the Speaker say this morning. We will move on from that. Member for Toowoomba South, do you have a point of order?

**Mr JANETZKI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at those remarks made by the member for Logan and I ask that he withdraw them.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, the member has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

**Mr POWER:** I withdraw.

**Mr SMITH:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am just seeking clarification that it was not that you could not use two former leaders and a current, for example, Palaszczuk-Miles or Newman-Crisafulli? I am just seeking a ruling on that.

**Mr POWER:** That was my understanding, too, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You could be right, member for Bundaberg. I will check with the Speaker later in the day. Let's take that as interpreted, that it is two different premiers, and let's stay away from that. I apologise, member for Logan.

**Mr POWER:** I do note that the government between 2012 and 2015 was one that the member for Toowoomba South is extremely proud of. He spoke of it as an asset. He is either proud of that government and what it did or he is ashamed of it. He is proud of the government that the member for Broadwater served in. We do know that that government made cuts, sackings and sales; they had asset sales. I note that the member for Toowoomba South in his speech said that they sold nothing, not a single asset. Am I quoting him correctly? I note that the AFR reported that the Newman government—sorry, the government between 2012 and 2015 of which the member for Broadwater was an active part and of which the member for Toowoomba South is so proud—made the big sell-off, over \$10.7 billion

worth of assets in sales. There was over \$824 million worth of property and \$370 million more to come that they had advertised. They had Queensland Motorways that they took off government ownership, they sold down the rail operator Aurizon and there was the stake in South Australian electricity.

That former government sold off assets of \$10.7 billion, but let's not forget that the government that the member for Toowoomba South was so proud of also had its plan. What was the plan called? The Deputy Speaker can tell us.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Pause the clock. Member for Buderim, you will cease your interjections. Member for Mudgeeraba, you will cease your interjections. Members, this has been a wideranging debate. I am going to let the member for Logan go on this particular point.

**Mr POWER:** It is important that we do a comparison with this appropriation and previous appropriations, especially under the government between 2012 and 2015, of which the member for Broadwater was a big part, with huge asset sales but more importantly with the Strong Choices plan. Strong Choices was the greatest asset sales plan ever put forward in Queensland and the LNP is the party of asset sales. The other thing we learned from the member for Toowoomba South was not just that those opposite have a plan for asset sales and they have a plan for cuts and they have a plan for sackings, because they are so involved in—

**Mr STEVENS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask that you bring the member back to relevance in terms of the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) that we are dealing with here today.

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

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Hang on, member for Toowoomba South; I will rule on that one first. Member for Logan, I have let you go a fair way to respond to the member for Toowoomba South, but I draw you back to the bill. Member for Toowoomba South, you have a point of order?

**Mr JANETZKI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I take personal offence—my entire contribution was about the assets the Labor Party sold—and I ask that he withdraw.

**Mr POWER:** I withdraw, but it is important that we recognise—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sorry, member for Logan, no 'buts' in a withdrawal, just an unconditional withdrawal.

**Mr POWER:** I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is essential that when members of the LNP have spoken about asset sales we recognise that the greatest asset sales plan ever put before this parliament was the Strong Choices plan. It is also important that we recognise the \$10 billion in assets that they sold during their time in government. I expect the member for Toowoomba South to withdraw the fact that he said in this parliament—he misled this parliament—that they sold nothing, not a single asset, because that is simply not true. It was \$10 billion worth of assets sold during that period of government and it is important that we recognise that.

We also need to recognise that the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) is importantly funding those Queenslanders who are on the front line—people who deserve a decent pay to take home, especially given the cost-of-living pressures that we recognise. This is a government that is proud of the fact that we give public servants a fair day's pay for their hard work. That is not something that we are ashamed of. That is something that we are proud of. This government recognises that this was part of the appropriations recognised for future expenditure, so in that way any of those on the other side who seek to mislead about the nature of unforeseen expenditure are misleading this House. We have seen an entire speech where they have failed to recognise the enormous asset sales that happened during the 2012 to 2015 government. Those opposite have refused to see that their appropriations at that point—and it is important that we compare this appropriation with past appropriations—added to the sacking of Queensland public servants, reduced the wages of public servants and involved the selling off of assets.

Importantly, under that government we also saw cuts to one of the vital services that Queenslanders depend on, and that is justice and youth justice. During that period those opposite cut more than \$170 million from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General—money that we in this appropriation, as a comparison, have put forward again as well as an extra investment. As part of the savage cuts, the LNP ripped \$70 million further during that time from courts and court services. This is something that the member for Toowoomba South seemed extraordinarily proud of as a part of the 2012 to 2015 government—the one where the member for Broadwater was so integral to these cuts. There were cuts of \$9 million from the planned funding for the court diversion program.



**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr POWER:** The member for Nanango is also proud of that government and proud of the cuts that were made to the court diversion program and the 20 jobs.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The speaker on his feet is obviously misleading the House. I take personal offence to his contribution and I ask that he withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, the member has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

**Mr POWER:** I withdraw. No doubt the abolishment of the Murri Court during that period and the abolishment of the Special Circumstances Court and the Drug Court were all cuts made by the LNP during this time that hurt justice in this state. One of the worst things was the ability to take youth offenders away from the circumstances that they were in given that there was another cut of \$26.5 million for youth court diversionary programs. I am proud that in raising these issues we can shine a light on the type of budget that cuts our services to justice and that cuts diversionary programs that make a difference and know that that is what would happen if the LNP were involved. The opposition member did not speak about the bill but mislead the parliament by saying that when in government they had sold nothing, not a single asset. I have put on the record that there were over \$10 billion in asset sales as documented by the *Australian Financial Review* and that they have the greatest plan of which they are extraordinarily proud—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Before calling the next speaker, I just wanted to clarify the ruling that the Speaker gave this morning. He said that we should only refer to the current or former governments by the name of the Premier at the time, so, member for Logan, you are correct and I apologise for that.

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (12.16 pm): I rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2). This supplementary bill highlights the extra expenditure in the May to June period last year of \$1.244 billion added to the previous supplementary of \$1.34 billion in terms of extra expenditure the Labor government has incurred on top of the budgeted almost \$70 billion for the state of Queensland, and yet again we can refer to this bill as another Labor cost blowout bill. I get the fact that these are in many cases unbudgeted expenditures that have come to the fore for different reasons, but with \$697 billion coming forward in terms of wages and super those EB negotiations would have been well known, as would the future super requirements. Unfortunately again through bad budgeting and bad financial management, these have not been included in the budgets for that year.

That is particularly evident for this government in all of its budgeting and projected financial costs to Queenslanders right across the board, and we have to look no further in terms of its infrastructure spends around the state to highlight the fact that its budgeting being totally incorrect is the reason that this Appropriation Bill (No. 2) is here in the House today. I remind people that we were assured that when the Cross River Rail project was put forward by then treasurer Jackie Trad it was going to come in at \$5.9 billion. I understand it is now at \$9 billion—just a fraction under today—and that is basically an overspend that is not far short of the 50 per cent mark. I am told by inside sources at Cross River Rail that the final figure will be closer to \$12 billion when it finally gets up and running.

In terms of budgeting matters for the Labor Party in Queensland, it is one of the reasons there is pain out there in the community about the cost of living because of the waste, the continued bad management of funds and the continual adding on of matters. As we know, soon all fines in Queensland are going up substantially. Yes, some of that money goes back into road improvements and transport improvements—I get all of those sorts of matters—but why is there an increase in penalties for wrongdoing that is making it even harder for those people who incur those penalties, many of whom are in low socio-economic areas? This means that they will have to pay more money to subsidise the government's bad spending and bad infrastructure planning. For example, with the Gabba redevelopment, the current Premier and then state development minister said, 'Yes, it's only going to cost a billion dollars to knock it down and start again,' getting rid of the poor little school in the neighbourhood as well.

The CFMEU said, 'Fellas, we have to do this so our workers can keep getting the BPIC payments on these infrastructure sites,' and that drives the cost of those infrastructure projects through the roof. Holland construction would not pay the BPIC price added to the light rail stage 3 through my electorate. They told the government, 'We're not paying it,' so when BPIC became part of the project the government had to stump up another \$250 million to pay for the blowout; otherwise, they would have

had to re-tender. Holland was adamant that it was not going to pay it. It is all about the budgeting process, the finances and the government's lack of capacity to put together a proper financial package, which will be an impost on Queenslanders for the year to come and many years after that.

That does not take into account all of the waste that we see the government involving itself in. I see \$200 million dropping out the backdoor for the Wellcamp white elephant. That money will go onto the bankcard debt that the poor old Queensland taxpayers will have to stump up for every year. It just amazes me that this government keeps saying that these costs are blowing out because of the increasing cost of building and as a result of all of the people moving to Queensland. What it does not talk about is all of the extra money that it is getting from all of those people coming to Queensland in terms of the enormous kick in stamp duty for this year's budgeting et cetera and also the enormous kick in GST revenue provided directly to the state government as a result of the enormous number of people moving to Queensland. That is the income side of it.


All the government wants to do is justify its cost blowouts by saying, 'The costs have gone up and it is all terrible.' However, good planning would have allowed for those matters to be taken into account and large expenditures would not have been incurred, meaning appropriation bills would not be brought back to the parliament. As I said earlier, we have debated one supplementary appropriation bill and this is the second, seeking another \$1.2 billion. Basically, with cost blowouts the government talks in billions as though it does not matter. Unfortunately, it does not really matter to the people of Queensland, because \$1 billion does not resonate with anybody in the community. I cannot even imagine what \$1 billion would look like. I would really like to see \$1 million drop on my table, to be honest, but I cannot even visualise \$1 billion. Mr and Mrs Average Queensland just say, 'There's another \$1 billion gone and another \$1 billion on the bill. It's just the government spending more money on our behalf.'

What people do not realise is that that is driving our debt to \$150 billion. Going on memory, I worked out that it is about \$26,000 that every Queenslanders owes, including kids. That is what Queenslanders owe to the moneylenders who have enabled this Queensland government to go on a spending spree that rivals that of other states. On a comparative basis, at \$150 billion our debt is equivalent to or even more than that of Victoria, although I am not sure where that is at today. Victoria is a classic example to compare ourselves against. A large state like New South Wales has a debt that is not far in front of ours. I cannot understand why this government keeps failing in its project costings and its estimates for budgets going forward. This impacts areas such as the health system. They have had a few ministers. We had the current Premier, we had the member for Redcliffe—

**Ms Bates:** Four.

**Mr STEVENS:** We have had four; I thank the shadow minister, the member for Mudgeeraba. We have had four health ministers who have been unable to deal with the health system. It does not matter that they keep throwing money at it—and there is another \$697 million in this appropriation bill; it still does not fix the health service. It is still a broken system, by their own words. Those are the same words that former premier Bligh used before she left office, resoundingly, because of her inability to treat the health system in a proper financial manner. This also affects the Police Service, which is desperately in need of further funding and not just for 'proposed' officers, as the minister said one time in the parliament. It is absolutely important that we maintain our thin blue line but it is falling away, and that goes for all other matters.

It is a tragedy that my speaking time is coming to a close. I do not have far to go. It is a very disappointing fact that there are 20 speakers yet to speak on the bill. Twelve LNP speakers would like to speak, on behalf of their communities, on this very important financial bill that will affect their electorates. Debate is being curtailed by the business program that has been foisted on this parliament by the hubris of this government, which is arrogant and out of touch with the proper processes of democracy. This appropriation bill will not be dealt with in a reasonable manner. Certainly several hours would allow members—not only the 12 from our side but also nine from the government side—to speak to a bill that is very important to the financial operation of Queensland. That is a tragedy. It is a mark of a government that has been here for too long. It is a mark of a government that needs to be shown the door in 2024.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (12.26 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2023. Whilst I certainly acknowledge the history lesson that we have been subjected to thus far, I will focus on the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2023. I know that there is a time period allocated to this debate so, again, I will try to keep my contribution relevant to the facts and figures that are located within the documents, within the bill and within the report that the committee prepared.

As has been noted in previous contributions, the bill allocates appropriations of some \$697 million to Queensland Health. In the public briefing we heard where the majority of that is allocated to—that is, the public sector wages policies and the superannuation arrangements that were made for Queensland Health workers. On this side of the House, we do not shy away from appropriately and adequately paying our Queensland Health workers.

I know that those opposite have an approach of breaking the back of healthcare worker entitlements in this state. We want to make sure that we keep our healthcare workers. Those who work in the health space know that there is an extreme shortage of qualified healthcare workers not only in this state but also in this country and internationally. I can tell the House exactly what will happen if we fail to pay our health professionals appropriately in accordance with their agreements—


**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mrs McMAHON:** Thank you for the history lesson, again, but let us focus on 2023. What will happen is that we will lose our healthcare workers. We will lose them to interstate and overseas.

I want Queensland healthcare workers to know that when they strike an enterprise bargaining agreement with the Queensland government we will be honouring it and we will be paying it. At the public briefing the member for Mermaid Beach was having a few issues with the unforeseen expenditure and the fact that there was an enterprise bargaining agreement. In the hearing it was explained that, yes, there may have been a wages policy in place, but because it had not been agreed to at the point of the regular budget cycle it was not included and that money could not be appropriated until such time as that enterprise bargaining agreement had been reached.

Those on this side of the House might have a better understanding of how enterprise bargaining agreements work and the importance of workers signing on to those EBAs, but we cannot allocate money to agreements that have not yet been struck. Queensland Health did represent the biggest supplementary appropriation for the 2022-23 financial year. We on this side of the House believe that our health workers who, let's face it, have been doing a lot of the heavy lifting for Queensland over the past three to four years, deserve to be adequately paid. They deserve the enterprise bargaining agreement that was struck.


When those agreements are struck, it is entirely appropriate that funds are allocated. I thank the previous industrial relations minister and the health minister for ensuring we have the health workforce we have in Queensland and that we are doing our best to keep them in the Sunshine State to ensure we have an adequate health system. I note that there were a number of other unforeseen expenditures across a range of departments. I have no doubt that other members will be making additional contributions in relation to those; however, I note that time for this bill is limited. Rather than take up my full time referring to historical budgets, election campaigns or throwing around campaigning ephemera, I will allow other members to contribute. Certainly, I thank the Treasurer for ensuring the committee was adequately briefed. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (12.31 pm): I rise to speak to the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2023. As a former member of the Economics and Governance Committee—

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr PURDIE:** I have one minute, apparently. I would like to begin by thanking my former colleagues on the committee and the secretariat for their hard work in the deliberation of this bill. The objective of the bill is to seek formal authorisation for the specified amounts the Treasurer paid from the Consolidated Fund for unforeseen expenditure that occurred in the 2022-23 financial year. Under the bill, the Treasurer is authorised to pay \$1.24 billion from the Consolidated Fund for 10 agencies. Those agencies and departments include: \$18.8 million for the department of child safety—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I call the minister to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (12.32 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contribution to this debate. As I predicted when I opened this part of the debate, the member for Toowoomba South set the standard for LNP members by opening his contribution with whingeing and whining, and it was all downhill after that. Members opposite should not criticise the government for having a short period for debate after we heard the blather from the member for Toowoomba South—taking up valuable parliamentary time going on a historical excursion entirely irrelevant to the purpose of the bill. The members of the LNP should be blaming the shadow Treasurer for wasting parliamentary time and taking time away from them. It was all downhill after the whingeing and whining.

I did not expect the shadow Treasurer, of all people—a senior frontbencher—to introduce the record of the Newman government into the debate and talk up the great job of the member for Clayfield and the frontbench of that government, which is the same frontbench as the frontbench of this tired opposition, including the current Leader of the Opposition. What sort of madness infects the LNP where they bring up the record of the Newman government? It is not madness; it is what they believe. They believe they never did a single thing wrong. Have all members heard the Leader of the Opposition's fraudulent attempt to airbrush out of history everything that happened under his mentor, Campbell Newman, and erase the fact that he was up to his neck in cuts and chaos? He read out the talking points that the member for Clayfield had. We can still hear them echoing all those years later.

Deep down, all members of the LNP are like that. They cannot bring themselves to admit that the Newman LNP government was a complete and utter disaster. They cannot admit it. The reason being is that they want to do it all again. I will pick up the member for Toowoomba South's suggestion: let us talk about the Newman government. This is a debate. I will take up the member for Toowoomba South's challenge and talk about what the Newman government did with the budget—most importantly, what that government cut. They cut 14,000 public servants—police numbers were cut, 1,800 nurses and midwives were cut. They cut funding to mental health—the biggest cut ever recorded by any state or territory. What a proud LNP record. There was the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Centre in the electorate of Inala. There is a lot of discussion about by-elections, but I have not heard the Leader of the Opposition out in Inala misleading the Vietnamese community. I have not heard him out there talking about the cuts to the Barrett Adolescent Centre. We are happy to put up our record against those opposite every day of the week. Our record on health could not be more different.

As members have noted, Queensland Health recorded unforeseen expenditure in the previous financial year. Some have incorrectly, as I predicted, called this an 'overspend.' This was due to unforeseen expenses in employee entitlements. This government for one will not deny workers in Queensland Health their lawful and proper entitlements. We will make sure they are amongst the best paid health workers in the country. In 2022-23 there were changes to superannuation. Doesn't the LNP absolutely abhor superannuation? They have opposed it every single day since Paul Keating introduced it in this country because they do not believe workers in this state and in this country deserve a dignified retirement. That is Paul Keating calling now; I apologise.

In 2023 there were changes to superannuation and there was a cost-of-living adjustment paid to our frontline staff. Queensland Health has previously recorded unforeseen expenditure due to employee entitlements. In fact, the last time Queensland Health recorded unforeseen expenditure was in the Consolidated Fund financial report of 2011-12. In 2012, that unforeseen expenditure for Queensland Health was attributed to the separation payments for the doctors and nurses the LNP sacked—they sacked 4,400 health workers. The then member for Mundingburra, the now member for Broadwater and Leader of the Opposition, now self-entitled and self-described 'Queensland premier-elect' assured the Townsville *Bulletin* 'those cuts would not affect services'. It was an eternity. Didn't we have to listen to the member for Toowoomba South for an eternity? Then he said, 'I'm going to make a contribution to the issue of appropriations', but instead he debated the business program. He was constantly being corrected by members of his own backbench.

I never thought I would say this in the parliament—I never thought I would reach this day—that the member for Mermaid Beach would make a better shadow Treasurer than the member for Toowoomba South. What an admission! The member for Toowoomba South attacked progressive coal royalties and incorrectly called them taxes. Once again, the LNP denied and refused to accept and support progressive coal royalties in this state. Their failure to support progressive coal royalties would blow a \$9 billion hole in the Queensland budget.

In speaking about investments and the alleged overspend that the LNP claim the government is responsible for, it was so interesting last week to hear the Leader of the Opposition talking about investment, including the direct Sunshine Coast rail line. The member for Broadwater thinks he knows better than the experts who design and construct railway lines. The 'chief engineer', the Leader of the Opposition, thinks he can build a railway to Maroochydore by 2032 for \$3.2 billion. I say to the Leader of the Opposition: where is the business case? Where are the costings? Where is the route? Of course the Leader of the Opposition has absolutely no idea. That should send a chill down the spine of every Queenslanders who relies on government services, because when the LNP make unfunded and uncosted promises what inevitably follows? It is one thing: cuts.

To build a railway line to Maroochydore, where are the billions going to come from? If they get rid of the progressive coal royalties, where will the \$9 billion come from? What will happen if they cut stamp duty for first home buyers to an unknown amount for an unknown cost with an unknown impact

on the market? There is one thing we can be assured of when that happens: there will be cuts, because the playbook has been written time and time again. Campbell Newman cut stamp duty as soon as he got into office. It was one of the first things he did.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** What happened? I accept the laughter from the member for Nanango because she sat around the CBRC table. She was proud to boast about it. She was part of that decision-making. The first thing they did was cut stamp duty and cut taxes. What happened? They created a massive hole in the budget. They threw their hands in the air. What did they have to do? They cut 14,000 jobs—14,000 Queenslanders paid for that decision with their jobs. That is what the LNP seeks to do again.

The direct Sunshine Coast rail line is an unfunded promise. He tweeted it. It is on Facebook from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, committing to build a railway line to Maroochydore by 2032. That is going to put a massive hole in the budget. We are going to hold them to that, Mr Deputy Speaker, I can assure you of that. We are going to hold every single LNP member on the Sunshine Coast to that promise.

We are going to hold them to their promise to build a nuclear reactor on the Sunshine Coast that is supported by Peter Dutton, Ted O'Brien and David Littleproud—all of those Queenslanders backing in nuclear energy. We look forward to the LNP who oppose desalination. They do not want a desalination plant. They do not want water for the community and for business but they want water for nuclear power. We look forward to that coming forward, too. What does all of this mean for Queensland? What would those cuts look like? You do not have to ask me. You can have a look at what the LNP did the last time they were in government.

It is Women's Week. They put all of this on the table in the debate, so let's have a look at the cuts to women's services that the LNP were responsible for. They cut \$470,000 from Family Planning Queensland for women's reproductive health services. They tried to abolish BreastScreen Queensland. They cut \$250,000 from Young Women's Place, Toowoomba. You would have thought that the member for Toowoomba South, who was not even in the parliament, would condemn that. A quarter of a million dollars was taken out of his community but he said nothing. They cut \$120,000 in Communities funding from Sisters Inside. They cut \$168,000 from the Women Exiting Prison Work Pathways Program with Sisters Inside. There they were destroying a pathway to rehabilitation for prisoners who want to get on the straight and narrow. What is the first thing the LNP did? They cut support services. That is what they did when they were in government. There is all this nonsense talk about gold standard rehabilitation. We know what they did in government. It was a rusted, broken, old model. That is what it was. It was not gold standard. That is their legacy.

The funding cuts went on and on. There were cuts to the Migrant Women's Emergency Support Service and the Banana Shire Emergency Accommodation and Support Centre. Talk about inflaming a housing crisis! I bet the member for Callide does not say anything about the \$33,000 cut to the Banana Shire Emergency Accommodation and Support Centre. There were cuts to the Sunshine Coast Cooloola Services Against Sexual Violence.

**Mr Head:** What about the cuts to maternity services in Callide?

**Mr DICK:** Oh, there he is, opening his mouth again. I take the interjection. As night follows day, there is the member for Callide digging a big hole, falling into it and then he keeps digging. The first rule of holes, member for Callide, is stop digging!

There were cuts to the Ipswich Women's Centre Against Domestic Violence. I remind the men and women—the women in particular—of Ipswich West of the \$50,000 cut to the Ipswich Women's Centre Against Domestic Violence. They cut \$50,000 from the Women's Health Information and Referral Service Central. It goes on and on. I cannot believe it. There were cuts to the Gympie and District Women's Health Centre, Hannah's House crisis shelter, the Caboolture Regional Domestic Violence Service and the Centre Against Sexual Violence. The member for Waterford, the Minister for Health, knows so much about that centre, as I do in my electorate, based in Logan City. There was a \$34,000 cut to that centre. They cut \$29,000 from the Logan Women's Health and Wellbeing Centre. They cut \$24,000 from the Mackay Women's Centre.

**Mrs Gilbert:** Shame!

**Mr DICK:** I know that the member for Mackay knows the impact that had on her community. They cut \$12,000 from the Murrigunyah Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Corporation for Women. They cut \$10,000 from the National Council of Women of Queensland. They cut \$70,000 from North Queensland Combined Women's Services. The LNP spared no-one—no organisation. In particular,

they did not spare any organisation helping women in distress in this state. That is to their eternal shame. On and on it went. I cannot believe that they made the cuts they did to Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander support services as well. That is a litany of shame that the LNP, for whatever reason, has never apologised for—not once.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As all of the other speakers on this side of the House are continually getting pulled up on points of order for relevance, I ask that you rule on relevance.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Appropriation bills are very wideranging. Members have spoken all over the place on this bill. I am going to let the Treasurer keep going.

**Mr DICK:** Thank you for your indulgence, Mr Deputy Speaker. That is the stark contrast. We brought this supplementary appropriation bill into the House. We made it very clear what that supplementary appropriation was for, including supporting proper pay and conditions for Queensland Health workers, supporting our renewable energy future by investing in CleanCo—new initiatives from the last budget to this point. This is the transparency measure we put into the budget bills by bringing forward all of those supplementary appropriations so they could be debated in budget week and so they could then go to the estimates committee and be subject to full parliamentary committee examination. That is what we have done as a government. We do not shy away from the appropriation of appropriate funds for the full and effective operation of the public sector in Queensland and supporting those agencies as they deliver the best for Queensland.

One thing I will not be criticised for—one thing the Labor government will not be criticised for—is our nation-leading investment and support for cost-of-living relief measures. We know that neither the LNP when in government—and that was a matter of debate during this debate—nor any other state or territory government in the Commonwealth has done more to support cost-of-living relief than our government. Electricity rebates were rejected by those opposite when they were in government until pensioners rose up. When they wanted to cut electricity rebates and other pensioner rebates, the pensioners of this state rose up and demanded they be repealed, and that is what happened. They backed down. It was one of the few times they backed down, because they refused to listen to other people. They refused to listen to the services organisations in Mackay, Nudgee, Toowoomba and Central Queensland. They refused to listen to them and they paid the ultimate price.

We will not let Queenslanders forget what they did and we will not let Queenslanders forget about the massive holes they blew in the budget. What about the first home owners' grant? What an embarrassing day that was! It was a chaotic day of crisis in the LNP. The shadow Treasurer popped up saying, 'Well, we're going to do an investigation,' and two hours later he was absolutely humiliated by his leader, who got up at a press conference in front of the shadow Treasurer and said, 'No. We're going to cut it.' They absolutely hung him out to dry. It was a deep embarrassment for the member for Toowoomba South.

What is the threshold going to be lifted to? You have not said how much, you have not said how it is going to be costed and you have not said how you are going to pay for it. We all know how it is going to be paid for. They create big holes in the budget—progressive coal royalties, increasing the threshold for stamp duty release for first home owners, building a \$13 billion rail line to Maroochydore or whatever the cost is—and do not level with the people of Queensland.

**Mr Langbroek** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** Welcome back, member for Surfers Paradise. He has only been here for 20 years but stupendously embarrassed himself in question time with the most ridiculous point of order you could possibly imagine.

I want to respond to questions raised by the member for Toowoomba South. I am advised that Queensland Health is also receiving net additional capital funding of \$21.7 million, including timing adjustments for the satellite hospital program and eHealth, to address demand and cost pressures. We do not shy away from funding Queensland Health. We are not going to cut Queensland Health; we are going to fund Queensland Health. I said that back in June when I stood in this House for 40 minutes and said that we are going to invest in the capital program across the state. We know it has been impacted by the increased cost of goods and building supplies. We know it has been impacted by the increase in the cost of labour. We are not going to shy away from it. We are going to make a virtue of investing in the capital programs—building the roads and rail systems, hospitals, police stations and satellite hospitals—that the people of our state deserve.

I am also advised that the adjustment to satellite hospital expenditure was to accelerate delivery. Almost all of those satellite hospitals are operating now. I think they have treated about 30,000 patients since they opened. What a great contribution that has been to the treatment of people in the community, but also—

**Ms Fentiman:** People like them.

**Mr DICK:** I take the interjection; people do love them and they are voting with their feet. They are taking pressure off our big tertiary hospitals. We have seen a drop in presentations in some of the impacted metropolitan hospitals where services are now being decanted to the satellite hospitals. The accident and treatment centres in satellite hospitals are now drawing category 3 and 4 patients away from the big emergency departments so they can deal with more serious cases. They have been a roaring success and we will continue to support our satellite hospitals. I have also been advised that rolling stock is on track to be delivered and there are no delays from the appropriation bill.

The member for Toowoomba South also raised questions about the coal price cap. I can advise that those specific amounts are commercial-in-confidence, as they properly should be. I thank all members for a very robust debate on a very important bill. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart):** Under the provisions of the business program agreed to by the House and the time allocated for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions.

Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

### Third Reading

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (12.54 pm): I move—


That the bill be now read a third time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (12.54 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 11 October 2023 (see p. 2911) and Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill resumed from 29 November 2023 (see p. 3807).

## Second Reading (Cognate Debate)



**Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (12.55 pm): I move—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Following introduction, the bills were referred to the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for consideration, and I want to take this opportunity to thank the committee for its detailed consideration of both bills. I would also like to thank the organisations and individuals who made submissions to the committee and participated in the public hearing.

The committee made six recommendations in relation to the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The committee's first recommendation was that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for its support. Today I table the government's response to the committee's report. I also table an erratum to amend the human rights statement of compatibility for the bill to address a technical error.

*Tabled paper:* Legal Affairs and Safety Committee Report No. 63, 57th Parliament—Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, government response [\[290\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, statement of compatibility with human rights: Erratum [\[291\]](#).

I propose to move some amendments to the bill during consideration in detail to address concerns raised during the committee process and address some technical matters. The committee made only one recommendation in relation to the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill, and that was that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for supporting the passage of the bill.

The Miles government is committed to ending all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in Queensland, and these bills are critical milestones towards achieving this goal. I want to acknowledge the courageous victim-survivors, families and stakeholders who have advocated tirelessly for these changes and I pay my respects to the lives so needlessly lost to domestic and family violence.

For many Queenslanders, the first time they heard the term coercive control was four years ago following the murders of Hannah Clarke and her three children. I want to particularly acknowledge and thank Sue and Lloyd Clarke, whose tireless advocacy has increased community awareness of the dangers of coercive control. I also want to acknowledge the family of Allison Baden-Clay, her parents, Priscilla and Geoff, and her sister, Vanessa, who also chairs our Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Council. Thank you to all of you for your guidance, your knowledge and expertise in developing this bill. Through unimaginable pain and loss, I have been repeatedly astounded by the incredible advocacy of victim-survivors and their families, whose lives have been torn apart as a result of domestic and family violence.

The Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill amends various pieces of legislation to strengthen domestic, family and sexual violence laws and provide additional protections for victim-survivors. In 2021 the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce was established by the government to provide independent and expert advice about the best way to legislate against coercive control. The taskforce, led by the Hon. Margaret McMurdo AC, examined coercive control and reviewed the need for a specific offence. The taskforce heard from women and girls from diverse backgrounds about how coercive and controlling behaviour left them feeling isolated, invisible and with their sense of identity stolen. One victim-survivor described coercive control through the metaphor of being like a frog in hot water, not realising the danger until she felt trapped, weak and could see no way out. Another victim-survivor described coercive control as—

... very exhausting, debilitating, emotional, scary and abusive, but it's very hard to explain the abuse that has taken place to an outside person as it makes me sound crazy. It's very hard to live through and heal from.

The taskforce recognised that no current Queensland criminal offence captures the full range of abusive behaviours which may constitute coercive control.

The bill implements the government's response to the second stage of legislative amendments recommended by the taskforce to address coercive control. The bill creates a new offence of coercive control which carries a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment. The manner in which the offence is created has been directly informed by the taskforce's recommendations and findings about the experiences of victim-survivors and coercive control. I would like to take some time to address issues raised in the LNP's statement of reservation regarding the drafting of this offence.




Firstly, in relation to concerns raised around the particularisation of the offence, victim-survivors told the taskforce that it is hard to pinpoint particular stories because the coercive control and intimidation they experienced was ongoing and relentless. Importantly, the prosecution must still particularise and prove each element of the offence and a jury must still be satisfied of the essential allegation that the defendant committed the offence of coercive control. Secondly, in relation to the threshold of harm, the taskforce did not recommend that there be a requirement that the harm suffered be serious or severe.

Debate, on motion of Ms Fentiman, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

## MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

### Miles Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): When governments give up on integrity, they give up on governing for Queenslanders. Queenslanders had hoped that a change of leader would bring a change of direction, but, sadly, 2024 feels a lot like 2023. When it comes to integrity, it is feeling worse than ever before—with a Premier standing up in this House today to admit that he misled the parliament.

In a moment, the deputy leader will go through the time line of events to show just how implausible the deniability is, the member for Maroochydore will discuss the influence of lobbyists and this government being owed to so many people, which kicked off the integrity crisis, and then the member for Nanango will explain what happens when a government cares more about its polling numbers than the numbers on the bill in front of them on the kitchen table. What I will do is explain why this matters to Queenslanders.

When I first stood in this place I said that the things Queenslanders cared about and they wanted our focus on were the economy, service delivery and integrity. When it comes to the economy, the mixed messages that have been sent, the broken promises on taxes and this government's failures across the board have come home to roost. Service delivery and the big four crises that Queenslanders are living through are a direct result of a failure of this government, but integrity is the problem that continues to dog this government time and time again. While this government is distracted by its own cover-ups, the problems facing Queenslanders are getting worse. That is why this matters. This is a government rotting before the eyes of Queenslanders, while life is getting harder for them. The big four crises are impacting them every day, and they do not trust a decade-old government to fix it. That is why this matters.

Repeat criminals running rampant and the government saying it is a media beat-up—that is why this matters. The worst ambulance ramping in the country, ballooning waiting lists and a government blaming everyone else for a health system in deterioration—that is why this matters. The biggest rise in electricity prices in the country, three times the national average, and the government will not say why the major power plant blew up because of their failure over 1,000 days ago—that is why this matters. And Queenslanders struggling to keep a roof over their head, 502 days after a Housing Summit that was supposed to do something about it while it has got worse—that is why this matters.

Today the Premier said that he has been listening to Queenslanders who are struggling to keep a roof over their head. I am not sure why he has not been listening in the myriad roles he has had where he could have done something about it for nearly a decade. He says that the housing crisis has come as some sort of a surprise to this government. It has been nine years of deterioration. Poor state policies have driven down housing supply. It has driven Queenslanders out of their home, and the Premier of this state was driving by homeless people and did not stop to ask if he could help. That is where things have got to in this state.

In just the handful of days since we were last in this place, here are some of the things that have happened on the watch of a nearly decade-old government that wants to have a fourth term and 14 years in office. We have had more cost and time blowouts when it has come to the health crisis build, and the only reason they came to light is because the shadow health minister put in requests. The government failed to release the promised youth crime data. There were three KPIs that they said they were going to do something about. We found out that they did not—six months after making that promise.

We found out that the promise to build Sunshine Coast rail all the way to Maroochydore is not happening. It is twice the price and half the line, creating a car park at Caloundra—and the government wanted people on the Sunshine Coast to celebrate it. They are not celebrating it. The only way they are going to celebrate it is if the government changes in October and the LNP build it all the way, as was promised many years ago.

We had rumours that the member for Maryborough was going to jump ship to the crossbench. We had the Attorney-General announcing her retirement days after committing to serving on the front bench. We had a police commissioner who decided to leave during her term. However, the most important thing that has happened—the one that should motivate all of us for change—was the funeral of Vyleen White. That is something that matters. That family are owed so much for their bravery, for their resilience and for a failure of policy that has made Queensland less safe. We thank that brave family for their resilience during an incredibly tough time. We grieve with them and we are motivated to do something in the future to make sure there are fewer victims. In the end, that is what matters.


What truly matters when it comes to the youth crime crisis is not trying to cherry-pick figures from time to time. I have heard things like unique court appearances and ages, but it is the number of victims that matters. That is what matters. In Queensland, that number has never been higher. The number of victims in Queensland is at historic levels and it is getting worse. It is a government that has denied the existence of a youth crime crisis that is gripping every part of this state.

There is nowhere you can go in Queensland where someone does not give you a story about it. I have not heard anyone describe it as a media beat-up, though. I have not heard anyone call out the abhorrent claim, but I have not heard another Queenslanders describe it as a media beat-up. I have heard what it is like to lose your ute that you need to earn a living, I have heard what it is like to comfort a child who has had somebody in their bedroom while they were asleep, I have seen what it is like for families to grieve the loss of a loved one, but I have never heard anyone outside of this building say it is a media beat-up. I think it is time that behaviour gets called out.

In less than two weeks, Queenslanders in two of the 93 seats in this place will get an opportunity to have a vote in a by-election. The government's integrity will be on trial, and Queenslanders will be the judge. They will be the first to judge the performance of this government. They cannot change this government, and that is really disappointing. It would be great if they could, because I believe that Queensland would be a better place if we could get a new government. However, I will tell you what they can do. They can call time on what has been a disastrous start to 2024. They can say that they have had enough of the youth crime crisis, they can say that they have had enough of the housing crisis, they can say that they have had enough of the health crisis, and they can say that enough is enough on Queensland's cost-of-living crisis. They can say something else: two regions that have been treated as the jewels in the Labor Party crown can say that they will not be taken for granted anymore.

I would ask Queenslanders to see how seriously the LNP is taking these by-elections by the quality of candidates we have put forward in. In the case of Inala, Trang Yen is somebody who started her working career helping the most vulnerable there, and the president of the football club in that community. In the case of Ipswich West, Darren Zanow is not only a very well respected person in business but also a community champion—someone who has fought for the most vulnerable, someone who has dedicated his life to helping his community in the show society. We know the reality of these seats and we know that the Labor Party expect and demand to win—we get that—but we say to Queenslanders in these two areas what an amazing opportunity they have not to change the government but to send a message that enough is enough in the crises that Queenslanders are living through.

## Women, Health

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (2.10 pm): I rise today, in Women's Week, to stress how important it is that this government continues to deliver for women in this state. After hearing the Leader of the Opposition, I will have to start by saying that the Miles government has not and will not ever give up on integrity. In fact, we have some of the toughest integrity laws in the country. No misleading of parliament, no delusional or constant twisting of the truth or being bereft of ideas will change that particular point.

We have worked since we have been elected to ensure that the rights of women not only in the workplace but also in society are advanced and that they are able to access the services they need. It is needless for me to say how many of those advancements we have achieved. Only under Labor governments do women advance in society. It is very rare that we get any of these advancements under

an LNP government. To see this, you only have to look at the 10 years of the previous federal LNP government. Not one thing came out that advanced the interests of women. In fact, when it came to female workers in vulnerable industries, they went backwards.

We are proud to have achieved the first paid domestic and family violence leave, portable long service leave for the community services sector, IR protection for sexual and gender-based harassment, improved parental leave, pay equity in the Public Service, significant improvements in superannuation and pay equity in the bargaining process. In the area of workplace health and safety, the psychological code of practice was enacted last year.

There are also some wonderful initiatives. The Minister for Education spoke about the Share the Dignity vending machines available in all of our schools providing free period products for people who need them. My constituency is particularly happy about access to the treatment of UTI infections and contraceptive medication in community pharmacies. We partnered with the Endometriosis Association of Queensland to develop a specialised endometriosis app. We decriminalised abortion; we took it out of the Criminal Code. We have implemented safe access zones for termination clinics. We have made revenge porn a criminal offence.

These are the issues that women are talking about. These are the issues that they are concerned about. They are also concerned about those issues affecting not only Queensland in a post-COVID environment but also every single state and territory in Australia, if not the world—issues like cost of living. It is not a Queensland phenomenon; it is an issue across the entire country. For the Leader of the Opposition to come in here and to try to twist the truth and say that somehow it is a Queensland-only issue shows that he is absolutely lacking in integrity.

The housing issue is an issue not only here in Queensland but all over the country—everywhere—and internationally as well. Health is an issue across Australia, not just in Queensland. Those opposite come in here and twist the truth—like somehow it has been ignored over the period of a darned decent Labor government—as they try to make out that it is only an issue here in Queensland.


The most serious issue of contempt is that someone in this House invaded the privacy of one of our female members by taking a photograph of a personal phone, against the standing orders of this House, held onto it since October—the Leader of the Opposition was fully aware of what was going on—and then used it for their grubby political tricks.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** All of your tricks will not convince the people of Queensland. Everything we have done will be at risk if the Leader of the Opposition is ever elected to government. We will spend every day reminding people that all they are good for is to cut, sack and sell.

*(Time expired)*

### Premier, Integrity

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): The honourable Minister Grace Grace talks about the housing crisis, the youth crime crisis, the health crisis and all of the other mainland states in Australia. I simply ask the question of the minister—true, she says it is an issue not just in Queensland: what do all of those other jurisdictions have in common? They have Labor governments. No matter where they are in mainland Australia, Labor governments have failed on every one of those crisis points.

Deliberately misleading the House is one of the most serious allegations that can be raised against an individual, and Premier Miles, the misleader, would have us believe today that he is just a forgetful Joe Biden. It is the 'Joe Biden defence' that he just forgot what he said or what he text messaged one of his colleagues. You cannot use the Joe Biden defence in the Queensland parliament. Seriously! Is Premier Miles, the misleader, saying that he is the equivalent of Joe Biden in this Queensland parliament and he just forgets what text messages he sends? It is ridiculous—absolutely ridiculous!

We know that on 11 October the now Premier, in his role as deputy premier at the time, sent a text message to the member for Pumicestone. On 15 November the member for Burleigh asked the then deputy premier a very specific question with respect to an RTI application to which the deputy premier at the time replied—

I confirm ... I always comply with all relevant requirements when it comes to right-to-information requests.

The member for Burleigh asked a further question on 14 February 2024. He asked whether, within a very specific time frame, the member, now the Premier, had sent a text message to the member for Pumicestone. The Premier said—

I thank the member for Burleigh. I can.

He deliberately misled parliament. He knew about it.

Members of parliament do not forget sending text messages. It is just not something you forget. He knew that he sent it. What happened between the times the member for Burleigh asked those questions and last night? The Premier got caught out in a lie. He got caught out, and that is his problem. He misrepresented. He misled parliament and he thought he would get away with it.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member, I will ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.


**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw. The Premier thought he would get away with it, but he did not. Now they try to distract from the issue at hand. The issue at hand is that the Premier sent a text message to the member for Pumicestone—he knew he did—but he did not think anyone would find out, until evidence was shown on Channel 9 news last night. That is the catch: Premier Miles was caught out in his mislead of the House.

This scandal goes even deeper. I can reveal that, with regard to the RTI application that the opposition raised—we were questioning whether the then deputy premier produced evidence of these text messages—the RTI officer confirmed that no such documents existed. We heard that this morning. They said, ‘No such documents existed or were given to us.’ What I can say now is: the letter the Premier tabled this morning is a letter from the RTI officer to a staff member in the opposition office.

How would the Premier have a copy of an RTI private letter between an RTI officer of his former department and a staff member in the opposition office without him seeking that private information? When you click on the RTI application and then click on ‘application finalised’ it actually comes up and says ‘the information or documents has not been published in the disclosure log because no documents were released’. How did the Premier obtain a copy of a private letter between the RTI officer and the opposition office? That is an abuse of integrity processes. That is what the Labor Party have come to in this state. They are going after a whistleblower who has exposed the Premier for misleading the House. The only reason the Premier was exposed as the ‘misleader’ he was is because of a brave whistleblower who caught the Premier out in this misrepresentation and misleading the House. But no, typical Labor Party—they want to go after the whistleblowers. The Premier ought to explain to this House how he has obtained private information between an RTI officer and the opposition office that has not been published. This government is rotting before our very eyes.

*(Time expired)*

### Liberal National Party, Women

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (2.21 pm): It tells you everything you need to know about the opposition when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition gets up and says that what we have talked about in the House today has been a ‘distraction’. I tell you what, member for Kawana, talking about women’s rights in the workplace, talking about respect at work for women and talking about women’s health for Queensland women and girls is absolutely not a distraction—absolutely not.

**Ms Bates** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. I will take some advice. Member for Mudgeeraba, some of the language that we have heard you use in your interjections is unparliamentary. I would ask you to withdraw.

**Ms BATES:** I withdraw.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** To suggest that us talking about women being respected in the workplace, their privacy in the workplace and not having male colleagues leering over their shoulders and taking photographs of them is absolutely not a distraction.

I spoke this morning about women’s health. One of the issues that again came through very clearly in our consultation with women and girls was about a woman’s right to choose. As I said this morning, Labor will always defend a woman’s right to choose. It is a fundamental principle that we hold dear and will not compromise on because some things should be above politics. A woman’s right to decide if, when and how she has a child is absolutely one of those things. We know that almost every

one of those members opposite voted to keep abortion in our Criminal Code. We know that the Leader of the Opposition did not have the conviction or courage to tell women why he thought abortion should stay in the Criminal Code. He then tried to tell us 'you all know where I stand on this', whilst refusing to rule out criminalising abortion once again.

We all know that actions speak louder than words, and the LNP's decision to preference One Nation in the Ipswich West by-election truly does say it all. The Leader of the Opposition wants Queenslanders to believe that he is a respectable, moderate politician yet at the same time his party is giving political support to the party of Pauline Hanson. Why is that? Why does this matter so much? It is because it serves the Leader of the Opposition perfectly. We know that he is slippery with the truth and that he will say whatever it takes for him to get elected. Fundamentally, the LNP and One Nation are virtually identical when it comes to their stance on women's rights and women's access to health care. We know that the member for Mudgeeraba, the LNP's health spokesperson, voted to keep abortion in the Criminal Code and is quoted as saying, 'As a nurse, I do not offer my support to this vote.'

The LNP then went to the 2020 Queensland election promising to review and wind back our laws. One Nation also went to the 2020 election promising to wind back our laws and their official policy position is still to seek every opportunity to roll back 'brutal and extreme abortion law'. This is why the Leader of the Opposition has chosen to align himself with One Nation. He has chosen to align himself with Malcolm Roberts who has protested our abortion laws here in Queensland by saying that it was part of a global UN conspiracy agenda. At that same protest, Malcolm Roberts carried a sign with the current LNP members for Moggill and Oodgeroo. This is the same member for Oodgeroo who said that the former member for South Brisbane—a proud woman of Lebanese heritage—was on a jihad to legalise abortion. It is no wonder they get on so well with One Nation. This is the same member for Oodgeroo who will be replaced by Amanda Stoker, the infamously anti-choice far right activist. Stoker is such a fan of the far right political judges in the US who overturned *Roe v Wade*—


**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Kawana is warned under the standing orders.

**Ms FENTIMAN:**—that she has publicly called for Australian governments to appoint the same kind of judges here in Australia. This is who the Leader of the Opposition wants on his team—someone who has openly advocated for the politicisation of our courts in order to wind back women's rights. I say to the LNP: shame on you for partnering with One Nation and shame on you for not standing up for women and girls.

*(Time expired)*

### **Miles Labor Government, Lobbyists**

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (2.27 pm): I am proud to be a woman. I can define what a woman is, despite the Minister for Health failing to know. I want to address the integrity issues that are burning at the heart of this dodgy, rotten government—from the Premier admitting that he misled the House to the influence of lobbyists in the halls of power of this government where there is more than just a sniff about them not being appropriately registered. The fact is that the Premier fails to take action until he gets asked questions by the media.

If you needed more evidence that this government has walked away from integrity, you need to look no further than how cosy Labor is with lobbyists. After days of scrutiny, we have the stage-managed resignation of Kate Jones—is she a lobbyist; isn't she not a lobbyist; she is a special consultant working for a lobbyist—is more evidence that this government has learned nothing and shows how close they are to Labor lobbyists. This is Anacta 2.0. Queenslanders have not forgotten Anacta—the Labor lobbyists who ran the 2020 campaign for Labor, not at Labor Party headquarters but ensconced in the executive building at 1 William Street.

This government is addicted to Labor lobbying firms. We saw how close this Labor government is to Labor-aligned lobbying firms in Kate Jones's text to Premier Steven Miles this morning. It only proves that they have learnt nothing. The reaction from the Premier was too little too late. Minutes before question time, former Labor cabinet minister Kate Jones apparently texted Premier Steven Miles to say that she was resigning from her work for a firm which was undertaking lobbying in Queensland. This is only after the media had revealed her links and meetings with this government as a 'special consultant' through the lobbying firm Akin. The lobbying firm Akin was registered in Queensland days

before Anastacia Palaszczuk was removed as Premier. Now Kate Jones is credited for helping force premier Palaszczuk's resignation and in bringing about the elevation of her mate, the member for Murrumba, Steven Miles, to the role of Premier with her factional support.

This firm's only registered lobbyist is a former ministerial staffer of Kate Jones. However, Kate Jones was not registered as a lobbyist, despite recent scandals of unregistered lobbying and Labor mates being paid for their influence and access to the halls of power. When Kate Jones texted the Leader of the Opposition shortly before question time to advise that she was resigning from this company and then she texted the Premier to advise him that she had advised the Leader of the Opposition of this, the integrity smell over this government did not go away. The Premier's assertion until this point was, 'What's everyone worried about? Kate Jones is just a mate. We have known each other for years. Nothing to see here.'

**An opposition member:** 'We've been doing deals for years.'


**Ms SIMPSON:** The whole thing with these Labor lobbyists is that they are mates; they have known each other for years. They have learned nothing. The scandal over Anacta running Labor's campaign still had not registered with Premier Steven Miles, nor had the strong words in Coaldrake's report about people lobbying as third parties. I remind the Premier that Coaldrake in his report *Let the sunshine in* recommended all professionals offering paid lobbying services to third parties be registered.

The Premier still has serious questions to answer. I have asked the Integrity Commissioner to investigate how deep these lobbying relationships go within this government. The Coaldrake review exposed the dodgy, rotten behaviour of this government, and it is clear that nothing has changed under Premier Steven Miles.

Labor have given up on governing for people. They are more interested in governing for themselves. They are choosing their own political interests over the interests of Queenslanders, and the chaos and crisis under Labor continues under the Miles government. They have learned nothing. They care not for the ordinary people because it is more about staying in power than serving them and addressing the health crisis, the cost-of-living crisis, the crime crisis and the housing crisis that this government have been at the heart of.

*(Time expired)*

## Women

 **Ms KING** (Pumicestone—ALP) (2.32 pm): It is Queensland Women's Week, and our Miles Labor government is focused on listening to women and celebrating women's achievements while delivering the services that women need most. These are key issues for half the population of Queensland. Contrary to the words of the member for Kawana, they are not a distraction. We are working hard to deliver life-changing health care for women and girls. We are investing in better care for endometriosis, more mental health care for women, publicly funded IVF, more menopause support and the first ever statewide women and girls health hotline.

What a contrast with the LNP, who we have seen this week will stoop to the grubbiest depths to pull women down. While we are encouraging women to enter male dominated fields, whether it is via a fee-free TAFE placement at QBuild or by running for parliament, the LNP are mostly celebrating their toxic boys' club. The LNP and their weak leader will not rule out stripping back women's abortion rights. We know that they are planning another round of savage health cuts like their cuts to family planning and their cuts to domestic and family violence services. These issues are not a distraction; they are key issues for women right across our state. The LNP disrespect the women of Queensland when they call these issues a distraction. They wonder why they have a women problem.

We expect robust debate in this House. I am proud to stand up and fight for my community. We have standing orders here to protect us and centuries of custom and practice that are designed to respect the institution and dignity of the institution of parliament. As a woman in this place, I am accustomed to the way LNP members routinely disrespect female members during debate, but not once did I expect even a member of the LNP to leer over my shoulder and take non-consensual photographs and then spread them around as clickbait. Shame! On behalf of my daughter and all women of Queensland who might ever aspire to public life, I am offended, I am troubled and I am appalled. Shame on the LNP member who invaded my privacy in such a creepy way. Shame on him for disrespecting standing orders and shame on his colleagues who in their silence are endorsing that creepy, disrespectful and inappropriate behaviour—

**Mr Lister** interjected.

**Mr Hart** interjected.

**Ms KING:**—and I am looking at the member for Burleigh.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Resume your seat, please, member for Pumicestone. Member for Southern Downs and member for Burleigh, you are both warned under the standing orders.

**Ms KING:** The LNP's toxic attitudes to women are exactly the reason women like me run for office. You will not deter us. We will not stop until we have uprooted—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Direct your comments through the chair.

**Ms KING:**—your toxic beliefs root and branch. Sitting near the LNP members opposite, I saw their disrespect for women every day. I heard them make repulsive, sexualised comments about women MPs, particularly the former premier. I heard them degrade women and diminish us, calling us nodding donkeys. Yesterday we saw them take that to a new low with their sharing of non-consensual photographs.

At the end of the day, this is on the Leader of the Opposition. There are two choices here: he lets the LNP blokes in his team get away with bullying female MPs either because it suits him or because he is too weak to pull them into line. He should be standing up to this misogynistic, grubby culture—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, member for Nanango. You are on the speaking list. You will have your opportunity.

**Ms KING:**—but in true bystander fashion, he is too weak and too cowardly. If the LNP win the next election, this is the standard the women of Queensland can look forward to: community leaders who think it is acceptable, even admirable, to invade women's privacy, to take non-consensual photos, to harass women in the workplace, and to strip women's rights and cut women's services. You only have to look at who was seated behind me when that photograph was taken to have an idea who may have been responsible. There is the member for Burleigh, who was right there behind me. There is also the member for Coomera. We know that he is a keen amateur photographer. I call on whoever that member was to man up—

**Mr Hart** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, you can leave the chamber for one hour under the standing orders. You were under a warning.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Burleigh withdrew from the chamber at 2.36 pm.*


**Ms KING:** I call on whoever took that photograph to man up, take responsibility and apologise. If he will not, the weak LNP leader should try to make him—if he is up to it. I am not holding my breath, though, because I do not believe the LNP are capable of change when it comes to women. They do not respect women. They do not back women at work. They want to defund women's services. They want to take our jobs. They want to score their cheap political points at the expense of women's bodily autonomy—and you all know it is true. The LNP are 100 per cent toxic—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Comments will come through the chair.

**Ms KING:**—when it comes to their treatment of women, and the women of Queensland know this very well. In Queensland Women's Week 2024, the LNP have shown that in 2024 they still cannot be trusted when it comes to women. Queensland women simply cannot risk the toxic LNP and their weak, unprincipled leader.

*(Time expired)*

## Electricity Prices

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (2.37 pm): Queenslanders have now endured two straight years of huge electricity price hikes, with prices set to rise again this year. According to Foodbank Queensland, many people have started reaching out for support for the first time in their lives. In January the charity reported—

We're finding people in secure rental accommodation, dual income families, mortgage holders, are also being impacted and experiencing food insecurity—sometimes going hungry, so missing a meal or going whole days without eating.

This rise in the number of households experiencing food insecurity comes as inflation and the cost of living surge. Driving all of it is the steep rise in electricity prices, not to mention insurance and rates.

To demonstrate the scale of the problem, the Australian Energy Regulator, AER, has reported that the number of households in energy debt is soaring, with 170,547 energy customers taking part in hardship programs at the end of 2021-22. That is 23,286 more than in 2018-19. Today, energy costs have significantly reduced the real incomes of Queensland households, particularly lower income working households, small businesses and those living and working in the regions. Such outcomes are unsustainable and will lead to wasteful and inefficient allocation of resources over time.


Today, Queenslanders are paying some of the world's highest electricity, gas and fuel prices. Electricity bills alone have increased more than 20 per cent over the last two years. Since 2009 in Queensland the average price of electricity has risen from \$35 per megawatt hour to \$160 per megawatt hour in 2023. That is a 357 per cent over little more than a decade. That is what happens when you implement policies that limit production and the use of energy, the lifeblood of a modern, industrialised society.

The current crisis is just a tiny taste of how painful this energy transition is going to be for Queenslanders. As well as reining in energy production and switching to less reliable methods, the government is intent on limiting and managing energy demand. The AEMO's draft 2024 Integrated System Plan emphasises the central role to be played by Australian households in this energy transition through the use of distributed energy resources. These distributed energy resources, or DERs, are a key part of the government's energy transition road map. They enable operators to strategically shift demand from peak to off-peak hours and shed demand on the grid during supply shortages by reducing consumption—in other words, rationing.

Restricting or eliminating the use of fossil fuels is only going to lead to higher inflation and food prices. Every step of large-scale food production relies on fossil fuels and their by-products. Fertilisers and pesticides are a by-product of natural gas production while plastics and other materials are by-products of both oil and gas. Large tractors run on diesel fuel. The steel necessary for farm equipment is made using coal. Transportation fuels move the food from farm to table and the list goes on and on, and that is just for the agricultural industry. As a case in point, in the last two decades Germany has managed to boost its shares of wind and solar in electricity generation to about 40 per cent but could barely make a dent in the fossil fuel share of primary energy use which went from 84 per cent to 78 per cent. This fact alone should tell us the impossibility of what Labor is trying to do, and that is because the physical world is a lot harder to nudge than people.

The real reason green energy has utterly failed to reduce costs either at the pump or on the grid is because green energy is merely adding to fossil fuels and it is not substituting them. We are duplicating the grid with a costly, inferior system. Surely it is obvious to anyone that renewables plus backup is always going to be a lot more expensive than just backup alone. The reality is that we simply cannot run Queensland's modern industrialised economy on intermittent energy. It is impossible. We are not going to. Moreover, all of these new systems and technologies being added are creating so much complexity that it is going to be impossible to fix, yet what are we doing? We have more and more complexity, more and more inflation, more and more energy poverty and it is going to be more and more painful for ordinary workers and families. We urgently need a comprehensive review of the current whole market to compare with other models to see which is the best in terms of providing a reliable and economic supply. Continuing with the present flawed model, distorted by subsidies and price caps, makes absolutely no sense. I have one question: is your standard of living better or worse under nine years of this government and is it going to get worse again?

### **Torres Strait, Marine Infrastructure**

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (2.42 pm): In 2023 the state and federal governments announced an \$80 million investment—a fifty-fifty partnership to upgrade vital marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait. The road to fixing this age-old marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait has not been an easy one for the Torres Strait Island Regional Council—a small, non-rateable council covering a vast region of 15 inhabited islands. As members can imagine, keeping up with the ongoing maintenance costs for marine infrastructure was always going to be a costly task. For TSIRC, the ongoing damages incurred over the years from extensive use and extreme weather conditions weighed heavily on council cost. I was first elected in 2017 and since then I have worked closely with TSIRC over the years to explore options for government support to upgrade marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait. This issue of marine




infrastructure is not new for me. Coming from a small island community myself, I am very familiar with the condition of marine infrastructure in my home community of Yam Island. Additionally, I have inspected many other boat ramps and jetties in TSIRC's footprint to get a clear picture and to advocate in the best interests of the community.

The discussions around marine infrastructure have been ongoing, but I really want to take this opportunity today to talk about some of the highlights and key events that this government undertook to reach a positive outcome. In November 2022 the then minister for transport and main roads, Mark Bailey MP, and I met with the Torres Strait Island Regional Council at one of its ordinary meetings to discuss critical marine infrastructure in the region. At this meeting there was a request to match the \$40 million commitment by the federal Albanese government for a marine infrastructure upgrade. In September 2022 community cabinet was held on Thursday Island. During this time the transport minister and the ministerial champion for the Torres Strait, Shannon Fentiman, visited Dauan Island to inspect Dauan Island marine infrastructure. In October 2022 I had the pleasure of visiting Badu Island with Premier Steven Miles and Mayor Phillemon Mosby and took the opportunity to inspect marine infrastructure on Badu Island. We discussed the need for vital investment for infrastructure upgrades to unlock economic opportunities for these communities. I want to acknowledge the work of the current mayor of the Torres Strait Island Regional Council, Councillor Phillemon Mosby, who advocated fiercely for state and federal government investment to support the upgrade of critical marine infrastructure in the outer islands of the Torres Strait.

In March 2023 the state government held a cost-of-living summit on Thursday Island to hear directly from communities about their lived experience dealing with the everyday cost of living in the region. We acknowledge that the blue highway is an important part of everyday life for locals, supporting social and economic outcomes for these communities. Therefore, marine infrastructure is an essential part to support the lifestyle in many of these communities. It was during this time that the state government in partnership with the federal government announced an \$80 million investment—the largest marine infrastructure investment—to upgrade critical marine infrastructure in the Torres Strait and northern peninsula area. I want to commend and thank Premier Steven Miles for taking a keen interest to visit Badu Island with me to see for himself the state of the island's only marine infrastructure. We heard directly from locals about its use and also safety concerns they held for its use. We also discussed the economic benefits of a marine infrastructure upgrade and what that would mean for the community. The Premier and I learned that Badu Island hosts a number of cruise ships a year, unlocking opportunities for soft tourism and offering a unique experience to Badu Island people and culture. I am proud of our government's achievements and I am proud to represent the Miles government. We will continue to show up for Queenslanders every day. We are listening and we are delivering.

### **Member for Pumicestone; Cost of Living**

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (2.47 pm): I have sat in this House and just had to listen to a diatribe from the member for Pumicestone. On behalf of all LNP members, I completely reject what she was alleging. I have a question for the member for Pumicestone: if the member for Pumicestone's standards are so high, how come the member for Pumicestone did not out the Premier and how come the member for Pumicestone was complicit in the Premier's mistruth here in this parliament?

I will now move on to the cost of living—a fact and an issue that is hurting each and every Queenslander. All across this state, no matter where we go, Queenslanders are talking about the cost-of-living crisis. In terms of the bills that land in people's mailboxes and when they sit around their kitchen tables, what are the bills that are important to Queenslanders? They are talking about struggling to make ends meet. People are telling me that they are looking at turning their fridges off at night, whether they can afford to pay for groceries to put in that fridge to feed their kids when they go to school or choosing between paying their electricity bill or whether their son or daughter plays sport. We know that the weekly grocery shop has risen, and as a mum of three I know that firsthand.

Two weeks ago I wrote to the Premier asking the Premier to widen his supposed terms of reference for the inquiry into cost-of-living pressures, and let me be abundantly clear, and I hope the Premier is listening to this: given the misleading statements that he has been desperately trying to peddle—and we know the Premier likes to have misleading statements—the big supermarkets must absolutely be held to account. The critical drivers of the Queensland cost-of-living crisis must also be put under the microscope in the inquiry, including those that the state government is responsible for: the impact of electricity on rising grocery costs; the impact of skyrocketing insurance costs on grocery prices because of the crime crisis in this state; the impact of rising water costs, and let us remember

that this is a government that refuses to do anything about water; and the impact of increased transport costs on those grocery bills. Why? Because we have billions of dollars worth of backlogged road maintenance across this state.

Skyrocketing electricity prices have impacted businesses run by mums and dads. We have a minister in denial, who said that electricity prices are not going to go up in this state. Guess what: the minister has been called out, and so has this government. The Queensland Competition Authority and the Queensland Auditor-General have both said that lack of supply due to Callide C being offline for over 1,000 days—we have been told how the explosion happened but we do not know why—has contributed to increased prices. When there is a 19.9 per cent increase in electricity prices—triple the national average—that is a cost-of-living problem. When there is 6.7 per cent increase in health costs across the state—the highest in the nation—that is a cost-of-living problem. When there is a 4.2 increase in transport costs—the highest in the nation—and an 8.4 per cent increase in rent in Queensland, that leads to a cost-of-living crisis. There has been an 18.5 per cent increase in insurance costs because of the crime rate in this state. That leads to a cost-of-living crisis. There has been a 7.4 per cent increase in the cost of sports participation which leads to a cost-of-living crisis in this nation.

It is important to recognise that these are not just numbers on a spreadsheet; these are everyday people. In the last few weeks I have driven from Cairns to Mackay, stopping at many places along the way: Innisfail, Tully, Townsville, Ayr and Bowen. Let me tell members a story about Cheryl, who owns a fish and chip shop in Townsville. She told me how she is struggling to pay those huge electricity bills. She is supporting people who are down and out and she does not want to have to raise the prices of her chips or her fish. It is people like Cheryl who deserve to have an expansion of the cost-of-living inquiry to not only hold the big supermarkets to account but also hold this government to account for issues that affect everyday Queenslanders.

### **Redland City Council, Weinam Creek**



**Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (2.52 pm): There really is power in collaborating and working together to deliver for Queenslanders. I was pretty surprised, given that we are in caretaker mode, that Thursday a week ago Redland City Council announced that it had a preferred development partner for the Weinam Creek car park. The member for Kawana and I, I believe, are still on a unity ticket that it is a bit of a debacle down there and it is something that needs to be prioritised. I was surprised to see the media release, which says—

Redland City council has announced Consolidated Properties Group as the preferred development partner to deliver the multi-storey car park and retail precinct within the Weinam Creek Priority Development Area (PDA).

The Weinam Creek PDA master plan was approved in 2022 and is set to create a dynamic new destination, as well as an effective transport hub and gateway to the Southern Moreton Bay Islands.

In August, Redland Investment Corporation went out with an RFP process. They called for expressions of interest. It has taken until now for this media release to come out. We are some six months down the track and not once was I provided with any sort of briefing on what was happening in terms of what is a real priority: the car parking in that area, which is at a critical point. The LNP mayor is calling on me to do something when she has not, in all of that time, directly communicated with me to talk about how we could possibly collaborate. There is a non-binding MOU, as it turns out from the correspondence.

On seeing this media release I wrote to the mayor with questions, because the community rightly deserves to know what is the deal with the developer: what does that look like? I asked pretty common questions, such as how many car spaces are going to be provided. There are 10,000 people living on the islands. At the end of last year's council meeting, the council officers said that there had been a thousand new homes across those four islands. They have been ploughing in development across the islands without any plan to deal with parking.

In my letter to the mayor I asked how many car spaces are going to be provided and what is the time line for that. The media statement was a bit loose. It says two to three years. The next phase for the developer is the detailed design. There has to be an existing design. There should be a rough idea of how many car spaces there are. I asked if council was going to maintain ownership of that car park. That is a way we can control the cost of living for those communities. When we talk about genuinely helping with cost of living, council being able to control those prices by maintaining ownership is a very important question. The other question was about alternative arrangements for car parking during the construction process. None of those questions are answered at all. It is all very loose.

I am looking forward to some meetings I have later this week with both Economic Development Queensland and Redland Investment Corporation, which has, subsequent to my letter to the mayor, reached out and said, 'Can we give you a briefing?' It would have been really nice if they had engaged with me throughout that RFP process. They have done six to seven months of work without actually saying, 'This is what we're doing.' It is an important piece of infrastructure for our island communities.

I am looking forward to getting more information that builds on the letter from the mayor. The letter from the mayor is extraordinarily interesting. I am not sure what time of night this was written, but it is certainly very interesting. I am also looking forward to being able to collaborate with the mayor going forward. It has been extraordinarily challenging. Post that drink-driving offence, I think the engagement has been next to nothing.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 1 March 2024, from the Mayor of Redland City Council, Ms Karen Williams, to the member for Redlands, Ms Kim Richards MP, regarding the Weinam Creek redevelopment project [\[292\]](#).

Talking about the power of collaboration, I look forward to Jos Mitchell potentially being the next mayor of Redland City Council. I know that she is absolutely invested in the community. She will be transparent with information. She will consult and communicate with the good people of Redlands, particularly the island community, which is a really challenging space where water and ferries are the way that you get to and from your home. I am looking forward to that and to getting more information for my community on this very important project.


## CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL

#### Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Resumed from p. 363, on motion of Ms Fentiman—

That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (2.57 pm): The LNP will not be opposing either of these bills. We will, however, be moving amendments to one part of the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill relevant only to the Penalties and Sentences Act and the Youth Justice Act, which are also being amended by the bill. I will detail our reasons for doing so a little later in my contribution.

At the outset I acknowledge, as I think the Attorney did—and I notice the Attorney, having commenced her address, was stopped after four minutes, which is most unusual—the many organisations, community groups, families of victims and victim-survivors themselves for the tireless efforts they have made to address the pervasive and intolerable instances and effects of domestic, family and sexual violence. To those here in the gallery today, or those who may be in the gallery a little later today or may be taking note of these proceedings in other places, I want to say thank you for your advocacy, strength and perseverance. We should also pause to remember all those who all too tragically have lost their lives as victims of domestic violence—we have seen that play out many times in the media, much to our disgust—and the police, of course, who have to answer and respond to these terrible calls. Perhaps this bill, when it passes, will be some small recognition of that sacrifice, of that loss of life, and that it should not go unnoticed or be in vain.

I also want to acknowledge the work of my colleagues and friends Ros Bates, the member for Mudgeeraba and shadow minister for women and a former shadow minister for domestic and family violence; and Amanda Camm, the member for Whitsunday and shadow minister for women's economic security, the prevention of domestic, family and sexual violence and child protection. The member for Whitsunday cannot be here this week. She has provided a medical certificate to the House. I know that she would want to make a contribution and, in fact, take the lead on this debate but is unable to do so. Both Ros and Amanda are committed to improving the lives of Queensland women and children who experience, all too frequently and tragically, harm at the hands of others and also, let us not forget, while they are in state care.

This coercive control and affirmative consent bill is a significant and substantial piece of amending legislation. I will be addressing my comments to that first. The bill responds to a number of reports and inquiries, most notably and recently the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. It amends quite significantly 10 acts and three substantial regulations—namely, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Regulation 2023, the Evidence Regulation 2017 and the Recording of Evidence Regulation 2018. It also repeals the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Act 1978. Taken together, those acts and regulations are a substantial and important source of the criminal law and practice in Queensland. These are laws that have been in operation, particularly in the case of the Criminal Code, for very many years. In the case of the definition of 'consent', the law goes back to the original drafting of the code by Sir Samuel Griffith over 100 years ago. The antecedents of that definition are there.

Therefore, this takes the law in Queensland into uncharted waters with the introduction of novel concepts in the criminal law, particularly the new offence, in new section 334C(1), of coercive control. We have had discussions about what coercive control might be. There have been reports of what constitutes coercive control. Even as late as this morning the federal Attorney-General's department was issuing materials about what constitutes coercive control. However, we have never actually had a definition or an offence of coercive control.

The bill replaces the definition of 'consent' for the purposes of chapter 32 of the Criminal Code. Chapter 32 of the Criminal Code deals with rape and sexual offences. That definition currently states that 'consent means consent freely and voluntarily given by a person with the cognitive capacity to give the consent.' The proposed new definition states 'consent means free and voluntary agreement'. This, in effect, is said to change the view of women and girls as so-called sexual gatekeepers through the use of the word 'given' to equal and respected partners in sexual relationships through the use of the word 'agreement'. It follows findings on that matter by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce as outlined in its report. Many other changes relating to the law about rape and sexual offences are also being made in this legislation. Importantly, the bill expressly deals with the act of stealthing, which is a welcome addition and something that I have been commenting on for a considerable period.

In new section 334C, the bill introduces the new offence of coercive control. It is a new offence that strikes at the black heart of a behaviour that we see reported all too often and in too many instances of domestic abuse. It is a behaviour that we think we all know but that, in the vast range of human relationships, has until now defied legal definition and action. This bill attempts to provide that definition. In doing so, it has attempted to cast a very wide net and some have submitted that it is too wide. In particular, concerns are raised by the Law Society that the absence of particularity in the formulation of the offence or proof of each alleged act in the chain of acts in the offence will lead to unfairness and uncertainty.

In her short contribution, the Attorney-General referred to the LNP's statement of reservation and the raising of the issue of particularity about the offence, which is the need to specify each individual offence, each time the offence occurred and the elements of each offence. It is not just the LNP raising this issue. It is also a very real concern of the Queensland Law Society. The society's president, Ms Fogerty, made a presentation to the committee in which she raised those concerns and spoke to them.

In my view, the Law Society's submissions and those of its president and its CEO, should be considered very carefully. Let us remember: members of the Law Society, and particularly those who are members of their Criminal Law Committee and Domestic and Family Violence Committee, practice in this area of the law every day of the week. They are in the courts. They are dealing with these issues. When they raise concerns, they ought to be taken on board. These are concerns not just of the LNP; they are genuine concerns held by very many people in the legal profession, at Legal Aid Queensland and the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties. The lack of particularisation is understandable because coercive control is a new offence and it is difficult to put one's finger on any one event and to record any one time that it occurred. Often and understandably, there is a chain of events that leads to coercive control and that together amount to that offence. However, it must be taken carefully.

The element of intent in relation to each of those offences is another issue because intent traditionally establishes criminal liability in Queensland. Under the code in Queensland, it is not an offence in a general sense unless there is an intention to cause the offence. To remove that is a major change. It is important to note that the taskforce recommendation was that the offence be modelled on what was introduced in Scotland, which Professor Evan Stark referred to as 'a new gold standard' for criminalising coercive control. The Scottish model still partially maintains intent in the offence of coercive

control so to depart from the model is risky and, as I said, that has been raised before. Warnings and critiques must be closely monitored. We cannot have prosecutions fail due to poor or sloppy drafting. Where issues arise or may arise in the future, we must be vigilant to act on them to minimise adverse and unforeseen outcomes.

The key to the rollout of this new offence will be education and training, both for the wider community and the frontline officers and police officers involved. That was made clear in the taskforce report time and time again. In my discussions with the Hon. Margaret McMurdo, former president of the Court of Appeal, she personally indicated the necessity for a large, substantial and speedy investment in resourcing, training and education. She pointed to the Scottish model, where there were two years between the passage of the legislation and the introduction and prosecution of the offences as well as vast amounts of money involved in training people.

While we would like to be optimistic about this being rolled out effectively, our experience of the track record of this government when it comes to funding the entirety of the action against domestic and family violence makes us doubt their abilities to do so. I call on the minister to take the opportunity, in responding to this debate, to identify the funding the government will be putting on the table for the necessary preparation and training because during the committee process the department was asked, on a number of occasions, to outline what funding would be available and the department was unable to do so.

In volume 2 of the first report, the taskforce stated—

Queensland must implement systemic reforms before a new standalone offence criminalising coercive control commences. The offence should be introduced and passed, then time allowed so that all parts of the system are clearly aware of the elements of the offence and its implications.

The report went on to state—

... no new offence to criminalise domestic and family violence including coercive control be implemented until service system responses are improved.

This government has given us no reason to trust that that is occurring. The taskforce also stated—

The effective implementation of a new coercive control offence will be largely dependent on the willingness of the Queensland government to whole-heartedly embrace this reform and resource it appropriately. This will not be a cheap endeavour in the short-term. But the investment in doing this right is not only a moral obligation, but a financially sound one.

Again, I ask the minister: what resourcing is being put into this reform to ensure that this change will be effective?

With the introduction of the new offence, new definitions are required including for 'domestic violence' in new section 334B. A new concept of 'economic abuse' is defined as well as 'emotional or psychological abuse'. These are now found in proposed new section 334A of the code. The bill empowers a court to issue a restraining order whether a person is found guilty or not guilty or the prosecution ends in another way, perhaps in a *nolle prosequi* where the Crown does not proceed.

Amendments to the Evidence Act impose duties on the court about the types of questions that can be put to a witness. The public, including media, are now to be excluded automatically from trials where a complainant gives evidence. There is no public interest test. The only test is if an applicant's presence would serve the proper interest of the applicant and would not be prejudicial to the interests of the complainant. This legislation fetters judicial discretion. That discretion is being fettered in regard to the directions judges may give to juries when considering evidence, including evidence as to the time when a complainant made the complaint or, indeed, the absence of a complaint. There are now prohibited directions that a judge in a criminal proceeding may not make. This includes the so-called *Markuleski* direction as follows—

A *Markuleski* direction addresses the risk of unfairness that the accused will be denied the chance of acquittal on all counts, if given the state of the evidence, such a result ought reasonably to follow if the jury were to reject as unreliable any part of the complainant's evidence. Where an acquittal on one count would appear to require an acquittal on another (as, e.g., where the acquittal necessarily reflects adversely on the reliability of a complainant whose evidence is central to the other count), the jury should be told so.

This is expressly provided for in the current sentencing benchbook for the Supreme and District courts. The benchbook continues—

Particularly in sexual cases, it will often be crucial to tell the jury that any doubt with respect to the complainant's evidence in connection with one count should be considered when assessing ... overall credibility and, therefore, when deciding whether ... evidence is reliable in relation to other counts. A *Markuleski* direction is not always necessary. It is important to note that it is considered by the courts as addressing the risk of unfairness against an accused of the chance of an acquittal.

The bill goes on to make changes to the Penalties and Sentences Act. It is to be amended to include in the sentencing guidelines provisions about taking into account for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander offenders the 'effective systemic disadvantage and intergenerational trauma on the offender'. We will be taking issue on this change as we believe it substantially impedes on the foundational principle of individual justice in our criminal justice system.

As I have shown, this bill is far-reaching in its effect and substantial in its consequences. In this respect, while for some it will never be implemented quickly enough, it is a very real concern that the drafting was not open for consultation for three months as recommended by the taskforce. While the LNP committee members raised this, it was also, as I have pointed out in respect of other concerns, raised by others including the Queensland Law Society. Quite simply, no excuses provided can cover the fact that the recommendation was not followed and that proper consultation, including the draft bill being made available for a period of three months for such a significant piece of legislation, was limited at best. The danger, of course, is that the legislation is incomplete or just plain wrong and we find ourselves back here having to make amendments to get it right. We already see amendments circulated by the minister this morning. Having to do that does not serve the interests of anyone.

I could do no better than to repeat the well-drafted words of paragraph 3 of the LNP members' statement of reservation. It refers to the recommendations and goes on to say—

In doing so there is concern uncertainty will replace certainty and long established principles that underpin our criminal justice system will be weakened or in some cases abandoned. If this is the case then there must be a clear and obvious benefit in doing so. If this benefit cannot be established the real risk is that change will worsen an already unacceptable situation for both complainants and respondents and lead to delay, expense and uncertainty. Thorough and proper consideration is therefore essential. Regrettably this has not occurred to the extent necessary for such a significant piece of legislation.

As I indicated, this bill changes very substantially the law about rape. I want to deal with this very contested area. Rape is a terrible crime. It is abhorrent to all right-minded members of society. Offenders must be severely punished. Society, and women in particular, as most often but not exclusively the victims of this crime, must be protected. Almost three years ago to the day this House debated changes to the law of rape. In doing so, we relied to a large extent on the recommendations of the Queensland Law Reform Commission review of the offence. It pays to remember that the commission conducted a thorough and comprehensive review. It balanced the right to a fair trial, including the presumption of innocence of the accused and the need for the prosecutor to prove each element of an offence, with the fundamental right of complainants to liberty and safety and individual rights of bodily integrity and human dignity.

The commission examined transcripts of trials of rape and sexual assault cases up to 2018 in 135 trials. It analysed the Queensland Court of Appeal decisions in rape and sexual assault cases between 2000 and 2019 and reviewed transcripts of a further 76 trials in which consent or mistake of fact was raised. It consulted widely with all those groups and organisations representing people with an interest and received many submissions. After having undertaken this quite lengthy and detailed task, the commission resolved that the existing law did not require extensive changes. The commission said—

Detailed examination of the existing law in this area does not generally reveal significant issues for reform to the definition of consent or the excuse of mistake of fact, as it applies to rape and sexual assault. The Commission does not recommend wholesale changes to those provisions.

It went on to say—

One of the key strengths of the criminal law in Queensland is its combined certainty and flexibility. The Criminal Code sets out the general rules and the core elements of each offence and any excuses or defences. Their interpretation is permitted to develop on a case by case basis, having regard to the factual circumstances of each case and prevailing community attitudes and standards. The jury system is also a significant part of this process.

It went on to say—

The law regarding consent needs to be clear, for judges and juries as well as for the wider community. As a general aim, it is also desirable for the laws in Queensland to be reasonably consistent with those in other jurisdictions, taking into account fundamental differences between the common law and code jurisdictions—

so the differences among Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria. Further—

Reforms should also, where possible, be informed by available empirical evidence.

It went on to say—

... the Commission sees merit in amendments that aid in providing clarity to the existing provisions.

In March 2021 this House amended the Criminal Code to provide that clarity, taking on board those reforms. While there are fair reasons advanced for the change being contemplated by this bill to the law of consent and rape in Queensland, we must take care that in trying to create a better and safer environment for victim-survivors we do not inadvertently make things worse. That is my fear with this legislation and that is why I believe that a review within a reasonable time, say, three years from its proclamation, is necessary.

It can be easily foreseen in a new area of law in such a contested area between prosecutors and defendants that there will be a significant number of appeals to at least the Court of Appeal and subsequently to the High Court in this area. There will be considerable interest in the meanings of words such as 'free', 'voluntary' and 'agreement' in the context of this amended section. Delays and appeals serve no-one's interests. Back in 2021, with regard to the suggestions of change to the rape laws and the definition of consent I said—

... we remain open to the consideration of further legislative changes that, as I said in my opening remarks, are strongly supported by the evidence and that deliver a better system and outcomes than that which it seeks to replace.

That is still our position. We will be supporting these laws, but I must say that the evidence that this will result in a better system is thin on the ground. There is a great deal of hope—and we all hope—that it does lead to better outcomes, but we must remain vigilant and we must review the laws to ensure they are giving the better outcomes we hope for for all those who seek to call upon them. Ultimately, there is still much to commend the statement by the Law Reform Commission on page 14 of its report—

... there are limits to what the criminal law is practically and properly able to achieve in terms of changing social practices. Sexual offences occur within a broad social context and raise complex issues that go beyond the criminal law on consent. Legislative amendment is only one means of addressing these issues.

That goes back to the position I had in relation to the money being made available for education and training.

The criminal law has its limits. As a society we must all do more to ensure safe, rich and fulfilling lives for all of us. We need to engender more respect for each other, not less. But these are not tasks of the criminal justice system alone; they are tasks for all of us.

I would also like to thank the victim-survivors who came forward to share their experiences and have input into this bill. It is through them bravely retelling and reliving their experiences that we can get the change needed to make a safer Queensland. As one person presenting to the committee stated—

It is not just about getting a DVO; it is about being believed, being taken seriously and getting the abuse to stop.

Our hope is that action taken in this bill will make a difference to those people.

I want to turn now to the proposal to change the Penalties and Sentences Act and, in particular, to insert provisions in sentencing guidelines referring to 'systemic disadvantage and intergenerational trauma' if the offender is an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. I table my proposed amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, amendments to be moved by Mr Tim Nicholls MP, accompanying explanatory notes and statement of compatibility with human rights [293].

The LNP does not support this change. We do so because it offends against the principle of individual justice in this country. An individual is tried for each individual offence. A verdict is rendered on each charge. A sentence is delivered based on the individual aspects of each case, the nature of the offence, the impact on the victim and the circumstances of the offender. Ours is not generally a 'set and forget' formulaic system of justice. Our courts deliver individual justice relevant to the facts of each case.

When it comes to sentencing—and, in particular, sentencing guidelines for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders—the High Court has had its say on this type of approach. In *Bugmy v The Queen* in 2013 the High Court decisively dismissed the proposition that a sentencing court should take judicial notice of the systemic background of deprivation of Aboriginal offenders. It regarded such a proposition as 'antithetical to individualised justice'. It said—

There is no warrant, in sentencing an Aboriginal offender in New South Wales, to apply a method of analysis different from that which applies in sentencing a non-Aboriginal offender. Nor is there a warrant to take into account the high rate of incarceration of Aboriginal people when sentencing an Aboriginal offender. Were this a consideration, the sentencing of Aboriginal offenders would cease to involve individualised justice.

In fact, the High Court raised the spectre that such a provision similar to the one we are discussing might be discriminatory because it might be thought to contravene the principle of individualised justice by establishing a sentencing consideration based purely on race.

In *Munda v Western Australia* in 2013, a case decided at the same time as *Bugmy*, the High Court found it to be 'contrary to principle to accept that Aboriginal offending is to be viewed systemically as less serious than offending by persons of other ethnicities'. The High Court observed—

To accept that Aboriginal offenders are in general less responsible for their actions than other persons would be to deny Aboriginal people their full measure of human dignity. It would be quite inconsistent with the statement of principle in *Neal*—

another case—

to act upon a kind of racial stereotyping which diminishes the dignity of individual offenders by consigning them, by reason of their race and place of residence, to a category of persons who are less capable than others of decent behaviour. Further, it would be wrong to accept that a victim of violence by an Aboriginal offender is somehow less in need, or deserving, of such protection and vindication as the criminal law can provide.

I will discuss that more in consideration in detail.


I want to turn quickly now to the position in relation to the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill. Let us be under no misapprehension here. This bill is here entirely because this government, the now Miles and formerly Palaszczuk government, comprehensively failed Queenslanders when it came to the operations and functions of the DNA lab. Utter failure—that is the only way to describe what occurred with DNA testing at Forensic Services Queensland. When it came to the operation and functions of the DNA lab, Labor is the guilty party. No other words cover it. Two inquiries, hundreds of hours, hundreds of millions of dollars, untold angst and waste—all because the health minister at the time, the now Attorney-General, failed to take notice of what has happening under her very nose. Now, as a result, a cherished and longstanding principle of law has to be overturned because quite simply this government could not get its act together.

From the beginning, the LNP have stood by the victims and scientists and called for the issues in this lab to be thoroughly investigated and addressed. I first raised this matter in a speech in this place in December 2022. We have asked questions of this House. We remember the now Attorney-General who as health minister said that it was all just a beat-up, that it was being done for political purposes. Two inquiries later, over 11,000 cases under review and delay after delay after delay for current cases—for people who are simply seeking a death certificate following a plane accident so they can administer the probate of a will of their dearly beloved—and Queenslanders are still paying the price.

The now health minister stayed quiet while this was occurring. The then attorney-general and minister for justice, despite this matter being one of the greatest failings of the justice system, stayed quiet. We asked questions at the beginning of 2021. 'Shandee's Story', the *Australian* podcast series, kept going. The then minister for health in February 2022 said, 'There has been no evidence of systemic failings.' On 29 March, in answer to another question from the opposition, the then minister for health confirmed there would be a review, noting—

We should not in any way taint their reputation. There are allegations being made. I think it is important that we ensure public confidence. That is why I am referring this on.

It missed the point all along that this is not just about confidence. It is not just about the public thinking there are no issues. It is about the victims and justice for the victims. We have spent, as I say, hundreds of thousands of dollars. We have had two inquiries. At the moment we are still waiting for the outcome of the reviews into all of these cases. There is a special unit in the Director of Public Prosecutions. There is a special unit in the police department. Forensic Services Queensland cannot do the work that they should be doing. They are sending it interstate and overseas because of the delays. Over 103,000 samples potentially need to be retested, with 37,000 cases. There have been delays and costs. Justice delayed is justice denied. This is an abject failure. We will be supporting this bill because we support justice for victims, but we will never let this Labor government forget their failures when it comes to testing at the DNA lab.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (3.27 pm), continuing: I continue my contribution to the second reading debate. Before the break I was addressing some of the issues raised in the LNP's statement of reservation. I talked about how, firstly, in relation to concerns that were raised about the



particularisation of the offence—and I did want to say this again—importantly, the prosecution must still particularise and prove each element of the offence and a jury must be satisfied of the essential allegation that the defendant committed the offence of coercive control.

Secondly, in relation to the threshold of harm, the taskforce did not recommend that there be a requirement that the harm suffered be ‘serious’ or ‘severe’. This was reinforced during consultation where stakeholders told us that in making it a requirement that the harm be ‘serious’ it is incongruent with the nature of coercive control where many of the behaviours may be intended to be perceived as benign or inconsequential. In fact, Lloyd Clarke eloquently articulated these complexities in an article written for the *Australian* earlier this year. In Lloyd’s words—

Coercive control is about taking away the person’s voice, and ultimately their identity. That’s how control is truly exerted. Like water torture, it’s a steady drip, drip, drip of tricks and manipulation that leaves the victim entirely at the mercy of their tormentor.

When referring to Hannah’s case, Lloyd said—

None of these actions in isolation could reasonably be considered a sign of impending murder. But when they are viewed as a concerted pattern of behaviour, the warning is very clear.

I now turn to the amendments in the bill which strengthen sexual offence laws. As recommended by the taskforce, the bill amends the meaning of consent in the Criminal Code including by changing consent to mean a free and voluntary agreement between the parties to a sexual activity. As one victim-survivor told the taskforce, ‘It’s hard to say no anyway. They might get violent and hurt you. Half the time your body freezes up.’ There will now be clearer boundaries in place for consensual sex, and these amendments better reflect community expectations of equality and mutual respect in relationships. The bill also expands the list of circumstances where there is no consent.

The statement of reservation in the committee’s report, whilst acknowledging that affirmative consent amendments were broadly supported, raised the concern that the bill will criminalise spontaneous sexual intercourse between long-term partners and married couples where consent can be based on non-verbal cues. The model of affirmative consent in the bill requires that a person says or does something to ascertain consent, which can include a non-verbal cue. The bill does not prohibit the jury from considering the context of an existing relationship between the parties to the sexual activity. However, it remains essential, regardless of a person’s relationship status and regardless of whether they are married or not, that there is consent to every sexual act every time. That is what this bill requires. Submissions to the taskforce made it clear we are still finding that some women may not view rape in marriage as assault, or at least the view is blurred by long-term relationships. This is really very often supported by offenders’ tactics. Rape can happen between people who are married or in long-term relationships. The taskforce was alarmed at the lack of understanding about this in the community.

I note concerns about the breadth of the amendment, which provides that a person is taken to have not consented to an act if they have participated because of fear of harm of any type. The approach taken in the bill intentionally focuses on whether or not the fear of harm is why the person participated in the sexual act rather than the seriousness of that harm. That is aligned with the approach in Victoria. If the bill required the harm to be serious, that might suggest it is acceptable for somebody to participate in sexual activity because they are afraid of being harmed as long as that harm is not serious. This is not the message we want to be sending to our community about consent.

The bill introduces a new provision which provides a non-exhaustive list of circumstances where there is no consent. This includes where the person participates because of a false or fraudulent representation by the other person about whether they have a serious disease and that disease is transmitted to the person. The Queensland government acknowledges the advocacy of submitters to the committee in relation to this provision and recognises the need to ensure the bill does not unintentionally criminalise or stigmatise persons with HIV.

Recommendation 3 of the committee report concerns a review of this serious disease provision and recommends that the government consider amending the bill to remove that provision pending the outcome of that review. As outlined in our government’s response to the committee’s report and acknowledging the concerns raised by stakeholders, especially the advocacy from Queensland Positive People and their president, Mark, who is here today, the government will review the provision relating to the transmission of a serious disease following passage of the bill and will delay the commencement of the provision pending the outcome of that review and further consultation.

The bill will also expressly reference stealthing conduct as non-consensual sexual activity. Failing to use or interfering with a condom erodes a person's right to bodily autonomy and is a form of reproductive coercion. The taskforce found that stealthing changed the nature of the sexual act for which consent was given. I want to again acknowledge the work of Chanel Contos and the many other advocates who raised awareness of this particular form of violation. I am confident these changes mean that the law will better reflect community expectations of equality and mutual respect in sexual relationships and will protect the rights of Queenslanders to choose whether and how they engage in sexual activity.

The bill also amends section 348A of the Criminal Code which provides for the operation of mistake of fact in relation to consent. A defendant will now not be able to rely on their mistaken belief that a complainant was consenting as being reasonable if they did not at the time or immediately before an act say or do something to find out whether the complainant was consenting. These amendments are far better aligned with modern community expectations. Narratives of implied consent will no longer be acceptable and the voices and experiences of victim-survivors will matter.

The committee's report made a number of recommendations which are addressed in detail in the government response. The government has always recognised the need for comprehensive review and evaluation of the reforms in the bill to ensure amendments are operating as intended and has committed to legislating to provide a statutory review to occur as soon as practicable five years after the last of the relevant amendments from both taskforce reports commence.

Recommendation 6 of the committee report arises out of concerns about the publishing of identifying information about deceased First Nation complainants. Acknowledging these concerns, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail of the bill to provide that a court may have regard to any cultural considerations relevant to the applicant or complainant when making a complainant privacy order.

I want to assure stakeholders that we are aware of the importance of delayed commencement for key reforms in the bill to support necessary implementation activities. In response to the member for Clayfield's suggestion that I put on the table how many resources the government is committing to implementing these important initiatives, I can advise the House that the government has now committed well over half a billion dollars to implement the recommendations of the taskforce reports as well as the Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service Responses to Domestic and Family Violence. Work is already underway to implement the foundational elements identified by the taskforce to support the operation of these amendments. We are ensuring that we are strengthening the service system, undertaking community awareness-raising and education activities, and supporting the training of frontline staff.

Turning now to the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill, this bill establishes mechanisms to correct possible erroneous outcomes and maintain the balance in our criminal justice system. In December 2022 the Commission of Inquiry into Forensic DNA Testing in Queensland was established to ensure transparency and public confidence in relation to testing and analysis of DNA and the criminal justice system more broadly. The uncovering of the breakdowns at the Queensland forensic laboratory were due to the ongoing resilience and advocacy of Ms Vicki Blackburn along with scientific experts who pursued truth and transparency. I particularly want to acknowledge Dr Kirsty Wright. I want to thank both Vicki and Dr Wright for all they have done to bring these issues to light.

The inquiry observed that failings at Queensland Health Forensic and Scientific Services raised the alarming likelihood that not only have many offenders not been charged because of deficiencies in the management of the lab but also some offenders have been acquitted wrongly. In light of these matters it was identified that Queensland has the most restrictive exception to double jeopardy of any Australian jurisdiction. The bill makes important amendments to ensure an acquitted person can be retried for serious offences such as manslaughter, attempted murder and rape if there is fresh and compelling evidence. The bill also clarifies that evidence is not precluded from being fresh solely because an expert witness failed to exercise reasonable diligence. Fresh evidence could include new forensic evidence.


I acknowledge that some stakeholders raised concerns that the expansion of the exception challenges some fundamental principles of our criminal justice system. However, I agree with Lord Justice Auld's comments in his 2001 review of the United Kingdom's criminal courts. He said—

If there is compelling evidence ... that an acquitted person is after all guilty of a serious offence, then, subject to stringent safeguards ... what basis in logic or justice can there be for preventing proof of that criminality? And what of the public confidence in a system that allows it to happen?

A rational legal system ought to be adjusted to permit new and conclusive evidence, such as DNA evidence, to be taken into account. This should be done with the proper safeguards in place and only applied to acquittals for offences that sufficiently damage the integrity of the system. The criminal justice system is dependent on the participation of victims and members of the public, and therefore it is vital that it evolves so that it remains transparent, accountable and relevant.

The bill also includes a framework for subsequent appeals against conviction if there is fresh and compelling or new evidence. Whilst wrongful convictions are rare, the criminal justice system is not infallible and there is a risk that an innocent person may be convicted. The subsequent right of appeal in the bill provides a transparent and impartial mechanism to correct a miscarriage of justice if a wrongful conviction has occurred. Again, this is critical to ensuring public confidence in the administration of criminal justice in Queensland.

Today is a significant milestone for Queensland's criminal justice system. These reforms are central to improving our responses to domestic, family and sexual violence and ensuring possible erroneous outcomes can be corrected and balanced in the criminal justice system. I once again want to acknowledge those who participated in the committee process and the work of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. Finally, to the victim-survivors and their families and friends who have shared their stories and experiences in the hope that others will not have to go through what they have, we hear you and we thank you. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (3.41 pm): I rise to speak to the cognate bills being debated: the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill. The Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, in its report No. 63 of the 57th Parliament, tabled in this Assembly on 19 January 2024, recommended to the Assembly that the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be passed. The Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee, in its report No. 1 of the 57th Parliament, tabled in this Assembly on 19 February 2024, recommended that the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill be passed.

The objectives of the coercive control and affirmative consent bill are to: firstly, implement the government's response to the second tranche of reforms recommended by the taskforce in chapter 3.9 of the taskforce's first report, *Hear her voice: report one—Addressing coercive control and domestic and family violence in Queensland*, building on the groundwork established by the Domestic and Family Violence Protection (Combating Coercive Control) and Other Legislation Amendment Act, including by introducing a new offence to criminalise coercive control; secondly, give effect to the government's response to a range of recommendations from the taskforce's second report, *Hear her voice: report two—Women and girls' experiences across the criminal justice system*, relating to domestic and family violence, sexual violence, publication restrictions and women and girls as accused persons and offenders, including amendments to create an affirmative model of consent in Queensland; thirdly, progress further amendments to abolish or reform particular jury directions, re-examining recommendations 65 and 66 of the *Criminal justice report* of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, in light of report two; fourthly, implement the government's response to two related domestic and family violence recommendations from the Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service Responses to Domestic and Family Violence report, *A call for change*; and, fifthly, amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to allow a court to make an order to extend a police protection notice in exceptional circumstances.

The report tabled presents a summary of the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's examination of the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The committee's task was to consider the policy to be achieved by the legislation and the application of fundamental legislative principles—that is, to consider whether the bill has sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of individuals and to the institution of parliament. This bill implements a host of

recommendations from multiple inquiries, including the *Hear her voice* reports from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, the commission of inquiry into the Queensland Police Service and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

Years of investigations, reviews, hearings and submissions at both levels of government across Queensland have shown one thing: the need for change. This bill is about change, and that is good. We need change. We need to change how we think about and how we treat consent. We need to change how the criminal justice system responds to coercive or controlling behaviour. We need to change how juries are to be directed, how first-time domestic violence offenders can be channelled towards rehabilitation and what considerations exist when deciding bail and sentencing.

This is a considerable amount of needed change but, above all, this bill is about one thing. It is about changing the experience of girls and women who have had to journey through the police and court system—a system that is designed to protect them and give them justice. Sadly, this is a system that has let many of them down. It is not enough to call out the behaviour, draw attention to the statistics or have an awareness campaign. We have been there and done that but nothing changed. It is not enough to have White Ribbon Day or the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. What we do need is deep, structural reform.

The coercive control and affirmative consent bill achieves that and will amend over 10 pieces of legislation, including the Criminal Code, the Evidence Act, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act, the Penalties and Sentences Act and the Youth Justice Act. It is a privilege to be part of a government that is tackling one of the greatest social issues of our time head-on. Our government has sat down with stakeholders, listened to the experts, heard the stories of victim-survivors and examined the facts. This is a government that is carrying out major reform, rather than tinkering at the edges and failing. We are a government that is making things happen so that no-one is left behind.

The objectives of the double jeopardy exception and subsequent appeals bill are to enhance criminal justice system responses to possible wrongful convictions and unjust acquittals by: establishing a statutory framework to allow a person convicted on indictment or of a summary offence to make, with the leave of the Court of Appeal, a subsequent appeal against the conviction; and expanding the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception to 10 prescribed offences in addition to murder. In expanding exceptions to the double jeopardy rule and providing an avenue for subsequent appeals, this bill modernises core aspects of Queensland's criminal justice system by enhancing how we respond to unjust acquittals and wrongful convictions.

The rule of double jeopardy and the principle of finality provide important safeguards against procedural abuse and should undoubtedly be preserved. However, it is often necessary to update fundamental civic principles as community expectations evolve. I believe this bill strikes an appropriate balance between reform in the spirit of justice and the preservation of the protections enshrined in these long-established principles.

In every other Australian jurisdiction, double jeopardy exceptions encompass serious offences such as rape, attempted murder and certain sexual offences against children. In Queensland at the moment, the exception applies only to murder. This broad application of the principle of double jeopardy has perhaps resulted in the acquittal of those accused of the most abhorrent of crimes when the evidence indicated their guilt.


The bill's provision for a subsequent appeals framework is an equally significant reform for Queensland. Just as the community has an expectation that guilty parties are convicted of crimes when evidence points to their guilt, the community expects that those convicted of serious crimes are given the opportunity to have these convictions overturned when evidence emerges indicating their innocence.

The bill will not limit the number of subsequent appeals a convicted person may make under the new subsequent appeal framework; however, they must obtain the leave of the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal must be satisfied that a subsequent appeal has a reasonable prospect of success. The bill also provides that the right of subsequent appeal applies retrospectively to convictions, original appeals and applications for leave to appeal that have occurred prior to the bill's commencement on the ground that there is fresh and compelling evidence or new and compelling evidence.

The committee notes the broad support from stakeholders for a subsequent appeals framework that brings Queensland into alignment with other Australian jurisdictions. The committee believes that individuals who have been wrongfully convicted deserve as many opportunities as reasonable to have their case reheard, especially if it involves evidence that did not exist, or was not available, during the original trial.

Stakeholder feedback provided during the committee's investigation was supportive of the inclusion of another legislative pathway, with the Queensland Law Society stating support 'for the defendants who have already unsuccessfully appealed to the Court of Appeal but then come into possession of further evidence'. The Queensland Law Society added that 'defendants can have defective trials and appeals which are effectively no fault of their own'.

The Criminal Code provides two exceptions to the double jeopardy exception rule and allows the court to order a retrial if: the charge is murder and there is fresh and compelling evidence against the acquitted person—fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception; or the charge is for a 25-year offence and acquittal is tainted. The bill proposes to amend the Criminal Code to expand the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exceptions. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (3.50 pm): Four years ago, our state and our country were shocked and horrified to see the deaths of Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children. To see these four lives taken, seemingly so happy and content on the exterior, by a controlling and manipulative husband and father was deeply troubling. Their images are etched into the memories of Queenslanders, and I pay tribute to the work of Sue and Lloyd Clarke following this tragedy. I am constantly in awe of the victims in our state who harness their grief to speak up for what matters, always hoping to prevent another family going through the devastation they have. Sue and Lloyd, Hannah would be so proud of, and grateful for, what you have done. While your grandchildren have had their chance to grow up taken away, I am confident your legacy will help make the world that children are growing up in safer than your beloved grandchildren experienced.

I have been committed to standing in this chamber and speaking against the scourge of domestic violence for many years now. As a survivor of domestic and family violence, I have always been not only sympathetic on these issues but also empathetic. Whilst, like many survivors, I have learned coping mechanisms to deal with the memories of my own experiences, it is always brought sharply into focus when I continue to hear the stories of other women and children who, despite all the media attention and legislation, continue to suffer.

When I was a child I witnessed my own mother as a victim of coercive control but did not realise it at the time: seeing my mother begging for money to play bowls or getting out a dress that she had bought and hidden months earlier and telling my father that she bought it from the op shop; seeing my mother's friendships with ladies she had met whilst doing the one thing she was allowed to do, which was attending to the flowers at the local church, choose not to remain friends with my mum because they knew what was happening in her life and they could not understand why she did not just leave; and watching her schoolteacher friends not come back to our house for barbecues or birthdays because they witnessed the abuse and they did not want to be a part of it—and, of course, at the same time not one of them ever reported it to the police. Watching my mum have to lie, hide things and try and work her way around my father to have some sort of a life was sad.

This bill criminalises the offence of coercive control. As the former shadow minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence, I have long been a strong advocate against all forms of violence to women and children, including coercive control. In as far back as 2017, the LNP had a suite of reforms to combat these issues, including a standalone summary offence for domestic violence which included coercive control, elder abuse and financial abuse. Domestic and sexual violence champions at the time thought that without it being included in a summary offence the onus of proof in coercive control would be left up to the victim and make it much harder to convict the perpetrator. Of course, domestic violence and coercive control do not end outside the bedroom door. I know that my mother often was the victim inside the bedroom and often used it as a method to calm my father down so that he did not hurt us or anyone else.

It has been a long time coming and there is still much work to be done to make sure we are ready as a state to make it effective. What concerns me is not criminalising coercive control; it is the ability of the government to use the offence appropriately to protect women. The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce made it very clear that this legislation would need extensive training and education prior to

its enactment, but when it comes to recommendations this government has proven itself unable to deliver. In just one example, the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board has made multiple recommendations regarding Queensland Health and the need to train frontline workers in recognising the signs of domestic and family violence. However, the Auditor-General in his 2022 report *Keeping people safe from domestic and family violence* was still asking for years-old recommendations to be enacted as a priority. This was following a 2022 coronial inquest where at least 20 risk factors for homicide of an intimate partner had been present at the time of the victim's death. It cannot be the case that this government only acts on the headline and does not deliver the changes needed to make this work. This offence will only be as useful as this government makes it. Without the right training and education, it could likely lead to unjust outcomes and unintended consequences.

I understand there are concerns that have also been raised by the Queensland Law Society. The LNP want to back these laws because we do believe coercive control should be an offence; however, we must monitor the implementation and ensure we are getting the right and just outcomes.

The resourcing of domestic and family violence services as well as sexual assault services with the introduction of affirmative consent must be addressed. I know the women who operate these services. They put in their all day in and day out, stretching out every last bit of funding. They are already on their knees with the pressure of increased demand. It has often been quoted to me by those on the front line that they are sick of review after review and outcomes that do not change. In their words—

The government puts out huge glossy reports and brochures and when you open the front door, the funding cupboard is bare.

On many occasions when the services are so stretched they have in the past referred to me for help. My group of domestic and sexual violence warriors is a group I have where we wrap services around women at all hours of the day and night. I am blessed to be able to organise rapid responses for women who fall through the gaps, and I will continue to do so. However, my concern is that, as always, other members of parliament do not have access to a group like I have and that women are not receiving the services they need when they need them.

It is also concerning when the government's own funded groups like DVPC on the Gold Coast and DVConnect tell victims: 'Go see Ros Bates. She will get something happening for you.' So I was concerned to see in the explanatory notes this statement—


The Bill is likely to increase demand for courts, police, the legal profession and funded domestic, family, and sexual violence service providers due to the increase in the number of matters being reported or coming before the courts, as well as an increase in the complexity of matters being heard. This demand will be monitored, and any cost impacts will be assessed and included in future budget processes.

Instead of front-ending the money, it has been proposed that these services, already under pressure, wait until they are likely completely crippled before they can get an uplift.

The government needs to address the disparity of funding between domestic violence services and sexual violence services. I know that the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence, which has never turned anyone away, continues to find the funding to assist domestic violence victims on the Gold Coast and stretch its own shoestring budget to do it. It is simply not fair for this workforce, and they are our front line. I implore the government to offer as much support as possible to these services to ensure we can get the best outcomes for women and children suffering domestic and family violence and sexual violence.

The LNP will continue to stand up for victims of domestic and family violence. I will be attending yet another Red Rose Foundation rally for the five women who have allegedly been killed at the hands of domestic violence already this year. I have been to so many of these over the past nine years I have lost count, yet the number of women and children allegedly murdered by an intimate partner continues to rise.

The LNP wants justice for sexual assault victims, and we must ensure the law strengthens the chance of prosecution and leaves no room for error. On too many occasions I have worked with rape victims and the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence and have seen the alleged perpetrators let off. Even worse, when only six per cent of rape victims' cases ever go to court, it makes you wonder if this legislation will address that problem or confuse the problem and make it more difficult for women to come forward and more difficult to get to court for a conviction. There are simply too many, and we must do better. We owe it to our daughters, our sisters, our mothers, our aunts and our friends. All Queenslanders deserve to be safe in their own homes.

 **Mr HUNT** (Caloundra—ALP) (3.59 pm): I rise to make this contribution to the cognate debate on the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023. As always, I thank my fellow committee members: the chair, Peter Russo, the member for Toohey; Ms Jonty Bush, the tireless member for Cooper; Mr Steve Andrew, the member for Mirani; the very welcome and recently joined Mark Boothman, the member for Theodore; and Mr Jon Krause, the member for the Scenic Rim. As always, the secretariat supporting the committee have been absolutely outstanding and I thank them for their tireless work on our behalf.

With respect to this very important issue of coercive control, the committee has combined the work of several inquiries and added its own work to the subject. The other inquiries included the *Hear her voice* reports and the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, the Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

On that basis, the committee has made a number of recommendations, which include that: the bill be passed; the Queensland government, in collaboration with the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, the Department of Education, the Queensland Police Service, Queensland Health, peak bodies from the domestic and family violence and sexual violence support sector and First Nations and multicultural organisations, develop and implement an education campaign that includes material that is age appropriate, culturally sensitive and suitable for persons with impaired capacity to support the proposed reforms—this campaign should increase awareness about the abusive nature and legal implications of technology facilitated abuse and develop resources for online safety and digital literacy; and the Queensland government will review the operation of the Criminal Code Act 1899 provisions relating to consent and the transmission of serious diseases to ensure they capture an appropriate range of diseases and consider amending the bill to remove the provisions relating to the transmission of serious disease pending the outcome of that review.

The committee also recommends that the Queensland government conduct a review of the perpetrator diversion scheme within 24 months of the scheme's implementation. The review should involve consultation and input with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, peak bodies within the domestic and family violence and sexual violence support sector and the Queensland Police Service and courts. To take one example of what the bill proposes, in practice it will amend the existing consent framework in the Criminal Code to provide an affirmative model of consent implementing recommendations 43 and 44 of *Hear her voice* report 2. According to the explanatory notes, the bill amends section 348 of the Criminal Code to define 'free and voluntary agreement' rather than 'given'. It also provides a new subsection to help in the understanding of affirmative consent stating—

- (2) A person may withdraw consent to an act at any time.
- (3) A person who does not offer physical or verbal resistance to an act is not, by reason only of that fact, to be taken to consent to the act.

Alarming, when I was explaining this change to some male members of my community, some small number expressed confusion that consent could be withdrawn at any time, and some went on to ask why. I pointed out that this is because human males are not farm animals and a higher standard of behaviour is to be expected of us than say, for example, a draft horse. Interestingly, when I explained some of the changes to many of the women in our local community groups, all of them understood and enthusiastically agreed with the need and the positive benefits of these changes. To be very clear about this issue of 'agreed' rather than 'given' consent, the bill provides examples of where there is no consent, including when—

- (a) the person does not say or do anything to communicate consent;
- (b) the person does not have the cognitive capacity to consent to the act;
- (c) the person is so affected by alcohol or another drug as to be incapable of consenting to the act;
- ...
- (e) the person is unconscious or asleep;
- (f) the person participates in the act because of force, a fear of force, harm ... that person or someone else or to an animal or property, regardless of—

whether that harm occurs—

- (g) the person participates in the act because of coercion, blackmail or intimidation ...

...  
(h) the person participates in the act because the person or another person is unlawfully confined, detained ...

...  
(j) the person participates in the act because of a false or fraudulent representation about the nature or purpose of the act ...

It is vital that the community and, in this instance the LNP in particular, understand the basic tenants of consent. Clandestine photographs of women in the workplace, for example, are not okay.

The bill proposes to amend the Criminal Code by establishing the criminal offence of coercive control. The offence applies when a person commits domestic violence against a person they are in a relationship with on one or more occasion, with the intention of coercing or controlling that person and the conduct would be reasonably likely to cause that person harm. The bill uses definitions of domestic violence, economic abuse, emotional or psychological abuse and related terms that are broadly consistent with that contained in the Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Act. The bill, where appropriate, modifies those definitions to ensure they reflect the breadth of coercive control behaviour. The bill provides that it is immaterial whether the domestic violence was directed at another person or the property of another person—this is intended to capture behaviour which seeks to coerce or control a victim by impacting or threatening a child, a family member or another person or their property—and the conduct actually caused harm to the other person or whether the person was aware of the unauthorised or unreasonable surveillance or economic abuse at the time of the course of the conduct.

It is very clear that the great majority of submitters were supportive of including the new offence of coercive control into the Criminal Code. That said, there was some dissenting opinion. The Australian Lawyers Alliance was concerned that the criminalisation of coercive control is an ineffective way of educating communities on an issue that is entrenched in social and cultural attitudes. Perhaps the most interesting was the concern raised by the submission of Dr Goldsworthy and Dr Raj of the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties. They note—

It is somewhat at odds with general principles of crime and punishment to create an offence which carries a maximum penalty of 14 years' imprisonment where, conceivably, no injury, harm, or, indeed, awareness by the victim of any acts by the accused, have occurred.

I believe that both of these concerns are missing the central threat that is posed by the phenomena of coercive control. It is abuse, it is extremely dangerous and it is all too frequently a precursor to violence and in some cases death.


Further clarity was provided by the department. DJAG referred to the taskforce consideration 'that the focus of the offence should be on the behaviour of the perpetrator, as opposed to the impact of the victim'. DJAG also referred to the taskforce recommendation that 'there should be no requirement to prove that the victim was actually caused harm' and suggested that the legislation should make it clear that the prosecution only needs to prove that the course of the conduct would be of a nature that was likely to cause the victim to suffer harm reasonably arising in all circumstances.

Moving now briefly to the double jeopardy exception and its subsequent appeals bill. The committee has made only one recommendation—that is, simply, that the bill be passed. The objectives of the bill are to enhance criminal justice system responses to possible wrongful convictions and unjust acquittals by establishing a statutory framework to allow a person who is convicted on indictment of a summary offence under section 651 of the Criminal Code to make, with the leave of the Court of Appeal, a subsequent appeal against the conviction and expanding the fresh and compelling evidence of double jeopardy exception to 10 prescribed offences in addition to murder. The bill provides that a person may make a subsequent appeal against the conviction on the grounds that there is fresh and compelling evidence, or new and compelling evidence.

To touch briefly on one submission, the Queensland Law Society stated its support for 'another legislative pathway for a defendant who has already unsuccessfully appealed to the Court of Appeal but then come into possession of further evidence'. However, the Queensland Law Society also indicated that there is a risk of enlarging appeal rights which may lead to 'endless attempts by often self-represented prisoners to claim that they have found new and compelling evidence'. DJAG noted regarding the risk of large numbers of self-representing litigants that the bill adequately addresses these concerns by having appeals only occur with the leave of the Court of Appeal.

Both of these bills unquestionably strengthen our legal framework and make Queensland safer. As such, I commend them to the House.



 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (4.10 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023 and the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023.

At the outset, I would like to pay tribute to the work of Sue and Lloyd Clarke and the Small Steps 4 Hannah Foundation for their tireless work to raise awareness of coercive control. The rate at which we see women and children die or suffer at the hands of domestic and family violence is far too high, and we are not seeing the progress we need to keep them safe.

An independent taskforce was established in March 2021 which recommended a systemic shift from focusing on responding to single incidents of violence to focusing on the patterns of abusive behaviours that occur over time. This government has been too slow and has failed to follow through on some 400 recommendations since 2015 to prevent DV and improve responses to it. Astonishingly, close to a decade later we are still covering the basics, skirting around the edges and cleaning up disasters like the DNA lab failure.

The objective of the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023 is to enhance criminal justice responses to possible wrongful convictions and unjust acquittals. It is clear that this bill is being introduced due to the failures in the Queensland DNA lab and the expected retrials needed. The bill seeks to expand the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception to 10 prescribed offences in addition to murder, all punishable by life imprisonment.

Legal stakeholders have pointed out how this legislative change as it relates to double jeopardy goes against fundamental legal principles. These new laws are seen to go to extraordinary lengths to overcome the devastating repercussions of the forensic lab debacle. At last update we heard that over 103,000 samples in 37,000 cases are possibly up for retesting as well. As well as impacts on cases, we have seen coronial investigations delayed and bodies unable to be identified and sent interstate.

The Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023 amends over 10 pieces of legislation including the Criminal Code, the Evidence Act, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act, the Penalties and Sentences Act and the Youth Justice Act. I thank the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for its examination of the bill. It describes the somewhat cumbersome bill in the report's foreword, which states—

This Bill is about change. Changing how we think about and treat consent. Changing how the criminal justice system responds to coercive or controlling behaviour. Changing how juries are to be directed, how first-time domestic violence offenders can be channelled towards rehabilitation, and what considerations exist when deciding bail and sentencing.

The bill introduces a new standalone criminal offence for coercive control and creates an affirmative model of consent in Queensland, meaning free and voluntary agreement can be withdrawn at any time. The bill also aims to abolish or reform particular jury directions and implement recommendations from the Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service Responses to Domestic and Family Violence report. The bill also allows a court to make an order to extend a police protection notice in exceptional circumstances.

I would like to quote the committee chair and Labor member for Toohey and challenge his inference that this government is the beacon of consultation and engagement. He refers to a government that has sat down with stakeholders, listened to the experts, heard the stories of victim-survivors and examined the facts, and claims this Labor government is making things happen so that no-one is left behind. As always, the government's rhetoric does not align with the truth. The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce strongly recommended—

The Bill including the new diversion scheme should be released as a consultation draft for a period of at least three months before it is introduced into Parliament. This consultation should include legal, domestic and family violence, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders, and people with lived experience of domestic and family violence.

Instead, the bill's consultation draft was released on 18 July 2023 and feedback closed on 4 August 2023. Rather than the recommended three months, the consultation period was just 14 business days—14 days. This is not genuine consultation. This is not indicative of a government that is concerned with anything but lip-service and is further proof of a government that is more concerned about how things look than how they are. As the bill is drafted, the Queensland Law Society submitted that it would be too difficult for juries to understand and it will produce unjust outcomes. A government that continues with legislation that may produce unjust outcomes is far from a government committed to ensuring no-one is left behind.

The LNP members of the committee were of the belief that the committee's report did not adequately deal with issues raised by stakeholders. This is a worrying finding, especially when the bill introduces novel concepts to Queensland's legal framework and alters some well-established laws that have been subject to intense scrutiny by both the Queensland Law Reform Commission and this parliament. Not only did the government ignore the independent taskforce it proudly set up; it cut the consultation short, minimised those who participated, cherry-picked the feedback to suit its timeframes and left lawmakers scratching their heads.


Key themes in the discussion about the bill included legal definition of 'domestic violence', the protection of victims from being cross-examined by offenders, prevention of cross-applications which are used to further control and intimidate victims, and sexual offence terminology which sees a change from 'carnal knowledge' throughout the Criminal Code to 'penile intercourse'. That was the most contested issue by stakeholders. Legal Aid Queensland and the Queensland Police Union expressed concern about resourcing. The QPU anticipate an average of 10,000 cases per year, which will generate a minimum of 880,000 additional police hours—11 police officer days per file.

The *Hear her voice* report 1 raised concerns about the exclusion of the common law requirements. The Queensland Law Society stated that the new provision does not require specific intent at the time of each act alleged to constitute the course of conduct. This will result in protracted trials. This is not justice for victims, they said. Legal Aid Queensland states that for a major change to a serious criminal offence it would have been helpful to see further examination of the issue. Numerous stakeholders raised concerns regarding the broad criteria of harm constituting a lack of consent. For the public to have confidence in these new laws and to ensure injustice is not perpetrated, these issues must be addressed.

As has been repeatedly called for by the sector, a strong community education campaign, training and extra resources must occur prior to the proclamation of this bill and not later, when the government finds itself again in crisis and facing public outcry like we are seeing with the failed youth justice reforms. The Queensland Police Union indicated that in order to service necessary new domestic and family violence laws an additional 500 senior and specially trained police officers will be required. For a government that repeatedly ignores resourcing issues, this is a red flag. While there have been repeated calls to focus on prevention to ease enforcement requirements, the government has only spent four per cent of the \$7.1 million expenditure on domestic and family violence prevention initiatives.

The government should constantly have one thing at the top of mind—that is, 'How can we make our citizens feel safer in their homes, their workplaces and their neighbourhoods?' We have heard way too many times from victims that the barriers they face to reporting abuse can include the treacherous road they must take through the justice system. We must remove these barriers, not increase them.

While there are major deficits in drafting and challenges to common law principles, I concur with the committee's recommendations to make improvements where possible. The proposed changes in both bills will only be as good as the ability of the government to carry them out and monitor them effectively. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (4.17 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill. It is great to be debating legislative reform like this in Queensland Women's Week. I think many of us would agree that it would be nice to keep the focus on aspirational things and high standards and hopes for all Queensland women and girls. We should be talking about things like economic prosperity, the gender pay gap, cultural contributions to Queensland that Queensland women have made and the great work that women are doing in STEM in Queensland.

The position of women in Queensland should always be coming from one of strength, hope and pride but, regrettably, we cannot ignore the evidence that every week a woman is killed in Australia through domestic and family violence and that women are usually the victims and men often the perpetrators. To be debating a bill that criminalises coercive control here in Queensland in Women's Week is symbolic. It is only happening because we have a Labor government in Queensland—a government that cares about women and, importantly, a government that backs up that care with legislative protections like this bill.


Of course, the issue of domestic and family violence is of great significance to me. As everyone in the House knows, my sister lost her life through an act of domestic and family violence when she was just 19 years old. I have said here before that grief is unique and it should not be compared. One of the complicating factors in a homicide that is not always present in other losses is the very public nature of that loss. After Jacinta died, a common reaction I received from friends, colleagues and random people in the street was, of course, 'Didn't you see anything?' Over the years I have thought so much about this because, yes, of course I saw things. I saw everything. I lived with him, too. I saw that he would not let her leave the house without him. I saw the love bombing followed by periods of silence. I saw that he was controlling finances and I saw that she stopped seeing her friends, so the question is not, 'Didn't you see anything?'; it should be, 'What could you have done with the stuff that you saw?' and the answer at that time was, 'Nothing,' because back then we were brought up on a diet of DV posters in bathrooms and at bus stops with images of women with black eyes and broken arms, and this formed our definition of what domestic and family violence was.

If you ask any copper from 20 years ago—10 years ago even—the response would be, 'Until someone has laid a hand on you, there's nothing we can do.' This bill—against a backdrop of many years of advocacy by the community, by victims, by survivors and by groups and the education and reform piece that has gone into this—will capture that pattern of behaviour that is, by definition, coercive control and it will recognise that as a crime in and of itself. Like others, I want to commend all of the work of the victim-survivors, the agencies and the department. Many people, including in this House, have been involved in that and I celebrate us all in this.

The bill amends the Criminal Code to introduce a new offence of coercive control which will carry a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment. While I do appreciate that there will be prosecutorial challenges as the system adapts to that, it does send a really clear message to the community that there is no place for violence against women. The bill also amends chapter 32 of the Criminal Code to implement an affirmative model of consent. We know that the greatest challenge that comes up in a rape or sexual assault trial is not whether a sexual act occurred but rather whether consent was agreed to. This bill provides that consent means a free and voluntary agreement entered into between the parties and acknowledges that consent can be withdrawn at times. The bill further clarifies the circumstances in which consent is not given—for example, if the person does not say or do anything to communicate consent, if the person does not have cognitive capacity to give consent, if they are affected by alcohol or drugs to a point that they are incapable of consenting or withdrawing that consent, if they are unconscious or asleep or if they participate in an act out of fear or force of harm to themselves or others. The bill also ensures that stealthing is a crime. The act of removing a condom during intercourse without consent is a practice that unfortunately has been happening to people for too long.

The committee recommended that the bill be passed. We also made a couple of recommendations. One of them was around section 103ZZN(3) around the publishing of identifying material. The issue of cultural considerations was raised by some of the submitters. I acknowledge knowmore and others who raised that in committee hearings. I welcome the minister's proposed amendments to include a new section in the Evidence Act—a provision stating that the court may have regard to any cultural considerations relevant to the complainant or the applicant in considering whether to make a complainant privacy order.

The Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill is also being debated today. This was a bill that, again, our committee scrutinised and recommended be passed. The rule against double jeopardy is one that is central to our justice system. However, on rare occasions fresh and compelling evidence will arise that was simply not put in front of the jury during trial. Queensland has had an exception to the double jeopardy rule for murder for some years. I am aware that sexual violence support groups have put a strong case forward to expand those exceptions to crimes of sexual violence and this bill will expand the exception for the double jeopardy rule to an additional 10 serious crimes including manslaughter and attempted murder, rape and some aggravated sexual assault charges. I want to commend the department. It has done a lot of work on this bill. We often recognise the submitters, as we ought to, in this House, but the departments also do a lot of work in bringing this together and leading the consultation piece with relevant stakeholders, so I do really want to recognise it. Both of these bills will really strengthen our legal framework and I commend them to the House.

 **Mrs GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (4.24 pm): Four years ago our state and our country were shocked and horrified by the tragic deaths of Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children. To see these four lives taken by a controlling and manipulative husband and father was deeply disturbing. The images of Hannah and her children smiling and happy before their lives were horrifically cut short will be etched into the memories of so many Queenslanders. I pay tribute to the work of Sue and Lloyd Clarke and all victims of crime who show tremendous courage and strength to harness their grief and trauma and speak up for change in the hope that it will prevent another family from going through the devastation they are suffering through.

The Clarkes are not alone in their fight against domestic violence. Many have come before them and, sadly, many have come after them, because the truth is Queensland has a longstanding issue with domestic and family violence. One only has to look at the statistics of people breaching domestic violence protection orders to see the prevalence of domestic violence in our communities. In 2015 there were 19,299 breaches. Fast forward nine years, in 2023 that has risen by almost 220 per cent—up to 61,622 breaches of domestic violence protection orders, and that is in the last decade alone. That is hundreds and thousands of breaches with hundreds and thousands of victims, because behind these statistics are real people with real stories of constant terror, manipulation and control. These are stories of women and children who have lost their lives to coercive control and others who have barely made it out alive. To put this into context, here is what one victim-survivor said to the committee—

Coercive control harms women in multi faceted ways that are not overtly apparent to the onlooker. I cannot show you a black eye or a broken arm because I don't have one. I cannot show you intimate injuries because these are on the inside of my body. I cannot show you the ways in which this man harangued me for hours in my own bedroom, blockaded me in my own home, and refused to leave my property because I was too intimidated to call the police at the time. I cannot show you how this man raged at me in my own bedroom for hours on end ... But it is real and it happened. I cannot show you the welt on my backside from the time he picked up a rod of dowel in my home and hit me with it 'as a joke', then told me I am 'overly sensitive' and can't take a joke. That welt has gone now, but the memories have not. What I can do is attest to the fact that this man's behaviour towards women follows a pattern, and is pathological in nature. I can attest to the fact that he has treated other women like this and will likely go on to harm other women in exactly the same ways, well into the future. No one will believe those women either, or support them, or hear their evidence ... because of the very fact that his behaviour is coercive, calculated, careful and manipulative.

To this brave woman and to all of the victims who have told their story to the committee, we are listening to you, we believe you and we want to see action on this and we will support you.

The LNP supports making coercive control an offence and we have long since advocated for this legislation to make this kind of manipulation and control an offence. In fact, it is my view that it has taken this government far too long to act. In May 2020 we on this side of the House introduced a bill to establish a new coercive control offence, but the Labor government refused to debate it. This government had the opportunity back in 2020 to make these changes and failed to act, and now we have this bill before the House. This government has once again failed to follow the recommendation of the taskforce in relation to consultation on this bill. Recommendation 78 of the first *Hear her voice* report sought that a consultation draft on the bill be open for a period of at least three months before it is introduced to parliament. Guess how long the consultation period for this bill was open? Just 14 days.

Not only did this government fail to act when it should have; it rushed consultation on the bill. No doubt we will hear the minister crow about lengthy consultation prior to the bill being released, but that is not the same as consulting on the bill. It should have been open for a consultation period of three months as was recommended by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, but instead this third-term government only gave it 14 days. Whilst supportive of the intention of the bill, many submitters expressed concerns about the rushed nature of that time for them to get their submission in and concerns with the technical drafting of the bill. The Queensland Law Society expressed concern that the offence provision does not require particularisation of specific intent at the time of each act alleged to constitute the course of conduct which is coercive control. The QLS called for the offence to be redrafted having proper regard to the conventions of drafting, the need for certainty and core human rights principles.

Legal Aid Queensland expressed a similar concern in relation to the lack of particularisation necessary to establish the offence. To that end, the taskforce recommended that the offence be modelled off Scotland, which Professor Evan Stark referred to as a new gold standard for criminalising coercive control. The Scottish model maintains some particularisation of intent in the offence provision. In my view, to depart from what has been recommended is risky and I am concerned that this could have unintended consequences.


Significantly, the bill also introduces an affirmative consent model. The fantastic women who operate services to support this model are using every cent of funding they have. They are on their knees asking the government for more. They are sick and tired of review after review and outcomes that do not actually change anything. What these fantastic advocates need is more support and funding that will actually make a difference in the lives of the women they help. Yes, our criminal justice system needs significant reform, but great care needs to be taken to avoid unintended consequences. Some stakeholders have expressed fear that the proposed model introduces uncertainty into a well-established part of the law and could lead to cases being taken to the High Court and potentially less justice found for victims of rape.

Finally, I want to deal with the changes to the Youth Justice Act contained in this bill. The bill amends the sentencing principles for when a court is sentencing an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child for an offence. When sentencing an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander youth, the bill proposes to amend the sentencing considerations in the Penalties and Sentences Act and the Youth Justice Act which require sentencing courts to consider the hardship of a sentence on the offender having regard to characteristics such as age, sex, gender identity, disability, parental state or religion. Given there are already provisions in the Youth Justice Act to take into account the personal history of an offender, this proposed clause seems like an overreach and unnecessary to include. Further, when the High Court was considering a similar provision they made the point that such provision might be discriminatory because it might contravene the principle of individualised justice by establishing a sentencing consideration based on race. As the shadow Attorney-General mentioned in his contribution, the LNP will address this in further detail in consideration in detail.

I also want to address the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023, which is the double jeopardy bill being debated in cognate with the coercive control bill. Let's face it, the double jeopardy bill is before this House because of the Labor government's catastrophic failures in the management of Queensland's forensic services lab. This could turn out to be the greatest case of government maladministration in living memory. These laws are before this parliament because murderers and rapists could be walking free as a result of the state government's failure in the DNA lab.

The law as it stands is that a person convicted of a crime can only appeal their conviction once, with the exception of murder trials, where there is fresh and compelling evidence against the person and it is in the interests of justice. This bill proposes there be no limit on the number of subsequent appeals a convicted person can make, pending leave of the Court of Appeal, for an additional 10 new offences. This will apply retrospectively. These are drastic changes that go against the fundamental principle of double jeopardy. This is the extraordinary length this state government has gone to to cover up its failures in the DNA lab—the extraordinary length it is having to go to to overcome the devastating repercussions that we might see in relation to the forensic lab failures. These are significant shifts in the core doctrine of double jeopardy, illustrating the extreme measures the government is forced to go to to mitigate the consequences that stem from its DNA lab failures.

We do not even know how many victims of this government's stuff-up there are. The last update was that there are 103,000 samples and 37,000 cases probably up for retesting. That is 37,000 victims of the government's monumental failure. Because of this we have coronial investigations being delayed and we have bodies of loved ones unable to be identified. That is 37,000 cases possibly up for retesting as a result of this government's catastrophic failure when it comes to the state-run DNA lab. This legislation is an attempt by the state Labor government to cover up its failures and is indicative of a government not fit to govern. The Labor governments talk about women's security, but women are not safe under this government. An LNP government will prioritise fixing Queensland's forensic lab and give these victims back their voice.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (4.34 pm): I rise to give my support to this bill through my contribution today. I start by recognising all of those who are victims but also survivors of domestic, family and sexual violence right across Queensland. There is domestic, family and sexual violence in Bundaberg. It is in all of our communities. It does not discriminate against any demographic throughout the electorates in which we live. In Bundaberg we have our Edon Place community organisation, we have Zonta, we have women's breakfasts to highlight domestic and family violence in our community, we have candlelight vigils and we have walks of awareness where we recognise the number of deaths each year at the hands of domestic and family violence. We had Sue Clarke come and speak about

her daughter and her grandchildren and Hannah's friends speak about how they were not able to recognise that what was happening was actually coercive control: it was an act against a human to deny their liberty or to force an action upon them.

Domestic, family and sexual violence is creating a framework where women are losing their lives, and if they are not losing their lives they are trapped within the lives they are living at the hands of violent men across our state. Whilst I note that of course domestic violence occurs between any genders and any couples, we know that women are by far the victims statistically and that there needs to be a mindset of change. We see that mindset of change through this bill, through the coercive control introduction and also through the changing of the wording around consent to an affirmative consent model.

Coercive control is something that is always spoken about at those breakfasts and candlelight vigils that I mentioned and in conversations in the workplace. For so long we have known what coercive control is but we did not know how to describe it in a legal framework. We did not know how to find a way to prosecute it. Because of brave women in this state standing up and telling their stories, we are making change for the better. We are making change that brings about a coercive control framework with a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment.

We are seeing the very mindset of consent changing. It is changing away from the terminology of agreement being given to free and voluntary agreement. It is important that we change to an affirmative consent model because something given can still be taken—something given can still be taken by force, by coercion, by intimidation and by threats. That is why it is important that those who may disagree with an affirmative consent model realise that the mindset of 'Well, she didn't say "no"' is not an acceptable excuse to violate the body of a woman, to violate the body of a man, to violate the body of anyone in this state. Free and voluntary agreement: that is why this affirmative consent model is so important.

I will not speak much longer, because I know that there are many members on our side wishing to speak. I also recognise that there are many on the other side who wish to speak. I want to try to give as much time to our speakers as possible, but I do want to highlight concerns I have about those opposite and their criticisms of our support for community organisations and key stakeholders and criticisms of whether or not our government will be funding those community organisations. If the other side want to put forward alternatives around funding models, I thought I would put on the record the LNP's record around domestic violence support and community stakeholders.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SMITH:** They cut \$40,000 from DVConnect, \$69,000 from the Sunshine Coast Cooloola Services Against Sexual Violence, \$152,952 from Domestic Violence Prevention Centre Gold Coast and \$50,861 from the Ipswich Women's Centre Against Domestic Violence.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hart): Member for Bundaberg, can you explain to me how this is relevant to this bill or whether you are challenging the speech of a member on the other side, because I have missed that?

**Mr SMITH:** Absolutely. Recommendation 2 of the committee is about making sure there is education and support through key stakeholders and community organisations. The opposition spokesperson—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SMITH:** I am sorry, Mr Deputy Speaker, I thought I was speaking to you.


**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Nanango.

**Mr SMITH:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The opposition spokesperson directly called on the member for Waterford to address the funding towards—

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Bundaberg is not only challenging the ruling of the chair; I also note—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Nanango, that is not a point of order.

**Mr SMITH:** I will not go on, because it is an exhausting list. I will say to all of those women in Queensland: we on this side of the House have heard your voices and never again will we allow your voices to be silenced.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.40 pm): I rise to make some comments in the cognate debate of the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill before us today. I want to reflect on some of the comments made by the non-government committee members, the member for Currumbin and I, in the statement of reservation. I was going to start with the double jeopardy bill but, having reflected on the comments of the member for Bundaberg and the way in which he was attempting to frame this debate in terms of funding for education, which was a good recommendation that came out of the inquiry into the bill, I want to note that when governments change laws as significant as this it is very important that they get it right. One of the biggest concerns that LNP members and significant serious learned stakeholders have is that the government has rushed this and does not have the legal provisions right so they will not do what they are intended to do.

We support the bill. We support its intent to criminalise coercive control and to put in place penalties for it. That reflects all of the inquiries that we have supported, starting with—and I recognise the interjections of the member for Nanango during the speech of the member for Bundaberg—the *Not now, not ever* inquiry, which was started by the LNP government in 2014. We support the criminalisation of coercive control. However, it is a big concern that not enough time has been taken to properly frame the offence. I take the House to our statement of reservation in which we reference the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce's clear recommendation that the offence be subject to at least three months consultation before being introduced into parliament. I think the member for Currumbin reflected earlier that there were 14 days of consultation before it was wrapped up in a bill and introduced into parliament. If the government supports the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations, why can they not actually take on board its recommendations about getting the offence right?

Last year we held an inquiry into victims of crime legislation in Queensland. I was a part of that inquiry. Throughout the inquiry, other inquiries and my time in this place, one of the things I have learned is that it is not just the offence that is committed against someone that can be traumatic; the judicial process can be traumatic as well. We need to look at the warnings of the Law Society, the Bar Association and other stakeholders about this law. I fear that, if this law is flawed, it will result in huge trauma for victims because it is not framed correctly. The government has ignored all of the warnings. They did not put it out for proper consultation and they are ignoring the warnings of stakeholders throughout the process.

The Queensland Law Society's warning is completely clear and plain. It said—

In its present form, the offence is a disservice to both complainants and accused persons, and the wider community. It will be too difficult for juries to understand. It will produce unjust outcomes.

How much clearer a warning can there be for the government? I will not read all of the quote because it is quite long, but the Queensland Law Society also stated—

This will result in protracted trials. There will be an amplified interrogation of the facts and the matters that underpin a charge of coercive control.

When they refer to 'an amplified interrogation of the facts', I think they mean longer cross-examinations of victims about the facts because the offence is not framed correctly. That is a disservice to victims and it a disservice to everyone who supports the intent of criminalising coercive control. For whatever reason, and I do not know what the reason is, the government has decided to ignore the recommendation of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce about properly consulting on the bill.

When the member for Waterford spoke earlier, I note that she made a reference to delaying some provisions of the bill that relate to what constitutes harm or not having consent in relation to the transmission of diseases. That is an example of listening to stakeholder feedback. Other provisions in the bill could also be delayed and put out for more review and wider consultation, as was initially recommended.

The Queensland Human Rights Commission did not make a submission on the flaws in the drafting of the bill. However, they were present at the public hearing, heard the cogent evidence from the Law Society and, essentially, adopted that view.

The member for Bundaberg talked about funding for education and training and threw accusations around the chamber about what has been done in the past and what will be done in the future. I simply say: get the first things right first. That involves getting the law right in the first place. The government is failing on that front as evidenced by all of the submissions to that effect. In the future we will be back here amending this law because it has not been framed correctly for anyone.

The other bill before us is the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill. The report was given without a statement of reservation. We recommend that the bill be passed. There are two elements to the bill. The subsequent appeal framework where people can appeal against a conviction when there is new or fresh evidence was broadly supported by all stakeholders as a way for people who have been convicted to reopen their case and perhaps be acquitted if new or fresh evidence comes about. There is also an expansion of the exceptions to double jeopardy where the state can potentially bring a prosecution against someone who has been acquitted on the basis of new or fresh evidence, which was subject to a lot more conjecture in the committee. The Queensland Law Society, as a matter of high principle, I think, opposes the provision because they say that the principle of double jeopardy is a key factor in balancing the power of the state against the power of a defendant, with the state having all the resources and quite often defendants not having many resources at all.

Something of interest arose during the committee process. The member for Currumbin referred to the fact that this bill relates to the DNA lab maladministration and that 103,000 DNA samples, or something like that, might have to be retested and a whole lot of cases may need to be reopened as a result of the maladministration.


**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Mr KRAUSE:** Some 37,000 cases. I thought it was quite interesting that one of the government members on the committee objected to the member for Currumbin referring to that maladministration as a 'debacle'. What else can you describe it as? It has been a debacle over many years. I cannot remember who it was now, but one member took offence to it being called a debacle. That is absurd because it was a catastrophic failure and we have seen that reflected in the media. This bill is basically a response to that. It has been brought forward very quickly after a couple of commissions of inquiry so that if people need to be re-tried based on new evidence to come out of the retesting of DNA samples they can be.

We are broadly supportive of that change to the double jeopardy laws. It is not creating a whole new mechanism, because we have one in Queensland already—it has been in place since 2007 for murder. There is a process for reopening a murder case if fresh or new evidence comes about. There was some conjecture about the test to be applied.

The QLS recommended that a miscarriage of justice test be applied in the case of both fresh and new evidence, whereas the bill takes a slightly different approach and requires the defendant in the case of new evidence to prove on the balance of probabilities that that evidence might prove their innocence. I know that that seems to be the situation in Western Australia, where this provision is already in place, but we need to reflect upon the considerations put forward by the Bar Association and the Law Society. In the end, they are the experts when it comes to dealing with criminal law—not people in the government who are bringing forward these bills in a rush to deal with the DNA debacle and other debacles that they have presided over.

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.51 pm): Just a few weeks ago, on the day before the anniversary of the terrible murder of Hannah Clarke and her children—Aaliyah, Laianah and Trey—our community gathered in Hannah's Place, a park in the White's Hill section of Camp Hill dedicated to the memory of Hannah and her children. There were hundreds of people of all ages—a very diverse group—gathered with one purpose: to attempt to break a world record for the highest number of people doing a handstand simultaneously. They did this to honour the memory of Hannah and her kids.


Hannah was a fine sportswoman, a gym fanatic and a mainstay at her local PCYC, and she loved her handstands. Ironically, everyone was happy. Hannah's family were beaming at the level of support. It was fantastic to see all of the kids excited—perhaps not really understanding the full impact of the day but knowing that they were doing something good for society. Across the road was the school



where Hannah's name is still on the honour board as school captain. It was surreal to be surrounded by so much happiness only a few streets away from where those terrible events took place four years ago—on a street where my grandparents lived for 40 years and where I would have played at a similar age to those young children.

These events started with coercive control, a term that not many people were familiar with at that time. I certainly did not understand it. Hannah's parents, Sue and Lloyd Clarke, have tirelessly led a campaign trying to educate the community about this, trying to change people's behaviour, trying to get help for those people who need it, including trying to get help to people who might be perpetrators—I think that is amazing—and trying to change the laws. I thank Sue and Lloyd and their entire family for their courage in leading this campaign. I do not think many of us could really contemplate how difficult it would be. I support the laws in this bill because they have been recommended by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, a body that Sue and Lloyd Clarke made several presentations to and have been very supportive of.

For the record, I did not do a handstand. I do not think I could hold a handstand for the required time, so you can probably blame me that we failed to break the world record. I certainly will not be practising to do that next year. I was an official judge. Not everyone can do a handstand—I put myself in that category—but I can support these laws. I believe that they will make our community safer and a better place to live. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (4.54 pm): I, too, acknowledge the member for Greenslopes' contribution and the complete and utter tragedy he referred to. There are no other words to describe it. I know that the Clarks have a very close connection to Kingaroy. It is with such a heavy heart that we are talking about this topic once again. However, talking about it really does keep alive the memory of Hannah and those three beautiful children. It also keeps alive the memories of many others who have been faced with not only domestic violence but any form of violence—family, emotional, financial.

Many people in this House who have been here over the years have heard me speak about why I came into this House and why I entered politics. I reflect upon a time in around 2010 when on a Sunday night I took a phone call from a concerned community member about a person they wanted me to assist in my role as a lawyer. I had taken a call previous to that evening, on a Sunday afternoon, from someone from the Queensland Women's Legal Service requesting that I, as a private lawyer, just try to help this same person. That was something I did many times. I had no problem, as the only female lawyer in the South Burnett, doing that type of pro bono work no matter the day of the week. I recall that both I and a local police officer assisted that woman and her child to escape her brutal, horrendous, horrific husband. We found them a safe spot to go. In this small town, I had to front court the next day to make sure she could get a protection order for herself and her child. I think that was one of the first times that I understood and appreciated the extent of coercive control.

As the member for Currumbin so ably spoke about when reflecting upon someone who submitted to the committee, it is quite often the case that lawyers in these courts see someone with a bruised eye or a hurt part of their body, but there are other cases where they cannot see the pain that a client is going through.

I was very proud, along with then attorney-general Jarrod Bleijie, to propose a policy to make sure we supported the Women's Legal Service. Why? I was the only lawyer in the South Burnett who took these calls on a Sunday on behalf of my female clients. There were others who should have been supported in the 14 years prior, under Labor governments, through state funding for regional women, for a support base. The then attorney-general provided an extra \$750,000 to the Women's Legal Service in Queensland to make sure a women's hotline could be set up so that regional women had someone to call. That came after a 20 per cent cut by the Labor government to the Queensland Women's Legal Service. I cannot sit here and be preached to by members such as the member for Bundaberg who do not know the history of not only why members come into this place but also what goes on in governments of their colour.

That is why the then premier brought in the *Not now, not ever* report—a report not only coupled with the largest historical funding for domestic violence that this state has ever seen—

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I take that interjection—and the highest historical funding for child safety in this state. That is what the LNP did in government. We stood up for women and we stood up for children. We had our priorities right. Members opposite can grunt and groan all they like, but what has

happened in the past nine years? In 2017, when we were in opposition, the member for Mudgeeraba announced landmark domestic violence policies including coercive control and financial and elder abuse. Where did they go? Absolutely nowhere under this incompetent Labor government. Then in 2020 I stood in this House and demanded changes to coercive control legislation. What was I met with? I was met with ridicule and silence. Members opposite should not come in here and tell me that we do not support women. Never tell me that the women on this side do not deserve our seats in parliament.

**Ms Enoch:** Who said that?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Who said that? I will take that interjection. Every single day we sit here and get ridiculed by those opposite because we are women standing up for our communities—that, because we are centre-right women, we do not deserve a voice. This absolutely must stop. I am so sick and tired of it.


I want to move on to the other debacle. While the government is making sure we do not have enough time to talk about the issues that are important to us, what about the DNA lab debacle? We on this side of the House stood up on behalf of the victims and said, 'There is an issue with the DNA lab.' We said it over and over again. What did the then attorney-general and the health minister say? They said it was pure politics. Let me tell the House that it was the LNP who stood with those families and the victims of that DNA debacle. It is the LNP who still stand with those women and we stand with the whistleblowers of that DNA debacle.

Make no mistake: we are making some of the largest changes to the criminal justice system in this country's history. Why are we here today doing that? It is because this Labor government failed to act. They abused a whistleblower. They abused a media person—Hedley Thomas, who was standing up for the Shandee Blackburn story. They abused victims of crime. They refused to listen to people who were standing up on behalf of their communities saying, 'There is a problem with the DNA lab.' There was not one inquiry but two inquiries. That is what it took for this government to make changes.

Where are we right now? The figures have been given but I am going to say them again: over 103,000 samples—103,000 samples—that might have to be retested and 37,000 cases. Let me say this once again: this is the biggest debacle in Queensland's history. When you are taking samples from a man's private parts and not finding DNA—that is what victims were telling this mob. What did these people say? 'There is nothing to see here.' We are playing pure politics.

This is a government that is all about the media release. They only care about what things look like. They do not actually like the detail. Let me tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, the devil is always in the detail when it comes to this Miles government. They can come in here and pretend they have not been in government for nearly the last decade, but they have. They have been in government and what have they done to support women and domestic violence victims? They refuse to listen to our constituents. They refuse to listen to whistleblowers. They refuse to listen to people on this side of the House because they think they know better. I can tell you, Mr Deputy Speaker, enough is enough.

It is about time this government started listening to the real people in Queensland—the victims of these terrible crimes. I say this: the biggest crime of all is that this government have left murderers and rapists and who knows who else walk away because of their incompetence. I say shame—shame on this government!

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (5.03 pm): I rise to speak in support of these cognate bills. We know that no-one is exempt from violence and, in particular, domestic and family violence. We also know that women and girls are grossly over-represented in the space of domestic and family violence. We know that an intrinsic part of domestic and family violence is coercive control. That is why today we are saying enough is enough and we are making coercive control a crime.

This legislation is another important milestone our government has made towards eradicating all forms of domestic and family violence and keeping Queensland women and girls safe. In recent months we have seen too many violent attacks on innocent victims such as Vyleen White in Redbank Plains. This government is strengthening community safety by boosting police numbers and banning the sale of knives and weapons to minors. We also know that community safety starts in the home.

Quite simply, victims of coercive control are victims of crime as well. Legislating against coercive control is an important step in recognising the seriousness of this offence and improving safety for victims. Coercive control is a pattern of abuse—that intimate partner terror that harms, punishes,

isolates and frightens a victim. It often indicates a high risk of harm and lethality to current and former partners. Perpetrators use controlling behaviour to destroy a woman or girl's self-agency, her sense of safety and her ability to seek help.

I want to thank all of the brave victim-survivors who spoke of their experiences to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. Their truth has led us to where we are today. Some accounts from women in the *Hear her voice* report were harrowing. Some even spoke of not realising that what they were experiencing was coercive control. The DFV Prevention Council reiterated this in a statement they put out only recently—that the dynamics of violence and coercion are the same for every person, yet the lack of recognition of the experience makes it harder for some people to reach out for help.

Those who did find the courage to seek help found that support was lacking due to a lack of understanding in the community of what coercive control behaviours looked like or because physical abuse had not been present. Sadly, many victims said that they felt the justice system had let them down and that their reports to police were not being taken seriously. Legislating against coercive control will ensure that this behaviour is seen as a serious crime and it will allow more women and girls to be heard, believed and seen.

I want to acknowledge the work of the Hon. Margaret McMurdo AC for her leadership on the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and the whole taskforce itself for their hard work in bringing victims' stories to light. I want to commend the minister for her work in this space as well. We are grateful to have such strong advocates here in Queensland who have done so much to create awareness in the community of domestic and family violence and coercive control—advocates such as Sue and Lloyd Clarke, the parents of Hannah Clarke, and Vanessa Fowler, the sister of Allison Baden-Clay. They have done a tremendous amount of work to inform the public about domestic violence and coercive control through their own personal stories and advocacy. That advocacy is that much harder when it is so close to home.

We are grateful for the incredible work being done by DV support organisations in the community. I know in my electorate of Ipswich we are very fortunate to have the Domestic Violence Action Centre to help women get the support and advocacy they need. DVAC's CEO, Amie Carrington, is a wonderful advocate for women in general, and her hardworking team are working miracles every day to help women escape abusive relationships.

At the 2020 election we made a promise to make coercive control a crime and to deliver that promise within four years. I am very proud to stand here today alongside my colleagues to deliver on that promise. It shows that we are listening to Queensland women and giving them what they need to stay safe in their homes.


The LNP cannot be trusted to do the same. No matter what we hear from those opposite, we know that when they were in government they cut funding to NGOs. We heard the member for Bundaberg talk about those cuts. I mentioned our local organisation before—the Domestic Violence Action Centre. Their funding was cut by over \$50,000 when the LNP were in government. These are essential frontline services that women rely on. The LNP will take Queensland women and girls' causes backwards, and that is something that we cannot risk.

I also want to speak today about the double jeopardy exception and subsequent appeals bill. This bill reflects our government's ongoing commitment to ensure that Queensland's criminal justice system stays contemporary and efficient. I did want to mention this briefly.

Double jeopardy laws came into play in Ipswich just 51 years ago. The killer of Ipswich toddler Deidre Kennedy walked free after a second attempt to bring him to justice. The Queensland Supreme Court and the Australian High Court quashed his conviction based on the principle of double jeopardy. The community was—and still is—justifiably angry at what they perceive to be a gross miscarriage of justice. At the time, that murder shook our community due to the horrific, random nature of the killing and the callous disregard of the offender for such a young, innocent life. We had a beautiful commemorative service last year to mark the 50th anniversary of Deidre's murder. The decisions of the Supreme Court and the High Court clearly show that rigid adherence to double jeopardy rules risks perpetrating an injustice.

We know that the retrial of an offender is an extraordinary thing; however, when there is fresh and compelling evidence against an accused person it is in the interests of justice that it happen. This bill will strengthen our criminal justice system's response to wrongful convictions by introducing a right of subsequent appeal. We want Queenslanders to have confidence in our justice system, and that is

why we are committed to strengthening our Criminal Code so that it meets community expectations. We have listened to women on coercive control. We have listened to community concerns about expanding double jeopardy exceptions. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (5.11 pm): I rise to speak on the cognate debate with specific reference to the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023. The bill was introduced in response to the 2022 report by Walter Sofronoff KC following his inquiry in forensic DNA testing in Queensland. The commissioner made a number of observations and findings relevant to the consideration of any reform of chapters 67 and 68 of the Criminal Code. Importantly, it found that in many ways the methods, systems and processes used at the forensic DNA laboratory do not measure up to best practice.

The commissioner highlighted that, in large part, the laboratory's focus on turnaround times was driven by chronic underfunding. The commissioner commented that these issues of underfunding were well known at the highest levels of Queensland Health and the Queensland government as far back as early 2005. As the commissioner identified, the totality of these failings have had serious negative ramifications for the criminal justice system. There is no doubt that the failure to obtain all of the evidence available from samples has affected some cases. In most cases, it may have reduced the prospects of conviction by a failure to obtain evidence which could support a complaint. It is possible, but unlikely, that the failures could have resulted in a wrongful conviction. The number of cases actually affected and whether with different processes those cases would have resulted in different outcomes has never been properly quantified.

The bill introduces a subsequent right of appeal for convicted persons who have exhausted their original right of appeal. Under the new framework, a convicted person may make a subsequent appeal against their conviction if there is fresh and compelling evidence or new and compelling evidence relating to the offence. I strongly support the introduction of another legislative pathway for defendants who have already unsuccessfully appealed to the Court of Appeal but then come into possession of further evidence. Currently, the only remaining avenue available to a convicted person after exhausting the original appeal process is to petition the Governor for a pardon. A person cannot make a subsequent appeal against a conviction to the Court of Appeal even if evidence later emerges indicating the person is innocent. The bill also contains amendments enhancing the state's ability to respond to possible unjust acquittals by expanding the number of offences to which the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception applies.

The term double jeopardy refers to the longstanding criminal law principle that a person cannot be retried for an offence for which they have already been convicted or acquitted. The explanatory notes provide the following rationale for the rule against double jeopardy: a person should not be harassed by multiple prosecutions about the same issue; the need for finality in proceedings; the sanctity of a jury verdict; the prevention of wrongful convictions; and the need to encourage investigators and prosecutors to be efficient in putting forward their best case.

I am opposed to the bill's further watering down of the double jeopardy rule which would expand the offences to which the double jeopardy exception applies. The current exceptions are sufficient for maintaining public confidence in the state's criminal justice system whilst continuing to uphold fundamental legal principles. The bill's changes have been linked to the findings of the forensic lab inquiry; however, once enacted its effect will not be restricted to any cases emanating from the inquiry. The bill's changes will apply to all matters involving offences engaged by the new provisions. This is what is known as mission creep, and it is one reason I support the introduction of a further right of appeal for a defendant but oppose the relaxation of the rule for the Crown, because there is a different set of considerations at play.

Defendants can have defective trials and appeals which are effectively no fault of their own, whereas the Crown should be bound by its forensic decisions, its approach and its ethics at trial because it is in a better position and the other side is a single individual against the might of the Crown. Furthermore, it is also important to acknowledge that the current rule against double jeopardy does not affect the prosecution's ability to bring a charge in circumstances where charges against a person have never been laid or charges against a person were laid but then later discontinued.


The rule against double jeopardy works hand in hand with the principle of finality in criminal law, which is important to the proper and economic allocation of public resources. At its core, however, the rule against double jeopardy is also a fundamental control on state power, given that in every case the

power and resources of the state will be greater than those of an individual accused of a crime. The fundamental nature of the rule against double jeopardy within Australia's criminal justice system is recognised by section 234 of the Human Rights Act 2019, which provides—

A person must not be punished more than once for an offence in relation to which the person has already been finally convicted or acquitted in accordance with law.

In this way, the rule against double jeopardy encourages efficient police investigations, safeguards against the use of prosecution as a tool of state oppression, and acts as a bulwark against repeated attempts to subject an accused to the criminal justice process. Double jeopardy serves to maintain confidence in the criminal justice system in a way that is too easily underestimated.

The state has many advantages over the defendant in a criminal trial, including possessing greater resources and powers to conduct investigations. In a criminal offence the prosecution starts with an advantage because many jurors will say, 'If there was nothing in this case, the police would never have brought it.' The criminal justice system rectifies those imbalances with the presumption of innocence and placing the burden on the prosecution to prove the offence beyond a reasonable doubt. In addition, this attempt to correct the imbalance is supported by the rule against double jeopardy. Once, an accused person could leave the courtroom with the prospect of rebuilding their life. That will no longer be the case if this bill is enacted. The prospect of their being charged again will hang over their head for the rest of their lives.

 **Ms LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (5.17 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill in this cognate debate. I want to take this opportunity to thank the committee for its detailed consideration of both bills. I would also like to thank the organisations and individuals who made submissions to the committee and participated in the public hearing. I also want to take this opportunity to thank the victim-survivors and their families whose lives have been torn apart as a result of domestic and family violence for their incredible advocacy.

I meet with victim-survivors and families of domestic and family violence from Central Queensland often—too often. The impacts of these crimes on our community are significant: the emotional impact, the financial impact and the ongoing trauma. Children have told me how they have to deal with explaining to their friends at school, 'Mum's dead and Dad's in jail', or 'Dad stabbed Mum; now he's in jail', or in another case, 'Gran's dead; Dad's in jail.'

Let's remember that victims and perpetrators are not always in an intimate relationship. Domestic and family violence is not always between intimate partners. Karen Gilliland was the mother of three beautiful children. She was a healthcare worker who lived in our community in Rockhampton. She was tragically murdered by her ex. I know that Karen's family has been absolutely torn apart by this horrendous crime. They are still picking up the pieces every day. Tayla Black, Murphy Margaret and Susan Duffy are also alleged victims of domestic violence who were taken from their family and friends. The impacts of domestic and family violence on the people in my community are raw, real and palpable. The wounds truly run deep and affect us all in ways that are difficult for me to describe.


I also want to acknowledge the hurt and pain that domestic and family violence has on the practitioners who work to prevent these crimes in our community—the police, the social workers, the solicitors, the psychologists and the domestic and family violence prevention workers. I know that they work so hard to prevent harm and to prevent deaths, and when we lose someone, or a few, it is absolutely devastating.

I am so incredibly proud to be part of a Queensland Labor government which has introduced this landmark legislation to parliament for a new standalone offence of coercive control. Victim-survivors and their families tell me that this is incredibly important legislation to them and it may have made a big difference in their cases.

Debate, on motion of Ms Lauga, adjourned.

## PRIVILEGE

### Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have received correspondence from the member for Pumicestone regarding a complaint in accordance with standing order 269 regarding a photograph of her mobile phone evidently taken during the sittings of the Assembly, most probably by a member of

parliament. The image was subsequently shown on 9News. The member complains that (a) a member has spied upon her mobile telephone, probably through another mobile device, and then divulged the private communication between herself and another elected member of parliament; and (b) the matter also amounts to intimidation.

I am of the opinion that a member spying on the papers or devices of a member in the Assembly, probably through another mobile device, and then divulging the private communication amounts, or is intended or likely to amount, to an improper interference with the member's free performance of their duties as a member of parliament. I wish to make it clear that I consider spying on members' papers and devices in the Assembly to be a very serious matter that should be considered by the Ethics Committee. I have previously asked all members, staff and guests to respect the privacy of other members, staff and visitors to the precinct and to not photograph or film others carrying out their duties on the precinct.

It is disappointing that as I make this statement the offending party, likely a member, has not come forward and owned up to the transgression. I note that many of our rules relating to conduct and filming et cetera in the precinct and the House are directed to strangers, such as the media. We have taken it as read that members will not engage in such conduct; the committee may decide that a different approach is required. I also note and warn everyone—strangers, staff and members—that I consider secret filming or recording in the precinct as a grave matter. As this matter is now referred to the Ethics Committee, I remind members that standing order 271 now applies and members should not refer to these matters in the House.


## **CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

### **CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### **Second Reading (Cognate Debate)**

Resumed from p. 399, on motion of Ms Fentiman—

That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Ms LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (5.23 pm), continuing: The Miles government is committed to ending all forms of domestic and family violence. Let us be clear: coercive control is domestic and family violence. It is abuse perpetrated on a victim designed to harm, punish or frighten their victim. Coercive control is serious. It has serious impacts on the victim and their families and a new standalone offence reflects that non-physical violence is just as dangerous as physical violence. This legislation will implement the government's response to a second tranche of reforms recommended by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, including amending the Criminal Code to establish the offence of coercive control.


I am incredibly pleased that the government has gone further to respond to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce *Hear her voice* reports in the newly released Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy 2032. I would encourage all members of this place to read that document because it contains some excellent strategies to help women and girls experiencing domestic and family violence and sexual violence so that they have access to sensitive, trauma informed and culturally safe health care here in Queensland.

Through the consultation on the strategy, we heard from 12,000 women and girls who made a submission that they want: equitable access to support for those affected by domestic and family violence and sexual violence, especially in rural and remote areas; improved information and education about domestic and family violence and sexual violence available to young people to assist with prevention and recognition; safe, supportive and informed care and guidance following an experience of domestic and family violence and/or sexual assault or violence; and effective integration of primary health care into secondary, tertiary and other social service systems.

The bill before the House that we are debating today was developed following extensive consultation with stakeholders, including the domestic and family violence sector and the legal profession. The reform builds on the first tranche of legislative amendments to strengthen Queensland's response to coercive control which took effect in 2023. I was proud to rise in this place and speak in support of that first tranche of legislation.

These laws will be supported through broad community education campaigns and tailored communication responses for diverse cohorts. These reforms are also being supported by the development of a domestic and family violence training and change management framework which will inform training across relevant agencies. Other related initiatives include increased resourcing to help perpetrator intervention services meet increased demand and better support for victim-survivors and the development of new programs to hold perpetrators to account.


The bill establishes a court-based perpetrator diversion scheme, introduces a new offence of engaging in domestic and family violence to aid a respondent, and inserts new aggravating factors for domestic violence offences. The Miles government will continue to raise awareness about coercive control to help protect victims from this insidious form of abuse. I am proud today to stand in this place to support this bill. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (5.26 pm): I rise to make a contribution in the cognate debate specifically on the double jeopardy legislation. I would, firstly, like to thank my fellow committee members. Even though I was only transferred to the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee when the report was tabled, I feel it is appropriate for me to make a contribution on this very important issue. I would like to start with the general feedback from stakeholders. The Queensland Law Society supported the legislation in that it is another legislative pathway for defendants who have already unsuccessfully appealed to the Court of Appeal but then come into possession of further evidence. The Queensland Council for Civil Liberties also welcomed the amendments. Legal Aid Queensland stated that they did have some concerns because it could potentially increase the number of litigants before the court.

The bill proposes to make changes to the criminal justice system in response to possible wrongful convictions and unjust acquittals by: establishing a statutory framework to allow a person convicted on indictment or of a summary offence under section 651 of the Criminal Code to make, with leave of the Court of Appeal, a subsequent appeal against the conviction; and expanding the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception to 10 prescribed offences in addition to murder. The bill does not mention the reason we have actually come to this point, but that reason is the failure of the Queensland DNA lab. We heard the member for Currumbin say that there are up to 37,000 possible cases that may need to be retested. I believe there are 103,000 DNA tests. It should never have come to this. I know that my fellow members in the LNP have been speaking about this issue since December 2021. It took numerous repeated calls and whistleblowers to come forward and blow open the issues in the DNA lab before the current Labor state government was finally forced into action.

In Queensland under the current framework, a convicted person can appeal a conviction only once. The amendments in the bill will allow for an open number of subsequent appeals a convicted person can make, but this must be obtained through the Court of Appeal. This will allow the Court of Appeal to filter any potential vexatious appeals. If an appeal to the Court of Appeal is unsuccessful, the convicted person has a right to have their appeal heard to the High Court, but I should note, from my understanding of the bill the High Court has no jurisdiction to actually hear additional information or evidence.

The bill provides a right for a subsequent appeal if there is fresh and compelling evidence. The Court of Appeal will decide the merit on a case-by-case basis. The evidence must be credible and of real significance in relation to the matter of the upheld guilt. Therefore, these changes are necessary to fix the potential wrongs caused by the massive DNA lab debacle. While it is a potential comfort for the 37,000 DNA cases that need to be retested, it is also completely unacceptable for Queenslanders who are left in the dark with this massive debacle. DNA evidence forms a critical part of our justice system and Queenslanders need to know that their justice service is serving with credibility and honour to all Queenslanders.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (5.30 pm): I rise to make my contribution to this cognate debate. This week, Queensland Women's Week, we introduce some landmark legislative changes here in Queensland—changes that will largely contribute to a safer Queensland for Queensland women.

From the outset, we start this conversation by acknowledging that the experience of women and girls in the justice system is one of fear, prejudice and unfairness, and we acknowledge that women are overwhelmingly impacted by domestic and family violence. I would like to touch on the contribution of the member for Ninderry, who reflected that some of these amendments might lead to some unfair outcomes. I would certainly acknowledge that we do not have fair outcomes at the moment. I understand that thousands of women have contributed to the reports of the taskforce that have led to these amendments, and they have done so because currently the outcomes for women are wholly unfair.

In this debate we have a lot to cover, so I will focus my contribution on the amendments around coercive control and affirmative consent. Before I start, I would like to acknowledge the many thousands of women whose experience with domestic and family violence and the criminal justice system more broadly, as well as interactions with and within the QPS, contributed to the many inquiries and reports that have directly led to this amendment. Their stories, their strength and the sacrifices that have been made by Queensland women over decades drive us forward.

I spent many years as a first responder to domestic and family violence incidents, and I remember the cultural change that Queensland had to go through to eradicate the idea that what happens in the home stays in the home. We know that we have come a long way since the early nineties, but we must realise that there are still those who have this mindset. I remember undergoing the first big tranche of domestic and family violence amendment training that incorporated the definition of 'domestic and family violence' to include economic, emotional and psychological abuse, and I can tell members that this was not necessarily widely accepted by members of the QPS at the time. Those who have read the commission of inquiry report would not be surprised. It is one thing to take action when assaults occur and property is damaged—things that can be directly observed and proved—but when other aspects like economic and psychological abuse take a bit more effort, there is often resistance.

I was a senior project officer for domestic and family violence in the QPS when the last tranche of sweeping changes to DV legislation occurred in 2017. I travelled the state talking to our district domestic and family violence coordinators and conducting regional training sessions, so I understand that the changes that this legislation seeks to make will require education—education not only for our frontline police but also to the wider community.

The amendment to be introduced in chapter 29A in the Criminal Code is to include the offence of coercive control. This is something that I consider to be the next big cultural shift in domestic and family violence legislation in Queensland. Coercive control in section 334C will apply where: the person is in a domestic relationship; the person engages in a course of conduct that consists of domestic violence occurring on more than one occasion; the person intends the course of conduct to coerce or control the other person; and the course of conduct would be reasonably likely to cause the other person harm.

To name this offence coercive control and to include it in the Criminal Code indicates the serious nature of this offence, and certainly many contributions already today have indicated a number of instances where coercive control has led to the death of a Queenslanders. I applaud the inclusion of this offence and acknowledge the education campaign that will have to accompany these changes, particularly with our young people, through programs like Respectful Relationships in our schools. This generational change that we start today must start with our young people.

The other amendment I would like to comment on relates to the changes to affirmative consent. Under section 348, consent will mean free and voluntary agreement. Previously the wording was around 'given'—that someone had to give consent. Much of the feedback did focus on the fact that this particular wording required, in most cases, women to be sexual gatekeepers—that is, the person to say yes or no, that it was up to one person. However, I acknowledge and commend to the House the comments, contributions and submissions by those that really did touch on modern community standards of healthy relationships requiring mutual agreement. This word 'agreed' also brings us into line with most other jurisdictions. This requires consent and an understanding that consent can be withdrawn at any time; that a person who does not offer physical or verbal resistance is not, by reason of that fact, to be taken to have consented; and that the person does not consent to an act just because they consented to the same or different act with the same or other person at a previous time.




I also applaud the inclusion of additional circumstances which infer or which indicate there is not consent—that is, that a person did not say or do anything to communicate consent; that they did not have the cognitive capacity to consent; and, more importantly, that the person is so affected by alcohol or other drugs as to be incapable of consenting to the act. There certainly have been a number of cases where a defendant has claimed to have been too intoxicated to understand whether consent had been given or not, particularly when that person is impacted by alcohol or drugs voluntarily.

The fact that a person is unconscious or asleep clearly is not giving consent. The fact that we had to actually write that in legislation is quite sickening if you think about it, but this is where we are at. This is how unfair the current system is: we have to spell out in black and white that if a person is asleep they are not consenting to a sexual act.

That the person participates in an act because of force or fear of force is not consent. I could go on, but the more I read this list the more disappointing one can find that, in a modern society, we actually have to outline and articulate what is not consent. However, I can tell you that every time we have to write something like this in black and white it is because someone has used this as an excuse to have unwanted, uninvited and non-consensual sex. This is why the system as it is is so unfair. Let's not go into how difficult it is to actually prosecute these things in court, but someone—a defendant or a defence team—has gone into court and used these as excuses and got off a charge of rape or sexual assault. We have to stand in here today and pass these amendments to this particular section of the Criminal Code to say that this is not consent. The fact that we have to do this is extremely disappointing in what should be a modern-day society.

Here we are: we will pass this bill today or tomorrow. I hope that this bill gives guidance to some people about what is now acceptable and not acceptable and what is now criminal and not criminal. More importantly, I hope the fact that this is written down—that this amendment is passed here in the state of Queensland—makes this a safer state for Queensland women because we know that, by and large, it is Queensland women who have been on the unfair end of our current legal system. I applaud this bill and I applaud the work of the many thousands of women who came forward to shape this bill in front of us today. I ask all members to pass this bill. I commend it to the House.

 **Mr MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (5.40 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate in relation to the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023 along with the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023. These are two very complex and significant changes to Queensland criminal law that need to be rigorously scrutinised. I do not pretend to be an expert on this subject matter, but given the importance of these changes I have followed the debate closely. I have spent a considerable amount of time trying to understand the best way to keep our community safe.

That being said, I support the intent to keep people safe from controlling and abusive partners. I support the intent to ensure those who commit abhorrent acts like rape, attempted murder and the sexual assault of a child are held to account for their actions, even when they may have been previously acquitted, when there is new and compelling evidence. Like other members on this side of the House, I have some concerns about some of the provisions that we are debating here today—concerns about drafting errors and about the workability of the provisions. These are concerns that were succinctly articulated by the shadow Attorney-General and well established in the statement of reservation submitted by the LNP members for Currumbin and Scenic Rim.

Domestic violence is a stain on our society. The abuse of those who should be loved and protected by their abuser cannot ever be accepted. The pain and suffering that is experienced by victims like Hannah Clarke and her children must stop. It is incumbent on all of us in this place to take every step possible to tackle this scourge. The question is how we achieve these objectives in a workable, consistent, timely and fair manner. I have been disappointed by some of the contributions so far today because ultimately I believe that all members of parliament, regardless of their political affiliation, want to address the scourge of domestic violence. The real question is how to go about that. I support measures to make coercive control a criminal offence because coercive control is abuse and it is abuse that far too frequently results in physical harm to the victims as well. No Queenslanders should have to live in a state of constant fear.

Pathetic political diatribes, such as we heard earlier from the member for Bundaberg, do nothing to advance the cause of protecting victims of domestic violence. I think we can have a mature debate that recognises there are legitimate concerns about the way in which the state government has implemented these reforms and the legitimate concerns of stakeholders like the Queensland Law Society without resorting to the pathetic political arguments that were articulated earlier by members like the member for Bundaberg. It has been reported that domestic and family violence related deaths in Queensland alone rose by 50 per cent in the last year, with around a third of the alleged killers having had a domestic violence protection order against them or contact with police in the 12 months prior to the murders.

Queensland police data showed that in 2023 domestic violence rates saw a major increase from previous years, with QPS receiving more than 171,000 family and domestic violence reports. The Queensland Police Service has previously said that up to 40 per cent of total calls for service—and up to 60 per cent in some districts—relate to domestic and family violence. The number of recorded offences for breaches of domestic violence protection orders have increased dramatically, with police recording more than 61,000 breaches of those orders in 2023. All of the evidence is clear: Queensland has a problem with domestic and family violence. I am disappointed that it has taken so long for this legislation to come to the parliament for consideration. We have seen countless reviews and inquiries but the problem is getting worse.


Sue and Lloyd Clarke, the parents of Hannah, have dedicated themselves to advocating for the criminalisation of coercive control in Queensland. I think it is a testament to them and their firm belief that if coercive control had been criminalised earlier their daughter might still be alive today. Sue, mother of Hannah and the co-founder of Small Steps 4 Hannah, said that 'There are so many things that need to go right for a victim of coercive control to escape their situation.' 'Most of all, they need to know that when they do make a move the law will be there to back them up.' I agree with her sentiments completely.

Like so many others have, I pay tribute to Sue and Lloyd Clarke for their tireless advocacy on this issue—tireless advocacy that hopefully, through this legislation, will result in the lasting legacy of a safer Queensland; a Queensland where victims of domestic violence are protected and where perpetrators are held to account. While I am on that issue, I also want to raise the need for greater support for the families of victims and victim-survivors of domestic and family violence. I have raised this through written correspondence with the Attorney-General. Constituents in my electorate whose daughter was a victim of domestic and family violence felt that they were unable to access sufficient support to help them support their daughter through the process of dealing with an abusive partner. There was a criminal process that followed that incident. I would like to see the government do more to support not just victims but also the broader family unit that supports those victims here in Queensland as well.

There is one aspect of this bill that I have considerable concern about, and that is the provisions that amend the Penalties and Sentences Act and the corresponding sections of the Youth Justice Act which seek to differentiate penalties for those who break the law based on their race. Under Queensland law there is already sufficient regard for the personal history of an offender, including any disadvantage or trauma that they may have faced. I can see no reason why we need to further divide our community by establishing different criminal penalties for people dependent on their race. All Queenslanders should be considered equal in the eyes of the law. The relentless attempts to divide our community do not advance the cause of anyone and, in my view, it needs to stop.

On the issue of double jeopardy, let us be clear that this legislation is only required because of the failures of this state government and the forensic services lab. We have been raising this issue for many years and we must have justice for victims. The issues in the forensic services lab have endangered our legal system. The fact that we need to come in here with clauses around double jeopardy to resolve these issues is a disgrace; it should have been addressed earlier. We must ensure we try to keep the legal tenant of finality to the greatest extent possible; however, I do support the government's measures to address these failures because there must be justice for the victims of these crimes despite the failures in the forensic services lab. I note that the government has not provided any update as to the number of cases that will likely need to be retested so we do not know how many cases will use the provisions contained in this bill. We heard that there were up to 37,000 cases that may need to be retested, so it would be useful if the government would provide an update as to the quantum of cases that will likely need to go before the courts under these provisions.

From the beginning, the LNP has stood beside victims. We believed the victims. We believed the scientists and the whistleblowers and we called for the issues with the lab to be investigated and addressed. It was very disappointing that some members opposite—in particular, Minister D’Ath—fought against every review and inquiry. It was all about managing the media; it was all about the perception rather than the problem. The government’s response to this issue has been less than genuine. The victims deserve better. The victims deserve a government that will have their back. It is good to see that the government is finally accepting there is a problem in the forensic services lab and has come into this House with legislation to try to address some of the shortfalls that have arisen, but we need to see a government that puts victims first. I call on the government to be genuine about supporting all victims of crime across this state. Unfortunately, there are far too many and that number is only rising. I support the amendments to be moved by the shadow Attorney-General. I ask members opposite to genuinely put victims at the forefront of the criminal justice system.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (5.49 pm): I am so proud to rise to speak in this cognate debate during Queensland Women’s Week. I want to touch on specifically the issues of stealthing and affirmative consent before I move on to coercive control. At the outset I want to reassure the House that none of the examples I will give are before the courts. I will start with stealthing.

For those unfamiliar, stealthing occurs when a condom is removed during sexual intercourse. A constituent came to meet with me about this issue a few years ago, as this had happened to her when she was out on a date. She felt very strongly that she was a victim of sexual assault. She had never agreed to have sex without a condom and she would never have given her consent if that question had been put to her before the condom was removed without her consent. All members of this House would know that no-one gives unconditional consent. Consent is not given in a blanket ruling by anyone. That is just not possible.

Modern community expectations are that consent needs to be explicitly sought for each new act. Just as with all relationships, these things are not static and new activities require new consent. Stealthing exposes women in particular to pregnancy and exposes anybody who is a victim of stealthing, no matter their gender, to sexually transmitted disease. Both of these are life-changing events. Thankfully, most people I have spoken to in my community very much understand why stealthing should be an offence, and it is a part of the bill that I am incredibly proud to support today. I know that there will be many members of my community relieved to see it as part of this legislation.

Something else I have spoken about and am passionate about is affirmative consent. This is just so important. I have spoken in this House before about how consent should both be requested and be freely given. I also suggested in one of my previous contributions—I say it again today—that if anybody who is engaging in intimate relations has any doubt as to whether the person they are with is consenting, they have two options: they can ask if they are consenting; and if they are not willing to ask, they should just feel free to assume that they are not consenting. Indeed, under Queensland law that is exactly what they will now need to do.

I think we need to dispel this myth that consent and any discussion around it is thought of as a roadblock. It should never be thought of as a roadblock. It is an important expression between two people of respect and mutual engagement. Quite frankly, if people are unwilling to have a grown-up discussion about consent and what that looks like, they are probably not mature enough for the activities that would follow.

Under the bill, consent needs to be freely and voluntarily given. People really need to ask and they must freely give that consent. Anything short of that is not on. Previous speakers have spoken about somebody being intoxicated, asleep or afraid. I have heard stories from friends who consented to one sexual activity under extreme duress because they feared that otherwise they would have to engage in a non-consensual activity. Under these laws it is explicit—it is clear—that that is not consent. That is not what consent looks like. If someone is trying to negotiate their way to safety and partaking in activities they just do not want to against their will, that is not consent. Our young people certainly—all Queenslanders—deserve better.

The bill also makes provision for age-appropriate education to ensure that our young people understand what this means and why it is important that they ask for consent. This is key because, sadly, there are sections in our community that believe it is okay to coerce somebody into sexual activity. This bill, as I said, clearly outlines what consent looks like.

When it comes to consent, I have the best role model in the world. I have a three-year-old who is incredibly good at saying no. She is really clear. She puts her whole body into it. She puts her hands into it. She uses her voice and she says 'no' so loudly that you could be in no doubt. I give credit to her early childhood educators, because that is what age-appropriate education looks like when talking to our young people about consent. I think that is fantastic and I hope that assertiveness and that clarity continues throughout her entire life. I certainly was not so good at that age.

**Mr Perrett** interjected.

**Ms PUGH:** It took me many years to be as assertive as that, I regret to inform the member for Gympie.

I want to touch on coercive control. I have spoken before about my experiences in supporting close friends through their coercive control experiences. We know that each type of a coercive control victim's experience looks a little bit different. Each coercive control abuser and survivor has their own unique clusters of behaviour. According to some of the research that I was reading online, some perpetrators are actually clever enough to target and tailor their coercive control behaviours towards the victim in such a way that it will be more effective with that particular victim.

I also had a look at the Victorian branch of Relationships Australia website. They outline the coercive control behaviours. They include: isolating someone from their support system—from family and friends—so they cannot get the support they need; monitoring their activity throughout the day; denying them freedom and autonomy so they know where the victim is when they are at work or school by perhaps restricting their access to transportation; taking their phone; and changing their passwords or knowing their passwords so they can check what they are doing.

Then there is gaslighting, where the abuser makes them doubt their own experience by insisting they are always right and instilling their narrative of a situation, even if the evidence is to the contrary. In essence, gaslighting is based on lies and manipulation of the truth. Other behaviours include name-calling, severe criticism and put-downs—these are all extreme forms of bullying—limiting a victim's access to money and controlling their finances. This also has the impact of restricting their freedom and curtailing their ability to leave the relationship. It includes coercing the partner to take care of all of the domestic duties, turning their children against them, controlling aspects of their health and body, making jealous accusations about the way they spend time with family or friends, regulating their sexual relationship or threatening their children or pets.


It is important to note that most coercive control victims will not experience all of those behaviours. They might experience a number of them, but there will be some that are missing. One of the few things that is consistent about coercive control is that slow, strangling feeling of dread that eventually comes to sit with those victims when they realise they are caught in this cycle that can be so incredibly difficult for them to get out of.

I want to finish by thanking the women in my community who shared their experiences with me on all of these different aspects of the legislation along the journey to making this legislation a reality. I want them all to know that their voices have been important in bringing this issue before parliament in the form that it takes today in this incredibly important piece of legislation.

Debate, on motion of Ms Pugh, adjourned.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Gladstone, Gas Pipeline

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs) (5.57 pm): I rise to make a ministerial statement to update the House in relation to an incident on the Queensland gas pipeline owned and operated by private company Jemena. At this time information is still coming in; however, the information that we do have available is that there will be a significant decrease to gas availability in and around the Gladstone area for a temporary and hopefully short period.

A short time ago I spoke with the CEO of Jemena, the company that manages these gas pipeline assets on behalf of its major gas clients. The CEO advised of a rupture in the pipeline and provided assurances that he is working with his counterparts across industry to repair the pipeline as soon as practicable. Safety of the community, distribution to critical infrastructure and the economic security of

the Gladstone industrial workforce, including at Rio Tinto facilities, have been key considerations in managing this unfolding situation. I have received briefings from the Department of Energy and Climate and cabinet colleagues in the resources and manufacturing portfolios, and I thank them for that. I have been briefed on the powers being exercised by the Australian Energy Market Operator.

I am advised that the Queensland gas pipeline ordinarily supplies Gladstone approximately 145 terajoules per day. I am further advised that, in order to continue the supply of Gladstone, gas is being directed from the Meridian gas fields with up to now just 38 terajoules a day. The Australian Energy Market Operator advises that this drop in gas availability requires it to make decisions relating to temporary gas rationing. These are decisions that must be made in the interests of community safety and economic security. It will be important for Jemena, the pipeline operator, to confirm that it has appropriate arrangements in place to ensure companies, and therefore their workforces, do not suffer adverse impacts as a result of this incident.

The cause of this event is yet to be determined; however, I understand that the section of the pipeline affected has been isolated. The incident is under control and the site is now being investigated by relevant agencies. I will endeavour to update the House as more information comes to hand. Finally, thankfully nobody was injured, and the relevant authorities and companies are working together to resolve the situation safely and with minimum disruption to the community.


## **CRIMINAL LAW (COERCIVE CONTROL AND AFFIRMATIVE CONSENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**


### **CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION (DOUBLE JEOPARDY EXCEPTION AND SUBSEQUENT APPEALS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### **Second Reading (Cognate Debate)**

Resumed from p. 406, on motion of Ms Fentiman—

That the bills be now read a second time.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (6.01 pm), continuing: I also want to thank the victim-survivors and their families such as Hannah Clarke's family for their ongoing advocacy. It is the hardest thing in the world to experience a loss—an event as world changing as they have—and continue to advocate as they have. I know every single member of this House joins me in expressing their appreciation to them and the many other families who have done exactly the same thing. I also thank Brisbane local Bri Lee, whose conversations with me around the importance of affirmative consent helped me better understand why it should never be negotiable and why this legislation today is so important. I am in awe of every single person who contributed their voice to this bill over a number of years and I commend it to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (6.02 pm): I rise to speak to the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. There are many aspects of the bill that are laudable and worthy. Sexual and domestic violence are a blight on our society. They must be stamped out. However, wandering into territory governing intimate partner relationships is fraught with trouble, subjectivity and takes us down some curious paths. I note, for instance, that the affirmative consent provisions would criminalise the non-payment of a sex worker. That is a logical extension of the principle of affirmative consent, but I find myself agreeing with some stakeholders who said that we should not be wasting the time of the QPS chasing down debts to sex workers.

I have other concerns with the sections relating to affirmative consent. While the intentions behind these sections seem noble—to combat sexual assault and promote a culture of respect and communication—the implementation and consequences of such legislation raise significant issues that cannot be ignored. Affirmative consent laws mandate that individuals must obtain 'free and voluntary agreement' before engaging in sexual activity. On the surface this may sound like a reasonable requirement—emphasising the importance of mutual understanding and respect between partners—however, in practice these laws create myriad problems. First and foremost, the law would place an unrealistic burden on individuals to constantly seek explicit affirmation during intimate moments and is a very invasive creep of government or legislation into those varied parts of managing relationships

which is part of the human condition. This not only disrupts the spontaneity and natural flow of human interaction but also fosters an environment of anxiety and paranoia. It transforms what should be a moment of connection and intimacy into a bureaucratic process where individuals fear legal repercussions if they fail to follow a strict script.

Furthermore, the laws overlook the complexities of human behaviour and communication. Non-verbal cues, body language and contextual factors play crucial roles in how individuals express consent and desire. Affirmative consent laws disregard these nuances, leading to situations where individuals may genuinely desire sexual interaction but hesitate to verbalise it explicitly out of fear or discomfort. Moreover, affirmative consent laws undermine personal responsibility. They infantilise individuals, suggesting that they are incapable of navigating their own sexual encounters without explicit legal guidelines. Rather than fostering a culture of empowerment and accountability, these laws promote a culture of victimhood where individuals are encouraged to perceive themselves as potential victims of sexual misconduct at every turn. Additionally, affirmative consent laws reverse the presumption of innocence—a cornerstone of our legal system. It is now sidelined in favour of a 'guilty until proven innocent' approach where individuals must constantly prove their innocence against vague and subjective accusations.

I also have concerns regarding the sections in the legislation relating to coercive control. Again, while the aim of the laws may seem admirable—to protect individuals from psychological abuse and manipulation—the reality is that these laws present significant challenges and potential pitfalls that cannot be overlooked. Coercive control laws seek to criminalise behaviours that are deemed to exert undue influence and control over a partner. While on the surface this might appear to be a necessary step in addressing domestic abuse, in practice it raises a host of complex issues. First and foremost, the legislation risks criminalising behaviours that are not inherently abusive. Relationships are, by their nature, nuanced and multifaceted. What may appear as control to an outsider might be a consensual dynamic within the relationship. By criminalising a broad range of behaviours—from monitoring social media accounts to restricting access to finances—these laws risk criminalising ordinary disagreements and conflicts that occur within relationships.


My most significant example of that is in some of the Aboriginal communities. In Doomadgee the people that I am pretty close with have an interesting way of communicating with me sometimes which could be misinterpreted by outsiders. Perhaps they are just angry with me, but I know that that becomes a real quagmire for police and others trying to sort out domestic violence at that end which ties up a lot of resources. Yes, it is not good, but they are very complex issues to resolve and pull the rights and wrongs of that out.

Moreover, there is no clear and objective criteria for defining what constitutes coercive behaviour. Unlike physical abuse, which often leaves visible marks and evidence, psychological abuse is inherently subjective and open to interpretation. What one person perceives as controlling behaviour another may view as legitimate attempts to maintain boundaries or ensure safety. As a result, there is a significant risk of false accusations and wrongful convictions under these coercive control laws. Furthermore, the legislation may inadvertently discourage individuals from seeking help or reporting abuse. Victims of abuse often hesitate to come forward due to fear of retaliation, shame or financial dependence on their abuser. By criminalising behaviours that may be perceived as controlling, these laws may deter victims from seeking assistance out of concern that their partner or family member will face criminal charges, leading to further isolation and harm. Additionally, these laws will place an undue burden on the QPS and the courts. Detecting and proving psychological abuse is inherently challenging and requires a high degree of expertise and sensitivity. I wonder if the QPS and the courts have the necessary training and resources to accurately assess complex interpersonal dynamics, leading to inconsistent enforcement and potential miscarriages of justice.

At the end of the day, affirmative consent and coercive control sections of this legislation risk criminalising ordinary behaviour. While the goals may be laudable, their implementation and consequences fall short of their intended objectives. These laws create more problems than they solve, undermining personal autonomy, fostering a culture of fear and suspicion and eroding fundamental rights. Instead of relying on heavy-handed legislation, we should focus on comprehensive education, open dialogue and fostering a culture of mutual respect and communication. Only through genuine understanding and empathy can we truly address the complex issue of sexual assault in our society. I understand that anything opposing the nature of what this bill is trying to achieve is going to be

interpreted as not caring about women and not caring about these horrific events that happen and may be seen as not acknowledging the pain and suffering of the families of those victims, but there is inadvertently a lot of damage occurring to males in Queensland caught in the crossfire with much of this.

Despite some of the good that this may do, there is a growing impact on males in this state who suffer inadvertent consequences when these sorts of laws can be weaponised through the ill will of a partner. We all have our stories, but I have had close personal contact with someone where it has been the reverse—the abuse applied to the male. The male does not report it. By and large, there will not be an army of males reporting coercive control by females. I cannot see that happening. This is about the females reporting the males. There will be more males inadvertently caught out by malicious behaviour—weaponising by people with malicious intent. When added to the subjectivity of this component, it raises a greater threat to males who are trying to do the right thing being caught in the crossfire of this legislation.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (6.11 pm): I rise in support of the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023. As a former minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence, I know that this bill means a lot to everybody in this House for various reasons. I particularly recall when we first started having the conversation about coercive control. It was at the time when Hannah Clarke and her three beautiful children were murdered in a way that shocked not only Queensland and Australia but I think the world. This bill amends the Criminal Code to introduce a new offence of coercive control which will carry a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment. It amends chapter 32 of the Criminal Code to implement an affirmative model of consent. Amendments are also made to the Evidence Act to introduce jury directions for sexual offence trials and to strengthen the provisions pertaining to improper questions.

I commend the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's examination of this bill. There were some particular words from the chair in the foreword to the report which I think speak to the reason this bill is so important. To quote the chair—

Above all, this Bill is about one thing—changing the experience of girls and women who journey through the police and court system, a system that is designed to protect them and give them justice. A system that has sadly let many of them down.

He goes on to say—

It is not enough to call out the behaviour, draw attention to the statistics or have an awareness campaign. It is not enough to have White Ribbon Day or the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. Deep, structural reform is necessary.

That is what this bill is about. When Hannah Clarke and her children were murdered, there was absolute horror, disbelief and outrage. As the minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence at the time, I was very conscious of the calls to introduce legislation immediately to make coercive control an offence. I want to congratulate the two attorneys-general and ministers for the prevention of domestic and family violence for their actions to make sure that when we did introduce this legislation it was right. At the time, there was very little evidence of any coercive control legislation anywhere in the world having successful convictions. We have all said in different ways in this House, on both sides of this parliament, what a tricky offence it is to describe—to recognise a pattern of behaviour, for police to be able to recognise at a scene and to create the body of evidence that is necessary to secure a conviction. I commend the work of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce in going through that process so that the bill that is before the House now will have the greatest success possible in achieving conviction. That is incredibly important.

I want to thank all of the women who came forward to give evidence to that taskforce and all of the women who came forward through the progress of this bill through the parliamentary committee. Many of them may never have spoken of this before. I want to acknowledge their strength and their bravery. I also acknowledge the people who work alongside them who, unfortunately, well before everyone heard about Hannah, had only too strong a recognition of coercive control and how dangerous it was for the women who were experiencing it.


The time when the world heard of the events that had led up to Hannah's death and the pattern of behaviour by her former partner was the first time that many women had heard a story which was the same as their own. This made them recognise that what they had been experiencing for such a long time was, in fact, domestic violence, that domestic violence is not physical. I have worked closely with Allison Baden-Clay's sister, Vanessa Fowler, and her parents, Geoff and Priscilla. They said to me

so many times that once they learned about coercive control they realised that the pattern of behaviour they had seen around Allison's life was, in fact, coercive control and that they wished they had understood what that meant so they may have intervened. We have all heard the characteristics of coercive control: isolating a victim from their family and friends and making them feel bad about themselves and unwilling and unable to talk to others around them about what is happening. I believe strongly that this bill is incredibly important in the journey for so many women—not only the bill itself but also the awareness that has been raised around what coercive control looks like and the awareness that there is support in the community for people who put up their hand and say, 'This is me.'

To the matter of affirmative consent—and this goes to the comments of the chair of the committee about the experiences of women in the criminal justice system, many who have never come forward in sexual assault offences because they have been aware of the attrition rates through the legal and judicial system and have simply felt that it was just not worth their while to ever say anything—this bill makes it really clear to potential offenders, to women, to legislators and to the justice system that it is not okay to have sex with a person unless they specifically say they want it. It is not okay to have sex with a person if they are drunk. It is not okay to have sex with a person if they are asleep or unconscious. It is not a defence to say, 'I thought she wanted it.' That person must tell you that they want to have sex with you.

What has been raised throughout the examination of this bill and the coercive control bill is that we cannot address these things just with legislation. There has to be change in the attitudes of people towards sexual relationships. The National Community Attitudes Towards Violence Against Women Survey tells us some quite confronting statistics: 28 per cent of respondents said that when a man is very sexually aroused he may not even realise that the woman does not want to have sex; 42 per cent said it is common for sexual assault accusations to be used as a way of getting back at men; 32 per cent said that a female victim who does not leave an abusive partner is partly responsible for the abuse continuing; 21 per cent agree that sometimes a woman can make a man so angry that he hits her when he did not mean to—and so the list goes on.

Those are really scary attitudes. Unless we deal with them there will be a difficult battle for everyone. That is why the Respectful Relationships curriculum in Queensland schools is so important. We need our young people to know, from an early age, that you must treat others with respect. You must treat the person with whom you are in a relationship with respect. Respect is the basis of all human relationships. I commend these bills to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (6.20 pm): I rise to address the cognate debate on the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023 and the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023. The Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was introduced into the Queensland parliament on 11 October 2023 by the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women. Subsequently, it was referred to the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for detailed consideration. This legislation seeks to implement a number of recommendations that have arisen from multiple inquiries, including the *Hear her voice* report from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, the commission of inquiry into the Queensland Police Service and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

Turning to one of the key aspects of the legislation, for which it is named, importantly, the legislation will amend the Criminal Code to establish the criminal offence of coercive control. With the enacting of this legislation, the offence of coercive control will apply when a person commits domestic violence against a person they are in a relationship with on more than one occasion with the intention of coercing or controlling that person and the conduct would be reasonably likely to cause that person harm. I note that the offence will be limited to those in a domestic relationship, which refers to and uses the 'relevant relationship' definition from the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act—that is, those in a domestic relationship that encompasses past and present intimate partner relationships, wider family relationships and informal care relationships. I note that the legislation will also utilise definitions of 'domestic violence', 'economic abuse' and 'emotional or psychological abuse' that are broadly consistent with the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act.



Coercive control is simply abhorrent and has no place in a civil society. We have heard members from across the chamber speak to that today. It is a set of behaviours and a form of domestic violence that, at its very core, destroys victims through fear and intimidation and leaves victims feeling alone, powerless and utterly trapped. I acknowledge comments by the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee that there was general support for the new offence of coercive control. However, I also acknowledge that there have been significant concerns raised in relation to how this offence has been drafted by the state Labor government and what that will mean in practice for prosecuting the offence of coercive control.

I turn to another substantial change within the legislation, which is the amendment of the Criminal Code to insert an affirmative model of consent and the subsequent expansion of situations where consent is invalidated, withdrawn or not agreed to. Whilst the Liberal National Party shadow Attorney-General has canvassed at length the substance of the issues that have arisen through the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's consultation and examination of this proposed change, as the LNP shadow minister for education there is a specific aspect I wish to address.

I note that the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee made the specific acknowledgement that 'education and collaboration are the key to effective implementation of these systemic changes to Queensland's consent laws'. Accordingly, in its report, the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee stated—

The committee recommends the Queensland Government, in collaboration with the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, Department of Education, Queensland Police Service, Queensland Health, peak bodies from the DFV and sexual violence support sector, and First Nations and multicultural organisations, develop and implement an education campaign that includes material that is age appropriate, culturally sensitive and suitable for persons with impaired capacity, to support the proposed reforms. This campaign should increase awareness about the abusive nature and legal implications of technology-facilitated abuse and develop resources for online safety and digital literacy.

This is an important recommendation and one that the Labor state government must diligently implement. Such a substantive change to the Criminal Code deserves a well-resourced and appropriate community education campaign. I know Queenslanders would appreciate the Minister for Education further outlining—and I heard the contribution of the member for Bulimba—how these matters will be communicated, particularly through schools to students.

I acknowledge the proposed amendments within the legislation that will update the consent framework for the distribution of intimate images and prohibited visual recordings, which are also addressed in the committee's second recommendation. This is a serious matter and one that continues to be raised with me as the shadow minister for education. It involves online bullying by and of students, including the doctoring of images as well as the unauthorised distribution of images and recordings. I know that many students, parents, teachers and school staff have seen the work that has been undertaken by the government in this space with respect to students and schools, but certainly more needs to be done. From a personal perspective, recently I have seen a family member become a victim of cyberbullying and stalking. I am very concerned about the risk to young people and particularly school-age Queenslanders.


In my remaining time I wish to address the Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Bill 2023. In relation to the specific legislation, amendments will be made to both the Criminal Code Act 1899 and the Appeal Costs Fund Act 1973 in order to enhance criminal justice system responses to possible wrongful convictions and unjust acquittals. The explanatory notes state that this will be done by—

- establishing a statutory framework to allow a person convicted on indictment or of a summary offence under section 651 of the Criminal Code to make, with the leave of the Court of Appeal, a subsequent appeal against the conviction; and
- expanding the fresh and compelling evidence double jeopardy exception to 10 prescribed offences in addition to murder.

Specifically in relation to the double jeopardy exception and, again, as extensively canvassed by the LNP shadow Attorney-General, many within the Queensland legal community expressed concerns in relation to these changes and what it means for one of our legal system's most fundamental principles. However, what this does underscore is that the Queensland legal and judicial system must endure such changes due to the absolute chaos and heartbreak caused by the failures of the state Labor government, particularly when we refer to the forensic DNA testing processes and laboratory in Queensland. It must not be forgotten that this legislation is being debated because of the systemic failures of the forensic services DNA lab and the state Labor government.

It is shameful that the state Labor government, at virtually every turn and in the face of growing and insurmountable evidence, continually resisted and argued against the need for a fundamental review and investigation of the failings of the DNA lab. For the Labor government, this issue was more about managing the media perception rather than addressing the serious matters raised at the time and, in particular, providing support to Queensland victims and their families. In stark contrast, from the very start the Liberal National Party stood by Queensland victims, their families and the brave scientists who never wavered in their fight for justice. The failures of Queensland's forensic DNA testing lab and the denials, inaction and claims of playing politics that were levelled by the state Labor government mark a dark chapter in Queensland's history. It is in that context that this legislation is being debated in the Queensland parliament today.

It is unfathomable but, in the interests of justice for victims, fundamental legislative principles are having to be set aside to cover for the failures of the state Labor government and the devastating and ongoing consequences that have come from the forensic DNA testing debacle. These are the consequences of a state Labor government that has given up on working for the best interests of Queenslanders and, at times, has cared more about how things look than how they really are. There is no doubt that Queenslanders deserve better.

 **Hon. C MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Minister for Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (6.29 pm): I am very proud to add my voice to the support of the cognate bills before us. In particular, I wish to make a contribution in relation to the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I commend the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice on the significant body of work which is seeking to make change, as the parliamentary report noted—changing how we think about and treat consent and changing how the criminal justice system responds to coercive or controlling behaviour.

I am really pleased to see the amendments to an affirmative model of consent. As the mother of teenage girls, I saw it as my responsibility to educate my daughters early around the issue of consent and am so pleased that we now will have stronger laws in Queensland around this really important matter. Not everyone has the privilege of education by an overbearing mother. I note the committee's recommendation that the Queensland government, in collaboration with the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, the Department of Education, Queensland Police Service, Queensland Health and of course our peak bodies from the domestic and family violence and sexual violence support sector, as well as First Nations and multicultural organisations, looks at developing and implementing an education campaign that includes material that is age-appropriate, culturally sensitive and suitable for persons with impaired capacity to support these proposed reforms. We recognise, of course, that this campaign must also increase awareness about the abusive nature and legal implications of technology facilitated abuse.

I now turn to coercive control. Journalist Jess Hill at the launch of the Criminalised Coercive Control Campaign said—

... criminalising coercive control will not magically fix ... justice system ... police, courts, family law ... but criminalising coercive control will replace the broken lens we have on domestic abuse: instead of seeing a collection of incidents, it will make visible the system of abuse that endangers—and even kills—so many women ...

As a government we have recognised that our systems do not always consistently protect victims of domestic and family violence and sexual violence. We took that important step of establishing the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce to independently examine coercive control and review the need for a specific offence of domestic violence and the experience of women across the criminal justice system. As has been noted many times in this parliament, the response to the taskforce's request for submissions was overwhelming. In fact, over 700 submissions were made of which 500 were from brave individuals sharing their lived experiences. As the taskforce report outlined, they were from all socio-economic backgrounds. Many were from First Nations women as well as women from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, those with disability, sex workers and people who identify as LGBTIQ+. Some were from men, a reminder that, exceptionally, women can also be perpetrators. Many victim-survivors described their experiences of coercive control as the most harmful aspect of their abusive relationship. The majority of submissions to the taskforce supported criminalisation and ultimately so did the taskforce. Its report set out a framework for the proposed legislation as part of 89 important recommendations to reform the domestic and family violence service and justice systems.

The bill proposes to amend the Criminal Code by establishing the criminal offence of coercive control. The offence applies when a person commits domestic violence against a person they are in a relationship with on more than one occasion with the intention of coercing or controlling that person, and the conduct would be reasonably likely to cause that person harm. The offence will be limited to those in a domestic relationship, which uses the relevant 'relationship' definition from the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. The bill also adopts the definitions of 'domestic violence', 'economic abuse' and 'emotional or psychological abuse' that are broadly consistent with the act.

The offence criminalises conduct of an adult where: the person is in a domestic relationship with another person; the person engages in a course of conduct against the other person that consists of domestic violence occurring on more than one occasion; the person intends the course of conduct to coerce or control the other person; and the course of conduct would, in all the circumstances, be reasonably likely to cause the other person harm. 'Harm' is defined in the bill to mean any detrimental effect on the person's physical, emotional, financial, psychological or mental wellbeing, whether temporary or permanent. The prosecution is not required to prove that the person intended each act of domestic violence that constitutes the course of conduct, when considered in isolation, to coerce or control the other person.


We know that coercive control is at the core of domestic and family violence. As the Minister for Child Safety, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Multicultural Affairs, I see the daily intersection that domestic and family violence plays in my portfolio—whether it is children exposed to terrible violence, elder abuse perpetrated by family members, violence towards Queenslanders with disability or the cultural lens that sometimes allows domestic and family violence to remain in the shadows of our communities. As individuals, we may see it through the lived experience of family or friends. As members of parliament, we see evidence of it from the many brave constituents we represent and who seek our help.

As always when speaking on domestic and family violence within my community, I wish to pay tribute to the incredible organisations, services and individuals who are there for victim-survivors. I want to particularly acknowledge Amie Carrington and the incredible team from the Domestic Violence Action Centre who service the Ipswich part of my electorate. I also wish to recognise the team from the Centre for Women & Co, based in Logan, who provide outreach services to Flagstone and Greenbank, growing parts of my electorate.

I want to acknowledge our police—in my electorate, the officers working in the Goodna, Springfield and Jimboomba stations. I do not ever underestimate the incredible workloads and challenges that our police face, especially when it comes to domestic and family violence matters. I am proud that our government is making a significant investment to deliver new initiatives including more victim liaison officers, more domestic and family violence support workers in police stations, more specialist domestic and family violence officers, and more specialist police prosecutors.

I continue to advocate for Ipswich to be considered for a specialist domestic and family violence court—something that I know is strongly supported by my fellow Ipswich MPs. At a local level, I wish to thank some of our terrific law firms who support domestic and family violence victims through the legal process. In particular, I highlight the dedicated work of Kath Manby and VM Family Law in Greater Springfield.

We all recognise how important it is to prevent domestic and family violence in our community, but is it our government, the Miles Labor government, that is tackling one of the greatest social issues that our state, and indeed our nation, is facing. We are undertaking major reform because we know that every step will bring us closer to the end of domestic and family violence in our community. Today's bill is a major step as we make coercive control a criminal offence and ensure that all victims have full control of their lives—as it should be. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (6.37 pm): I rise to speak in this cognate debate and to support the bills before the House. I know that we are dealing with very sensitive issues in the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill was introduced into the House as a result of some truly incredible scenes in Brisbane with the Clarke family and some of the horrific details that come to us as members of parliament about some of the crimes

that occur under the guise of domestic and family violence. The bill amends the Criminal Code to introduce a new offence of coercive control, which will carry a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment. It amends chapter 32 of the Criminal Code to implement an affirmative model of consent, to provide that consent means free and voluntary agreement, and to make it explicit that stealthing is a crime.

I commend the work of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. The reason we are debating this in the House today—it has been incredible talking to the police officers in my electorate and others about what we as a government have done, with crossbench support in many cases—is to address the scourge of domestic and family violence. I know that the member for Gladstone's brother is a police officer in Gladstone. It is interesting that, since we as a community have sent a strong message that domestic and family violence is not accepted in any form, we have seen an incredible increase in the number of reports and police action in this area. In fact, an incredibly good police officer in my electorate—I will not call him out on the basis that I might embarrass him—said that when he first started in the force they were dealing with domestic violence 20 per cent of the time and other issues 80 per cent of the time. In the decades he has been in the force that has almost flipped on its head in that police are now being called to domestic and family violence incidents 80 per cent of the time, compared to the 20 per cent of some decades ago.

It is up to this parliament, this House, to send a strong message—that this kind of action that is going on in our community is not acceptable. That is why I welcome this bill and I wanted to talk to it. I was talking with a friend, an acquaintance—someone I know—who went through a very traumatic domestic violence situation recently. It will scar that person for a long time. We need to look at all forms of the coercive control offence—not only physical domestic violence but certain patterns of behaviour. Are we going to get this absolutely perfect? There would be so many manifestations of coercive control that we will have to work through, but we have to start somewhere. Hence I commend the work of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce.

The bill was developed following extensive consultation with stakeholders including the domestic and family violence sector and the legal profession. The reforms build on the work that we have been doing as a government to address this issue. We might say domestic violence is out of control. Coming from a cultural background in an Italian community, I think what was once swept under the carpet has now, through the laws we have introduced and the public education we have done, been brought to the fore. It is no longer acceptable. People no longer turn a blind eye. People who recognise that something is happening should not walk away. They should ask, 'Are you okay? Is there anything I can do to assist?' They should provide that support. I think that a lot more predominantly women—I am not saying it is only women—are coming forward because we now have the supports in place and the laws in place that give them the confidence that if they want to do something about their situation they can, knowing that there is assistance out there in the community.

I agree with others that there is a need to change the culture and that you change culture through education, but it takes many facets to change culture. You have to have the laws. You have to be able to apply the laws. You have to be able to educate people about the laws. Hence you can then change behaviour. If all of those things are not working together, it is very difficult to change the culture that is established. I do not understand why people engage in this behaviour. I am fortunate in my relationship. I do know of other relationships that are not as, can I say, wonderful as my own. A lot of people know my husband and I know many partners—husbands and wives—of members in this House. Many of us are very fortunate. Unfortunately, there are people in our community who are not so fortunate.

I think that it is imperative that we send a very strong message. Conduct to coerce or control the other person has to be called out, particularly if it is likely to result in death. We have read about some of these terrible incidents. My skin crawls every time I think about Hannah Clarke and her children. It is truly unbelievable that someone would even think about inflicting something like that, let alone going through with it. We have to define what that intended harm could be. It means any detrimental effect on a person's physical, emotional, financial, psychological or mental wellbeing, whether temporary or permanent. I thank all of those who have worked hard to assist us in pulling all of this together.


I also acknowledge the extensive and transformational work by all of those stakeholders who came before the committee—and the committee did a wonderful job—all those who made submissions, all those who were able to inform us how their lives have been affected. I take my hat off to them all for their bravery in coming forward. I equally thank those in my electorate who have said, 'Grace, it is terrific

that the government is doing this. There are so many instances where this occurs and we do need to change it.' We need to continually engage with these reforms and of course with the victim-survivors of domestic violence as well. I know that Lloyd and Sue Clarke are very supportive of this. They are proud to have played a part in advocating for standalone coercive control laws in Queensland. They are grateful that the government has heard their calls and responded. It is imperative, as I said, that we support these cognate bills to send a strong message that this kind of action is not acceptable.

In regard to the double jeopardy exception and subsequent appeals bill, I think in today's modern world, if there is fresh or new evidence that we can use to ensure that people who have previously been acquitted are held to account, we should do so. Unfortunately, errors may have happened. I think the bill strikes a good balance in relation to this.

There are 10 additional offences that will be included. They include manslaughter, attempted murder, unlawful striking causing death, killing an unborn child, rape, incest and repeated sexual conduct with a child. I think it is important that, if there are exceptional circumstances where a retrial of an acquitted person is meant to happen because of evidence that has come forward, the legislation provides for that.

I am also proud to say that we started the very comprehensive Respectful Relationships education in our schools. We have to start early. It is age appropriate. We started this many months ago. It is now in our schools. I commend the bills to the House.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (6.46 pm): I rise to make my contribution on this cognate debate, but in the time available I will limit my comments to the coercive control and affirmative consent legislation. For years victim-survivors have struggled for the law to recognise even the most basic forms that family, domestic and sexual violence take and the harms they cause. They have struggled for politicians to listen to reason. In many cases victim-survivors have struggled just to stay alive to be here to tell their stories. How do we prevent these harms? When we, as policymakers and legislators, fail to do so, how do we respond? This bill is an imperfect and incomplete answer, but it is timely. There is much in this legislation which is well overdue and which I am proud to have played a small part in fighting for.

In 2021 the Greens were incredibly fortunate to work with RASARA, Rape and Sexual Assault Research and Advocacy, on amendments to the Criminal Code (Consent and Mistake of Fact) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2020. Those amendments, which both Labor and the LNP voted against at the time, would have introduced an affirmative model of consent into Queensland law. That was nearly three years ago. Tasmania introduced affirmative consent laws in 2004. Victoria, New South Wales and the ACT brought in affirmative consent laws in 2022. The government's decision to abandon affirmative consent in 2021 was completely out of step with contemporary expectations about sexual consent.

While this bill enshrines consent as a voluntary and free agreement between participants of an act, absent from the new legal framework is the understanding that affirmative consent is also necessarily informed consent because, if a participant wilfully and intentionally withholds or is deliberately dishonest with information that is plainly material to the other person's decision to consent, there can be no consent. Nonetheless, these laws are a big step in recognising a more functional, sex-positive and safe definition of consent which better reflects the community's understanding of consensual sex and which better understands how rape is perpetrated. To every person who has fought for these changes, to the many advocates and victim-survivors: thank you and congratulations on seeing this reform through.

This bill also introduces a standalone offence of coercive control. Coercive control is not always visible from the outside. It may not even be fully apparent to its victims until its pattern of abuse and coercion is fully established. At that point it may have become enormously difficult to escape or seek protection or recourse. The individual acts that make up a pattern of control do not necessarily amount to individual offences and they can be difficult to prove, especially when the claimant is subject to the ongoing harms of the relationship. Creating any new offence—expanding the scope of possible criminalisation—is a big deal. It is a move that requires very careful consideration; however, legislating a new offence to recognise coercive control has the potential to provide potentially life-saving recourse for victims of domestic violence.

The Greens will be supporting a standalone offence of coercive control in order to afford victim-survivors the chance for recognition and recourse they have asked for and which they desperately deserve. In doing so, I would like to highlight the concerns of many organisations that have highlighted the issues associated with increased criminalisation, misidentification of victims and perpetrators, and the fact that without investment in support and services these laws cannot be expected to work.

The Australian Lawyers Alliance is 'opposed to a carceral solution as the most appropriate option to deal with this social issue'. The Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service writes, 'We have concerns about misidentification of female victim-survivors borne out of our experience providing assistance.' The Greens reaffirm our commitment to a more nuanced policy to prevent family violence. We echo the concerns of the Queensland Sexual Assault Network, the Queensland Mental Health Commission, the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence, Full Stop Australia, Legal Aid Queensland, the Queensland Human Rights Commission, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, Sisters Inside and many more. These organisations and experts know that these laws are not a silver bullet and that without additional investment in other areas they will not work.

In the UK, a review of similar laws found no evidence that criminalising coercive control reduced rates of domestic violence. Less than 10 per cent of police investigations into alleged coercive control in the UK resulted in a charge, and less than five per cent resulted in a prosecution. We cannot simply handcuff our way out of domestic violence. We need to encourage broader investment in tackling the root causes of crime such as social disconnection, poverty, housing insecurity and addiction. We need investment in supporting victim-survivors to recover from violence, and we demand investment in programs and counselling that potential perpetrators can go to for help before their conduct meets the threshold of police intervention.

We know that putting sole responsibility for responding to domestic violence onto the police does not work. The recent inquiry into police responses to domestic and family violence highlighted how ill-equipped the police are to respond to domestic violence, citing instances of acute misconduct as well as systemic and cultural failures. In one instance an unnamed officer thought it appropriate to access the details of a domestic violence complainant, travel to her place of work, question her and then demand a massage. In another high-profile case of egregious misconduct, Senior Constable Neil Punchard deliberately leaked the details of a domestic violence victim to her abusive ex-partner. CCTV evidence of the victim's abuse was taped over and the victim was told by another officer not to waste their time. In the words of the victim, 'officers minimised domestic violence' and left her with 'no faith that the Queensland police could protect her'.


The problem is far bigger than just these individual officers. A study of coronial files compiled over a decade found that almost a third of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women killed in domestic violence had been previously identified by police as perpetrators. The same study also found that police responses to domestic violence frequently contributed to the deterioration of familial relationships and worsening domestic violence within the family unit, even where police acted in accordance with training and policy. Without alternatives to police intervention we risk overburdening the police with a problem they cannot solve and where police involvement frequently destabilises and exacerbates already unsafe and violent circumstances. We risk Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people as well as poor, ethnic and disadvantaged communities being policed in a way that entrenches criminogenic disadvantage, because that is exactly what has been happening in this country for over 200 years.

In November we wrote to the Attorney-General to suggest that she adopt very minor, straightforward amendments to the bill that would require the minister to review what effect the laws have had on the community in three years time, which is similar to the review done in the UK. The amendments would also require particular attention to be paid to how these laws are being policed in First Nations and multicultural communities. In the absence of the member for South Brisbane, and given that the amendments are outside the long title of the bill, I will not be moving these in consideration in detail, but I will table them now so that they are at the very least on the public record. I again ask the Attorney-General to accept these amendments so that we can know if these laws work and if not why not.

*Tabled paper:* Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023, amendments to be moved by Dr Amy MacMahon MP [\[294\]](#).

The bill also contains some welcome nods towards evidence-based approaches to criminal justice. There is a new requirement for courts to consider the impact that failing to grant bail to a defendant would have on that defendant's children if the defendant were, for example, a single mother. This purports to keep the family unit intact during a prosecution. Concessions like this do not mean much in a vacuum without housing and other social supports. Without jobs that pay more than the minimum wage and without properly funded schools, people are going to fall through the cracks and into criminal offending.

The bill sets out rehabilitation programs as an alternative to prosecution for first-time breaches of DVOs. We know that prison makes people more likely to reoffend, not less likely, so the provision for these programs is welcomed, but the provisions are worthless unless the relevant programs are fully and consistently funded. There is also the near total absence of support for families prior to escalating the situation with police. Right now a mother cannot get help for a violent son without risking his arrest. Labor wants another two prisons to lock up children as young as 10 years old. We already have the highest rate of youth incarceration in the country. Surely it is clear that if locking kids up worked then crime rates would be falling. Labor and the LNP's approach to justice is to ask, 'How do we punish every crime? How do we fund enough cops and prisons to do so?' But the question we must ask ourselves is, 'What are the conditions that produce crime in the first place and how do we address them?'

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (6.57 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the female MPs in this chamber in honour of Queensland Women's Week. This year's theme is 'Count Her In', which aims to highlight the critical importance of women's economic empowerment as central to realising women's rights and gender equality. It is a call to action for women and girls to exercise our fundamental right to equally participate in all areas of our society, including in education, the economy, politics and at home.

This year's Women's Week theme has allowed me to reflect on how proud I am to be part of a government that has sat down and listened to victims of sexual or domestic and family violence to change the course of this social issue. Our government has listened to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations from the *Hear her voice* reports and implemented some of these directly into this bill. The bill will strengthen the government's response to domestic, family and sexual violence by establishing coercive control as a standalone offence. The offence will carry a maximum penalty of 14 years imprisonment and criminalise the conduct of an adult where the course of behaviour in a relationship would, in all circumstances, be reasonably likely to cause another person harm. To ensure this encompasses coercive control, 'harm' is defined in the bill as any detrimental effect on the person's physical, emotional, financial, psychological or mental wellbeing, whether temporary or permanent.


Coercive control is dangerous. It has serious impacts on the victim and their families. As a former educator and school leader, I have witnessed firsthand how domestic and family violence can affect a student's wellbeing. This includes not only their educational outcomes but also a range of behavioural influences including poor mental health, low self-esteem and internalised behaviours. As Assistant Minister for Education, I strongly endorse the criminalisation of coercive control to better protect our students and their parents and bring justice to victim-survivors.

Further to tackling coercive control, the bill refines the meaning of 'consent' by amending the existing framework outlined in the Criminal Code. The new affirmative model of consent has been implemented into the bill following recommendations 43 and 44 of the *Hear her voice* report. The bill amends section 348 of the Criminal Code to define consent as a free and voluntary agreement rather than given. To further clarify this meaning, the bill also provides new subsections to aid in the understanding of affirmative consent. This includes that a person may withdraw consent at any time and a person who does not offer physical or verbal resistance is not to be taken to consent to the act. This new and refined definition of 'consent' will ensure that the judiciary carefully considers every sexual or domestic and family violence case that comes before them, with the victims' rights in their best interest. The Queensland Mental Health Commissioner agreed that the existing definition was outdated and framed women and girls in a negative light.

Debate, on motion of Ms McMillan, adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

### Kawana Electorate

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.00 pm): I want to congratulate Chris and Lauren who have just opened The Station in Birtinya. This is a family friendly entertainment precinct. They had the opening night on the weekend and it was great to see hundreds of people attend. There is a new skate park, and they had Betty Taylor and the Temper Trap. I wish Chris and Lauren and all the staff at The Station all the very best. Live music is real on the Sunshine Coast, and it is great to have a venue back in Birtinya that people in the live music industry can go to, particularly locals. Congratulations to Chris and Lauren, and thank you for bringing that business back up and running.

I want to address a few issues in the Kawana electorate. One is the traffic issues on Buderim Street out the front of Currimundi State School and Currimundi Special School. We have been trying to get council to fix this dangerous intersection for many months. I have been working with the school P&C and Education Queensland to look at better traffic management and parking issues, but the reality is that the intersection out the front of the school needs a complete upgrade. It is a council road and I am hoping the new council will get on with the job and make that road safe for all the students and pedestrians in the Currimundi area.


Meridan State College are having their P&C AGM tonight—right now—which I cannot get to. I want to thank David and all of the team for the tremendous work they have done over the year. I understand he is running unopposed—wouldn't that be great in elections! Talara had their P&C AGM recently, as did Buddina. Currimundi will have their AGM tomorrow, PLC recently had their AGM, and the AGM at Kawana Waters State College is to come. Thank you for the wonderful work that all of our P&Cs do across the Kawana electorate.

Youth crime continues to be an issue in the Kawana electorate. We are setting up a Meridan e-Neighbourhood Watch. Unfortunately, we cannot get enough community members to participate in an actual physical Neighbourhood Watch, so Caloundra police and the Kawana Police Station have agreed to give us a liaison officer and we are going to set up a Meridan e-Neighbourhood Watch for that community to bring the community together and tackle these issues as a community.

In the time remaining, I want to address the Sunshine Coast direct rail. The Labor Party have cut the Sunshine Coast direct rail from Maroochydore. This is a rail project that has been promised to the Sunshine Coast community for over 20 years. We need the rail not to stop at Caloundra; we need the Sunshine Coast heavy passenger rail to go from Beerwah to Caloundra to Kawana and right through to Maroochydore. Under the Labor Party's plan to stop the rail at Caloundra, it will never happen and people on the Sunshine Coast will never see it go to Maroochydore.

What will that mean for the people of Caloundra? That will mean that Caloundra Road will become more of a car park than it already is now. Caloundra and Kawana residents know the traffic congestion on Caloundra Road, and that will be worse with everyone north going down to Caloundra for a train station. It is time the Labor government committed to the full rail corridor right through to Maroochydore. The Sunshine Coast community deserve that full rail corridor and better public transport on the Sunshine Coast to better connect places like The Station so that people can go out and have a great night and get home safely.

### Jordan Electorate, Mater Chicks in Pink Springfield Walk

 **Hon. C MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Minister for Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (7.03 pm): This coming Sunday there will be a sea of pink in Greater Springfield. I am so proud to be supporting Mater Health Services to lead an International Women's Day Fun Run in our local community in support of Mater Chicks in Pink. The Brisbane International Women's Day Fun Run has been a much loved event for over 30 years and has grown to record crowds of 20,000 at the 2023 event. In fact, this year's Brisbane CBD fun run has sold out so I am pleased that we will be able to run and walk in Springfield to raise funds towards lifesaving breast cancer research as well as support and services for breast cancer patients at Mater hospitals across Queensland. This includes those patients at the Mater Cancer Care Centre in Springfield.




I recently met the incredible Maria Jenner, a local Brookwater mum. Less than 12 months ago, Maria was handed a shock breast cancer diagnosis. After discovering a hard lump measuring about three centimetres in her left breast last April, Maria was diagnosed with stage 2 HER2-positive breast cancer—a fast-growing form of invasive breast cancer affecting one in five women. Maria underwent 17 rounds of chemotherapy and a double mastectomy to fight the disease. I am very pleased to say that Maria is now cancer free. As she has said, a positive attitude, support from family, friends and colleagues, as well as being able to receive treatment close to home were beneficial to her recovery.

Having the Mater Cancer Care Centre through the Mater Private Hospital in Springfield has been an absolute godsend for so many. In fact there have been more than 1,000 patients there actively in treatment, including immunotherapy, monoclonal antibodies, hormone therapy, chemotherapy and supportive or palliative care. For those receiving treatment who live in our community, I regularly hear how allowing them to receive treatment locally, with minimal travel, has led to less stress and worry during their most challenging times. It is why this event on Sunday is so important to me and our community because it will provide a platform to raise funds for these services and to honour those affected by breast cancer. I am pleased to say that, whilst we will not have 20,000 on the day, over 150 locals have now registered to participate, which is absolutely amazing given this is the very first year we have organised this local event.

A number of local businesses and organisations have also come on board. I wish to thank Springfield Lakes IGA, The Cheesecake Shop in Springfield, The Skin Sanctuary at Brookwater and the Goodna Redbank Plains Girl Guides, who will be on the barbecue doing the sausage sizzle. The five-kilometre run and walk will set off from the Mater Private Hospital and will end at the brand new Mater Health Hub where there will be food and entertainment. I am hopeful that through this event we can make significant strides towards advancing breast cancer research, improving patient outcomes and ultimately finding a cure. Whilst fundraising goals may vary for each participant, every contribution, no matter how small, makes a difference in the fight against breast cancer.

### Unlicensed Tobacco Shops

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (7.06 pm): I want to ask when this state Labor government is going to do something about the proliferation of organised crime in the form of unlicensed tobacco shops in my electorate and throughout the state.

**Mrs Frecklington:** Hear, hear!

**Mr LISTER:** I take that acknowledgement from the member for Nanango. Legitimate businesses in my electorate of Southern Downs and elsewhere are suffering a loss of trade to these chop-chop shops, when they are paying licensing fees to be a licensed retailer for tobacco products. These unlicensed retailers are selling vapes, there is no excise on the products they sell, they are paying no tax, there are obvious biosecurity concerns about what is coming in through the back door and is not being checked, and kids are buying tobacco products at these places. If these retailers are happy to trade unlicensed, they are unlikely to be concerned about transgressing against the law about selling cigarettes, tobacco products or vapes to minors.


I have already written to the minister. I got a reply back from her, which I will acknowledge, but she basically told me to go to the state government website and report it. Many of my electors in Southern Downs have put in complaints about these places, but very little action is taken by Queensland Health under the new powers that this government put through for itself.

I will read into the record a number of establishments which have proliferated. We had two last time we spoke in the House about this matter and now there are five. There is: the Goondiwindi Tobacco shop at 111 Marshall Street, Goondiwindi; AJ Tobacconist at 111 Palmerin Street, Warwick; Warwick Tobacconist Gifts & Convenience Store at 2/105 Palmerin Street, Warwick—they are even on the internet and have their little shop marked on Google Maps; the Axen tobacco shop at 7 Rogers Street, Stanthorpe; and a new unlicensed tobacconist on High Street, Stanthorpe, not far from being opposite the Victoria Street intersection.

When Queensland Health do respond to the complaints that they have been getting, they invariably go in and confiscate some stock or begin proceedings against some minor offender who is behind the counter. However, they are not doing what it takes to stamp this out for good. When you are

dealing with organised crime, you have to hit them hard. I wrote to the health minister and I said that you have to go after the landlords, because there is not a landlord or an agent of a landlord who has seen these premises in recent times who could possibly be unaware of the purposes for which they are being used. In fact one complainant said to me that the landlord of an illegal tobacconist rejoiced in it and said, 'It's a good business. It makes lots of money, so I'll be sure to have a good tenant there.' If landlords are prosecuted for being culpably involved in the sale of unlawful tobacco products, then landlords will very quickly stop renting their premises and we will not have them opening up again after a couple of hours following a Queensland Health raid.


### **Macalister Electorate, Small Business**

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (7.09 pm): It has been a pretty big week in Macalister. We had what is considered the local area's biggest event for small business—that is, the annual Beenleigh Yatala Chamber of Commerce Prawn Day. For those who are uninitiated and have not been, it is a day of nonstop, as-much-as-you-can-eat prawns and the serving of some local wines and craft beers. It is really good to support our local prawn farms that are out alongside the Logan River. This year, as my special guest, I had the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development there, because it is predominantly a small business event. There would have been, I think, over 700 people in attendance representing over 150 small businesses in the local area. The Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries was out there, marvelling us with his prawn-peeling skills, and for the first time ever we had the Premier attend our Prawn Day. Whilst we did enjoy the company, the prawn peeling and the endless stream of selfies that people were after, more importantly we actually contributed to the Noel Herbst Memorial Prawn Peeling Competition. Not wanting to boast or anything like that, we did come second in the first round. Unfortunately, there was a bit of an incident with a prawn at the end of it. Anyway, everyone enjoyed their day.

I am very thankful to the small businesses that I hosted and the school principals that I hosted, because it is actually our high school students who do the hosting and serving on the day. Our Beenleigh State High School students and Windaroo Valley State High School students were out there contributing to the day as part of their hospitality training. It was also an opportunity for me to invite many of my sporting clubs because they are in the company of many small businesses, so when they are looking to connect with community small businesses for sponsorship it is a great networking day for everyone.

I want to make a special acknowledgement of a couple who celebrated 70 years of blissful marriage on the weekend—Val and Shirley Curtis of Wynnum West. I know that the member for Lytton would otherwise be telling this story, but it was a wonderful family event to celebrate 70 years of marriage in the bayside area. On behalf of everyone who came along, Nanna and Grandad, it was a very wonderful and fantastic experience, and thanks for looking after us all.

### **Burns, Mr M; Smallacombe, Mr B**


 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (7.12 pm): Tonight I pay tribute to two significant people in my electorate who recently passed. Many in this place would know Mike Burns, a dear friend of many and a dear friend of mine. Mike made a significant impact in the Central Highlands in agriculture, Rugby League and politics. Mike moved to the Central Highlands with his family in 1978 from Nanango, took up a position with a major seed company and later opened his own agricultural seed business called Fairbairn Ag. He was heavily invested in bringing new crop opportunities to the region. He loved agriculture and played a significant role to ensure we had competition in the market against the major seed proprietors, and many of the farming families across the Central Highlands thank Mike for doing so. He was heavily invested in bringing new crop, as I said. Mike also opened the very famous Fairbairn Bakery, which is still open today. If you want to taste the best pies in Queensland, you should try one from the Fairbairn Bakery. They have stores in Emerald, Blackwater and Airlie Beach. It certainly is worth having a crack at those.

Mike was also heavily involved in Rugby League in the Central Highlands as a player, coach and administrator. Mike never liked the accolades, but it would be fair to say that he was one of the driving forces for the Emerald Tigers, and that was evident at his funeral when the Emerald Tigers formed a guard of honour. Finally, he was my chairman of the Gregory SEC LNP and also that of the late Vaughan Johnson OAM. He was awarded life membership to the LNP for his services over four decades and he was a significant contributor not only to the community and to the Catholic Church but also to many communities around the Central Highlands.

I now turn to another pioneer for agriculture in the Central Highlands who passed away recently, Bruce Smallacombe. Bruce was a trailblazer when it came to manufacturing agricultural equipment. Based in Capella, Bruce was not just fixing agricultural equipment through his engineering business; he was also developing new, cutting-edge equipment to conserve moisture in the dry times of dryland farming. I remember him developing the paddle-pop machine which would scoop small mounds of dirt. Once it rained, those areas would retain the water, leaving a great moisture profile for those crops. Bruce was also instrumental in selling Australian-built tractors—the Phillips Acremaster, which was built in Western Australia. While unfortunately not being built anymore, it was well received in the early 1980s and was a significant part of developing the Central Highlands as a premium dryland cropping area, certainly around the Capella, Clermont and Emerald areas.

Both men played a significant role in my family's life but also in the lives of many people on the Central Highlands. It seems we are starting to see a lot of these pioneers of the Central Highlands pass away, but they made a significant contribution to the economic and social cohesion in the Central Highlands. Vale, Mike Burns and Bruce Smallacombe.

### Women and Girls' Health Strategy


 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (7.15 pm): It is Queensland Women's Week, so what better time to release the Miles government's groundbreaking Women and Girls' Health Strategy. One of the key planks of this strategy is the vital funding around pelvic pain and endometriosis, a diagnosis that is much more front of mind than it was just 10 years ago. In the interests of keeping this important conversation going, I will share with the House something that many members of the House already know—that is, my journey around being diagnosed with adenomyosis last year, followed by my hysterectomy last Christmas. I want to say up-front that every woman's experience is different and that some of the treatments that did not work for me would be perfect for other women. There are no one-size-fits-all treatments for these kinds of conditions, but all stories are important.

Like many women, I have had chronic heavy menstrual bleeding since my first period when I was 13. My parents tried their best to help. I was put on the pill, I got some additional medication for what was quickly becoming anaemia, and on it went for the next 20 years. In my early 30s, as I prepared to run for parliament, the heavy bleeding also became very irregular and would often go for weeks at a time, so I had an IUD, a Mirena, put in which so often fixes the issue. However, for me the issue became even worse. I experienced what is called flooding. I could not even leave a public bathroom one day. I actually was trapped in there shortly after I was elected. It was pretty embarrassing and horrific, and a friend had to help me out. With supplementary medication, eventually the Mirena worked and I had no further issues until my daughter was born, when the issue returned and became worse. This time I met with a surgeon. I had an ablation, which is where they burn out the inside of your uterus to stop the issue returning. For most women, if the other things do not work that does. For me, still no.

Last year I had another scan and that picked up new fibroids. I received a final official diagnosis of adenomyosis, and there was a mass there as well that my doctor did not like. She decided that I should really have my uterus out by Christmas and I thought that was for the best. Despite the significant recovery from major surgery, it actually for me was not even as bad as period pain. The day after my surgery the nurse came in and said, 'How is your pain? What relief do you need?' I said, 'Actually, I'm fine. It's just like it is every month, pretty much.' That sums it all up, doesn't it?

I am now two months post-op and I can say that for me it was a great decision. Deciding to have major surgery is daunting, but I am already experiencing the benefits. I do not have to worry about my energy levels dipping. I certainly encourage women in a similar situation to think about it.

### McCallum, Mr R; Benarkin State School


 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (7.18 pm): On behalf of the South Burnett community, I would like to put on record my condolences and gratitude for the services to our community by Reg McCallum OAM. I know that the current member for Bundamba has a family connection to the great Reg McCallum. Reg McCallum, born in 1926, passed away suddenly on 24 January this year, aged 97. It was 'suddenly' because he was in full flight and spirits right up to his passing; he had taken himself into Nanango, had a cup of coffee with someone at the bakery, gone shopping at the IGA, then got himself home again. Reg is survived by his daughter, Libby, and remembered by a much loved community.

Reg McCallum served 40 continuous years on the Nanango Council—32 of those years as mayor or shire chairman. He was recognised in 2008 as the longest serving mayor in Australasia. Reg only retired in 2008 due to the amalgamation of Nanango into the South Burnett Regional Council. He was rightfully awarded an Order of Australia medal in 1989 for his services to local government. I can't get over the long list of Reg's contributions. He was a volunteer, seen at all Australia Day events, and he was very active in many community projects. He was patron of the Nanango Race Club; the third president of the longstanding club. He was a life member of the Brisbane Valley Heritage Trails and an integral part of the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail's formation. We have the Reg McCallum Park in Henry Street, Nanango. He was awarded South Burnett's Citizen of the Year in 2009 at our Australia Day Awards.

He was a local legend, but he just liked to call himself a 'bushie'. He was a true gentleman. It is difficult to comprehend his accomplishments, as he would always downplay his achievements. His name is synonymous with Nanango. He always remembered people's names. He was incredibly generous with his time to me and my husband, Jason. Most of all, Reg will be remembered for his quick wit, friendly nature and hard work. He was a perfect gentleman. May you rest in peace, Reg McCallum.

With the remaining time I have left, I want to give a big shout-out to Benarkin State School. It has only 47 students. principal Kerry Christie and P&C president Belinda Bear worked hard to get a defibrillation machine on the wall of Benarkin State School. I want to give a big shout-out to the two school captains, Mikayla Bear and Koby Bear. Thank you so much, Deb, for the scones at the leadership morning. What a great school Benarkin State School is!

### **Mansfield Electorate, Education**


 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (7.22 pm): The Mansfield electorate is a hub of educational excellence, attracting families from diverse backgrounds to move to my electorate in search of superior educational opportunities. This flourishing environment directly reflects the values and investment by the Queensland Labor government.

As a former principal and still a registered teacher, I am deeply committed to ensuring every child in the Mansfield electorate receives the quality education they deserve. It angers me to reflect on the previous LNP's government's failure to prioritise education and, therefore, the children of our community. Under the LNP's watch, vital resources were withheld and teacher numbers were declining in growing schools. The closure of Nyanda State High School and Old Yarranlea State School in my electorate and the ill-conceived attempt to auction Fortitude Valley State School to the highest bidders exemplify the LNP's disregard for education. The proposed slashing of 650 teachers over a period of four years and threats to prioritise the cleaning workforce, place teachers on performance pay and principals on contracts was a misguided attempt to offset the LNP's staggering \$24 billion in unfunded election commitments.

In stark contrast, the Queensland Labor government has consistently demonstrated its commitment to education. Over the past four years we have employed 1,000 teachers annually and recognising a projected growth in enrolments by at least 8,000 students every year until 2026, we have hired 6,000 new teachers and over 1,500 teacher aides since 2015. While the LNP's overzealous primary focus is always on rapidly achieving a budget surplus, it is crucial to strike a balance between fiscal responsibility, elevating educational standards to compete globally and delivering the services that our communities need and deserve.

I live in the Mansfield electorate; I know firsthand what our community values. Allow me to demonstrate to those opposite what understanding a community looks like: \$16.2 million for a new sports hall at Rochedale high; more than \$11 million to rebuild Upper Mount Gravatt State School after the fire and a safety fence; more than \$400 million invested in Mansfield State High School since 2017; more than \$30 million on new buildings at Mansfield State School; and more than \$30 million for Wishart State School since I was elected in 2017 for new learning spaces, refurbishment and additional classrooms. Queensland school students, their families and education staff deserve nothing but the best. I will continue to prioritise the education of our children and to ensure every child in my community has the opportunity to thrive and reach their full potential.


### Burdekin Electorate, Energy Supply

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (7.25 pm): On 2 February, the *Townsville Bulletin* quoted the Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs as saying ‘power is an essential service’. For many of my constituents the significance of this statement cannot be overstated. For years now, the communities of Alligator Creek, Nome, Julago, Cungulla and Elliot Springs have suffered through repeated unannounced electricity outages—a fact the minister has not denied. Just yesterday there was an unplanned outage in this area that ran for 13½ hours. A constituent of mine—an Australian who served this country in East Timor, the Solomon Islands and Afghanistan—had some advice for the minister and it was ‘to come and see us people who are living like we are in a Third World country’. He went on to say that in East Timor, the Solomon Islands and even Afghanistan they did not lose power as often as he does at his home just 20 minutes south of Townsville.

The Energy Queensland annual report 2022-23 shows that electricity prices for Ergon’s residential customers increased by a whopping 28.7 per cent in that financial year and that more than half of the households were highly concerned that they may not be able to afford their electricity bill. That same report shows an almost 80 per cent increase to more than 10,000 guaranteed service level payments due to a lack of network reliability, despite a reduction in both peak and minimum demand. The minister refers to planned outages and upgrades, while the mayor of Townsville pays her dues to the Labor Party with mock outcry. Meanwhile, my constituents are told by Ergon that the problem lies at a substation—a substation that Ergon requested funding to replace, only to be denied by this government. The minister’s statement to the *Townsville Bulletin* published on 2 February when referring to reliability issues went on to say, ‘Politics shouldn’t come into it.’ If the information provided to my constituents by Ergon is correct, the minister is wrong because it is the minister who has ultimate responsibility. The minister said, ‘Ergon sparkies and engineers were already in the process of planning and delivering these upgrades.’

In reality, it seems that those sparkies and engineers have been let down by this minister in the same way that the residents of Alligator Creek, Nome, Julago, Cungulla and Elliot Springs have been left with an electricity supply akin to the Third World. Today, I call on the minister to come clean. Was a request for funding to upgrade the substation at Stuart made? If so, who rejected that request? My constituents deserve reliable electricity and they also deserve the truth. We are sick and tired of the constant power outages. We are sick and tired of the excuses. It is about time this government stepped up to the plate and delivered reliable power to these areas.

### Bundamba Electorate, Community Cabinet; TAFE

 **Hon. LR McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (7.28 pm): Recently, our local community celebrated a great, historic milestone moment when Queensland was governed from Bundamba. The very first community cabinet meeting for 2024—indeed, the very first community cabinet meeting of the Miles Labor government—was held in Ipswich at our local Bundamba TAFE. This was a cause for double celebration for me personally, both as the member for our mighty Bundamba community and as the Minister for Training and Skills Development.

Along with the members for Ipswich and Jordan, I was proud to welcome the entire cabinet to our local TAFE, where many locals are skilling up with our free TAFE. Free TAFE for over 70 courses means that locals can skill up and become qualified for good jobs—locals like Shelby. I caught up with Shelby recently when I dropped in to LEAD Childcare at Riverview. Shelby will soon be graduating from Bundamba TAFE with a Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care—one of our free TAFE courses in priority industries. The Miles government is proud to back locals like Shelby with free qualifications to help place them in skilled jobs and great careers. With over 66,000 Queenslanders taking up free TAFE in the last 12 months, it is clear that Queenslanders absolutely love free TAFE. There is no better time than right now to enrol in free TAFE and to save.

Construction is officially underway on the big battery at Swanbank Power Station. It is delivering good local jobs as well as more clean, cheap power. This 250-megawatt battery is backed by a \$330 million investment in South-East Queensland’s very first clean energy hub right in our local community. Ipswich has a long, proud history of generating the electricity that has powered the south-east’s growth and delivered good, secure jobs for our community. Swanbank has been powering

our homes and businesses for more than 50 years. Thanks to continued public ownership under the Miles Labor government and our groundbreaking Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, it is going to be powering on with highly skilled local jobs for at least 50 more.

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

### **ATTENDANCE**

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Head, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly, King A, King S, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Mander, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Skelton, Smith, Stevens, Stewart, Sullivan, Walker, Watts, Weir, Whiting