TO BE IN TIME FOR CORRECTION
PROOFS MUST BE RETURNED
BY **12 noon** TO THE
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
(PROOF)

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

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SEVENTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 10 September 2024

Subject Page

CW PITT
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

JM MATHERS
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 10 September 2024

TUESDAY, 10 SEPTEMBER 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.

PRESENTATION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that on Friday, 30 August I presented to Her Excellency the Governor the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill and the Appropriation Bill for royal assent and that Her Excellency was pleased to subscribe her assent in the name and on behalf of His Majesty.

ASSENT TO BILLS

Mr SPEAKER: I have received from Her Excellency the Governor and the Deputy Governor letters in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letters will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letters for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 23 August 2024, from Her Excellency the Deputy Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 23 August 2024 [1765].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 August 2024, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 23 August 2024 [1766].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 August 2024, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 30 August 2024 [1767].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Member for Mirani, Katter's Australian Party

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have been advised by the member for Mirani that he is now a member of Katter's Australian Party.

REPORTS

Committee of the Legislative Assembly

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I table reports of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly: report No. 37 titled *Annual report 2023-24* and report No. 38 titled *Annual reports of former portfolio committees 1 July 2023-12 February 2024, and Youth Justice Reform Select Committee 12 October 2023-17 April 2024, and Supermarket Pricing Select Committee 7 March 2024-31 May 2024*. I commend the reports to the House.

Tabled paper: Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 37, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24 [1768].

Tabled paper: Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 38, 57th Parliament—Annual Reports of Former Portfolio Committees 1 July 2023-12 February 2024 and Youth Justice Reform Select Committee 12 October 2023-17 April 2024 and Supermarket Pricing Select Committee 7 March 2024-31 May 2024 [1769].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Walsh, Ms M, Admonishment

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I advise, pursuant to the resolution of the House on 20 August 2024, that I have issued a letter admonishing Ms Mary Walsh for her conduct.

Parliamentary Gift Shop

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I am excited to announce the launch of our new gift shop range and display. The new range features a selection of items perfect for every occasion. Our latest collection includes stylish white and black water bottles, premium notebooks, sleek pens, versatile duffle bags, crest printed socks, Parlimints and stationery sets, with silk ties, scarves and tea towels soon to follow. The range will be further expanded in the near future to include items featuring cultural artwork designed by Casey Coolwell-Fisher, a Quandamooka Nunukul woman of Minjerribah, North Stradbroke Island. Of course, the most prolific sale item in the gift shop continues to be the Speaker's Gin No 1. I encourage all members and staff to visit the gift shop in the annexe foyer to discover the new range and find the perfect gifts, particularly in time for Christmas.

School Group Tours

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Darling Heights State School in the electorate of Toowoomba South and Strathpine West State School in the electorate of Pine Rivers.

PETITIONS

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

Gympie-Woolooga Road, Upgrade

Mr Perrett, from 685 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the Gympie-Woolooga Road from the Exhibition Road intersection to the Wide Bay Highway [1745] [1746].

Gympie, Multipurpose Indoor and Outdoor Sporting Facilities

Mr Perrett, from 1,240 petitioners, requesting the House to work collaboratively with the Gympie Regional Council to develop multipurpose indoor and outdoor sporting facilities for the region [1747] [1748].

Ramsay and King Streets, Intersection Upgrade

Mr Katter, from 603 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise critical upgrades to the intersection of Ramsay and King Streets, Cloncurry [1749] [1750].

Flinders Highway, Upgrade

Mr Katter, from 533 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise critical upgrades to the Flinders Highway [1751] [1752].

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

National Parks, Ecotourism

Mr Berkman, from 4,183 petitioners, requesting the House to revoke the part of section 35 of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 that provides for the establishment of ecotourism facilities in National Parks [1753].

Children, Sexual Assault

Mr Bennett from 1,530 petitioners, requesting the House to implement a range of measures to provide stronger legal protections and expedited judicial processes for children who are victims of sexual assault [1754].

Glastonbury and Exhibition Roads, Intersection Upgrade

Mr Perrett, from 342 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the Glastonbury and Exhibition Roads intersection at Southside, Gympie [1755].

Zara's Rule

Mr Powell, from 2,687 petitioners, requesting the House to allow parents or nurses to call for immediate intervention from an ICU or PICU doctor when they deem a patient to be in a life-threatening situation and feel their concerns are not being heard, to be known as Zara's Rule [1756].

Warrego Highway, Safety

Ms Leahy, from 1,325 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to address the safety of the Warrego Highway [1757].

Highfields State School, Traffic and Pedestrian Safety

Mr Watts, from 738 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of traffic and pedestrian safety measures at Highfields State School along the New England Highway [1758].

Mundubbera-Durong Road, Upgrade

Mr Head, from 636 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the single lane sections of the Mundubbera-Durong Road between Boondooma and Brovinia [1759].

Bruce Highway, Upgrade

Mr Perrett, from 905 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to upgrade the Bruce Highway between Curra and the planned Tiaro bypass [1760].

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

Land Tax Thresholds

2,058 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure an increase of the land tax thresholds takes into account the doubling of unimproved land value changes over the past 16 years [1761].

Waraba Priority Development Area

468 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to ensure that the new priority development at Waraba, Caboolture West, is an environmental and energy efficient development [1762].

Undeveloped Land, Resumption

473 petitioners, requesting the House to resume unused blocks of land; give the owners a year to begin building on the land and if they fail to do that resume the land for the price paid by the owner [1763].

Petitions received.

MOTION

Citizen's Right of Reply

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.38 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House notes Report No. 227 of the Ethics Committee tabled on 22 August 2024 and the recommendation of the committee that a right of reply be incorporated into the *Record of Proceedings*, and
2. That the House adopt the committee's recommendation and incorporate the right of reply into the *Record of Proceedings*.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

RESPONSE BY MR JUSTIN CHOVEAUX TO STATEMENTS MADE BY THE MEMBER FOR REDLANDS ON 1 MAY 2024

On 1 May 2024 in a statement during the second reading debate for the Disaster Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the member for Redlands, Ms Kim Richards MP, referred to me by name.

The allegations made by the member for Redlands related to statements that I made at a public hearing of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee on 26 March 2024.

In my opening statement at that hearing, I said that there had been no consultation with rural fire brigades or brigade members that the legislation would result in the loss of unincorporated status for rural fire brigades nor the substantial changes to their working conditions and environment.

My statement that there had not been consultation with rural fire brigades or brigade members on the legal status of brigades was clarified by the member for Redlands as Acting Chair at the time.

ORDER FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Return to Order

The CLERK: I inform the House that, in accordance with an order made by this House on 21 August 2024 for the production of lists of meetings with lobbyists directed to shadow ministers and assistant shadow ministers, a return to order was tabled by the Clerk on Friday, 6 September 2024.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Deaf Youth Parliament

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I want to acknowledge that yesterday in the Queensland parliament we had what we believe is a Commonwealth first but potentially a world first—that is, we hosted the first Deaf Youth Parliament. That parliament was conducted entirely in Auslan. It was done with an amazing amount of grace and passion by the youth members involved. I also wish to acknowledge that we had a number of members of this House who made their way to the chamber to either witness what was happening with the Deaf Youth Parliament or meet with those students during the breaks. This is something that is very important in terms of making sure our young people know everything they can about the fact that we have a parliamentary democracy that they can be a part of whilst also ensuring we have great diversity and inclusivity in the parliament—something that I have always wished for.

This was three years in the making and I want to acknowledge Brett Casey, the CEO of Deaf Connect, who has been a long-time friend of mine. This stemmed from a conversation we had. To have the opportunity to preside over the Deaf Youth Parliament yesterday was one of the biggest honours I have had as a member of parliament. The students and their parents and carers and support staff were amazing. I certainly wanted to acknowledge that and ensure it is on the record that that is something that I think all members of this House can be proud of.

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—

23 August 2024—

1588 Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 50, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1589 Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 51, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 May 2024 and 11 June 2024

26 August 2024—

1590 Clean Economy Jobs, Resources and Transport Committee: Report No. 11, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1591 Clean Economy Jobs, Resources and Transport Committee: Report No. 12, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 21 May 2024 and 12 June 2024

1592 Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 12, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1593 Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Act 2003: Survey Requirements for Mining Tenures (Version 4.00)

27 August 2024—

1594 Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee: Report No. 18, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 May 2024 and 11 June 2024

1595 Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee: Report No. 19, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1596 Cost of Living and Economics Committee: Report No. 12, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 17 April 2024 and 11 June 2024

1597 Cost of Living and Economics Committee: Report No. 13, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1598 Queensland Ombudsman—Inspector of Detention Services: Cleveland Youth Detention Centre inspection report: Focus on separation due to staff shortages, August 2024

28 August 2024—

1599 Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 20, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

1600 Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee: Report No. 21, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 May 2024 and 21 May 2024

29 August 2024—

1601 Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee: Report No. 10, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

30 August 2024—

1602 Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 52, 57th Parliament—Inquiry into prehistoric, dinosaur and paleo tourism in Outback Queensland

1603 Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1604 Public Report of Ministerial Expenses for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

1605 Public Report of Office Expenses for the Office of the Leader of the Opposition for the period 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024

2 September 2024—

1606 Queensland Audit Office—Annual Report 2023-24

1607 Screen Queensland—Directors' Report and Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2024

1608 Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal—Annual Report 2023-2024

3 September 2024—

1609 Queensland Rural and Industry Development Authority—Queensland Rural Debt Survey 2023

1610 Survey and Mapping Infrastructure Act 2003: Survey Requirements for Mining Tenures (Version 4.01)

4 September 2024—

1611 Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 13, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 17 April 2024 and 30 April 2024

1612 Health, Environment and Agriculture Committee: Report No. 14, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 1 May 2024 and 11 June 2024

1613 Gas Distribution Network Code made under the Gas Supply Act 2003 (Second Edition: effective 26 April 2024)

5 September 2024—

1614 Ethics Committee: Report No. 228, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2023-24

6 September 2024—

1615 Clean Economy Jobs, Resources and Transport Committee: Report No. 13, 57th Parliament—Mount Isa Mines Limited Agreement (Continuing Mining Activities) Amendment Bill 2024

1616 Letter and attached documents regarding any meetings attended by shadow ministers or shadow assistant ministers in their shadow portfolio capacity at which a registered lobbyist was in attendance

1617 Queensland Government: Fourth Progress Report titled 'Delivery of Recommendations: Commission of Inquiry into Forensic DNA Testing in Queensland', June 2024

1618 Response from the Minister for Child Safety, Minister for Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Mullen), to an ePetition (4128-24) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 612 petitioners, requesting the House to condemn the actions in Gaza that place Palestinians at risk of Genocide

1619 Response from the Minister for Child Safety, Minister for Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Mullen), to an ePetition (4129-24) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 553 petitioners, requesting the House to condemn Israel for its occupation of Palestinian territory

1620 Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee: Report No. 7, 57th Parliament—Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024, government response

1621 Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 44, 57th Parliament—Inquiry into the provision and regulation of supported accommodation in Queensland, government response

9 September 2024—

1622 Memorandum of advice from the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie, titled 'Order for Production of Documents: Return to Order—Shadow Minister Lobbyist Meetings'

1623 Queensland Racing Appeals Panel—Annual Performance Report 2023-24

1624 Response from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Communities (Hon. Furner), to an ePetition (4068-24) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 639 petitioners, requesting the House to ban the use of choke collars used on dogs

1625 Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Fire and Disaster Recovery and Minister for Corrective Services (Hon. Boyd) pursuant to section 56A(2) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Building Fire Safety Regulation 2008, and the Fire Services Regulation 2011

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Government Owned Corporations Act 1993:

1626 Government Owned Corporations Regulation 2024, No. 161

1627 Government Owned Corporations Regulation 2024, No. 161, explanatory notes

1628 Government Owned Corporations Regulation 2024, No. 161, human rights certificate

Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 1991, Community Services Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 2020, Contract Cleaning Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Act 2005, Industrial Relations Act 2016:

1629 Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Regulation 2024, No. 162

1630 Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Regulation 2024, No. 162, explanatory notes

1631 Building and Construction Industry (Portable Long Service Leave) Regulation 2024, No. 162, human rights certificate

Drugs Misuse Act 1986:

1632 Drugs Misuse (Dangerous Drugs) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 163

1633 Drugs Misuse (Dangerous Drugs) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 163, explanatory notes

1634 Drugs Misuse (Dangerous Drugs) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 163, human rights certificate

Planning Act 2016:

1635 Planning Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 164

1636 Planning Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 164, explanatory notes

1637 Planning Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 164, human rights certificate

Youth Justice Act 1992:

1638 Youth Justice (Monitoring Device Conditions) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 165

1639 Youth Justice (Monitoring Device Conditions) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 165, explanatory notes

1640 Youth Justice (Monitoring Device Conditions) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 165, human rights certificate

Resources Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Act 2024:

1641 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 166

1642 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 166, explanatory notes

Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, Explosives Act 1999, Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004:

1643 Resources Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 167

1644 Resources Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 167, explanatory notes

1645 Resources Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 167, human rights certificate

Further Education and Training Act 2014:

1646 Further Education and Training Regulation 2024, No. 168

1647 Further Education and Training Regulation 2024, No. 168, explanatory notes

1648 Further Education and Training Regulation 2024, No. 168, human rights certificate

TAFE Queensland Act 2013:

1649 TAFE Queensland Regulation 2024, No. 169

1650 TAFE Queensland Regulation 2024, No. 169, explanatory notes

1651 TAFE Queensland Regulation 2024, No. 169, human rights certificate

Major Sports Facilities Act 2001:

1652 Major Sports Facilities Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 170

1653 Major Sports Facilities Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 170, explanatory notes

1654 Major Sports Facilities Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 170, human rights certificate

Water Act 2000:

1655 Water Plan (Boyne River Basin) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 171

1656 Water Plan (Boyne River Basin) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 171, explanatory notes

1657 Water Plan (Boyne River Basin) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 171, human rights certificate

Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021:

1658 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 172

1659 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 172, explanatory notes

1660 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 172, human rights certificate

Work Health and Safety Act 2011:

1661 Work Health and Safety (Sexual Harassment) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 173

1662 Work Health and Safety (Sexual Harassment) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 173, explanatory notes

1663 Work Health and Safety (Sexual Harassment) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 173, human rights certificate

Work Health and Safety Act 2011:

1664 Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 174

1665 Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 174, explanatory notes

1666 Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 174, human rights certificate

Justices Act 1886, Magistrates Courts Act 1921, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

1667 Justices (Sharing of Records) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 175

1668 Justices (Sharing of Records) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 175, explanatory notes

1669 Justices (Sharing of Records) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 175, human rights certificate

Casino Control and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2022:

1670 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 176

1671 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 176, explanatory notes

1672 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 176, human rights certificate

Criminal Code and Other Legislation (Double Jeopardy Exception and Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Act 2024:

1673 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 177

1674 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 177, explanatory notes

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

1675 Criminal Practice (Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Rule 2024, No. 178

1676 Criminal Practice (Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Rule 2024, No. 178, explanatory notes

1677 Criminal Practice (Subsequent Appeals) Amendment Rule 2024, No. 178, human rights certificate

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

1678 Criminal Practice (Fees and Allowances) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 179

1679 Criminal Practice (Fees and Allowances) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 179, explanatory notes

1680 Criminal Practice (Fees and Allowances) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 179, human rights certificate

Criminal Law Amendment Act 1945:

1681 Criminal Law Regulation 2024, No. 180

1682 Criminal Law Regulation 2024, No. 180, explanatory notes

1683 Criminal Law Regulation 2024, No. 180, human rights certificate

Electoral Act 1992:

1684 Electoral Regulation 2024, No. 181

1685 Electoral Regulation 2024, No. 181, explanatory notes

1686 Electoral Regulation 2024, No. 181, human rights certificate

Public Trustee Act 1978:

1687 Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2024, No. 182

1688 Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2024, No. 182, explanatory notes

1689 Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2024, No. 182, human rights certificate

Summary Offences (Prevention of Knife Crime) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024:

1690 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 183

1691 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 183, explanatory notes

Summary Offences Act 2005:

1692 Summary Offences (Prevention of Knife Crime) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 184

1693 Summary Offences (Prevention of Knife Crime) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 184, explanatory notes

1694 Summary Offences (Prevention of Knife Crime) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 184, human rights certificate

Youth Justice Act 1992:

1695 Youth Justice (Access by Accredited Media Entities) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 185

1696 Youth Justice (Access by Accredited Media Entities) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 185, explanatory notes

1697 Youth Justice (Access by Accredited Media Entities) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 185, human rights certificate

Environmental Protection Act 1994:

1698 Environmental Protection (Air) Amendment Policy 2024, No. 186

1699 Environmental Protection (Air) Amendment Policy 2024, No. 186, explanatory notes

1700 Environmental Protection (Air) Amendment Policy 2024, No. 186, human rights certificate

Corrective Services Act 2006:

1701 Corrective Services (Searches and Testing) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 187

1702 Corrective Services (Searches and Testing) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 187, explanatory notes

1703 Corrective Services (Searches and Testing) Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 187, human rights certificate

Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994:

1704 Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 188

1705 Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 188, explanatory notes
1706 Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 188, human rights certificate

Fisheries Act 1994:
1707 Fisheries Amendment Declaration 2024, No. 189
1708 Fisheries Amendment Declaration 2024, No. 189, explanatory notes
1709 Fisheries Amendment Declaration 2024, No. 189, human rights certificate

Water Act 2000:
1710 Water Plan (Wet Tropics) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 190
1711 Water Plan (Wet Tropics) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 190, explanatory notes
1712 Water Plan (Wet Tropics) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2024, No. 190, human rights certificate

Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2023:
1713 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 191
1714 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 191, explanatory notes

Civil Proceedings Act 2011:
1715 Civil Proceedings Regulation 2024, No. 192
1716 Civil Proceedings Regulation 2024, No. 192, explanatory notes
1717 Civil Proceedings Regulation 2024, No. 192, human rights certificate

Pharmacy Business Ownership Act 2024:
1718 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 193
1719 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 193, explanatory notes
1720 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 193, human rights certificate

Pharmacy Business Ownership Act 2024:
1721 Pharmacy Business Ownership (Postponement) Regulation 2024, No. 194
1722 Pharmacy Business Ownership (Postponement) Regulation 2024, No. 194, explanatory notes
1723 Pharmacy Business Ownership (Postponement) Regulation 2024, No. 194, human rights certificate

Agriculture and Fisheries and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024:
1724 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 195
1725 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 195, explanatory notes
1726 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 195, human rights certificate

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, Fisheries Act 1994, Nature Conservation Act 1992, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:
1727 Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 196
1728 Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 196, explanatory notes
1729 Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 196, human rights certificate

Forestry Act 1959:
1730 Forestry Regulation 2024, No. 197
1731 Forestry Regulation 2024, No. 197, explanatory notes
1732 Forestry Regulation 2024, No. 197, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992:
1733 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Regulation 2024, No. 198
1734 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Regulation 2024, No. 198, explanatory notes
1735 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) Regulation 2024, No. 198, human rights certificate

Recreation Areas Management Act 2006:
1736 Recreation Areas Management Regulation 2024, No. 199
1737 Recreation Areas Management Regulation 2024, No. 199, explanatory notes
1738 Recreation Areas Management Regulation 2024, No. 199, human rights certificate

Marine Parks Act 2004, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, Work Health and Safety Act 2011:
1739 State Penalties Enforcement and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 200
1740 State Penalties Enforcement and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 200, explanatory notes
1741 State Penalties Enforcement and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 200, human rights certificate

Heavy Vehicle National Law as applied by the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012 (Qld) and by the law of States and Territories:

1742 Heavy Vehicle (Mass, Dimension and Loading) National Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 201

1743 Heavy Vehicle (Mass, Dimension and Loading) National Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 201, explanatory notes

1744 Heavy Vehicle (Mass, Dimension and Loading) National Amendment Regulation 2024, No. 201, human rights certificate

MEMBER'S PAPER

The following member's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Chatsworth (Mr Minnikin)—

1764 Nonconforming petition regarding koala fencing on Old Cleveland Road

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Social Media, Age of Access

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (9.41 am): I have spoken in this House before about my concerns around social media use by young people. In my own home, Kim and I have struggled to manage our kids' social media use. We have even had our own close calls with harassment and bullying, but we are lucky we have been able to talk about it with them. I know that some families are not so lucky.

Parenting has always been hard and in the online age it is even harder. Studies here in Queensland have shown the devastating impact social media can have on young people. Those impacts can leave a scar for life. The time to act is now. All parents need a helping hand to keep their children safe. Social media companies should be held to account, especially when they exploit their users for great profit. I am pleased that today the Albanese government announced they will introduce legislation to enforce a minimum age for access to social media. This will build on the work undertaken by the South Australian government and former chief justice Robert French. It is something I have supported for some time. I look forward to working with the Prime Minister and my state and territory counterparts to implement this important reform, because there is nothing more important than keeping our children safe.

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Athletes

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (9.42 am): Both the Olympic and the Paralympic Games have captured the hearts of the world. All of Queensland has been behind our incredible athletes. Just yesterday we watched the dazzling Paralympics closing ceremony, closing the books on the games for another four years. I want to recognise our 49 incredible Queensland Paralympians who went on to win 28 medals: seven gold, five silver and 16 bronze. That is six more than Queensland's best performance in London in 2012 and nine more than in Tokyo. Congratulations to every person who helped make this Paralympic Games our best ever.

To our athletes, coaches and support teams: thank you. You have all done Queensland and Australia proud and now it is time to show our appreciation. This Saturday we will welcome our Olympic and Paralympic athletes home to Brisbane. In partnership with the Brisbane City Council, we will host a free event at South Bank between 9 am and midday. I encourage all Queenslanders to get out and show their support. Come down and meet your favourite athlete while enjoying live music and foods from around the world. It is going to be a great day.

Satellite Hospitals

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Premier) (9.43 am): Quality health care is the most important thing a government can deliver. It is what we spend the most in our budget on and it is one of our biggest employers. Thousands of doctors, nurses and health professionals go to work every single day and save lives. That is what matters. I will always do what matters to improve the health outcomes of Queenslanders no matter where they live.

That is one of the reasons we embarked on our nation-leading Satellite Hospitals Program in 2020. Since then we have opened seven satellite hospitals across the South-East, in high-growth areas where health care is most in demand. They have made a huge difference, especially on local emergency departments. The latest health data shows that more than 160,000 Queenslanders have visited a satellite hospital since they opened, all while there has been a 26 per cent reduction in less serious presentations at nearby local hospitals. That is people with things like cuts, burns, broken bones

and UTIs who are getting treated by the doctors and nurses at a satellite hospital instead of in an ED. That matters, and it is why we will do even more.

If elected in October, I will open more satellite hospitals right around the state—in Mackay, Beenleigh, Yarrabilba, the Fraser Coast, the Sunshine Coast and Rockhampton—because hospitals right across the state are under pressure, exacerbated by rapid growth, and as more people move to the regions we will deliver better health care closer to home.

Satellite hospitals are just one piece of the puzzle. We are investing $28.9 billion in health in our budget, my first as Premier of this great state. That is delivering an extra 3,378 hospital beds for Queenslanders. Some 220 will be delivered this year alone. This year we will also recruit 6,100 more frontline staff and allow pharmacists to prescribe more medication to women, like the contraceptive pill and UTI medication. We will also use our mental health levy to invest more than $520 million to deliver new and expanded mental health services to ensure that all Queenslanders have access to free health care in their communities and that our hospitals have the beds, the resources and the health workers they need for Queensland. That is what matters to me because it matters to Queenslanders, and Queenslanders can trust that I will deliver.

Economy

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.46 am): The Miles Labor government is committed to doing what matters for Queenslanders. More than anything else, that means delivering relief from national cost-of-living pressures. As interest rates set by the Reserve Bank continue to squeeze households across Australia, Queensland's economy remains resilient. Australian Bureau of Statistics data released last week shows that state final demand in Queensland rose 0.4 of one per cent in the June quarter for an annual growth rate of 1.8 per cent. With domestic spending across Australia running at 0.2 of one per cent, this means domestic spending in Queensland is twice as strong as the country as a whole.

National inflation data released at the end of August showed Consumer Price Index growth slowing to 3.5 per cent for the 12 months to July. The drop from 3.8 per cent in the year to June was in large part due to electricity rebates, including the Miles Labor government's nation-leading $1,000 electricity rebates. In the year to June, the CPI for electricity prices fell 11 per cent.

The strength of business conditions in Queensland is being recognised by businesses as well. The NAB Monthly Business Survey showed an improvement in business conditions in July, up two points from June to 14 points. That Queensland figure is almost three times the national figure of just five points. The NAB survey also showed that business confidence in Queensland continued to outperform the nation. Strong business conditions mean a strong labour market, and detailed labour force figures from the ABS for the month of July show that the unemployment rate in regional Queensland is just 3.8 per cent. The lowest unemployment rate is in the Darling Downs and Maranoa at just—wait for it—1.7 per cent. All those LNP MPs from the Darling Downs and Maranoa can thank me later. That rate is followed closely by the Mackay-Isaac-Whitsunday region with an unemployment rate of three per cent, Cairns at 3.4 per cent and Townsville at 4.1 per cent.

I can also tell the House that yesterday S&P Global reaffirmed Queensland's AA+ credit rating, noting our exceptional liquidity, large holdings of financial assets and wealthy economy. Queensland's economy is strong under the Miles Labor government. It is only the Miles Labor government that will continue to do what matters to keep Queensland's economy strong.

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Athletes; Health Infrastructure

Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (9.49 am): With the conclusion of the Paris Paralympic Games over the weekend, we have seen an amazing month of elite sport. First in Paris we saw Australia's Olympians doing us proud, with our most successful medal haul ever, and following in their footsteps we have seen the amazing efforts of our incredible Paralympians. It was great to see another Queensland golden girl added to the list, with the truly inspirational Alexa Leary winning gold in the pool in Paris. Our Paralympians won 63 medals, 18 of them gold, matching our Olympians in gold medals won. As outlined by the Premier, we cannot wait to welcome some of our amazing athletes at the official welcome home ceremony this weekend to celebrate their outstanding achievements.

We understand the importance of supporting athletes with disabilities. That is why recently I was pleased to announce $1 million in funding for the Jamieson Trauma Institute to help break down the barriers to sports participation for people with disabilities. The institute will partner with the

Queenslanders with Disability Network, QUT, UQ, Griffith University and consumer advocates to undertake this important research initiative. Leading up to Brisbane 2032, we want to create a more inclusive and accessible Queensland and more opportunities for everyone. I look forward to seeing what this collaboration will bring.

Our $107 billion Big Build is powering Queensland to help ensure we are ready to put on a spectacular games under the IOC's New Norm, one that leaves a lasting legacy in communities right across the state. We have already announced almost $1 billion in infrastructure investment in minor venues. In fact, over half of the $1.87 billion Minor Venues Program will be either out to tender or have had contracts awarded before the end of the year. These venues will be ready for community use well before the games, whether it is the new Moreton Bay sports centre, the upgraded Barlow Park in Cairns or new facilities at the Sunshine Coast and Chandler.

Our Big Build is also delivering for health, with seven satellite hospitals already delivered and, as the Premier said, almost 160,000 Queenslanders receiving free health care close to home. Due to the success of the satellite hospitals, a re-elected Miles government has committed to delivering additional satellite hospitals throughout this great state. Our Big Build also includes more than $14 billion in health infrastructure projects that are in the pipeline, including new hospitals in Toowoomba, Bundaberg and Coomera, plus the new Queensland Cancer Centre within the RBWH precinct. Hospitals in areas such as Redcliffe, Ipswich, Logan, Townsville, Cairns, Mackay, Hervey Bay and Robina are also in line for major expansions and upgrades. I am proud to be the Minister for Infrastructure in this state. Our Big Build will create jobs in new industries, protect our great lifestyle and grow the economy.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms GRACE: Isn't it lovely to see them supporting our big build in hospitals! The new Miles government is doing what matters for Queensland.

Nursing and Midwifery Student Placements

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (9.52 am): Across our state hundreds of nursing and midwifery—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, Minister. Members to my left, I have not been able to hear the minister since she rose to her feet. You will cease your interjections or I will start warning members.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for McConnel. We do not need your assistance.

Ms FENTIMAN: Across our state, hundreds of students are completing their final-year clinical placements, gaining invaluable frontline experience to prepare them for working in our hospitals. Thanks to investments from the Miles government, hundreds of students are undertaking their placements in regional, rural and remote communities.

As part of our $1.7 billion Health Workforce Strategy, we are offering $5,000 payments to eligible nursing and midwifery students to undertake their placements outside the south-east corner. Since its introduction in January this year, more than 250 students have received the payment. We know that this financial support is invaluable, especially as students face rising cost-of-living pressures. A recent survey by Queensland Health showed that 95 per cent of students receiving the allowance found it very helpful with their expenses. One student said that the incentive helped cover the cost of fuel and bills during their placement when regular employment was not feasible. In addition to financial relief, the allowance encourages students to embrace country life and forge connections in the communities, often influencing them to stay after graduation. Many students reported that their placement experience shifted their career aspirations towards regional work. One student said, 'The experience definitely influenced my willingness and perspective on working rurally, and it has now become an option for my career.'

As Queensland's health minister, I am pleased with the positive impact the program is having on not only the students but also our regional communities. The initiative is a clear example of the Miles government's commitment to investing in the future healthcare workforce. I encourage more nursing and midwifery students to apply for the funding because working in regional or rural Queensland offers an invaluable experience. As one student noted, 'I loved it and feel my scope and exposure will be dramatically increased.'

This is just one of many initiatives from the Miles government that is aimed at strengthening the future of health care in Queensland. It is also one of many cost-of-living measures that is at risk if those opposite are elected in October. Our amazing nursing and midwifery students deserve to know whether or not the LNP will commit to maintaining those payments. I take this opportunity to wish our final-year nursing and midwifery students all the best with their future careers. Those students represent the future of health care in Queensland and I know their contribution will be profound.

Renewable Energy

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy and Clean Economy Jobs) (9.55 am): Queenslanders know that we must decarbonise to protect jobs and that we must act now. Those opposite spend a lot of their time talking about their perceptions of the costs of Queensland's transition to a clean economy. What they will not talk about is the cost of inaction—the environmental cost to natural wonders like the Great Barrier Reef or the Daintree and the potential devastating impact on tourism sector jobs. The potential cost of inaction to jobs is huge. Without action to achieve 75 per cent emissions reduction by 2035, analysis shows Queenslanders would forgo 145,000 jobs. Our action to transition to clean energy is protecting primarily blue-collar jobs in the big industries that are decarbonising, involving companies such as the XXXX brewery, Arnott's biscuits, Woolies and Wesfarmers to name just a few.

Failing to reduce emissions would also be a huge cost to hip pockets, with Queenslanders forgoing the $430 billion economic boom predicted from achieving the legislated targets by 2035. We know that climate impacts could affect the affordability and availability of insurance for Queenslanders. In fact, the Insurance Council of Australia predicts that the cost of more extreme weather events will jump to more than $2½ thousand per household by 2050. Queenslanders cannot afford inaction. That is why the Miles government is committed to taking measured steps to transform Queensland to a sustainable clean economy. We are making a major investment in renewable energy including through once-in-a-lifetime infrastructure like Queensland's pumped hydro. It is a big investment up-front with a long return and enduring benefits for Queensland, firming up Queensland's clean and affordable energy supply.

Queenslanders expect a government that will act on a real plan. That is why today I can table the first advice from the Clean Economy Expert Panel. It says that we should align Queensland's sectoral decarbonisation plans with the Commonwealth. It says that there are opportunities for the establishment of new zero emissions commodity production. It says that we should focus on place-based knowledge and place emphasis on regional perspectives. It says that we should include cross-cutting themes that play out across multiple sectors like focusing on jobs, communities and emerging technologies. We are following that advice. That is why today, in accordance with the obligations outlined under section 11 of the Clean Economy Jobs Act 2024, I am tabling the program of sectoral decarbonisation plans. The Miles Labor government is getting on with the job of protecting jobs, building a more resilient economy and planet, and most of all reducing costs for Queenslanders. That is real action under a real plan, doing what matters for Queenslanders.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Program for making emissions reduction plans' [1770].

Tabled paper: Clean Economy Expert Panel report, dated 20 August 2024, titled 'Advice on the Queensland Government's proposed program of emissions reduction plans' [1771].

Natural Disasters, Preparedness

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Treaty, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Minister for Communities and Minister for the Arts) (9.59 am): Queensland endures the most natural disasters of any other state or territory in Australia, and this past summer reminded us just how destructive severe weather can be. We know all too well the devastation that bushfires, floods and cyclones cause. It is why the work of our response agencies, including the Community Recovery team, is so very important. Through jointly funded state and Commonwealth disaster recovery funding arrangements, we support Queenslanders to recover and rebuild.

I am pleased to update the House today on the recent change to one of the key Community Recovery grants—the Structural Assistance Grant—which will help even more Queenslanders get back on their feet. For the second time in two years, the Structural Assistance Grant has been given an uplift, this time to a maximum of $80,000 per household. This is an increase of $30,000 from last year's limit of $50,000 per household. This uplift is a boost for eligible Queenslanders affected by severe weather events, particularly those whose homes have been destroyed or suffered catastrophic damage.

This extra support will benefit people like Belinda from Tara in the Warrego electorate who can now fund the replacement of her household septic system as part of her Structural Assistance Grant rebuild plan. This is on top of funds that Belinda has already accessed to complete her council approvals and preliminary works and to establish her new cabin-style house onsite. This is a fantastic result and a massive step forward for Belinda and her family in their recovery and demonstrates the importance of Community Recovery grants following a natural disaster.

As well as increasing the maximum amount claimable for the Structural Assistance Grant, we have removed the requirement for applicants to have building approval prior to meeting the eligibility criteria. This is a significant change that allows eligible residents of non-building approved properties that are damaged or destroyed in future events to apply for help. I am pleased to advise the House that this record uplift has been backdated to benefit eligible applicants from the February 2023 Western Downs bushfires.

In the last season alone, my department processed $80.1 million in personal hardship assistance grants, benefiting more than 377,000 people. That is more than the previous three seasons combined. The Miles government is doing what matters for Queenslanders, whether that be in times of natural disaster or through our record cost-of-living relief. We know that only a Labor government will continue to support these vital community and social services, and all of this is at risk under those opposite.

Education, Cost of Living

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (10.01 am): We know that the cost of living is a massive issue for Queenslanders. It is why the Miles Labor government has prioritised measures to help alleviate that pressure, including through the $1,000 energy subsidy, 50-cent public transport fares, 20 per cent off car rego and FairPlay vouchers. Every time we speak to our constituents we hear what a difference those initiatives are making.

In my portfolio of education, we are acutely conscious of the difference that we can provide for families so parents do not have to decide between the essentials of life and their children's education. This is why I am so pleased to announce today the next tranche of successful school applicants in our $15 million School and Community Food Relief Program, which includes $10.7 million to be provided directly to schools to coordinate and administer food programs.

Schools in communities experiencing high cost-of-living pressures and food insecurity have been prioritised in this program. In July I announced the first 99 schools, and today I can tell the House that a further 400 schools will receive funding to provide healthy and nutritious food for students. Applications have been received for coordinators to run the programs in 178 schools, and I look forward to announcing those successful applicants very soon.

This measure is in addition to our other incredibly important education cost-of-living initiatives such as: free kindy, saving families an average of $4,600 per child per year; free TAFE; our Textbook and Resource Allowance of $155 per student for years 7 to 10 and $337 per student for years 11 and 12; access to free and subsidised digital devices for learning, with over 42,000 devices provided already and around $30 million invested since 2020—and I recently announced that an additional 140,000 digital devices will become available; our $106.7 million Student Wellbeing Package, providing access to health and mental health support from GPs, psychologists or similar wellbeing professionals at no cost to students or families; $102 million in the last year alone to support families whose homes are geographically isolated through the Living Away From Home Allowance Scheme; $32.1 million to install, stock and maintain Dignity Vending Machines in all interested state schools, outdoor education centres and student residential facilities; after-school homework centres; and the school transport assistance scheme.

Our education cost-of-living initiatives are not just aimed at kids and their families. On the weekend, I was so pleased to announce a $71 million package of initiatives aimed at, firstly, paying final-year teaching students $5,000 to do their prac in a high-priority regional area and, secondly, promising to pay $20,000 over four years to our early-career teachers who are willing to move to those high-priority regions. This will help address not only critical teacher vacancies in those regions but also cost-of-living challenges. This includes assisting with any HECS debt they may have incurred. Of course, we are paying subsidised or free accommodation in many of those areas as well.

All Queensland kids deserve the best start in life and that is exactly what we are working to give them. We are supporting kids and families and we are supporting the people who support them in our schools. We are doing what matters.

Queensland Training Awards; TAFE

Hon. LR McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.05 am): Good training not only changes lives; it transforms communities. Over the weekend, we celebrated Queensland's finest at the 2024 Queensland Training Awards. From apprentices to trainees and teachers to employers, the awards showcased the very best of Queensland's frontline training heroes, none more important than those in our healthcare sector.

The dedication of Aurukun's own Rhonda Woolla to a Certificate IV in Pre-Hospital Emergency Medical Response earned her the title of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Student of the Year. What a true champion! I am sure that everyone in the chamber will join me in congratulating her and all of the winners, who will proudly fly the maroon flag at the nationals.

Behind many of the nearly 750 nominations for this year's awards lies the transformative power of free TAFE. Labor's signature cost-of-living initiative has opened doors and unlocked dreams for tens of thousands of Queenslanders, providing them with the opportunity to gain qualifications and pursue their dreams without the burden of financial constraints. It is an investment in our people. It is an investment in our communities. It is an investment in our future.

A few weeks ago almost 300 new frontline healthcare heroes graduated, thanks to free TAFE. With savings of up to $25,000 each, they are stepping up to serve our communities. These are the workers who will literally be saving lives. Incredibly, there are those in this chamber who would undermine them and risk it all—dismantling free TAFE, stripping away cost-of-living relief and undermining our training sector and its educators. As a result, businesses will struggle to find the skilled workers that they need to grow and innovate and our communities will be deprived of frontline healthcare heroes.

These risks are a direct attack on the aspirations of Queenslanders. They are a threat to the future of our workforce, our economy and our communities. Queenslanders deserve access to quality training and education, regardless of their background or financial circumstances. Queenslanders deserve free TAFE, and delivering free TAFE is doing what matters. Only the Miles Labor government has the guts to back Queenslanders with a fully funded plan to deliver free TAFE.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I would ask you withdraw that unparliamentary language, please.

Mr McCALLUM: I withdraw.

Police Service, Personnel

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Community Safety) (10.08 am): The Miles government does what matters for Queensland. That is why we are investing so heavily in community safety. It is why we are investing so heavily in police personnel.

Thanks to the agile and aggressive recruitment campaign being undertaken by the Queensland Police Service, supported by the Miles Labor government—the biggest recruitment campaign in Queensland's history—the combined number of police officers and recruits employed in our academies is now the highest on record. There are currently nearly 800 recruits undergoing training. In addition, there are more than 2,300 applicants in the recruit pipeline. In just a few weeks over 100 recruits will graduate from the academy, starting an avalanche of graduations thereafter with, on average, one graduation happening every month for at least the next 12 months.

It will not stop there. More than 400 additional recruits are due to enter the academy over the next few months. This includes additional intakes of more than 200 recruits in October and intakes of more than 200 recruits in November. The Queensland Police Service advises me that, by the end of 2025, the combined police officer and recruit headcount is projected to exceed the government's election commitment.

We are paralleling this investment in police personnel with record investment in police infrastructure. Just last week we turned the first sod on the new Ripley police facility. In recent weeks we officially opened the new Cooroy police facility and the cutting-edge new emergency services facilities which include a new police station at Caloundra South. We are deliberately designing and constructing these facilities with an eye to the future. Our record investment in police personnel means we will need more and bigger police facilities across the state. That is what we are investing in. We are investing in more police, investing in more, bigger and better police infrastructure and investing in

community safety. Our record is clear: the Miles government is doing what matters for community safety. The Miles government is doing what matters for Queensland.

Manufacturing

Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (Minister for Regional Development and Manufacturing and Minister for Water) (10.11 am): The Miles government is delivering for Queensland, including supporting our manufacturing sector. September is manufacturing month—an opportunity to highlight this incredible industry which contributes around $20 billion a year into the Queensland economy and employs over 180,000 Queenslanders. As I have always said, if we can make it in Queensland we should. That is why we are making trains in Queensland. That is why we have invested $270 million in supporting our manufacturers.

I kicked off manufacturing month in Mackay visiting manufacturer High Amp Maintenance. They are a welding and fabrication business that received more than $176,000 in round 3 of the Manufacturing Hubs Grant Program. Thanks to this funding, they will purchase a CNC laser cutter and create 10 new full-time positions. I also met with Fatz Fabrication in Rockhampton to celebrate them receiving a $94,000 grant. They will install a 3D scanner to increase their competitiveness and create six full-time jobs on the back of that grant.

So far, our three rounds of hubs grants and six rounds of Made in Queensland grants have created and supported nearly 8,000 jobs for Queenslanders. This is something that I am incredibly proud of, especially when members recall that we inherited a sector that had shed 10,000 manufacturing jobs under the LNP in Queensland.

We have achieved a lot, but we are not done in Queensland. I am pleased to announce today that round 4 of our Manufacturing Hubs Grant Program and round 7 of our Made in Queensland grants will be opening very shortly. That is $25 million more available to our manufacturers to purchase the equipment they need to grow and create more jobs in Queensland.

I look forward to relaying this good news to our manufacturers tonight at the manufacturing showcase on the Speaker's Green. I encourage all members to attend, particularly those on the other side of the House, to see for themselves just how strong and diverse our manufacturing sector is in Queensland. If members need persuading, among the 36 manufacturers in attendance tonight will be Moffatt Beach Brewing, Priestley's Gourmet Delights—for those with a sweet tooth—Lick Ice Cream, which is a Queensland made ice cream manufacturer, and our First Nations food manufacturer FigJam & Co.

These new grant rounds are on top of the more than $6.2 million I announced two weeks ago for manufacturers to install more energy-efficient equipment to cut emissions and drive down those local manufacturers' energy bills. Based on feedback from manufacturers, I announced that we would fund 100 per cent of eligible lighting projects for our local manufacturers and 75 per cent of efficiency programs up to a maximum of $50,000. We have done this because the statistics show that lighting upgrades drastically reduce energy costs for our manufacturers which means more money in the pockets of our manufacturers. Labor will continue to support our amazing manufacturing industry because we back Queensland jobs, not cut them.

PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Crime and Corruption Commission, Reports

Mr KRAUSE (Scenic Rim—LNP) (10.15 am): I lay upon the table of the House the Crime and Corruption Commission's covering letter and reports titled *Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee, section 138(2) of Crime and Corruption Act 2001—Controlled Operations Committee: report on activities: 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024* and *Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee, section 385 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000—Surveillance device warrants: annual report: 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024*.

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2023-24 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee: Controlled Operations Committee—Report on activities from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024 pursuant to section 138(2) of the Crime and Corruption Act 2001 [1772].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2023-24 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on aspects of surveillance device warrants pursuant to section 358 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 [1773].

The first report is produced pursuant to section 138 of the CC Act, which requires the Controlled Operations Committee to provide a written report on their activities under that act to the chair of the

Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee. The second report is produced pursuant in section 358(4) of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, which requires the chair of the CCC to provide a written report containing specified information, which is outlined in subsection (1) of section 358, concerning the use of warrants issued under chapter 13 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, to the chair of the PCCC. The committee received the reports on 26 July and I am tabling them within 14 sitting days of receipt, as required.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (10.16 am): I give notice that I will move—

That the Fisheries (Structural Reform Stage 2) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2024, subordinate legislation No. 52 of 2024, tabled in the House on 21 May 2024, be disallowed.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.16 am.

Wright, Dr K

Mr CRISAFULLI (10.16 am): My question is to the Premier. The debacle of the state-run DNA lab is one of the greatest administrative failures in a modern justice system. An LNP government would appoint Dr Kirsty Wright to lead a review into the crucial reforms at the lab. Given that Dr Wright's insights led to two royal commissions that uncovered these failings, why did Labor slam the door on using Dr Wright's expertise to rebuild the lab?

Mr MILES: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I can advise him and the House that the individual he has referred to did not apply for the position that he refers to. She did not apply for the job.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. We are going to hear the answer from the Premier. The question has been asked.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for McConnel.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mr MILES: We are well aware of the Leader of the Opposition's disdain for merit-based appointment processes. The way selection processes in the Public Service work is that they advertise a position, people who want the position apply for the position and then a panel makes a recommendation based on the people who want the job. There is not a process—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nanango.

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Scenic Rim, you are warned under the standing orders. A gap in the proceedings is not an opportunity for you to interject.

Mr MILES: The process of soliciting applications for positions, applying selection criteria and making recommendations about the most appropriate candidate is well established in our government. The requirement for people to apply for jobs before they get given one is one that we will stand by.

Forensic Services

Mr CRISAFULLI: My question is to Premier. Two years on, less than two per cent of the 40,000 DNA samples have been retested. Rapists and murderers are walking free. Many rape victims have not been contacted to be served justice. Given the enormity of the DNA debacle and the ongoing failure to fix it, will any minister be held accountable?

Mr MILES: I thank the member for the question. Our teams are working hard to do the retesting that is required. It is well documented the extensive process that has been undertaken to identify precisely what needs to be addressed. We have publicly disclosed all of that information and all of the efforts to address it. Those teams will continue to prioritise the most urgent tests for investigations and for court cases while also working through the remainder of the backlog.

Cost of Living; Health Services

Ms PUGH: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline how the Miles Labor government is delivering record cost-of-living relief and more frontline health services for Queenslanders, and is the Premier aware of any risky alternative approaches?

Mr MILES: I thank the member for Mount Ommaney for her question. It was fantastic to be in her part of the world at the weekend and to meet with so many of her local community leaders. We talked with them about what is really important to the Mount Ommaney community. We got an update on the very significant Centenary Motorway projects already underway such as the new bridge at Jindalee.

We also talked about our vision for the next stage for the western corridor, and that is a new tunnel from Toowong to Darra which will effectively complete Brisbane's western ring-road network—a very exciting project that will make an enormous difference for everyone who travels west of the city and out towards Ipswich. When considered alongside our Gympie Road bypass tunnel proposal, it will allow people to travel effectively from Aspley to Darra on connected motorways. This would be fantastic. It is just one element of our Big Build, where we are building the roads, the schools, the houses, the hospitals and the firmed renewables that our state needs for the future.

We have spent the last couple of weeks outlining the locations where we will build our next wave of satellite hospitals—places that have seen significant population growth that is putting pressure on their emergency departments. These are places like Mackay, Yarrabilba, Beenleigh, Rockhampton, the Sunshine Coast and the Fraser Coast—all locations deserving of new health facilities. That builds on the seven existing satellite hospitals that have already been so successful. Some 160,000 Queenslanders have benefited from the services available at the seven existing satellite hospitals, leading to a reduction in lower acuity presentations at nearby hospitals of up to 25 per cent. That is on top of the three new hospitals that we are building in Bundaberg, in Toowoomba and on the northern Gold Coast, as well as the massive hospital expansions right across this state.

That is delivering fantastic new facilities for local communities as well as great places to work for all of the nurses, doctors, midwives and health professionals whom we continue to employ, because on this side of the House we will always back our health workforce. On this side of the House we will always support them.

Wright, Dr K

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is to the Premier. The Labor government ignored Dr Kirsty Wright twice before backflipping and calling two royal commissions. Given the government has ignored Dr Wright yet again, does the Premier admit that more murderers walking free, more rapists on the street and more injustice for victims would continue under a re-elected fourth-term Labor government?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question, but I caution members to my left to ensure there are no imputations or things that cannot be factually proven in a question. I will allow the question.

Mr MILES: I thank the member for Clayfield for his question. Of course we value and appreciate the contribution of Ms Wright and her ongoing—

Mrs Frecklington: Dr Wright!

Mrs Gerber: She's a real doctor.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members!

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my right!

Mr MILES: As far as I know, there is only one deregistered nurse in this place, for the benefit of the member for Currumbin. Of course we continue to value her contribution. The Minister for Health advises me—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, I cannot hear the Premier. I realise there is a degree of feeling in the room this morning, but I will ask you to come back to the business of the House.

Mr MILES: As I was saying, we greatly value the contribution that she has made. I encourage her to continue to make that contribution while we continue to do the important work of ensuring our lab workers have the resources and the expertise that they need to complete the testing backlog.

Government Owned Corporations, Capital Expenditure

Mr SMITH: My question is of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. Can the Deputy Premier please explain whether capital spending by government owned corporations can be used for general government operating expenditure, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any other risky approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Bundaberg for his question. As the member for Bundaberg knows and all members of the government know, when GOCs make capital purchases they invest in revenue-generating, productive infrastructure. These sorts of investments do not add to the government's operating position. Instead, they build the balance sheet of the state and generate dividends into the future.

On the other hand, operating expenditure by government and government departments does not generate a financial or commercial return. That money is used to employ frontline workers in the health system, in community safety and right across government and to deliver essential government services. That is pretty simple stuff.

Even a high school economics student would know that—but not the Leader of the Opposition. The LNP leader says that he will stop building dams and use that money for operating expenditure. Last week he was quoted in the *Courier-Mail* about the massive shortfall in his unfunded child protection plan. The LNP leader asserted in that story that his child safety plan was 'fully costed, fully funded'. How often have we heard that four-word slogan? He referred to cancelling dams—cancelling that infrastructure expenditure—to pay for operating expenditure. He said, 'You can get a lot of child safety officers for $24 billion.'

We know that the LNP leader likes keeping things murky, but one thing is crystal clear now: he does not understand the most basic principles behind the state budget. We know he is weak on economic matters. We know he is weak on fiscal matters. We know he is weak on budget matters.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Deputy Premier, we have talked previously in this House about using terms such as 'weak' directed at particular members. I ask you to withdraw those statements.

Mr DICK: I withdraw. We know the Leader of the Opposition is incompetent when it comes to fiscal matters and budgetary matters and economic matters. Spending in the GOC sector involves borrowings that are repaid through a commercial return. There is no commercial return on child protection. Maybe the leader of the LNP knows better? Is he going to charge for the work of child safety officers? Is he going to charge a commercial rate? Who is going to pay? We know the LNP leader is desperate to privatise satellite hospitals. He wants to charge for them. He wants to get a return on them.

The LNP leader needs to know today that he will not get a commercial return on child protection officers. Is it any wonder that SET Solutions went broke under the incompetent leadership of the LNP leader when he was the sole director and CEO? That is because he is economically illiterate. That is the truth. He is a shifty salesman with no substance.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr DICK: He is incompetent with that. How could you possibly put him in charge of the budget of Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh and member for Logan, you are both warned for quarrelling across the chamber.

Forensic Services

Ms CAMM: My question is to the Premier. Media reports have revealed that the backlog of rape kits at Queensland's DNA lab is 20 times the size of Victoria's. With hundreds of Queensland rape victims waiting more than a year for critical evidence to get justice, does the Premier admit that, after two years, two inquiries and too many victims, this third-term Labor government is incapable of fixing the DNA lab debacle?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question but I will again mention that there are factual elements and also a significantly long preamble to that question. I give guidance to those members to my left.

Mr MILES: I thank the member for her question. I can advise the House that, since the effort to address that backlog commenced, the number of cases outstanding has been reduced by some 3,500 in the last six months. The staff of forensic services Queensland, the Queensland Police Service and the DPP are working hard to address those delays and we continue to ensure they are well supported to do so.

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Small Business

Mr KELLY: My question is of the Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing. Can the minister update the House on how the Miles Labor government is delivering the venues and opportunities for small business for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Greenslopes for his question. I know that he has many small businesses in his electorate and he wants to see them thrive in 2032—and thrive they will because of the opportunities that will come from the Olympic and Paralympic Games. As I said earlier, we were very proud of all of our athletes during the games. We know that the legacy of the games is more than just the two weeks and four weeks of the track or the pool. We want to showcase our world-class food. If there was one issue that came out of Paris that a lot of the athletes were not happy about, it was the food. Let me tell those athletes who are going to be around in 2032 that the best food, the best produce and the best wineries are right here—

Mr McDonald: From the Lockyer Valley.

Ms GRACE:—and in the Lockyer. I take that interjection. We have fine growing regions in our beautiful state of Queensland, and we know that there will be billions of dollars of economic gain for those small businesses. We came out with the Premier saying, 'There'll be beef on the menu. It won't be just vegan.' There will be great fruit and vegies. It was terrific to meet with Jo Sheppard, the CEO of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, to discuss the opportunities for those farmers—not only with the food content and the sales but also with tourism. Let's not forget that it is a great opportunity to showcase and grow our world-class tourism and hospitality in the years ahead.

The Miles Labor government, the Premier and I are determined and committed to support small businesses—unlike the Leader of the Opposition. He may talk about helping victims or having concern for victims. He can duck and weave and he can whinge and whine. It is interesting that the member for Broadwater talks about victims except the ones of SET Solutions. What about the victims and his conduct? They are millions of dollars out of pocket, yet there is nothing from the Leader of the Opposition. He talks about victims when there is political gain. Oh, yes; he is very concerned about victims when there are political gains and cheap political pointscoring. He uses the tragedies of others for their political advantage. If the Leader of the Opposition really cares about victims, he should come clean and start providing an explanation to the victims for what he did with SET Solutions. He needs to explain why he had to pay $200,000 in hush money so that those small businesses went away, yet he stands there day after day saying, 'It wasn't my fault. I did nothing wrong.' Those small businesses—

(Time expired)

Wright, Dr K

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Premier. The LNP has been advised that Dr Wright applied for a board position on the Forensic Science Queensland Advisory Council. She submitted the application well within the advertised period, and she received a confirmation email on 18 June and a rejection letter on 21 August. Will the Premier apologise to Dr Wright for his earlier comments and acknowledge the missed opportunity to use her skills to fix the DNA debacle?

Mr MILES: I thank the member for Glass House for his question. I understood that the Leader of the Opposition was asking about a different position—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MILES: I will check *Hansard* because I am quite confident the Leader of the Opposition asked about the CEO position, which I am advised she did not apply for. As I indicated earlier, there are well-established processes in the Public Service for merit-based appointment. In the case of—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Premier and member for Kawana, you are both warned under the standing orders.

Mr MILES: It is, frankly, extraordinary that the opposition would come in here and effectively announce that they would no longer respect merit-based appointment processes.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left!

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mr MILES: In fact, the Leader of the Opposition outside of this House has just announced that they would arbitrarily appoint an individual to that director's role. That is despite that individual not applying for that position and an independent panel having assessed the applicants and recommended an appointment. This goes to the entire approach of those opposite to the Public Service. They are already announcing appointments that they would make to positions that should be filled on merit. This should send shivers down the spine of every single public servant—that those opposite would come in and override merit-based appointment processes to appoint people they intend to announce via X, the platform formerly known as Twitter. This is a new low even for the LNP in Queensland, who we know have stooped very low before.

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba South, well done. You are warned under the standing orders.

Renewable Energy

Mr HUNT: My question is of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. Can the Deputy Premier advise how the Miles Labor government is funding Queensland's renewable energy transition, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any risky alternative approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Caloundra for his question. Everyone knows, including the member for Caloundra and all members of government, that the cost of building is going up. When our government has to pay for unavoidable cost increases, we are up-front with the people of Queensland. Last month Powerlink informed the government that the cost of the CopperString project had increased by $1.2 billion due to the increased cost of construction materials and the need to reroute part of the line. When we approved that funding we announced that we would pay for the increased cost through additional borrowings. Through that process, the government is being honest, up-front and transparent about costings and we are being transparent about how we are going to fund it.

I am asked by the member for Caloundra about risky alternatives. The LNP leader makes a false claim that he supports CopperString, but those words ring hollow because the LNP leader will not say where the money is coming from. The LNP leader cannot borrow it because he says debt will be lower. Once again, the LNP leader is incapable of giving a straight answer to the people of Queensland. The member for Broadwater cannot even tell people where he lives. He is enrolled in Bulimba, but he will not answer a simple question.

When it comes to CopperString and so many other issues, the LNP leader cannot provide a straight answer. The LNP leader needs to be up-front and transparent about how he will fund his promises. Members of this House—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

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

Mr DICK:—witnessed a train wreck of an interview with David Speers a few weeks ago. It was like watching the *Titanic* edge closer and closer to the iceberg. David Speers asked the LNP leader four times if he had been pursued in the Supreme Court of Victoria for trading while insolvent—four times. It required a simple 'yes' or 'no' to the type of question Queenslanders need an answer to. What did he say? 'No findings. Fulfilled my obligations.' How often have we heard that? David Speers asked him whether he had paid $200,000 in a secret settlement. Another yes-or-no answer was required. There was the same formulation of words: 'No findings. Fulfilled my obligations.' I was embarrassed for the LNP leader because David Speers was laughing at him. But this is not a laughing matter.

Let's face it: the LNP leader is treating Queenslanders with absolute contempt. He treats the media gallery with contempt, he treats his electorate with contempt and he treats Queenslanders with contempt. He will not give a straight answer about funding his election promises; nor will he give them a straight answer about his failed business history.

Minister for Health

Ms BATES: My question is to the Minister for Health. On the qualifications needed to be health minister, the minister told the media, 'We need good communicators in those complex roles.' What did the minister mean about the former health minister's inability to communicate, and why is communication more important than competency and patients?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for the question. She was proven such a competent minister in the Newman government that she lasted only 12 months and she was the first minister—actually, she was the first nurse with restrictions on her registration that Campbell Newman sacked. The hypocrisy from those opposite to get the member for Mudgeeraba to ask a question about competencies when clearly we know, from the *Courier-Mail* and others, that all the chatter is that she will not be the health minister if the LNP win the October election. So who is it going to be? They are shuffling seats over there. Will it be the member for Moggill? Will it be the member for Surfers Paradise? We know that Amanda Stoker is probably going to come in and be their attorney-general if they win, so what will happen to the poor old member for Clayfield? When all of the chairs are moved, I think we will see that the poor old member for Mudgeeraba probably will not be left with a seat—once again.

I can tell you what it means to deliver for Queenslanders in this very challenging portfolio.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

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

Ms FENTIMAN: It is delivering more beds, delivering more staff and delivering the resources our health heroes need. What is the plan of those opposite? Who would know? They are trying to slip into government without one dollar on the table for health, without one policy to help ease ambulance ramping and elective surgery.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). The question was regarding what the minister meant about the former health minister's ability to communicate.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, I believe that in allowing the question I have allowed what could be seeking an opinion, and I have allowed the question. I believe the minister can answer as she sees fit.

Ms FENTIMAN: In fact, the one thing that the LNP have said they are going to do is have real-time data. When I talk to the nurses at Logan Hospital, they absolutely laugh. How is that going to help them in their busy shifts dealing with the huge number of ageing, complex patients that are coming to our hospitals because of the collapse of primary care after a decade of neglect from the former federal LNP government and the pressures we are facing in aged care? How is that going to help the nurse on shift in the emergency department? It is laughable that they think that will have any impact on the demands we are facing. When they were in government, for the 12 months that the member for Mudgeeraba sat around the table did they invest in any beds for Queensland hospitals?

Government members: No!

Ms FENTIMAN: Did they announce any new hospitals?

Government members: No!

Ms FENTIMAN: Did they announce any new staff?

Government members: No!

Ms FENTIMAN: No. They sacked 4,400 health staff. That is the member for Mudgeeraba's legacy. It is the Leader of the Opposition's legacy. Has he apologised?

Government members: No!

Ms FENTIMAN: We know he will do it again. He will cut the staff and cut the beds.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, I did not want to interrupt the minister because that is what you were trying to do with your interjections. You are warned under the standing orders.

Minister for Health

Mr TANTARI: 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 the Miles Labor government is supporting health care and workers, and is the minister aware of any risky alternative approaches?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Hervey Bay. It was fantastic to join him last week, along with the Premier and the member for Maryborough, to announce that a re-elected Miles Labor government will bring a brand new satellite hospital to the Fraser Coast because that is what families expect of their government—to provide world-class quality health care close to home for free. I know that our wonderful doctors and nurses on the Fraser Coast are just as excited.

I am also so proud to announce that the Miles Labor government has delivered on our 2020 commitment to hire 9,475 frontline health staff, with more than 770 of them in Wide Bay. This is in stark contrast to those opposite. As I have already explained today, they sacked 4,400 health workers across Queensland, including 345 in Wide Bay. The Leader of the Opposition has refused to be up-front with Queenslanders about any plans he has for health, including whether or not they will embark once again on sacking frontline health workers from our system—just like he has refused to be up-front about his time when he was sole director of SET Solutions, a company that traded whilst insolvent. Time and time again, whether it be at the very few press conferences the Leader of the Opposition agrees to give or whether it is in one-on-one interviews—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms FENTIMAN: Seriously! How many times have we seen him running away from the cameras in this place? You just have to look at his performance at the Tourism and Transport Forum event last month to see how desperate he is not to answer questions about this. As the Deputy Premier has said, that David Speers interview was a train wreck. I have never seen anyone go, 'I have one line. They have given me one line. I can't possibly say anything else other than these four words.' It does not matter what the question was or that David Speers put different questions to him—'No findings, no obligations'; 'No findings, no obligations'; 'No findings, no obligations.' It was like a broken, wind-up pull-string toy. He said the same thing over and over. It was embarrassing. It was hard to watch. Talk about not being able to think on your feet and actually answer a question! He then obviously worked out that he could not say those four words in another answer to a question, so he said, 'Go and read the report.' We have all read the report, and the PwC report said that he was trading whilst insolvent.

(Time expired)

Minister for Health

Mr BLEIJIE: My question is to the Premier. The health minister said she was disappointed that the former premier appointed the member for Murrumba as Premier. Did the health minister express her disappointment directly to the current Premier, and what were those concerns expressed by the health minister about the current Premier?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I rule the question out of order.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members to my right.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Mudgeeraba is warned under the standing orders. I am making a ruling. The House will hear the ruling. Member for Kawana, I rule the question out of order. It is not, as I hear it, related directly to matters that the Premier is responsible for in terms of the business of government. I believe that you have been here long enough to know that. I give guidance to members in relation to questions going forward. If questions are asked to simply have matters put on the record, I will name members.

Intergovernmental Relations

Ms PEASE: My question is of the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. Can the Deputy Premier please update the House on the government's relationship with other governments across Australia, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any risky alternatives?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Lytton for her question. As she and all government members know, our government, led by our Premier, has a very strong, productive and effective working relationship with all other state and territory governments and, of course, with the Albanese federal Labor government. Those relationships are built on mutual respect and understanding.

The member for Lytton asked about risky alternatives. Quite frankly, I am concerned about what other governments have on the Leader of the Opposition. We know of the LNP leader's failed business venture when he was the sole director and CEO of SET Solutions. That company ended up owing the Australian Taxation Office $772,000. The LNP leader also owed the federal government's Department of Jobs and Small Business $962,000—almost a million dollars. This means that more than $1.7 million was owed by the Leader of the Opposition, when he was the director of that company, to the federal government.

The LNP leader's company, SET Solutions, also owed the Victorian government $92,000. What did the man who succeeded the Leader of the Opposition as the director of that company say in evidence to the Supreme Court of Victoria? The man who succeeded the opposition leader as director of SET Solutions gave evidence that the LNP leader's company was found to be billing Victorian taxpayers for ineligible students. That is the evidence of the director who took over from the Leader of the Opposition. The company was rorting the Victorian government for ineligible students—and that money has never been repaid.

I worry about what other governments have on the LNP leader, because Queenslanders deserve to know. They do not deserve four-word throwaway slogans; they deserve real, straight answers from the Leader of the Opposition. Do members remember that the Leader of the Opposition said he was going to do politics differently in Queensland—all that palaver and carry-on?

Mr CRISAFULLI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Premier's comments are incorrect. They are personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, the Leader of the Opposition has found your comments to be personally offensive. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr DICK: I withdraw, Speaker. The people of Queensland need to know what the LNP leader did as the sore director of SET Solutions. We know it was bad because he paid $200,000 in a secret, hush money payment to keep it quiet. If it were not for the ABC, Queenslanders would never have known. He is yet to update his register of interests about that liability. Queenslanders deserve to know what else the LNP leader did. If you cannot be honest with the people of Queensland—if you cannot give direct, straight up-front answers—and if you owe money to Queenslanders and to other governments, you cannot run Queensland.

Residential Tenancies

Dr MacMAHON: My question is to the Minister for Housing. Last week in the media the minister said of renters seeking permission to install air-conditioners or ceiling fans that those requests must not be unreasonably refused by rental property owners. Can the minister confirm that, under the current legislation, renters are within their rights to install ceiling fans and air-conditioners to make their homes livable?

Ms SCANLON: I thank the member for the question. Of course, there are rules in place that allow people to negotiate with their landlord around the installation of air conditioning and other cooling devices. I am very pleased to say that our government has recently announced a partnership with the Albanese government to make sure that we roll out more energy-efficiency measures in public and community housing in this state. We are also building more community and public housing. This is something we can do because we have two Labor governments. The Greens political party has members in the federal parliament who for months—months!—blocked critical investment in the Housing Australia Future Fund. They blocked 30,000 social and affordable homes being built across this country and sided with the LNP.

We heard just two weeks ago from the leader of the LNP, Peter Dutton, that if they are elected to government not only will they abolish that fund but also they will abolish the shared equity scheme. I notice that we have heard very little from the Leader of the Opposition about the shared equity scheme

since his mates in Canberra have conveniently said that they do not back it anymore. They do not support social and affordable housing. They do not support first home owners getting into the market.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I thank the member for Nanango's interjection. Under the LNP, social housing went backwards in this country. I am happy to answer housing questions any day of the week. The person who will not answer questions is the Leader of the Opposition. He will not answer questions about his dodgy business deals before he came into this parliament.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. The member for Waterford will cease her interjections. The member for Nanango, the minister may well have taken that first interjection but she is not taking the others. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms SCANLON: We will always answer questions because we on this side of the House are very proud of the delivery of our very ambitious housing plan. What I thought was interesting were some comments made recently by our political opponents. The member for Bulimba—sorry, Broadwater—said in the same day that they want to see more housing supply—

Dr MacMAHON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order: relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Housing, I believe that you did attempt to address the question in your initial statements but you have strayed somewhat. I would ask that you either come back to the question as asked or resume your seat.

Office of Fair Trading

Ms NIGHTINGALE: My question is of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Can the Attorney-General update the House on how the Office of Fair Trading deals with dodgy traders, and is the Attorney aware of any other dodgy risks to Queenslanders?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Inala for her question. We know that it is important to protect Queenslanders from dodgy operators. I am proud to say that, once again, the Office of Fair Trading have stepped up and found another dodgy trader out there. They managed to recover nearly $500,000 from David Lindsay Thorley and his company Thorley Products, which has been trading as Spectrum RV. Mr Thorley took almost $500,000 from six Queensland consumers to manufacture recreational vehicles. The customers paid significant deposits. The vehicles were never produced. Thanks to the great work of the Office of Fair Trading, this individual has been fined and ordered to pay costs.

I am concerned about the behaviour of others in this state who are not being transparent and accountable. We know that the Leader of the Opposition has not been transparent and accountable when it comes to SET Solutions. We know that he has hidden the fact that the person he was involved with in the business, Mr Rabieh Krayem, was an LNP donor. He was one of the owners of the business. That in itself is not necessarily a big deal, but when the member was asked—the Leader of the Opposition was asked by journalists—if the company had links to the LNP or donors, he said no. When he was later challenged on this—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH:—those opposite do not want to hear this—the opposition leader's office argued that he was not asked specifically about Mr Krayem's donation history—very tricky words. There is no surprise he would take that approach. This is a person who voted against transparency and accountability on electoral laws. If they were still in government they would be able to accept donations of up to $16,900 from a single donor without anyone knowing. That is what they believe in.

We have heard this morning also about the Leader of the Opposition and what he thinks of transparency and accountability. Coaldrake will be gone before the member opposite even gets into government because he has said he will appoint Dr Kirsty Wright to oversee reform of Queensland's forensic lab if elected next month. In what role? They claimed they were not talking about the role of CEO, but she never applied for that. The Leader of the Opposition is going to appoint someone who never applied for the job of CEO or he is going to appoint her to an advisory board and override an independent panel that had experts including the chief scientist at the AFP's Forensics Command and also president of the Australian Academy of Forensic Sciences—

(Time expired)

Path to Treaty

Mr ANDREW: My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Minister for Communities and Minister for the Arts. Will the minister please explain to the House what steps have already commenced to enact the Path to Treaty legislation and what work would be needed to undo this process if the legislation were to be repealed?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for Mirani for his question. I want to take this moment to acknowledge that he has found a new home with the Katter's Australian Party. I do wish him the best in his new endeavours. I want to acknowledge the fact that his very first question since his defection to the Katter's Australian Party is about the Path to Treaty legislation. I want to acknowledge that he obviously has an influence over the Katter's Australian Party in terms of their concern and interest in the Path to Treaty legislation. I find it really exciting and comforting that they are perhaps looking at the Path to Treaty legislation as something to be held up.

In terms of the Path to Treaty legislation there are two main elements that have already been enacted. One is the establishment of a truth-telling and healing inquiry; they began their work on 1 July. The second is the establishment of the Treaty Institute. That institute has been appointed and they have been working very hard on the very foundations of establishing that institute. I imagine that just like other members of the Katter's Australian Party, he is speaking to First Nations leadership across this state. First Nations leadership across this state is fully supportive of Path to Treaty legislation. They are absolutely fully supportive of Path to Treaty legislation and want to see it enacted in full.

Of course, that came from a real desire to see that big gap that we see in life outcomes closed. Our state, like all other states and territories across this country, is engaged in a national Closing the Gap agreement. That agreement is about Closing the Gap in life outcomes for First Nations peoples. We saw in this state a need to reframe the relationship to be able to meet our commitments under the Closing the Gap agreement. That reframing of the relationship began many years ago and through lots of consultation we got to the point of bringing to this parliament, the 57th Parliament, Path to Treaty legislation, which was supported. It had bipartisan support and was emphatically supported by the member for Broadwater, the Leader of the Opposition, who stood in the chamber in Cairns and absolutely supported that legislation. However, within months he abandoned Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people; he backflipped and turned his back on them.

This is what we see in the Leader of the Opposition. You cannot trust a single word he says. He could not even run his own business in a way that would be transparent. He is shifty, he is dodgy, and that is what we see from him when it comes to Path to Treaty legislation.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I have spoken previously about using terms such as 'dodgy' to characterise a member. I ask you to withdraw those comments.

Ms ENOCH: I withdraw.

Police Service, Personnel

Mr SULLIVAN: My question is of the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Can the minister update the House on how the Miles Labor government is supporting our hardworking and dedicated Queensland Police Service, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr RYAN: I thank the member for Stafford for the question. Mr Speaker, as you know, I have known a number of members for Stafford, including the member's father, and I have to say this member for Stafford is the best member for Stafford that the Queensland parliament has ever seen. Also I have to say that this member for Sandgate is the best member for Sandgate this parliament has ever seen.

This is a very important question about community safety. We heard in my ministerial statement about how this government is supporting the Queensland Police Service with the biggest recruitment campaign in Queensland history, with almost 800 recruits at the academy right now. That is why we are supporting the Queensland Police Service with new infrastructure—infrastructure like the new Townsville Police Academy in North Queensland. I might say it is a project that those opposite have not yet committed to. When we know that they will not say they are committed to a project we know it is on their list of cuts. It makes sense it would be on their list of cuts because when the Leader of the Opposition was a member for that region they actually had a plan to close down that academy, to outsource the academy, to ensure that the Queensland Police Service—

Mr Watts interjected.

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

Mr RYAN:—no longer conducted training for police officers in Townsville. We are guaranteeing the future of training police in Townsville with a new academy as part of the Kirwan police project.

Talking about the academy, I have heard a whisper that there will be a new training program at the academy. It is all about interview skills for dodgy witnesses. I understand that the questioning for the recruits at the academy will go something like this: 'What's your name?' 'Leader.' 'No, what's your real name?' 'No obligations, no findings.' 'What's your address?' 'No obligations, no findings.' 'Are you sure you don't live at Bulimba?' 'No obligations, no findings.' 'What's your occupation?' 'Premier-elect.' 'No, that's not right. Weren't you the previous director of SET Solutions?' 'No obligations, no findings.'

When it comes to the Leader of the Opposition, he is the dodgiest of witnesses. He has questions to answer, but he cannot provide the answers. He is dodging accountability, dodging transparency and he owes the people of Queensland accountability and transparency when it comes to his dodgy business dealings.

Premier, Travel Arrangements

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I have a question to the Premier. The Premier said it was cheaper to fly a private jet than to hire a car. If, as the Premier says, it is cheaper to fly a luxury private jet than hire a car, can the Premier explain why more Queenslanders are not hiring luxury private jets to eat cake with a friend?

Mr MILES: With regards to the itinerary that the member for Nanango refers to, I visited four different locations over two days and returned to Brisbane in time to attend an event alongside the Leader of the Opposition. While it might make for fun politics for the member for Nanango to pull out one leg of that trip, I do not regret whatsoever visiting the community of Bundaberg alongside my trips—

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Chatsworth, member for Pine Rivers, you are both warned for quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr MILES: I visited Hervey Bay, Maryborough, Bundaberg and Rockhampton on that trip. They are all important Queensland cities, places that deserve to see their political leaders. I will continue to visit regional Queensland whenever I get the opportunity because Queensland is a big state and, unlike the other states, we have those big provincial cities that are powerhouses of our economy. In all of those locations I met with locals, I heard from them and I announced for them initiatives that would benefit those communities.

I will continue to spend as much time as I can in regional Queensland delivering for them, because I believe that that is what good governments do. To have the member for Nanango attacking me for spending as much time as I can in regional Queensland is typical of those opposite. We on this side of the House proudly represent regional Queensland and we proudly ensure they have a strong voice in our government, including with our strong local representatives in all of those communities, and I am determined to ensure that continues.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bonney, I find your lack of faith disturbing. You are warned under the standing orders.

Small Business

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is of the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development. Can the minister update the House on how the Miles Labor government is supporting Queensland small businesses, and is the minister aware of any risky alternative approaches?

Mr McCALLUM: I thank the member for Barron River for his question. He is a member of the Miles Labor government—a government that is dedicated to supporting our hardworking Queensland small businesses, small businesses that know they can rely on the $250 million Queensland Small Business Strategy, which backs them with support and initiatives. This is a strategy that is locked in. It is fully funded and it does not come with risk.

The member for Barron River has asked me about risks. Let's look at the risks that are playing out internationally. In America we have a self-proclaimed businessman running for the office of President of the United States for the Republicans, Donald Trump. The world sees the risk associated with him and the risk associated with his record—dodgy business dealings, ripping off businesses,

secret hush money payments to avoid legal troubles, a sham training company subject to multiple investigations—Trump University—funnelling taxpayer money to enrich himself and his mates, not paying workers and not paying taxes. This might sound familiar, but the policies are not any better—big on promises with very little detail, nothing but slick slogans, only good for billboards and sound bites. Let's not forget about the cuts: cuts to laws to prop up multinational fossil fuel companies; cuts to education, housing and transport; cuts to jobs and worker benefits; and cuts to free health care. We have heard this before.

Mr Millar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Gregory, you are warned under the standing orders. Members' correct titles will be used in this House.

Mr McCALLUM: Worst of all, he is running on a law and order agenda whilst headed to court himself. Then there is tax reform for the rich, giving back billions to multinationals and voting against access to a woman's right to choose. I am talking about Donald Trump, but there are some chilling parallels with what is happening here in Queensland—a cautionary tale if ever there was one. The only question as we head towards October and November is: will it be the White House, will it be the white beach house down the Gold Coast or will it be the white—

(Time expired)

Fire Department

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Minister for Fire and Disaster Recovery. I refer to media reports today regarding complaints within the Queensland Fire Department. When did the minister first become aware of these allegations, and can the minister clarify what action the minister took?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have two minutes to respond.

Ms BOYD: I thank the member for the question. It is a great opportunity for me to be really clear about the type of culture that we expect in the fire service. Every single member of the senior leadership of the Queensland Fire Department expects this standard. Both the commissioner and I have been very clear about it on the public record. There is no place for the types of allegations that were made at Whyte Island in a modern fire department. It is abhorrent and there is absolutely no place for it whatsoever. The commissioner has said so, as have I. I take this opportunity to encourage every member of the Queensland Fire Department, whether they are a volunteer or whether they are a paid employee, that if they have a matter to report they should come forward and report it. Reporting it means that—

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). The question was specifically when the minister was aware of this matter and what action she has taken.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Glass House. The minister has 54 seconds remaining. I trust that she will round out her answer to address that element of the question. The question did contain some preamble also and I will allow the minister to use her remaining time. Minister, under standing order 118(b) I will ask you to come back to the question as asked.

Ms BOYD: Reporting it, Mr Speaker, means that action can be taken and people can be supported. The allegations were made to my office in February this year. From there, inquiries were made with the Queensland Fire Department and a report was provided to me that the matter had been fully investigated and the matter was closed.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MOTION

Business Program

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.16 am): I move—

1. That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages; and the Child Safe Organisations Bill and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation 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 periods of time as specified:

(a) the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill, all stages to be completed within a maximum of two hours and 30 minutes;

(b) the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, all stages to be completed within a maximum of three hours and 45 minutes, or by 12.30 pm on Wednesday, 11 September 2024, whichever occurs first;

(c) the Child Safe Organisations Bill and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, all stages to be completed within a maximum of three hours;

(d) the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Vaping) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, all stages to be completed within a maximum of two hours and 30 minutes;

(e) the Progressive Coal Royalties Protection (Keep Them in the Bank) Bill, all stages to be completed by 4.45 pm on Thursday, 12 September 2024; and

(f) any substantive procedural motion to be moved by the Leader of the House, a maximum of five minutes to complete.

3. The following time limits for the bills listed in 2. apply:

(a) the minister to be called on in reply:

(i) for the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill, by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;

(ii) for the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours, or by 12 pm on Wednesday, 11 September 2024, whichever occurs first;

(iii) for the Child Safe Organisations Bill and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;

(iv) for the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Vaping) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;

(v) for the Progressive Coal Royalties Protection (Keep Them in the Bank) Bill, by 4.25 pm on Thursday, 12 September 2024.

4. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by the specified times, the 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 or motion without further debate;

(c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion; and

(d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

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

AYES, 49:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Rourke, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

NOES, 37:

LNP, 34—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Zanow.

KAP, 3—Andrew, Dametto, Knuth.

Pair: Lauga, Perrett.

Resolved in the affirmative.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.22 am), by leave without notice: I move—

That this House—

1. notes the Ethics Committee report No. 225 tabled in the House on 22 August 2024;
2. finds the member for Coomera in contempt for taking a photograph of the member for Pumicestone's mobile phone in the chamber and sharing it with others;
3. accepts the apology from the member for Coomera on the floor of the House as an appropriate penalty; and
4. resolves to take no further action.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY BILL

Resumed from 22 May (see p. 1732).

Second Reading

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (11.22 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I want to acknowledge the work of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee and its staff in conducting its inquiry into the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. I thank the committee for its detailed consideration of the bill and its report. The committee made one recommendation—that the bill be passed. I appreciate the committee's support of the bill.

I would also like to thank everyone who made submissions to the committee, participated in the public hearings and contributed to the development of the bill, so many of whom have joined us in the gallery today. Last year I had the privilege to meet with a number of these incredible advocates, including Anastasia, Lexie, Danielle and Shannon, and hearing from many more families. After hearing their stories, I asked Queensland's Health Ombudsman to undertake a systemic investigation into the health services offered by providers in Queensland.

To all of the donor-conceived people, advocates and families, I know it took courage to speak up and expose how the fertility industry's self-regulation has, in some instances, failed to protect Queensland families. Donor-conceived people courageously shared their stories, describing the unique stress and anguish that can come from finding out that you may have many siblings or from not being able to know your background or medical history. Some described finding out they were donor conceived as a traumatic experience that left them feeling like they had lost their identity. Others described the richness that being able to develop meaningful relationships with their donor siblings and the donor can bring to their lives. Parents of donor-conceived children shared their sometimes painful experiences and explained how they will feel the effects in their families for years to come. People undergoing fertility treatments shared how they have felt mislead and unheard during a highly emotional and stressful time. Thank you for your bravery and resilience in sharing your personal stories. We have heard you. Your rights are enshrined in this bill, which will protect the welfare and interests of people who use assisted reproductive technology and who are born as a result. The bill will improve confidence in Queensland's fertility industry by providing greater oversight, transparency and protections for Queenslanders. For donor-conceived people, your welfare and interests throughout your lives will be of paramount importance in the administration and operation of the legislation.

I would also like to thank the Health Ombudsman and her team for their intensive and detailed work throughout their investigation into the fertility industry. The final report, which was published on 1 July 2024, identified a range of systemic issues and made recommendations to government and industry. The final report confirmed the need for robust legislation to regulate the fertility industry in Queensland. The bill puts into action a range of recommendations that the Health Ombudsman made for legislation, including the need for robust industry oversight, a family limit on the use of donor gametes, informed consent and prohibiting sex selection. The committee supported the introduction of a licensing scheme and noted strong stakeholder support for regulating the fertility industry. The licensing framework will give Queensland Health powers to oversee providers and enforce compliance.

Some industry stakeholders expressed concern that the penalties for offences in the bill are too punitive. Queensland Health will have a range of regulatory actions that can be applied before pursuing an offence, including the ability to impose licensing conditions, issue an improvement or prohibition notice, or suspend or cancel a licence. However, it is important that the bill takes a strong stance on

serious ethical and clinical breaches. When there are instance of such conduct, the penalties are proportionate to the impacts which are significant and at times can be lifelong.

The bill includes a range of requirements that will govern the ethical conduct of the industry. The committee found that while stakeholders often raised competing views, the bill has struck the appropriate balance. This is particularly the case for the family limit, time limits for use of donor gametes and withdrawal of consent. The bill will legislate a maximum number of Australian families that may be created from a single donor. It will be an offence for a provider to perform an assisted reproductive technology procedure knowing that it would result in more than 10 families being created in Australia from the same donor. This is in line with several other jurisdictions in Australia. The limit responds to the concerns we heard from donor-conceived people about the impacts of having many siblings. It strikes a balance between limiting the number of families that may be created without unduly restricting the availability of donor gametes.

The bill also sets a maximum time limit of 15 years for the use of donated gametes and embryos. Assisted reproductive technology providers seeking to use materials after this period must apply to the chief executive of Queensland Health. Some stakeholders raised concerns that this provision could pressure people into extending their families sooner than they otherwise would have, for example, if the gametes had already been in storage for some time. This is not the intent of the provisions. It is to ensure that providers are acting ethically with respect to materials stored over many years. This is particularly important to donor-conceived people given the impacts of potentially having an age difference of many years between a person and their genetic parent or genetic siblings.

The bill includes provisions around the counselling and information that must be provided to ensure that patients are able to make informed decision about their options. Stakeholders were generally supportive of the role of counselling in the provision of assisted reproductive technology services, provided that it was appropriate and of high quality. Following providing the information and counselling and obtaining consent, providers must act in accordance with a person's consent. This also applies if consent is withdrawn or modified.

The bill will also prohibit the use of a person's gametes in procedures after that person has died. There are two exceptions to this. The first is when the person specifically consented to the use after their death. The second is if the gametes are retrieved under the new processes established by the bill.

The Health Ombudsman's report identified record keeping as another critical area where legislation is needed. During consultation, many donor-conceived people shared their experience of approaching a provider for information about their conception and genetic history only to learn that those records had been destroyed or lost. One donor-conceived person said—

> By adulthood I had resigned myself to the fact that I would never know the identity of my father or siblings, I would never know the family that genetically I was a part of. I did not know my cultural background or the medical conditions I might need to watch out for.

The bill will require providers to collect information and retain records for at least 99 years and not destroy records.

The bill also requires providers to collect donors' relevant medical history information, which will also be recorded in the donor conception information register for access by genetically linked people. The ability to share emergent information about serious health conditions is so important to donor-conceived people and their families. I have heard firsthand from people who have a health condition that may have a genetic component and want to warn their siblings, only to find the relevant fertility clinic is unable or unwilling to provide that warning.

The Health Ombudsman's report details similar concerns. A parent of a donor-conceived child told the ombudsman of spending three years pushing to share their child's health issues with donor siblings. They were repeatedly reassured by the clinic that any health issue would be shared immediately, no matter the severity, but families of donor siblings say that no disclosure was made. The bill makes it clear that providers are authorised to pass on health information that may come to light after a gamete or embryo is donated where a medical practitioner has certified a serious risk of harm. I note the committee considered that these provisions will benefit donor-conceived people.

The bill addresses the critical gaps and risks identified in the Health Ombudsman's report. Some of the more clinical matters will be dealt with through licence conditions and implementation activities. During consultation and the committee's inquiry, some providers suggested that legislating protections could increase costs to patients and their families. The new regulatory framework will avoid unnecessary red tape for clinics as much as possible, and providers should already be doing the things in the bill under the current self-regulatory model.

The bill will also respond to recommendations made by the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee following its inquiry into matters relating to donor conception information by establishing the donor conception information register in the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages. When I was attorney-general, the member for Toohey and I met with Professor Katharine Gelber, who was a key advocate pushing for this inquiry to occur. Professor Gelber and other stakeholders demonstrated that there was strong support for the establishment of the register and that it will 'make a real difference to the lives of donor-conceived people and their families'.

Many donor-conceived people stressed the importance of knowing their genetic origins and the beneficial impact of being able to access information about a person's donor-conceived siblings and donor. The bill establishes an access-to-information framework that will allow all donor-conceived people, regardless of when they were born, to access identifying and non-identifying information about a donor where the information is held on the register. Donors and parents of donor-conceived people will also be able to access certain information through the register.

Under the bill, donor-conceived people aged 16 years or older will be able to apply for and access information on the register, including identifying information about the donor. Access from 16 years of age is intended to support donor-conceived people to know important information about their genetic origins from an age of relative maturity. This is consistent with a person 16 years or older being able to apply to alter their records under the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2023. The bill allows the parents of a donor-conceived person or a person with parental responsibility for a donor-conceived person under 16 years of age to apply for and access information about the donor, including identifying information if the donor consents to its release. This is intended to facilitate sharing of this information with the donor-conceived person in an age-appropriate manner.

Some stakeholders submitted that retrospective operation of the register will disproportionately impact upon the privacy rights of donors who donated prior to 2004 on the condition of anonymity or who otherwise did not consent to their identifying information being released. Retrospective operation of the register was strongly recommended by the committee. It was their view that a donor-conceived person's right to know identifying information about a donor outweighs the donor's right to anonymity. The bill will require providers to disclose historical donor conception records to the register, regardless of whether the donor donated on the condition of anonymity. If a donor's identifying information is held on the register, a donor-conceived person will be able to access it upon application. Retrospective operation of the register will ensure that donor-conceived people can access important information about their genetic origins.

The bill also provides for addendums to be issued to the birth certificates of donor-conceived people born in Queensland. The addendum will outline that further information about the person's birth is available in a register kept by the registrar. The addendum model outlined in the bill is intended to provide an independent avenue for donor-conceived people to become aware that they are donor-conceived. The model is intended to maintain the privacy of a donor-conceived person, as the method of the person's conception will not be noted on the birth certificate itself and inadvertently disclosed when the birth certificate is used as an identity document.

The Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill will protect Queenslanders and their families now and into the future, along with providing certainty and confidence for Queensland's fertility industry. Once again, I would like to thank the families and individuals who have spoken up about these issues and have fought tirelessly to bring about these reforms. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Bush): Before I call the next member and before we get too far into the debate, I will remind members of those who are on a warning. They are the members for McConnel, Scenic Rim, Burleigh, Logan, Woodridge, Kawana, Everton, Toowoomba South, Buderim, Clayfield, Callide, Mudgeeraba, Nanango, Toowoomba North, Pine Rivers, Chatsworth, Bonney and Gregory.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.37 am): Today I rise to make my contribution on the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. At the very outset, I acknowledge that this bill covers some ground that is complex and sensitive for many people. By their very nature, assisted reproductive technologies are just that: complex and sensitive. To be frank, these technologies are quite an incredible scientific and medical feat that have given many Queenslanders the very special and very great privilege of being a parent.

Assisted reproductive technology refers to treatments or procedures that address fertility. The most well known and most common of these treatments is in-vitro fertilisation, widely known as IVF. Research from the University of New South Wales National Perinatal Epidemiology and Statistics Unit,

published last year, indicates that one in every 18 babies born in Australia is conceived through IVF. This highlights that many Queenslanders will rely on or know someone who has used assisted reproductive technology to start or grow their family.

Not just IVF but also these technologies more broadly are continuing to play a significant role in the journey of many Queensland families. I am cognisant that, even with these quite incredible technologies at our disposal, some couples are still not able to have children despite it being their every wish. Despite many cycles of treatment and the hope that comes with that, for whatever reason things just do not work out for some couples. That will often come at not just a great financial expense but also a great emotional one. That emotional toll and that heartache may be felt for many years. I think it is important that we all take a moment to consider those people today. I am sure many of us will count couples in that circumstance as family and friends.

This legislation will bring Queensland into line with the rest of the country, which we as the opposition see as a good thing. Unlike most other Australian jurisdictions, there is no state-based legislation that regulates the provision of assisted reproductive technology services in Queensland. This has resulted in assistive reproductive technology providers in Queensland being effectively self-governed.

We on this side of the House have heard the calls of those with very personal stories about some of the failings in the industry in years gone by. I myself have met with some of them, and I do commend and acknowledge those who have spoken up about their concerns. Similarly, we on this side also understand the industry is broadly supportive of being regulated. With those two things in mind, the LNP will not be opposing this bill today.

I think many would agree that, since the early days of these procedures being first performed in Queensland, many of the providers in the space have come a long way. The business operators and the clinicians who staff these services are, on the whole, dedicated and professional. Of course, that does not mean that things have always been perfect. In fact, in some cases it appears it has been far from perfect and that has led to some difficult personal circumstances for some Queenslanders. Hearing stories of donor mix-ups or examples of a donor sperm sample being used dozens of times over is frankly disturbing and it is not good enough. There are members of our community who have to live with these consequences. We on this side will certainly not stand in the way of what is important legislation that will bring Queensland into line with the rest of the country.

The LNP did point to the fact that Queensland lagged behind other jurisdictions when these issues were being raised publicly and that it was important that the necessary safeguards were put in place. I do acknowledge that, in this bill, the government does seek to do that by establishing a state-based framework to regulate ART services as well as a donor conception information register. Two prior bodies of work have led to the formulation of the legislation—in 2022, the Queensland parliament's Legal Affairs and Safety Committee reported on its inquiry into matters relating to donor conception and, in 2024, the Health Ombudsman completed an investigation of ART providers in Queensland.

I do note that the Health Ombudsman had only delivered interim findings at the time the minister introduced the legislation, though the final report has since been completed. The Health Ombudsman noted there was a compelling case for the proposed legislation which we are debating today to strengthen the safeguards for consumers, donors and Queenslanders who are donor conceived. Again, having carefully contemplated these findings, it is another important reason why the LNP will not oppose the bill.

I will turn to the particulars of the bill now. I am conscious that the government has granted only a very brief period of time to debate this very important legislation—barely two hours—so I will keep my contribution brief so as to allow as many of my colleagues the opportunity to have their say. I do want to touch on some key points.

In relation to the establishment of a regulatory framework, the opposition is supportive of the provisions that introduce a licensing scheme, meaning ART technology providers will be required to obtain a licence to operate in Queensland with it now being on offence to operate without one. Similarly, we are broadly supportive of the provisions around providers supporting their clients through information and counselling services based on the complexity of the procedure. As I said earlier, this is a complex and sensitive area of medicine so having these types of support services available is important. Of course, most good operators have services like these, or a version of them, already embedded into their practice.

There are also new consent and record keeping provisions which the opposition is largely supportive of. I do want to talk to the provisions of the bill that deal with the retrieval and use of gametes and embryos a little more. The LNP is completely supportive of the prohibition on the use of gametes from close family members as well as the prohibition on the use of assisted reproductive technology for non-medical sex selection. We will also support limiting the number of donor-related families who can be created to 10, restricting the number of families who may use a particular gamete donor. That will hopefully avoid the disturbing circumstances that we have heard of previously and will no doubt hear more about throughout the debate.

I do note that there are some stakeholder concerns about the definition of 'family' under this provision and that these restrictions may impact some sections of the community more than others—for example, when someone may have found a new spouse or a partner. I will leave it to the minister to clarify those concerns.

Above all, I want to point out the bill's provisions that propose restrictions on the use of gametes and embryos when the gamete provider has died or when 15 years has passed since the donation was made. What is being proposed in relation to a deceased donor is entirely reasonable: however, the blanket 15-year timeframe which would see those samples rendered useless after reaching that milestone, even if the donor is still alive, may deliver some unintended consequences. The committee heard that imposing such a timeframe may exacerbate an already worrying shortage of donated samples that the entire industry is grappling with. It is worth noting that donating human tissue in Australia, including gametes, can only be done altruistically. Destroying what are otherwise healthy samples may do a disservice only to the people who will ultimately need to rely on them.

For instance, let's say that a donor's sample has only been used twice across a 15-year time span. Even if those samples are still deemed to be viable, they will still be destroyed once that deadline comes up. Even if another family wished to use that sample at some point in the future, they would not be able to. I am concerned about this provision mainly because of the potential to worsen an already limited field of donated gametes. It is then the families who rely on a donation that will be impacted because there are too few donors. I do hope the government has weighed up this potential impact and the very real possibility for unintended consequences to arise from this proposed restriction.

I will move now to the other main component of the bill, which is the provisions around the Donor Conception Information Register. Providers will be required to lodge historical information to the register within six months of the commencement of the relevant provisions. These provisions are retrospective, meaning providers will be required to provide relevant historical information to the registrar even if the person whom the information is about did not consent to that disclosure or if laws or guidelines in force at the time the donation was collected precluded their disclosure.

Some possible scenarios which these provisions could enliven could include: allowing for a donor-conceived person 16 years or older to apply for and access identifying and non-identifying information held on the register about the donor without consent; and allowing for a descendant of a donor-conceived person who is 16 years or older, such as a child or grandchild, to apply for and access the same information that the donor-conceived person can access. There are a number of other scenarios but there is not enough time to go through them.

As with any law brought into this place that involves retrospectivity, I do worry about the potential for unintended consequences. Any member who has been around this place long enough will know the cautionary tales of retrospective legislation changes in years gone by. I really do feel for donors who have acted in good faith and have always been under the impression their decision to donate was effectively anonymous because that will no longer be the case.

I do understand the government's motive and intention behind these changes, and I think they are good motives and good intentions. Being able to understand their own genetic origin is important to a donor-conceived person for a good number of reasons, not least of which so they can have confidence in having a partner in the future to whom they are not closely genetically linked. This is a very real circumstance for many parents of donor-conceived children. Yes, there are good reasons for retrospective changes based on the failings of the past but, again, the impact on the lives of some people is likely to be quite significant as a result and we should all be conscious of that fact.

It is entirely possible, or perhaps even likely, that these changes could be challenged by those who have made donations in the past on the proviso their identity not be disclosed. We will carefully watch how this unfolds. We do not oppose the changes but we sincerely hope the government has judiciously considered the potential ramifications going forward.

The establishment of the register also provides a mechanism for noting a person's status as donor conceived on their birth certificate. Under the proposed changes, the Registrar General will be required to issue an addendum to a birth certificate if a donor-conceived person born in Queensland who is 16 or over requests their birth certificate. The addendum must state that further information about the person's birth is available in a register kept by the registrar. It will then be up to the person concerned to decide whether they wish to request that additional information. Stakeholders have identified there is some concern that the proposed addendum to birth certificates may bring about issues related to privacy, family dynamics and the rights of non-biological parents. Again, I think those are entirely justified concerns.

There are also some stakeholders who have suggested that the age one is able to access these records should be 18 years rather than 16. It would be good to understand the government's rationale as to why 16 was the age chosen. I believe some of the other jurisdictions in Australia follow the 18-year milestone.

I must say that some from within the sector have expressed their disappointment in the consultation undertaken as part of the legislative changes. They have said that the process was more one of being spoken at rather than being listened to or of genuine consultation. I acknowledge that there has been previous work done in this space—the OHO inquiry and the previous committee inquiry. That some stakeholders felt this process was rushed was disappointing to hear, particularly when I feel there was a real openness by the sector to embrace new regulations and to try to get it right.

Sadly, we are seeing rushing of a different kind today. The government is allowing this House barely two hours to debate this legislation. It is important legislation and it is very complex, too. I expect that many members from across the chamber are likely to have personal experiences which have shaped their views. That the government should choose to truncate the passage of the bill through the House in the manner it is doing is deeply disappointing, particularly given the sensitivities and complexities around this area of government policy.

I want to round out my contribution by saying thank you to those who have advocated for change in this field—along with those who are willing to change their practices for the better. I think it is very unlikely we will see any sort of marked slowdown in the use of assisted reproductive technologies across Queensland in the years ahead so ensuring there is a framework to protect those who rely on this technology is very important.

The opposition will not stand in the way of this legislation. I sincerely hope the government has carefully considered the potential for unintended consequences which may arise from this bill, because this really impacts the lives of people in a significant way.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (11.51 am): I rise to speak to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. The Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee, in its report No. 14 of the 57th Parliament, tabled in the Assembly on 2 August 2024, recommended that the bill be passed. The primary objectives of the bill are to establish a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology services and a donor conception information register.

During its inquiry into the bill, the committee received and considered a variety of evidence. This included 34 written submissions from stakeholders, written and oral briefings provided by Queensland Health and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, and evidence provided by witnesses at our public hearing in Brisbane. The evidence received by the committee indicates that stakeholders are broadly supportive of the bill's objectives and how it seeks to achieve them. However, some expressed concern about specific provisions, most commonly related to proposed donor family limits, the donor conception register and the birth certificates of donor-conceived people.

The bill responds to two previous inquiries: the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's inquiry into matters relating to donor conception and the Office of the Health Ombudsman's recent investigation of assisted reproductive technology providers in Queensland, set out in an interim and final report. The bill implements most of the recommendations made by the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, including its central recommendation that all donor-conceived people be legislatively provided with the right to know the identity of their donor. Those recommendations not implemented by the bill primarily relate to funding or the practicalities of implementation, being matters not typically included in primary legislation. The bill also implements several of the preliminary recommendations made by the Office of the Health Ombudsman in its assisted reproductive technology report, including that legislation be introduced to provide robust oversight of providers operating in Queensland.

The committee was satisfied that the regulatory scheme set out in the bill would improve the oversight of services in Queensland, protecting the health and wellbeing of those who use these

services. As previously stated, the committee recommended that the bill be passed. On 22 May, the Hon. Shannon Fentiman introduced this bill into the House and stated—

Today I am proud, as the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women, to introduce the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024 into this House. The bill will establish a robust framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology providers and services and will establish a donor conception information register in Queensland. This legislation will ensure that the wellbeing and interests of people receiving fertility treatments are central to the delivery of assisted reproductive technology services and that the welfare and interests of people born as a result of these services are of paramount importance.

The minister went on to state—

By regulating providers and establishing a donor conception register, the Queensland government is demonstrating a commitment to protecting the welfare and interests of people who use assisted reproductive technology and those born as a result of such treatments. This bill demonstrates that the Queensland government's commitment to improving health care for families and for women forms part of our landmark Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy 2032.

At the public briefing on 12 July 2024, around the issue of a donor conception information register, Ms Tricia Matthias, Acting Deputy Director-General, Strategy, Policy and Reform, Queensland Health, stated—

In terms of the Donor Conception Information Register and key issues raised by stakeholders, one key issue was the age of donor-conceived persons to access information. As the committee is aware, the stakeholders had a range of views regarding the age of donor-conceived people accessing the register. While many stakeholders supported access to the register from the age of 16 years, some stakeholders recommended that donor-conceived people under 16 years should be able to access the register. Others recommended the age of access should be from 18 years of age to be consistent with the recommendations of the former committee.

Mrs Kerry Favarato, representing Donor Conceived Australia, stated in her contribution—

In conclusion, the proposed legislation to regulate ART services and establish a donor conception register in Queensland is a commendable step forward, reflecting a growing recognition of the complex social, ethical and personal dimensions of donor conception. The urgency of passing this legislation in Queensland cannot be overstated. While we endorse most provisions, critical amendments are needed to safeguard the rights and lifelong interests of those conceived through ART. This is not just a legislative issue but a matter of fundamental human rights.

The committee carefully considered the retrospective impact of the new donor conception register, including the adverse impact it would have on the privacy of donors, some of whom had previously expected to remain anonymous. The committee recognises that establishing this register is necessary to ensure that all donor-conceived people have the ability to know the identity of their donor; however, this means placing the rights and wellbeing of donor-conceived people above those of donors who may have preferred to remain anonymous. The committee concluded that this is appropriate, given donors made their decisions to donate as competent adults while the donor-conceived offspring had no choice in the matter of their conception. Jigsaw Queensland, in their written submission, stated—

Jigsaw Qld supports the right of donor conceived people over the age of sixteen to information about their personal origins and a similar right for donors to have information about their children.

It went on to state—

When it comes to examining these issues, there is much to learn from the past experiences of people affected by adoption and the impacts of legislative changes since 1990. Just as it was when adoption legislation was being debated in the 90s, some now misguidedly believe that there exists a vast army of donor offspring and donors waiting to pounce on unsuspecting biological relatives ... In fact, the adoption experience and statistics would suggest otherwise.

Ms Alexandra Eccles, a donor-conceived person, in her written submission stated—

I am a donor conceived person, born in the early 90's. I was lucky enough to be born to two people who, even thirty years ago, had a deeper understanding of the importance of honesty and transparency than the medical professionals that they entrusted at the fertility clinic. They told me the truth of my conception when I was very young, and my Mum repeatedly spoke with and wrote to the clinic, expressing her deep concerns over donor anonymity and asking for more information about the donor to give me. They told her that it was in everyone's best interests to not disclose that I was conceived using donor sperm. I'm grateful that in spite of this, she was ethical enough to know better.

She went on to say—

The main thing that I want to ensure is heard is that when the clinics refer to 'historical' practices, they imply that everything is fine because they are no longer doing this or that. However, the repercussions of those practices are still very much the present for many of us, who without legislation have no hope of making them historical for ourselves.

Based on the above, I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (12.00 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. During the committee process we heard stories from many different perspectives, including stories from individuals who are and who always will be affected by the past—traumatic stories that have taken donor-conceived individuals on an emotional roller-coaster. Witnesses

to the committee referred to the Ombudsman's report into IVF treatment. The report highlighted harrowing systemic failures that have been going on for a very long time—failures that deeply affect the lives of donor-conceived persons and their families.

Currently in Queensland there is no state-based legislation that regulates assisted reproductive technology services. This is different from other states where the majority have legislation in place—states such as Western Australia, New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and the ACT. Operators in Queensland must adhere to federal requirements to maintain their professional accreditation. Failure to comply with the reproductive technology committee code of practice or the National Health and Medical Research Council guidelines is not an offence under federal law and there is almost no enforcement done.

This has resulted in a self-governing approach by the assisted reproductive providers in Queensland. This self-governing approach has led to claims of clinics using wrong donor gametes and, through right to information, there were concerns that a donor could have possibly fathered a thousand children. Therefore, it is long overdue for safeguards to be put in place in the industry to protect the interests of consumers, donors and those Queenslanders who are donor-conceived.

The primary objectives of the bill will establish a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology services and a donor conception information register. Assisted reproductive technology providers will require a licence to operate in Queensland. The bill requires licence holders to provide counselling to those involved in donor conception programs. It also requires a variety of record keeping of information by assisted reproductive technology providers.

The bill proposes several restrictions on how gametes and embryos can be used: limiting the number of donor related families that can be created to 10 and reducing the number of families that can use a particular gamete donor.

As I said, I will keep my contribution short because many other members wish to speak. I want to thank the brave individuals who presented themselves at the committee hearing to tell their stories. Your courage and strength was inspirational to everyone who was present. I thank you for expressing your opinions and the desperate need for change. I thank you for your contributions.

Mr HUNT (Caloundra—ALP) (12.04 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate surrounding assisted reproductive technology. As always, I would like to thank my fellow committee members for all their hard work on this bill and, indeed, on all the bills that have come before us during this term of the 57th Parliament. I thank Peter Russo for his guidance as committee chair, Ms Jonty Bush for her endless hard work and Ms Sandy Bolton for her friendly and collegiate approach. I also thank Messrs Mark Boothman and Jon Krause, the members for Theodore and Scenic Rim respectively. I thank the secretariat who support us so very well and make every effort to ensure the committee process is as easy as possible for participating MPs—and don't we need it sometimes!

The Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee's examined the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. The primary objectives of the bill are to establish a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology, known as ART, services and a donor conception information register. During its inquiry into the bill, the committee received and considered a variety of evidence: 34 written submissions from stakeholders; written and oral briefings provided by Queensland Health and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General; and evidence provided by witnesses at a public hearing in Brisbane. The evidence received by the committee indicated that stakeholders were broadly supportive of the bill's objectives and how it seeks to achieve them. To that end, the committee has made but a single recommendation, and that is that the bill be passed.

The industry that has emerged around assisted reproductive technology has enabled families to grow and in many cases has enabled families to exist in circumstances that would otherwise have been impossible. With that in mind, we should acknowledge the pure and unmatched joy that the industry has made possible—a joy that only family life can bring.

I am not talking about the bit where you are already running late for school drop off and you walk into your child's room only to find them half dressed, daydreaming, playing on their iPad after you have expressly told them to hurry up because you are already late—not that bit of joy. I am not talking about the bit where your child comes to you after dinner and informs you that they need to take a list of incredibly arbitrary items to school the next day for a group assessment that no household could possibly summon up in less than 72 hours and that your child has known for three weeks—not that bit of joy either.

I am talking about the other bits—the good bits. Mostly it is terrific, and the assisted reproductive technology industry has had a part to play in the creation of many happy families, but—and there is always a 'but'—it is fair to say that in Queensland the industry has existed in a largely unregulated space and that this has not been without its share of problems both for the donor-conceived people and for the bodies who need to enforce compliance.

The bill has two main policy objectives: establishing a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology, or ART, services in Queensland and establishing a donor conception information register in Queensland. For context, in Queensland there is a relatively small number of clinics that provide ART services—all of which are private providers. At present there are eight different providers operating in Queensland. Together they run a total of 24 accredited ART units across the state. Without the support that will be afforded by this bill, Queensland is unable to enforce compliance with either the National Health and Medical Research Council ethical guidelines or the RTAC code of practice. In effect, the industry is self-regulating.

Naturally a self-regulating industry will encounter service delivery problems from time to time, so in 2022 the committee was tasked to hand down a report into matters relating to donor conception. In its initial report, the committee made six recommendations including that all donor-conceived persons be legislatively provided with the right to know the identity of their donor when they reach the age of 18, regardless of when they were born; identifying information about donors, including their medical history, be made available on request to all donor-conceived persons when they reach the age of 18; and a central donor conception register be established within the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages. In response, our government has enlivened several key principles that will regulate how ART providers operate in Queensland.

The bill proposes a new licensing scheme for ART providers operating in Queensland and implements key preliminary recommendations made by the Health Ombudsman. In March 2024 the Health Ombudsman recommended 'that legislation is designed to provide robust oversight of ART providers, including the licensing of providers, audits, and investigation of non-conformities and adverse events'. This preliminary recommendation was made in light of a finding that 'there are gaps and risks in the current self-regulatory system in respect to ensuring the safety and quality of ART services'. These licences will be required for clinics rather than individual practitioners and personnel who work within them; however, clinics will be required to ensure that ART services are only provided by, or under the supervision of, a medical practitioner. This move towards regulation was welcomed by one donor-conceived person who indicated that she was relieved that legislative developments were progressing to regulate an industry where providers have, in her view, placed convenience and profit over health and safety.

The bill would require ART providers to provide people with information and counselling prior to the provision of ART services. As might be expected, the nature and breadth of these services will vary according to the nature of the services being provided by the ART provider—from a fairly rudimentary level of information and expectations right up to a more extensive level, which will include things like the ART provider's obligations in relation to collecting, keeping and disclosing information about the person and their donor-conceived offspring, and the person's rights and the rights of the donor-conceived offspring to information from the donor conception register.

Unsurprisingly, members of our LGBTIQ+ community make up a significant proportion of people accessing ART technology so their commentary on this point is highly relevant. It is notable that organisations representing LGBTIQ+ families indicated support for the counselling requirements. For example, Rainbow Families Queensland told the committee that a survey that it conducted in 2022 showed that—

> ... relevant, quality, affordable counselling ... was highly valued by our community.

and that—

> ... few would strongly oppose it being a mandatory feature of the regulatory framework. Rather, most concerns were framed around cost, quality of service, and also appropriateness and sensitivity of the counselling for LGBTQ+ people.

The bill also proposes to establish a donor conception information register, known as the register, and a mechanism for noting a person's status as a donor via their birth certificate. The bill would require ART providers to collect and maintain certain information relating to donors and the ART procedures and to take reasonable steps to determine whether a child is born as a result of a procedure. If a birth has occurred, an ART provider must provide all relevant information to the registrar within three months of becoming aware of the birth. ART providers would also be required to provide historical information to the registrar within six months of the commencement of the relevant provisions.

A person's contact information would only be accessible via the register where they have consented to this. The bill provides that, in giving consent for their contact information to be provided, a person may specify how contact is to be made. A person who obtains other information about the donor from the register can use that information to seek them out outside the framework provided by the bill. This would impact on the donor's right to privacy. However, as noted in the statement of compatibility, submissions made to the committee as part of its earlier inquiry indicated that 'donor-conceived people generally seek information about the donor to inform their own identity and sense of self, rather than using the information to contact the donor if the donor has not indicated that they would like to be contacted'. This suggests that attempts to contact donors who have indicated that they do not consent to contact may be relatively rare.

For a great many Queenslanders, the passage of this bill will not make a great difference to their daily lives, but for a significant number of Queenslanders, and Queenslanders who are yet to be, this bill will make life better and I commend it to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Before calling the next member, I recognise in the gallery today members of the Rotary Club of Burleigh Heads and three exchange students from Japan, Norway and the USA. Welcome.

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (12.13 pm): This bill introduces a new regulatory scheme for what is known as assisted reproductive technology—the most well known being IVF—where previously there has been no regulation of the sector. It also implements recommendations of the 2022 Legal Affairs and Safety Committee report into donor conception information for a register of donor conceived persons. This requires the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages to maintain a register of persons who are donor conceived, along with relevant information such as family and medical history. ART providers are required to lodge information on the register, yet parties to a private donor conception procedure have no legal obligation to lodge information. As I said in my speech on the LASC report at the time, there is already a legal obligation to register all births in Queensland, including parentage information, and it would be a minor change to also include private donor conception information. With the lodgement of information from gametes obtained other than registered IVF clinics being voluntary, it is likely that some donor-conceived people will not be able to access information about their own genetic heritage. This goes against the objectives of the act, which states that the welfare and interests of Queenslanders who are born as a result of assisted reproductive technology are of paramount importance, and we heard that from witnesses at the public hearings. This highlights the additional regulatory burden placed on ART providers, for whom it is compulsory.

While each of the new laws applied to ART providers make sense in isolation, the totality of the laws may limit the number of people willing to become donors. With Australia importing 50 per cent of gametes due to an already existing shortage, this will need to be monitored as these laws take effect. Other issues raised included donor privacy, the age of access for donor-conceived people to donor information, the number of donor-conceived children a donor can have, the provision of counselling as well as the ban on sex selection, although an exemption is provided for genetic disease reasons. Overall, there was broad support for regulating ART, from Donor Conceived Australia to the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union.

There were some differences regarding the age at which it was appropriate to access information as well as the number of recipients of gametes from the same donor—whether 10 families or 10 individual children—and this was raised by Rainbow Families Australia and several Queenslanders who have been through the donor process. Understandably, there were concerns raised regarding the expectation of donor privacy prior to the introduction of required consent to the release of identifying information to persons born as a result of the donation in 2014. At a public hearing, the issues for donors and their families were raised by Dr Stokes, medical director of Coastal IVF, who shared the difficulties experienced by themselves and their families. The fact that free counselling would be provided to both donor recipient people as well as the donors and their families was reassuring, as this is essential.

Finally, I would like to thank my fellow committee members, our hardworking secretariat and all who submitted or took the time to contact my office regarding this.

Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (12.17 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill. I want to start by making a couple of opening statements. I want to recognise that Queensland's fertility sector is broadly efficient, professional, caring and safe. Around 15,000 to 20,000 cycles of IVF are completed every year in Queensland, and fewer than one per cent of those result in a complaint so we have a broadly safe and efficient sector.

I want to recognise the service providers who work in fertility services, including those who are in my electorate who met with me around the bill. They offer people the chance of having or expanding their family when they otherwise may not be able to, including ourselves. Our youngest, Albie, was conceived through IVF. She is a beautiful miracle baby and we would not have her without that service. Even the days that are tough—and there are tough days—I savour because the alternative is so much worse. I do want to recognise all those people who work in that really important sector we have in Queensland.

That said, it is clear that when things go wrong—when samples are misused, when people are not fully informed or when consent is not given—the gravity of those mistakes is lifelong and life-changing. I want to also recognise those advocates whose experiences have contributed to this bill. It was clear from reading the submissions, listening to people who presented to the committee and reading the report of the Office of the Health Ombudsman, which I did, that reform was clearly needed.

In terms of the background to the bill, following the stories raised with her and in the public, the Minister for Health directed the OHO to complete a section 81 investigation into assisted reproductive technology in Queensland across 24 providers registered with RTAC. The initial scope of that investigation looked at issues of noncompliance or adverse events associated with the handling of gametes and embryos, including the collection, labelling, storage and transportation; the screening of gametes and embryos used in Queensland; record keeping and provision of information; maximum donation and distribution within Australia; whether adequate information is made available to consumers to allow them to provide informed consent when choosing ART treatment; issues related to the quality of donated sperm and the impacts that that has on the choices for ART treatment; the use of sex selection in accordance with the National Health and Medical Research Council guidelines; and issues associated with discarding of gametes and/or embryos which is the genetic or biological material.

The OHO's investigation identified significant systemic issues relating to the provision of ART services here in Queensland, including the gaps and risks in the current self-regulatory regime. The OHO found there was, in fact, justification for legislation to regulate ART providers in Queensland and to strengthen the safeguards of consumers, donors and donor-conceived people, and this bill is a response to that.

The bill will establish a framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology providers and services and will establish a donor conception information register in Queensland. The legislation will ensure the wellbeing and interests of people receiving fertility treatments are central to the delivery of assisted reproductive technology services, and that the welfare and interests of people born as a result of these services are of paramount importance.

This bill deals with key themes in the OHO report. I will speak to two. In relation to the theme of appropriate collection, storage, identification and distribution of gametes and embryos, the OHO, in their report, commended the ART providers who were fulsome in their investigation and participated in site visits. It was this ability to gather information that led to the recommendations that were outlined.

While the occurrence of gamete misidentification and mix-up is incredibly small, the gravity of this type of event is large. One of the case studies provided during their investigation was the following—

A couple undertook ART treatment from a provider resulting in three children. The couple intended for all three children to be biologically related using a single sperm donor of their choice. Following private genetic testing undertaken by the couple, they learned that their two younger children were not biologically related to the oldest child, although the two younger children are full siblings. One of the younger children also has significant disabilities which may have been inherited from the unintended sperm donor.

I reiterate that the OHO found that this was uncommon, but the case study illustrates and justifies how important robust record keeping and systems are to minimise this risk.

The bill adopts a key recommendation from the Health Ombudsman by establishing a licensing framework to ensure robust oversight of providers. Providers will be required to obtain a licence to operate in Queensland, and it will be an offence to operate without one. The bill encourages transparency from the sector and requires licensed providers to give written notice of certain events within prescribed timeframes. Queensland Health will operate the licensing regime. They will have powers to investigate, and will also have the ability to issue an improvement notice where it is necessary for a provider to rectify a particular matter to prevent or to minimise a risk to the health, safety or welfare of patients or people born as a result of those services. Queensland Health will also have the power to suspend or cancel a provider's licence. Inspectors will be appointed under this bill to investigate, monitor and enforce compliance with the act and will have powers to enter premises, inspect and seize things

and require production of information. The penalties will be serious. Noncompliance of this requirement will be an offence.

The second theme I will speak to is the establishment of a donor registry for Queensland. Most, if not all, submissions received illustrated the impact that not knowing your genetic history and not knowing your biological truth has a profound impact on donor-conceived children in particular. I want to share elements of a statement provided to the committee anonymously. It reads—

I only become aware that I was conceived using donor sperm three weeks prior to my 38th birthday. I asked [my mum] if Dad was my biological father. She admitted that he was not and explained I was conceived using donor sperm.

The next day I looked at my face in the mirror and was at a loss as to who I was looking at. The experience was harrowing and not one I would wish on anyone. I now understand that this experience has a term, genetic bewilderment.

This bill requires providers to collect and keep information about gamete providers, including donors, and people who undergo procedures, for at least 99 years. The bill also makes it an offence to destroy records. It is imperative that services are preserving and recording Queenslanders' genetic origins and that they take their role as custodians in that very seriously.

The bill will establish the donor conception information register in the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages. The establishment of the register was considered and recommended by the parliamentary Legal Affairs and Safety Committee that I was on in this term of government following our inquiry into matters relating to donor conception information. We heard then and we have heard again through this parliamentary committee process from donor-conceived people and their families that access to information about a donor is often fundamental in informing their identity and that the inability to do that contributes to ongoing mental health and familial consequences.

We also heard, as a committee, of the life-changing positive impacts that it has for donor-conceived families when they are able to put those pieces together. One of the submitters advised us that—

Hearing the three-page letter from my donor was one of the most beautiful experiences of my life. As he described his life, it was as if he was describing my life and interests and it provided clarity for where so many of my talents came from. The letter also explained that I had a donor-conceived (DC) brother and sister, both born in the same year as me, and they helped write the letter also. I instantly had 3 new family members! What an amazing day.

It is for these reasons that our former committee recommended the establishment of a retrospective register so that all donor-conceived people can be provided with the right to access identifying information about a donor, regardless of when they were born. Whilst it is raised with us, and we have acknowledged, that the establishment of a retrospective register impacts on the right to privacy of donors, the right of donor-conceived people to know their genetic origins outweighs that competing right to privacy.

As the minister remarked in her introductory speech, making the register operate retrospectively creates information access equality for all donor-conceived people, regardless of when a donor-conceived person was born, and ensures all donor-conceived people are treated equally before the law.

This bill demonstrates the Queensland government's commitment to improving health care for families and for women and that that forms part of our landmark Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy. I commend the bill to the House.

Dr MacMAHON (South Brisbane—Grn) (12.26 pm): I rise in support of the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill an intervention in the for-profit fertility industry that is well overdue. The fertility industry's profits have soared in recent years, fuelled by the hopes and dreams of everyday families who hope to have a child. In allowing such a vital service as assisted reproductive technology to be run by what are essentially private equity firms, the government has exposed Queenslanders to unethical corner-cutting conduct in the name of streamlining administration and reducing expenses. This bill takes some important steps towards regulating this industry, and I want to commend the steps this bill takes towards protecting the right of donor-conceived children and all families involved with assisted reproductive processes.

Like in other developed countries, the fertility industry is big business in Australia. Many fertility clinics are listed on the Australian Stock Exchange with internal sales targets, insidious marketing strategies and big advertising campaigns. In the early days of technologies like in vitro fertilisation, these procedures were administered through teams at hospitals. Once these procedures became more mainstream in the 1980s, pioneering doctors' clinics, like that of Dr John Hennessey at Wickham Terrace, were where hopeful families lined up in the hope of conceiving a child.

Now the fertility clinics are run by big, private equity firms. Look at the big names of the for-profit fertility clinics who submitted to this inquiry and, in many cases, provide ample criticism of this new level of rigour this bill will bring to their operations. This includes Monash IVF and Virtus Health who made a submission prepared by multinational law firm, Minter Ellison. If you look at the board of directors of these firms, you do not see teams of people with health care or research experience; you see people with years of experience in finance, marketing, strategy and other private equity experience. These firms are big business, and the overwhelming experience you hear reported by people is that they simply feel like a number in a system.

Of course, one of the factors driving the growth of this industry is that many people are choosing to start families much later in life than before. But while we have perfectly healthy 20-something women being marketed services like freezing their eggs at enormous cost, we have an industry that is preying on people's hopes.

The ABC has been reporting on these issues for many years. It has shown how the for-profit model of most IVF clinics have led to the use of unproven and unregulated treatments as well as the lack of transparency about success rates, and it states that the countless everyday people who have shared their experiences with the ABC have pleaded for greater regulation and oversight of the fertility industry, wishing their care was handled more sensitively.

As the Australian Medical Association set out in its submission, some Queensland doctors have expressed concern that some assisted reproductive technology services may not always adhere to historical understandings of ethical practice and could be viewed as exploiting the vulnerabilities of certain patients within this cohort. As the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union pointed out, commercial incentives mean that assisted reproductive technology providers have a reason to continue to provide a service that may have limited likelihood of success. They said—

> It is not unheard of for women to undergo up to 20 rounds of IVF treatment on the advice of their ART provider, without receiving a second opinion, additional psychological counselling, or undergoing additional assessments to identify physical or genetic issues that may have an impact on fertility. The psychological impact of repeated, unsuccessful rounds of treatment on women and their families must be considered well above the commercial interests of providers.

The QNMU suggested that fertility providers should be required to publish data on their outcomes and be transparent about the effectiveness of their services.

Donor Conceived Australia points out in its submission—

> Historically, the people most affected by the ART process have not been consulted about it: donor conceived people.

I want to acknowledge the donor-conceived people who live in my electorate and affirm, as Donor Conceived Australia does, that the rights of those people created through donor conception are paramount in all policy, legislation and decision-making related to donor conception practices. They regard this bill as a positive step towards regulating the fertility industry and protecting donor-conceived people's rights, including access to information and knowledge of their genetic and medical history.

> Until this bill is enacted, the Queensland fertility industry is effectively self-regulated. Queensland is among the least progressive jurisdictions in Australia on donor conception, so it is vital that we legislate this bill in order for Queensland to start to regulate this industry and to create a donor conception register. Donor Conceived Australia set out a position on donor conception and assisted reproductive technology. Many of these principles have been reflected in the legislation before us today but some have not. They include—
>
> 1. The rights of the child created via donor conception are paramount in all policy, legislation, and decision-making related to donor conception practices:

DCA points out that this is not reflected in the legislation. In the objectives section, the rights of donor-conceived children are placed somewhat secondary to the rights of those using assisted reproductive technology. This section should be updated to assert the rights of donor-conceived people. Donor Conceived Australia goes on to set out the other key principles that should apply to this legislation, including—

> 2. All children have the right to grow up knowing and having the opportunity of forming a relationship with their biological parents, siblings, and extended family members;
>
> 3. Donor-conceived individuals should have the option of contacting their biological donor parent when and if they choose to do so, and be supported to do so;

I have been advised of situations where large fertility clinics have blocked access to biological donors on request, even when this donor has indicated that they were willing to be contacted. This is an example of where commercial motives, like the need to streamline processes and save time, interfere in a dishonest and unjust way with the rights of donor-conceived people to contact their biological parents. They also include—

4. Each state and territory have a centralised register and that there is a mechanism by which data from these registers can be linked, in the absence of a national register;

Establishing a register brings Queensland into line with other jurisdictions where a donor conception register already exists. In addition to the benefits of a register, harmonising the laws between the states and territories is something that various submitters to this inquiry have emphasised. The University of Queensland research by Newton, Macmillan and Gelber set out the need for a bill like this when the government accepted the recommendations of the 2022 inquiry into the rights of donor-conceived people. We know—it is backed by research—that fertility clinics are often unwilling or unable to provide accurate information. This might include denying donor-conceived people access to donor conception records, even where donors have consented, and giving incorrect information about siblings. Commercial incentives without regulation result in situations like this.

We also know from research that donor-conceived people who find out about their conception during early childhood have more positive attitudes towards their conception and better wellbeing in comparison to donor-conceived people who discover their origins later in life. There are broad social benefits to donor-conceived people knowing their origins. Understanding one's genetic heritage and cultural background is important to all of us. Knowing who we are related to is also important to avoid situations like incest. Dealing with health issues often requires knowledge of one's genetic heritage, and many donors want to know their donor-conceived adult children. This bill places the rights of donor-conceived people above the commercial pressures on an already hugely profitable industry. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms LUI (Cook—ALP) (12.35 pm): I rise to speak on the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. I would like to acknowledge the work of the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women, Hon. Shannon Fentiman, who in late 2023 directed the Office of the Health Ombudsman to conduct an investigation of certain issues relating to assisted reproductive technology provision in Queensland. The directive by the minister to the Office of the Health Ombudsman to run an investigation into certain issues relating to ART is one of the key components in bringing this bill to parliament. The Health Ombudsman's final report stated that its findings indicate a compelling case for the need for proposed legislation to regulate ART providers in Queensland and strengthen the safeguards for consumers, donors and donor-conceived children.

The bill responds to two previous inquiries: the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's inquiry into matters relating to donor conception, and the Office of the Health Ombudsman's recent investigation of ART providers in Queensland, set out in an interim and final report. I want to acknowledge the work of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee. I acknowledge the chair, Peter Russo, and the other members of the committee for their work in the examination of the bill. The committee examined 34 written submissions from stakeholders, received written and oral briefings provided by Queensland Health and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, and held a public hearing in Brisbane. To help inform the findings of the report, the committee heard from a wide range of stakeholders including academics, legal and medical professionals, assisted reproductive technology providers, religious bodies, unions, donor-conceived people and donors. The evidence received by the committee indicates that stakeholders are broadly supportive of the bill's objectives and how it seeks to achieve them. Some expressed concern about specific provisions, most commonly related to the proposed donor family limit, the donor conception register and the birth certificates of donor-conceived people.

While fertility and the ability to conceive naturally represent a joyous time for some, we know that this is not the case for everyone. I have witnessed in my own family group where the challenges of fertility become incredibly stressful and often very difficult to deal with. Access to ART in this day and age changes this. Knowing that there are alternative ways to conceive—if not naturally—gives people hope. The explanatory notes state—

ART refers to treatments or procedures that address fertility.

Having access to ART unlocks a wonderful opportunity for people who wish to start a family. The opportunity includes a range of procedures, the most well known of which is IVF. ART services are used by a range of people who would otherwise be unable to conceive, including LGBTIQ+ families, single women and couples experiencing infertility.

While this report acknowledges the historical and ongoing issues faced by donor-conceived people in gaining access to information regarding their donor-conceived status, genetic origins and health information, the committee had to consider the complex issue of whether a donor-conceived person's right to know their genetic origin outweighs a donor's right to privacy, noting the longstanding practice within the industry to assure anonymity to donors.

As for the complex nature of the bill, it is absolutely necessary to strengthen our laws to protect individuals' rights in Queensland. Currently in Queensland there is a relatively small number of clinics that provide ART services all of which are private providers. At present there are eight providers operating in Queensland. Together, they run a total of 24 accredited ART units across the state. There is no state-based legislation that regulates the provision of ART services in Queensland. However, the majority of other Australian jurisdictions, including the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia, have ART legislation in place.

Currently, in Queensland ART providers are required by federal law to maintain professional accreditation whereby they must comply with the National Health and Medical Research Council's ethical guidelines on the use of assisted reproductive technology in clinical practice and research and the Reproductive Technology Accreditation Committee of the Fertility Society of Australia and New Zealand's code of practice for assisted reproductive technology. However, it should be noted that failure to comply with the NHMRC guidelines and RTAC code of practice is not an offence under federal law where very limited enforcement mechanisms are available. This means that in the absence of state-based legislation Queensland is unable to enforce compliance with either the NHMRC guidelines or the RTAC code of practice. In effect, the industry is self-regulated. This has recently become a source of concern due to several high-profile cases in which it was alleged that ART providers had failed to comply with these requirements, leading to adverse impacts on people using ART services and donor-conceived people.

The bill has two main policy objectives and they are to establish a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology services in Queensland and to establish a donor conception information register in the state. The bill proposes establishing a new regulatory framework for the provision of ART services in Queensland. The framework includes requirements that clinics must meet when providing ART services, restrictions on the retrieval and use of gametes and embryos, and provisions that facilitate the disclosure of health information between donor related individuals.

The bill proposes a new licensing scheme for ART providers operating in Queensland, a preliminary recommendation made by the Health Ombudsman. The new measures mean that ART providers must apply for and be granted a licence to provide ART services in Queensland. Providing ART services without a licence will be an offence subject to a maximum penalty of 200 penalty units, or two years imprisonment. Under these new laws, licences will be required for clinics rather than the individual practitioners and personnel who work within them. However, clinics will be required to ensure that ART services are only provided by, or under the supervision of, a medical practitioner and Queensland Health will be responsible for the administration of the licensing scheme.

The bill proposes several compliance mechanisms as part of the licensing scheme which will give the public certainty and security when it comes to protecting people's rights and interests. As heard by the committee, Lyndal Bubke, a donor-conceived person, stated she was relieved that the legislative developments were progressing to regulate an industry where providers have, in her view, placed convenience and profit over health and safety. The bill would permit ART to disclose health information to certain people if a medical practitioner certifies that this is necessary: to prevent or reduce a serious risk to someone's life or health, or to warn a person about the existence of a health condition that may be harmful to them or their descendants. ART providers would be permitted to disclose health information about a donor or a relative of a donor to a range of people. This would include donor-conceived people and their descendants or parents, a person who became pregnant using a donated gamete and a person who has a gamete donated by the donor.

This bill is absolutely necessary, like I said before, and I fully support and commend the bill to the House.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (12.44 pm): I rise to address the debate on the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. Introduced into the Queensland parliament by the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and the Minister for Women on 22 May 2024, this legislation primarily seeks to establish, firstly, a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology services and, secondly, a donor conception information register. As part of this legislation, amendments will also be made to both the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 and the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2023.

Assisted reproductive technology can refer to various medical interventions that are designed to assist individuals and couples in achieving pregnancy, especially when difficulties are encountered attempting to conceive naturally. As we know, assisted reproductive technology encompasses a wide range of techniques and treatments to address fertility with the most common and perhaps well-known

of these treatments being in vitro fertilisation, or IVF. Other treatments also exist including intracytoplasmic sperm injection and embryo cryopreservation. Such techniques and treatments often involve the manipulation of eggs, sperms and embryos to facilitate fertilisation and implantation.

For many Queensland women and couples facing infertility, assisted reproductive technology offers a chance to conceive where natural methods fail. Such technologies are an incredible advancement and indeed can be essential given infertility affects approximately one in six Australian couples of reproductive age. This can be caused by various factors such as age, medical conditions or genetic disorders. Importantly, assisted reproductive technology also empowers individuals and couples, particularly women, by giving them reproductive autonomy and a higher likelihood of becoming parents, even when faced with biological barriers.

The appropriate oversight and regulation of assisted reproductive technology is equally important. Research has shown that approximately one in every 18 Australian births is now conceived via IVF. Given the complex ethical, medical and legal implications surrounding assisted reproductive technology, the provision of appropriate regulation can provide greater safeguards and assurances that these technologies will be applied safely, ethically and legally. Similarly, appropriate regulation and oversight can assist in maintaining high standards of medical and ethical care whilst preventing potential exploitation, malpractice or unsafe practices.

Turning specifically to this legislation, and as outlined by the minister during her introductory speech, it is important to note that this legislation has come as a direct result of two past inquiries—the 2022 Queensland parliament's Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's inquiry into matters relating to donor conception; and this year's investigation conducted by the Queensland Health Ombudsman into assisted reproductive technology providers in Queensland after receiving a direction from the Minister for Health. In relation to the investigation by the Queensland Health Ombudsman, Queenslanders will recall that this action was taken following a number of high-profile cases reported through the media including allegations of incorrect sperm being used in IVF treatments, a donor being responsible for potentially the birth of 1,000 children and other shocking revelations. As it was also reported and acknowledged, whilst Queensland had more clinics than any other jurisdiction, our state lagged behind the rest of the country with no formal legislation or regulation governing assisted reproductive technology services, which have operated under a self-regulating model.

I note that at the time this specific legislation was introduced by the Minister for Health, the Queensland Health Ombudsman had only delivered interim findings of its investigation. The final report of the Queensland Health Ombudsman, released on 1 July 2024, identified a number of systemic issues relating to the provision of assisted reproductive technology services and identified various risks of the self-regulatory regime under this sector. I want to take this opportunity to thank and acknowledge the Office of the Health Ombudsman for its body of work including the 38 recommendations spanning over 11 key themes including its finding that there was a compelling case for the proposed legislation to strengthen the safeguards for consumers, donors and Queenslanders who are donor conceived.

Briefly, I note that of the proposed initiatives within this legislation pertaining to the regulatory framework, such measures include the introduction of a licensing scheme, requirements for licensed providers to provide prescribed information and consultation services, detailed requirements for obtaining consent, various requirements for information collection and record-keeping practices, restrictions on how gametes and embryos can be used, as well as specific health information disclosure requirements.

With respect to the proposed establishment of the donor conception information register, I note that providers will be required to provide historical information to the registrar within six months of the commencement of the relevant provisions, which will be retrospective. I note that this legislation will also provide for a mechanism to note a person's status as donor conceived via their birth certificate and, accordingly, the Registrar-General of the Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages will establish and maintain the new register. Regarding all of these provisions as they relate to the new licensing scheme, the donor conception information register and birth certificates for donor-conceived persons, no clear timeframe has been provided as to when these provisions are likely to commence other than on a date to be fixed by proclamation.

As articulated by the Liberal National Party's shadow minister for health, the Liberal National Party will not be opposing this important legislation. The time has passed for the assisted reproductive technology sector to go from being self-regulated to being appropriately oversighted and legislatively regulated as per other states and jurisdictions within Australia. That being said, whilst the industry has provided its broad support and cooperation to move away from self-regulation, it must be noted that

concerns have been raised related to potentially unintended consequences which may arise from this legislation. This includes the retrospective nature of some of these measures, including those pertaining to donor disclosure as well as addendums to birth certificates. It is therefore highly important that the Queensland government maintain a comprehensive examination of the implementation of this legislation.

In concluding my contribution, I wish to thank all stakeholders and submitters who contributed to the consideration of this legislation by the Queensland parliament's Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee, particularly those Queenslanders who shared their own personal stories and experiences with assisted reproductive technology. I also want to acknowledge my medical colleagues who work in this sector at both the Wesley Hospital and St Andrew's War Memorial Hospital, particularly the obstetricians and gynaecologists who provide these invaluable services. I also thank all members of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee, including the deputy chair, the LNP member for Scenic Rim, and the LNP member for Theodore, for their thorough examination of this legislation. I know that all members of that committee, on both sides of the House, did an incredible amount of work in looking into the issues pertaining to this sector. I hope that this legislation provides significant benefit to Queenslanders.

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (12.51 pm): I rise to support the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024—not only a bill that is important for people in Queensland who are affected by this but also a very interesting area of technology, science and medicine and the ethics that we have as a society. The bill provides a state-based framework to regulate assisted reproductive technology services and establishes a donor conception information register in Queensland. The absence of a binding national framework is where this legislation slots in and will see greater regulation and greater enforcement in what is a very profound area for many people in this state and for the future. How one comes into being is an intrinsic part of one's self. For many people that is fairly straightforward but for other people it may not be so, and this bill addresses a range of those issues. I thank the minister for bringing it forward and I thank those who have scrutinised it so well at a parliamentary committee level. It is a very important area to get right and this will contribute to our state having much better regulation in this really important area for those whom it affects.

In terms of the failure of self-regulation, we are aware of a number of quite startling cases, one might say, where siblings were unrelated to family members and far more donor-conceived people than contemplated under the NHMRC guidelines. That has a tremendous impact on those whom it affects, often lifelong, and we want to ensure that in future that does not occur. I thank the government for responding to those unprecedented failures and strongly agree with the provisions in the bill, particularly in terms of a donor-conceived person's right to know their genetic origin outweighing the donor's right to privacy. Knowing where you come from is something really quite important fundamentally to any person. That absolutely is the first priority and I support that.

With regard to the establishment of a donor conception information register, it is important for people's rights to be respected. I am pleased to see that the government previously agreed to all six recommendations of the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee and thank the member for Toohey and members of that committee for their work to allow people from the age of 18 who are affected to know, if they wish to know, the facts and the truth of their origins—something very important. Providers also need to take reasonable steps to locate a gamete provider if more than five years have passed, so the quality of the work and management in providers is something that is very strongly focused on in this bill. The lack of professionalism in certain cases in the past has to be prevented from reoccurring, and that is what the bill seeks to do. The bill also prohibits an assisted reproductive technology provider from performing a procedure that results in more than 10 donor related Australian families. That is clearly a response to one particular case. The prevention of sex selection is something that most reasonable people would understand and is something that we have to ensure occurs in the future.

The use of genetic material from those who have died is a very difficult and interesting area, particularly given that it often deals with terrible circumstances. The provisions of the bill—that the person must have consented or not expressly objected or is likely to have supported the use—are reasonable provisions and give some support and comfort to those who might find themselves in a situation where they were planning a family but then a tragic event intervened. This bill supports them in terms of their wishes and the wishes of someone who may have been impacted by something terrible. It also allows for the partners of people who may be medically alive but only alive with support to access their material for what was a clear intention for them in the future. The bill also allows some exceptional circumstances for the surviving spouse or a family member acting on behalf of the surviving spouse to access that material where the surviving spouse may be incapacitated or not able to deal with things.

It is good that the bill is quite finely grained in terms of supporting people in those circumstances. The bill also deals with stored gametes retrieved from a deceased or unresponsive person. In that circumstance, the proposed use must be reviewed by an independent review body. That requires its support and that is appropriate given what we are dealing with.

Finally, as I referred to earlier, there are strong provisions in the bill for providers in terms of professionalism on information collection. For those people accessing their history, they need to have accurate information that has been collected methodically and consistently so that their rights are respected and that logistically those rights are also respected. Professionalism in this area is essential for people's rights to be respected. I support the bill.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bailey, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Miles Labor Government, Performance

Mr CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): In the final sitting week of this parliamentary term Queenslanders got a view of what the parliamentary term has been all about: one side offering solutions to the big crises facing this state; the other, in a desperate, unmitigated personal attack, flailing for their political survival. We will see more of this desperation as this government, which has run out of ideas and run out of a mandate for Queensland's future, seeks to cling to power by trying to scare Queenslanders into giving them a fourth term and 14 years in office.

The battlelines for the next election have been drawn. The question Queenslanders will ask themselves is this: after 10 years of this government are things better or worse when it comes to youth crime, health, housing, cost of living and who has the right plan for Queensland's future? The LNP has the right plan for Queensland's future. It starts with making our communities safer. If Queenslanders vote for change, by the end of the year the making our communities safer laws will be law: we will implement adult crime, adult time; detention as a last resort will be removed; and the sentencing provisions will be amended to ensure that the rights of victims count ahead of the rights of offenders.

We have spoken a lot about early intervention. Every time we raise it the government talks about a figure. The figure we talk about is victim numbers. The victim numbers in this state will be the barometer by which we are held accountable if Queenslanders vote for change. There are more victims in Queensland than anywhere else in the country, which shows that what the government is doing is not working. We need stronger laws, we need gold standard early intervention and we need rehabilitation with purpose. We will never give up on young people. When young offenders are released from detention they need to have a structure to keep them on the straight and narrow. When over 90 per cent of offenders reoffend within 12 months it is obvious that everything the government is doing is broken—including keeping our most vulnerable safe.

Two decades ago, a bright young boy from the Sunshine Coast went missing. He was taken in the most horrific of circumstances. For two decades, Bruce and Denise Morcombe have fought for change. They have fought to defend the memory of their son and to make sure that others do not go through what they have gone through. They have called for a public child sex offender register. Year after year the LNP has called for a public child sex offender register and the government has found every reason to put the rights of paedophiles ahead of the rights of children. After a decade, this government is trying to rewrite history as though they have never heard about this idea. The Morcombes have been front and centre. Victims have been front and centre. The LNP has been front and centre. If Queenslanders vote for change, the rights of child sex offenders will be put below the rights of vulnerable children.

It starts with the first tier: if known predators do not comply with their terms of release they forego their rights. People deserve to know if a child sex offender has not kept their reporting obligations with police. They should be named and their image should be out there. The second tier is an application-based system. You should know the people who are in your local area so that, as a parent, you can keep your child safe. The third tier is a community protection disclosure scheme. If there is someone who is coming into the life of your child, whether it be a parent of a friend of one of your children, whether it be a new person coming into your family environment, you deserve the right to know about that person's past. You deserve the right to be able to keep your child safe. Of course there must be safeguards. It is the police who have to do the enforcement. The parents need to know how to keep

their kids away from harm's way. We have to tip the balance of power back in favour of the vulnerable, in favour of the parent, away from the paedophile. If Queenslanders vote for change this will be law in Queensland. Queenslanders will forever know it as Daniel's law in memory of that bright young boy from the Sunshine Coast.

The LNP is also committed to easier access to health services. It is important that every Queenslander has a world-class health service no matter where they live. There is no doubt that with ambulance ramping remaining stubbornly high for the last six months at almost 45 per cent—the worst six months ever recorded in our nation's history—things must change. The number of people waiting for surgery or waiting to see a specialist continues to rise and it must change. If Queenslanders vote for change we do have the right plan for Queensland's future. Within 100 days Queenslanders will see what is happening in their hospitals.

We want to save Queenslanders from paying for Labor's failures. The days of ministers not being held accountable for projects blowing out in time and in budget must be a thing of the past. One cannot accept that a project can go from six lanes to four, can blow out by years and be twice the price. Only this government can accept that as business as usual. It is important that we have a system in place where workers are well paid, where they are safe, where contracts are adhered to and productivity returns to this state.

We are determined to secure our housing foundations to give the vulnerable a roof over their head, to give working Queenslanders the ability to pay their rent and to give young Queenslanders the hope of owning their home, which is why we will implement Queensland's first ever shared equity scheme. Those who do not have access to the bank of mum and dad should have the ability to get a toehold into the market. Every single cent of the Housing Investment Fund will be spent on new social housing. We have the right plan for Queensland's future when it comes to re-energising the community housing sector to make sure that the community housing sector can continue to grow as the needs of Queenslanders continue to grow. We have a focus on supply because in the end the feeding frenzy that the government has overseen is a direct result of not getting enough product to market. With 29 per cent less lots, more than one in three fewer homes are being built. That has created a situation where Queenslanders do not know, when their rental agreement comes up, whether or not they will be able to afford the next increase, they do not know whether or not they are going to have a roof over their head and they have lost hope of home ownership.

If government changes, Queensland will have the first minister for home ownership, a single point of accountability, to make sure that we go from last to first within a decade. We are going to work harder for Queenslanders. We will conduct ourselves in a way that Queenslanders can be proud of, where Queenslanders can know that the government's focus is on their survival, on their cost-of-living challenges, not on the government's political survival.

Today in the House what we saw was not only a reflection of the last four years but, indeed, an entree into what the election campaign will be like. This is a government that has run out of puff. This is a government that is desperate. This is a government that is clinging for its survival.

This government will do and say anything to stay in power. Its KPI is not whether or not there can be fewer victims. It is not whether or not the Labor Party can see an end to the housing crisis. It is not whether or not we can have structural reform to put downward pressure on things such as insurance and electricity costs so that Queenslanders do not continue to pay record-high prices. That is no longer the focus of this government. This government's focus is on political survival. However, Queenslanders know that there is a better way. Queenslanders are yearning for a fresh start. Queenslanders are determined to see an end to a decade of chaos and crisis. Queenslanders know that there must be a fresh start in this state. Above all, Queenslanders know that nothing will change unless we change this government.

Liberal National Party, Performance

Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Infrastructure, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (2.10 pm): I am proud to be a member of a government that is doing what matters for Queensland. We hear a lot from those opposite about the kinds of things they will bring in, but that must be with a magic wand because we hear no details, just glib lines and four-word slogans. They are going to solve the world's problems: 'Give us 100 days and we will solve everything. We will solve health. We will solve housing. We will solve everything.' However, actions speak louder than words. They talk about crisis and chaos. In the Campbell Newman years, most members that I see opposite sat around the cabinet table and they were turfed out after three years.

Actions speak louder than words and Queenslanders will not forget it. What we have in Queensland at the moment is the lowest unemployment rate—

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Resume your seat, Minister. Member for Mermaid Beach, even when interjecting you will use correct titles. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms GRACE: Isn't it interesting how we on this side of the House respectfully listened to the Leader of the Opposition, but as soon as we try to give it back they do not like it because they do not like the truth.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair.

Ms GRACE: All the blokes opposite with their big voices try to drown me out. Well, try harder because it ain't going to work. At the moment, this state has one of the lowest unemployment rates and we are the economic powerhouse of Australia. Across the board, the Miles Labor government is delivering policies guided by values of fairness and equality—values I have stood for all my life. They are policies that matter and that have real impact.

Those opposite talk about the past 10 years but they forget about what happened during COVID and how this government kept the state safe under the immense pressure that, I might say, came from the federal LNP government. We kept Queensland safe. The world has changed post COVID. We have seen things happen post COVID that I have not seen in my lifetime, but that is totally ignored by those opposite. I say to them: when you ignore reality you cannot bring about real change, no matter how many glib slogans you may have. Since COVID we have had 13 interest rate rises in a row. That started before the federal LNP government was turfed out but somehow it is the Albanese government's fault. No-one out there believes you, because it started straight after the LNP government was turfed out. That has had a significant impact on the economy but Queensland remains a powerhouse.

People will vote with their feet. When those opposite were last in government, Queensland had negative population growth. People were moving to the southern states to get out of their clutches. Since Labor has been in government we have had unprecedented growth in this state. The numbers speak for themselves. You can scoff and you can laugh but at the end of the day the numbers speak for themselves.

We are taking real action on climate change with publicly owned renewables and expanded environmental protections. We have made a record investment in schools. There is our $107 billion Big Build program. We have made a massive investment in expanding health facilities. I can advise members opposite that you do not fix health with real-time data. We have introduced 50-cent public transport fares. We are finishing Cross River Rail, which they neglected to do. We are protecting a woman's right to choose and supporting marriage equality. We introduced voluntary assisted dying, which was opposed by those opposite. We are tackling homelessness with a minister who is directly focused on delivering 53,500 social houses through a $3.5 billion investment and fairer renting laws. Last but not least, we have introduced free kindy and free TAFE. Members opposite should not come in here and make out as if nothing has happened. We are doing what matters for Queensland.

What we need to know is what those opposite are really saying. When I am doorknocking, people tell me that they have no idea what those opposite stand for. Where are they on a woman's right to choose, nuclear energy, 75 per cent emission reductions, First Nations people, progressive coal royalties, renewable energy, common-law rights, tree-clearing rights or voluntary assisted dying? We do not hear a word from those opposite. You are not up to it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I did not want to interrupt the speaker but, member for Bonney, you are warned under the standing orders.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not need your assistance.

Miles Labor Government, Performance

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): Good luck to our candidate Christien Duffey. He has a senior minister out doorknocking in her electorate so well done, Christien. On 26 October Queenslanders have a choice between the Labor Party, which has overseen the health crisis, the crime crisis, the cost-of-living crisis and the housing crisis, and a united LNP team

that has the right plan for Queensland's future. Ours is a plan to put doctors and nurses back in charge of health; a plan that introduces into our youth justice system consequences for actions—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order, member for McConnel.

Mr BLEIJIE:—like Adult Crime, Adult Time and victims before offenders; a plan that gets our power stations back up and running—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Please resume your seat. Member for McConnel, that engagement that you just had with the chair was highly disrespectful. I ask you to withdraw.

Ms GRACE: Deputy Speaker, I was actually addressing—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not want an explanation.

Ms GRACE: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask you to cease your interjections going forward.

Mr BLEIJIE: We have a plan to get our power stations back up and running to reduce electricity prices and we have a plan to release more land so that more Queenslanders can live the Australian dream of owning their own home. We will abolish a tax. We will abolish stamp duty for first home buyers who are buying or building their first home in Queensland.

Over the past 10 years we have seen this Labor government run from crisis to crisis. We have seen this Labor Party so focused on themselves and what is in it for them that they have forgotten about Queensland. At the weekend we saw the infighting within Labor. I must say that Minister Fentiman's takedown of the Premier and the Attorney-General was the most extraordinary act of betrayal I have ever seen in this place. A *Courier-Mail* article quoted Minister Fentiman as saying 'I was disappointed that she anointed Steven'.

Minister Fentiman is one of the most senior ministers of the Labor government and she is disappointed in the leadership and the direction of her own Premier. If that is what the front bench thinks of Premier Miles, what on earth does the backbench think? Such was her disappointment in the chosen leader that she put up her own hand, supported by the members for Caloundra and Keppel, who 'love hearted' her announcement on Facebook. The *Courier-Mail* article states—

That said, Ms Fentiman won't rule out another tilt at the Labor leadership.

"We'll see what happens, I wouldn't say no" ...

We have not even had the election yet and she is already after the job. Will she have a tilt at the Labor leadership between now and the election in 46 days time? Probably. I think it is on.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. I think it will be on in the next 46 days. The article further states—

While Ms Fentiman ... insists she did have a choice in accepting the health ministry—"who else would you have put in?" she asks ...

Not only is she disappointed in the Premier, her own leader, and wants to run for the leadership of the Labor Party before the election; she has said that not a single Labor member sitting on that side of the chamber is good enough or is up to the job of being a health minister. Only she is, she said. She said that only she can communicate. Apparently the former minister could not communicate. That is the problem with the Labor Party and Minister Fentiman. She has made it all about herself and she has forgotten about Queenslanders. If I were sitting in the Labor Party at the moment, I would be saying to myself, 'Who needs enemies or the LNP when you've got Minister Fentiman sitting in your team?' They do not need the LNP when they have the enemy right at the heart of the cabinet table.

Between now and the election, we will see the Labor Party go from concerned to complete desperation. They will say things about their political opponents that are simply not true. They will attack the family of their political opponents. We know this because we have seen it. We have been here before. The desperate attacks that we will see from the Labor Party are a play from the old political playbook. They are fighting with each other to see who can deliver the most attacks.

There are a couple of contenders in this race. We have had the Deputy Premier and the health minister battling it out in the last three weeks as to who can attack the opposition the most. I did laugh when I read in the paper on the weekend that the Deputy Premier had said—

When I am on the roof cleaning my gutters I can see my electorate.

The only gutter the Deputy Premier knows is the political gutter. He has not worked a hard day in his life. I have shaken hands with the Deputy Premier and his are not the hands of a gutter cleaner; his are the hands of an arrogant upstart who thinks he is better than anybody else. That is the reality. The battlelines for this election are drawn and the only way to change Labor's chaos and crisis is to change the government on 26 October. Show Labor the door in '24.

Opposition members: Hear, hear!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! Pause the clock. I will just take some advice before I call the next speaker. Member, you used some unparliamentary language towards the end of your contribution. I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr POWELL: Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Can I ask which language was unparliamentary?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can come and see me later. I am not going to repeat it.

Mr POWELL: If it is in reference to the words 'arrogant' and 'upstart', they are far from unparliamentary.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: My ruling is that that language is unparliamentary. I have discussed that with the Clerk. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Member for Broadwater

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (Minister for Housing, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Public Works) (2.21 pm): It is always great to follow the member for Kawana's theatrics. He is the planning minister for the opposition who could not even come up with enough questions during estimates so he left early. That is how much the LNP care about planning and housing in this state.

It has been 42 days since the news broke of the Leader of the Opposition's connections to the failed SET Solutions and 42 days that Queenslanders still do not have the answers to the questions that have been put forward. The Leader of the Opposition has refused to front this chamber, has refused to front media and has refused to front Queenslanders.

Ms Richards: That says it all.

Ms SCANLON: I take the member's interjection—it says it all. Deflection after deflection, it gets murkier every single day. The Leader of the Opposition said he had no links to LNP donors but then it was proven that, in fact, he did. He said he left the company with 'no obligations and no findings against him' but it has been reported that he was pursued in court and paid $200,000 in hush money to liquidators.

When I was last in this chamber during matters of public interest, I asked some very simple questions.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection of the member for Surfers Paradise. I would love it if the Leader of the Opposition would provide that information to the *Gold Coast Bulletin* or any media for that matter. That is the point: you continue to refuse to answer basic questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Direct your comments through the chair.

Ms SCANLON: When I was last in this chamber, I asked about the Leader of the Opposition's comments when he said he was promised a major capital injection. I asked, 'Who made that promise?' I asked, 'How much was that promise for?' I asked, 'What did he offer in return for that promise?' How did he secure the Newman government grant for companies to establish a call centre for jobs and training in Townsville?

Opposition members interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I note many of the interjections from those opposite. I know they do not like these questions. They do not want to answer them but they are very simple questions that the Leader of the Opposition should answer. Did he disclose that the director of two companies was also a donor to his

2012 campaign? How did he become the sole director of SET Solutions, the training company included in the call centre venture less than 12 months later? Why did he say that creditors were paid when hundreds were not? Why do liquidators suspect he was trading while insolvent? Did he know that that was the case? None of those questions has been answered. If the Leader of the Opposition cannot be up-front about his dodgy and shady business record, what else is he hiding from Queensland?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I ask you to withdraw the unparliamentary language.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw, Deputy Speaker. There is a pattern of secrecy emerging from the Leader of the Opposition. On the weekend, the *Gold Coast Bulletin* revealed the Leader of the Opposition does not, in fact, live in the electorate that he supposedly represents.

Mrs Frecklington: And where does the minister live? Yeronga, any chance? Where does the minister live? Where does the minister spend her time?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nanango.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Nanango. I live in Nerang, in the community that I grew up in. I continue to live there to this day.

Mrs Frecklington: Come on, Minister!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Please resume your seat, Minister. Member for Nanango, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms SCANLON: The member for Broadwater continues to do everything in his power to suppress and hide the fact that he does not live on the Gold Coast. He cut and run.

Ms Richards interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection of the member for Redlands. He cut and run on Townsville and now, evidently, he is cutting and running on the Gold Coast. I wonder what Verity Barton thinks about these actions. She, of course, was the youngest woman ever elected to this parliament. The Leader of the Opposition claims to be some sort of self-proclaimed feminist, some ally of women. Instead, time and time again we have seen him do the complete opposite when given the opportunity. He destroyed the career of the youngest woman in parliament. That is the decision he made by taking that seat off the youngest woman in parliament.

I am a proud born-and-bred Gold Coaster and I am very pleased to continue to live in the community that I grew up in and very proud to represent it. What Gold Coasters do not deserve is to be treated like mugs, and that is what the Leader of the Opposition is doing by misleading his community. If the Leader of the Opposition cannot tell the truth about his business dealings, if he cannot tell the truth about where he lives, what else is he hiding from Queenslanders?

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection of the member for Surfers Paradise again. These are very simple questions that Gold Coasters should have answers to. All we are asking is that the Leader of the Opposition fronts the media and answers basic questions because the people of Queensland deserve all of those.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! Before I call the next speaker, I want to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the Majha Youth Club from Stretton.

Miles Labor Government, Performance

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (2.27 pm): I have been sitting here listening to two government members and not once have they spoken about government policy. Not once have they spoken about doing something to protect and preserve the life of Queenslanders, to look after victims, to lower the cost of living or to make health care and housing more affordable. We have just had the housing minister, who, by all accounts, enjoys reclining and enjoying life in Yeronga as much as she does in Gaven, tell us a story in relation to where the Leader of the Opposition lives. She is more interested in where the Leader of the Opposition lives than she is in providing housing for those people who are living in tents under the bridge just down the road. That is the focus of the member for Gaven.

She says that the Leader of the Opposition is refusing to answer questions of the media. I just spent 40 minutes with the Leader of the Opposition downstairs talking about Labor's failures with the DNA testing laboratory—ten minutes of which he answered every question the media put to him about it.

We have seen this story before. We saw this in 2011-12. We saw this story writ large in the dying days of the decrepit and discredited Bligh Labor government, and it is straight out of the same playbook. In fact, it is written by the same playwright. We know that they are shipping them up from Canberra and New South Wales to defend themselves by digging dirt but that will not save them. That will not save them because Queenslanders are sick and tired of a Labor government that has lost the plot when it comes to acting for and respecting Queenslanders. This is no more evident than the debacle that is the DNA testing laboratory, which has a backlog of 40,000 serious offences and only two per cent of them have been tested in the last two years.

Over 1,000 rape test kits are languishing and 40 per cent of them have been sitting there for more than 12 months. Victims, mainly women—and mainly young women, member for Gaven—are not getting justice because those rape test kits are not being tested and results are not being provided in the timeframes necessary.

All we have from this government is a discredited plan that is not delivering what victims want and what experts say should occur. We have a government that is ignoring the one person who actually called it out—and called it out not once, not twice, but three times. This is a government that did not even pick up the phone to say, 'Thank you for your application, but we have selected someone else.' They sent a form letter back to Dr Kirsty Wright saying, 'Thanks, but no thanks.'

This is a government that is against Dr Wright—a Queensland expert who has worked in the armed forces, who worked internationally identifying bodies and who brought Daniel Morcombe's killer to justice. They ignore her. That is why today the LNP was pleased to announce that, if we are successful in October, we will appoint Dr Kirsty Wright as a special agent of government to go into FSQ and find out what is going wrong. At the moment we are getting nothing. At estimates we found out that the government and the lab do not know how long it will take to test the backlog. They can give us no timeframes.

They have not yet implemented some of the critical recommendations of the Sofronoff report which exposed one of the worst failures in Queensland's criminal justice administration history and found that people had lied on certificates they had given to the courts in the criminal trials of the most serious criminals. Potentially, murderers, rapists and other people committing sexual assaults are now walking free because this government does not care.

They have no plan that they are prepared to share with the people of Queensland to give them confidence in the testing at FSQ. They have no confidence in the ability of the courts, because of that failure, to deliver justice in Queensland. The only way we will fix the DNA lab, get Forensic Science Queensland operating as it should and delivering world-class services and get rid of the chaos and crisis of the Labor government is to change the way you vote in October 2024. Vote for the LNP and show Labor the door in 2024.

Member for Broadwater

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (2.32 pm): I am the member for Bulimba and I love being the member for Bulimba. Bulimba is such a great community. Who would not want to live there? Everyone loves living there. It is a running joke in my office that there must be hundreds of thousands of people living in my electorate, because no matter where I go across the state someone comes up to me and says, 'I live in your electorate.' I was in Mount Isa earlier in the year and I ran into some girls from Lourdes Hill in Hawthorne. I was visiting Father Mick and there were a bunch of Lourdes Hill girls there. They raced up to me and said, 'We live in your electorate.'

In fact, there is only one person I know of who lives in my electorate who has never wanted to tell me that they live in my electorate. Funnily enough, that is the Leader of the Opposition. I found that out on the weekend. I think he is the member for Broadwater. Is that on the Gold Coast? I think it is on the Gold Coast. I was very surprised to hear that he actually lives in my electorate. I cannot blame him, because it is a great place. It is a big dodgy to not live in your own electorate. If he really cared about his electorate he would probably live there. We know that he is a guy who is not big on loyalty. He ditched Mundingburra. He did over Verity for Broadwater. He has obviously ditched Broadwater for Bulimba. He has a track record of doing that, but why would he not just say it? It is not a trick question: do you or don't you live in Bulimba? Not only did he not want to say, he was a bit snickety about it. We hear from the LNP that the Labor Party is next-level desperate because we raised this, but it was the *Gold Coast Bulletin* that raised it in the first place; we did not raise it. They made a statement and said Labor was a bit desperate. Why would he not say? It is yes-or-no answer. It is not a tricky question.

That might be a little question, but he cannot lie straight in bed even when he is talking about where he lives. That is a bit weird. The problem is that he cannot lie straight in bed when it comes to anything he tells Queenslanders. We have seen that with SET Solutions. He cannot tell us about his training company. He cannot tell us whether he traded insolvent. He cannot tell us what happened when it comes to the $200,000 hush money. He cannot tell us whether he paid his own consultancy ahead of creditors. He cannot tell us why he did not declare his liability on his register of interests. He simply cannot be transparent about anything. He cannot give us a straight answer about anything.

We talked this morning about the train wreck of an interview—the David Speers interview. Every single question he answered he answered with a slogan. This is a man who speaks in slogans. His whole plan for Queensland is a bunch of slogans. Whether it is on youth justice, health or education, you cannot get anything out of him except a slogan. He must be a heck of a conversationalist because that is all he does. How are you, David?—no obligations. What are you doing on weekend?—right priorities. Have you been busy, David?—rolled gold. Is there any substance to anything that he says?

He will not tell us what his plans are for Queensland. He cannot answer a question. He cannot give us any details. We are waiting to hear what he is going to do to build up the teaching workforce. What is he going to do with rolled gold intervention in youth justice? What are his plans for addressing the serious questions facing the education system at the moment around behavioural issues, complexities in classrooms and disabilities? Is he going to step up and ask for federal government funding? We cannot get a word out of him in terms of what he is going to do.

He wants to be the premier. In seven weeks time this guy could seriously be the premier of Queensland. Queenslanders still do not know what this man's plans are. He can talk about health over and over again, he can talk about education over and over again, he can talk about community safety over and over again, but all we have on any one of those issues is a bunch of slogans. It is time that this man was straight with Queenslanders.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have heard the member use the word 'lie' three times. I am wondering if that is unparliamentary language in this place.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Indeed, it is. I want to check something with the Clerk. The point of order is correct. I ask you to withdraw the unparliamentary language.

Ms FARMER: I withdraw. It is time this man told Queenslanders who he is and what his plans are. Let's get some detail.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I understand it is appropriate in this place to address members by their correct titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. I will take some advice. That is correct. Member, I will ask you to use correct titles when referring to members.

Ms FARMER: The member for Broadwater needs to be straight with Queenslanders.

Miles Labor Government, Star Casino

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (2.38 pm): Things are genuinely tough for Queenslanders right now, but we received a bit of good news from this government last week. Apparently, you just have to ask for a massive, multimillion dollar handout and you will get one. Jokes—that is only if you are in the right industry.

Last week the Premier confirmed that they will give a multimillion dollar handout to Star casino. This is the same company found unsuitable to hold a casino licence due to corrupt conduct and links to organised crime. This is the same Star casino that has been given a tax deferral worth hundreds of millions of dollars. That is hundreds of millions of taxpayer dollars that could be spent on social housing or on free meal programs for kids or on public health care or on state schools. Those things are apparently less important than keeping this shonky casino operator afloat.

Labor are trying to tell us they have no alternative but to prop up Star casino with taxpayer dollars. They want us to forget that this is not even the first time they have used Queenslanders' money to bolster Star's profits. The Queen's Wharf development should never have gone ahead. It should never have been approved. The state government should never have agreed to hand over 10 per cent of the Brisbane CBD to a gambling company on a 99-year lease. They should never have agreed to let them install thousands of new life-destroying pokies and lock away public space for multimillion dollar apartments that no ordinary person can afford.

We should have guessed that something was not quite right with Star when none of the details of the government's agreement with them were released—not the lease, not the community impact statement, not the cost-benefit analysis, no probity checks, no business case, nothing. Labor did not ditch this deal with Star when they could have—instead, they doubled down. In 2022 when the Gotterson inquiry found that Star should not even hold a casino licence in Queensland, Labor should have cancelled their licence there and then. Instead they repeatedly deferred a 90-day suspension, protecting Star from having to release any details of their remediation plan, and they endorsed their continued development of the Queen's Wharf mega casino.

What of the fine Star got for proven corrupt and criminal behaviour—behaviour including money laundering and actively encouraging gamblers who were banned in other states to come up here to Queensland and bet? That fine was substantially less than what they are getting back now in the form of tax breaks from Labor.

What are ordinary people and small businesses in Queensland supposed to take away from this? Is the take-home lesson that maybe they should all break the law, miss key financial reporting deadlines and wait for a taxpayer bailout or does that only work if you are major donors to the Labor Party? Does that only work if you have the right personal connections or lobbyists on your side? Even the CFMEU did not get this kind of special treatment. The Labor Party did not think it was so important to protect the jobs of Queensland union staff fired without any accusations of wrongdoing, did they? When it comes to the gambling lobby, there is apparently nothing this Labor government will not do for them.

Star was suspended from trading last week after failing to lodge their financial reports on time, and there is a very real chance they could go bust, but we have some high rollers in this House. Premier Miles is going to put hundreds of millions of dollars on the table. He is all in on Star this time round. It is not his money of course; it is Queensland taxpayers' money. If Star goes bust, who will be picking up the tab now? It will be Queenslanders.

I do not know what conversations the Premier is having, but I have not had a single person in the community tell me they want their money spent on bailing out corrupt flailing casino operators. Would you rather a thousand more pokies or more public homes? I think I know how the families who are living in crisis accommodation in my electorate would answer that. I think the Premier should speak to some of the students who come to my weekly community meals in Auchenflower and explain why it is that Star is getting a tax break while they are struggling to afford food. I would like him to tell the students at Indooroopilly State High why they are learning in demountables and do not have science labs and are going without enough bathrooms while Star gets a handout.

I want to know how this Labor government justifies public money for casino operators, for fossil fuel companies and for the greyhound racing industry while ordinary Queensland families skip meals, delay seeing the doctor, miss out on school activities and struggle to keep a roof over their heads. This government can never again tell us there is no money to spare. We know there is money to spare if they are just willing to prioritise something. The question is: when will they prioritise the needs of ordinary Queenslanders over big corporate profits?

Miles Labor Government, Central Queensland

Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (Minister for Regional Development and Manufacturing and Minister for Water) (2.43 pm): The Central Queensland Labor team is fit and we are ready for a long race coming up. For those punters in the House who have heard of the early crow, the LNP are the early crow for the election: they think they have won it. We are work horses. We are not show ponies like the LNP. While the Central Queensland LNP members are stuck in the stables complaining and doing not much as usual, we are rolling up our sleeves in CQ and we are getting on with it.

On top of our record cost-of-living relief that we have delivered, we have delivered Rookwood Weir, we have delivered support for manufacturing and we have delivered support for our local councils. We have also given our commitment for a new satellite hospital at Rockhampton and we are delivering a ring-road for that fantastic community as well, plus we are delivering the Mount Morgan pipeline. Of course we are full steam ahead with the Fitzroy to Gladstone pipeline—that mighty pipeline delivering water to new industries in Gladstone.

The current LNP mob highlight why we need a Labor government and Labor members in Rocky, Keppel and Gladstone, because the LNP are an embarrassment in Central Queensland. Can you believe Senator Matt Canavan, sitting in air conditioning in Yeppoon with his selfie stick and his merchandise surrounding him, was talking down our support for the Boyne smelter to make sure those jobs were secure until 2040?

Mr Head interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order, member for Callide!

Mr BUTCHER: In our biggest industrial city, instead of backing jobs in Central Queensland, he is just a negative keyboard warrior continually talking down workers in Central Queensland. We saw the federal member for Capricornia enjoying chockies and whiskey on a trip to Tasmania while talking down the Queensland manufacturing industry—an absolute embarrassment as a federal member—and the members for Flynn and Callide, pretending to care about the Great Artesian Basin, even though the LNP stumped up $5 million—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. What is your point of order, member for Callide?

Mr HEAD: I take personal offense to those comments and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Member for Callide, the references do have to be personal. It was to the electorate rather than to you as an individual, but I will listen carefully. If I do hear any personal reflections, I will certainly be pulling those up.

Mr BUTCHER: The LNP federal government stumped up $5 million to pump carbon capture and storage into Australia's largest underground aquifer!

Manufacturing is such an important part of the Central Queensland economy. We know that Queensland's economy relies on Central Queensland. We back our manufacturers in Queensland unlike the LNP who continually talk them down. I am proud of our manufacturing record in Central Queensland. We are supporting businesses right across the region.

When I visit manufacturers in Central Queensland I meet operators who play by the rules and who want the best for their business and their family. They are honest and hardworking and they have integrity. The same cannot be said for the Leader of the Opposition. Wasn't that David Speers interview on TV the other night an absolute train wreck, literally? 'No obligations, no findings'—and he said it four times. It is our Queensland version of Scott Morrison's 'I don't hold a hose, mate' comment and Tony Abbott's death stare into nowhere. The LNP never take responsibility. They always shirk blame and always dodge the tough questions that Queenslanders and the media ask.

A fortnight ago in Bundaberg, the LNP used a hospital as a photo booth for a political ad. Apparently they got in the way of our hardworking health workers and an ambulance which is an absolute embarrassment. When called out for it, what did the Leader of the Opposition and the candidate do? They called health workers liars and they did a runner from the press when they asked them questions about it. The opposition leader is a good runner—and that is not a compliment. Whether it is running from the press conferences or running away from SET Solutions, this bloke has serious questions to answer not just to the parliament—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Use correct titles, please.

Mr BUTCHER: The member has serious questions to answer not just to the parliament but to the whole of Queensland. The LNP leader really is just a shifty salesman. His story gets murkier and murkier every day in Queensland.

Mr Head interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Callide!

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. What is your point of order, member for Clayfield?

Mr NICHOLLS: My point of order is unparliamentary language. I am sure you heard the word 'shifty' used by the member, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BUTCHER: I withdraw. As murky as a brown snake in Bulimba, you could say he is running away from questions and running away from Runaway Bay!

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you take a point of order, member for Clayfield, I do know he has used further unparliamentary language. Minister, I ask you to refrain from using unparliamentary language. If it continues, I will sit you down.

Mr BUTCHER: I withdraw. This is a bloke who said his business had no links to LNP donors, but it turns out—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Use correct titles, please. Does that satisfy your point of order, member for Clayfield?

Mr NICHOLLS: Yes.

Mr BUTCHER: I withdraw. This is a member who said his business had no links to LNP donors—but guess what? It did. Despite the train wreck interview on the ABC, it has been reported that he was pursued out of court and paid $200,000 in hush money to liquidators. This does not pass the pub test in any pub I have ever been to.

Mr Head interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: If he did not do anything wrong, if there is nothing to see here, why pay the hush money?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Before I call the next speaker, member for Callide, you are warned under the standing orders. You have continued to interject repeatedly.

Miles Labor Government, Performance

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (2.49 pm): When it comes to talking about Central Queensland, we only have to look at this list of names: John Barounis for Maryborough, Bree Watson for Bundaberg, David Lee for Hervey Bay, Donna Kirkland for Rockhampton, Nigel Hutton for Keppel and Glen Kelly for Mirani. They are names of people who are working. When you talk about Central Queensland and the failures of the Palaszczuk-Miles government, have a look at the Bruce Highway. The Bruce Highway is in such a terrible state that our own Premier will not even drive on it. He gets in a luxury private jet and flies 11 minutes. He stays off the Bruce Highway because he is so nervous about driving on it so he gets in that jet for 11 minutes to go from Hervey Bay to Bundaberg. What did he do in Bundaberg? He probably did not even buy the cake from a local baker. He gets a dodgy mud cake for the member for Bundaberg—

Mr Saunders: From Woolies.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Oh, there we go. I will take that interjection from the member for Maryborough. Apparently he bought it at Woolies. He did not even support a local baker.

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Resume your seat, member for Nanango. Member for Maryborough, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will just finish what the member for Callide was interjecting in the last speech. What did he say? He said, 'This is all Labor did. They blow up power stations and they rip down dams.' I will add another one to that. What about building a pipeline without any electricity attached? The pumping stations now have to have big diesel generators put in because the power was not connected. What about the water treatment plant? We know that water has to be treated but how are they going to do it? I will say it will be a big diesel generator. This is a government that is all talk and no action.

We know that this is a desperate government. I will go to the member for Bulimba and what she was talking about. I would like to remind the member for Bulimba about her Channel 7 interview. The member for Bulimba was asked, 'What do you say to Queenslanders worried about crime?' For a full 10 seconds—a full 10 seconds—the member for Bulimba was completely lost for words. They have no plan and no answers. The only way to change Labor's inaction is to change the government on 26 October. We will then have a government led by the member for Broadwater, David Crisafulli, delivering the following: our Making Queensland Safer Laws in before Christmas; the removal of detention as a last resort; Adult Crime, Adult Time; victims rights with victims put first; and, of course, $175 million to the Staying on Track program.

In the short time I have left, I have to mention the member for Waterford and that absolute train wreck of an interview. I have never seen anything like it. The government has not even lost yet and the member for Waterford is already putting her stake in the ground. Just wait until after October. The member for Waterford wants to follow both Annastacia Palaszczuk and me as the next female

opposition leader in Queensland. It was very obvious that the member for Waterford had not even spoken to the current Premier. She said—

I was disappointed that she anointed Steven ...

She then doubled down, referring to Annastacia Palaszczuk by saying—

It was disappointing that she felt she had to weigh in on that.

I dare say there were many disappointed people on that side. It was not just the member for Miller who was very disappointed that the member for Gaven was the biggest supporter of the current Premier because it was the member for Miller and the member for Keppel who actually jumped on board the Waterford train to be the next Premier of Queensland. I am not sure if the members for Keppel and Miller are going to keep their seats, but if they do then the member for Waterford has those two little votes stitched up. I am not quite sure about the member for Gaven because bring on Bianca Stone in the seat of Gaven! There is someone who actually cares about getting people out of tents and into homes. That is exactly what Bianca Stone will do. We need to show Labor the door in '24.

Thuringowa Electorate, Infrastructure

Mr HARPER (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.54 pm): You would have to have been living under a rock if you do not know what has been happening in Townsville in the last week. There have been some very important announcements, but I will start my contribution by saying bye-bye to the Broncos, the Dolphins are done, the Titans are tired but the North Queensland Cowboys will be playing the Knights. I hope they knock them over and get the job done at the Queensland Country Bank Stadium on Saturday night. That is a stadium that was proudly built by this Labor government.

Speaking of getting the job done, the job was done last Friday when we did the sod turn on—wait for it—Riverway Drive stage 2. What a journey it has been. First I had to doorknock most of the Upper Ross back in 2014 to get the $45 million funding secured for stage 1, which duplicated between Gollogly and Allambie Lane. There are 25,000 road users a day on this 10-kilometre road. It is a very busy roadway. We got that job done and we cut that ribbon in 2018.

The rest of the Upper Ross then said that we had to go all the way up towards the dam for stage 2, so I doorknocked thousands of residents on the river side. In 2020 we secured the $95 million funding required to do stage 2. It is completely different to stage 1. Stage 1 brought around $50 million worth of private investment with the new Riverway Plaza, which means jobs for locals, and stage 2 will do the same. The Upper Ross consists of Condon, Rasmussen and Kelso. They are very busy and growing suburbs that make up half of my electorate.

People are pretty excited to see that stage 2 has begun, but it did not come easy. The main pipeline under Thuringowa Drive from the Ross River Dam to the Douglas treatment plant broke in 2020 so this government assisted the then Townsville City Council with a further $33 million to build a brand new pipeline providing water security for our city, from the Ross Dam nine kilometres down. There are some members in this place who helped get that funding and I am forever grateful.

That particular road is now underway. The construction has begun. Over 140 jobs will be created on that. That is what our proud Labor government does. It is job-generating, major road infrastructure that is unmatched by the LNP. There was not one commitment from the LNP in 2020 to do Riverway Drive stage 2. It took a Labor member. I worked hard in that electorate to make sure the thousands of people I spoke to are getting the infrastructure they deserve in the Upper Ross. I cannot wait to invite some members to come up and do the whole drive on Riverway Drive when it is completed all the way to the dam.

Speaking of the dam, I am working with the Townsville Barramundi Restocking Group. They are after $5 million. There are 74,000 registered boat owners in North Queensland and we want to get them fishing on the dam. There are 120,000 barramundi sitting in that dam just waiting to be caught. I am looking forward to having some people visit my electorate soon. I have an MP petition out there right now to get as much support as I can to get some funding on that project.

If I add it all up, there is $45 million for stage 1, $95 million for stage 2 and $33 million for the pipeline. There is an additional $8 million that we gave the current Townsville City Council to open up the Beck Drive extension but they have rejected that money. That is $181 million that I have secured to get into the Upper Ross and deliver that road infrastructure. I urge the Townsville City Council to rethink that and actually open up that back road. We cannot rely on one way in and one way out, despite the duplication. They need to get on with the job and use that money because people want it. They say it is common sense. We have seen thousands of people come into the area on the back of the

Townsville Ring Road opening with stage 5. There are two huge land developments right now creating more housing for our area and I am right behind that. They attribute that to the new ring-road.

Just in Thuringowa on roads alone, around $620 million has been delivered on the ring-road, Riverway Drive and Hervey Range. Only a Labor member will do that. It is completely unmatched by any LNP candidate or any other candidate. None of them are backing the Upper Ross like I am. I will continue to fight and deliver for the best electorate in Queensland—that is, Thuringowa.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Contempt of Parliament

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (2.59 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. It has been brought to my attention that there has been a further abuse of the democratic rights of this institution of parliament. At 2.20 pm this afternoon, a media release was put out by the Premier, the Minister for Health, and Attorney-General and Minister for Justice titled 'Laws passed to regulate assisted reproductive providers'. Those laws have not passed this chamber. That debate is currently underway. The Premier and the ministers have misrepresented the proceedings of this House. They have demonstrated that they are treating this chamber as nothing more than a rubber stamp, and I will be writing to you accordingly.

ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TECHNOLOGY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2850, on motion of Ms Fentiman—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (3.00 pm): I rise to speak briefly on the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024. I want to acknowledge the work of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee for dealing with what must have been a very complex and, I imagine, at times quite emotional issues, some tricky ethical issues, that are not like a number of bills that we consider in this House. They have done an excellent job. At reading their report, you can see some of the really quite significant ethical issues and human rights issues that they had to contend with, and I congratulate them on a very well-considered response. I congratulate also the minister herself for making sure we have some regulation in this incredibly important sector.

Their report acknowledges—and I think we all know it—that assisted reproductive technology offers an opportunity to people who would like to be parents to become parents in a way that would never have been thought possible only decades ago, and it would be remiss not to acknowledge that.

However, it is also a sector which requires government to exercise significant responsibility. As it has grown, we have seen those increasing opportunities for things to go awry. All of us have not only known but been really close to people who have gone through the IVF process. We know what an incredibly emotional journey it is, what a challenging journey it is. For some people it is not a successful journey and it can be absolutely devastating, but how even more devastating if one goes through the process and we have not regulated enough for them to miss the grief that comes out of processes going wrong. This bill is about making sure that that is right.

I want to acknowledge some of the human rights considerations and the legislative standards that the committee had to consider when it was going through this bill. They include: the impact of new licensing requirements on the right to property and right to privacy and reputation; the disproportionate impact of the new requirements regarding counselling and the 10-family limit on single women and LGBTIQ+ couples which affects the right to equality, the right to protection of children and families, and the right to access health services; the impact of the donor conception information register on the right to privacy; the impact of inspectors' powers on the rights to property and privacy; the impact of the chief executive's power to make certain decisions on the right to a fair hearing; the impact of the reversal of the onus of proof in relation to certain offences on the right to a fair hearing and rights in criminal proceedings. The committee examined all of these issues and they found that although the bill does impact a number of human rights, any limitations are reasonably justified.

We heard public reports from some really brave people who had suffered really overwhelming consequences of the lack of regulation in this sector. We heard their stories and our hearts broke for them. I want to acknowledge the bravery and courage shown by those people in sticking with it and, although they could not right the wrongs that had been done to them, they were making sure it never happens to anyone else.

In Queensland, we have had some kind of regulatory system, but the Health Ombudsman identified the gaps and risks associated with that regime which was effectively a self-regulating regime. This bill requires an assisted reproductive technology provider to apply for and be granted a licence from the chief executive of Queensland Health in order to provide ART services in Queensland, and it prohibits ART providers from using a particular embryo or performing an ART procedure in a particular way for the purpose of producing or attempting to produce a child of a particular sex. It limits the number of people or families who may use a particular gamete donor and make sure they are an accepted part of ART regulation in Australia.

I am sure that everyone working in this sector wants to know that there is regulation—and people who may be their patients—and that they can stand tall and stand proud that they can always be trusted, and that is what we as governments must ensure is available to those people who so desperately want to have children of their own. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (3.06 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill 2024 on behalf of my community. The journey to becoming a parent is different for everyone. For a variety of reasons, society is seeing a rise in potential parents wishing to access assisted reproductive technology. I know that this technology has been used by many families in my community. I also acknowledge the sensitivities, financial expense, joy and, in some cases, devastation experienced by local families. I also acknowledge the tireless efforts of the families and donor-conceived people who have been advocating for this regulation for a long time now. I also acknowledge the great work of broadcasters like the SBS and the ABC who have recently cast a spotlight on those that provide this technology to families.

It is of utmost importance to this government that Queenslanders have confidence in assisted reproductive technology providers and know that they are being held to rigorous, ethical and clinical standards. This is what we would expect, and Queenslanders expect, of any medical fraternity providing a service to Queenslanders. It is also very important to my community. This bill demonstrates the Queensland government's commitment to improving health care for families and for women which forms part of our landmark Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy 2032.

Assisted reproductive technology providers in Queensland must be accredited with the Reproductive Technology Accreditation Committee under the Fertility Society of Australia and New Zealand. This bill will protect the welfare and interests of people who use assisted reproductive technology and people born through the use of this technology. This is critically important.

I now turn to the considerations for donor-conceived people. Over many years, a number of young people have had conversations with me about the importance of them knowing their genetic origins and the beneficial impact of being able to access information about their donor-conceived siblings and their mother or father. Our genetic heritage, especially for young people, is important as they develop their identity. The bill establishes an access to information framework which will allow all donor-conceived people, regardless of when they were born, to access identifying and non-identifying information about a donor when the information is held on the register. This will make a real difference to the lives of donor-conceived people and their families.

We have heard from the donor-conceived community about the ripple effect the search for answers and secrecy has throughout their lives—the questions about their medical history and ancestry and the yearning to understand that unknown part of themselves. We know that identity plays a significant role in our self-worth and sense of wellbeing. I again take the opportunity to thank the many individuals, organisations and groups who advocated for this historic reform. I thank the health minister for her work on this bill, as the committee has done. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (3.10 pm), in reply: I thank members for their contributions to the debate on the Assisted Reproductive Technology Bill. I appreciate that there is general agreement about the need for this bill not only among members in this House but also among people born as a result of assisted reproductive technology, patients and providers of fertility services.

In this debate, and in the time leading up to it, we have heard many stories about how the fertility industry has touched people's lives. I thank those members who have shared personal stories of their

own or their constituents' fertility journey. I would also like to thank the Assisted Reproductive Technology Regulation team in the System Policy Branch of Queensland Health for their ongoing work. I again acknowledge the dedicated and passionate advocates who have been calling for reform in this area.

The Miles government has listened and understands there is a need to enhance the industry's existing self-regulatory model with regulations. This bill is about safeguarding the industry into the future, for patients and for the people who are born. This bill is about ensuring people who are born as a result of donated gametes and embryos have the ability to know their genetic heritage through the establishment of a donor conception information register. One donor-conceived person told the committee, 'This legislation will be leading the way forward in truth and transparency.'

It is a privilege to progress this bill through the parliament today. I will now address some of the matters raised by members during the course of this debate. The member for South Brisbane raised concerns regarding whether the rights of donor-conceived people are the paramount consideration in the bill. I am pleased to advise the member for South Brisbane that the main objects of the bill, at clause 3, state—

(2) The welfare and interests of people who are born as a result of assisted reproductive technology are, throughout their lives, of paramount importance in the administration and operation of this Act.

This principle will inform how the bill will be interpreted and will be the primary consideration.

Several members raised concerns regarding the definition of 'family' for the purposes of the family limit. 'Family' is defined to mean a parent, their spouse and their children. If, for example, a couple separates and one of them repartners and wishes to start a family with their new partner using donor gametes, this would be counted as a separate family. 'Family' has been defined to achieve the purpose of reducing the impacts of donor-conceived people having many siblings as well as avoiding other risks. I appreciate that there are many types of families and many possible scenarios to work through. Queensland Health will work with the sector to guide them through how this provision should be applied and will release guidance material to inform the sector during implementation.

The bill sets a time limit of 15 years to use donated gametes and embryos. The 15-year time limit aims to strike a balance between the use of donated material by intending parents and the rights and welfare of donor-conceived people. Throughout consultation, donor-conceived people described the importance of storage time limits on the ability to form meaningful relationships with their siblings and the difficulty of being able to do this when siblings are from different generations. For many, sibling relationships are the longest lasting relationships of our lives. This time limit is not, however, a blanket ban as proffered by the member for Mudgeeraba.

The bill recognises that every person's fertility journey is different. In some circumstances a person may require more than the 15-year limit to complete their family. In that situation, a person may apply to Queensland Health to seek an extension to the time limit prescribed in the bill and the director-general may approve extensions if satisfied there are reasonable grounds for doing so. The director-general will consider applications on a case-by-case basis to ensure the ongoing use of older material is ethical and appropriate in the particular circumstances. This is not intended as a clinical or scientific review of the efficacy of using older material. The bill provides that an ART provider must dispose of any donated gametes or embryos once the time limit has been reached. There is no time limit for a person seeking to store their own biological materials, given this is managed in line with the person's consent.

I note that the member for Mudgeeraba made commentary on the consultation process for this bill. I make no apologies for this bill being progressed with urgency, particularly given the extremely serious nature of the stories that I have heard and some of the cases that were uncovered this year during the Health Ombudsman's investigation. Whilst this bill may have been developed quickly, it has been developed thoroughly. We have had many advocates calling for this reform for many years. Queensland Health undertook extensive consultation during development of the bill, receiving 25 written submissions and 28 survey responses to its initial consultation paper along with hosting several information and focus group sessions. Overall the team had over 150 different engagement sessions during the development of the bill. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General also consulted thoroughly on the development of the requirements for the donor conception information register, building on the work of the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's inquiry. I again take this opportunity to thank everyone who participated in consultation processes relating to the development and the scrutiny of the bill.

The member for Moggill raised concerns about the retrospective nature of the donor register and the fact that it may have unintended consequences, particularly to donors. It is accepted that the establishment of the register will impact upon the privacy of donors who donated on the condition of anonymity. Although historical donors may have been assured anonymity at the time they donated, we now know that this was not best practice or in the best interests of donor-conceived people. It is appropriate, fair and just that all people conceived through donor conception have the right to understand their complete identity and genetic history.

Whilst the bill delivers this right for donor-conceived people, it also ensures any impact on privacy is limited as far as possible. While a donor's name and date of birth will be provided to the donor-conceived people who apply for it, the donor's contact information—their email address or similar—will not be released to any person without the donor's consent. The bill outlines that the registrar may take reasonable steps to contact a donor if a donor-conceived person has made application for identifying information. At this point the registrar can advise the donor of counselling services that will be available to them. Ultimately, the bill will ensure all donor-conceived people—regardless of when they were born—have the same legislative ability to access important information about the donor.

This bill will improve confidence in Queensland's fertility industry, improve protections for patients and, most importantly, protect the people who are born as a result of assisted reproductive technology throughout their lives. I commend the bill to the House.

It has been brought to my attention that a government media release regarding laws currently being debated in this chamber was published inadvertently due to an administrative error. We have asked that the release be removed. I am advised that that request preceded the matter of privilege by the member for Glass House. I apologise to the House. The government respects the institution of this parliament and would never purposefully publish a release ahead of the deliberations of this chamber. Given the bipartisan support for this bill, this should not distract from how historic this day is for many donor-conceived people in Queensland.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 161, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (3.19 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. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (3.20 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.

An incident having occurred in the gallery—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Lui): Order! Order in the gallery. Order!

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (3.20 pm): I rise to advise the House that the automatic adjournment this evening will commence at the conclusion of the cognate debate of the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill.

RESPECT AT WORK AND OTHER MATTERS AMENDMENT BILL

CRIMINAL JUSTICE LEGISLATION (SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill resumed from 14 June (see p. 2370) and Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill resumed from 21 May (see p. 1626).

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (3.21 pm): I move—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Labor governments stand up for the values of equality, opportunity, fairness and reform. From workers' rights and entitlements to universal health and education systems, Labor governments have always been dedicated to keeping Queensland fair. That is why I am so proud to be progressing the significant reforms these two bills will deliver. They are testament to the Miles government's ongoing commitment to tackling sexual harassment in the workplace and continuing the fight against domestic, family and sexual violence.

On 14 June 2024, the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 was introduced into the Legislative Assembly and referred to the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee for consideration. The committee's only recommendation was that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for their consideration of the bill. I would also like to thank those stakeholders who made submissions to the committee and participated in the public hearing in addition to the Queensland Human Rights Commission's report *Building belonging*. While this bill represents an important step in the process of modernising and strengthening Queensland's anti-discrimination laws, it is only the first step. The Miles government remains committed to advancing further reforms to implement recommendations of the *Building belonging* report with the benefit of further consultation.

In my contribution to today's debate, I will address the committee's comments as well as the statement of reservation and will highlight amendments I intend to move during consideration in detail of the bill. This bill will start to bring Queensland's laws into line with other Australian jurisdictions that have taken steps to modernise their anti-discrimination laws and create safer, more respectful environments for workers. Before turning to the amendments I intend to move, I will briefly outline the substantive elements of the bill.

The bill contains amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act to implement key reforms from the 2020 Australian Human Rights Commission *Respect@Work* report to strengthen and clarify protections against workplace sexual harassment as well as those recommended by the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's inquiries into discrimination, vilification and sexual harassment laws. Importantly, the report encouraged having consistency in sexual harassment and sex discrimination provisions across federal, state and territory anti-discrimination legislation.

Despite this report, the 2022 national survey revealed that a staggering 77 per cent of Australians aged 15 or older have been sexually harassed at some point in their lifetime, including 89 per cent of women. The survey also noted that reporting on this harassment is low, with fewer than one in five people who experienced workplace sexual harassment in the last five years making a formal complaint. These statistics are abhorrent in the 21st century. All Queenslanders have the right to feel safe from discrimination, sexual harassment, vilification and victimisation.

The bill includes new prohibitions on harassment on the basis of sex in work related contexts and subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex, modelled on the Sex Discrimination Act. Australian workplaces are already subject to these prohibitions under the Sex Discrimination Act and should already have policies and practices in place to adhere to these laws. I

will go into more detail shortly, but I table a copy of a letter sent by me to religious representatives and reviewed by the Human Rights Commissioner detailing how this bill will work with religious institutions to maintain their religious doctrines, beliefs and practices.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 10 September 2024, from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Hon. Yvette D'Ath, to the General Secretary of Queensland Churches Together, Reverend David Baker, regarding concerns raised by faith leaders in relation to the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 [1774].

The bill amends the preamble, long title and object provisions of the Anti-Discrimination Act, which I will refer to as the ADA for the remainder of my speech, to update existing references to promoting 'equality of opportunity for everyone' to incorporate the concept of 'equitable outcomes'. The concept of substantive equality recognises that equal treatment, or equality of opportunity, may not be sufficient to secure equitable outcomes. This is not a new concept. The ADA already provides for 'welfare measures', such as the provision of travel concessions for pensioners, and 'equal opportunity measures', such as programs designed to increase the recruitment and retention of women in male-dominated roles.

The opposition's statement of reservation expressed concern that the bill's amendments to the objects go beyond the objects of the Sex Discrimination Act. However, the focus of the Sex Discrimination Act is more narrow than Queensland's Anti-Discrimination Act. It therefore makes sense that the object of 'equitable outcomes' under the ADA applies to the broader range of protected attributes and prohibited behaviour under this act.

As recommended by the *Respect@Work* report and the *Building belonging* report, the bill includes a new positive duty that requires duty holders to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and other objectionable conduct as far as possible. The ADA has broad scope, and the positive duty will apply to discrimination, harassment and certain other objectionable conduct under the ADA on the basis of all protected attributes under the act. The positive duty will require duty holders to take 'reasonable and proportionate' measures to eliminate relevant conduct as far as possible and will bring Queensland in line with other states that have equivalent duties.

What constitutes a 'reasonable and proportionate' measure will vary based on a range of factors identified by the bill. This flexible standard recognises that what is required for a small business owner to comply with the positive duty will necessarily be different from what is required for a large business. Religious organisations will only be subject to the positive duty to the extent that they already have a duty under the ADA not to engage in that conduct. Notably, the ADA already contains numerous exemptions for religious organisations including in the areas of work, education and provision of goods and services. This bill will not impact these exemptions.

The bill additionally implements recommendations from the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee reports regarding its inquiry into serious vilification and hate crimes and the inquiry into the Criminal Code (Serious Vilification and Hate Crimes) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023. The bill includes amendments to vilification provisions in both the ADA and the Criminal Code to expand the list of attributes and to update the definition of 'public act' to ensure it captures electronic communications and social media as well as public acts which occur in closed environments.

Additional amendments to the ADA will introduce a new harm-based vilification prohibition that captures public acts which a reasonable person would consider hateful, reviling, seriously contemptuous or seriously ridiculing. The statement of reservation expressed concern that the amendments exceed in significant respects the recommendations of the former committee reports. Recommendation 5 of the former committee's report on its inquiry into serious vilification and hate crimes was to consider lowering the threshold of the civil incitement test so that the test reflects a focus on the impact the vilification has on the victim. The bill inserts a new harm-based provision that, consistent with the committee's recommendation, is focused on the harm caused to the person. To link the reasonable person to the community at large would fundamentally undermine the operation of the new harm-based provision and does not create a more objective standard.

As to concerns about the amendments to the incitement provision which replace 'incite' with 'likely to incite', this minor change is a simple reflection of existing case law that there is no need to show particular public conduct actually incited a third party but instead that the conduct was capable or likely to incite hatred. The amendment reduces the risk of uncertainty rather than increases it, as suggested by the statement of reservation.

Some submitters raised concerns of the potential for the new harm-based provision in the bill to impact the ability for religious bodies to express their genuinely held religious beliefs, including in schools. However, the threshold for conduct to be caught by the new provision is set appropriately at a high level to avoid any undue limitation on the freedom of expression or religion. It captures public acts which a reasonable person would consider hateful, reviling, seriously contemptuous or seriously ridiculing. There are also exceptions, including for a public act done reasonably and in good faith, for academic, artistic, scientific or research purposes or for other purposes in the public interest.

Finally, the bill will expand the list of attributes on the basis of which discrimination is prohibited to include 'expunged conviction', 'homelessness', 'irrelevant criminal record', 'irrelevant medical record', 'physical appearance' and 'subjection to domestic or family violence' and update a number of existing attributes.

In addition to these important reforms to the ADA, the bill includes amendments to implement key reforms to other legislation. The bill includes amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to introduce an aggravating sentencing factor which will implement recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report titled *Penalties for assaults on public officers*. The aggravating factor will apply where an adult offender is convicted of an offence involving violence against, or that resulted in physical harm to, a person in their workplace.

I want to acknowledge the long campaign No One Deserves a Serve run by the SDA union and Justin Power in particular, who is present in the gallery today. Every day unions fight for reforms like these that protect their workers, and I am proud that we were able to incorporate these powers into this bill to provide additional protections to the types of workers the SDA represents. We all remember the treatment of our retail and supermarket staff during COVID and we should not allow that conduct to continue.

The bill also clarifies that the court does not need to store written reasons for orders of imprisonment or detention if the reasons are otherwise recorded. The bill includes amendments to the Magistrates Act 1991 in order to provide magistrates with an entitlement to access unpaid parental leave—a right that all workers should have. The bill also includes amendments to clarify that Queensland magistrates, District Court judges and certain officers of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal have the same immunities and protections as a Supreme Court judge.

I now turn to the amendments that I intend to move during consideration in detail of the bill. In submissions to the parliamentary committee, several stakeholders emphasised the importance of continuing to progress the broader reforms recommended by the *Building belonging* report. I intend to move amendments to the bill to implement further key recommendations from the *Building belonging* report. As strongly supported by numerous submissions, I intend to move amendments to update the tests for direct and indirect discrimination. These new tests will remove complex and unnecessary legal tests which have produced uncertainty for all parties as to their rights and obligations.

To accompany the modernisation of the tests for discrimination, I intend to move amendments which will insert a new protected attribute which captures 'a combination of two or more protected attributes' to make it clear that discrimination can occur based on a single attribute, on the basis of two or more attributes or on the basis of a combined effect of two or more attributes. The amendments will also introduce a shared burden of proof which will apply primarily in matters of direct discrimination. Other amendments will clarify that the new prohibitions on harassment on the basis of sex in work related contexts and subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex do not limit the operation of any other provision of the act that provides protection against similar behaviours on the basis of attributes other than sex.

In response to the committee's suggestion, amendments will provide a consistent two-year time limit for all complaints. In response to concerns about the limited scope of the investigation and enforcement powers for the Queensland Human Rights Commission, amendments will allow the commissioner to conduct investigations into all types of systemic contraventions of the Anti-Discrimination Act. The commissioner will also be empowered to prepare and publish a report as an outcome of an investigation into noncompliance with the positive duty. To better support duty holders seeking to understand and implement the new positive duty, I also intend to move amendments to make it mandatory for the QHRC to publish guidelines on compliance with the positive duty.

To address concerns raised about the meaning and scope of some of the new protected attributes, I will move amendments to clarify the scope of these attributes. Amendments will also seek to set a commencement date of 1 July 2025 for the majority of the anti-discrimination amendments.

This is with one exception in relation to the amendments enhancing representative complaints, which will commence on 1 December 2024. I also intend to move consequential amendments to Queensland legislation that are required to reflect the establishment of the new Commonwealth Administrative Review Tribunal that will commence on 14 October 2024.

Amendments will also be moved to the Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991, the District Court of Queensland Act 1967 and the Judicial Remuneration Act 2007 to introduce a legislative scheme for the appointment of reserve judges in the Supreme Court of Queensland and the District Court of Queensland. The new reserve judges scheme will supplement the existing provisions that provide for the appointment of acting judges. The amendments will provide for the appointment of an eligible person as a reserve judge for up to five years and a reappointment option. The engagement of a reserve judge will be at the discretion of the Chief Judge or the Chief Justice, who will have the ability to engage reserve judges on an as-needed basis for up to six months at a time. These amendments will give the courts greater flexibility and expediency to call in additional judges on a short-term basis to assist with periodic increases in workload and temporary vacancies.

The Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 will be amended to clarify when the court must provide Queensland Corrective Services with a sentencing transcript. Finally, an amendment is to be made to the Criminal Code to clarify that the offence of serious assault in section 340 applies to operational workers in public hospitals. This is in response to the submission from the Australian Workers' Union and makes clear the application of this provision to security officers, wardies, cleaners or food service workers and reinforces that assaults on workers are never okay.

The important reforms in this bill will help to ensure every worker should be able to go to work knowing that their workplace is a safe and inclusive environment free from harassment and other harmful conduct. The bill progresses the important and ongoing process of strengthening and modernising anti-discrimination protections in Queensland more broadly. The Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill represents a vital step towards driving necessary change in our workplaces—and beyond—to eliminate unacceptable, damaging and deeply harmful behaviour.

Turning now to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024, on 21 May 2024 I introduced the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024 into this House. The bill delivers the third and final major stage of reform in response to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. The Miles government is committed to making the necessary changes to end all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in Queensland, with a total investment of $1.9 billion since 2015 to achieve this goal. This bill further signifies that commitment.

The bill was referred to the Community Support and Services Committee for consideration and on 2 August 2024 the committee tabled its report, which made four recommendations, including that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for its support and careful consideration of the bill. I also extend my thanks to those organisations that made submissions and to those who appeared before the committee. Today I table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 46, 57th Parliament—Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024, government response [1775].

The response notes recommendation 1 and indicates the government's in-principle support for recommendations 2, 3 and 4, which focus on guidance in the bill's implementation. In line with the response to recommendations 2 and 4, I note that work is underway to assist in the bill's implementation, including consideration of communication and guidance material for new position-of-authority offences in the bill. In addition, having regard to recommendation 3, I can foreshadow that I will be moving an amendment to the offences in the bill during consideration in detail to clarify the list of persons who are taken to be in a position of care, supervision or authority.

Before turning to the amendments I intend to move, I will briefly outline the key reforms in the bill. The bill introduces two new position-of-authority offences into the Criminal Code. These offences build on the momentum established by the new affirmative consent model, which commences this month. The offences will criminalise adults who engage in sexual interactions with 16- or 17-year-old children where the adult in question has the child under their care, supervision or authority. The offences will bring Queensland into line with other states and territories and send a clear message that this conduct will not be tolerated. Under the offences, certain adults will be automatically taken to have a child under their care, supervision or authority. These adults include, among others, a teacher or principal at a school where the child is a student; a health practitioner if the child is their patient; or a person employed at a place where a child is in custody. This is intended to capture adults in settings

where it is clear that the adult has a child under their care, supervision or authority and where it is irrefutable that any sexual interaction with that child is improper.

The bill contains a number of other important amendments to improve Queensland's criminal justice system's response to victim-survivors. The bill will codify rules around the admissibility of tendency evidence and coincidence evidence in Queensland, bringing us into line with uniform evidence law jurisdictions, such as New South Wales, Tasmania, the Australian Capital Territory and the Northern Territory. This is a landmark reform to the rules of evidence and follows findings by the taskforce and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, which singled out Queensland as having the strictest rules for the admission of this type of evidence. The bill will also allow for the admission of expert evidence about the nature and effects of sexual violence, assisting juries to better understand victim-survivor behaviour and dispel rape myths. To support these amendments, the government has funded the establishment of the expert evidence panel pilot to provide access to expert reports and evidence in particular courts in Brisbane and Townsville.

In addition, the bill provides greater procedural protections to victim-survivors by facilitating the greater use of alternative arrangements, such as giving evidence remotely, introducing directions hearings and requiring that the evidence of all special witnesses in sexual offence proceedings is videorecorded and stored for use in subsequent proceedings. These protections will improve a victim-survivor's experience of a criminal proceeding. They will reduce re-traumatisation and empower victim-survivors to give their best evidence.

The bill introduces a new inadmissibility of evidence provision into the Corrective Services Act 2006, ensuring that any admission made about charged conduct during participation in a program cannot be used as evidence in legal proceedings related to the offence for which the prisoner is on remand. These amendments are intended to remove a perceived barrier for participation in rehabilitation programs, thereby supporting rehabilitation efforts without prejudicing the proper administration of justice.

The bill provides for a statutory review of amendments arising from both taskforce reports. As recommended by the taskforce, the review is to occur as soon as practicable five years after commencement of the last of the relevant amendments. The statutory review will provide an opportunity to consider whether the significant legislative reforms actioned by the Queensland government in response to the taskforce are operating as intended.

Other amendments include extending the maximum duration of non-contact orders that may be made under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 and clarifying the admissibility of recorded evidence-in-chief in committal proceedings for domestic and family violence offences.

I will now turn to the amendments that I intend to move during consideration in detail of the bill. The committee received submissions from stakeholders raising concerns about the list of adults who are taken to be in a position of care, supervision or authority, for the position of authority offences. It is vital that the list is clear and to this end I intend to progress an amendment to the bill. The amendment will provide a definition for a 'health practitioner' to make it absolutely clear who this is intended to capture. The amendment will also narrow one of the categories on the list to specifically target adults employed at entities providing accommodation to children in the custody or guardianship of the chief executive under the Child Protection Act 1999.

In addition, and having regard to the feedback of key legal stakeholders, I intend to move amendments to the new tendency evidence and coincidence evidence framework for greater consistency and alignment with the uniform evidence law. I also intend to move a number of amendments more generally to address technical issues in the bill.

On an unrelated matter in the Criminal Code, I will move amendments to clarify the scope of the offence of choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting in section 315A. Following a Queensland Court of Appeal decision there has been uncertainty as to whether the offence extends to the compression of a person's neck in a manner that does not hinder breathing but does restrict or cut off blood flow. I will move amendments to remove any doubt: to clarify that to choke, suffocate or strangle another person includes the application of pressure to that person's neck that completely or partially restricts the other person's respiration, blood circulation or both. Additionally, as I announced last week, to respond to ongoing stakeholder advocacy, I have asked the Queensland Law Reform Commission to undertake a holistic review of the offence to ensure it is operating as intended. I encourage those who are interested to engage with the QLRC's review. I acknowledge all stakeholders who have contributed their time and invaluable insight to inform these critical reforms for Queensland.

Finally, to the victim-survivors and their families and friends who have courageously shared their stories and experiences, we hear you, we thank you and we will continue to say Not now, not ever to domestic, family and sexual violence. I commend the bills to the House.

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (3.45 pm): In the foreword to the 2020 *Respect@Work* report Commissioner Kate Jenkins noted—

Australia was once at the forefront of tackling sexual harassment globally.

She went on to say—

Women's organisations in Australia began to press for the legal and social recognition of sex discrimination in the early 1970s. This movement built on Australia's ratification of two key international conventions:

- the International Labour Organization's Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention in 1973
- the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women ('CEDAW') in 1983.

She went on to say—

Australia now lags behind other countries in preventing and responding to sexual harassment.

The report went on to state that the AHRC's most recent survey in 2018 showed that sexual harassment in Australian workplaces is widespread and pervasive and one in three people experienced sexual harassment at work in the past five years. I am sure we can all agree that that is a very frightening statistic. It is unacceptable. The report goes on to say—

Sexual harassment is not a women's issue: it is a societal issue, which every Australian, and every Australian workplace, can contribute to addressing.

Workplace sexual harassment is not inevitable. It is not acceptable. It is preventable.

Today we debate whether this bill is the best way to deal with those concerning statistics, among the many others, and whether it does so after due consideration of all of the matters it purports to deal with. I have to say we do so in yet again a Labor government imposed constraint, given that this is a cognate debate and the need to debate two lengthy and serious bills, which are on unrelated issues, in such a very short timeframe. On top of which the Attorney has circulated amendments, very much at the last minute, to change and clarify the law relating to the strangulation offence because of uncertainty in the original changes and other changes which we will now hear will implement what the Attorney herself has only just described as key recommendations of the *Building belonging* report. These amendments of key recommendations from the *Building belonging* report are being circulated just prior to lunch and expected to be passed before this day's sitting is finished without any review by committee or any chance for stakeholders to make a contribution. We know stakeholders are keen to make a contribution because 37 of them made very significant contributions and I acknowledge the contributions of all of the parties and submitters to the committee in respect to the respect at work bill. We have amendments that are being proposed today, which implement something from which is a contested area and where people do have serious concerns, at the last moment on the third last sitting day of a four-year term of the 57th Parliament.

This is not the best parliamentary practice. This is not the way that proper legislation ought to be passed. This is legislation by creep, not legislation by scrutiny and proper passage. Each of the bills included in this cognate debate deserve more than the short timeframe that has been allowed for debate today and given the very large amount of amendments just circulated this morning, including, for example, amendments to the legislation pertaining to the appointment of reserve judges in the Supreme and District Courts which has not been discussed before, which is now expected to be accepted by this parliament and passed into law. I would argue very strongly that that is not the way that such significant laws ought to be passed and, as I say, in the case where the appropriate committee has not had the time to do the work necessary and parties have not had the opportunity to make their contribution. As I said in my contribution just after lunch, the only way to stop this chaos and crisis is to change the government on 26 October and show Labor the door in 2024.

The respect at work bill was, amongst other things, formulated in response to recommendations from a number of inquiries. These include the Australian Human Rights Commission's *Respect@Work: national inquiry into sexual harassment in Australian workplaces* report, which I have referred to already; the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee's report on its inquiry into the Criminal Code (Serious Vilification and Hate Crimes) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill; and the Queensland Human Rights Commission's *Building belonging; review of Queensland's Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*. The bill also amends several other acts as detailed in the explanatory notes.

At the outset, I reaffirm the LNP's commitment to making our communities safer, and that includes having the right legislation in place to ensure people can live together peaceably. All Queenslanders deserve respect, no matter their background or beliefs. Unchecked, vilification, harassment and discrimination tear at the warp and weft of the fabric of our community. Too often we see injury, hurt and violence caused by those who choose to inflame and exploit the seeming differences amongst us while ignoring the great many common threads that bind us.

However, does this mean we must all agree? Of course not. Do we all need to believe the same thing as our neighbours, our work colleagues or even our friends? Of course not. Ought we be able to express our views freely, frankly and in a forthright and, in this place, some might even say theatrical fashion? Of course. Do we want to see freedom of speech, thought and religion unnecessarily curtailed? No, we do not. Do we want honest citizens to fear the heavy hand of the state as it watches over every thought or word spoken? No, we do not. The challenge for this bill and the question that has to be answered is: does it achieve those aims? Does it limit free speech and freedom of belief beyond that which is strictly necessary to prevent serious vilification, discrimination and harassment?

It is claimed by the government that, if enacted, this bill will align Queensland law with that of the Commonwealth pertaining to sexual harassment in the workplace and as recommended by the *Respect@Work* report, with adjustments for Queensland's legal system—that is, Queensland's manner of preparing this legislation. If that were all it did and due consideration to submissions had been had, there would be much more support for the bill. While similar to Commonwealth reforms in many areas, three significant problems arise because this bill goes beyond the recommendations of the 2020 report.

The bill enacts some recommendations of the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee with which the LNP mainly agrees. We certainly agree with confirming that the immunities that apply to magistrates and District Court judges are the same immunities that apply to Supreme Court judges. We have no objection to the provisions of parental leave under the Magistrates Act 1991. However, we are concerned with aspects of the bill that seek to implement parts of the QHRC's *Building belonging* report. That report recommended a complete rewrite of the Anti-Discrimination Act. The government supported in principle all 120-plus recommendations in that report and committed to introducing a bill to repeal and replace the Anti-Discrimination Act within the current term of government. In fact, the government went so far as to circulate—and has circulated for the past almost 12 months—a draft new bill. Substantial and reasonable concerns to that bill were raised by very many faith groups and Queenslanders from across all denominations. In light of those objections, what we now see is a piecemeal approach that puts parts of that bill and the changes that the *Building belonging* report recommended into this legislation, seemingly leaving out a batch of the recommendations for some future action, presumably in the hope that if re-elected in October the government will be able to bring them in without facing the electoral backlash that they know they would suffer if they had introduced the bill in its entirety.

Today we found out that, as the Attorney-General herself said, some key parts of the *Building belonging* report were not included in the original bill that this House considered and she now proposes will be introduced by amendments and passed later on this afternoon. Again, that will happen outside a normal consultation process. It is a piecemeal approach and one that has engendered significant concern from both supporters and opponents of the proposals. We heard that again from the Attorney-General, who said that today she will move amendments in order to appease or address the concerns of those people who support the changes and want to see *Building belonging* passed in its entirety. We did not hear the Attorney-General talk about any consideration being given in relation to those who have grave concerns about the *Building belonging* report and some of the proposals that it introduces.

The LNP does not support the piecemeal approach to this reform. The latest iteration of reform to the Anti-Discrimination Act really highlights the political cowardice of this government. They are much like their national counterpart, which will not even publicly release their legislation in terms of religious freedom unless they get a carte blanche from the opposition. They have hidden it away, hoping it goes away. They are afraid of the fight. Knowing it is unpopular and facing an election, this government is trying to slip through changes without proper public scrutiny or debate in the dying days of a dying government that has seemingly abandoned its long-held positions.

The LNP has expressed its concerns in the statement of reservation. I will outline some of those a little later. I acknowledge that 37 stakeholders made submissions to the committee. I particularly acknowledge the many good and compassionate groups that support the bill. As I said in my introduction, there are many aspects of the bill that are worthy of support. Other organisations and

groups, equally compassionate and equally charitable, also voiced concern about the impact of the bill, particularly on faith-based organisations and institutions. I want to acknowledge all of the parties who made those submissions.

With respect to that, I note that the Attorney tabled a letter that she sent to Reverend David Baker. That letter is dated today, 10 September. I repeat: the letter is dated today, 10 September—the day we are debating a bill that has been reviewed by the Queensland Human Rights Commissioner. It is a four-page, dense letter that deals with a number of matters including positive duty, harassment, vilification—that is, matters that were all raised in submissions that the combined churches and others made to the committee back in July. It has taken until now, 10 September 2024, for that response to be provided.

The date, the timing and the actions of this government speak for themselves: amendments moved by lunch on the day that the bill is to be passed and a letter to supposedly address reasonable concerns that have been raised in a sensible and considered fashion by reasonable people who hold genuine beliefs. Those concerns are being answered in this way. It is a disgrace. Members opposite know it is a disgrace and their communities will know it is a disgrace. Whether peoples' kids go to the local Catholic primary school, a Christian Schools Australia school or a mainstream religious school, they all know what this government is up to. The reason we know that is because they have told us that they know. We know that they do not like what is going on and no reasonable explanation has been given to deal with that.

A pattern of concern not properly addressed in the LNP's view and certainly not addressed in a letter sent in the dying days of debate on the bill emerged from the submissions. Concerns frequently raised related to the vilification provisions outlined in part 4 of the bill, relating to the positive duty provisions in chapter 5C, and those surrounding the definition of harassment on the basis of sex in part 3, division 2. In the short time I have, I want to highlight some of those major concerns. In essence, and as University of Queensland constitutional law professor Aroney said in his submission to the inquiry, three problems arise from the sections of the bill that go beyond the recommendations of the *Respect@Work* report. The concern to prohibit harassment on the basis of sex is an important focus of that report. However, by those terms, the report is specifically seeking to prevent discrimination against a woman for being a woman. Many of the submitters said that the bill goes well beyond that requirement.

Here are the problems. The first and core problem concerns the definition of harassment on the basis of sex in proposed section 120 of the bill. The definition consists of three elements. As Professor Aroney points out, there are issues in relation to each of those elements. Perhaps of most concern is the subjective nature of the test and the use of the word 'offended'. In Australian law, the only places where an 'offend' standard is imposed are the Tasmanian and the Northern Territory anti-discrimination acts and the Commonwealth Racial Discrimination Act. It is important to note that, in a number of cases, senior Australian judges have expressed serious concerns about laws that would render it unlawful to cause offence or to offend others. Therefore, simply causing offence or offending others may well be considered unlawful. International human rights law is careful to limit the scope of hate speech laws to conduct that positively incites individuals to acts of discrimination, hostility or violence. It does not refer or reference 'offend'. That is one problem.

The second problem relates to the positive duty to eliminate harassment on the basis of sex, and it is the requirement to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate harassment. I know the Attorney mentioned part of this in her earlier address to this place. These provisions, in our view, are open to an interpretation that an organisation must adjust its teaching and its practices concerning its beliefs about sexuality, sex and gender, and that could require an organisation to alter its beliefs and teachings which, again, contravenes some international requirements.

The third problem raised by Professor Aroney is the proposed vilification provisions in proposed sections 124C and 124D. Again, I note the Attorney mentioned both of these sections and, in particular, the provisions of 124C regarding hateful, reviling, seriously contemptuous or seriously ridiculing conduct.

In the statement of reservation, LNP members noted that the bill's amendments to the vilification provisions exceed the recommendations of the LASC report. We expressed concerns that proposed section 124C would alter the usual broad application of the objective test by shifting to a more subjective approach and exceeds the recommendations in that report. The proposed section defines a reasonable person as a person 'who has the same age, gender identity, impairment, race, religion, sex, sex characteristics or sexual orientation as the other person or members of the group'. Whilst at the surface

level this might appear to be an objective test by reference to the reasonable person, it narrows the definition of a reasonable person. It is not the reasonable person at large who has traditionally been described as the passenger on the second back seat of the Clapham bus—and in many other ways in Australian law that is a normal, ordinary, careful and thoughtful person in the Australian community; it is narrowing it down to a particular set of people, and that is the subjective part of it because it introduces those requirements of having the same age, gender, identity, impairment, race and other attributes that I described. It introduces a test that depends on a particular identity.

The shift to a subjective approach would open the provision up to diverse interpretations. For example, individuals have varying levels of sensitivity to offensive conduct and the interpretation of what constitutes vilification could differ widely, even if assessed by judging from a person or group who have that particular attribute. Proposed section 124C also references conduct that a reasonable person would consider hateful.

A number of organisations in their submissions raised concerns that hateful conduct can be interpreted differently from different perspectives, and this is particularly so given a reasonable person here is someone, again, with a particular protected attribute in question and not to the reasonable person in general. The government noted that this new harm-based provision has been formulated to represent the higher threshold of seriousness for the conduct to be captured under the provision—I note that the Attorney mentioned that—and that the drafting adopts a threshold recommended by the Victorian Legal and Social Issues Committee. It does not negate the fact that the provision is potentially unclear and that the government has not addressed stakeholders' concerns about the subjective use of the word 'hateful'. There has been no clear statement by the government about how it will ensure that the terminology will not be weaponised against religious and faith-based organisations.

Quite simply, if the government does not intend it to affect those organisations, it could easily have adopted the language of New South Wales—that is, by including a religious discussion or instruction purposes exemption in proposed section 124C(3), which is the exemption provision which, again, the Attorney referenced in her contribution to the debate. That provides that an exemption applies for 'a public act, done reasonably and in good faith, for academic, artistic, scientific, research ... or for other purposes in the public interest, including discussion or debate about and expositions of an act or matter'.

It would have been so simple to put it in there to address the concerns of faith-based organisations, if it were the government's intention to include a religious discussion or instruction purpose, but the government has chosen not to do so. The government could also address the subjective element in proposed section 124C(2), which is the reasonable person test, without attaching it to a particular identity and remove the simple reference to hatred, which does not appear in the *Respect@Work* report either.

There are other matters in relation to positive duty and the proposed implementation of recommendation 17 of the *Respect@Work* report, which recommends amending the Sex Discrimination Act at the Commonwealth level to introduce a positive duty on all employers to take reasonable care as far as possible. There are many differing stakeholder views on 'positive duty', and those concerns are covered in many of the submissions that were made.

One of those concerns is that the duty would force religious schools and organisations to have policies at odds with fundamental beliefs and doctrines, particularly on matters related to marriage, gender and sexuality. A fuller debate and discussion in relation to those matters would have, I think, reassured those organisations about the import and effectiveness of those provisions. Some of those religious organisations supported the implementation of a positive duty to allow for religious freedom which they argue is important in religious institutions like religious schools that must maintain their religious ethos. Both sides of the argument are taking place with respect to that. Both sides of the argument arguably have the same objective—that is, religious freedom. Further debate and clarity as to what the effects would be if a positive duty were implemented would be beneficial to all the parties. A simple solution would be for the bill to clarify that a positive duty does not prevent religious bodies and schools or others from teaching their beliefs. Again, the government has not taken this on board.

The LNP members have expressed their concerns in their statement of reservation. We have expressed concerns regarding the actions, conduct and words that are lawful or may otherwise give rise to litigation. There is currently uncertainty which poses challenges to those at all levels of society, including individuals, businesses and community organisations.

Others will cover the issue of equitable outcomes, which I note the Attorney has also addressed in her contribution. The subjective nature of equitable outcomes and the unknowability raise concerns. The legal ambiguity which may be created would make it difficult for individuals, businesses and courts to interpret and apply the law consistently. It is a pity that the government has made such a hash of this bill. Had it been more considered, less ideological and more in line with the original reports it purports to introduce, it would have led to better legislation, in the LNP's view.

In the short time left to me, I turn now to the criminal justice legislation bill, another very important piece of legislation. The bill implements the third major tranche of the legislative reforms arising from the recommendations made by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce in its two reports. The LNP has, of course, supported the work done by that taskforce and has supported the recommendations in those two reports; however, that does not mean it is uncritical of the way the government is implementing the changes that have been made.

The bill will implement the government's response to the taskforce recommendations relating to sexual violence and women and girls as accused persons and offenders. These are recommendations 42, 53, 54, 57, 60, 75, 79 and 149 of report two. It also introduces the standalone offence of sexual acts with a child aged 16 or 17 under one's care, supervision or authority and introduces a second limb to the existing course of conduct offence of repeated sexual conduct with a child.

It is intended that these amendments will provide a protective function for young people over the age of consent—that is, the age of 16—but under the age of 18. Recommendations 27 to 29 of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse included that states and territories should review any position of authority offences, such as what we are looking at today, applying in circumstances where the victim is 16 or 17 years of age and, if the offences require more than the existence of the relationship of authority—that is, that it is abused—amendments should be made so that the existence of the relationship is sufficient. It becomes a standalone matter. There is no further requirement that it be abuse; it is just the fact that there is a relationship that makes it the offence. As the Attorney has pointed out, all other Australian jurisdictions have criminalised this type of conduct. We support this move.

I note that QSAN support the bill, especially the provisions relating to the rights of special witnesses, the videorecording of evidence for reuse and expert evidence in sexual violence matters, and strongly support the tendency and coincidence amendments. The Queensland Indigenous Family Violence Legal Service similarly support the legislation, as do DV Connect. The QFCC support amendments to the inadmissibility of admissions made by prisoners in programs, the inclusion of the new offence of sexual acts with a child under one's care, the amendments to the Evidence Act and the extension of the duration of non-contact orders.

While there were objections raised by some submitters—notably the Law Society, which strongly opposes the new offence provisions—on balance, and subject to ongoing monitoring of its operation, the LNP accepts the proposed changes, as I indicated. Acknowledging that the bill does implement considered recommendations of the taskforce, it is still important to take note, we believe, of the very real concerns of Legal Aid Queensland, the Bar Association and the Law Society. Each of these organisations raised serious issues, particularly around the proposed changes to the Evidence Act and the admissibility of tendency and coincidence evidence as well as similar fact or propensity evidence. I know that my colleague the member for Currumbin has some very strong views in relation to the admission of similar fact and tendency evidence as well. She may wish to make a contribution about it.

As I have said a number of times in debate about changes to the evidence laws in Queensland, this is often a contested area and, as a field of law, can be quite complex and time consuming. Notwithstanding that, it needs to be carefully considered as there are real issues of prejudice to an accused that must be taken into account when considering the ease of admissibility of highly prejudicial material, which tendency and propensity evidence can often be. Having noted the submissions and the department's response, in our view this is an area that will need to be monitored to ensure it operates as intended.

I also note the amendments that the Attorney foreshadowed she will be moving which seek to clarify strangulation laws following a High Court decision that, if my memory serves me correctly, came down in December last year. I note the Attorney's reference of a review of the offence of strangulation to the Queensland Law Reform Commission to ensure it operates as intended.

Given the concerns raised above about the respect at work bill, the short time for consideration and debate in the public realm, its rushed and incomplete nature, especially around the *Building*

belonging measures, the amendments that have been introduced late in the consideration of this bill and the unwillingness of the government to consider some simple clarifying amendments, the LNP will not be supporting that bill. In respect of the criminal justice legislation bill, the LNP will not be opposing that bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Before calling the next speaker, I wish to advise the House that television pool cameras will be testing some new camera equipment during government business this afternoon. The equipment will not be recording any pictures or sound but will be testing the shot size of a new lens.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (4.12 pm): I rise to speak in the cognate debate on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee, in its report No. 13 of the 57th Parliament tabled in the Assembly on 2 August, has recommended to the Assembly that the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 be passed.

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. The committee also examined the bill for its compatibility with human rights in accordance with the Human Rights Act.

Discrimination and vilification have no place in a free, democratic society. Unfortunately, in some instances it is still the case that vulnerable groups within our community are confronted with barriers which prevent them fully taking part in society purely because they are identifiable as members of a particular group. A robust, workable anti-discrimination framework protects such groups and provides a process for recourse in the event of any contraventions.

This bill delivers reforms to the Queensland statutory anti-discrimination scheme—contained in the Anti-Discrimination Act—to reflect recommendations from various reports and to modernise the operation of the scheme. The bill proposes to implement recommendations from the Queensland Human Rights Commission's report titled *Building belonging: review of Queensland's Anti-Discrimination Act*, particularly in respect of expanding and updating the attributes protected from discrimination under the Anti-Discrimination Act and by introducing a positive duty to eliminate all forms of unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment, vilification and other associated objectionable conduct as far as possible.

In response to the findings of the *Respect@Work: national inquiry into sexual harassment in Australian workplaces* report, prepared by the Australian Human Rights Commission, the bill includes new prohibitions of harassment on the basis of sex and subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex. These reforms are supported by an extension to the time limit for making a complaint of unlawful sex-based harassment and expansion to the powers and functions of the Queensland Human Rights Commission to investigate those complaints and systemic issues of work related sex-based harassment. I am proud to be part of a government that seeks to strengthen protections for all workers, particularly those from diverse backgrounds.

Ms Christine Castley, Chief Executive Officer of Multicultural Australia, stated at the public hearing—

> We particularly support the clauses which introduce expanded and modernised protected attributes, including expanding the definition of 'race' to include immigration or migration stratus; the improved protections against vilification to include both an incitement and a harm-based test; and the introduction of a new positive duty to prevent discrimination before it happens.

I will now move on to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The Community Support and Services Committee, in its report, recommended that the bill be passed. When the bill was introduced by the Attorney-General, the Attorney stated—

> This bill further reflects the government's unwavering commitment to end all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in Queensland and to improve the experiences of women and girls across the criminal justice system.

The Attorney went on to state—

> This bill gives effect to nine taskforce recommendations, eight of which were made in the second taskforce report, *Hear her voice—Report 2: Women and girls' experiences across the criminal justice system*. This report was a continuation of the work of the taskforce and examined the barriers faced by Queensland women and girls accessing the criminal justice system, both as victims and as offenders. The report examined why women and girls withdraw complaints of sexual violence at almost every stage of the criminal justice system and contemplated how we can provide greater support to these brave victim-survivors who, by seeking to bring a perpetrator of violence to justice, play an important role in keeping our community safe. The taskforce was told that women and girls who have lived experience of the criminal justice system were angry, tired and wanted change. The

Miles government has heard these calls for change and this bill is a continuation on a path to improve the experiences of all victim-survivors of domestic, family and sexual violence.

I commend the bill to the House.

Ms CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (4.20 pm): I too would like to contribute to this cognate debate. I would like to put on the record though that 3¾ hours to debate two significant pieces of legislation, as well as amendments that have been circulated by the Attorney, is not adequate and flies in the face of what this parliament is set up to do, which is to be a place of robust debate and to have the time to carefully consider legislation and to make representations from stakeholders and the communities we represent.

I want to place on the record in particular the *Respect@Work* report and the work of Kate Jenkins in this space, particularly in relation to sexual harassment being a real issue that continues in workplaces all across our state and nation and the important role that a safe, inclusive and respectful workplace should have. I will leave any further comments though, as outlined by our shadow Attorney-General, in regard to the LNP's position on this bill and the way in which it has been made cognate.

I will move on to my portfolio area as the opposition spokesperson in relation to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024. The bill aims to improve the justice system response to domestic, family and sexual violence as a result of the recommendations made by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. We thank them for their work and for their advocacy for women, in particular, victim-survivors of sexual violence which this bill also aims to address.

The existing offence of repeat sexual conduct with a child will now include adults in positions of care or authority or supervision who engage in unlawful sexual behaviour with children aged 16 or 17 years. We note the amendments to the position of authority offences in regard to a health practitioner but also a residential care service and a person associated with a residential care service that provides accommodation where the child resides. The further clarity around those definitions is critical in terms of safeguards given that we have almost 2,000 children in residential care services in this state. That is an unprecedented number.

We also note the amendments regarding the new provisions concerning tendency evidence and coincidence evidence by ensuring they align with interstate laws. These changes have been advocated by many with lived experience of horrendous court experiences—in particular, victim-survivors of sexual violence who when in a courtroom relive their traumatic and violent experiences. Hopefully for them these amendments will go a long way. These amendments will allow for expert evidence to be given in criminal sexual offence trials to dispel what historically have been myths about the experience of a rape victim about their expected behaviour at the time of a criminal act or post a criminal act which many, particularly women, have endured for many, many decades.

However, what is a sad indictment on this government is that currently there are some 420 victims in Queensland, as reported by the *Australian* and the media over the past 24 hours, who have waited more than 12 months for a result from their rape kits—a backlog of current cases 20 times larger than Victoria. Victims of sexual assault are awaiting those results to see whether there is DNA evidence present. That is critical in the prosecution of any case.

Today we had the announcement by the LNP that, if elected in October, Dr Kirsty Wright will oversee the reform of the DNA lab. That goes to the heart of justice for sexual—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Pause the clock. Attorney-General, what is your point of order?

Mrs D'ATH: I appreciate the member's comments are important issues but they are not relevant to the bill. I ask the member to be brought back to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I am listening closely to the member's contribution. I am finding it relevant for the minute, but I will ask the member to speak to the long title of the bill.

Ms CAMM: We are debating the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. We are talking about evidence. We are talking about amendments. I think DNA evidence is critical when we are talking about reform. The government do not get to cherrypick what they want to own and what they want to disregard. This goes to the heart of victim-survivors. This

is the opportunity for members in this House to raise critical issues that go to the heart of our justice system which this government is failing.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Greenslopes, what is your point of order?

Mr KELLY: It may go to the heart of many things but it does not make it relevant to the current debate. I would argue that this is not relevant to the debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, I have been listening closely to the member. I have taken some advice and I find that the member is being relevant to the bill.

Ms CAMM: Once again, those opposite are forming a protection racket to stifle victim-survivors' voices in this House. It is shameful and it is disgraceful.

I would like to move on, if it is okay with government members, to speak about victim-survivors of strangulation. I point to the amendments outlined by the Attorney which have come about after the long-term advocacy, in particular, of the Red Rose Foundation—and I want to pay tribute to Betty Taylor from the Red Rose Foundation and her incoming CEO, Brian Sullivan. The Attorney pointed out that these amendments have come about on the basis of the Court of Appeal but also on the basis of stakeholder advocacy—in particular, the amendment and definition of 'choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting' for subsection (1). This has been called upon for years—years and years. In the final days of this Labor government, finally they have listened. It is the victims and it is the Red Rose Foundation that own this amendment, and I hope it goes a long way to ensuring those victim-survivors get justice.

I want to highlight the prevalence of strangulation offences that we are seeing and the unintended consequences that have occurred under this government's watch by not clearly defining strangulation. In particular, strangulation offences lodged in the Magistrates Court here in Brisbane have increased in the last 12 months. The number of defendants convicted of strangulation offences is not at a threshold that victim-survivors would expect. With offences lodged in the last 12 months across the state at 1,186 and those convicted with penalties imposed at 423, there is clearly a failing in the legislation because of the lack of clarity around the definition of 'choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting'. Why is this important? It is important because of the prevalence of these offences and it was highlighted by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce as critical that this amendment be made. I will certainly watch with anticipation how this plays out in further cases across the courts.

Once again, I outline that there has not been enough time or consultation. The government is rushing this through without giving the members of this House adequate opportunity to express our views in full on these two very complex bills—not to mention my time being cut down by those opposite. The LNP stands for victims and we will make Queensland safer when everyone gets to show Labor the door in '24.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Before calling the next speaker, I remind the House of those members on a warning. They are the members for Mermaid Beach, Bonney, Nanango, Callide and Maryborough.

Mr HUNT (Caloundra—ALP) (4.29 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the respect at work bill and the sexual violence bill. I will confine my remarks to the former rather than the latter to coincide with the report handed down by my own committee. I would like to thank my committee: the ever-patient Peter Russo, member for Toohey; the ever-dynamic Jonty Bush, member for Cooper; the ever-captivating Sandy Bolton, member for Noosa; the ever-affable Mark Boothman, member for Theodore; and the ever-deliberate Jon Krause, member for Scenic Rim. The secretariat played its usual role, oscillating somewhere between being indispensable and just plain fantastic, and I thank them once again for their efforts.

The Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee examined the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024. The primary objective of this bill is to promote respect at work and strengthen protections against vilification. The most significant changes proposed in the bill include amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 that would: prohibit sex-based harassment in workplaces and subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex; and impose a positive duty to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation. To that end, the committee has made just one recommendation: that the bill be passed.

In recent times the Australian Human Rights Commission conducted an inquiry into workplace sexual harassment in Australia. Its *Respect@Work* report, published in 2020, found that workplace

sexual harassment remained prevalent and that the current system for addressing sexual harassment was complex and confusing for victims and employers to understand. More recently in Queensland, in 2021 and in early 2022 our committee conducted the inquiry into serious vilification and hate crimes which it reported on in January 2022. Many of the committee's recommendations relating to legislative change were addressed in the Criminal Code (Serious Vilification and Hate Crimes) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023.

One of the primary objectives of the respect at work bill is to promote respect in workplaces across Queensland. To achieve this objective, the bill proposes to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act to: update its objectives; expand and update the attributes that it protects; clarify the kind of behaviour that it prohibits; create a new positive duty to prevent discrimination, sexual harassment and other behaviour prohibited by the Anti-Discrimination Act; provide the QHRC with strengthened powers to investigate and enforce compliance, including with the new positive duty; and make certain improvements to the complaints process, including in relation to representative complaints. The bill also proposes amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act relating to vilification.

It should be noted in relation to this bill that, while the Anti-Discrimination Act already prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex as well as sexual harassment, despite the existence of such prohibitions, the Australian Human Rights Commission found that sexual harassment remained widespread in workplaces across Australia. It suggested this was partly due to a disconnect between the existing prohibitions and the general public's understanding of them. To respond to this problem, the AHRC recommended the express prohibition of sex-based harassment and the creation or facilitating of an intimidating, hostile, humiliating or offensive environment on the basis of sex. In line with these recommendations, the bill proposes to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act to insert new prohibitions on such behaviour.

The bill proposes amending chapter 3 of the Anti-Discrimination Act to include a new prohibition of harassment on the basis of sex. This new prohibition would only apply in relation to work or work related areas. The bill provides that harassment on the basis of sex happens if a person: engages in unwelcome conduct of a demeaning nature in relation to another person; engages in the conduct on the basis of the sex of the person harassed; and engages in the conduct with the intention of offending, humiliating or intimidating the other person, or in circumstances where a reasonable person would have anticipated the possibility that the other person would be offended, humiliated or intimidated by the conduct.

This will capture conduct which is done on the basis of: the other person's sex; or a characteristic that a person of the other person's sex generally has; or a characteristic that is often imputed to a person of the other person's sex; or the sex the other person is presumed to have, or to have had at any time, by the person engaging in the conduct—or, according to the great sage of Disney and Bambi's friend Thumper, 'If you can't say something nice, don't say nuthin' at all.' This is not to diminish this bill in any way, but it is not a bad rule of thumb in any case.

The bill also proposes inserting a new chapter 5C into the Anti-Discrimination Act which will establish a positive duty to 'eliminate, so far as possible, discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and certain other objectionable conduct'. The new positive duty would apply to 'all persons (including individuals, corporations and bodies politic, including the state) who under chapters 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the AD Act, must not engage in discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and other objectionable conduct'. In practice, the positive duty will mean that people subject to it will be required to act proactively—and that is the key—to prevent prohibited conduct rather than merely waiting for complaints to be made. The explanatory notes state that the kinds of action that will be required will include—

- ensuring there are organisational policies in place that address the importance of respectful behaviour …
- ensuring easily accessible information is available;
- conducting workplace surveys to measure knowledge and awareness of unlawful conduct like discrimination ...
- engaging in informal or formal disciplinary discussions with members of the organisation who are displaying conduct that may be disrespectful ... and
- managers and people in positions of leadership clearly and regularly articulating expectations of respectful behaviour.

None of those are untoward or even onerous for any organisation. While most stakeholders were supportive of the bill and its objectives, it is fair to say that some most certainly were not. Some faith-based organisations had concerns with the bill that seemed slightly out of step with the potential scope of the bill. While the Australian Muslim Advocacy Network suggested that, by improving

protections against discrimination, the bill had the potential to promote freedom of religion, this was not typical of the feedback from faith-based submitters.

I will not name the individual institution concerned, but one contended that the new prohibition on sex-based harassment and discrimination, as well as the new positive duty to prevent discrimination, would place a disproportionate and unreasonable burden on religious bodies, especially faith-based schools. The same submitter seemed to suggest that Christian groups would be forced underground if this bill were passed and that the very future of the Christian faith would be in jeopardy. For my part, I am very confident that Christianity in Queensland will survive this bill without having to resort to meeting in caves and drawing the shibboleth sign of the fish in the dirt to secretly identify themselves as Christian.

Mercifully, DJAG was able to advise that, in practice, the impact of the new prohibitions on workplaces, including religious schools, will be limited given the existence of equivalent prohibitions in federal legislation already. For example, workplaces are already subject to an equivalent prohibition on hostile work environments under section 28M of the Sex Discrimination Act.

I am going to run out of time and be beaten by the clock, so I will simply say that no-one can argue that this is not a good outcome for Queensland.

Mr McDonald: You can extend the time.

Mr HUNT: Thanks, member for Lockyer, but I will give that a miss. On that basis, I commend the bill to the House.

Mr KRAUSE (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.39 pm): I rise to make some comments on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill as part of this cognate debate today. I say first up that this bill should be rejected because it creates great uncertainty about freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of religion, and creates a test for vilification that will essentially mean anybody who feels they have been offended could take legal action against other people, and it imposes on a range of parties the positive obligation, the bounds of which are not set out in law but are subject to 'guidelines' to be set by the Human Rights Commission.

Under this Labor government, it is clear that this bill is just the beginning of changes to the anti-discrimination law in Queensland. That much was made clear by the Queensland Human Rights Commission when they appeared before the committee, along with a host of other stakeholders who urged the government to go further and enact even deeper activist changes to these laws. There is only one way to stop that agenda being pursued by the Labor government, starting with this bill, but with more to come in the future, and that is to vote for the LNP and to show Labor the door in October 2024.

I opposed the Queensland Human Rights Commission when it was created by Labor in the past and I remain opposed to it now. I warned when it was created that it would become an alternative forum for arguments about the balancing of competing rights when it should be this parliament that has such debates.

The bill provides the Human Rights Commission with powers to investigate individuals and workplaces for compliance with a positive duty being imposed by this bill, even without a complaint being made by anybody that a party is breaching the law. This is a major expansion of power for that unelected commission that has very little oversight and no accountability to the public. It could, for example, investigate an entity for failing to take reasonable steps to ensure 'equitable outcomes' in their employment policies, hypothetically, on the basis that not enough people of a particular minority group are being employed by that entity.

Putting aside the uncertainty about what 'equitable outcomes' actually means, this provision creates potential for the Human Rights Commission to effectively become the woke police, by either investigating or carrying the threat of investigating businesses who, in their view, are not doing enough to ensure 'equitable outcomes', a term that is not defined and which the department was not able to really define in the committee process.

I say 'in their view'—in the view of the Human Rights Commission—because the bill provides the Human Rights Commission with the ability to issue guidelines for how parties are to comply with their positive duties, and these will, in reality, become not guidelines but rules for how compliance will be met. Fail to meet the so-called guidelines and you could be investigated by the Human Rights Commission. They will be rule-maker, investigator and prosecutor under these provisions. This extension of the power of the Human Rights Commission is just one reason why this bill should be rejected.

However, the uncertainty created by various other provisions is a further major reason the bill should fail. Part 2 of the bill contains significant departures from Commonwealth legislation, recommendations made by the Australian Human Rights Commission and also recommendations made by the former Legal Affairs and Safety Committee. These provisions will give rise to substantial uncertainty about what actions, conducts and words are unlawful, and give rise to litigation against individuals, businesses and community organisations through no fault of their own.

The uncertainty begins with clause 6, which would amend the object of the Anti-Discrimination Act by including, alongside the objective and longstanding notion of 'equality of opportunity for everyone'—and that is an objective notion—the subjective notion of equitable outcomes. It is undefined, but the notion is added by the bill to the purpose of every distinct provision aimed at preventing discrimination. Departmental representatives could not precisely and concisely explain to the committee what this term means. When asked what an equitable outcome means, a representative of the department said—

Equitable outcomes is where everyone is equal under the law.

Obviously, I immediately thought that this means equal opportunity, which is already the law in Queensland, so I queried again—

Equal opportunity?

The reply was—

It is more than equal opportunity.

Again I queried—

So it is more than equal opportunity?

The reply which came out next really does not shed a great deal of light on the matter, because in the end the answer was quite circular. It was—

It is more than equal opportunity, yes. Everyone has the same opportunity, but it does not recognise that some people have attributes where they might have been subject to systemic disadvantage and discrimination, so they do not start from the same place, and sometimes they need other measures, including education, for example, from the Queensland Human Rights Commission, to address and raise community understanding about that disadvantage so that you can have equitable outcomes.

Still, there was no real outline of what equitable outcomes are, except that we need to have them. That is because the definition is subjective. It can mean different things to different people. The comments from the department clearly show that the door is opened to social engineering projects, in this case through the state backed Queensland Human Rights Commission. The uncertainty of this term creates a level of uncertainty and unknowability about the extent of this legislation. People will simply not know what the bounds of the law are. Worse than that, it arms the Human Rights Commission and the government with the tools to determine what version of equitable outcomes is the so-called correct one, the politically correct one, what outcomes of anti-discrimination law are the right ones, even though in society many of these issues have been and will continue to be hotly contested debates—for this place, not for the commission.

The answer also alarmingly shows that it is the view of the department that people require education from the Queensland Human Rights Commission about these matters, a most insulting thing to suggest to Queenslanders. It also lays bare the power being given to the QHRC to determine what is going to fly in terms of 'equitable outcomes' and the concept of discrimination and the positive duty to prevent discrimination.

In relation to the bill's amendments to the vilification provisions, they exceed in significant respects the recommendations of the LASC. Proposed section 124C manipulates the objective test by confining the question of whether something is hateful, reviling, seriously contemptuous or seriously ridiculing to a person or group with a protected attribute to whether a 'reasonable person' with that protected attribute would find it so. The question should be considered by asking how a 'reasonable person' in the community at large considers such conduct under section 124C. Section 124D introduces an offence for conduct 'likely to incite'. This term is uncertain. What is likely to incite for one person will not incite at all for somebody else. This term is so prone to different interpretations by different people. It is not an objective test and nor does it create a factual question at law. It creates significant uncertainty about the bounds of that provision in contrast to the existing provision.

The existing provision, it seems, is already generating some ridiculous outcomes because of the Human Rights Commission. I highlight today reports that Dave Pellowe, from an organisation called

Church and State Ministries, has had a complaint made against him and accepted by the QHRC because he pointed out to another person the difference between Aboriginal traditional religion and Christianity. It is reported that this is alleged to be racial humiliation and vilification. Since when is it unlawful? Since when is someone taken to the Human Rights Commission for expressing support for the essential tenets of their religion and pointing out differences between that and others? Why should a person of faith answer to a complaint of vilification simply for professing Christianity? This is an alarming development under the present vilification laws as overseen by the Human Rights Commission. There is only one way to stop this, and that is to vote to show Labor the door in 2024.

If the bill is enacted and the test of what is vilification is watered down even further to the point where anyone who finds something personally insulting or humiliating can make a claim against a person at the QHRC, what impact does that have on people engaging in religious discussion? What impact does that have on a political discussion? It will lead to a curtailing of all of these things by self-censorship or by the threat of people taking you to the Human Rights Commission because they feel offended by something you have said. People will engage in self-censorship or be subject to the enforcement of 'guidelines' from the Human Rights Commission.

The bill does not expressly limit these freedoms, but these limitations are cloaked in the threat of confusing, subjective and ambiguous provisions being enforced to litigate against parties by the Human Rights Commission or other parties.

I table a news report in relation to that matter I spoke about in relation to Mr Pellowe.

Tabled paper: Article from skynews.com.au, dated 16 August 2024, titled 'Christian preacher to be dragged before Qld Human Rights Commission over opposition to Welcome to Country ceremony' [1776].

It is the role of parliament to state with certainty what the law is, and this bill is not doing that. We should not be providing the Human Rights Commission the role to play as a quasi-legislator as well as a quasi-judicial function. The impact of uncertainty is that parties may face legal action, or complaints made against them to a state-run body, for allegedly failing to comply with the law that it is impossible to know the bounds of. The only people empowered by this bill are the QHRC. Uncertain laws are bad laws, and this is a bad law when it comes to upholding those freedoms in Queensland that we should all treasure very dearly. It should be rejected.

Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (4.49 pm): Sorry, I was a little bit slow to rise there as I was a bit taken aback by the previous speaker's sweeping criticisms of the Queensland Human Rights Commission. I think certainly people in my electorate will be very interested to look at *Hansard* today at 4.40 pm to review those comments, and I will be directing them to those comments.

I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill and the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill. I will start my contribution on the criminal justice part of this cognate debate. The objective of the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is to implement the third major suite of legislative reforms that arise from the recommendations that were made by Queensland's Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce across its two reports.

The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce has absolutely advanced the discussion of women's experiences in the criminal justice system in Queensland. As this is the last speech I will give on a bill in this term of parliament, I want to acknowledge what an important piece of work this was for Queensland. I would not go a week without referencing that work in my electorate or with stakeholders in terms of how significant that was for women interacting with the criminal justice system. I thank the Attorney-General and the Minister for Health for their work on this groundbreaking reform.

This bill represents the Queensland government's third suite of legislative reforms in response to those recommendations. It gives effect to nine taskforce recommendations. This report was a continuation of the work of the taskforce, which examined the barriers faced by Queensland women and girls in accessing the criminal justice system—both as victims and as offenders. The report recognised the difficulty that women and girls face in the system—that they often withdraw complaints of sexual violence at almost every stage of the criminal justice system. The report considered how to provide greater support to victim-survivors who not only have a right to see justice served but also play a really key role in keeping our community safe when they come forward to report these crimes.

The taskforce was told that women and girls who have lived experience of the system were, quite frankly, exhausted from trying to interact with it. They were often being retraumatised, they felt violated, they were angry and they wanted change. This government has listened and this bill is represents

continuation along a path to improve the experiences of all victim-survivors of domestic, family and sexual violence.

The bill proposes a number of key reforms including: to create a new position-of-authority offence; to improve protections to support special witnesses through the court process; to extend the maximum duration of non-contact orders; to codify the law as it relates to the admissibility of tendency evidence and coincidence evidence; to expand the scope for the admission of expert evidence; to remove any doubt that participation in a program while on remand in custody cannot be used in evidence in proceedings relating to the offence for which the person has been charged; to establish a statutory review; and to clarify the law as it relates to the admissibility of recorded statements, in particular committal proceedings relating to domestic and family violence offences. Amendments moved during consideration in detail will clarify the scope of the offence of choking, suffocation and strangulation in a domestic setting to clarify the intention to capture acts that prohibit either the oxygen or the blood flow of the victim.

This cognate debate also includes the respect at work bill, which proposes to reform Queensland's statutory anti-discrimination scheme to reflect recommendations from various reports including the Queensland Human Rights Commission's *Building belonging* report and the earlier report from our parliamentary Legal Affairs and Safety Committee. This bill will expand and update the attributes protected from discrimination under the Anti-Discrimination Act. This bill will introduce a positive duty to eliminate all forms of unlawful discrimination, sexual harassment, vilification and other associated objectionable conduct as far as possible.

The Queensland that I know and love and want to contribute to is one that is greater through our difference. It is a Queensland that celebrates identity and an individual's or a collective's rights to express that identity. Actions that create stigma or shame, hostility and hate have no place in the Queensland that I want for our future, so I am very proud to have been part of the committee that scrutinised this bill.

This bill also responds to the findings of the *Respect@Work: national inquiry into sexual harassment in Australian workplaces* report, prepared by the Australian Human Rights Commission. I have spoken to many vulnerable workers—many women, many young people and migrants—who have been subjected to workplace cultures that have not met the threshold of direct discrimination but have absolutely been hostile and psychologically unsafe. I am particularly supportive of the proposal to introduce new prohibitions against subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex. Amendments are being moved during consideration in detail that will respond to some of the recommendations that were made across the committee reports, including to clarify the availability of existing protections in the Anti-Discrimination Act for attributes other than sex with respect to subjecting a person to a hostile work environment and harassment. The amendments will create a single time limit for bringing a complaint to within two years of an alleged contravention of the act rather than having two separate complaint time limits. It will also provide additional powers to the Queensland Human Rights Commission including powers to conduct investigations and to publish reports.

Finally, as this is the last bill I am speaking on in this term of government, I want to thank my committee colleagues. On most occasions I think we have worked really well as a team. We have challenged each other, we have found common ground and, ultimately, I think we have completed some great work together. I thank them. I particularly acknowledge the member for Caloundra, Jason Hunt, who in every speech finds something nice to say about each one of us. His comments are always very creative and new. I do not know how he comes up with them all but he has done a fantastic job—even today. He has consistently sung our praises now for four years. He is like that in the committee process also. I want to thank our chair, the member for Toohey, who has a strong dedication to preserving and upholding human rights in Queensland. Both of these members have become great allies and I thank them for their friendship.

Both of these bills advance the safety, the rights and the dignity of vulnerable Queenslanders. They are important bills to debate and to progress. I am proud to support them. I commend the bills to the House.

Debate, on motion of Ms Bush, adjourned.

CRIME AND CORRUPTION (REPORTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.56 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Crime and Corruption Act 2001 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill 2024 [1777].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill 2024, explanatory notes [1778].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill 2024, statement of compatibility with human rights [1779].

Today I am pleased to introduce the Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill 2024, which establishes new reporting and public statement-making powers for the Crime and Corruption Commission on corruption matters. In introducing the bill, I once again acknowledge the careful and comprehensive review that was undertaken by the Hon. Catherine Holmes AC, SC. Undoubtedly, Ms Holmes' review represents some of the most in-depth scholarship that has been undertaken on public reporting by integrity bodies to date. As the Holmes report uncovered, while there is a lot of work that simply asserts the principle that public reporting is critical for enhancing public sector integrity and the work of anti-corruption agencies, there is a corresponding lack of work considering the specific effects of public reporting or the value of different forms of reporting.

The Holmes report arguably goes a long way towards filling this gap. It delves into how and when reporting by integrity bodies is most likely to be effective in achieving important objectives. Indeed, the Holmes review forensically considered all sides of what reporting in the public interest about corruption means. It includes the important considerations of transparency and confidence in the CCC and our public institutions which weigh in favour of reporting but also the rights of individuals and the harm that public exposure can have, particularly where corruption allegations or investigations ultimately fail to come up to proof.

The harm that can be occasioned to individuals is something that I spoke about at length in the chamber during the last sitting. This is because it is important, not only to the individuals whose lives and reputations are involved but also to the CCC itself. As the state's most powerful integrity body, the CCC's conduct in the treatment of individuals who may be subject to its extraordinary powers must be beyond reproach. Where it is not, public confidence may be irreparably lost. It goes without saying that it is parliament's job to make the laws to determine the scope of the CCC's powers, including its powers to publicly report. Sometimes the issues facing legislators are such that, because of their complexity, independent and expert advice is warranted.

I am not insensitive to the time that has elapsed since the High Court handed down its consequential decision in CCC v Carne. In that case, the High Court held that there was no alternative source of power to make a report on a corruption complaint other than for the limited purpose of giving a report to particular entities, including prosecuting authorities, for the purpose of those entities deciding whether or not prosecution proceedings or disciplinary action was warranted. The imperative to fix this situation was clear and the calls to do so were also loud and clear. 'A simple fix', many said, was all it would take. The government decided to take a prudent step back and properly consider the High Court decision, the CCC's past approach to public reporting and different viewpoints on the topic. Ultimately, it was this government's view that addressing the issue of public reporting by the CCC was too important to be rushed and warranted independent and expert advice. Ms Holmes was appointed in March this year to conduct this significant piece of work and provided her report to government on 20 May 2024. The government has taken just over three months to properly consider the report's findings and recommendations and how best to translate these into substantive legislative provisions.

The intervening period since the High Court's critical decision has allowed the development of a set of laws that establish clear parameters for CCC reporting and public statements that are clear, balanced and, above all, in the public interest. In line with the Holmes report, the bill applies a number of important limitations and safeguards to the new powers. First and foremost is the requirement that the CCC be satisfied that the preparation or publication of a report, or the making of a public statement is in the public interest. The test requires that consideration be given to a range of specific factors, including the need for accountability in government and the public sector and the human rights of persons who may be identified in a report, in particular, their right to privacy and reputation, a fair hearing and the presumption of innocence.

Before a report or statement is released, any person who is identified in that report or statement must be given a draft of the report or statement and the opportunity to make submissions on it. Any submissions made must be fairly stated in the report. Where a report includes adverse comment or

opinion about a person or recommendations based on their conduct, the bill ensures that the evidence upon which these aspects of the report were based is also provided to them if this evidence is not already included in the report. Where the need to avoid including confidential information means it is not possible to provide this evidence in full, then the substance of the evidence must be provided to the person. In this way the bill ensures procedural fairness is afforded as fully as the circumstances allow.

I turn now to the specifics of the kinds of reports that the bill will empower the CCC to prepare. The first is a corruption investigation report. This report is prepared in the exercise of the CCC's corruption functions. A corruption investigation report, without limiting the way in which the CCC may perform its corruption functions under the Crime and Corruption Act, provides one way in which the CCC may choose to provide advice and recommendations to units of public administration in relation to completed corruption investigations. While the Holmes report recommended a number of separate report types for reporting on corruption investigations, the CCC raised concerns about the complexity this would present for them, particularly having regard to the complexity inherent in corruption investigations, which often involve multiple subjects and individuals. The government has taken on board this feedback by creating a single power to report on a completed corruption investigation. However, the protections inherent in the Holmes report recommendations are retained.

The CCC can only prepare a report on a completed corruption investigation. This is an important protection. The Holmes report observes—

Public confidence, indeed, is likely to be damaged if a report is prematurely made on an investigation which comes to nothing. Nor is it clear why reporting on an incomplete investigation is likely to be educative or provide a deterrent—again, it may in fact be counter-productive if the premise of the report proves to be unfounded—or why those results cannot be achieved at the conclusion of the investigation.

This does not mean that the CCC will have no way for important information to be made public before this point. The bill, in line with the Holmes report recommendations, gives the CCC the power to make public statements about corruption complaints or corruption investigations for specific purposes. For example, it may be necessary in exceptional circumstances to address public misconceptions about a person. The bill provides the CCC with the necessary flexibility to do this. Other important protections relate to the identification of investigated persons, who generally may only be identified where corrupt conduct is made out via processes independent of the CCC. This includes situations where the person is convicted of a corruption offence, the subject of a corrupt conduct finding before the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal or the subject of serious disciplinary action. This represents an appropriate balance between the individual's right to reputation and privacy and the public's right to know about important corruption matters.

It also means that court and disciplinary processes will be concluded, subject to appeal rights, and therefore the risk of prejudicing ongoing proceedings is also diminished. Any limitation this may impose on the CCC in respect of its ability to tell the public sector and the general public about significant corruption risks is entirely consistent with the CCC's existing role under the Crime and Corruption Act. The CCC was not established, and has no power, to make findings of corrupt conduct. This is clear and was a point emphasised by the Holmes report. The report states—

The Commission's corruption functions do not encompass formulating or expressing opinions on conduct which, while it might be reprehensible, is not corrupt and has no connection to corruption.

I note some concerns have been raised regarding the limiting of the CCC's ability to make adverse or negative comments against individuals not the subject of a serious corrupt conduct finding. However, this approach is broadly consistent with other jurisdictions, though direct comparison is difficult due to differing purposes of each jurisdiction's corruption body. What is clear is that other jurisdictions do not give their corruption bodies an unfettered discretionary power to make adverse comments about any individual.

Further, in drawing from the decision of the Court of Appeal in Carne v CCC, the Holmes report highlights that the CCC's relevant corruption function does not imply a function of doing 'whatever it believes would be likely to promote a standard of conduct to be expected of senior public servants and public officials, beyond raising those standards above a level at which conduct is corrupt'. Instead, the CCC is established, first and foremost, as a standing commission, set up with investigative powers, not ordinarily available to the police service, to enable it to effectively investigate major crime and cases of corrupt conduct and help increase the capacity of units of public administration to deal with corruption. It also has an important corruption prevention function, which I will touch on later.

Before moving on from the serious corrupt conduct threshold established by the bill as a basis for the identification of investigated persons, I note that the bill includes amendments to section 50 of

the Crime and Corruption Act to clarify the definition of a prescribed person for the purposes of QCAT exercising its original jurisdiction to make corrupt conduct findings. These amendments are designed to ensure that all persons who hold an appointment in a unit of public administration, with the exception of elected office holders, who I will come to in a moment, can properly fall within QCAT's jurisdiction.

In line with the Holmes report, the bill allows elected office holders to be identified as an investigated person even where they are not convicted of a corruption offence. The Holmes report highlighted a number of reasons for this. Elected office holders are of a different character who, by virtue of their position, have a greater expectation of public scrutiny. As stated by the Holmes report—

> Where there are live, substantial and serious questions about the conduct of a member of Parliament or local government, the public interest may require making relevant evidence known to the public.

However, the identification of elected officials in a corruption investigation report is subject to an important caveat, as described by the Holmes report—

> Such a report should not, however, be the occasion for criticism or commentary by the Commission. The reporting should be purely factual and neutral. If the conduct in question is particularly blameworthy, one can be confident members of opposing parties and the media will make that clear.

Contrary to some suggestions, the bill does not institute a blanket prohibition on the CCC criticising politicians—where an elected office holder is convicted of a corruption offence, the bill allows the CCC to treat the official like all other investigated persons in this position and make adverse comments or opinions, or recommendations based on their conduct, as appropriate. Separate to the power to prepare a corruption investigation report, the bill gives the CCC the power to prepare a corruption prevention report. Such a report may include details of a completed corruption investigation and may be used by the CCC to make recommendations to a unit of public administration on the investigation. In recommending the power to prepare such a report, the Holmes report observed—

> It can be accepted that there is a role for reporting publicly after an investigation which has not resulted in any action against an individual, in the exercise of the prevention function insofar as it concerns corruption. Such a report may illustrate a corruption risk or make recommendations to avoid such a risk, or both, and that may involve including some investigation detail.

This kind of report is subject to limitations in line with its prevention focus, including that only recommendations made in general terms may be included in the report.

While these recommendations may have regard to the conduct of investigated individuals, they must not be directed towards them. Importantly, the bill provides greater independence to the CCC in tabling reports by allowing the CCC to give a corruption investigation report or corruption prevention report directly to the Speaker for this purpose. An express power to publish a report without the need to also table the report is also included. As explained in the Holmes report, this option will ensure that the CCC can tailor the impacts on privacy where publication to the world at large is not necessary to achieve the purposes of the report.

I turn now to the issue of the CCC's past reports and statements. The CCC has made it clear that it seeks retrospective validation of all past reports and statements that have been prepared. The government cannot support this approach. While many of the CCC's previous reports and statements are clearly of great value, a blanket validation would amount to an effective endorsement of past wrongs occasioned by the CCC in circumstances where some individuals have suffered real and long-lasting harm. To label these actions as valid or just is to diminish the negative impacts that some past reports and statements have had.

The CCC's past actions in this regard were done in purported compliance with the Crime and Corruption Act and were undoubtedly well intentioned. However, it does not necessarily follow that we now need to go back in time and say that making these reports was right all along. It is important to both own and learn from our mistakes. However, the government understands the CCC's perspective and, as noted by Ms Holmes in her report, there are factors weighing in its favour. Ms Holmes ultimately recommended, of course, that only past reports and statements conforming to the new reporting requirements should be retrospectively validated.

What is clear—and we agree with the CCC's views in this regard—is that finality and clarity are needed in relation to liability for past reports and statements. That is why the bill I introduce today does depart from the Holmes report on this issue. The bill includes provision to extinguish civil liability in respect of the preparation and publication of past reports and the making of public statements involving corruption matters or investigations. This provision is limited in scope to actions prior to the High Court's decision and it does not interfere with any pending or concluded litigation. It applies simply to actions that were undertaken in good faith and without gross negligence to protect the CCC, and by extension

the state, from civil liability arising from the preparation or publication of past corruption reports or public statements.

To conclude, this is a strong bill and it is a fair bill which has been drafted having regard to aspects of the CCC's feedback and the recommendations and instructive observations of the Holmes report. The bill sets important and clear limits, on the face of the Crime and Corruption Act, on the incursion of fundamental human rights where previously there were none. I acknowledge that the new framework may require a little more work on the part of the CCC about when and how to report on corruption matters, but this is entirely appropriate and reasonable. The bill gets the balance right. It has regard to all of the competing tensions and interests and puts forward a nuanced and considered framework to enable the CCC to report and make statements on corruption investigations. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (5.12 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

In division—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I am not sure what is worse—that shirt or the fact that you did not know what the tackle count was.

Government members interjected.

Mr MANDER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Am I allowed to ask you to withdraw?

Mr SPEAKER: You can ask.

AYES, 51:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Rourke, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 33—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Zanow.

KAP, 4—Andrew, Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pair: Lauga, Perrett.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee

Mr SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee.

MOTION

Order of Business

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.18 pm): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

Mr SPEAKER: Is leave granted? Leave is granted.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I have already agreed that leave was granted.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I am sorry, but was that the member for Bonney who called that or was it the member for Glass House? Member for Glass House, there was no audible negative until the—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I certainly did not hear it.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House.

Mr de BRENNI: I move—

That so much of the standing and sessional orders be suspended to postpone general business order of the day No. 1 until such time as the Crime and Corruption (Reporting) Amendment Bill is debated.

The motion before the House is procedural in nature. It deals with the order of general business on the *Notice Paper* and in particular general business order of the day No. 1, which is the Crime and Corruption Amendment Bill, which was introduced by the member for Clayfield and sent to the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee for its review. I note that the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee recommended that the bill not be passed and it is a matter of public record, particularly from contributions during the last sitting week, that the majority of this chamber would not support that bill in its current form.

The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice has introduced legislation today in respect of the Crime and Corruption Commission's functions. In particular, the legislation deals with the reporting functions and powers of the Crime and Corruption Commission. There is no secret that the bill introduced by the government today deals with the matters canvassed in the member for Clayfield's bill—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Kawana, you will cease your interjections. You know full well that you direct your comments through the chair or you make no interjection at all.

Mr de BRENNI: There is no secret that the bill introduced by the government today deals with the matters canvassed in the member for Clayfield's bill, which I note is the only private member's bill introduced by the LNP opposition during this session of parliament—the most well resourced opposition in the country and just one bill. I can see members of the Katter party who have been extolling their efforts in bringing 11 bills into this House.

The subject matter of both bills is very complex. The policy is not simple and the drafting of legislation is not simple either. I am advised that the head of the Law Society said on ABC Radio in August—

The Law Society's long-held view in relation to this is it is not legislation that should be rushed. This is legislation that needs to be subject to proper scrutiny through the committee process, scrutiny by the public and rushing legislation through does not help anyone.

Subjecting these bills to scrutiny through the committee process is exactly what the government is doing. It is not only the Law Society. The member for Clayfield himself fired off a number of tweets, which I table, that state—

It can't be overstated what a serious breach of integrity it would be for Crime and Corruption Commission Laws to be rammed through Parliament, without a Committee process and community consultation…

Tabled paper: Extract from social media, dated 24 June 2024, featuring posts by the member for Clayfield, Mr Tim Nicholls MP [1780].

While the government notes the views of the CCC and its current leadership, I am advised that during estimates the current chairperson of the CCC in relation to the new laws stated, inter alia—

I was heartened to hear the Premier say that because certainly that was the first indication that I had received, even indirectly, that any proposed amendments following on from the review would be the subject of a committee process.

He said—

Having said that, I would much prefer that there be time taken to consider these matters very carefully if what the government proposes to do is to introduce amendments consistent with the review's recommendations.

While I note that the CCC does support the member for Clayfield's bill, I am advised that the CCC chair at estimates said, amongst other things, in a range of comments—

As I indicated to the committee considering that bill, there are certainly areas that could be improved in relation to the bill.

It is therefore prudent that legislation be reviewed by a parliamentary committee and then debated in conjunction with the private member's bill before the House on the same subject matter. This will ensure the best possible outcome for the people of Queensland and the Crime and Corruption Commission as a body.

Mr Lister interjected.

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

Mr de BRENNI: It will allow us to identify the improvements in the private member's bill extolled by the CCC and it will respond to the Queensland Law Society's urging for an unhurried approach to legislating on this issue.

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (5.23 pm): I did not think those opposite could get any lower when it comes to abusing the democratic institution of parliament. This is a gag of the most horrific and offensive order. All of what the Leader of the House has said has already occurred. The private member's bill has been on the *Notice Paper* for months. It has gone through committee, as the Leader of the House suddenly determines this bill should. All this motion achieves, and the Leader of the House knows it, is to gag the opposition's private member's bill. This will not be debated this term of parliament, which is exactly what those opposite wanted because they want to protect their mate Jackie Trad. This is a protection racket of the highest order and those opposite should hang their heads in shame at what they have done to this chamber. This is a new low in the parliament of Queensland across its entire 100-plus year history. We will not support it, not for one moment.

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

In division—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will remind the House that standing orders still apply during the ringing of the bells and during divisions.

AYES, 49:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Rourke, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 33—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Zanow.

KAP, 4—Andrew, Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pair: Lauga, Perrett.

Resolved in the affirmative.

EDUCATION (GENERAL PROVISIONS) (HELPING FAMILIES WITH SCHOOL COSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 11 October 2023 (see p. 2924).

Second Reading

Dr MacMAHON (South Brisbane—Grn) (5.30 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill to fully fund state schools in Queensland will now get debated in the nick of time. The Labor government has an opportunity now to lock in place full funding for state schools before the election. I want to thank the parents, teachers, P&C groups, community service organisations, unions and everyday Queenslanders who made submissions on the committee inquiry into this bill, including West End State School P&C and the Buranda State School P&C, two of the incredible state schools in South Brisbane.

This was the first inquiry of its kind this state has had on the issue of state school funding in Queensland. State schools in Queensland are chronically underfunded. The committee report sets this funding out in black and white—

It is anticipated that Queensland's state schools will receive 90.5 per cent of SRS funding in 2024

Not 100 per cent but 90.5 per cent! That is what the Labor government thinks of Queensland state schools.

I say to those people who made submissions that your extensive knowledge and firsthand experience of underfunding in our state schools was invaluable. Because of you, the committee was able to hear directly from families and P&Cs about the impacts that current underfunding is having, including the enormous financial hardship on families, teachers' worsening conditions, the huge out-of-pocket costs that teachers incur so that their students do not go without and the reliance on P&C groups to fundraise to finance essentials for schools. Despite hearing about those concerns, particularly the costs associated with out-of-pocket expenses for Queensland families, the committee has recommended that the bill, which is designed to ensure that state schools are fully funded and genuinely free, not be passed. The committee has not recommended that the parliament undertake any alternative investigation or efforts to increase school funding.

I want to paint a picture of the values and priorities of this Labor government. Just next door, the Star Entertainment Group has been allowed to build a gigantic casino on parliament's doorstep. Due to money laundering, links to organised crime and fraud, Star has been found unsuitable to hold a casino licence in New South Wales. In 2022, the Gotterson inquiry found Star unfit to hold a casino licence in Queensland. However, last week the Premier took it upon himself to give Star a tax break. Star has been given a 99-year lease on public land. They have been allowed to build a bridge across the river that deposits people directly into the restaurant and retail precinct of the casino. Therefore, you can be a fraudulent, underhanded mega company and you will get the red carpet treatment from this Labor government—you will get a priority development area to bypass planning laws and you will get a tax deferral. However, if you are a state school—too bad. This Labor government has said, 'Sorry, we don't have the money to spare to make sure you are fully funded.' Instead, state schools are underfunded by $1.7 billion every year.

State schools go without the resources they need. Teachers are worked to the bone in the middle of a teacher shortage. If new class reader books are needed to teach kids to read or if repairs are needed to a crumbling toilet block then it is left to parents, staff and the P&Cs to run raffles or Father's Day stalls or sell a few sausages on election day in order to pay for the things that state school kids need. This is Queensland: it is one rule for the big corporations and LNP and Labor donors; it is another for regular people.

The state and federal governments are meant to be negotiating new bilateral agreements on school funding but it seems they are in a deadlock on how much the federal government will increase funding by, with no plan to get Queensland state schools to 100 per cent funding anytime soon. The federal government are saying that they will increase their funding to 22.5 per cent while many of the state governments are pushing for 25 per cent from the federal government. The Labor state government have only committed to 75 per cent funding for state schools by 2032. Even if the federal government increased their funding to 25 per cent, state schools will remain underfunded until 2032. In estimates, I asked the minister—

If the federal government are offering 22.5 per cent of school funding, is it the Queensland government's intention to provide the remainder that is needed to get up to 100 per cent?

Her answer was, 'No.'

There is nothing radical about helping families with school costs. This bill proposes to fund schools to 100 per cent of minimum needs funding and provide additional funding to cover other costs such as uniforms and extracurricular opportunities—essentials for a well-rounded education. It is simply the minimum that Queensland kids deserve. No matter where kids grow up in Queensland, from Cooktown to Surfers Paradise, and no matter what their parents and carers earn, the Greens believe that Queensland kids should be able to receive a great state education for free—I repeat, for free.

The Australian Education Union estimates that Queensland state schools are underfunded by $1.7 billion annually. The Queensland Teachers' Union said—

... the Union agrees with the statement, contained in the Explanatory notes, that 'Queensland state schools are not funded to meet the minimum educational needs of students.'

It further stated—

The QTU recommends that the Queensland Government must ensure that all state schools in Queensland receive a minimum of 100 per cent of the SRS.

By ending the $1.7 billion shortfall in annual minimum needs-based funding and covering out-of-pocket expenses, we could scrap state school service and subject fees. We could provide stationery, textbooks and resources so that families are not out of pocket. We could hire the teachers and staff that our schools need. We could make sure that our hardworking teachers have the time and resources to focus on teaching without having to pay thousands out of their own pockets. We could make sure that no child misses out on excursions, school sports and cultural programs.

Since the Gonski review 13 years ago, which was meant to fix the massive gap in state school funding, Queensland state schools have missed out on billions of dollars in minimum needs funding. Economist Adam Rorris, an education, finance and training adviser to the Australian government, said—

When governments fail to reach this funding level, they fail the students of this country.

Labor and the LNP have failed Queensland kids.

The average child completing state high school this year will have lost out on about $37,000 in minimum needs funding since they started year 1 and even more if they are disabled, if they are a First Nations child or if they are a child from a low-income family. That means more kids falling through the gaps, more families struggling to pay out-of-pocket school costs and more unpaid hours for teachers and school staff.

Because state schools are funded $3,000 below minimum needs funding, schools have no choice but to charge parents and carers for essential resources, sports, excursions and school camps. Parents and carers are hundreds, if not thousands, of dollars out of pocket for their kids who are at state schools, in the middle of a cost- of-living crisis. According to one parent, the total cost of mandatory school fees, subject fees, resource fees, software and technology and minimum uniform requirements for their daughter's first year in a state high school came to $2,139 before any optional extras like excursions. One parent submitted—

As a solo parent with 2 kids in state school, the fees take me all year to pay off ... there is subject fees, excursion fees, camp fees that cost over $300 for 2 day camps. I can't afford this so my kids have never been. They want to join music but I can't afford it.

Just imagine what it must be like to tell your child that, through no fault of their own, they cannot go on school camp with their friends, they cannot learn to play music or play a sport and they will be denied the opportunities to thrive that other children have. This is Labor's and the LNP's vision for Queensland: a society of haves and have-nots. As one submitter wrote, it is embarrassing. West End State School P&C submitted that in the last year the number of requests received from families for financial assistance to pay for things like books and resources has increased fivefold. That is a fivefold increase in families reaching out for help. Other P&Cs spoke about their fundraising efforts to cover the essentials for their schools.

Today, this Labor government has the opportunity to do the right thing by Queensland kids. Legislating full school funding would lock in full school funding. It would mean that, regardless of who formed the next government, Queensland state school kids will get the funding that they need and teachers will get the funding and staffing they deserve.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Before I call the next speaker, I acknowledge that we are joined in the gallery by Liam Donovan from Capalaba State College, Oscar Donovan from Alexandra Hills State High and their dad, Sam Donovan, from the electorate of Capalaba.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak against the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023, introduced by the member for South Brisbane. I would like to thank the Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee for its inquiry into and report on the bill, tabled on 11 April 2024. I note that the committee was clear in its report, delivering only a single recommendation—that the bill not be passed—and the government will be following that advice.

The government will be opposing the bill on the basis that it: one, pre-empts ongoing intergovernmental negotiations on school funding; two, overlooks the role of the Australian government in school funding; and, three, imposes potentially limitless costs on the Queensland government. How extraordinary and how entirely predictable is it that what the Greens say about the situation in Queensland has very little connection to the truth!

It is very disappointing that the member for South Brisbane does not join me, the education ministers of almost every other state and territory in Australia, all of the education unions, all of the major parent groups, students, teachers aides and all of the unions of those who work in our schools in calling on the federal government to make up the funding shortfall in education. The member knows very well that the Queensland government has committed to 75 per cent full funding of state schools by 2032. We have sought for the federal government to increase its commitment from 20 per cent to 25 per cent to make the funding up to 100 per cent. The member knows very well that the federal government has proposed 22.5 per cent.

The member for South Brisbane says I said one thing at estimates but, in fact, I did not say that the Queensland government refuses to fund the shortfall; all I said was that we expect the federal government to play its part. The member for South Brisbane would do Queensland well to actually join our fight, to join every single stakeholder group in this state to make sure that the federal government pays its fair share. For every dollar that the Queensland government needs to make up for the federal government, there is $1 less that can be spent on other important priorities for our schools and for Queenslanders in general.

The negotiations with the federal government are premised on the view that all of our state schools are on a path to reaching 100 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard, and state and federal governments are required to contribute to that. The member for South Brisbane is overlooking this joint responsibility. We must have the federal government contributing its part to the costs of education in Queensland.

The bill that the member for South Brisbane has introduced also overlooks the expectations that are related to Commonwealth funding, which is tied to policy reforms. We are in the middle of intense negotiations around this and the member would like these changes to start at the beginning of next year. The Australian government will contribute funding—and we want it to contribute 25 per cent—but it, of course, wants to be engaged in how the money is spent. This bill would not allow Queensland to meet the funding conditions, which would mean that the Australian government would be less likely to give us any—if not most—funding at all.

In Queensland, we are focused on making sure that all students, no matter who they are or where they live in Queensland, can access a high-quality education. We are extremely proud of our hardworking school staff who are dedicated to making sure that students have a rich and engaging educational experience, and this bill includes the uncosted and unfunded expectation that any and all academic and extracurricular services that are offered at private schools could and should be offered at all state schools—and this should be free. There is no cap on this expenditure. This may include opera and ballet visits, overseas visits and ski trips. Every state school and every non-state school has the right to offer these additional opportunities but the bill proposes no cap. Under the member for South Brisbane's bill, whatever is offered by a private school at whatever level must be matched. The member for South Brisbane fails to recognise that the Queensland government has a budget of over $20 billion for education in Queensland every year.

The member for South Brisbane has referred to infrastructure. The infrastructure budget for this year is over $1.2 billion. In fact, in the member's own electorate of South Brisbane, we have spent over $355 million since 2015 and $27.6 million in this financial year alone will be invested on top of that.

There are new and upgraded facilities and new programs happening all over Queensland. If the member listened to my ministerial statement this morning, she would have heard—and, in fact, would know about—all of the initiatives that we have put in place to make sure that students are not disadvantaged such as: our Textbook and Resource Allowance; our access to free and subsidised digital devices for learning, and I announced an additional 140,000 of those; $10.7 million for healthy food and drinks to students; our learn-to-swim funding; our Dignity Vending Machines; and our student wellbeing packages. I announced accommodation support to encourage teachers to work in rural and remote areas of Queensland because we need to put resources in those areas.

I can advise that the department is reviewing its policies and procedures related to fees and charges in schools to make sure these continue to meet the needs of our communities and are responsive to cost-of-living pressures. As part of this review, the department has written to all state school principals who use these procedures about how we can most appropriately support parents and carers. We are also in the process of reviewing resourcing arrangements for all Queensland state schools—it is the first time in 30 years. It has been such a healthy and constructive process which all principals and teachers have told me they are glad with the way it has been delivered.

The bill introduced by the member for South Brisbane does not comprehend the ramifications for the Queensland government as we try very carefully to negotiate a new federal funding agreement with the Australian government. It overlooks the critical role that the Australian government must play in partnering with us—and I urge the member to join us in advocating strongly with every single education stakeholder in Queensland and in most other states of Australia. I urge her to take part in that process so the Australian government actually contributes to our funding.

The bill imposes potentially limitless costs on the Queensland taxpayer because there is no ceiling to what the member would like to see us offering. Our business is to make sure that every single child gets a good quality education in Queensland. We remain steadfastly committed to all our students, no matter where they live, having access to high-quality, early learning education and training programs.

I want to thank all of our school staff for the amazing job that they do to make sure that that happens. Nothing is more important to us than the future of our students, and the proposals outlined in this bill are not viable to achieving those outcomes. It is for those reasons that the Miles government will be opposing the bill.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (5.48 pm): As the Liberal National Party's shadow minister for education, I rise to address the debate on the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023. The Liberal National Party will not be supporting this legislation. In fact, the Liberal National Party opposes this bill.

We know that Queenslanders are doing it tough as a result of Labor's ongoing cost-of-living crisis. Whilst the Liberal National Party certainly acknowledges the intent of this bill in proposing to reduce out-of-pocket expenses for families of schoolchildren and students, the Liberal National Party state opposition holds a number of significant reservations pertaining to how this legislation has been prepared and the associated lack of comprehensive information, details and appropriate consideration of legislative and budgetary implications.

Having been examined by the Queensland parliament's Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee, this proposed legislation remains vague as to the means by which the state government is to implement measures to address out-of-pocket expenses associated with attending state schools in Queensland. I note that the parliamentary committee expressed its concerns that the legislation's requirement that the minister introduces a subsequent bill to enact its objectives might place the minister in conflict with their collective cabinet responsibilities.

Throughout the parliamentary committee's inquiry it was also found that the Department of Education could not fully cost the implications of this legislation and that, given the scope of the cost of the extracurricular activities the department could be required to meet if the legislation is passed, the cost could be 'potentially limitless'. Ultimately, the parliamentary committee found that it was not satisfied that the objectives of this legislation could or should be met and, accordingly, recommended that this legislation not be passed. It must be noted that, despite this legislation requiring considerable additional and potentially unlimited financial investment from the state government, at no stage, neither within the explanatory notes nor in submissions, could the Greens member for South Brisbane articulate the estimated cost to implement the measures contained in the bill.

The Greens political party certainly has form when it comes to its failure to grasp even the most basic economic principles and deliver comprehensive and costed policies. As a case in point, this legislation fails to distinguish between what is core funding and what is not. No meaningful detail has been provided in relation to what items should be funded by the state government and what items would not be funded. While it is clear that the legislation seeks to have the state government meet the costs of student resources, uniforms and compulsory excursions, it is unclear if selective extracurricular activities such as overseas travel for STEM and robotics events or interstate sporting competitions would also have all costs met by the state government.

The legislation clearly intends for the state government to cover all costs for student resources, uniforms and compulsory excursions. As has been identified, there is a substantial lack of clarity on whether selective extracurricular activities such as overseas travel for STEM and robotics events or even interstate sporting competitions would also be funded. The absence of such important detail could lead to confusion as well as any number of unintended consequences including the inconsistent application of funding and arbitrary determination of what is and is not covered.

Finally, can I clearly state that our public state school education system is critically important for all. As the state member for Moggill, I want local parents and families to be able to access our public state schools, whether they be primary or secondary, and to have that access and availability locally and on a continual basis, both now and into the future.

There is no doubt that there are significant concerns about existing local school infrastructure in the western suburbs of Brisbane. The delivery of a new high school for the electorate of Moggill is critically needed. It also has to be noted that if we are to truly achieve the outcome of fully funding all of our Queensland public state schools then the federal Albanese Labor government must step up and provide the required funding to our state jurisdiction of Queensland.

As I have heard the contribution in this debate from the Greens member for South Brisbane, what has to be asked is: where are the federal Greens members for Ryan, Brisbane and Griffith when it comes to approaching the federal government and championing that additional funding being provided by the federal Labor government? Those federal Greens members had preference deals at the last federal election and it is important that they do that work in Canberra. It is important that federal Greens members of the lower house, and senators for that matter, step up to the mark and champion that in Canberra. To date, we have not seen that occur at all.

I want to be clear and reiterate that the Liberal National Party acknowledges the considerable strain that Labor's cost-of-living crisis is placing on Queensland families. The Liberal National Party will always support comprehensive and well-developed measures which can meaningfully ease the significant burden of mounting cost-of-living expenses. It is incumbent on the state government to be proactive in tackling the cost-of-living crisis by further addressing those areas of the family budget that the state Labor government can influence.

There is no question that the state government must do more to assist Queenslanders with what has become a debilitating cost-of-living crisis. This legislation, however, is not a solution to that problem and the Liberal National Party does not believe that the legislation, in its current form, will be able to achieve its stated objectives.

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (5.54 pm): This bill is an incompetent bill, poorly drafted, not well considered and certainly not worthy of support by this chamber. The committee had only one recommendation on the bill. That was that it not be passed. I think that speaks volumes.

What we have here is a bill that requires Queensland schools to be funded at 100 per cent of the SRS by 2025, but it does not specify which level of government is responsible for funding that increase. This is a key point of negotiation for the next school funding agreement due to commence next year. Queensland has asked the Commonwealth to increase its funding from 20 to 25 per cent of the SRS. This bill does not recognise that some SRS funding may be tied funding, with the Australian government making it clear that any additional funding it provides under the next school funding agreement must be directed to specific activities. It will not be available for expenditure on individual student resources necessarily.

On other fronts, let us look at the competency or lack thereof of this bill. The bill proposes that Queensland schools be funded at 100 per cent of the SRS by 2025, but it does not specify the respective responsibilities of the Australian or Queensland governments to reach that target. The proposal pre-empts the outcome of the school funding negotiations currently underway between the Queensland and national governments. It certainly runs a very high risk of resulting in potentially limitless costs to the Queensland government because there are no costings to this bill. Let me say that again: there are not costings and there is no economic basis to this bill other than the vibe. That is not good enough.

This is the Legislative Assembly. This is not a Facebook page. This is not an Instagram page. This is parliament. What we are here to achieve is outcomes, not social media likes or confected outrage. We are here to get better outcomes for the students and kids of this state. As a state school kid who was the beneficiary of great educators who backed their students and supplied what they needed, I can attest to that.

What we are seeing from this government is incredible support for students right across this state through the state school system. We have laptops for disadvantaged kids—a $152 million program for 140,000 laptops over the next three years, adding to the 42,000 digital devices the government has supplied to disadvantaged students in state schools since 2020. We have already brought in free kindy, a key education investment for our youngest kids. We know that their cognitive development is critical, long before they get to school. This government brought that in well before the election. It is a great initiative.

We have the textbook and learning resources allowance which saves $155 for students in years 7 to 10 and $372—in fact, more than double that of students in years 7 to 10—for students in years 11 and 12. We also have the school transport assistance scheme. We have FairPlay vouchers, which are a very important budget initiative. The provide up to $200 for sporting registration and fees for kids aged

five to 17. I have had so much positive feedback from people on the FairPlay vouchers. There is no doubt that 50-cent public transport fares have taken a lot of pressure off families right across this state, not just in my electorate, but the number of times parents have, unprompted, raised with me the FairPlay vouchers is interesting and startling. They love them, they support them and they see that we are supporting them.

We are providing state school students with free access to mental health support from psychologists, social workers, guidance officers and youth workers. There are the after-school homework centres. There is free access to supervised after-school homework support at 120 state schools across the state. In terms of the school and community food program, there is $15 million to support schools across Queensland to deliver school breakfast and lunch programs. There are GPs in schools as well.

We also see very strong leadership from our principals and school leadership to include all kids from all kinds of backgrounds. Anybody who knows their schools knows that the principals, the deputy principals and the staff do incredible things to include students who may not come from a high-income background. I back them 100 per cent.

This government's has opened 29 new public state schools in this state in less than a decade. That has been our commitment. We have invested heavily. I look forward to the education commitments we make leading up to the election because, as a Labor government, education is at the core of our values, giving kids every opportunity.

In my own seat we have seen a disability access completion at Sherwood State School to make sure kids of all abilities can negotiate a heritage school that has a lot of steps. It is open and it is going very well. We have seen nine new classrooms at Yeronga State School as part of the converted dental hospital there and a whole new learning centre and administration office for that school which will set it up for the next 10 to 15 years in terms of population growth. We have seen more than $5 million go to Yeronga State High School, whose enrolments are surging because of their commitment to great pedagogy and inclusion of kids from all kinds of backgrounds.

We saw a recent commitment by this government only last week from the Minister for Education who came to Junction Park State School—a $14 million commitment to a new prep block and essentially a year 6 block. This will bring preps on to site so they do not have to cross the street, with a purpose-built block. It also includes a replacement of two classrooms and a security fence. This will be fantastic for Junction Park State School students. I thank the minister for her support of my community at Junction Park. It is a great school with great values. It is was a real pleasure to attend trivia night on Saturday night. Whether it is the parents or the staff, they go above and beyond to back all of their kids.

The equation in this place by the Greens party of the Labor Party and the LNP is absolutely dishonest and deceptive. Here we have a government with 29 new schools and with record investments in education and innovations, as I have outlined, versus an LNP who literally sold off schools in the growth state. In the growth state they cut the education budget. They sold off Nyanda high school. They were trying to sell off Fortitude Valley.

Mr WEIR: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I do not think this is mentioned in the bill that is being debated at the moment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): I will get some advice. Member for Miller, I have given you a bit of latitude. I ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I certainly take your guidance. Resourcing is critical. You do not resource schools by selling off schools. You do not do that. What we need to do is continue to expand the education system which is what this Miles Labor government is doing.

Let's also talk about the level of support that families in every state school are getting right now because of the budget this year—a $1,000 power rebate brought in by this government and up to $1,300 for some people; the $300 power rebate from the national Albanese government; a cut to rego; and of course the 50-cent fare policy. The number of parents who have said to me, 'I love it,' is phenomenal. They are not telling me they like it; they are telling me they love it because it gives them that extra relief. It is funded by progressive royalties of multinational mining companies—something that is responsible and costed.

We have brought in $25 billion of revenue from progressive royalties over the last two years. That is funding better schools, better transport, better hospitals and cost-of-living relief. That is what a responsible government is doing. We are criticised by the Greens party who talk about the big corporations in their rhetoric and their social media lines, yet they criticise our cost-of-living measures.

This is a government that is doing exactly that in terms of making multinational mining companies pay their fair share, and the people support it. The number of people who have said, 'I absolutely support that,' is phenomenal. They can see that we are funding our expansion of schools, hospitals and transport and cost-of-living relief in a responsible way. We are not just putting it metaphorically on the government credit card. It is funded responsibly.

This bill does not fund anything responsibly. It is a vibe. It is a social media vibe at best and it is not worthy of this parliament. What is worthy of this parliament is this government's commitment to education and to continue that commitment. I look forward to our platform going into the election. That is what deserves support, not this bill.

Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (6.04 pm): It is interesting to follow the member for Miller. I have to remind him and the Labor government that in my time as a member here they have closed three schools in my electorate—Lundavra, Bungunya and Tannymorel. Those communities are now—

Mr Millar: They closed Bungunya! That is where I went to school.

Mr LISTER: Your school has been closed. We are not going to see any more Lachy Millars generated by that particular school which is a real shame. Those communities have lost their schools. I would also say in response to the member for Miller that I do not see too many 50-cent fares in my electorate. In fact the roads are falling apart, so where is all the money for that when we hear about progressive coal royalties?

In talking about this bill, I can understand what the Greens want to achieve and how this might go down well in their electorates. What this bill does not provide is what is significant. It is significant for the things which it would deny the communities that I represent. I do not have affluent communities full of activists who would love to see the world change and hope that everyone can be like them. I represent communities that do it tough, communities with low incomes—far lower than most of the Labor Party electorates and certainly the Greens electorates in this place. Their kids go to state schools that have inbuilt disadvantage. I do not necessarily criticise the government on this point because running small schools in isolated areas is an expensive business but it is a necessary business.

I represent communities where young students, as young as preppies, spend 45 minutes on a bus to get to school in the morning. I represent communities where students in order to go to years 10, 11 and 12 have to hop on a bus for half an hour or more each way. I represent communities with schools where the funding that has been proposed—and it would be a bonanza—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. What is your point of order?

Ms McMILLAN: I am concerned that the member is pre-empting debate on a bill that will follow this one. I ask for your ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. At this point we do not believe there is a point of order. I ask the member for Southern Downs to be mindful that there is another bill that deals with remote schools on the *Notice Paper*. I note that it is quite a specific bill as in there are specific aspects to that bill. I will listen to your contribution.

Mr LISTER: Thank you and I will be mindful of your guidance. Those schools in my electorate suffer other disadvantages. The government announced—and I lauded them at the time—significant funding to provide GPs and allied health and counselling for students at schools, but that does not apply in my electorate because it is impossible to recruit the staff to deliver that. I think about how this bill proposes to enrich the lives and experiences of students probably in metropolitan areas, but it will do nothing for children at a school which is in want of those services.

One particular principal of a prep to year 10 school in my electorate made the point that increasingly young students are now having to access what was funding for the high school students for counselling to deal with trauma and so forth. That is going down through grades 6, 5, 4 and 3. We are getting students who are very young coming to school without having had breakfast who are traumatised from their experiences at home. This bill will do nothing to assist them.

There are many schools in my electorate—there are 40-odd schools in the electorate of Southern Downs—and many of them are small schools with a limited number of students. It is not possible to provide the same breadth of opportunities at those schools as you might experience in a larger school. Access to music or other specialist subjects and opportunities is limited. It is catered for to the very best of the ability of the teachers in those clusters who share resources. I have seen some wonderful work to make sure the best possible opportunities are obtained by students in those small schools.

This bill will do nothing to assist in that regard. This bill will do nothing to reduce the amount of time that a preppie spends on a bus going to and from school every day. This will not add an extra music teacher to a school that has only one teacher because the principal is the teacher. This will not provide for a psychologist or a school nurse in a remote school which has a lower socio-economic demographic and a higher index of need than many of the schools which occupy the affluent electorates held by the Greens. There is nothing in it for the people of Southern Downs to support this bill and I will be joining my party, the LNP, in opposing it.

Mr O'ROURKE (Rockhampton—ALP) (6.10 pm): I refer to the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023, introduced by the member for South Brisbane. The private member's bill was referred to the Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee for examination and the committee recommended that the bill not be passed. To assess the private member's bill the committee called for written submissions, resulting in 64 responses from various stakeholders. In addition to the submissions, the committee organised two public briefings. During these briefings we heard from the member for South Brisbane and representatives from the Department of Education. The purpose of these briefings was to gain insights into the bill's intended outcomes and the implications for the education sector.

Further to the public briefings, the committee sought direct evidence from five key stakeholders during the hearing held on 18 March 2024. These stakeholders provided statements based on their expertise and experience within the education sector, offering diverse perspectives on the potential impact of the bill. However, after carefully considering all of the evidence and the statements provided, the committee expressed concerns about the bill's ability to achieve its stated policy objectives. Consequently, the committee recommended that the bill should not be passed.

It is important to note that current school costs covered by the state under the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006 include instruction, facilities and administration. I believe that every member in the House would agree that these are appropriate costs to be covered by the state government in our schools. The recent budget showed that we are investing a record $20.9 billion to ensure that our schools have the right staff, supports and environments to make all kids succeed. This bill seeks to have other costs be covered by the state as well. Some of the examples given were textbooks, stationery, computers, school uniforms, extracurricular activities, excursions and camps.

I am aware of the cost-of-living challenges that my constituents are facing. That is why I am so pleased that our government is providing support for families with regard to free laptops, free kindy, the textbook and resource allowance, school transport assistance programs, free period products in schools, free breakfast and lunch programs, FairPlay vouchers and health supports in our schools. These are real programs providing real support to Queensland families. These have been outlined, costed and funded. This bill, on the other hand, was not able to outline or clarify how much additional funding would be required to fulfil its objectives. The lack of clarity raised concerns among the committee as it made it challenging to determine the feasibility and financial implications of the proposed measures.

The committee also highlighted an important consideration regarding the Department of Education's role in managing the costs associated with academic and extracurricular activities. The department has limited control over the expenses incurred by non-state schools for similar activities. As a result, the cost for the department in providing equivalent opportunities for students in state schools could be highly variable and potentially limitless. The lack of this control further complicates the implementation of the bill and raises questions about its long-term sustainability.

The absence of clear funding details and the challenges associated with cost controls in the education sector were significant factors in the committee's recommendation to not pass the bill. While the bill's objectives of providing quality education and reducing financial barriers for families are commendable, the committee expressed concerns about the feasibility and the financial implication of the proposed measures. Given the concerns raised during the inquiry, the committee could not recommend the bill be passed in its current form. It is crucial that any legislation aimed at improving education outcomes is carefully considered.

Mr DAMETTO (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (6.15 pm): I rise to give my contribution on the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023. The Katter's Australian Party will be opposing this bill for a number of reasons, which I will outline during my speech tonight. Many schoolchildren across Queensland get an opportunity to engage with Queensland education, especially across the Hinchinbrook electorate. We have many Queensland state schools

and we know that those state schools and their teachers play an integral role in making sure students across Hinchinbrook and Queensland receive a quality education.

The intention of the member for South Brisbane's bill before the House is to make sure that those schools are funded properly, but the reality is that the money has to come from somewhere. We cannot have an open chequebook when it comes to education. We should be trying to deliver a quality education, and I know that is what our teachers in Hinchinbrook are doing. I know they are doing their best with the money that is allocated to each of those schools. The KAP will always fight to see more funding allocated in those regional areas, because we have been told by a number of organisations that state school students in regional areas are being disadvantaged compared to their so-called cousins in Brisbane and metropolitan state schools. We will continue to fight to make sure those schools are better funded so that their playground equipment and other learning equipment is of the same standard as that of their counterparts in Brisbane or other metropolitan areas.

The bill that the Greens have introduced basically opens up a floodgate. I sit on the Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee and I was able to ask a number of questions of the member for South Brisbane. My line of questioning was with regard to the value that we place on not only education but also the equipment we use to educate our students. My point is: when children are given things for free, they do not seem to see the value in them. When I am trying to teach my son things or when people are trying to teach their children things, they want to show them that there is a value attached to the things they are using and the education system they are engaging with.

It would be great if our state schools had the money to provide the same education as some of our private schools across Queensland, but the reality is that if you want a better education you have to pay for it. If you want things that are better than the standard in life, you have to work harder and pay for them. Yes, some of these children may be growing up in a lower socio-economic group and may not be able to afford private education, but the reality is that plenty of people in Queensland and across Australia have risen above that through hard work and seeing that they wanted more in life. This might sound very cruel, but the reality is that if you want things in life then you are going to have to work hard for them—or you can just switch to a socialist society, which I think the Greens are trying to push here.

What the KAP continues to try to do in this Queensland parliament is offer a counterpoint to the Greens. As the Greens party are growing in the Brisbane metropolitan area and as their popularity grows amongst young people wanting a more socialist society, the counterpoint in the Queensland parliament is the growing KAP representation from North Queensland. We are making sure there is a point of difference in this parliament that does not pander to a growing Greens-left consortium here in the south-east. That is important to make sure we keep things on track here in Queensland.

We need to continue to invest in Queensland schools and we need to make sure our classrooms are up to scratch, but the fact is that having an open chequebook saying that every student should have every possibility of learning in front of them is just ludicrous. If we are going to spend every cent in every dollar to have everything funded in this state, eventually the quality of education will be lowered.

I brought up in the committee hearings an example of a gentleman I worked with years ago when I was a fitter at Queensland Nickel. He was from Bulgaria and grew up in a Socialist country. He said very interestingly that in a Socialist country, everyone got a chance to do everything, which sounds fantastic. He said, 'We all got a chance to do archery, but the archery equipment was terrible.' He used some more colourful language than that, but I will not use that tonight; I do not need to be pulled up in the last sitting week of parliament. Everyone played basketball and had a uniform paid for, but it was a not a very good uniform and it was not a very good basketball court. So, when there is open slather and everyone has the opportunity to have things fully funded, eventually the quality will come down. I do not want to see that in Queensland. I want to see people value education. I want to see people value education that their children may have the opportunity to reach towards. I want to see young people saying, 'You know what? I want a little bit extra in life. I do not want just the standard equipment. I will get an after-school job so I can afford that sort of stuff.' I want to live in a society where people still value work and hard work to achieve things in life. I think this bill is counteractive to that.

We already have children across Queensland who are getting mixed messaging on what should be expected of them as they grow up. Participation awards seem to be thrown around like they are confetti. We need to continue to teach children that it takes, like I said, hard work and discipline to achieve things in life. I think an open chequebook and full funding to the sky is the limit, which has been proposed here in the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill proposed by the Greens, is disastrous for the state, especially when it is not costed.

I am completely compelled to say this: I do not understand how this bill even made it to the floor of parliament for debate. It is a money bill, if you ask anyone. This would draw on consolidated revenue. I do not even understand how this made it to the floor of parliament.

We continue to debate this in the House tonight. Before I get pulled up, I will do the right thing. I reaffirm that the KAP will not be supporting this legislation.

Ms NIGHTINGALE (Inala—ALP) (6.22 pm): I rise against the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023. This bill seeks to mandate that all school costs, including extracurricular activities, be covered entirely by the state for families at state schools. As a teacher and mother of children who attended state schools, I am and always will be a strong advocate for free state education. This bill proposes that the state government cover an extensive range of costs that go beyond individual student resources such as textbooks, stationery and computers. It also proposes providing a comprehensive school uniform for each year of a student's enrolment and funding a wide array of extracurricular activities from sports and music to academic challenges. By attempting to ensure state schools provide every type of activity offered by non-state schools at no cost, we risk imposing a potentially limitless financial burden on the Queensland government. This is not just an abstract concern; it has real implications for our state's budget and priorities.

It is like sending a child into a department store with an empty trolley to do the Christmas gift shopping and then trying to work out how you are going to buy food, pay the rent and keep the lights on because they have spent every cent on Xbox games and Lego. What might we see in the Greens' trolley in an everything-is-free, education shopping spree? Could it stretch to cover extravagant items like high-end art supplies or even luxury items such as sailing lessons or designer formal wear? An everything-is-free approach may sound idealistic, but it is not practical or sustainable.

Current practices already allow principals the discretion to waive fees, arrange payment plans or provide access to optional activities for students facing financial hardship. I see this happen every day in my community. Schools and their communities work diligently to manage costs transparently and fairly. Having served on the executive of two P&C associations, I have seen firsthand how schools consult with their communities to make informed decisions about costs, from school excursions to uniform pricing. Together they make decisions, sometimes down to the brand of crayon to include on the book list.

When I talk with parents, teachers or principals from state schools in my electorate of Inala, they never once ask for everything a student gets at a private school. When you ask parents, they tell you that they want improved student learning, and teachers want time to focus on student learning, rather than spending additional time on administration and data collection which this bill would require. This is a workforce that needs reduction in workload, not an increase.

Parents tell me every day that the practical cost-of-living supports, like the significant support our government already provides to families and students, is making a difference, like the $152 million program to supply additional laptops to disadvantaged students, many of whom are in my electorate of Inala. Additionally, the Free Kindy initiatives offers a saving of up to $4,800 per child and provides 15 hours of free early education per week, giving them the best start in life. We also support the Share the Dignity program which ensures that free period products are available at participating schools. This means that students come to school more often and are not staying at home to avoid the fact that they cannot afford period products.

The Miles Labor government is prioritising the mental health of our students. We offer free access to mental health professionals within state schools and we are expanding the successful GPs in Schools program to include additional schools. Then there is the free supervised homework assistance and healthy snacks and $15 million to the School and Community Food Relief Program to support breakfast and lunch programs. These practical, cost-of-living relief measures mean that we are helping families in real and tangible ways. These measures demonstrate our commitment to supporting students and families effectively and responsibly. We are doing what matters for Queenslanders and for Queensland students.

In contrast, this bill disregards the comprehensive support already in place and could disrupt crucial funding negotiations between federal and state governments regarding the next funding arrangement. I oppose this bill and encourage other members to do so.

Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (6.27 pm): I rise to oppose the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023 published by the Greens electoral party. Their helping families with school costs bill would require the introduction of a further bill to expand the schooling costs to be funded by the state. The bill proposes the funding of individual student resources,

extracurricular services and adequate quality of the required school uniform and other resources necessary to ensure each student's participation in a state school's educational program. Currently, the EGPA requires the state to meet the cost of instruction, administration and facilities associated with state schooling. Beyond this, parents may pay for some schooling costs out of pocket.

Fees at each state school are set at the discretion of the principal in consultation with their school's Parents and Citizens Association and within parameters set by the Department of Education and legislation. Schools can charge fees for school-based resources, including the Student Resource Scheme and recovery of costs for extra non-curricular activities. Decisions are made at a local level to ensure any charges to parents or costs to the school are directly related to the educational outcomes of the student body.

Further, no student is denied any access under the leadership of the school principal based on their socio-economic circumstances. Certainly no student in any of the schools that I led during my 13 years as a principal was denied access to any extracurricular activity based on their socio-economic circumstances.

The bill prejudices ongoing intergovernmental negotiations with the Australian government and would be of potentially limitless cost to the Queensland government. This overlooks the role of the Australian government to fully fund schools: firstly, by placing the responsibility on Queensland to fill the current school funding gap when this should be a joint effort from the state and Commonwealth governments; and, secondly, by overlooking the Commonwealth's ability to tie conditions to its funding. We know that whenever the Commonwealth administers funding to the states and territories, that funding is directly tied to student outcomes, to benchmarks and to targets for each state and territory.

Under the Australian Education Act 2013, both the Commonwealth and the state and territory governments are required to contribute to the SRS. Queensland state schools are currently funded at 90.5 per cent of the SRS. Queensland contributes 70.5 per cent of the SRS and the Commonwealth contributes the remaining 20 per cent. As I mentioned, often the Commonwealth government expects states and territories to meet student benchmarks and performance targets. None of this detail is mentioned in the Greens' bill. Incredibly, this information is lacking. This puts Queensland students and Queensland state schools and its leaders at risk of not knowing what those expectations will be.

The bill requires Queensland schools to be funded at 100 per cent of the SRS by 2025. It does not specify which level of government is responsible for funding this increase. This is a key point of negotiation for the next school funding agreement, due to commence in 2025. Queensland has asked the Commonwealth to increase its funding from 20 per cent to 25 per cent of the SRS. Further, there are no costings in the Greens' bill in terms of where this money will come from and what other programs, projects or services in our state will be cut to provide money for this initiative. The bill does not recognise that some SRS funding may be tied funding from the Australian government, making it clear that any additional funding it provides under the next school funding agreement must be directed to specific activities. It would not be available for expenditure on individual student resources.

The private member's bill proposes that the state must fund state schools to provide activities that are comparable to those in non-state schools. Non-state schools provide a diverse range of parent funded curricular and extracurricular offerings. If it is necessary to ensure all types of activities provided at non-state schools are also publicly funded at state schools, this could result in a potentially limitless cost to the Queensland government. I would go so far as to say that this bill is an election push for those schools in particular wealthy electorates where students attend private schools and have limitless opportunities and access to activities and experiences versus state schools in the same electorate. Having said that, there are many state schools that provide exceptional and outstanding opportunities for their students. I have a niece who attends Kedron State High School who is currently studying in France for three weeks. That is a fantastic opportunity offered by a local state school.

State schools are required to provide clear communication to parents on the fees charged and the timing of payments, to resolve any disputes about invoices and payments and to consider financial hardship and, where appropriate, fully or partially waive fees and/or outstanding debt and put payment plans in place. This is particularly the case in the current economic climate. There are many situations that I can reflect on where families have been on a payment plan—many for around 13 years as two or three children move through secondary school.

The department has commenced a review of the policy settings and requirements for fees, charges and other costs set by state schools to minimise costs and provide relief to state school parents and carers, without compromising educational outcomes. The cost of living and the current economic circumstances in Queensland, Australia and globally have been the impetus for that review.

Cost-of-living issues are very much being considered as a part of that review. It is appropriate that a public education system engage in that process. I have heard the minister speak to a number of principals over many meetings. She has asked our local principals to ensure the opportunities being provided to students reflect the current economic climate and the economic context that our families are living in.

Updates will strengthen the focus on affordability and equity, including fee waivers for parents experiencing financial hardship, and provide clearer direction about prohibited fees and charges. A new retail entities procedure will also be introduced to provide greater guidance to schools regarding uniform suppliers, tuckshop and outside-of-school-hours care. The Queensland government and the Department of Education are aware of the impact of cost-of-living pressures and have put in place measures to support Queensland children and families. Many of my colleagues on this side of the House have listed those interventions. They include laptops, food programs, the $106.7 million Student Wellbeing Package over three years from 2021-22 to 2023-24, and providing state school students with access to mental health support from psychologists or similar wellbeing professionals at no cost. Often a school's ICSEA will determine the level of intervention that we as a state provide to our students in those economic groupings.

The 2024-25 state budget includes an additional $502 million for the whole-of-government Putting Queensland Kids First package, which includes further whole-of-person supports for students. The bill's proposals could result in a potentially limitless cost to the Queensland government. This is certainly supported by the committee's findings. Opposing the bill ensures the Queensland government will continue to implement the most efficient and effective resourcing arrangements for our state schools in the current funding environment. I oppose the bill before the House.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (6.37 pm): I rise to speak to the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill 2023. The Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee in its report No. 3 of the 57th Parliament, tabled in the Assembly on 11 April, recommended that the bill not be passed.

On 11 October Dr Amy MacMahon MP, the member for South Brisbane, introduced the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill into the Queensland parliament. The bill was referred to the Education, Employment and Training Committee for detailed consideration and report. It was subsequently transferred to the Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee following its creation on 14 February 2024. The committee was required to report on the bill by 11 April 2024 in accordance with standing order 136(1).

According to the explanatory notes, the objective of the bill is to strengthen the obligations of the Queensland government and the Minister for Education such that students in state schools receive a quality, well-funded education and opportunities to participate in a range of academic, sporting and cultural programs necessary for their complete academic and social development free of charge. The bill also requires that the academic and extracurricular services offered at state schools are comparable to services offered at non-state schools. To facilitate the calculation of costs to be paid by the state, the bill propose that the chief executive of the Department of Education be required to report information on enrolments and costs for each state school to the minister annually.

The bill would also require that the costs to state schools of providing educational and extracurricular services are to be met from: 100 percent of the Schooling Resource Standard funding amount for each state school; 100 per cent of the total loading for each state school; and any other amount for each state school identified through an annual analysis by the department of the costs of schools. The bill proposes to achieve its aims by inserting a number of new provisions into the Education (General Provisions) Act. There are no revenue or appropriation measures contained within the bill. However, it proposes to require the development of subsequent legislation for the provision of school funding. Clause 5 would insert a new provision into the education act that the minister must, by no later than the commencement of the bill, introduce a bill into the Legislative Assembly that achieves key objectives of the bill related to the funding of state schools and the reporting of school costs—proposed sections 56C and 56D in clause 5—by the start of the 2025 school year. That bill would have significant financial implications for the state.

This bill seeks to ensure that all school costs, including extracurricular activities, are free for families at all state schools. This bill also requires a further bill to be introduced to parliament to change the definition of what is funded by the state government. Currently schooling costs to be funded by the state under the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006 include 'instruction', 'facilities' and 'administration'. This bill seeks to include individual student resources, for example, textbooks,

stationery, computers; an adequate quantity of the required school uniforms for each year a student is enrolled at a school, including summer and winter, and any extracurricular activity uniforms; extracurricular services, for example, sports, music, drama, academic challenges and camps; other resources necessary to ensure each relevant student's participation in a state school's educational program; and that the academic and extracurricular services offered at state schools are comparable to the services offered at non-state schools.

Fees at each state school are set at the discretion of the principal, in consultation with their school's Parents and Citizens' Association and within parameters set by the Department of Education. Schools can charge fees for school-based resources including: student resource schemes to provide access to textbooks, consumables and equipment, either outright or for hire; and recovery of costs for extra or non-curricular activities, such as camps, excursions, performances, formals and sporting events.

The main concern with this bill is that the private member's bill proposes that the state must fund state schools to provide activities that are comparable to those in non-state schools. Non-state schools provide a diverse range of parent funded curricular and extracurricular offerings. This could result in a potentially limitless cost to the Queensland government if it is necessary to ensure all types of activities provided at non-state schools are also publicly funded at state schools. This bill would prejudice the ongoing negotiations between federal and state governments regarding the next funding agreement. This agreement outlines the funding mix and also the requirements of what funding is spent on. This is another example of the Greens party not understanding how to actually govern.

It needs to be noted that under the Labor government the following support is already available to families. There are laptops for disadvantaged kids—a $152 million program for 140,000 laptops over the next three years adds to the 42,000 digital devices the government has supplied to disadvantaged students in state schools since 2020. There is the Textbook and Resource Allowance, saving $155 in years 7 to 10 and $337 in years 11 and 12 per student off the cost of textbooks and learning resources. This is paid directly to the school and is passed on to every parent of secondary school-age students attending state and approved non-state schools. The School Transport Assistance Scheme assists with the cost of transport for eligible students. There is access to free period products at every school that wants it. FairPlay vouchers of $200 for sporting registration and fees for children aged from five to 17 years are available. There is a program providing state school students with access to mental health support from psychologists, social workers, guidance officers and/or youth workers for free. After-school homework centres provide free access to supervised, after-school homework support at 120 state schools across the state. Students also receive a free healthy snack whilst there. The School and Community Food Relief Program, a $15 million program to support schools across Queensland, delivers school breakfast and lunch programs. There is also the expansion of the hugely successful GPs in Schools program from the existing 50 high schools to a further 20 high-priority primary schools in Queensland.

In their statement of reservation, the LNP members of the Education, Employment, Training and Skills Committee said—

> The Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendments Bill 2023 proposes the reduction of out of pocket expenses to families. While the Opposition members acknowledge the intent of the Bill, we hold considerable reservations.
>
> ...
>
> The Opposition members of the Committee do not believe the Bill in its current form will achieve its objectives.

I recommend that the bill not be passed.

Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (6.45 pm): I rise to make a short contribution on this bill. I had the privilege of subbing on the committee during the hearing and the submission by the member for South Brisbane. I would like to congratulate the member for South Brisbane on getting a private member's bill to the second reading stage. They normally get knocked out at the first reading stage. I would like to congratulate the member for getting it this far.

The bill is pure politics. Part of me wants to support this bill because I want to see the Capalaba State College rowing team come to fruition like the rowing team at Brisbane State High School. I want to see the Alexandra Hills State High School have a ballet excellence program like the one at Kelvin Grove. This bill is ludicrous in its drafting in terms of its open slather on extracurricular activities to which any state school could choose to sign up. If this bill were passed, they would have the opportunity to do that. There would be a Mount Isa rowing club or a ballet excellence program in every state school

and also there would be free language excellence programs. Normally one kid gets the chance to go overseas and be exposed to those cultures while also taking studies in that language. Under this bill that kid would get that course for free, but why does that not open it up for every kid in the class? Why does not every kid have the opportunity to go overseas and learn a language? This is where this bill fails. Not only does it go up to 100 per cent SRS, but that envelope would be exponentially greater if this bill were passed.

We need to make sure that our state schools are well funded. We on this side of the House have a tremendous track record of delivering the infrastructure our schools need. Whether it be school halls, solar for state schools or air-conditioning every single classroom across Queensland, we have been a government that makes sure we listen to our school communities and we deliver on the needs for those school, in particular, the track that they want to go down. Whether it is like at Alexandra Hills State High School, which has a Rugby League excellence program, or at Capalaba State College, which has volleyball and basketball excellence programs, they offer many extracurricular activities. They do call upon the parents to contribute to those, but they also bind together as a community and fundraise for those programs. As an MP I am happy to contribute to those programs, whether it is through raffle prizes, getting behind the barbecue, helping with the fundraising for those events, or buying the box of doughnuts from the P&C. Part of having a good local school community is offering those extracurricular activities and being able to fund them.

The passage of this bill in its current form would create an open chequebook for these extracurricular activities—and we would be offering every single curricular activity like Brisbane State High School's rowing program. I do not think taxpayers in Capalaba should be having to fork out for the students at Brisbane State High School to do rowing down the Brisbane River because it is not an opportunity that Capalaba State College kids can have in their local community.

This bill is just a pure political stunt by the Greens, yet that is typical of what they do. It is that much of a stunt that it normally gets knocked off at the first reading stage, but this bill is a stunt—

A government member interjected.

Mr BROWN: I take that interjection.

Government members interjected.

Mr BROWN: I cannot hear their interjections. Yes, it does sound good at the outset and it is good for a meme on Twitter, but when we dig down into it, as with every bill produced by the Greens, it is all politics, no substance and no thought. That is why this House cannot support such a bill.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (6.50 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Education (General Provisions) (Helping Families with School Costs) Amendment Bill. I participated early on in the committee hearings into this legislation. Whilst I understand where the member is coming from, I want to highlight the efforts that my local P&Cs go to for their school communities. The wonderful individuals on these P&Cs give up an enormous amount of their time to fundraise for the schools to offset some of the costs. For instance, when it comes to school camps, extracurricular activities and getting jerseys made up, the P&Cs at quite a few schools in my electorate work tirelessly in this regard. When it comes to competing against schools from other districts, it would be remiss of me not to highlight that many of the schools in my electorate do not have the excellence programs that some inner-city Brisbane schools do, and that puts them at a distinct disadvantage when it comes to where the money is going. These schools do not have rowing programs and ballet classes. It would be remiss of me not to highlight that.

As the members for Southern Downs and Hinchinbrook highlighted in their contributions on this legislation, there are different parts of our state which are lacking in resources even when it comes to teaching numbers. There are small townships with one-teacher schools. This places an enormous burden on the teaching staff. We also need to take that into account in terms of these issues. The member may feel that this is very important for her electorate, but as a member of the education committee for many years I can certainly attest to the disparity in what is happening between the more rural areas and the inner-city Brisbane areas. There is a clear disparity between the two. We need to look at funding when it comes to those areas to ensure they get their fair share.

When it comes to schools in my electorate on the Gold Coast, the state schools do their best to have some fantastic facilities. The schools in my electorate have STEM excellence programs and sporting excellence programs. This demonstrate that those schools are trying to cater for their students' needs, but when they are competing against the top echelon private schools on the Gold Coast and in Brisbane, such as Brisbane Grammar, they are always going to find it very difficult simply because of

the amount of money going into those private schools and how they divvy that up. St Stephen's College in my electorate is a very expensive school and the education there is second to none. Our state schools do their utmost to compete with that. Many state schools are competing with it very well, so that shows that the system at the moment is working. When people want to enrol in the state school system, in schools such as Pacific Pines State High School and Helensvale State School, that shows that the state school system is competing very well.

Whilst there is merit in what the member is trying to do with this legislation, we have to understand that there are schools that are at a distinct disadvantage. I did promise the Greens member that I would not take up all of the time remaining, but I just wanted to highlight the absolutely fantastic work that our local P&Cs are doing to offset costs to make it affordable for families, especially when there is a cost-of-living crisis gripping this state at the moment, with high rents which are forcing families to literal breaking point. I will limit my contribution to those few remarks. Again, there is a bigger picture than just resourcing inner-city Brisbane schools, because there is a clear disparity with schools in regional areas and it is not fair on them.

Dr MacMAHON (South Brisbane—Grn) (6.55 pm), in reply: I thank the minister and those members who have made contributions tonight. I share the member for Capalaba's delight: this bill has made it through to its second reading, but I must say that it is disappointing to get to this point and see that Labor, the LNP and the Katters are going to vote together to lock in continuing underfunding state schools in Queensland. I note that the minister talked about putting pressure on the federal government to increase its contribution to 25 per cent but note that, even if the federal government does that, Queensland state schools will go underfunded until 2032. If you have a child who is starting prep next year, not until they are in year 7 will they be in a fully funded school. The minister said that the government is steadfast in its commitment to full funding, yet we have this long runway where Queensland state schools will be underfunded.

A number of members noted that they are concerned that the bill will circumvent the negotiations Queensland is doing with the federal government, but I would note that that is only going to be the case if your intention is to sign an agreement where Queensland state schools are underfunded. There is nothing in this bill that would prevent negotiations that ensure state schools are fully funded, but it seems that is not the intention of the government.

A number of members were delighting in the fact that P&Cs have to do fundraising and sell doughnuts. Can members imagine that they would share delight in forcing P&Cs and parents to fundraise for the basics for their kids' education? A number of members were concerned that the bill will result in unlimited funding for things like extracurricular activities, but they have overlooked the fact that the bill puts the responsibility to determine those levels of funding with the minister and the chief executive based on feedback from schools. A number of members highlighted with derision funding things like high-end art supplies, rowing, ballet and language programs. What we see here is members who are committed to a two-track education system where the private school kids get one thing and the state school kids get another.

I note that the member for Moggill talked about putting pressure on the federal Greens. I would note that the federal Greens have introduced a private member's bill to replace the 20 per cent cap on Commonwealth funding and replace that with a 25 per cent cap. The federal Greens have literally done more than federal Labor to increase federal school funding to 25 per cent. If the Queensland government is trying to put pressure on the federal government to increase its funding to 25 per cent, its biggest ally is the Greens. After today, we are going to ensure that every resident in the electorate of Miller knows that Labor does not support full school funding and that every resident in the seats of Moggill, Bulimba and Capalaba knows that their members do not support full school funding.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).

RESPECT AT WORK AND OTHER MATTERS AMENDMENT BILL

CRIMINAL JUSTICE LEGISLATION (SEXUAL VIOLENCE AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Resumed from p. 2883, on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (7.05 pm): I will direct my comments to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill as it was part of our committee's deliberation, but I put on the record that we will not be supporting the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill.

The Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill addresses the critical issue of sexual and other forms of violence. Sexual violence and other forms of violence like domestic abuse is not only a justice and equality issue but also a public health crisis. Many of the factors leading to and emerging from sexual violence relate to the mental health of offenders and victim-survivors. The committee heard from many advocating that addressing this important public health issue is critical to lessening sexual violence and helping victim-survivors.

We understand the bill seeks to implement legislative reforms arising from the recommendations of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce to examine coercive control, review the need for a specific offence of commit domestic violence and the experiences of women and girls across the criminal justice system. The bill also includes a statutory review of amendments from the taskforce report *Hear her voice—Report 1: Addressing coercive control and domestic and family violence in Queensland* and *Hear her voice—Report 2: Women and girls' experiences across the criminal justice system*, which focuses on women and girls' experiences in the criminal justice system as victim-survivors of sexual violence and accused persons and offenders.

The bill's objectives are to introduce an expert evidence pilot for the purpose of giving expert evidence on the nature of sexual offences and matters that may impact the behaviour of victim-survivors; amendments to the Evidence Act 1977 around the admissibility of tendency evidence and coincidence evidence in Queensland to ensure that relevant evidence is admitted to criminal trials and reduce the likelihood of unjust acquittals of perpetrators; directions hearings that would assist victim-survivors to give their best evidence and minimise retraumatisation by the court process; amendment to the video recorded evidence to minimise the number of times victim-survivors have to give evidence, reducing the likelihood of that trauma, which was spoken about and investigated in our committee inquiry; amendments to the Corrective Services Act 2006 that are intended to remove any doubt that the participation in a program while on remand in custody cannot be used in evidence in proceedings related to the offence for which the person has been charged; extending the maximum duration of non-contact orders from two to five years for greater consistency with the approach to domestic violence orders and restraining orders for unlawful stalking, intimidation, harassment and abuse; introduction of a specific offence capturing people exercising positions of authority and control over 16- and 17-year-olds to give victims greater protections.

I want to spend a little time discussing the position-of-authority offence. I found interesting the amount of work put into it during the committee inquiry and the amount of examples that were produced to try to put this issue in context. Recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse included that states should review any position-of-authority offences in circumstances where the victim is 16 or 17 years of age and if the offences require more than the existence of the relationship of authority. All other Australian jurisdictions have criminalised this type of conduct. This state should also. It is insidious.

Submitters had mixed views on this offence. Some wanted it to go further with naming and stating that penalties were not severe enough, while some submitters opposed the introduction of the new offence, arguing two consenting individuals over the age of consent could be prosecuted. There was much discussion over that issue. The issue of position of authority and age of consent was raised many times, and it is clear that the prosecution of people using their position of authority over someone else may prove complicated. We must have hope that those junior in these relationships will have protection. There are examples where a teacher forms a relationship with their students resulting in children has recourse for the manipulation of that person. This is predatory behaviour. Regardless of the age of consent, those involved should be held to account.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (7.09 pm): I am so proud to rise in support of the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024. There is no place for sexual harassment, sexual assault or unlawful discrimination in our communities or in our workplaces. Unfortunately we know these behaviours are widespread and pervasive, with the Australian Human Rights Commission nationwide

survey finding one in three people experience sexual harassment at work. One respondent talked about the prevalence in her career—

> There is not one position I have held where I have not been sexually harassed. I have been sexually harassed by colleagues, by superiors, by customers ... and by junior men in my own workforce.

As Minister for Women it is appalling but not surprising to me to see that women are sexually harassed at higher rates than men in the workplace and that men are significantly more likely to be the harasser, with 79 per cent of incidents being reported as the harasser being a man, but it is critical to understand that sexual harassment is not just a women's issue; it is a whole-of-community issue. Every Queenslander, every Queensland workplace, has an obligation to address this. In the words of former sex discrimination commissioner Kate Jenkins—

> Workplace sexual harassment is not inevitable. It is not acceptable. It is preventable.

The bill amends the Anti-Discrimination Act to provide greater safeguards for Queensland workers. Importantly, it introduces a positive duty on employers to eliminate workplace sexual harassment, sex discrimination and sex-based harassment or subjecting a person to a hostile workplace environment on the ground of sex. To achieve this, employers must shift their focus to actively preventing workplace sexual harassment and discrimination rather than responding only after it occurs.

Currently in Queensland Health we have a comprehensive independent review underway to identify the strengths of Queensland Health systems for ensuring safe working conditions and to identify any areas that may need further development. The review is being led by Australia's longest serving sex discrimination commissioner, Elizabeth Broderick AO. This is part of the Queensland government's commitment to being a model employer and to ensuring we foster safe and more supportive workplaces for Queensland Health's frontline workforce. It is the kind of proactive action that is required to make sure we have the right systems in place to address sexual harassment, sexual assault and unlawful discrimination in one of Queensland's largest and most dispersed workplaces. Importantly, this bill includes consequences if businesses fail to comply by empowering the Queensland Human Rights Commission to investigate compliance with this duty, issue compliance notices and enter into enforceable undertakings.

All Queenslanders deserve to feel safe in their workplace and supported appropriately when reporting harassment, but we know that fewer than one in five people who experience workplace sexual harassment make a formal report or complaint about it. Disturbingly, those who did report were labelled as a troublemaker, ostracised, victimised or ignored by colleagues or resigned. The impacts of this cannot be understated. One respondent stated—

> Each time I laughed along with my own humiliation or kept quiet about the humiliation of another woman or marginalised person, I died a little bit more on the inside.

The people of Queensland deserve safe, inclusive and respectful workplaces, and this bill serves as a testament to the Miles Labor government's steadfast dedication to making sure that our workplaces not only are physically secure but also foster the mental and emotional wellbeing of our valued workforce. I am so proud to be part of a government that is delivering this historic reform. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (7.13 pm): The first of these two bills, the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill, introduces new anti-discrimination requirements that will apply to all Queensland workplaces, as we have heard. It is based on the recommendations of the Australian Human Rights Commission 2020 *Respect@Work* report, two Queensland parliamentary committee reports on vilification, from 2022 and 2023, and the 2022 Queensland Human Rights Commission report *Building belonging*. The bill introduces several changes to the Anti-Discrimination Act, expanding the attributes for which discrimination is prohibited, including prohibiting workplace harassment on the basis of sex, and provides a positive obligation on businesses to take efforts to reduce harassment.

The committee report stated that many stakeholders were supportive of the bill. However, some were disappointed that it did not go further in introducing reforms from the four reports that preceded it. A couple of those concerns include that the bill does not provide in the list of protected attributes medical status, including HIV or AIDS. That was recommended in the original committee report of 2022 and supported by the government in principle. In the committee report of 2023, the additional attributes were trimmed and no longer included medical status. This was the reason I wrote a statement of reservation.

Secondly, religious groups raised concerns that the bill will affect their organisations. The Australian Christian Lobby stated that the reforms proposed in the bill 'target those of faith in an unwarranted way' and would 'operate to the permanent disadvantage of religious organisations'. A number of my own residents have similar concerns, highlighting that this bill provides no exemptions for religious organisations, unlike the current anti-discrimination bill that does provide an exemption. There are concerns that the bill could restrict genuine debate about religion, sex and gender as the definition of harassment based on sex is so broad that it could encompass traditional religious teachings and practices. The department responded that, in practice, the impacts of the bill will be limited given the existence of equivalent prohibitions in federal legislation. If that is the case, we need to ask why the department did not provide reassurance and address those concerns before the bill was brought to parliament. The statement of reservation highlighted that the bill will increase uncertainty in the law and it will be important to assess whether this actually occurs.

I turn to the second bill, the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, which implements further recommendations from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, the *Hear her voice* reports. Stakeholders generally supported the reforms, including the Queensland Sexual Assault Network and the Uniting Church in Australia Queensland Synod, although some legal organisations raised issues with specific provisions, for example, the position-of-authority offence. Based on recommendations from *Hear her voice* as well as the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, the bill introduces a new standalone offence of a sexual act with a child aged 16 or 17 who is under one's care, supervision or authority. This is above the usual age of consent. The *Hear her voice* report argues that it is clearly desirable that the laws criminalising sexual assault should be broadly consistent across Australia. Queensland and Tasmania are the only jurisdictions that do not have this offence and Tasmania is in the process of introducing such a law. The bill also provides a list of certain categories of people deemed to have a child under their care such as a teacher or guardian.

There were varied stakeholder responses to these changes. For example, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists supported the offence as they consider young people are a priority because of mental health harms from sexual violence. The Queensland Law Society, however, expressed concern over the criminalisation of certain consensual relationships between individuals over the age of consent, for example, a 17-year-old university student and an 18-year-old tutor. Legal Aid Queensland argued that there could be circumstances in which such relationships are consensual and that this law will criminalise such relationships. In its response, the department noted that this law is in response to the royal commission and concerns raised about people who have positions of authority over children. In its report, the committee recommended that the Attorney-General undertake a review of the persons listed as deemed to have a child under their care and of the operation of the defences available under proposed sections 210A and 229B once the provisions have commenced. This recommendation must be actioned. I thank the committee, the secretariat and all who took the time to contact my office with their concerns and to participate in this inquiry.

Mr TANTARI (Hervey Bay—ALP) (7.18 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I will limit my contribution to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill as I was a part of the committee that reviewed that bill.

The objective of the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is to implement the third major tranche of legislative reform, which shows a clear commitment from this Miles Labor government to make change for the better in this area. It arises from recommendations made by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce in its two reports: *Hear her voice—Report 1: Addressing coercive control and domestic and family violence in Queensland* and *Hear her voice—Report 2: Women and girls' experiences across the criminal justice system*.

More specifically, the bill aims to create a new position-of-authority offence, improve protections to support special witnesses through the court process, extend the maximum duration of non-contact orders, codify the law as it relates to the admissibility of tendency evidence and coincidence evidence, expand the scope for the admission of expert evidence, remove any doubt that participation in a program while on remand in custody cannot be used in evidence in proceedings relating to the offence for which the person has been charged, establish a statutory review of amendments from both taskforce reports and clarify the law as it relates to the admissibility of recorded statements in particular committal proceedings relating to domestic violence offences.

As we know, the taskforce that was established in 2021 to review the experiences of women in the criminal justice system made 89 recommendations in report 1 for reforms to Queensland's domestic and family violence and justice systems, with the Queensland government at the time outlining a commitment to support, or support in principle, all the recommendations. In report 2, a further 188 recommendations were made focusing on the experiences of women and girls in the criminal justice system—both the experiences of victim-survivors of sexual violence and the experiences of accused persons and offenders—with the Queensland government committing to support 103 recommendations in full and 71 in principle and to note the remaining 18.

The bill represents the Queensland government's first tranche of legislative reforms in response to the recommendations of the taskforce and follows the Domestic and Family Violence Protection (Combating Coercive Control) and Other Legislation Amendment Act—that is, the first taskforce act—and the Criminal Law (Coercive Control and Affirmative Consent) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024, the second taskforce act. The level of consultation undertaken by the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and by the taskforce in the preparation of reports 1 and 2 included over 950 submissions, 125 individual meetings and 79 consultations and engagements across Queensland with the judiciary, legislators, police, the legal profession, policymakers, academics, service providers, offenders and victim-survivors of sexual assaults.

The taskforce also recommended a statutory requirement for the operation of legislative reforms arising from report 1 and report 2 to be reviewed five years from when the amendments commence, with a view to include consideration of the impacts and outcomes achieved for women and girls. While several stakeholders, including the Queensland Family and Child Commission, the North Queensland Women's Legal Service, the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists and Legal Aid Queensland were generally supportive of the statutory review provisions within the bill, there were some concerns raised by stakeholders regarding the length of time for ongoing review. The QFCC in particular noted that these reviews would provide ongoing longitudinal data on the effectiveness of the amendments and implemented measures.

As the chair of the Community Support and Services Committee that reviewed the bill, I want to thank the committee for its robust review and considered recommendations that were included in the committee report No. 46. I want to acknowledge the government has noted the first recommendation of the committee and supports in principle the remaining recommendations in the committee report. It is also noted that, during consideration in detail, some amendments will be proposed in response to issues raised by the committee inquiry and committee recommendations in the committee report particularly around further clarification of those adults taken to have a child under their care and further consistency and alignment with the uniform evidence law for the new tendency evidence and coincidence evidence framework established by the bill.

I want to congratulate the Attorney-General and her department for the huge undertaking that they undertook to consult and develop this detailed policy that will have a lasting impact on women and girls across our state. I believe that, as a part of a suite of legislation that this 57th Parliament has debated, this bill builds on and strengthens the framework around these difficult societal matters. I want to acknowledge what the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence said when introducing the bill into the parliament. That was—

> This bill further reflects the government's unwavering commitment to end all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in Queensland and to improve the experiences of women and girls across the criminal justice system.

As a member of a Labor government, they are words that reflect entirely on what our party and our movement stands for and will continue to stand for as long as our banner waves. Finally, as the father of a daughter, they are the words that give hope that one day our daughters' homes, family environments, workplaces and experiences when engaging with the criminal justice system will finally be free from the adverse experiences that many endure today. Quite simply, this is the key to what this bill addresses. I support the cognate bills before the House.

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (7.24 pm): In my contribution to the cognate debate, I will focus primarily on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill. The Greens will be supporting this bill. In a moment, I will speak to some of the reasons why but I cannot do that without saying at the outset what a betrayal this watered down legislation feels like after Labor caved to pressure from the conservative Christian Lobby and ditched some of the most crucial elements of the initial draft legislation.

Stakeholders have been engaged in consultation on these reforms for around four years, as I understand it. As of February this year, they provided input on a version of the bill that was fundamentally different from the one that the government ultimately introduced. They then had only nine days to respond, much of that over the school holiday period. We have ended up with a bill that tinkers at the edges to improve protections for some people from some discrimination and vilification while others have been completely abandoned.

Thanks to Labor's backflip, religious institutions, including schools, are exempt from laws that prohibit discrimination in other settings. Thanks to Labor's cowardice, a teacher can be fired or refused employment because she lives with a boyfriend or gets pregnant before marriage. A doctor who wants to provide terminations can be fired from a Catholic hospital for professing that view. A religious accommodation provider can refuse to house someone because they are gay.

We are staring down the barrel of an LNP government which could mean an incredibly difficult four years for women, queer people and other marginalised groups. Instead of taking the opportunity to be bold and introduce real, transformative cultural shifts to protect them, Labor have done what they do best apparently and caved to their opponents rather than stand by whatever supposed principles they have left.

We have a bill that is a shadow of what it could have been, but I do want to put on the record my support for some of the positives that remain. The bill introduces new and updated protected attributes—that is, the list of things for which someone can be protected from discrimination. It is absolutely consistent with modern, social expectations that no-one should be subject to discrimination for being homeless, for being a victim-survivor of domestic and family violence, for their physical appearance, for potentially being pregnant or because of an expunged conviction or irrelevant criminal record.

I am also pleased so see the various changes in this bill that respond to the *Respect@Work* report, including a new prohibition of harassment on the basis of sex or creating a hostile workplace environment on that basis. Although this is primarily a clarification of existing protections against sexual harassment and discrimination on the basis of sex, it sets clear standards that I hope will at least help women feel safer and more comfortable at work, where too many women still do not.

The bill also imposes a positive duty on employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and other objectionable conduct as far as possible. This is an important change to shift the burden from the person experiencing discrimination and harassment to the people who are empowered to prevent it from occurring. It is no longer enough to just respond or punish when discrimination or harassment occurs. It should be incumbent on every workplace to do everything it can to prevent it from happening at all and to stamp it out when it does.

I understand that these new duties will be supported by the Human Rights Commission, which will create guidelines about how to comply with the positive duty. The commissioner will also be able to conduct investigations into compliance with the new positive duty and other contraventions of protections on the basis of sex in the workplace.

These are good changes. But the question arises: why are they not extended to all protected attributes beyond sex? I understand there is some correlation between the hostile work environment provisions and protections against indirect discrimination but this still does not explain why workplace protections are being extended on the basis of sex but not on things like disability, race or any other protected provisions. As the Caxton Legal Centre said in its submission:

> In reality ... disrespect towards women rarely occurs on the basis of sex alone. Women with disabilities, LGBTIQ+ women, mothers and other female carers, culturally and linguistically diverse women, women of faith, pregnant women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, and many others experience discrimination, mistreatment, hostility, and harassment on the basis of their particular manifestation of womanhood.

Intersectionality is, unfortunately, missing from the bill. Without it, the list of protected attributes becomes more like a cage. We are forced to isolate parts of a person's experience rather than addressing it holistically. As QAI reflected in their submission, splitting the reforms from the *Building belonging* report out from this bill has elevated protections for one attribute over others, taking us even further from an intersectional approach.

We had solutions to improve the law. They were in the draft legislation that went through years of consultation before Labor ditched them—for example, amending the definitions of direct and indirect discrimination so that hypothetical comparisons and complex statistical comparisons are no longer

required. It should be more than enough for a person to show that they have been treated unfavourably because of their sex, gender identity, irrelevant criminal history, parental status and other protected attributes. A person should not need to point to some other hypothetical person without their attribute who is treated more favourably. The current regime, which Labor retains in this bill, creates a complex, multistepped and unwieldy process.

The bill is also missing desperately needed reforms to the carve-outs in the Corrective Services Act that significantly restrict a prisoner's ability to seek redress for discrimination where others can. While I support the changes in the bill to expand and update the list of protected attributes for both criminal and civil vilification offences and to allow unions to make a representative complaint for work related matters, it is disappointing that sex workers were not included. Submissions from Basic Rights and Working Women Queensland pointed this out, when they stated—

> Since antiquity, sex workers have received social, moral, and religious judgement, scorn, and isolation. The barrier of the law, stigma and prejudice has meant many sex workers have experienced profound barriers to accommodation, health services, legal assistance and discrimination protections.
>
> ...
>
> ... vilification and hate speech occurs against sex workers frequently, and many people felt emboldened to do so given that the law did not offer protection to sex workers.

Now that Queensland is finally decriminalising sex work, I see no reason why this historical and ongoing vilification of sex workers has not been recognised among the new protections that are put forward in this bill.

In concluding on the first of the two bills, I reiterate that I support the new protections and the small steps forward that this bill takes, but I lament the loss of what could have been if Labor was not too scared to, in their own words, pick a fight with the churches ahead of the election. I cannot believe we still need to remind them of this, but some fights are worth picking. The human rights of teachers are worth fighting for. Intersectional protection from hate and discrimination are worth fighting for. If you are willing to throw teachers and nurses under the bus to appease the Australian Christian Lobby, those opposite should really ask themselves why they are here in the first place.

In terms of the criminal justice legislation, the government's decision to, once again, squeeze two bills into a cognate debate means I have to cut short my comments on the second bill, but I can say that the Greens support this bill and the recommendations of the committee which appear to be addressed in the amendments circulated by Attorney-General. I table a copy of some of the comments I would like to have made if we were not being procedurally gagged again.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024—MP for Maiwar Second Reading Speech' [1781].

These are important changes, but they do not properly reflect the scale of the problem, which extends to how our economy and society are structured and how this affects people's vulnerability to victimisation and their ability to survive and recover from violence.

We need proper investment in social housing. We need to raise social security rates, invest in a properly funded public health system and social services and address the cost-of-living crisis. Victim-survivors are kept vulnerable by a system that fails to provide for everyday people so those in the government can prop up the interests of their corporate donors.

In the moment I have to left, I take the opportunity to sincerely thank the committee secretariat—Lynda Pretty, Andrew Lilley and Kerri Swaine—for all of the work they have put into supporting us on the Community Support and Services Committee this term. They do exceptional work and we would be lost without them.

Ms LUI (Cook—ALP) (7.34 pm): I rise to speak on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 and the sexual violence bill. In my contribution I will focus on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill. Discrimination and vilification have no place in a free, democratic society, and this bill sets out to prevent discrimination and vilification of vulnerable groups in our community where they are confronted with barriers that prevent them fully taking part in society, purely because they are identifiable as members of a particular group. People should never be made to feel less deserving of opportunities because they belong to a particular group. A robust, workable anti-discrimination framework protects such groups and provides a process for recourse in the event of any contraventions.

The Australian Bureau of Statistics highlights that recent data from the Scanlon institute's *Mapping social cohesion* report shows that in 2023 almost one in five—that is, 18 per cent—of people had experienced discrimination based on their skin colour, ethnic origin or religion over the last 12 months. The Australian Human Rights Commission reported that in 2021-22, 3,736 complaints were received, which is up from 3,113 complaints received the year before—a 20 per cent increase.

Based on the statistics provided, there is definitely a need to protect individual rights. I want to acknowledge the work of the Attorney-General and members of the Community Safety and Legal Affairs Committee for their work to bring this important bill to parliament. I note that several inquiries and reviews have informed the development of the bill. The most significant of these include: the Australian Human Rights Commission's report *Respect@Work: national inquiry into sexual harassment in Australian workplaces*, published in 2020; two inquiries conducted by this committee's precursor, the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, on vilification and hate crimes—the inquiry into serious vilification and hate crimes reported on in 2022 and the inquiry into the Criminal Code (Serious Vilification and Hate Crimes) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2023; and the Queensland Human Rights Commission's review of the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 and its report *Building belonging: review of Queensland's Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*.

The *Respect@Work* report that was published in March 2020 found that workplace sexual harassment remained prevalent in that the current system for addressing sexual harassment was complex and confusing for victims and employers to understand. The report recommended that several changes were needed to the Sex Discrimination Act 1994 to address these concerns. Although the recommendations made in the *Respect@Work* report were addressed to the Australian government and focused on changes to Commonwealth legislation, they are relevant to the states and territories which have legislation that overlaps with the Sex Discrimination Act. In Queensland that takes the form of the Anti-Discrimination Act, which is the focus of this bill.

The main objectives of the bill are to promote respect at work, including by prohibiting sex-based harassment and subjecting a person to a work environment that is hostile on the basis of sex and imposing a positive duty to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation and strengthen protection against vilification. The bill's objectives also include clarifying the scope of judicial immunity in inferior courts, providing magistrates with an entitlement to unpaid parental leave, protecting workers from violent offences and aligning legislative requirements with modern court practices.

When it comes to promoting respect in workplaces across Queensland, the bill proposes amending the Anti-Discrimination Act to: update its objectives; expand and update the attributes it protects; clarify the kinds of behaviour that it prohibits; create a new positive duty to prevent discrimination, sexual harassment and other behaviour prohibited by the AD Act; provide the QHRC with strengthened powers to investigate and enforce compliance, including with the new positive duty; and make certain improvements to the complaints process, including in relation to representative complaints.

In regard to the new prohibitions relating to sex-based discrimination and harassment, the committee report states that the Anti-Discrimination Act already prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex as well as sexual harassment. Despite the existence of such prohibitions, the AHRC found that sexual harassment in the workplace remained prevalent across Australia. It suggested this was partly due to a disconnect between the existing prohibitions and the general public's understanding of them. To respond to this problem, the AHRC recommended the express prohibition of sex-based harassment and creating or facilitating an intimidating, hostile, humiliating or offensive environment on the basis of sex.

The bill proposes amending chapter 3 of the AD Act to include a new prohibition of harassment on the basis of sex. The new prohibition would only apply in relation to work or work related areas. As the explanatory notes state, the bill provides that harassment on the basis of sex happens if a person: engages in unwelcome conduct of a demeaning nature in relation to another person; engages in the conduct on the basis of the sex of the person harassed; and engages in the conduct with the intention of offending, humiliating or intimidating the other person or in circumstances where a reasonable person would have anticipated the possibility that the other person would be offended, humiliated or intimidated by the conduct. The proposed amendments will go a long way to address any complexity and confusion that the current bill holds.

At present, the AD Act places the burden of enforcing the right to equality on the person who has been the subject of unlawful conduct through making a complaint. As the explanatory notes detail, the

Respect@Work report recommended amending the SD Act to introduce a positive duty on all employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures to eliminate sex discrimination, sexual harassment and victimisation as far as possible. This recommendation has now been implemented at the federal level.

The *Building belonging* report made a similar recommendation. However, it suggested the introduction of a positive duty with broader scope, requiring action to prevent all forms of discrimination prohibited by the AD Act, not just discrimination on the basis of sex. To address this issue, the bill proposes inserting a new chapter 5C into the AD Act which will establish a positive duty 'to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and certain other objectionable conduct'.

What constitutes 'reasonable and proportionate measures' will depend on a variety of factors including: the size, nature and circumstances of a business or undertaking; a person's resources, including their financial resources; the practicability and costs of different measures; or a person's business and operational priorities.

The proposed amendments in this bill are much needed. I am supportive of the proposed amendments providing more clarity and security for people experiencing discrimination and vilification in the workplace. It is the right thing to do. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (7.42 pm): Rather than respect, the state Labor government has treated people of faith with contempt. The respect at work bill is a most misnamed bill as there is no respect in the way that the Labor government have brought it before the parliament, nor in the way they have treated faith communities who have raised genuine and considered concerns about government overreach. This is evident even today when at 2.30 pm the Attorney-General finally wrote back to faith-based groups in response to the concerns that they had raised with her months earlier about this bill. Did she listen? Apparently not.

I support the rights of parents to choose schools that are appropriate for their children. I support their right also to choose schools in faith-based communities who have the right to recruit in alignment with their faith and values which is why they have been established in order to care for the child and their journey. This view is also held by Muslim, Christian and other faith groups who have raised concerns that the state Labor government have overreached with this legislation and failed to listen to those concerns due to the way they have drafted this legislation with a lack of clarity and a lack of consistency. I will come back to those points in a moment. From what we can see, their concerns have been brushed off and the tabled amendments do not fix the complexity, the confusing nature of the rushed laws which are open-ended and will be further prescribed as they are defined by an external Human Rights Commission who will write the guidelines, not the parliament.

Furthermore, in the time allocated for this debate tonight, the government has chosen to cognate, meaning combine, the debate of two completely different bills, further limiting the time for scrutiny. As lawmakers, we should instead be striving to protect people from harm rather than causing it which, sadly, elements of this bill could do by the government's lack of care and their lack of focus on issues that do require a great deal of focus. No-one wants to see anyone hurt or offended. Apparently no-one wants to be bored because I just heard a government member yawn. This is a serious bill that does have serious impacts.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order! The House will come to order.

Ms SIMPSON: The question is: what level of offence or hurt requires the intervention of government, the law and a funded litigator against the one who is accused of an offence? If the threshold is too low and the laws vague and the funded litigator does not provide advice equally and openly, the risk is that justice is not served and the government overreaches while the more serious issues of serious vilification and incitement to harm are left without the focus they should have. That is very important. There are some serious issues of vilification and hatred and they do deserve the full attention and full force of government and the law to keep people safe.

This legislation though, as we have found out, has not addressed a number of serious issues that have been raised by learned legal advisers and those who have gone through it have said, 'It doesn't actually align with the Commonwealth legislation. It doesn't actually even align with some of the recommendations by the AHRC.' I want to address some of the interesting concepts that are in this legislation. They sound great until you, as an ordinary reasonable person, try to work out how you are

going to apply it. That is very important because people should know how to comply reasonably with the law and they should know what those thresholds are.

This legislation requires people to apply equitable outcomes, not equitable opportunities. This question was asked by the LNP members of the committee. There was a bit of dancing around the edges by some of the bureaucrats. When they are vague and they cannot answer the question—and they are supposed to be the ones answering the question—yet these laws are about to be enforced, you know you have a problem. Laws should be clear, not vague and not subjective.

I did hear some language from the Attorney-General earlier in the debate about having 'some flexibility'. I will be rereading her comments. It appeared that there was going to be some flexibility about how some size of businesses or others will be treated. We want to know that the law is clear and not subjective depending on who is appearing before it or who has the better funding and advice to appear. The law must be clear. The threshold should not be so low that those serious issues that do need attention go unaddressed.

There was also supposed to be a positive duty. I seek the Attorney-General's explanation as to what this actually means in practice. We are not talking about where there is evidence where there has been discrimination, but where they are looking for policies and, if they do not think they have it, they have the power under this legislation to go and investigate it and then litigate it or prosecute it under their own head of power.

They are quite powerful pieces of legislation. Once again I have had another government member yawn, but these concerns have been raised by a range of faith-based communities from across the spectrum. I want to quote from the Queensland Churches Together submission. They made the following point—

Freedom of religion and freedom of speech have been recognised as fundamental human rights at least since the creation of—

A government member interjected.

Ms SIMPSON: I heard another yawn. Apparently it is an inconvenient thing to talk about freedom of speech. I am used to having it chucked at me and people seeking to offend me across the chamber, but I have a right to speak for those who do not necessarily get a right to speak for themselves.

We want to see people protected from significant harm but we also want to ensure there is clarity in the law and it is used in a way that achieves the outcomes that we want to see as a society, while respecting that in a pluralistic society there are people who have diverse and different beliefs. We also have the right to agree or disagree and to hold those views or not hold those views. The submission from Queensland Churches Together raised a number of very strong points. They said that there was a risk of 'significant impact on religious communities and the freedoms of speech and religion'. It was a considered submission and I would recommend that members of the House read it and understand it because it seems to have been dismissed out of hand by the government.

Let us strive towards a society that hears different voices and has tolerance for the fact that not everyone believes the same. Let us strive for a society that understands that the law needs to be clear, that thresholds need to be not so low that you overlook where there is harm occurring to people and that resources are put to those significant issues in our society where people have a genuine concern for their safety and their wellbeing. We cannot dismiss that in any way. In fact, I seek to ensure that we put a focus on it and that the thresholds for ensuring that occurs are clear in law.

There is a different definition with regard to what a reasonable person is when ascertaining some of the provisions in this legislation. They are different from what they have been previously. Let us take these issues and not yawn, groan or complain that people are so inconvenient as to dare to have a voice to this parliament and put their submissions in. There are people opposite who think it is very inconvenient that they would dare to have a voice and put those submissions in.

The LNP have considered reasons for why we are not supporting these elements of the bills. This bill's changes have been problematic, badly drafted and prone to failure because they have not been done right. The government have not listened. They have failed to truly respect all of our community and listen to them and ensure their voices are heard. Instead we have had Labor members groaning and complaining because people dare to have a different voice to them.

Mr SKELTON (Nicklin—ALP) (7.52 pm): The Miles government is doing what matters for Queenslanders by strengthening protections against sexual violence and workplace discrimination. In June 2018 the AHRC was tasked with reviewing and reporting on workplace sexual harassment and making recommendations on its prevalence and nature and the adequacy of the legal frameworks in

place to deal with it. As we have heard from other members, this is very prevalent. The *Respect@Work* report, published in March 2020, set out the AHRC's findings and recommendations following its inquiry into workplace sexual harassment. Broadly, the report found that workplace sexual harassment remains prevalent and that the current system for addressing sexual harassment was complex and confusing for victims and employers to understand.

The respect at work bill amends the Anti-Discrimination Act to implement key reforms—adjusted appropriately for Queensland—recommended in the *Respect@Work* sexual harassment national inquiry report. These amendments address issues raised by stakeholders during the committee process by: updating the definitions of direct and indirect discrimination; providing protection from intersectional and cumulative discrimination and introducing a shared burden of proof for direct discrimination; clarifying the availability of existing protections in the Anti-Discrimination Act for attributes other than sex with respect to subjecting a person to a hostile work environment and harassment; creating a single time limit for bringing a complaint within two years of an alleged contravention of the Anti-Discrimination Act, rather than providing a two-year time limit for complaints about work related contraventions on the basis of sex and maintaining a one-year time limit for other complaints; and providing the Queensland Human Rights Commissioner with the power to conduct investigations into systemic contraventions of the Anti-Discrimination Act.

The bill will also change various definitions following the committee process including: ensuring the definition of 'expunged conviction' captures expunged convictions under corresponding laws in other states and territories; introducing an inclusive definition of 'homelessness'; ensuring the definition of 'potential pregnancy' captures a person's engagement in assisted reproductive technology services in order to become pregnant; and ensuring the definition of 'trade union activity' includes being represented by or seeking to be represented by a registered employee organisation. I say 'registered' to remind my friends on the opposite side.

The bill also makes amendments necessary to reflect the establishment of the Commonwealth Administrative Review Tribunal and will amend the Magistrates Act to allow for magistrates to access unpaid parental leave. It will clarify the immunity and protections provided to magistrates, judges and certain QCAT officers so that they have the same legal protections as a judge of the Supreme Court. The bill also amends the Penalties and Sentences Act to include a circumstance of aggravation for offenders who have committed assaults on public officers. The Criminal Code will also be amended to clarify that the offence of serious assault also applies to operational workers in public hospitals.

I now turn to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. In March 2021, the Queensland government established the independent taskforce to examine coercive control, review the need for a specific offence of domestic violence and, more broadly, investigate the experiences of women across the criminal justice system. Report 1 was released in December 2021, specifically considering coercive control and the need for a domestic violence offence. It made 89 recommendations for broad systemic reforms to Queensland's domestic and family violence and justice systems, with our government committing to support or support in principle all recommendations.

Report 2 was released on 1 July 2022 and focuses on women's experiences in the criminal justice system as victim-survivors of sexual violence and as accused persons and offenders. Report 2 includes 188 recommendations to improve women and girls' experiences of the criminal justice system. The government has committed to support 103 in full and 71 in principle and has noted 14 recommendations. This bill will implement our government's response to taskforce recommendations relating to sexual violence and women and girls as accused persons and offenders. Consistent with taskforce recommendations, the bill will also include a statutory review of amendments from both taskforce reports to occur as soon as practicable five years after the last amendment commences.

Crucially, this bill introduces new position-of-authority offences in the Criminal Code whereby an adult is criminalised for engaging in sexual or otherwise indecent acts with a child aged 16 or 17 where that adult has the child under their care, supervision or authority. This offence and the related amendments are intended to capture and deter members of the community who may use the influence, trust and power that is vested in them when a young person is under their care, supervision or authority. It is intended that these amendments will provide a protective function for young people over the age of consent but under the age of 18 years.

The bill lists certain categories of people who are deemed or presumed to have a child under their care, supervision or authority. Proposed section 210A(3) of the bill includes a non-exhaustive list

of persons deemed as such. For example, a teacher is deemed to have a child under their care, supervision or authority by virtue of this proposed section. This will not preclude a jury from being satisfied, depending on the facts of the particular case, that a teacher aide had a child under their care, supervision or authority. In cases where an accused is not captured by the list, it is a question of fact if circumstances existed that the child was under their care, supervision or authority. The bill contemplates other examples of people who may be captured by the offence including sporting coaches, music teachers, employers and religious or spiritual leaders. Importantly, however, these people are not deemed to have a child under their care, supervision or authority.

These laws strengthen our prohibitions on discrimination and protect the most vulnerable in society from those who may seek to exploit them. These reforms are crucial and necessary for our children and other at-risk communities. This is a Labor government doing what matters for Queensland and getting the job done. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (7.59 pm): The Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill is, without doubt, a disgraceful attack on religious-based schools about which Queenslanders should be deeply upset. It poses a significant threat to the fundamental rights of religious institutions to operate in accordance with their beliefs and is a complete betrayal of all faith communities.

The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which Australia has signed, declares that religious freedom is one of the most fundamental human rights and should be preserved. However, this is not upheld in this bill. I point out that article 18.4 of the ICCPR affirms the rights of parents to ensure the faith and moral education of their children in conformity with their own convictions. It is unacceptable that, because of this bill, religious institutions are effectively required to compromise theology that is fundamental to an orthodox interpretation of their scriptures. This is like saying you can read and even believe in the Bible, but are you not allowed to live according to its teachings because its teachings are deemed offensive to some.

While the ethos of the bill is to stamp out workplace discrimination, the bill instead directly discriminates against the millions who hold strong religious beliefs and want the freedom to educate their children in those beliefs. Already, more than 12,300 teachers and teacher aides in Queensland have resigned since 2020, placing our education system under severe pressure. If this legislation is passed, there will be no need for religious-based schools which will place further pressure on our state school system. The Australian Christian Lobby, in their submission to the bill, points out—

> Part of the problem is that discrimination law, including in Queensland, is already so extensive—because of definitions like 'gender identity'—that it frames religious organisations as 'discriminators' merely for having an ethos, and recruiting people who share it… No matter what some say against Christian schools, they are cherished and sought after by a wide cross-section of Australians, many in search of an alternative to schools in which radical ideology is vigorously forced on children.

The ability to teach about faith should be woven into the very fabric of daily life, creating a living example for children to follow. The capacity for schools to also employ Christian teachers is a fundamental principle of faith-based schools. Without the ability to do this, they will cease to function as a Christian school, and thousands of students and hundreds of thousands of parents will lose the right to have their children taught according to their religious beliefs. This has been the case since time began, but it seems the government in this day and age are hell-bent on persecuting those who have religious beliefs.

The KAP will continue to stand up for Christians and faith-based schools and vehemently oppose this legislation.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Youth Justice) (8.03 pm): I rise to speak on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024. There are obviously many important elements of this cognate bill. I want to speak mainly to the amendments relating to the Anti-Discrimination Act to implement key reforms which have been adjusted appropriately for Queensland, recommended in the Australian Human Rights Commission *Respect@Work* report. I think anybody who had read that report and just read some of the statistics around sexual harassment would be shocked. It said 33 per cent of people in the workforce between 2015 and 2020 had experienced workplace sexual harassment, and although experiences were not confined to one sex, women in particular were more likely than men to have experienced workplace sexual harassment. What is terrible is that even after that shocking report, which should have really raised awareness and, in fact, should have been a call to action for employers to make sure that they were doing the right thing, that they actually did have processes in place to protect their workers, what we found was that in 2022 a national survey revealed that 77 per cent of Australians, 15 years or older, had been sexually harassed, not necessarily in the workplace but at some point in their lifetime, but also that reporting of

workplace sexual harassment continues to be low, and that fewer than one in five people who experienced workplace sexual harassment in the last five years had made a formal report or complaint. Of those who did, one quarter said it resulted in no consequences for the harasser.

These statistics are simply unacceptable. We are employers ourselves; we have our own staff. We work in a place that has many staff members. Those of us who are ministers are working in departments which employ tens of thousands of people. It is our responsibility, as members of parliament, to make sure we are setting the highest standards and we are providing the right legislative environment which supports employers to do the right thing, but for the ones who are not, make it really clear what is acceptable and what is not acceptable.

There are so many challenges to controlling sexual harassment in the general community. So much work has been done through our work on domestic and sexual violence. Certainly in my own department, the education department, we are doing work around respectful relationships. This all contributes to the long game of making sure people are treating each other with respect. It is hard to control those things, but in the workplace, we can and we do need to set standards.

I note that the *Respect@Work* report said that there was a gap between public understanding of sexual harassment and incidents that might actually fall under discrimination on the basis of sex. This bill incorporates a definition of that which happens if a person: engages in unwelcome conduct of a demeaning nature in relation to another person; engages in the conduct on the basis of the sex of the person harassed; and engages in the conduct with the intention of offending, humiliating or intimidating the other person, or in circumstances where a reasonable person would have anticipated the possibility that the other person would be offended, humiliated or intimidated by the conduct. My understanding of the bill is that this will increase people's understanding and awareness of what is or is not harassment. This will support employers to do the right thing, but it will also support employees to be aware of when it is and is not appropriate to be treated the way they are. Having the conversation about this in itself is just so important.

I note in the committee report there are some concerns from faith-based schools that these changes will have an impact on their teaching practices or how they hire staff. However, I note there are currently federal laws in place which these workplaces are also subject to. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General has stated that a religious school would not be required to change its teaching practices unless those teaching practices are unlawful under the Anti-Discrimination Act.

The Department of Education has policies and procedures in place that prohibit workplace sexual harassment and discrimination. We are a proudly diverse and inclusive workforce and we hold our responsibility to a high standard to make sure our staff are treated properly.

I cannot speak about being safe at work, which is what this bill is about, without also mentioning the Occupational Violence Strategy, the campaign which I released on Monday, which draws a line on the way teachers and other education staff are treated in schools. That is the standard that we set which is that these people deserve the greatest respect because they are some of the most precious people in our kids' lives.

Obviously the bill also deals with the recommendations from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce relating to sexual violence and women and girls as accused persons and offenders. I cannot state my support highly enough for the way this government is attending to every single recommendation from that taskforce report and ensuring we are assiduously working through each one so that no more can women and girls ever be subjected to it in any way whatsoever. The taskforce uncovered a myriad of ways in which women and girls are still incredibly vulnerable. I really want to congratulate the minister for the work she is doing to systematically check off all those recommendations. I commend the bills to the House.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (8.09 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate, specifically to the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 for whose examination I was a committee member. The bill proposes changes to the Criminal Code Act 1899, the District Court of Queensland Act 1967, the Magistrates Act 1991, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009 and the Youth Justice Act 1992. With these amendments, the bill will go some way to aligning Queensland law with that of the Commonwealth in respect of anti-discrimination. We all want to stamp out discrimination and harassment in the workplace in all its forms.

I wish to thank all of the 37 submitters to the committee process. Their opinions were diverse and some concerns were highlighted. The LNP members of the committee did share some of the

concerns raised by the submitters, specifically in relation to the second part of the bill. These concerns relate to clause 6, amending section 6 relating to equal opportunity and equitable outcomes. The department representatives present at the hearings could not concisely explain what the term 'equitable outcomes' would mean as it was not defined in the bill. The notion of the equitable outcomes provision is noted to limit discrimination, but the open interpretation will cause uncertainty in terms of the extent of the legislation.

Proposed section 124C narrows the scope of what a reasonable person could deem as hateful, reviling, seriously contemptuous or seriously ridiculing conduct. Therefore, one should consider in section 124C(3)(c) what a reasonable person deems an inappropriate act. It states—

(c) a public act, done reasonably and in good faith, for academic, artistic, scientific or research purposes or for other purposes in the public interest ...

Section 124D states—

(1) A person must not, in a public act, engage in conduct that is likely to incite hatred towards, serious contempt for, or severe ridicule of, a person or group ...

The word 'likely' is broad in its definition and can be easily interpreted differently by different people. This causes another concern.

Chapter 5C, 'Positive duty', empowers the Queensland Human Rights Commission—an unelected body—to issue guidelines on how to comply with law, but this creates uncertainty when it comes to equitable outcomes. The Queensland Human Rights Commission will also be provided with expanded investigation and enforcement powers as part of their compliance powers. These uncertainties have the potential to cause legal actions for alleged failures to comply with the guidelines set out by the Queensland Human Rights Commission. These laws will therefore lead to unintended consequences and create uncertainties.

We all want to protect individuals from harassment and discrimination in all its forms, but this legislation will cause more issues than it fixes. When you create a law that makes it an offence to offend another, it has the potential to open the floodgates for litigation. The government needs to reconsider this bill as it is completely inappropriate.

Mr SULLIVAN (Stafford—ALP) (8.14 pm): I rise in support of the bills being considered in this cognate debate. One bill seeks to implement the Queensland government's response to the recommendations made by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce relating to sexual violence and women and girls as accused persons and offenders. This bill gives effect to nine of the taskforce recommendations, eight of which were made in the second taskforce report *Hear her voice—Report Two*.

I would like to start by focusing on the experience of victim-survivors in court. The bill improves court experiences for victim-survivors of sexual, domestic and family violence when they give evidence in court. Special witnesses in sexual violence or domestic and family violence criminal proceedings such as children, people who have a mental, intellectual or physical impairment, or victim-survivors of domestic or sexual violence will have a presumption in favour of measures such as prerecording their evidence, having a support person, or giving evidence in a different room to the defendant. It reminds me of a time a long time ago, when I had a full head of brown hair, as an associate in the old Supreme District courts, when kids were finally given the chance to give evidence in a separate room on a separate date. Televisions that looked like a mini fridge were rolled in and children were able to provide their evidence without facing the accused. While novel at the time, I think it laid the groundwork for where we are today. I am pleased to see it coming to fruition.

The proposed changes would allow expert evidence to be given in criminal sexual offence trials to dispel myths about how victim-survivors might be expected to behave at the time of the offence or after the offence has been committed. To be blunt, it is not one-size-fits-all when it comes to how someone reacts to abuse in those circumstances. Rules about the admission of evidence in criminal trials revealing a person's tendency to act in a particular way or to have a particular state of mind or showing their prior involvement in similar events will be aligned with other states and territories.

I also want to speak to the technical but important issue of the inadmissibility of admissions made during programs while prisoners are remanded. We want prisoners to participate in programs to rehabilitate themselves. In line with taskforce recommendation 149, the bill inserts new section 344AB into the Corrective Services Act to provide that an admission made by a prisoner as part of their participation in a program or service is not admissible against that prisoner for further legal proceedings. I think that makes sense. They are going to come out into society anyway, so do we want them to

participate in programs to improve themselves and to have self-awareness, or do we want to reprosecute them and stop other people from talking? I think it makes perfect sense.

I will also touch on the issue of strangulation. The amendments in this bill clarify the intent of the initial legislation. It was always intended to recognise that strangulation is a particularly significant and identifiable pause in time in the escalation of violence and the escalation of threats when it comes to domestic violence. Following the Court of Appeal decision, there was concern raised about whether the offence of choking, suffocation or strangulation in a DV setting in section 315A of the Criminal Code extends to the compression of a person's neck that does not hinder breathing but does restrict blood flow. Since the recent case of R v WCA [2023] QCA 265, where that point was argued, we want to make sure that this bill reaffirms what we as a government believed was already in place—recognising the particularly heinous act of strangulation when it comes to threats and signs of violence in relationships. This confirms the original intent of this government's work.

In terms of the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill I think it comes down to this—and we have heard those opposite talk about how we are going to ruin people's lives and hinder people. It comes down to this basic principle that every Queenslander should feel safe to go to work without fear of or actual sexual harassment or discrimination. That is a pretty basic fundamental core value for this parliament to support. As we know, workplace sexual harassment and discrimination remain prevalent in our community, sadly, and this is not only having devastating and profound impacts on the victims themselves but consequences on workplace productivity, threats to other people and workmates and the flow-on effect for their families as well as harm, which is not good enough.

Again, I also reflect on some more technical but important amendments including the amendments to the Magistrates Act to provide magistrates with entitlements to access to unpaid parental leave. I think this reflects the modernisation of courts with more women being appointed including women who bear children. I remember back in the first term of the Palaszczuk government a similar challenge occurred, ironically, as an industrial issue in the Industrial Relations Court. In that case a commissioner was pregnant and was prevented from taking parental leave or was threatened by the then president to not take parental leave. We need to recognise that more professional women and younger women are being appointed to positions on merit and their rights as mothers should be protected and recognised. This bill makes total sense to me.

There are a couple of other technical but important legal reforms including clarifying the legislative immunity protections provided to magistrates, District Court judges and certain other officers of Queensland such as at QCAT so they have the same immunity as Supreme Court judges. That has been assumed but this legislation puts it beyond doubt. I also want to touch on the fact that it is now going to be an aggravating sentencing factor where sexual harassment or discrimination occurs in an office or employment situation. Perpetrators will face the consideration of higher penalties because of the significance of that relationship.

I thank the chair and the committee for their work and I thank the minister for bringing this bill to the House. I commend the bills to the House.

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (8.22 pm): I rise to address the cognated debates on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill and the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I will be confining my comments to the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill alone.

The LNP is committed to keeping our community safe. In fact, we have put forward a number of policies that we believe will deliver much more than those opposite ever will. We strongly believe, though, in the need for respect, regardless of background or beliefs. I have shared many times in this chamber how my own upbringing has shaped my passion for mutual respect. That is just it: it needs to be mutual. Whilst there is much in this bill that is worthy of support, because it has been rushed and it introduces a level of vagueness that could lead to unjust outcomes and to a lack of mutual respect, the LNP cannot support it. That will be good news for many in my electorate. Graham from Beerburrum wrote—

It would seem that some of the aims of the new legislation MAY come into conflict with—

the spiritual rules—

and the Codes of Conduct that I have agreed to within my own religious community.

Daryl from Wamuran shared with me—

One of the most alarming aspects of this bill is the introduction of a new "*positive duty"* on employers to prevent discrimination.

On the surface, this sounds like a noble goal.

But in practice, it's a weapon aimed directly at the heart of religious organisations.

Under this law, Christian schools, churches, and other faith-based institutions could be forced to teach against their own beliefs in order to comply with the government's demands.

And to make matters worse, religious exemptions that have historically protected our freedoms are not being extended to these new sections of the legislation.

In other words, the freedom to speak, teach, and live our faith is on the line.

Damien from Caboolture shared—

I am writing to you in relation to the Respect at Work bill. In its current state it seems to pose some significant and hopefully unintended consequences for religious organisations especially given the current ideological climate around sex and gender. This is a concern for my wife and I as parents of two young children, we are doing our best to raise them in what we see as a respectful manner reflective of our Christian worldview.

I appreciate that everyone is entitled to hold their own convictions however, I have concerns about the new Respect at Work bill.

There appears to be a lack of discussion regarding its potential impact, given that this legislation could have serious implications for faith communities.

Damien continues—

My primary concern is that the bill, in its current form, makes it easy for anti-vilification measures to be weaponised by one minority group against another. Giving the Anti-Discrimination Commission the power to investigate religious institutions like churches and the broad definition of "harassment based on sex" could potentially cover traditional religious teachings and practices, putting faith communities at risk.

It seems to permit one group to impose their views on another and restrict the latter's freedom to operate in organisations that reflect their worldview/religion.

There seems to be little to no allowance for an organisation to hold to the tenants of their worldview when considering employment choices.

Any clarification you can provide in this matter is greatly appreciated.

I know that Veronica from Woodford also shared much of the sentiment that Damien just shared. Might I add that I really valued the respectful way in which Damien and others have provided their input to me on this particular piece of legislation. I want to unpack how these concerns arise. I know members who have been in this chamber will have heard these particular aspects referred to before, but I think it is important for the constituents of Glass House to understand why this bill creates a level of vagueness that we cannot support. Part 4 of the Anti-Discrimination Act is amended significantly through the bill. The current bill states—

A person must not, by a public act, incite hatred towards, serious contempt for, or severe ridicule of, a person or group of persons on the ground of the race, religion, sexuality, sex characteristics or gender identity of the person or members of the group.

This bill proposes to change that to—

A person must not, because of the age, gender identity, impairment, race, religion, sex, sex characteristics or sexual orientation of another person or a group of persons, engage in a public act that a reasonable person would consider hateful towards, reviling, seriously contemptuous of, or seriously ridiculing the other person or members of the group.

The challenge here is around the test of a reasonable person. For this section that test is someone who has 'the same age, gender identity, impairment, race, religion, sex, sex characteristics or sexual orientation as the other person or members of the group.' In other words, the reasonable person has to be someone who shares the values of the person who is feeling offended, hurt or harmed in the first place. The Institute of Public Affairs argues that this is a dramatic diminution from the standards in the current act insofar that it would remove the casual requirement that a person actually be affected by the speech, lowering the standard that someone need only consider it hateful. A similar point is made by Christian Churches Together and is raised in the LNP's statement of reservation. It is a very fair point as legislatively it modifies the objective reasonable person test.

The reasonable person test is a legal fiction designed to apply a similar standard on all matters where it is used. Attempts to actually call a reasonable person to give evidence about what they think have all failed. The significant problem lies with the formulation of the reasonable person test in proposed section 124C. Under proposed subsection (2) the class of a reasonable person has been substantially narrowed to only include a reasonable person as the same age, gender identity, impairment, race, religion, sex, sex characteristics or sexual orientation as the other person or member of the group. That means the reasonable person is no longer representative of the broader community. Rather, the reasonable person, as I said, is someone who might be more likely to be offended than a

person from the broader community. Again, this is concerning as it seems the law is being judged against the sense of a narrow section of society rather than the broader members of the entire community. It is precisely because of this that we should object to the proposal to limit the class of people suggested in clause 21, new section 124C subsection (2). It is that aspect about which people like Graham from Beerburrum, Daryl from Wamuran, Damien from Caboolture, Veronica from Woodford and a number of other constituents wrote to me with their concerns.

As I said at the start, we all want to be respectful and to be safe, but to ensure laws are applied fairly they need to be clear and irrefutable. This bill creates a level of subjectivity that I and the LNP cannot support.

Mr KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (8.29 pm): I rise to support both of these bills in the cognate debate. I will start with the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill. I started my working life in the 1980s, and the workplace in those days was not characterised by what you might call respect at work. We have taken great strides in a whole range of ways to try to improve things since those days and I see this bill as taking bigger steps in relation to that. As a union delegate I supported many people who were impacted by sexual harassment and racial vilification and even people who were targeted for not being members of a union or being members of a union, and in all of those cases people were extremely distressed by these situations. They are completely and extremely damaging, so the steps in this bill that seek to improve our operations in workplaces in relation to these matters are welcome and worthwhile supporting.

I have listened to the concerns raised in this debate tonight, particularly in relation to religious matters, and there are a couple of things that I want to discuss in relation to that. Voltaire visited London and came back to France with a view of pluralism and suggested that, from that point on, rather than having one religious view dominate perhaps one of the best ways for a harmonious society was to tolerate other views, and that was groundbreaking stuff at the time. From the point of view of survival of our species, protecting people's rights to explore their thoughts and to develop their beliefs is fundamentally important because all of those steps that people have taken around exploring metaphysical and physical ideas and other ideas has led to all of the advancements that we have seen across a whole range of human endeavours.

I think it is incredibly important that we protect those things, but I believe that we also have to balance that against people's beliefs where they start to impact on other people in society. We have seen horrific things occur where people have forced their religious beliefs onto other people. Just this morning I was watching the ABC and there was a report on what the Taliban is doing in Afghanistan. Women are not only no longer allowed to show their face; they are no longer allowed to be heard in public. That is an extreme case which I am sure nobody in this place supports, but it seeks to demonstrate why there is a need to think about how beliefs need to be regulated if they are going to impact on the broader society, and I think that is what this bill is attempting to do.

In my view, if you study enough history, I actually think religious groups have been the victims of a great deal of persecution and vilification for their beliefs, so I believe that this sort of legislation provides protection against the very things that people are railing against here. This is attempting to strike that balance, saying, 'Within your communities, within yourself and within your soul, explore, believe, think what you like, but we have to think about what that means if you move beyond your sphere and the impacts that you have broadly in society.' I do support these bills. I do not see people crawling off into caves and not being able to practise their beliefs or teach their children as they see fit. We simply do not live in a totalitarian state like the Taliban are running in Afghanistan—we will not be controlling people to that level—but where people step beyond the mark and are impacting on other people in society I believe we have legislative obligations to try to regulate that.

I turn now to the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024. This week I had the great pleasure of contacting the Small Steps 4 Hannah Foundation to congratulate it because it received a $100,000 community benefit gambling fund grant which it is going to use to roll out its whole program into 72 schools across Queensland—a program aimed at helping young people to identify the signs of coercive control and to stop it. That is a great thing.

I really am very appreciative of the work in this particular bill in relation to victim-survivors and I acknowledge the Attorney-General here tonight. I have to say that I have lived a pretty charmed life in that I did not have much experience or exposure to domestic violence before being elected to parliament and I was shocked when I went to the Holland Park courthouse to see victims being separated from those people accused of assaulting them by a very small partition that they could lean over. That was

very far from an ideal situation. That was quite a number of years ago—nearly eight or nine years ago—and I am pleased to say that the Attorney-General was very sympathetic and we were able to get some other arrangements in place so that there is much better protection for those victim-survivors. The measures that are in this bill that improve things for victim-survivors are certainly welcomed and very much supported.

I often reflect on the work of Sue and Lloyd Clarke and the Small Steps 4 Hannah Foundation and the amazing achievements they have managed to pull off. The input they have had into the taskforce that led to this legislation is quite significant, so I am certainly happy to see that we continue to try to update and improve and really say 'not now, not ever' to domestic violence. I commend the bills to the House.

Mr ANDREW (Mirani—KAP) (8.36 pm): I rise to speak on the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024. The bill expands the list of protected attributes for both criminal and civil vilification to include sex, age and impairment in addition to the existing attributes of race, religion, gender identity and sex characteristics. It also clarifies that the test for civil vilification does not require a complainant to show that another person was actually harmed but only that the public act was likely to harm and introduces a new definition of 'public act' for both criminal and civil vilification which includes social media and other online communication and clarifies that a public act can occur on private land or a place not ordinarily accessed by the general public such as schools and hospitals.

The bill also imposes a positive duty on businesses and individuals to 'eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment, harassment on the basis of sex and other objectionable conduct as far as possible'. Examples given in the explanatory notes include ensuring there are organisational policies in place that address the importance of respectful behaviour in the workplace and engaging in informal and formal disciplinary discussions with members of the organisation who are displaying conduct that may be disrespectful and unlawful under the Anti-Discrimination Act. Managers and people in positions of leadership must clearly and consistently express their expectations of respectful behaviour, yet the bill provides no definition of what constitutes respectful behaviour and what does not and neither does it define what 'objectionable conduct' is or how it may be identified.

Proposed subsection 131I(3) requires employers to take 'reasonable and proportionate measures' to enforce the bill's new laws, but it is unclear what acts they will be required to prevent or what steps would be considered reasonable and proportionate in doing so. There is no definition for any of these broad terms in the bill or the state's Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. The term 'hateful' is introduced under proposed sections 124C and 124D. This also is not defined in the bill. How can a business or organisation possibly be expected to meet such broadly stated standards when there is no guidance or objective test provided in the legislation itself? This is bad lawmaking and will almost certainly lead to significant uncertainty and confusion within businesses and other organisations.

The bill's use of ambiguous language is inconsistent with the rule of law, which requires a law to be clearly stated and for people to be capable of understanding their legal obligations. What makes the bill truly draconian, however, is that this positive duty will be enforceable whether a complaint is made or not. In other words, actual harm does not need to have occurred for an offence to have taken place. It will be enough that a reasonable member of a prescribed group may consider that certain conduct or speech is hateful or demeaning. This sets an incredibly low bar for the commission of an offence under these new laws.

Clause 173B of the bill empowers the Human Rights Commission to carry out an investigation on an individual, business or organisation simply on the suspicion that they may not be complying with this new positive duty to eliminate objectionable conduct. In conducting these investigations, the bill invests the commissioner with vast new information-gathering powers. To state the obvious, the bill carries enormous dangers for misuse by the government of the day, and for shutting down all discussion and debate on topics it deems inappropriate or politically inconvenient. In fact, the bill provides the perfect framework for the targeting of political groups or parties whose values and philosophies are not aligned with those of the government at the time. As a former president of the QLS once told a committee I was on, 'Give people the power to do something and eventually they will use it.' As one submitter said, the state has effectively contracted out the policing of its citizens to civil society groups and businesses. Is that not a strange fact? This is an incredibly alarming development, one that does not bode well for the future of democracy or freedom in Queensland.

Another distinct danger posed by the bill is that in fulfilling the bill's new positive duty, employers will end up overcomplying with the new vilification laws. Measures will no doubt be implemented that

not only eliminate any suggestion of hate speech, but any speech whatsoever—bar the weather and footy. We will go nowhere with that. In other words, they will apply their own precautionary principle when it comes to free speech in the workplace. We will see lists of topics presented to new employees detailing all the subjects they are not permitted to discuss or even mention.

Apart from that, the bill provides inadequate protections for good-faith religious discussion or free speech. That is not acceptable. It bans harassment on the basis of sex which will capture many religious teachings on gender and sexuality. It could even be used to target pro-life groups, such as Cherish Life, and gender critical feminist groups like Women's Forum Australia.

The provisions in this bill go to the very heart of free speech and freedom of religion in this state, particularly the right of conservative and religious groups to freely express their beliefs around sex, sexuality and gender. Apart from anything else, it will put Queensland's faith-based schools in an absolutely untenable position.

Mr Dametto: Shame!

Mr ANDREW: Yes, it is a shame. As former British chief rabbi Jonathan Sacks once warned, the state is now setting up its own religion. The fact is hundreds of thousands of parents choose to send their children to these faith-based schools because they value this type of education. Why shouldn't they? They enrol their children in these schools knowing that the teachers and staff are aligned with a particular set of beliefs and that students will be taught according to those beliefs—something once considered their right in a free country, in a great state like Queensland. This bill removes that right.

Mr Dametto interjected.

Mr ANDREW: I will take that interjection from the member. Moreover, as recent history has shown, all these schools may now be subjected to a barrage of activist lawfare, funded by wealthy vested interests in the NGO and social justice crowd. Many could even be faced with multiple discrimination complaints at the same time. In 2022, Queensland's Citipointe Christian College was the subject of five separate discrimination complaints with the Human Rights Commission over the school's enrolment contracts which contained a statement of faith and outlining the school's beliefs about human sexuality. The bill opens the floodgates to even more of this sort of ideologically-driven complaints and litigation, enabling well-funded activist groups to target people of religious faith and the schools where their children are educated. The exemption for religious speech provided under Section 109 of the bill is narrowly restricted to religious orders and church institutions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Mirani, I am sorry to interrupt you, but would you please resume your seat. Under the business program agreed to by the House and the time for this stage of the bills having expired, I now call upon the Attorney-General to reply to the second reading debate.

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (8.45 pm), in reply: I thank members for their contributions in this debate. Firstly, I thank the opposition for supporting one of the bills before us today, the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. In relation to the respect at work bill, which most members on the other side have spoken to, it is disappointing to hear the views of those opposite. It is a little bit unclear to me their exact reasoning for opposing it. There seems to be a theme around religious freedom. There seems to be criticism that it is not the exposure draft that we had out for consultation and it does not adopt everything in the Queensland Human Rights Commission report, *Building belonging*, but at the same time they criticise this bill for going too far. If I am interpreting the speeches of those opposite correctly, they cannot bring themselves to even go this far. If there is a stage 2, which the Miles Labor government has committed to, that is in line with the *Building belonging* report they absolutely would oppose it, which, as I say, is quite concerning.

We have heard plenty of talk from those opposite about an election coming. They have referred to it in this debate. While we say that there are concerns about an LNP government and what they would do around health, education, housing and infrastructure, the reality is the first thing they are going to come for is the social reforms that this government has brought in. One only needs to look at the reforms we have brought in that they have opposed: the Human Rights Act, termination of pregnancy, voluntarily assisted dying, civil partnerships, treaty, changes to Births, Deaths and Marriages—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). I ask that the minister be brought back to the bill before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): I will take some advice. It has been a fairly broad ranging debate, but it is not an open opportunity for the minister to speculate about what a future government might do. I invite the minister to remain relevant to her bills.

Mrs D'ATH: Back to the bar, I think, for some of them.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin and member for Nanango, order!

Mrs D'ATH: Responding to the concerns of those on the opposite side, I think the majority of them have not read the bill. They certainly have not looked at the amendments that we have circulated. If they had they would have seen that many of those amendments go to the issues that they have raised. When the member for Glass House says, 'We just want legislation that applies fairly', to apply fairly it has to apply equally. That includes religious institutions, private industry and NGOs. It should apply to everyone. That is what fairness is. That does not take away freedom of speech. It does not take away the right of religious speech. If anyone had listened to my speech earlier they would have heard that that is the case: that it is not being interpreted that way, it is not intended that way.

In relation to the concerns from the member for Mirani and others that this bill is too broad and that it does not define everything, it does not provide enough clarity, there are many pieces of legislation that this House has passed and that are in operation in this state that do not have specific definitions because there are too many scenarios that can come out of that particular terminology.

The whole purpose of this it that it will evolve over time and the case law will help develop what that is. We have heard many on the opposite side talk about the framework of this bill, including the harm-based provision and the reasonable person test. We have heard a lot of concerns raised by those opposite and those on the crossbench about how this bill is reframing the reasonable person test and that that is really concerning because they do not know what it will mean and they do not know how it will be interpreted.

I make this point: the bill makes clear whose reaction is to be assessed in order to determine whether the harm has been caused in line with jurisprudence on section 18C of the Racial Discrimination Act 1975 and, in particular, the examination of the relevant elements of that provision by Justice Bromberg in Eatock v Bolt in 2011. Justice Bromberg found that the person or group of people whose reaction is to be assessed was a reasonable representative who is an ordinary or reasonable member or members of the group that the conduct was directed towards. Since 2011, that reasonable person test has applied. It looks at the reasonable person who was in the group that the conduct was directed towards. Members opposite come in here talking fire-and-brimstone, saying that the sky is going to fall in, that we will not be able to get out of bed, that we will not be allowed to say anything and that we will be able to talk only about the footy, apparently. However, the reality is that these sorts of tests have been around for years. We have to stop this fear and division. This legislation is about removing fear and division, not creating it. It is not about creating fear and division.

We should look at the purpose of this: respect at work. Is it really that hard to have a positive duty to have a safe workplace, which includes a workplace that is free from vilification, hate speech and sexual harassment? This is a good thing because we need to start dealing with gender violence in this country and that has to start with the way that we treat people, including in the workplace. These things should not be tolerated. There should be consequences.

I acknowledge the Queensland Human Rights Commissioner, who is in the gallery tonight. The commissioner should be able to investigate and issue reports and guidance. If we are going to use Citipointe as an example, I would say that absolutely a school should be called out for that behaviour. By the way, they were called out for that behaviour before this bill was debated by the House so you cannot blame the bill for that. It is not the complainant's fault and we should not take away a complainant's right if they believe that the threshold has been met. Let the courts determine it. We should not take away people's rights to lodge a complaint about serious issues of vilification and hate speech because we do not want any particular part of society to have to deal with those complaints. It is a high threshold and we should not be spreading fear and division in relation to this bill. The bill is not at all targeting the heart of religion. It is targeting discrimination, harassment, hatred and vilification. That is what this bill is about. That is why it is here.

The member for Maiwar, as he often does, comes in here and says, 'We support it but' and then goes on to criticise, criticise, criticise. They say that we have caved in, that we should be bold, that we

should make tough decisions and that we should do the right thing when it comes to social reform, ignoring all the social reform that this government has brought in over the past 10 years. The member for Maiwar said that he is concerned about the next four years if the LNP gets in and he is worried about social reforms. Well, maybe they should not do a preference deal with the LNP if they are so worried about the LNP getting into government.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: They laugh, but I do not see any of them getting up to say that they are not going to do it. I do not see the Leader of the Opposition giving a press conference to say that he is not going to do any preference deals with the Greens. Then again, I do not see the Leader of the Opposition doing press conferences on many issues at all. Transparency and accountability only go so far when it comes to the Leader of the Opposition.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: The career candidate!

I am really proud that I am part of the Miles Labor government, that we have introduced this bill and that we are debating this bill. I am proud not only that we have committed to this bill but also that this bill is the first stage in important reforms around the *Building belonging* report. The statements that those opposite have made in relation to the *Building belonging* report and the serious concerns raised about that by stakeholders says that that is a path they will never go down. They are saying that there are concerns about this one so they will not go there. There are concerns raised by lots of stakeholders on lots of legislation that we have to deal with. Guess what? Our job is to make tough decisions. Our job is to look at the greater good for the people of Queensland. This bill provides for the greater good of the people of Queensland. I am proud of that and I commend the bill to the House.

Question—That the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 51:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Rourke, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 34—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Zanow.

KAP, 4—Andrew, Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Lauga, Perrett.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mrs D'ATH (9.02 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 10, lines 7 and 8—

omit, insert—

(1) The following provisions commence on 1 December 2024—

(a) part 2, heading;

(b) sections 3, 28(1), 31, 37, 38 and 46 to 48;

(c) section 51, to the extent it inserts—

(i) chapter 11, part 10, heading; and

(ii) sections 282 and 285;

(d) section 52(2), to the extent it inserts definitions *class member* and *registered employee organisation*;

(e) section 52(3).

(2) The following provisions commence on 1 July 2025—

(a) the provisions of part 2 that are not in force on 30 June 2025;

(b) part 3;

(c) sections 56 to 59;

(d) part 6;

(e) schedule 1.

2 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 10, after line 8—

insert—

(3) Part 11 and schedule 2 commence immediately after the commencement of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), section 8.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [1782].

Tabled paper: Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [1783].

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 3—

Mrs D'ATH (9.03 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 3 (Act amended)

Page 10, line 12, 'amends'—

omit, insert—

and schedule 1 amend

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 to 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mrs D'ATH (9.03 pm): I move the following amendment—

4 Clause 7 (Amendment of s 7 (Discrimination on the basis of certain attributes prohibited))

Page 12, lines 4 and 5—

omit, insert—

(4) Section 7—

insert—

(r) a combination of 2 or more of any of the above attributes.

(5) Section 7(pa) to (r)—

renumber as section 7(q) to (x).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (9.04 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

5 After clause 7

Page 12, after line 5—

insert—

7A Amendment of s 8 (Meaning of *discrimination on the basis of an attribute*)

Section 8—

insert—

(2) Also, ***discrimination on the basis of an attribute*** of a person who has 2 or more attributes includes discrimination in relation to—

(a) any of the attributes; or

(b) 2 or more of the attributes; or

(c) the combined effect of 2 or more of the attributes.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mrs D'ATH (9.04 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

6 After clause 7

Page 12, after line 5—

insert—

7B Replacement of ss 10 and 11

Sections 10 and 11—

omit, insert—

10 Meaning of *direct discrimination*

(1) ***Direct discrimination*** on the basis of an attribute happens if a person treats, or proposes to treat, another person unfavourably because the other person has an attribute.

(2) For subsection (1), it does not matter—

(a) whether the person's attribute is only 1 of the reasons for the unfavourable treatment; or

(b) whether the person who discriminates considers the treatment is unfavourable.

11 Meaning of *indirect discrimination*

(1) ***Indirect discrimination*** on the basis of an attribute happens if a person imposes, or proposes to impose, a condition, requirement or practice that—

(a) has, or is likely to have, the effect of disadvantaging another person because the other person has an attribute; and

(b) is not reasonable.

(2) Creating an environment in which a person with an attribute is disadvantaged is taken to be imposing a condition, requirement or practice under subsection (1)(a).

(3) For subsection (1), the person imposing or proposing to impose the condition, requirement or practice has the onus of proving, on the balance of probabilities, the condition, requirement or practice is reasonable.

(4) In deciding whether a condition, requirement or practice is reasonable, the following matters may be considered—

(a) the nature and extent of the disadvantage resulting from the imposition, or proposed imposition, of the condition, requirement or practice;

(b) whether the disadvantage is proportionate to the result sought by the person who imposes, or proposes to impose, the condition, requirement or practice;

(c) whether any adjustment could be made to the condition, requirement or practice to reduce the disadvantage caused;

(d) whether there is an alternative condition, requirement or practice that would achieve the result sought by the person imposing, or proposing to impose, the condition, requirement or practice and would result in less disadvantage;

(e) the cost of any adjustment or any alternative condition, requirement or practice;

(f) the financial circumstances of the person imposing, or proposing to impose, the condition, requirement or practice;

(g) any other relevant matter.

11A When does a person discriminate against another person

(1) A person discriminates against another person if the person directly or indirectly discriminates against the other person on the basis of an attribute.

(2) For subsection (1), it does not matter—

(a) whether the discrimination is only direct discrimination, only indirect discrimination or both direct discrimination and indirect discrimination; or

(b) whether the person who discriminates is aware of the discrimination; or

(c) whether the discrimination happens because the person does an act or makes an omission.

(3) Also, a person's motive for discriminating against another person is irrelevant.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Mrs D'ATH (9.05 pm): I move the following amendment—

7 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 3)

Page 16, after line 22—

insert—

120AA Relationship with other conduct

To remove any doubt, it is declared that this part does not limit any other provision of this Act that prohibits conduct of a person that is the same as or similar to conduct prohibited under division 2, whether the conduct is engaged in on the basis of, or in relation to, sex or any other attribute.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 21, as read, agreed to.

Clause 22—

Mrs D'ATH (9.06 pm): I move the following amendment—

8 Clause 22 (Insertion of new ch 4, pt 5)

Page 23, lines 9 to 12—

omit, insert—

(4) To remove any doubt, it is declared that this section does not limit any other provision of this Act that prohibits conduct of a person that is the same as or similar to conduct prohibited under this section, whether the conduct is engaged in on the basis of, or in relation to, sex or any other attribute.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 28, as read, agreed to.

Clause 29—

Mrs D'ATH (9.06 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 29 (Amendment of s 138 (Time limit on making complaints))

Page 27, lines 26 to 31 and page 28, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

within 2 years after the alleged contravention of the Act (the ***complaint period***).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 29, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 30 to 38, as read, agreed to.

Clause 39—

Mrs D'ATH (9.07 pm): I move the following amendments—

10 Clause 39 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1A)

Page 36, lines 33 and 34 and page 37, lines 1 to 3—

omit, insert—

contravention of the Act that is or is suspected to be systemic.

(4) For subsection (3), a contravention of the Act is systemic if the contravention—

11 Clause 39 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1A)

Page 40, line 18—

omit, insert—

173L;

(d) prepare a report about the investigation, and publish the report or give the report to the Minister, under section 173NA.

12 Clause 39 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1A)

Page 44, after line 28—

insert—

173NA Report on investigation

(1) A report about the investigation—

(a) may include the commissioner's recommendations for dealing with the matter the subject of the report; and

(b) must not include personal information about an individual unless the information has previously been published, or given for the purpose of publication, by the individual; and

(c) must not include an adverse comment about an entity unless—

(i) the entity has been given an opportunity to make submissions in relation to the adverse comment; and

(ii) the submissions are fairly stated in the report.

(2) For subsection (1)(c), an adverse comment does not include a statement that a respondent did not participate in resolving a complaint.

(3) The commissioner may do either or both of the following—

(a) publish a copy of the report—

(i) on the commission's website; and

(ii) in any other way the commissioner considers appropriate;

(b) give the report to the Minister.

(4) If the Minister is given a report under subsection (3)(b), the Minister must table the report in the Legislative Assembly within 6 sitting days after the Minister receives the report.

13 Clause 39 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1A)

Page 44, lines 30 and 31—

omit, insert—

contravention

14 Clause 39 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1A)

Page 46, lines 7 to 10—

omit, insert—

173Q Commission guidelines

The commission—

(a) must issue guidelines about how persons may comply with the positive duty; and

(b) may issue guidelines about any other matter relating to this Act.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 39, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 40 to 47, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mrs D'ATH (9.08 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

15 After clause 47

Page 56, after line 22—

insert—

47A Replacement of ss 204—206

Sections 204 to 206—

omit, insert—

204 Burden of proof—general

(1) In a complaint proceeding, if there are facts from which it could be decided, in the absence of any other explanation, that the respondent contravened the provision of the Act the subject of the alleged contravention, the respondent is taken to have contravened the provision.

(2) Subsection (1) does not apply if the respondent proves, on the balance of probabilities, that the respondent did not contravene the provision.

(3) Subsection (1) and (2) apply in addition to any other provision of the Act that provides for who has the onus of proving a particular matter.

Note—

See, for example, section 11(3) and 205.

205 Burden of proof—exemption

(1) An exemption is a defence to discrimination, and the person seeking to rely on the exemption has the onus of proving, on the balance of probabilities, that the exemption applies.

(2) In this section—

exemption means an exemption under chapter 2, part 4 or 5 that applies to discrimination.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 48 to 50, as read, agreed to.

Clause 51—

Mrs D'ATH (9.08 pm): I move the following amendment—

16 Clause 51 (Insertion of new ch 11, pt 10)

Page 59, lines 14 and 16, after 'commencement'—

insert—

of the provision in which the term is used

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (9.08 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

17 Clause 51 (Insertion of new ch 11, pt 10)

Page 60, after line 27—

insert—

285A Burden of proof for complaints about pre-commencement conduct

(1) This section applies in relation to—

(a) a complaint made before the commencement that, immediately before the commencement, had not been finally dealt with; or

(b) a complaint made after the commencement in relation to an alleged contravention of the Act that happened before the commencement.

(2) New sections 204 and 205 do not apply in relation to the complaint.

(3) Former sections 204 to 206 continue to apply in relation to the complaint.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 51, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 52—

Mrs D'ATH (9.10 pm): I move the following amendments—

18 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 61, lines 29 and 30 and page 62, lines 1 to 10—

omit.

19 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 62, lines 11 to 14—

omit, insert—

expunged conviction, in relation to a person, means a conviction of the person that has been expunged or extinguished, or whose effect has otherwise ended, under—

(a) the *Criminal Law (Historical Homosexual Convictions Expungement) Act 2017*; or

(b) a law of another State that provides for the same, or substantially the same, matter as the Act mentioned in paragraph (a).

20 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 62, after line 15—

insert—

homelessness, in relation to a person, includes the person not having adequate, safe and secure housing.

21 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 64, line 12, 'pregnant.'—

omit, insert—

pregnant; and

(d) the person's undergoing of a medical treatment or other procedure that procures, or attempts to procure, pregnancy in the person other than by sexual intercourse.

22 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 65, after line 33—

insert—

(ba) being represented by, or seeking to be represented by, a registered employee organisation;

23 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 66, lines 19 to 27—

omit.

Amendments agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (9.10 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

24 Clause 52 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 67, after line 4—

insert—

(4A) Schedule 1, definition *discriminate*—

insert—

Note—

See also section 11A.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 52, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 53 and 54, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mrs D'ATH (9.11 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

25 After clause 54

Page 67, after line 24—

insert—

54A Amendment of s 319G (When treatment of offender by protected defendant is not direct discrimination)

Section 319G(1)—

omit, insert—

(1) This section applies if a protected defendant treats, or proposes to treat, an offender unfavourably because the offender has an attribute.

54B Amendment of s 319H (When term imposed on offender by protected defendant is not indirect discrimination)

(1) Section 319H(1)—

omit, insert—

(1) This section applies if a protected defendant imposes, or proposes to impose, a term that has, or is likely to have, the effect of disadvantaging an offender because the offender has an attribute.

(2) Section 319H(2), 'section 11(1)(c)'—

omit, insert—

section 11(1)(b)

(3) Section 319H(3), definition *term*—

omit, insert—

term means condition, requirement or practice.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 55 to 59, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs D'ATH (9.11 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

26 After clause 59

Page 70, after line 6—

insert—

59A Amendment of s 340 (Serious assaults)

Section 340(3), definition *public officer*, paragraph (b)—

insert—

Example—

a person appointed as a health service employee to perform functions as a security officer, wardsperson, cleaner or food service worker

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 60, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

Mrs D'ATH (9.12 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

27 After clause 60

Page 70, after line 10—

insert—

60A Amendment of s 3 (Definitions)

Section 3—

insert—

reserve judge means a person appointed as a reserve judge of the District Court under section 18.

retired District Court judge means a person who—

(a) has been a judge of the District Court; and

(b) has not reached 78 years of age.

60B Amendment of s 17 (Acting judge)

Section 17(8)—

omit.

60C Insertion of new ss 18 and 18A

After section 17—

insert—

18 Reserve judges

(1) The Governor in Council may, by commission, appoint as many reserve judges as are necessary for conducting the business of the court.

Note—

For the remuneration of a reserve judge engaged under section 18A, see the *Judicial Remuneration Act 2007*, section 9A.

(2) A person is eligible for appointment as a reserve judge only if—

(a) the person is a retired Supreme Court judge or retired District Court judge; or

(b) the person has not reached 70 years of age and has been—

(i) a judge of a supreme court, district court or county court of another State; or

(ii) a judge of the Federal Court of Australia.

(3) A reserve judge's appointment ends on the earlier of—

(a) the day, not more than 5 years after the appointment is made, stated in the person's commission; or

(b) the day the reserve judge reaches the age of—

(i) if the person is a retired District Court judge—78 years; or

(ii) otherwise—70 years.

(4) However, despite subsection (3), a reserve judge engaged under section 18A who, before the judge's commission ends, starts the hearing of a proceeding, remains a reserve judge for the purposes of finishing the proceeding.

(5) A person may be re-appointed as a reserve judge.

(6) In this section—

retired Supreme Court judge see the *Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991*, schedule 5.

18A Engagement of reserve judges

(1) The Chief Judge may, from time to time, by notice in writing, engage a reserve judge to undertake the duties of a judge on a full-time or sessional basis.

(2) Each engagement under subsection (1) must not exceed 6 consecutive months.

(3) A reserve judge engaged under this section—

(a) may be engaged more than once; and

(b) has, subject to the conditions stated in the judge's commission, the same powers, authority, immunities and protections as a judge.

(4) A period of engagement of a reserve judge under this section is not to be counted as service for the purposes of the *Judges (Pensions and Long Leave) Act 1957*.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 61 to 64, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 28 refers to the insertion of new part 6A and new clauses 64A to 64E and clause 62. It is clear the intention is to insert this amendment after clause 64.

Message from Governor

Mrs D'ATH (9.13 pm): I present a message from Her Excellency the Governor.

Mr SPEAKER: The message from Her Excellency the Governor recommends the amendments circulated by the Attorney-General. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

RESPECT AT WORK AND OTHER MATTERS AMENDMENT BILL 2024

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, DR JEANNETTE ROSITA YOUNG AC PSM, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly that an appropriation be made for the purposes of the attached amendment, to be moved by the Minister, to a Bill for an Act to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, the Corrective Services Act 2006, the Criminal Code, the District Court of Queensland Act 1967, the Human Rights Act 2019, the Magistrates Act 1991, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes.

GOVERNOR

Date: 10 September 2024

Tabled paper: Message, dated 10 September 2024, from Her Excellency the Governor recommending an amendment to the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill 2024 [1784].

Insertion of new clauses—

Mrs D'ATH (9.13 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs D'ATH: I move the following amendment—

28 After clause 62

Page 71, after line 27—

insert—

Part 6A Amendment of Judicial Remuneration Act 2007

64A Act amended

This part amends the *Judicial Remuneration Act 2007*.

64B Amendment of s 5A (Retired acting Supreme Court judge)

(1) Section 5A, heading, 'Retired'—

omit, insert—

Reserve Supreme Court judge or retired

(2) Section 5A(1) and (2)—

omit, insert—

(1) A reserve Supreme Court judge or retired acting Supreme Court judge engaged, or appointed to act, on a full-time basis is entitled to be paid, for a financial year, an amount equivalent to the amount payable to a Supreme Court judge under sections 5 and 21, less any amount the judge receives as a pension.

(2) A reserve Supreme Court judge or retired acting Supreme Court judge engaged, or appointed to act, on a sessional basis is entitled to be paid an amount decided by the Governor in Council and stated in the judge's commission of appointment.

(3) Section 5A(4)—

insert—

pension includes a pension to which a person is entitled on retirement as a judge under an Act of the Commonwealth or another State.

reserve Supreme Court judge means a person appointed as a reserve judge under the *Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991*, section 6A.

64C Amendment of s 9 (District Court judge other than the Chief Judge or retired acting District Court judge)

(1) Section 9, heading, 'or retired acting District Court judge'—

omit.

(2) Section 9, 'or a retired acting District Court judge'—

omit.

64D Amendment of s 9A (Retired acting District Court judge)

(1) Section 9A, heading, 'Retired'—

omit, insert—

Reserve District Court judge or retired

(2) Section 9A(1) and (2)—

omit, insert—

(1) A reserve District Court judge or retired acting District Court judge engaged, or appointed to act, on a full-time basis is entitled to be paid, for a financial year, an amount equivalent to the amount payable to a District Court judge under sections 9 and 21, less any amount the judge receives as a pension.

(2) A reserve District Court judge or retired acting District Court judge engaged, or appointed to act, on a sessional basis is entitled to be paid an amount decided by the Governor in Council and stated in the judge's commission of appointment.

(3) Section 9A—

insert—

(6) In this section—

pension includes a pension to which a person is entitled on retirement as a judge under an Act of the Commonwealth or another State.

reserve District Court judge means a person appointed as a reserve judge under the *District Court of Queensland Act 1967*, section 18.

retired acting District Court judge means a retired District Court judge appointed to act as a judge under the *District Court of Queensland Act 1967*, section 17(3).

64E Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary)

Schedule 2, definition *retired acting District Court judge*—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 65 to 70, as read, agreed to.

Clause 71—

Mrs D'ATH (9.14 pm): I move the following amendments—

29 Clause 71 (Amendment of s 10 (Court's reasons to be stated and recorded))

Page 75, after line 3—

insert—

(1) Section 10(1)(c), 'cause'—

omit, insert—

if the chief executive (corrective services) requests a copy of the reasons—cause

30 Clause 71 (Amendment of s 10 (Court's reasons to be stated and recorded))

Page 75, line 4, before 'Section 10'—

insert—

(2)

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 71, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 72 to 75, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, 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. The House will consider the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill first. In accordance with sessional order 4, the House must now consider clauses or remaining clauses, schedules and any amendments circulated by the minister in charge of the bill, in this case the Attorney-General. I note that the Attorney-General's amendments Nos 31, 32, 33 and 34 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendments Nos 31 to 34, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

31 After clause 75

Page 77, after line 20—

insert—

Part 9A Amendment of Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991

75A Act amended

This part amends the *Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991*.

75B Amendment of s 6 (Acting judges)

Section 6(12)—

omit.

75C Insertion of new ss 6A and 6B

After section 6—

insert—

6A Reserve judges

(1) The Governor in Council may, by commission, appoint as many reserve judges as are necessary for conducting the business of the court.

Note—

For the remuneration of a reserve judge engaged under section 6B, see the *Judicial Remuneration Act 2007*, section 5A.

(2) A person is eligible for appointment as a reserve judge only if—

(a) the person is a retired Supreme Court judge; or

(b) the person has not reached 70 years of age and has been—

(i) a judge of a supreme court of another State; or

(ii) a judge of the Federal Court of Australia.

(3) A reserve judge's appointment ends on the earlier of—

(a) the day, not more than 5 years after the appointment is made, stated in the person's commission; or

(b) the day the reserve judge reaches the age of—

(i) if the person is a retired Supreme Court judge—78 years; or

(ii) otherwise—70 years.

(4) However, despite subsection (3), a reserve judge engaged under section 6B who, before the judge's commission ends, starts the hearing of a proceeding, remains a reserve judge for the purposes of finishing the proceeding.

(5) A person may be re-appointed as a reserve judge.

6B Engagement of reserve judges

(1) The chief justice may, from time to time, by notice in writing, engage a reserve judge to undertake the duties of a judge on a full-time or sessional basis.

(2) Each engagement under subsection (1) must not exceed 6 consecutive months.

(3) A reserve judge engaged under this section—

(a) may be engaged more than once; and

(b) has, subject to the conditions stated in the judge's commission, the same powers, authority, immunities and protections as a judge.

(4) A period of engagement of a reserve judge under this section is not to be counted as service for the purposes of the *Judges (Pensions and Long Leave) Act 1957*.

75D Amendment of sch 5 (Dictionary)

Schedule 5—

insert—

reserve judge means a person appointed as a reserve judge of the Supreme Court under section 6A.

retired Supreme Court judge means a person who—

(a) has been a judge of the Supreme Court; and

(b) has not reached 78 years of age.

32 After clause 77

Page 78, after line 6—

insert—

Part 11 Amendments relating to Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth)

78 Legislation amended

Schedule 2 amends the legislation it mentions.

33 After clause 77

Page 78, after line 6—

insert—

Schedule 1 Other amendments of Anti-Discrimination Act 1991

section 3

1 References to unfavourable treatment

Each provision mentioned in column 1 is amended by omitting the words mentioned in column 2 and inserting the words mentioned in column 3—

Column 1	**Column 2**	**Column 3**
Provision	**Words omitted**	**Words inserted**
section 15(1)(f)	treating a worker unfavourably in any way	subjecting a worker to any other detriment
section 15A(2)(d)	treating the worker unfavourably in any way	subjecting the worker to any other detriment
section 18(d)	treating another partner unfavourably in any way	subjecting another partner to any other detriment
section 20(1)(d)	treating a person unfavourably in any way	subjecting a person to any other detriment
section 22(c)	treating the other person unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other person to any other detriment
section 23(d)	treating a person seeking work or an employer seeking a worker unfavourably in any way	subjecting a person seeking work, or an employer seeking a worker, to any other detriment
section 39(d)	treating a student unfavourably in any way	subjecting a student to any other detriment
section 46(1)(d)	treating the other person unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other person to any other detriment
section 55(c)	treating the other person unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other person to any other detriment
section 57(c)	treating the other partner unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other partner to any other detriment
section 69(c)	treating the person unfavourably in any way	subjecting the person to any other detriment
section 71(c)	treating the other partner unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other partner to any other detriment
section 83(d)	treating the other person unfavourably in any way	subjecting the other person to any other detriment
section 95(e)	treating a member unfavourably in any way	subjecting a member to any other detriment

2 Section 131D, ', 204 and 205'—

omit, insert—

and 204

34 After clause 77

Page 78, after line 6—

insert—

Schedule 2 Amendments relating to Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth)

section 78

Agricultural and Veterinary Chemicals (Queensland) Act 1994

1 Section 16(2), from '*Administrative*' to 'that section'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth), part 10, division 3, as that division

2 Section 19—

omit, insert—

19 Construction of references to part 7 of Commonwealth Administrative Review Tribunal Act

For section 16, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of this jurisdiction, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

3 Schedule, definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)(i)—

omit, insert—

(i) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), excluding part 7;

Competition Policy Reform (Queensland) Act 1996

1 Section 29, definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)(i)—

omit, insert—

(i) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), excluding part 7;

2 Section 33A—

omit, insert—

33A Construction of references to part 7 of Commonwealth Administrative Review Tribunal Act

For sections 30 and 31, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of this jurisdiction, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

Corporations (Queensland) Act 1990

1 Section 3(1), definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)—

omit, insert—

(a) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), excluding part 7;

2 Section 36A—

omit, insert—

36A Construction of references to part 7 of Commonwealth Administrative Review Tribunal Act

For sections 35 and 36, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of Queensland, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

Education and Care Services National Law (Queensland) Act 2011

1 Sections 39(1), 40(1) and 41(1), 'Administrative Appeals Tribunal'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal

Gene Technology (Queensland) Act 2016

1 Section 5(1), definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)—

omit, insert—

(a) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), excluding part 7;

2 Section 15(3), from '*Administrative*' to 'part IVA'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of this State, to the whole or part of part 7

Research Involving Human Embryos And Prohibition of Human Cloning for Reproduction Act 2003

1 Section 39, definition *Administrative Appeals Tribunal*—

omit.

2 Section 39—

insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal means the Administrative Review Tribunal established by the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth).

3 Section 39, definition *decision, 'Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act 1975* (Cwlth)'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth)

4 Section 40(1), 'Administrative Appeals Tribunal'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal

5 Section 40(2), '*Administrative Appeals Tribunal Act 1975* (Cwlth)'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth)

6 Section 40(3), from '*Administrative*' to 'part IVA'—

omit, insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024 (Cwlth), other than part 7

7 Section 40(4)—

omit, insert—

(4) For this section, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as the provision applies as a law of this State, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

8 Schedule, definition *Administrative Appeals Tribunal*—

omit.

9 Schedule—

insert—

Administrative Review Tribunal, for part 3, division 6, see section 39.

Telecommunications Interception Act 2009

1 Sections 9, 10(1) and 15(1)(a)(i) and (ii), 'AAT'—

omit, insert—

ART

Therapeutic Goods Act 2019

1 Section 9(1)(a)—

omit, insert—

(a) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth);

Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Domestic Commercial Vessel National Law Application) Act 2016

1 Section 4(1), definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)—

omit, insert—

(a) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024*, other than part 7;

2 Section 13(5)—

omit, insert—

(5) For this section, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of this State, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

Water Efficiency Labelling and Standards (Queensland) Act 2005

1 Section 5(1), definition *Commonwealth administrative laws*, paragraph (a)—

omit, insert—

(a) the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), other than part 7;

2 Section 15(5)—

omit, insert—

(5) For this section, a reference in a provision of the *Administrative Review Tribunal Act 2024* (Cwlth), as that provision applies as a law of this State, to the whole or part of part 7 of that Act is taken to be a reference to the whole or part of that part as it has effect as a law of the Commonwealth.

Question put—That clauses 76 and 77, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 76 and 77, as amended, agreed to.

Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister to table the explanatory notes to her amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Mrs D'ATH (9.17 pm): I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [1785].

Tabled paper: Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2024, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendments [1786].

Mr SPEAKER: I note the Attorney-General's amendment No. 5 is outside the long title of the bill and therefore requires leave of House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendments Nos 1 to 11, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 6, line 10—

omit, insert—

(c) sections 8, 9, 10 and 11;

2 Clause 8 (Insertion of new s 210A)

Page 12, lines 13 to 15—

omit, insert—

(g) a person associated with a residential care service that provides accommodation where the child resides.

3 Clause 8 (Insertion of new s 210A)

Page 13, lines 18 to 30—

omit, insert—

associated, in relation to a residential care service, means—

(a) owns, or is involved in the management or control of, the service; or

(b) is employed or engaged by the service; or

(c) works as a volunteer for the service.

chief executive (child safety) means the chief executive of the department in which the *Child Protection Act 1999* is administered.

health practitioner means a person registered under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law to practise in a health profession, other than as a student.

4 Clause 8 (Insertion of new s 210A)

Page 13, after line 33—

insert—

residential care service means a service whose main purpose is to provide accommodation to children who are in the custody, or under the guardianship, of the chief executive (child safety) under the *Child Protection Act 1999*.

5 After clause 9

Page 15, after line 17—

insert—

9A Amendment of s 315A (Choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting)

Section 315A—

insert—

(1A) For subsection (1) and without limiting the subsection, a person is taken to choke, suffocate or strangle another person if the person applies pressure to the other person's neck that completely or partially restricts the other person's respiration or blood circulation, or both.

6 Clause 39 (Amendment of s 21AZJ (Meaning of *relevant proceeding*))

Page 37, lines 21 to 23—

omit.

7 Clause 40 (Insertion of new pt 7A)

Page 38, line 5 to page 43, line 24—

omit, insert—

129AA Application

(1) This part applies to criminal proceedings.

(2) Despite subsection (1), this part does not apply to—

(a) bail or sentencing proceedings; or

(b) evidence that relates only to the credibility of a witness; or

(c) evidence of the character, reputation or conduct of a person, or a tendency that a person has or had, to the extent that the character, reputation, conduct or tendency is a fact in issue.

(3) To avoid doubt, any principle or rule of the common law that prevents or restricts the admissibility of evidence about propensity or similar fact evidence in a proceeding is not relevant when applying this part to tendency evidence or coincidence evidence about a defendant.

(4) In determining the probative value of tendency evidence or coincidence evidence for the purpose of this part, it is not open to the court to have regard to the possibility that the evidence may be the result of collusion, concoction or contamination.

129AB Definitions for part

(1) In this part—

***coincidence evidence*—**

(a) means evidence that 2 or more events occurred that is adduced or to be adduced to prove, that a person did a particular act or had a particular state of mind on the basis that, having regard to any similarities in the events or circumstances in which they occurred, or any similarities in both the events and the circumstances in which they occurred, it is improbable that the events occurred coincidentally; and

(b) includes evidence from multiple witnesses claiming to be victims of offences committed by a defendant, that is adduced or to be adduced to prove, on the basis of similarities in the claimed acts or the circumstances in which they occurred, that the defendant did an act in issue.

probative value, of evidence, means the extent to which the evidence could rationally affect the assessment of the probability of the existence of a fact in issue.

tendency evidence means evidence of the character, reputation or conduct of a person, or a tendency that a person has or had, that is adduced or to be adduced to prove that a person has or had a tendency, whether because of the person's character or otherwise, to act in a particular way or to have a particular state of mind.

tendency rule means the rule of evidence expressed in section 129AD(1).

(2) A reference in this part to an act includes a reference to an omission.

129AC Use of evidence for other purposes

(1) Evidence that under this part is not admissible to prove a particular matter must not be used to prove that matter even if it is relevant for another purpose.

(2) Evidence that under this part can not be used against a party to prove a particular matter must not be used against the party to prove that matter even if it is relevant for another purpose.

129AD The tendency rule

(1) Evidence of the character, reputation or conduct of a person, or a tendency that a person has or had, is not admissible to prove that a person has or had a tendency, whether because of the person's character or otherwise, to act in a particular way, or to have a particular state of mind unless—

(a) the party seeking to adduce the evidence gave reasonable notice in writing to each other party of the party's intention to adduce the evidence; and

(b) the court considers that the evidence will, either by itself or having regard to other evidence adduced or to be adduced by the party seeking to adduce the evidence, have significant probative value.

(2) Subsection (1)(a) does not apply if—

(a) the evidence is adduced in accordance with any directions made by the court under section 129AH; or

(b) the evidence is adduced to explain or contradict tendency evidence adduced by another party.

Note—

The tendency rule is subject to specific exceptions concerning the character of, or expert opinion about, accused persons, see section 129AJ. (Other provisions of this Act may also operate as further exceptions.)

129AE Admissibility of tendency evidence in proceedings involving certain child sexual offences

(1) This section applies in a proceeding in which the commission by the defendant of an act that constitutes, or may constitute, a relevant child sexual offence is a fact in issue.

(2) It is presumed that the following tendency evidence about the defendant will have significant probative value for the purposes of sections 129AD(1)(b) and 129AI(1)—

(a) tendency evidence about the sexual interest the defendant has or had in children, even if the defendant has not acted on the interest;

(b) tendency evidence about the defendant acting on a sexual interest the defendant has or had in children.

(3) Subsection (2) applies whether or not the sexual interest or act to which the tendency evidence relates was directed at a complainant in the proceeding, any other child or children generally.

(4) Despite subsection (2), the court may determine that the tendency evidence does not have significant probative value if it is satisfied that there are sufficient grounds to do so.

(5) The following matters are not to be taken into account when determining whether there are sufficient grounds for the purposes of subsection (4) unless the court considers there are exceptional circumstances in relation to those matters to warrant taking them into account—

(a) the sexual interest or act to which the tendency evidence relates (the ***tendency sexual interest or act***) is different from the sexual interest or act alleged in the proceeding (the ***alleged sexual interest or act***);

(b) the circumstances in which the tendency sexual interest or act occurred are different from circumstances in which the alleged sexual interest or act occurred;

(c) the personal characteristics of the subject of the tendency sexual interest or act, for example, the subject's age, sex or gender, are different to those of the subject of the alleged sexual interest or act;

(d) the relationship between the defendant and the subject of the tendency sexual interest or act is different from the relationship between the defendant and the subject of the alleged sexual interest or act;

(e) the period of time between the occurrence of the tendency sexual interest or act and the occurrence of the alleged sexual interest or act;

(f) the tendency sexual interest or act and alleged sexual interest or act do not share distinctive or unusual features;

(g) the level of generality of the tendency to which the tendency evidence relates.

(6) In this section—

child means a person under 16 years of age.

relevant child sexual offence—

(a) means an offence of a sexual nature committed in relation to a child under 16, including an offence against a provision of the Criminal Code, chapter 22 or 32; but

(b) does not include conduct of a person that has ceased to be an offence since the time when the person engaged in the conduct.

129AF The coincidence rule

(1) Evidence that 2 or more events occurred is not admissible to prove that a person did a particular act or had a particular state of mind on the basis that, having regard to any similarities in the events or the circumstances in which they occurred, or any similarities in both the events and the circumstances in which they occurred, it is improbable that the events occurred coincidentally unless—

(a) the party seeking to adduce the evidence gave reasonable notice in writing to each other party of the party's intention to adduce the evidence; and

(b) the court considers that the evidence will, either by itself or having regard to other evidence adduced or to be adduced by the party seeking to adduce the evidence, have significant probative value.

Note—

One of the events referred to in this subsection may be an event the occurrence of which is a fact in issue in the proceeding.

(2) To avoid doubt, subsection (1) includes the use of evidence from 2 or more witnesses claiming they are victims of offences committed by a person who is a defendant in a criminal proceeding to prove, on the basis of similarities in the claimed acts or the circumstances in which they occurred, that the defendant did an act in issue in the proceeding.

(3) Subsection (1)(a) does not apply if—

(a) the evidence is adduced in accordance with any directions made by the court under section 129AH; or

(b) the evidence is adduced to explain or contradict coincidence evidence adduced by another party.

129AG Requirements for notices

(1) A notice given under section 129AD(1)(a) or 129AF(1)(a) must be given in accordance with any requirement prescribed by regulation.

(2) To remove any doubt, it is declared that a regulation may prescribe a minimum notice period for the purpose of section 129AD(1)(a) or 129AF(1)(a).

129AH Court may dispense with notice requirements

(1) The court may dispense with the requirement to give notice under section 129AD(1)(a) or 129AF(1)(a) as the case may be—

(a) on the application of a party; or

(b) on its own initiative if the court considers it appropriate to do so.

(2) To remove any doubt, it is declared that an application under subsection (1) may be made before or after the time that notice would otherwise be required to be given.

(3) A direction under subsection (1) may be—

(a) subject to any conditions the court thinks fit; and

(b) given at or before the hearing in which the evidence is to be adduced.

(4) Without limiting the court's power to impose conditions under this section, those conditions may include 1 or more of the following—

(a) a condition that the party give notice of its intention to adduce the evidence to a specified party, or to each other party other than a specified party;

(b) a condition that the party give notice only in respect of specified tendency evidence, or all tendency evidence that the party intends to adduce other than specified tendency evidence;

(c) a condition that the party give notice only in respect of specified coincidence evidence, or all coincidence evidence that the party intends to adduce other than specified coincidence evidence.

129AI Further restrictions on tendency evidence and coincidence evidence adduced by prosecution

(1) Tendency evidence about a defendant, or coincidence evidence about a defendant, that is adduced by the prosecution can not be used against the defendant unless the probative value of the evidence outweighs the danger of unfair prejudice to the defendant.

(2) However, this section does not apply to—

(a) tendency evidence that the prosecution adduces to explain or contradict tendency evidence adduced by the defendant; or

(b) coincidence evidence that the prosecution adduces to explain or contradict coincidence evidence adduced by the defendant.

129AJ Exceptions to tendency rule—evidence about character of an accused person

(1) The tendency rule does not apply to—

(a) evidence adduced by a defendant to prove, directly or indirectly, that the defendant is, generally or in a particular respect, a person of good character; or

(b) evidence adduced to refute evidence of the kind referred to in paragraph (a).

(2) The tendency rule also does not apply to—

(a) evidence of the defendant's character adduced by another defendant if—

(i) the evidence is an opinion about the defendant; and

(ii) the person whose opinion it is has specialised knowledge based on the person's training, study or experience; and

(iii) the opinion is wholly or substantially based on that knowledge; or

(b) if evidence of the kind referred to in paragraph (a) is admitted, evidence adduced to prove that that opinion evidence should not be accepted.

129AK Standard of proof for tendency evidence or coincidence evidence

(1) Tendency evidence or coincidence evidence need not be proved beyond reasonable doubt to the extent that it is adduced as tendency evidence or coincidence evidence unless—

(a) the court is satisfied that there is a significant possibility that the jury will rely on the evidence as being essential to its reasoning in reaching a finding of guilt; or

(b) the evidence is adduced as both tendency evidence or coincidence evidence and as proof of an element or essential fact of a charge.

(2) If tendency evidence or coincidence evidence is adduced as both tendency evidence or coincidence evidence and as proof of an element or essential fact of a charge, the evidence need only be proved beyond reasonable doubt to the extent that it is adduced as proof of the element or essential fact.

8 Clause 43 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 44, lines 9 to 11—

omit.

9 Clause 43 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 44, lines 12 to 14, '129AA'—

omit, insert—

129AB(1)

10 Clause 43 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 44, after line 14—

insert—

tendency rule, for part 7A, see section 129AB(1).

11 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)—

Page 50, after line 11—

insert—

Part 4 Consequential amendments in relation to Part 5 (Evidence)

Criminal Code

1 Section 590AA(2)(l), 'or part 6A'—

omit, insert—

, part 6A, part 6B, or part 7A

Question put—That clauses 1 to 49 and the schedule, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 38, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 39, omitted.

Clauses 40 to 49 and the schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 51:

ALP, 49—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Linard, Lui, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Rourke, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

NOES, 38:

LNP, 34—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Gerber, Hart, Head, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Zanow.

KAP, 4—Andrew, Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Lauga, Perrett.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Question put—That the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendments Nos 35 to 37 be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

35 Long title

Long title, after 'the *Human Rights Act 2019*,'—

insert—

the *Judicial Remuneration Act 2007*,

36 Long title

Long title, after 'the *Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009*'—

insert—

, the *Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991*

37 Long title

Long title, 'and the *Youth Justice Act 1992*—

omit, insert—

, the *Youth Justice Act 1992* and the legislation mentioned in schedule 2

Question put—That the long title of the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Honourable members, the cognate debate having concluded, I notify members that it is time for the automatic adjournment of the House, in accordance with sessional order 2.

ADJOURNMENT

Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Football Club

Mrs GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (9.24 pm): The Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Football Club is more than just a community sporting club. They are deeply rooted in our community, with a proud history of bringing our community together, of inclusivity and of including female participation in sport. In December 2022 they launched their girls academy, which I was so proud to support. Then in January last year the Eagles hosted a free girls come-and-try session, inviting girls aged six to 15 to give Rugby League a go. I dusted off my boots and ran out with the girls. I can vouch firsthand that the sessions were incredible.

In April last year the Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Football Club launched their women's team, the mighty Currumbin Sheagles. They are slaying, winning the women's A-grade grand final just 10 days ago—smashing Goodna 40-0. The Sheagles' grand final victory also wrote the Currumbin Eagles into history. The 2024 Sheagles team is the first ever Currumbin Eagles Rugby League team to win an A-grade grand final in male or female teams.

With so many girls and women joining the club, the Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Football Club is in desperate need of female change rooms and universal change rooms, so I initiated a petition. I want to table the petition's progress so far.

Tabled paper: Extract of nonconforming petition regarding women's change rooms for Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Club [1787].

Some 646 locals have signed this petition to get the state government to give the Currumbin Eagles Rugby League Football Club universal change rooms. Our local federal candidate for McPherson is on board. Leon Rebello came with me to inspect the need for change rooms at the Currumbin Eagles. There is still time for our community to get on board. The petition is still open. Jump onto my social media and sign the petition, because the Currumbin Eagles and our Currumbin Sheagles deserve the dignity of proper change rooms.

Fighting for the Currumbin Eagles to get change rooms has been a long, hard fight. I have talked about it in my budget debate speeches and I have written numerous letters of support, but has this state government done it? No, they have not. For me, this is just another reason we need to show Labor the door in 2024.

(Time expired)

Woodridge Electorate

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.27 pm): The Woodridge electorate means so much to me and it is an honour to represent the people of this great electorate in the Queensland parliament. That is why I was so delighted to see our community spirit on display at the Logan City Netball Association's 50th anniversary celebration last month at the club's headquarters just off Ewing Road in Woodridge.

Great local sporting clubs do not just materialise out of thin air. They are built by a community of dedicated, hardworking and committed volunteers and their families. That is why it was marvellous to see Sharon Pearce, one of the club's founders, at the anniversary celebration. Sharon had on display a range of club memorabilia, including her original player registration card, club photographs and her playing uniforms and tracksuits.

I also want to recognise Ivan and Estelle Snell, who, along with so many other local families, were the driving forces behind the establishment and development of the club. I would also like to acknowledge the great work of the current executive team including president Karlene Marechal, secretary Raelene Coxon, treasurer Sonya Carroll and immediate past president Tracey Chase. At the anniversary event we also celebrated the club's six new courts—a $750,000 investment by our Labor government that will ensure netball continues to be played in the heart of Woodridge for the next 50 years.

Last week I was also honoured to open the FamilyLinQ hub at Kingston State School. A $17 million commitment by our Labor government has delivered this first-of-its-kind facility in Queensland—a community hub that will provide a one-stop shop for the delivery of wraparound education, health, community and training services to the Kingston community. Our Labor government has committed to putting Queensland kids first. That is exactly what the FamilyLinQ hub will do.

Our government is proud to have partnered with the Bryan Foundation—one of our state's critically important philanthropic institutions—to deliver this game-changing centre. The Bryan Foundation has generously agreed to provide $10 million over 10 years to support the operation of the hub. I thank them most sincerely for this incredibly generous and powerful philanthropic contribution to our community.

Tonight I want to acknowledge all those people who have made the Kingston FamilyLinQ hub a reality, including former and current education ministers Grace Grace and Di Farmer; the Bryan Foundation chair, Jill Simes, and executive director, Matthew Cox; staff from the Metro South Hospital and Health Service, including director of partnerships, Debbie Cowan; the regional Education Queensland team, led by regional director John Norfolk; and the Kingston State School family, including current principal Robyn Marshall, past principal Trent Cowley and P&C president Sonya Austin. The FamilyLinQ hub at Kingston State School will change lives for the better. I am so delighted to have helped deliver this facility for children and families in the Woodridge community.

Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide, Report

Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (9.30 pm): Yesterday afternoon, the final report of the Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide was released. As the LNP's shadow minister for veterans and a former Australian Defence Force officer with 17 years of service, I would like to acknowledge the report. On behalf of the LNP opposition, I thank the commissioners and their staff and, most importantly, the thousands of serving ADF members, veterans and their families who appeared before the commission, lodged submissions and participated in the work of the commission.

The report, three years in the making, comprises seven volumes and thousands of pages and makes 122 recommendations. It is replete with the authentic voice of serving soldiers, sailors, aviators and their families, and it makes for sobering reading.

The royal commission found that over the past 25 years there have been more than 50 individual reviews and inquiries covering defence and veteran suicide and generating more than 750 recommendations. In spite of it all, there has been no sustained reduction in the rate of suicide by serving ADF members and veterans. The royal commission also found that over the same period 1,677 serving Australian Defence Force members and veterans died by suicide, although the commission estimates that the actual number is probably more than 3,000.

These are shameful statistics. They are a deep stain on our collective national record of support for those who wear or have worn the uniforms of our military and their families. The work of the royal commission has shone a side light on the crisis and tragedy of these suicides, and it has made it clear that suicide is preventable and that it is possible to reduce the rates of suicide and suicidality among serving Defence Force personnel and veterans. That prevention depends on a transformation in the way in which different agencies, different levels of government and the veterans community interact, on better cooperation, on better integration and continuity of services, and on a better understanding of military culture and the unique and demanding aspects of service life on serving personnel, veterans and their families.

The commission exposed a long history of systemic failures at the federal government level and also made clear in its recommendations and observations that the state and territory governments are not without some of the responsibility for the failings which have let our veterans down. State and territory governments are responsible for many of the services and regulations applying to serving ADF personnel, veterans and their families. Of course, the problems surrounding veterans' health and wellbeing in general, along with veterans' homelessness, domestic violence, exposure to the criminal justice system and incarceration, are certainly things which exist within the scope of state and territory governments.

There is no excuse for further inaction. We must collectively do our utmost to acknowledge the failures of the past and to get stuck into implementing the reforms which the royal commission has prescribed. The LNP opposition, if elected to govern Queensland next month, is committed to working closely with the federal government, external agencies and the veteran and ADF community to drive the necessary changes and to do better for our diggers. Lest we forget.

Nicklin Electorate

Mr SKELTON (Nicklin—ALP) (9.34 pm): Lest we forget, I agree. I am proud to rise as a member of the Miles Labor government and am proud of what it has done for the Sunshine Coast. Since being elected as the member for Nicklin, I am proud to say that the community has benefited from having so many things happen. Since 2020, we have seen the $301 million Maroochydore Road interchange upgrade, making it easier for my constituents to commute to the coast. We have started work on the $1 billion B2N rail duplication project and Sunshine Coast direct rail. The $86.2 million Nambour Hospital redevelopment is providing better health services for the Sunshine Coast. I was pleased to have the Premier there recently looking at our amazing emergency department.

There is the new multipurpose hall we are building at Yandina State School as well as car parks and a new playground. This is in addition to the new $19.6 million administration and general learning building at Yandina State School which I look forward to opening later this month with Minister Farmer. There is $17.4 million for the Performing Arts Centre of Excellence at Burnside State High School, as well as classroom refurbishments. There are new classrooms, accessibility upgrades and a tuckshop renovation at Nambour State College. There is $11.9 million for the new hall at Noosa District State High School.

We have air-conditioned every classroom, funded school breakfasts, started the school-based GP program and delivered an entirely new primary, secondary and special school at Palmview. We have increased funding for the STEM program at Burnside. We have supported education on the Sunshine Coast with the introduction of free TAFE and free kindy—amazing programs allowing people to study more and gain access to better employment opportunities.

The $9 million Nambour police station ensures our local officers are well looked after. There is another $4.9 million for the new police station in Cooroy, built in consultation with the community and sadly on the retirement of the wonderful OIC, Senior Sergeant Mal Scott. We have provided more funding for mobile police beats, body worn cameras and protective equipment and delivered more

police personnel—unlike those opposite, who sacked officers and made them pay for their own equipment.

I have delivered clubhouse or lighting upgrades for the Hinterland Blues and Palmwoods Hawks, the Nambour Crushers, the Yandina Cricket Club, the Nambour Yandina United FC, the Palmwoods Warriors, the Yandina Bowls Club, the Nambour Bowls Club and the Cooroora United FC. We have recently announced $2.7 million to upgrade the Cooroy Sports Complex. There is $350,000 for equestrian upgrades and a new long jump pit for little athletics.

We have provided local public and social housing and also youth housing at IFYS Old Church. I am immensely proud of this state government—doing what matters for Queensland and getting the job done for the Sunshine Coast.

Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide, Report

Mr MICKELBERG (Buderim—LNP) (9.37 pm): Every week for a quarter of a century there has been a funeral for a veteran who has taken their own life. Every week, another battle lost. Every week, another family devastated. Every week, another child loses their mum or dad—their hero.

The infantrymen that I served with are twice as likely to die by suicide than other Australian men. Women who have served in a combat role die by suicide at a rate that is more than 4½ times that of other Australian women. Those are statistics that every Australian should be concerned about—statistics that every member of this parliament should be ashamed of. This is not about politics. Both the Labor Party and the LNP have failed veterans in the last quarter of a century.

In my first speech to parliament I recounted my experiences from 2013 when, after returning from Afghanistan, I was home and I began to wonder if I would be better off ending my life so that I would not be a burden on my family, and I had worked out how to do it. I spoke of one afternoon when my wife, Anna, cancelled her shift as a police officer to be by my side. I reflected on how different things might have been had she not done that.

Service in the Australian Army was one of the most rewarding experiences of my life, but service in the military comes at a cost. After that day in 2013 I was diagnosed with PTSD—a consequence of my military service in Afghanistan and Timor Leste. While the impact of my PTSD has lessened over time, the truth is that I will always carry the effects of my service. Ten years later, I still lay awake at night afraid to go to sleep, fearful of the flashbacks that are still far too frequent. Ten years later, too often I am unreasonably irritated and agitated. Ten years later, I still place myself in the back corner of a room so I can watch the door. Ten years later, I still flinch every time there is a loud noise. While I have accepted that I will have to live with the mental scars of my service, I will not accept that future generations must suffer the same fate.

I am the fourth generation of my family who has served in the ADF, and I suspect I will not be the last. Our sons and daughters cannot be failed as past generations of veterans have been failed. There is no shortage of goodwill towards veterans, but goodwill alone will not address the scourge of veteran suicide. One simple step that all veterans can take is to commit to donating their brain to the Australian Veterans Brain Bank. The Veterans Brain Bank is a tissue bank that will facilitate research on disorders of the brain amongst ADF veterans. Veterans can donate their brain and, hopefully, the information gained can be used to better diagnose and support future generations of veterans. I have committed my brain to the brain bank after I die, and I encourage other veterans to also consider taking this simple but significant step. The Royal Commission into Defence and Veteran Suicide has done its job and now it is time for governments at all levels to do their job and implement the recommendations. Anything less will be failing our veterans.

Redlands Electorate, Infrastructure

Ms RICHARDS (Redlands—ALP) (9.40 pm): We in this chamber should be doing everything we can to support our veterans. The Treasurer has just stepped out of the chamber, but can I say what an absolute delight it was to host the community cabinet in Redlands. It was incredible to doorknock with the Treasurer and Minister de Brenni. It was absolutely awesome. They came and listened. When we talk about authentically listening and genuinely taking on board the issues of locals, that is absolutely what the Miles Labor government does every day of the week.

If anybody had the chance to watch *A Current Affair* last week, they would have seen my Redlands peeps live and large. Patti and the Grundys were on *A Current Affair*. I am thinking about singing because they did. That was the thing. They were talking about the car-parking issues down at

Weinam Creek. I spoke about this issue in my maiden speech and I have spoken about it during the many years that I have represented our community, but today I will sing—

Patti and the Grundys, I have some great news for you

We've got $80 million coming right for you.

On top of the $15 million that we have already committed to Weinam Creek, an extra $80 million will be delivered to build that car park if the Miles Labor government is re-elected. I know how important that car park is to our Southern Moreton Bay Islands community and to everybody on the mainland. Two or three times a week I find myself chasing that elusive car park. I say to our amazing island community and everybody in the Redlands: I will never stop advocating for you. I will be the hardest fighter you have witnessed. If I am re-elected, I will have $80 million to add to the $15 million already allocated to deliver the car park, and we know how important that is. I encourage everybody to jump on to *A Current Affair* and watch Patti and the Grundys talk about how important that car park is to them.

That leads into our 50-cent fares and the difference they are making to our community. Mary, one of our Southern Moreton Bay Islands locals, said that 50-cent fares are putting $180 back into her pocket every week. If I multiply that by the number of people on Macleay Island, Russell Island, Karragarra Island, Lamb Island and now Coochiemudlo Island—they got 50-cent fares on Monday, because we listen and we deliver—that is a huge saving. I am proud of everything our Miles Labor government does and I encourage everyone to 'vote 1 Kim Richards' come the next election.

(Time expired)

Traeger Electorate

Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (9.43 pm): This is probably my last adjournment speech in this House. I have reflected on the fact that every time I stand up to speak I seem to be cranky.

Government members interjected.

Mr KATTER: It is not really funny, actually, because Mount Isa, which I represent, is facing a really tough time. Having 1,200 jobs on the chopping block is nothing to laugh about. They are copper-producing jobs. Everyone says how critical minerals will take us through to the next century, but the third biggest copper mine is about to shut down and no-one in here has done anything about it. A $20 million rescue package is not going to save a copper mine; nor will it compensate for the near $200 million a year in wages from those 1,200 jobs. Excuse me if I get a little bit upset every time I come in here.

Last week, Mayor Peta MacRae, who is doing a great job in Mount Isa, had her newsagency smashed into by a car for the second time. She said something good in her Mayoral Minute the other week—that a $20 million package for Mount Isa does not compensate for the 1,200 jobs, because no-one wants to do anything about the fact that Glencore just wants to land-bank this copper and sit on it. There is $20 million to save Mount Isa, but for Rio Tinto to keep jobs in Gladstone they estimate they need $300 million to help continue aluminium smelting there. I am not saying that is a bad thing. That could actually be a good thing. I am not criticising that, but it makes me wonder why Mount Isa gets a $20 million package when there are 1,200 jobs at risk there and Gladstone gets more for a thousand jobs. It is no wonder I get a little bit angry.

The federal government makes about $800 million a year from Mount Isa. Some $3 billion to $4 billion in economic activity comes out of there. We are very grateful for the announcement of CopperString but we need certainty about that, not equivocation and conditions before an election or using it as a political football. You need to lock those announcements in. CopperString does not make the power at my house cheaper. It does not help me get to work faster. It does not give me a 50-cent fare. It helps the government to make more money to build more infrastructure down here. CopperString will help the government to make money—the same way the Great Northern Railway helped to make more money out of the North West Minerals Province. I am not asking for things that will help me and my lifestyle in Mount Isa; I am asking for things to help the government make more money for the state.

We need to look beyond that. We have the Meeting of the Mines Cloncurry coming up. We need to start talking about a new copper smelter in Queensland. There are only three left in Australia. Without a copper smelter, a lot of the future of the north-west will be wiped out. Glencore want to get rid of their smelter beyond 2030. They have been emphatic about that position.

A lot needs to be done. We can sit here comfortably and say that things will just keep ticking over, but they do not. The only reason those opportunities exist out there is because the government

was highly proactive. CopperString is a good start but it is not the end of the story. A lot still needs to happen or the wealth will not be generated and cities and towns will vanish.

Stafford Electorate

Mr SULLIVAN (Stafford—ALP) (9.46 pm): It is with great pleasure that I give the latest update for the beautiful electorate of Stafford. I will start with the Crisis Stabilisation Unit at The Prince Charles Hospital. It was great to have the Premier, the health minister and my neighbour the transport minister and member for Aspley formally launch the Crisis Stabilisation Unit. It is a unit designed to tackle the mental health issues of northsiders. It was developed with peer orientation from start to finish and involved staff with lived experience.

This builds on the Safe Space adjacent to the existing emergency department which allows patients, where appropriate, to be diverted away from the busy emergency department, with all of its lights and noises. It is a better setting for those in our community dealing with mental health issues. We also have the wonderful world-class facility in Jacaranda Place. I know that the Deputy Speaker himself has visited there. It was built by the Labor government because those opposite shut down the Barrett centre without providing a replacement. I thank the health and education workers who do such a great job providing care and education to the most vulnerable adolescents in Queensland.

In addition, construction of the new publicly owned car park at The Prince Charles Hospital is well underway. It will take 1,500 cars off local roads and provide cheaper fares to staff, patients, families and visitors. This is on top of the 93 additional beds this Labor government is delivering at Prince Charles.

That is not all. We have invested in local schools. The update to the Wavell Heights State School hall has been completed. Kedron has a new quadrangle and play area. Somerset Hills has seen a significant upgrade to its fields, lighting and clubhouse, benefiting the school, local community sport and the swimming club. Talk about a win-win! The construction of the new hall at Wilston State School is well underway and is looking great.

The School Transport Infrastructure Program is delivering across the electorate of Stafford, especially in Wavell Heights and at the Turner Road precinct in Kedron. That is on top of what we have delivered: new lights at the grounds of the Wilston Grange Gorillas; access to water for Grange Thistle FC and new funding for female facilities; lighting for Newmarket FC; support, in cooperation with the federal government, for the Brisbane Netball Association; and investment in modern Kedron Wavell Hockey change rooms and referee areas. In housing, we have delivered in Kedron, Alderley, Chermside and Chermside West. That is all at risk under an LNP government.

Finally, with your indulgence, Mr Deputy Speaker, on a personal note, I wish to welcome one of the latest additions to the constituency of Stafford. I place on the record how wonderful it was recently to welcome to the world our beautiful daughter Edith. She adds to our beautiful family. I thank Carolyn, in particular, for doing the heavy lifting, particularly while I am here in parliament. I think I am the third-last speaker tonight, so it will not be long before I will be home to do the next nappy change.

Glass House Electorate, Gambling Community Benefit Fund; Piva, Mrs J

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (9.49 pm): This past week there has been a boon in Glass House with the closing of my most recent Local Heroes grants, coinciding with round 121 of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund, meaning a combined total of $614,767 has been allocated to deserving community groups, individuals and organisations across my electorate. I want to highlight some of the Local Heroes grant applications that I received in this round.

Daniel Boughen is a 12-year-old Maleny boy who is on the autism spectrum. His mum, Chris, put in an application on his behalf as they are fundraising towards an autism assistance dog for Daniel, through Smart Pups. Chris stated that Daniel was her local hero and I was only too happy to support Daniel's endeavour. The Silver Fox Initiative will be using their Local Heroes grant to fund coffee giveaways across the Sunshine Coast on World Mental Health Day.

At the behest of my wife and daughters, sponsorship went to Rosetta Books for their involvement with the Sunshine Coast Hinterland Writers Festival. They have secured best-selling young adult fantasy author Lynette Noni to be a headline author and the funds will go towards her appearance fees. My wife, who is a huge fan, quickly accepted the other offer to be the one to interview Lynette. The Beerburrum School of Arts Association hall, the Eudlo War Memorial and the Maleny Blackall Range

Lions Club were also proud recipients in this round and, yes, that totals six. I can never choose just four worthy applicants.

Some noteworthy mentions from the super round of the Gambling Community Benefit Fund include the Woodford Show Society, which is receiving $94,000 to upgrade their facility. That will do wonders for the annual show. There is a bit of a landslide in Beerwah and Glasshouse Mountains, with the Glass House Country Men's Shed and the Glasshouse Mountains Community Hall receiving $100,000 and nearly $100,000 respectively to carry out improvements and fit-outs. The Beerwah State School picked up $54,000 for a shade shed. That is simply outstanding.

Before I conclude, I want to pay tribute to Mrs Jeannie Piva. Many would know Jean from the time when she and her husband, Bluey, operated the Blue Pacific Hotel on Bribie island. I am told she was always good for a beer and a hug, with her regulars often needing more of the latter than the former. I got to know her when she retired to Glasshouse Mountains. Jean was a formidable political force. She was a member of the Nationals and then of the LNP. She always had insightful takes on the political environment and gave great advice. I have no doubt that she would have made a fantastic member of parliament in her own right. To her surviving children, Ken, who ran for the Nationals in Glass House in 2006, and Judy and all who called her 'Nonna', including Elia Hill from Tennis Queensland who some members will know, I send my heartfelt sympathies. Jeannie was a fantastic member of both the Bribie Island and the Glasshouse Mountains communities. She will be sorely missed.

Crime, Liberal National Party

Mr WALKER (Mundingburra—ALP) (9.52 pm): Yes, there was crime under the Queensland LNP state government from 2012 to 2015. They were the biggest failure as a government in Queensland history and the opposition leader was there. One crime is one crime too many and no decent person likes crime—no-one. In 2014-15 alone there were 9,145 unlawful use of a motor vehicle offences, which was 175 vehicle offences per week. That is correct: those opposite, the LNP, had total chaos on the streets of Queensland. They were weak on crime.

In the 2014-15 financial year, when the LNP were in government, we saw a 14 per cent increase in the number of breaches of domestic violence protection orders. A total of 16,654 offences were reported to the Queensland police, equating to a rate of 347 offences per 100,000 persons. The northern region recorded the highest rate. The LNP turned their back on domestic violence in this state.

Assault offences were the most dominant as an offence against the person and a total of 28,144 offences were reported to the Queensland police in 2014-15. The northern region recorded the highest rate of offences against the person. That is right: the opposition leader, David Crisafulli, was the member for Mundingburra at that time and was responsible for slashing police numbers and failing to resource the police.

In 2014-15, the number of sexual offences reported to police increased by 10 per cent from the number reported in the previous financial year. The number reported equates to a rate of 123 offences reported per 100,000 persons. That increase in the rate is attributable to an increase of 14 per cent in rape and attempted rape offences and a seven per cent increase in other sexual offences. That is right: that happened under those opposite, the LNP.

In 2014-15, 31,642 unlawful entry offences were reported to police. The northern region recorded the highest rate, with 999 offences per 100,000 persons. That happened under the LNP's watch. During 2014-15, under the LNP's watch, excluding unlawful entry, 96,000 theft offences were recorded. That is the highest volume of offences in the property categories. The LNP, under the leadership of opposition leader David Crisafulli, is an absolute joke.

The House adjourned at 9.55 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, 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, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, MacMahon, Mander, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Rourke, Pease, Pitt, Powell,

Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Skelton, Smith, Stevens, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Zanow