



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 30 April 2025

Subject	Page
PRIVILEGE	993
Comments by Member for Miller, Correction and Apology	993
SPEAKER'S RULING	993
Answers to Questions on Notice	993
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 22 April 2025, from the member for Murrumba and Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, and the member for Springwood and Manager of Opposition Business, Hon. Mick de Brenni MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Patrick Weir, regarding answers to questions on notice provided by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services, Hon. Tim Nicholls.	994
PRIVILEGE	994
Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee	994
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	994
Visitors to Public Gallery	994
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	994
Housing Supply; Townsville Community Cabinet	994
Housing Supply	995
Housing Supply	996
Social and Affordable Housing	997
First Nations, Home Ownership	997
Youth Justice, Programs	998
Domestic and Family Violence	999
Domestic and Family Violence	1000
Domestic and Family Violence	1000
NOTICE OF MOTION	1001
Crisafulli LNP Government, Health System	1001

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 30 April 2025

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1002
Callide Power Station.....	1002
Nuclear Power	1002
Youth Crime.....	1003
Callide Power Station.....	1004
Youth Crime, Legislation	1004
Callide Power Station.....	1005
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 14 April 2025, from the member for McConnel, Hon. Grace Grace MP, and the member for Bundamba, Mr Lance McCallum MP, to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, and the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership, Hon. David Janetzki, regarding the explosion at the Callide C3 generator on 4 April 2025.	1005
Youth Justice.....	1006
Callide Power Station.....	1007
Youth Crime.....	1008
CopperString	1009
Domestic and Family Violence, Legislation.....	1010
North Queensland, Water Security.....	1011
Domestic and Family Violence	1011
CopperString	1012
Domestic and Family Violence	1013
PRIVILEGE.....	1013
Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>	1013
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1013
Introduction	1013
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025.....	1013
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes.	1013
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights.....	1013
First Reading	1016
Referral to Education, Arts and Communities Committee	1016
CRIME AND CORRUPTION (RESTORING REPORTING POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL.....	1017
Second Reading	1017
Consideration in Detail.....	1025
Clause 1—.....	1025
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments.	1025
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments. ..	1025
Amendment agreed to.....	1026
Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.	1026
Clauses 2 to 21, as read, agreed to.	1026
Clause 22—.....	1026
Amendments agreed to.....	1027
Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.	1027
Insertion of new clause—.....	1027
Amendment agreed to.....	1028
Clauses 23 to 29, as read, agreed to.	1028
Clause 30—.....	1028
Amendments agreed to.....	1028
Amendment agreed to.....	1029
Clause 30, as amended, agreed to.	1029
Clauses 31 to 34, as read, agreed to.	1029
Insertion of new clause—.....	1029
Amendment agreed to.....	1030
Insertion of new clause—.....	1030
Amendment agreed to.....	1030
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1030
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1031
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1031
Amendment agreed to.....	1031
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1031
Amendment agreed to.....	1032
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1032
Amendment agreed to.....	1033
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1033
Amendment agreed to.....	1035
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1035

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 30 April 2025

MOTION	1038
Crisafulli LNP Government, Health System.....	1038
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from the <i>Bundaberg Today</i> , dated 21 March 2025, titled 'Hospital build is on life support'	1045
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1050
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1050
Amendment agreed to.	1050
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	1050
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1050
CRIME AND CORRUPTION (RESTORING REPORTING POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL.....	1050
Consideration in Detail	1050
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.	1057
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1057
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1057
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1057
Insertion of new clauses—.....	1057
Division: Question put—That the member for Gaven be heard.	1059
Resolved in the negative.	1059
Amendment agreed to.	1060
Third Reading.....	1060
Long Title.....	1060
Amendments agreed to.	1060
TRUSTS BILL	1060
Second Reading	1060
ADJOURNMENT	1064
Federal Election	1064
Redland Whitewater Centre	1065
Federal Election, One Nation.....	1065
Keppel Electorate, Youth Week; Small Business.....	1066
Fall of Saigon, 50th Anniversary	1067
Redlands Electorate, Anzac Day	1067
Nudgee Small Business Awards	1068
Southport Electorate, Activities	1068
Hinchinbrook Electorate, Flood Events	1069
Women in Sport.....	1070
ATTENDANCE.....	1070

WEDNESDAY, 30 APRIL 2025

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Pat Weir, Condamine) read prayers and took the chair.



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

PRIVILEGE

Comments by Member for Miller, Correction and Apology



Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (2.01 pm): On 1 April when talking about important health care for Queenslanders, in particular in Townsville, I made reference to perinatal mental health beds being scrapped. It has been brought to my attention that my statement was incorrect. I retract the statement and apologise for the inadvertent error.

Mr Speaker, it has also been brought to my attention that I did not bow to you as Speaker as I exited the chamber during the last sitting while I was complying with your direction to withdraw. I apologise unreservedly to you, Mr Speaker, and to the House for my contravention of standing orders.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Answers to Questions on Notice



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 22 April 2025 I received a joint complaint from the Leader of the Opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business regarding answers to questions on notice by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. The correspondence alleged that the minister deliberately misled the Legislative Assembly of the Queensland parliament by not answering questions on notice due to his determination that it would be an unreasonable diversion of resources. I note that the elements of the contempt and particulars of evidence against each element were not set out in the complaint and, therefore, it is technically not compliant with previous Speaker's rulings about complaints of matters of privilege. I do not, therefore, intend to refer the matter to the Ethics Committee.

I note that the issue in this matter most probably goes to resources within the minister's office, and in that respect I have a degree of empathy. The total number of questions asked of this parliament to the end of the last sitting week is 524. The total number of questions asked of the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services is 209. That means that the minister has been asked 39.8 per cent of all questions asked. I appreciate that this may present challenges in answering the questions in the allocated timeframe, but it should not result in answers that do not attempt to answer the question.

I cannot, as requested, require the minister to resubmit answers to the questions on notice, but I can rule the answers submitted as out of order and that the questions remain unanswered. Those questions on notice are 165, 166, 173, 177, 179, 180, 183, 186, 195 and 196. I have circulated a detailed ruling on this matter and seek to have it incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT—ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

I received a joint complaint from the Leader of the Opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business regarding answers to questions on notice by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services.

The correspondence alleged that the minister deliberately misled the Legislative Assembly of the Queensland Parliament, by not answering questions on notice, due to his determination that it would be an unreasonable diversion of resources.

I note that the elements of the contempt and particulars of evidence against each element were not set out in the complaint and, therefore, it is technically not compliant with previous Speaker's rulings about complaints of matters of privilege. I do not, therefore, intend to refer the matter to the Ethics Committee.

In respect of compliance of the answers, the minister's answers to the questions in issue were accepted by Clerks at the Table based on the minister's advice regarding what resources were required to provide the information sought. In the absence of clear information that was inconsistent with this advice, the answers were assessed as compliant. This assessment relied on Speaker Pitt's ruling of 17 March 2022 that ministers are ultimately responsible for the accuracy of their answers, including assurances that the information is not available and difficult to source; and, if ministers provide a reasonable explanation for why an answer cannot be provided in the terms posed in the question, the question will be ruled answered. The assessment by the Clerks was, therefore, in accordance with Speaker Pitt's ruling which I have adopted.

However, I also note that the questions do not appear to be seeking minutely detailed data/information which was the situation that Speaker Pitt's commentary on placing an unreasonable burden on an agency was intended to cover. Most of the questions are asking for an update on various aspects of the Queensland Women and Girls' Health Strategy Investment Plan. On the face of it, it would seem possible for the minister to have provided at least a high-level (more general) response to these questions. Indeed, a high level response was later provided to the media.

Speaker Wellington's ruling of 22 March 2017 (ROP pp709-10) appears to be directly relevant to this matter. It deals with a situation where the then Premier's answer to questions on notice was simply to advise that it would be neither practicable nor reasonable to divert resources to identify the information requested over the years concerned. Speaker Wellington stated: "While I do not assess the quality of answers it appears that no attempt has been made to answer the questions in any way. Where a question is asked that is broad in terms of its scope or it seeks information over a number of years, I am comfortable with the responsible Minister making an attempt to answer the question. But the Minister should attempt to answer the question". In that instance, Speaker Wellington ruled the questions unanswered.

I note that the issue in this matter most probably goes to resources within the minister's office, and in that respect, I have a degree of empathy. The total number of questions asked this Parliament to the end of last sitting week is 524. The total number of questions asked of the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services is 209. That means that the minister has been asked 39.8% of all questions asked. I appreciate that this may present challenges in answering the questions in the allocated timeframe. But it should not result in answers that do not attempt to answer the question.

I cannot, as requested, require the minister to resubmit answers to the questions on notice. But I can rule the answers submitted as out of order and that the questions remain unanswered. Those Questions on Notice are: 165, 166, 173, 177, 179, 180, 183, 186, 195 and 196.

Mr SPEAKER: I table the correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 22 April 2025, from the member for Murrumbidgee and Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, and the member for Springwood and Manager of Opposition Business, Hon. Mick de Brenni MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Patrick Weir, regarding answers to questions on notice provided by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services, Hon. Tim Nicholls [396].

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I advise that on 8 April 2025 in accordance with standing order 269, I referred to the Ethics Committee a complaint by the member for Greenslopes which alleged a breach of standing order 266(13), 'publishing a false or misleading account of proceedings before the House or a committee'. The complaint relates to the content of correspondence that was issued from the federal member for Griffith which allegedly misrepresented the member for Greenslopes' contribution to a bill. As the matter is now before the Ethics Committee, standing order 271 applies and the matter should not be referred to in proceedings in the Assembly.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to Public Gallery



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery today by students and teachers from Rochedale State School in the electorate of Mansfield and Coopers Plains State School in the electorate of Toohey.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Housing Supply; Townsville Community Cabinet



Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (2.05 pm): Our government is giving this state a fresh start and making sure more Queenslanders have a place to call home. A decade of Labor created our state's worst housing crisis. Under Labor rents skyrocketed,

vulnerable Queenslanders were left on housing waitlists and many more were locked out of owning their own home. Our government is serious about delivering new homes to Queenslanders and ending the housing crisis. We have already delivered practical steps to help more Queenslanders into the property market and to ease the cost-of-living crisis. We know that first home buyers are struggling to enter the housing market.

From tomorrow, Queenslanders who make their first home a new home will not pay a single cent of stamp duty. We have axed a Labor tax. We promised to do this before the election and we have delivered it for Queenslanders, just as we said we would. We have also made changes to allow Queenslanders to rent out a room and still be able to keep their first home owners grant. We are also working hard to increase housing supply and deliver more homes for Queenslanders. The Securing our Housing Foundations plan will unlock one million homes by 2044, unleash the community housing sector and establish a \$2 billion infrastructure fund.

We recently opened applications for round 1 of our new Residential Activation Fund. This fund will accelerate the delivery of trunk and essential infrastructure required to activate new residential housing developments. We are supporting housing supply across the state; that is why at least 50 per cent of the \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund will be invested in regional, rural and remote local government areas.

Our new Housing Ministerial Taskforce Cabinet Committee will focus government on maximising housing supply. It is about supply—supply, supply, supply. We will deliver tens of thousands of new social and community houses; 10,000 of those new homes will be delivered on church and charity owned land after we made it accessible for housing. Our government's plan is already delivering real outcomes to unlock home ownership and boost housing supply because every Queenslander deserves a place to call home.

I am also happy to announce today that our government's next community cabinet will be held in Townsville on 26 May. I have already travelled to Townsville many times as Premier, and growing up in North Queensland means it is a very special part of the state for me.

A government member: Go the Broncos.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will not take that interjection. Townsville is front and centre in our quest to address Labor's youth crime crisis. They were the first community to sound the alarm when Labor watered down the laws a decade ago. In recent months we have been supporting North Queenslanders through the recovery from flooding and severe rain, but there is a lot to look forward to in Townsville as well. The city will play a key role in our 2032 Delivery Plan, and our Hospital Rescue Plan will deliver more beds and more services for Queenslanders.

It will be our first visit as a cabinet to regional Queensland following today's introduction of historic domestic violence laws which my colleagues will speak on in more detail soon. We will have the chance to speak with stakeholders and police about the positive impact the laws will have. Residents will have the chance to meet with our ministers on Sunday ahead of a cabinet meeting on Monday, 26 May. I am looking forward to talking with Townsville locals once again and hearing how we can achieve the best outcomes for a magnificent region.

I would like to address a tragic incident that occurred overnight in Bundaberg. Sadly, a cyclist, just going about his daily life, lost his life in a hit-and-run incident overnight. It will be a tough day for the victim's family and friends. Our thoughts and prayers are with them.

Housing Supply



Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (2.09 pm): The Crisafulli government is unlocking the door to home ownership for more Queenslanders. From tomorrow, stamp duty on new builds for first home buyers will be abolished. This means thousands of young Queenslanders will save on up-front transaction costs, paving the way for increased home ownership.


Just this morning, the Premier, the member for Keppel and I spoke with builder John Kay in Central Queensland. He is ready for increased interest in new builds from young people off the back of this tax abolition. Across Queensland, it will deliver an average saving of \$9,906 for a house-and-land package at median prices. In Brisbane North, that is a saving of almost \$39,500 for a house-and-land package at the median price and a saving of more than \$24,000 in Toowoomba. That is more money back in the pockets of first-time buyers, putting home ownership back within reach after years of Labor's housing crisis.

By focusing on new builds, our policy is incentivising a greater supply of housing. Queensland Treasury predicts this reform could deliver additional support to around 3,000 Queenslanders each year, helping them move into their first home sooner.

In addition to abolishing stamp duty on new homes for first home buyers, the Crisafulli government is delivering a place to call home for more Queenslanders, with a \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund and removing restrictions preventing first home buyers renting out rooms. This will permanently unlock restrictions for the more than 20,000 first home buyers in Queensland each year. Our Residential Activation Fund will be targeted towards building new homes, rather than purchasing from the existing market.

Over the last decade under Labor, the great Australian dream of owning a home has turned into a nightmare. Under Labor, Queensland had the lowest rate of home ownership of any state. It now takes an historic high of more than 10 years for an average household to save for a 20 per cent home deposit in Brisbane. Over the next decade, we are aiming for Queensland to have the highest home ownership rate in the country. It is a long journey, but this first step is key to making the dream of home ownership a reality for more Queenslanders.

Housing Supply

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.12 pm): Queenslanders know that we are in the midst of a housing crisis, a housing crisis caused by those opposite through 10 years of failure in getting roofs over Queenslanders' heads. I already see the failed former housing minister smiling over there, saying, 'Oh, no, that is not the case.' The statistics speak for themselves. The Labor opposition is out there doing videos on vacant blocks of land—only vacant because they never built a house on it. They spent more time mowing vacant blocks of land than building houses, more time starting the mower than laying bricks and putting roofs over people's heads. That is the reality and that is the priority of the Labor Party.

But now Queenslanders are excited because we have a new government in Queensland, the Crisafulli LNP government, that has got down to the business of housing supply in this state. Not only that, we have a treasurer who has axed a tax. Who would have believed a treasurer in this state, sitting in that chair, with words coming out of his mouth, 'The government has axed a tax'? Well, you would never believe it if that mob over there was still in charge. All they did was increase tax, charges and fees, and that led to a decline in building approvals, housing approvals and lot approvals. That was the reality. Now the Crisafulli LNP government is getting on with the job.


I want to thank particularly regional Queensland where I have been out and about in the last few weeks. I want to acknowledge Mayor Janice Moriarty of the Central Highlands Regional Council and Mayor Wendy Taylor from the Maranoa Regional Council. I met with Mayor Blackburn in Bundaberg where I announced, with the member for Burnett—and turned the sod—81 new social homes in Bundaberg. They were not delivered by the Labor Party who had a pretty incompetent but high-ranking member in their team. He is still there and still incompetent. He is still there! We are delivering 81 social homes in Bundaberg—not Labor, not the Labor member for Bundaberg; it is this government.

In better news—in great news—I have a big announcement on housing. It has been discussed this morning by the Premier and the Hon. the Treasurer about the RAF, the Residential Activation Fund. This is a \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund that this government has set up, and \$1 billion, 50 per cent, will be spent in rural and regional Queensland. This is about supply, supply, supply—getting supply to the market. There is no use having plans to build homes if you do not have a block of land to build it on. It is no use having glossy brochures like the former mob did if you do not have a plan to release the land to build the houses on. But we do. Finally in Queensland, there is a government with a plan and a \$2 billion infrastructure fund. The first round of the funding of \$500 million will be handed down in the June budget, but we did not wait for the budget. We got a crack on early and we released it, nearly a month ago now, for applications.

Here is the announcement: there are over 100 applications in the system already, and that is from only a matter of weeks. We are going to have to close round 1 about 23 May because it has been so popular with landowners and local governments, and they want engagement. You know what? They want to release land. They want infrastructure and they want to back a government that is getting on with the job, releasing the supply into the market, so they can build the houses of the future and so that we can finally start attacking and arrest the decline of the social housing waiting list that went up to over 53,000 under the former Labor government.

It is this LNP government that is putting the homeless people first in our housing policy. It is this LNP government that is resetting the planning partnership with council. I am ever so excited not only to be a member of this team but also to see the work our amazing team is doing on the ground, getting land released, working with councils, not against them, not blaming them for the housing crisis, but helping to ease it and fix it in this state.

Social and Affordable Housing

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (2.16 pm): The most heartbreaking measure of Labor's housing legacy is this: almost 50,000 Queenslanders are on the social housing waitlist. It is no coincidence that number is so high when our community housing proportion is so low. Under Labor, community housing providers were held back by red tape and a Labor Party who did not believe in genuine partnerships. While our state's population grew by 16 per cent, community housing under Labor grew by just three per cent. Social housing did not fare much better, growing at just a third of the population growth over the last decade. That is barely 500 homes delivered per year.

Queensland now has one of the lowest shares of community housing of any state in the nation. Labor said they would change that. Back in 2017, then minister de Brenni launched the Partnering for Growth plan. It promised a lot, but it failed to deliver. Over nearly eight years, former ministers Enoch and Scanlon continued the same approach—too slow, too centralised and too focused on government doing it all.


We are changing that approach to deliver the homes that Queenslanders desperately need. In just six months, the Crisafulli government has delivered what Labor could not—a Community Housing Master Agreement. This new framework will replace more than 2,000 outdated and inconsistent contracts with just 114 modern agreements. It is about simplifying processes, reducing red tape and giving providers the certainty they need to get on with the job of delivering more homes. Under the master agreement, community housing providers will be able to: grow equity in their funded portfolios; leverage assets to unlock finance and drive growth; access longer term leases, moving from one- or three-year contracts to agreements of at least 20 years; and benefit from new arrangements to reduce the cost of insurance on department-leased properties. These changes will give providers the confidence they have been calling out for to invest and help more vulnerable Queenslanders.

Our reforms do not stop at the management of our housing system. Giving community housing providers the tools to grow means nothing if they cannot actually get homes built. For too long, Queensland's building and construction sector has been weighed down by inconsistent regulation and poor oversight. That is why we have renewed the leadership team at the Queensland Building and Construction Commission.

We have appointed Angelo Lambrinos as the new QBCC Commissioner and CEO. Mr Lambrinos is a qualified engineer with more than 25 years experience delivering major infrastructure reform, including recently at Transurban and on the Brisbane Metro project. He brings deep industry knowledge and a track record of operational reform in the public and private sectors. He will be supported by well-known and highly respected new board chair, Greg Chemello—one of our state's best known change agents. Mr Chemello has led cultural and governance renewal at the Ipswich City Council. He was the CEO of Economic Development Queensland and the City of Moreton Bay and previously served as deputy director-general in the department of infrastructure. I also welcome Amelia Hodge to the QBCC Board. With senior leadership experience at the Australian Property Institute and the Queensland Law Society, Ms Hodge brings legal and regulatory expertise that will further strengthen the commission's governance and decision-making abilities.

This is the fresh start that was badly needed at the QBCC—one focused on better customer service, on more transparency, on modernising systems and on restoring trust in our state's building regulator. The Crisafulli government is serious about getting the right regulatory environment to deliver the homes and the infrastructure Queenslanders desperately need. We promised to bring a new approach, and that is exactly what we are delivering.

First Nations, Home Ownership

 **Hon. FS SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (2.20 pm): Housing is more than just a roof over one's head; it is the foundation on which individuals and families build their lives. Safe, secure and affordable housing is essential for


health, education and economic stability. We are working in partnership with local leaders to give Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people the opportunity to own their own home, where they previously had not been able to because of government regulation and barriers under Labor. The Crisafulli government has made a steadfast commitment to provide Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people with an opportunity to reduce disadvantage and our Indigenous housing schemes are a cornerstone of this commitment. Together with my colleague the Minister for Housing, we are working to deliver innovative home ownership schemes that address the unique needs of these communities. We are investing in the construction of new homes, the renovation of existing structures and the provision of essential services such as clean drinking water.

One of the most innovative aspects of our Indigenous housing scheme is the rent-to-buy model launched under the new Palm Island Home Ownership Scheme. This will allow residents to purchase their government-owned social home by entering into a rent-to-buy agreement with the Palm Island Aboriginal Shire Council. Currently, only 1.4 per cent of Palm Island residents own their own home, which many families have lived in for generations. This highlights the desperate need for targeted housing solutions like the new Palm Island Home Ownership Scheme. In other discrete communities the rate of home ownership is 5.3 per cent for our First Peoples and across the state it is 38 per cent. Overall, the general Queensland population home ownership rate is 64 per cent.

The Palm Island rent-to-buy scheme is set to be expanded to other remote Aboriginal communities in Queensland where appropriate, and there will be different models depending on the feedback provided by those communities. Additionally, we are delivering education programs for prospective first home owners. Remote living can compound disadvantage significantly, but another barrier to expanding housing in a timely way is access to developable land due to some of the complex land tenure issues. My department, through RILPO, the Remote Indigenous Land and Infrastructure Program Office, will continue to work in cooperation with Indigenous leaders to resolve these planning and tenure issues so that timely housing is available to more communities.

The Crisafulli government is delivering on its commitment, working in partnership with local leaders and communities to deliver practical on-the-ground measures including home ownership, more houses and essential services such as clean drinking water. The rollout of the first tranche of the Closing the Gap Priorities Fund last month is also addressing critical needs in discrete Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities by directing funds away from lawyers to where they are needed most—supporting better living conditions, employment, education outcomes and health services. By improving housing outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities, the Crisafulli government is working in partnership with communities to overcome disadvantage and make the aspiration of home ownership a reality.

Youth Justice, Programs

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.24 pm): The Crisafulli government made a commitment to Queenslanders that we would deliver programs to restore safety where they live and reduce the number of victims of crime in this state. I am proud to update the House today on yet another step we have taken to deliver on that promise.


The first round of funding for our Kickstarter early intervention program is out to market. Ten million of the \$50 million investment is on the table, ready to kickstart early intervention programs to provide at-risk youth with the education, support and guidance they need to get back on the right track. Community organisations can right now apply for a grant of up to \$300,000 to provide regionally focused early intervention programs tailored to meet the needs of local communities right across the state and prevent crime at its roots. The Kickstarter program is part of the Crisafulli government's \$100 million commitment to Gold Standard Early Intervention across Queensland, with \$50 million to fund Kickstarter and \$50 million to provide ongoing funding to early intervention programs with proven success.

We know that one of the best ways to prevent crime is to intervene early—to put kids on a different trajectory before they become hardened criminals—and that is what these programs will do. After a decade of rising numbers of serious repeat offenders in this state, it is clear that Labor's early intervention models failed. We know the number of youth charged with stealing cars and robbery tripled under Labor and the number of youth charged with break-ins and assaults doubled. That is Labor's legacy and that is what the Crisafulli government will change because, clearly, what has been done for the past 10 years has not worked.

Developing new early intervention programs under Kickstarter is crucial to the change that Queenslanders voted for to prevent the next generation of youth from going down a path of crime and to stop the merry-go-round of repeat youth offenders continuing to offend in our communities. Unlike Labor's approach of having no meaningful measures for success for intervention programs, we will ensure regular performance monitoring is undertaken. In order for programs to receive ongoing funding, they will have to meet strict KPIs centred on reducing reoffending, ensuring school attendance or training or a job—where that is appropriate—and re-engagement in their local communities. Under the Crisafulli government, early intervention programs will be outcomes focused and deliver for communities.

We are sending a strong message: there will be consequences for actions under Adult Crime, Adult Crime but we also want to give young people the best chance at a brighter future by stopping them from veering off the rails in the first place. By investing in Gold Standard Early Intervention programs, we can stop crime before it happens and turn the tide of Labor's youth crime crisis. Queenslanders put their faith in this government to drive down crime and restore safety to our communities and our Kickstarter grants are yet another measure that will deliver this. We will not stop until there are fewer victims of crime in this state.

Domestic and Family Violence

 **Hon. AJ CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.27 pm): As you look around this House, you will notice members wearing protea badges, a symbol of diversity and courage. The protea became symbolic of the *Not now, not ever* report born out of a special taskforce launched by the then LNP government. The protea was chosen because it symbolises transformation—a transformation of society's view on domestic violence. It stands for the courage to act, to speak up and for communities to change. I acknowledge all those who are working towards this change. The protea is now more relevant than ever as we embark upon landmark reform in how we respond to domestic violence and the reform the system requires. We take this first step today by introducing legislation into this House that will protect victims and hold perpetrators to account.

It is important that we continue to have conversations that put domestic and intimate partner violence at the forefront of conversations with our communities. Talking about it is one thing, but we must act. If we do not follow through on our commitments to keep our community safe and hold perpetrators to account, we will continue to hear horrific stories of women being murdered.

The Crisafulli government is committed to keeping women and children safe and delivering safety in our community where they live and in their home. In doing so, we all need to work together. What we have observed is that we can no longer do things the way we always have. What is needed is an overhaul of a system that has been left to flounder by the former government where system gaps still exist, victims are still failed and perpetrators are not held to account.

I was honoured today to have Sue and Lloyd Clarke stand with the police minister and me, as I know they have done before with previous governments, as we spoke about legislative reform. We spoke about the need for this reform. The Clarkes know all too well what can be taken away through the horrors of domestic violence. In a written statement Lloyd said—

We're so relieved to see police being emboldened to act meaningfully against perpetrators of family and domestic violence ...

...

The onus should always be on the perpetrator, not the victim. We hope these laws make it easier for people to seek help and give them the confidence to turn to police when they need protection.

On behalf of Hannah, Aaliyah, Laianah, and Trey, we want to thank the Queensland Government for putting victims of family and domestic violence first.

It is my hope that in introducing today's legislation on which I have worked alongside the police minister, the Attorney-General and also the Minister for Victim Support we can turn a tide.

This month, in May—tomorrow—marks Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month. I want to take this opportunity on behalf of all members of this House and Queenslanders to thank Sue and Lloyd Clarke for their courageous advocacy as well as their family and Small Steps 4 Hannah. Today—right now—they are being honoured at Government House with their Order of Australia medal in recognition of their service. They have travelled the nation and spoken of the need for domestic and

family violence reform not just with regard to coercive control but in working with police, educating and supporting police to ensure they have the resources they need as well as educating our next generation of young people to start with the basics of respect.

Throughout May many landmarks across South-East Queensland and across the state will be lit up to mark Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month. The Queensland government will also continue to support Challenge DV's Darkness to Daylight event on 29 and 30 May, and I look forward to seeing as many parliamentary colleagues out there running or walking, as the Premier and I have done in the past. Other events across the state include candlelit vigils, community marches, information sessions and remembrance walks that I know many in this House will participate in.

I encourage all Queenslanders to speak out against domestic and family violence, to get involved, to listen to victims and, most importantly, to call out behaviour of perpetrators so that we may hold them accountable.

Domestic and Family Violence



Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.32 pm): This House will soon be called upon to endorse landmark reforms to help combat domestic and family violence. This scourge of domestic and family violence has spread throughout society and represents one of the greatest challenges we face. These crimes reach into every corner of our state. Nowhere is immune. This cannot continue. The time has come to say enough is enough. The current framework is not working.

In the past decade instances of domestic and family violence have skyrocketed. DFV incidents have increased by 218 per cent. That is not just a number; that represents real people, real victims, who are demanding change. Our police are at the front line. They respond to a call for help every three minutes. That call could be coming from your mother, sister, aunty or friend. We expect police to be there when we need them.

To do their job, to protect victims and hold perpetrators to account, police need change too. They need the right laws and resources. It is imperative that the laws governing our police reflect the changing circumstances in which they are expected to operate. Right now frontline police are redlining under the sheer number of calls for help. What may have been appropriate a decade ago is no longer effective in combatting the current tsunami of crime created under Labor. It is for this reason that we will be furnishing our police with the legislative backup they need to do their job, the backup they have been calling for. Victims, frontline police and advocates are all calling for change.

For the past five years the Queensland Police Service has been desperate for reform. The Police Union has led the charge. I want to acknowledge their long-term advocacy and acknowledge the presence of their president in the gallery this afternoon. We have listened. Change is coming. Backup is on the way. We could not stand back, continue to do the same thing and expect a different result. Police protection directions will allow officers to take decisive action to protect victims. As with all our reforms, the rights of victims will take precedence. We will not allow our laws to be hijacked by offenders who believe that their interests outweigh those of everyone else. Those who seek to exert power over, harm or intimidate others must realise that we are committed to curbing their behaviour and making them accountable for their actions.

This is an ideal time for those opposite to accept that their prescription to combat domestic and family violence did not work. I am heartened to note comments by senior members of the opposition who have spoken out against this violence. The member for Waterford said in 2015, '... action from across all sections of the community is vital to tackling the scourge of domestic and family violence.' The member for Woodridge said in 2020, 'Domestic and family violence has no place in our communities. Not now, not ever.' The then premier said just last year, 'We do not tolerate violence against women and children.' The opposition will have an opportunity to back up their words when this legislation is debated. In the interests of all victims and all families they can do nothing else.

Domestic and Family Violence



Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (2.36 pm): Domestic and family violence is a scourge on our society and there is an ever increasing demand for timely, effective and supportive responses from our police, our justice system and community support services. The theme for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, starting tomorrow, is: take positive action today to build a safer Queensland. That is exactly what the Crisafulli government is all about: making Queensland safer.

We are taking positive action today and every day to build a safer Queensland, as we have shown with our first steps in the Making Queensland Safer Laws. As has been said, later today we will again demonstrate our commitment to building a safer Queensland by introducing legislation which supports victims of domestic and family violence while providing the police and the courts with the tools they need to keep Queenslanders safe. These major domestic and family violence reforms will protect more victim-survivors of DFV sooner and will deter perpetrators. Among these reforms will be the expansion of the scheme which allows complainants in an alleged domestic violence offence to give their evidence-in-chief in summary criminal proceedings and committal proceedings by way of a videorecorded statement. Currently this scheme operates as a trial in only three South-East Queensland locations. We will expand the scheme to magistrates courts throughout the state to ensure all victim-survivors of domestic and family violence have an option of giving evidence this way.

We will also clarify that in civil proceedings under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, such as an application to obtain or vary a domestic violence order, a court can consider a recorded statement. Providing a recorded statement rather than a written statement or affidavit can support victim-survivors in providing a detailed account of the alleged offending in a location where they can be comfortable, such as their home, rather than a police station and at a time that is appropriate to them. Using this recorded statement as evidence-in-chief or evidence in civil proceedings can minimise the oral testimony that a victim-survivor has to provide during court proceedings, in turn reducing their trauma from retelling their horrific experiences.

We will also make amendments to simplify and streamline the scheme to increase its availability throughout the state and improve victim-survivors' experience during the process. Important safeguards such as requiring a complainant's informed consent are retained. On the eve of this year's Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month the Crisafulli government is taking action today to build a safer Queensland.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Crisafulli LNP Government, Health System



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.39 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

1. notes Premier Crisafulli promised the LNP health plan was the most detailed ever taken to an election.
2. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver 2,200 hospital beds by 2028 and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
3. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver 3,300 hospital beds by 2032 and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
4. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver health projects on time and on budget and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
5. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to not cut health services and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
6. notes the member for Clayfield claimed the LNP had never promised 2,200 hospital beds by 2032 and condemns the member for Clayfield for not knowing the LNP election commitments.
7. condemns Premier Crisafulli for not having any timelines or costings in the LNP government's health plan.
8. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to appoint the member for Mudgeeraba as the health minister and, on behalf of the people of Queensland, the House thanks the Premier for breaking that promise.
9. notes the federal Liberal National Party opposition led by—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Just cease for a moment. We will hear the notice of motion in silence.


Mr MILES: The notice of motion continues—

9. notes the federal Liberal National Party opposition led by Peter Dutton is a major risk to health services in Queensland and Medicare which will make it harder for Queenslanders to seek the health care they vitally need.
10. notes that cutting, delaying, reducing services and breaking promises is the Liberal National Party way, both federally under Peter Dutton and in Queensland under Premier Crisafulli.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time today will conclude at 3.41 pm.

Callide Power Station

 **Mr MILES** (2.42 pm): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer guarantee that his office had absolutely no influence over the decision not to publicly release media statements and information following the Callide Power Station explosion ahead of his big speech?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the opportunity to speak a little more about the Callide Power Station, because there is so much that has to be discussed about the Callide Power Station and the mess that those opposite left the Callide Power Station in. I am going to return to the subtext of the Leader of the Opposition's question. I have put that on the public record—that is known—and I am going to return to that shortly. However, let us look through what exactly those opposite left us with, because those at the front with all the key decision-making in the opposition today left behind a mess at Callide. They left behind a mess at Callide Power Station.

I went through some of it yesterday. We had the \$10 million Brady report. We had the \$38 million that they were trying to spend covering up the Brady report because they did not want to face up to the fact that, when Callide went out because of their lack of investment, 477,000 Queenslanders were without power. The power station was offline for 1,200 days and power prices went up 19.9 per cent in the immediate aftermath of that outrage at Callide. Even worse, the then energy minister would not come out and say anything about it until such time—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is far too much noise from both sides of the House.

Mr JANETZKI: Without any doubt, those opposite left it in a mess. They left it in a mess and all those up the front today committed—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118(b) in relation to relevance. The Treasurer was asked about his influence over the decision to publicly release media statements. He said he would come back to that. We are looking forward to hearing the answer.

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer, you have 40 seconds to talk about the release of the information.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, we are still waiting for an answer from 3½ years ago from the former energy minister. The statement of CS Energy makes it clear. I have been on the public record. If those opposite want to lecture those of us on this side of the House in relation to transparency, I ask them to ask a question of the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations today. Why do they not ask the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Industrial Relations a question today? This is the legacy of those opposite: Callide in disruption, outages and Queenslanders paying the price.

Nuclear Power

Mr McCALLUM: My question is to the Treasurer. Peter Dutton has said that he will use Commonwealth powers to do what is in the country's best interests and overturn state governments that object to nuclear energy. Has the Treasurer sought legal or departmental advice on Commonwealth powers that can be used to overturn the state ban on nuclear power in Queensland?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the member for Bundamba for the question. It looks like the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has been sidelined today because he cannot get a question right, so they have gone to the member for Bundamba.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: This is the second question and the second time I have had to rise to my feet. Warnings will begin from here, or worse.

Mr JANETZKI: The good news for the member for Bundamba and those opposite is that the question is in order. It is in order, so that is good news for the member for Bundamba. We have been clear. The question the member for Bundamba is asking in respect of those issues is a matter for Canberra—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr JANETZKI:—and we have been utterly clear. We are determined to focus on the things in the control of the state government. We want to be in charge of the things in the control of the state government.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, you are the first on the list. You are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: That is why our five-year Energy Roadmap is so important to Queenslanders. That work is so important. I think the clock is paused, but I am happy to keep going anyway; it is nearly a dixer. The Energy Roadmap is important work for Queensland. Let me say this: there is no greater example of why the work of the Energy Roadmap is so important than the underinvestment by those opposite into the power grid of Queensland. They oversaw an absolute underinvestment in the power grid of Queensland. They want to ask a lot of questions about Callide, but one of the key figures that damns all of those at the front of the opposition today is that in the five years before the Callide explosion in 2021 they pulled out \$500 million in dividends. That is what those opposite—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b). None of the minister's response to the question is at all relevant to the question. The question was specifically about whether he sought legal or departmental advice about overturning state restrictions on nuclear energy.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being responsive to the question as asked.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition! I will hear the point of order in silence.

Dr ROWAN: He is providing broad context and is answering the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: It was a very broad question and obviously there were points about the federal election, but there was also a question about any advice sought. You have 43 seconds left on the clock.

Mr JANETZKI: Keep it paused. What those opposite did in pulling out \$500 million in the last five years before Callide exploded says everything about their disrespect for the energy system here in Queensland. They are all still there: the member for Miller, the member for Woodridge, the member for Murrumba, the member for Waterford. All the key people are there. We have said time and again we will always focus on the things within our control. The answer to the question is no—no advice has been obtained.

Youth Crime

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the House on how the LNP's approach to youth crime is making Queensland safer and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to start by thanking the member for Cook for the question. I want to acknowledge the work he is doing in his community. He has a very large electorate with a number of distinct communities, but I did want to focus on two in particular and they are Mareeba and Mossman. I know there has been a series of community meetings about the youth crime crisis and the member has been front and centre in the work he has done. On the back of it the community is finally being listened to, and on the back of it the community is seeing some results.

One of the stories that the member has briefed me on following one of these meetings is the story of a shop owner who had her windows smashed more than a dozen times in a very short period of time. Imagine the impact of that, psychologically and financially. She was speaking with the member a little over a month ago and it has not happened in the last month. I know it is a very low bar to talk about someone having reprieve for a month, but it shows the depth of the youth crime crisis in this state and the work that needs to be done. It shows that there are small inroads that are being made. I call it green shoots. It is not cause for celebration—far from it—but it has been the first turnaround after 10 years of one-way traffic. A decision was taken a decade ago—and many of the faces whose heads are down now are those who took that decision. They made a conscious decision. One of the now frontbenchers came in here and gloated about the decision to allow young people not to have consequences for actions. On the back of it we created a generation of untouchables. What we are doing is restoring that safety where you live by having consequences for actions.

What have those green shoots delivered? In the first quarter of data, following the passing of the first round of the Making Queensland Safer Laws, we saw an 8.2 per cent fall in stolen cars and an 8.4 per cent fall in break and enters. It is easy to say statistics, but I want to focus on what that means. That means in that quarter 453 fewer people had their cars stolen and 1,033 fewer people had the violation of their homes being broken into. It is not a cause for celebration.

Mr Healy: No.

Mr CRISAFULLI: It is so high. I am going to take the interjection from the member for Cairns because when the member was a frontbencher he made excuses. He was one of those opposite who told his community there was nothing wrong. He stood in this place and told them it was all in their imagination. I was asked about alternative approaches. The difference between myself and those opposite is the following: we understand the depth of the crisis, we understand there is a long way to go, but we will never tell people that there is not an issue. We will never say they are making up stories. We will never say that it is a media beat-up. We will never stop until this state returns to being the safe place it was.

Callide Power Station

Mr DICK: My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer confirm if former LNP deputy premier and current CS Energy director Jeff Seeney was present at a meeting between CS Energy and the responsible shareholding ministers on 16 April, just hours prior to CS Energy issuing a statement taking the blame for the Callide explosion?

Mr JANETZKI: The member for Woodridge got the question out. That is excellent news. The notification that I announced yesterday in my ministerial statement was an important part of the action that we took immediately once the gravity of the incident was known. Yesterday when I walked through the actions that were taken, the immediate notification of real-time outage was a key part of that action taken. Also we are focused on a government owned corporation review.

What I wanted to say in relation to this is that I had standing meetings with all GOCs in my diary for that day—with all my energy GOCs, in relation to CleanCo, CS Energy and Stanwell. At those meetings I disclosed to their chairs, deputy chairs and CEOs in relation to that notification process. They were standing meetings and I delivered that news to them that day. Those GOCs now know that if there is outage here in Queensland, regardless of the gravity or the seriousness of the incident, those notifications must be made in real-time. That is what is necessary. The deputy chair of CS Energy, with the chair of CS Energy and the acting CEO and other figures, were there at the meeting.

Mr Crisafulli: You would hope so!

Mr JANETZKI: You would hope that those people would be present. What I would say in relation to the statement from the board of CS Energy is that that is their statement. I recall the board of CS Energy actually apologising to those opposite. Would you believe it: the board of CS Energy apologised to the former energy minister in that government. I have no idea why exactly they would have apologised. In my mind they should have been apologising to the board of CS Energy. They were the ones that appointed Jim Soorley to the board for nearly 10 years. Exactly what qualifications did Jim Soorley have to chair the board of CS Energy for 10 years? They should have been apologising to the board of CS Energy for the \$500 million they pulled out of CS Energy to plug their budget hole. They should have been apologising to the board of CS Energy. CS Energy and all the GOCs understand the requirements that are upon them and that is for the betterment of Queensland.

Youth Crime, Legislation

Mr G KELLY: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the House on the impact of the first tranche of the Crisafulli government's Adult Crime, Adult Time laws and is the Attorney-General aware of any alternative approaches?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I was very quick to my feet and luckily I did sit back down because the honourable member did ask me about alternative approaches and I want to get to that part of the question. What I can say is thank you very much, member for Mirani. Here is a hardworking member of parliament from Central Queensland, a man of the bush, who really represents that part of the region. I know, for example, when he goes into Rocky to do his shopping he hears from people who talk about the amount of cars that are being stolen and getting driven around Rocky. I mention that for the member for Rocky as well.

We know that, just as in Townsville, Cairns and other areas of Queensland, those opposite left people hanging and decided that youth criminals could run rampant—but not the Crisafulli government. We got in first and then, before Christmas, we passed the Making Queensland Safer Laws to make sure there are consequences for actions, to make sure detention as a last resort was removed and to make sure victims are put first. Importantly, we also gave the police, the magistrates and the judges the laws and the tools that they require to deal with the kids and young thugs who are running rampant through not just Central Queensland but all of Queensland. We gave them the laws they need to deal with that.

It is interesting that, as the Premier just said, we are seeing green shoots. Without a doubt, more needs to be done and that is exactly what we are doing. What have the magistrates said? One magistrate said—

Now the government changed those laws because they decided on a bill to hold young offenders who commit serious offences to account by ensuring that the courts have primary regard to the impact of offending on victims and can impose the appropriate penalties that meet community expectation.

In relation to the laws, another magistrate said—

They have tripled the maximum penalty that a court can impose and, even in the Childrens Court of Queensland, for many of those offences they have effectively tripled the maximum penalty.

That is exactly why we are seeing green shoots across Queensland.

I am asked about alternatives. Those opposite need to hang their heads in shame because they know full well—

Mr McDonald: They're still in denial.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. They are still in denial because they genuinely do not believe that the changes they made to the laws over a decade ago created a generation of untouchables.

(Time expired)

Callide Power Station

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Minister for Industrial Relations. Sources have told the opposition that Workplace Health and Safety Queensland were on site at the Callide Power Station within hours following the explosion. Why did the industrial relations minister fail to inform the Premier and Queenslanders of the severity of the explosion and that his department were on site investigating?

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker and honourable colleagues, records are meant to be broken and today I am proud to announce that in six months this is the first question on any subject matter from the Labor opposition to me. Records are meant to be broken and I thank the honourable member for the question. I can advise the honourable member that I was literally drafting a Dorothy Dixier about this very question and then the former industrial relations minister jumped to her feet to ask it. I will can the Dorothy Dixier, keep to what I had and answer the question.

I was interested to read a letter that I received a few days ago from the honourable shadow industrial relations minister and the member for Bundamba.

Ms Grace: Answer the question.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will answer the question; don't worry about that. They want to give me more time, too. The honourable member wrote to me asking about CS Energy and the latest incident. She also requested a briefing from Workplace Health and Safety for herself and the member for Bundamba. That got me interested. I table a copy of that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 14 April 2025, from the member for McConnel, Hon. Grace Grace MP, and the member for Bundamba, Mr Lance McCallum MP, to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, and the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership, Hon. David Janetzki, regarding the explosion at the Callide C3 generator on 4 April 2025 [\[397\]](#).

It got me interested because Workplace Health and Safety were on site and there is greater workplace health and safety. Because there is now a government that backs our inspectors rather than the CFMEU and dodgy unions, they can actually get on with their job. I thought, 'You know what? The honourable shadow minister was the minister for industrial relations.' I started asking questions about

how many incidents Workplace and Health Safety were advised of in relation to Callide. I can put on the record a few facts for the honourable shadow industrial relations minister. Callide notifiable events from March 2015 to 2024—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118(b). The Deputy Premier said he would answer the question. There is only a minute left. We expect to hear a detailed answer that is relevant to the question about whether or not and, if not, why he did not inform the Premier.

Mr SPEAKER: There were two parts to the question. At this stage, the Deputy Premier is addressing one part of the question. He has one minute left to round out his answer.

Mr BLEIJIE: From March 2015 to November 2024, a total of 145 notifiable events were received relating to CS Energy Ltd: 45 were triaged as administration, eight were triaged as electrical safety and 92 were triaged as workplace health and safety. During that period, the former Labor government issued CS Energy with 107 improvement notices and five prohibition notices, and 27 immediate compliance notices were issued by inspectors and rectified by CS Energy. Of the 111 improvement notices, 91 were issued to CS Energy's Callide Power Station workplace and all five prohibition notices were issued to the Callide Power Station workplace by the former Labor minister.

Then I got looking. Here it is: 52 pages. Did you tell the Premier at the time? Did they notify Queenslanders? There are 52 pages!

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You were correct: there was a minute left on the clock but now there are just 12 seconds. There is no relevance in the response to the question. Why did the Deputy Premier fail to inform the Premier? That was the question.

Mr SPEAKER: The second part of the question was about informing the Premier. Deputy Premier, you have 12 seconds to go.

Mr BLEIJIE: I am wondering which premier it was because former minister Grace did not inform her premier. There are 52 pages of compliance, enforcement and prohibition notices and you stayed silent. Do not lecture Queenslanders about this when you stayed silent for 12 years.

(Time expired)

Ms GRACE: That was way over the top. I take personal offence and I ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The standard of behaviour in the House had better improve dramatically. There are a couple of things to point out. Deputy Premier, your comments should come through the chair—you are aware of that—instead of across the chamber. The member has taken personal offence and I ask that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Youth Justice

Mr BAILLIE: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister provide an update on how the Crisafulli LNP government is reforming Queensland's youth justice system and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mrs GERBER: At the outset, I thank the member for Townsville for being a fierce advocate for community safety in his community. For many years in the community of Townsville he has been working on the ground to advocate for and support his community. In fact, Townsville was at the epicentre of Labor's youth crime crisis. It was one of the first communities to call it out. The member for Townsville has been steadfast in his support for tougher laws, for better support for victims of crime and for ensuring his community is safe where they live. I thank the member for Townsville for all the work he is doing for his community.

The Crisafulli government is reforming the youth justice system in this state because, under the watch of those opposite, criminals were left to run rampant, particularly in the electorate of the member for Townsville. Queenslanders deserve change. They deserve to feel safe in their communities. However, under Labor they had 10 years of weakening laws, 10 years of failure to meaningfully invest in early intervention and rehabilitation programs and 10 years of denial that there even was a youth crime crisis.

What the Crisafulli government is delivering in order to reform the youth justice system in this state is tougher laws, and we have already delivered the first tranche of that. Adult Crime, Adult Time, just like we promised, was made law before Christmas. We have more reforms that are currently before this House in relation to strengthening our laws.

We put out to market two early intervention programs—Regional Reset and Staying on Track—which have just closed, in fact. A number of community providers have tendered for Staying on Track to deliver meaningful rehabilitation in our detention centres and when the youths are released back into our communities. Gold Standard Early Intervention is currently open for tender right now. Up to \$300,000 in grants is available for community organisations to provide Gold Standard Early Intervention in our communities right across Queensland.

We are implementing our Detention with Purpose plan, under which there will be mandatory education, zero tolerance to violence and consequences for actions in our detention centres. We also have more police on our streets. We are seeing the grass shoots appearing in our courts, with judges referencing our laws. The word is spreading. The word is spreading to youth offenders. Young people in our detention centres are asking about our tough new laws and the consequences that they could face under Adult Crime, Adult Time. They have been made aware that there is no longer a soft-on-crime approach in this state. We are seeing grass shoots.

Under Labor, we had 10 years of weakening laws and the denial that there even was a crime crisis. That ends with the Crisafulli government. We put the rights of victims before the rights of offenders.

Callide Power Station

Mr MILES: My question is to the Treasurer. Yesterday, the Treasurer did not answer if his office was provided photos of the explosion at Callide Power Station on the day of the explosion. Was the Treasurer's office provided photos of the explosion on the day of the explosion—yes or no?

Mr JANETZKI: I am confused by the question from the Leader of the Opposition because it is on the public record. Pay attention! Keep up. Do the research. It is all on the public record. Those opposite are not paying attention: it is all on the public record. It is on the public record.

What is also on the public record is the deceit from those opposite when it comes to Callide. They walk in here and they smear the reputation of board members and they smear the reputation of public servants through the Coaldrake review. When they come into this House, they try to smear and add deceit upon deceit. They know the truth. They know what is on the public record, yet they walk in here and pretend otherwise.

We will not tolerate their lecturing, their deceit, their smearing of public servants or their smearing of hardworking Queenslanders. We will not tolerate it. We took action immediately when we found out the gravity of this incident. That is not just me saying that; the board of CS Energy said we were grievously misled. Public servants were misled. The senior management of CS Energy were misled. Their board were misled. The Brady report, which was 300 pages, showed where those opposite obfuscated for 3½ years. It took a court appearance for the energy minister to come out and tell the truth. Those opposite pulled out \$500 million in the five years before the explosion. They know the depth of their deceitfulness.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118(b): the question was: yes or no?

Mr SPEAKER: I understand that the Treasurer said it is on the public record. He may continue his answer.

Mr JANETZKI: Read it. Do some work. Work harder. Do not come in here and smear. One of the—

An honourable member interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: Keep it paused. One of the key reasons we needed the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee in Queensland was their lack of investment. We have returned investment to the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee here in Queensland—\$1.4 billion—and we will do more, if necessary. We have set down key performance indicators on safety metrics, on performance metrics and on finance metrics. We have added accountability. Those opposite walk in here and talk about accountability and transparency. The Deputy Premier has just shown what they truly think of that. Let's never forget that those opposite paid \$300,000 in bonuses to executives at CS Energy while it was out of action for 3½ years.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are looking forward to hearing the answer. Therefore, I move—

That the honourable member for Toowoomba South be further heard.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: Mr Speaker—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not hear the decision on the question. The ayes have it?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There was a little bit of confusion in the House, but the ayes have it.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will be giving a general warning if that happens again. Treasurer, you have two minutes.

Mr JANETZKI: Those opposite need to work harder and pay attention.

Mr Crisafulli: They're high-fiving!

Mr JANETZKI: Those opposite make a mockery of this place. They are the worst opposition we have seen in a very long time.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you are one of the loudest in the House. I give you latitude but my patience is running very, very thin.

Mr JANETZKI: They make a mockery of this House. The member for Murrumba and the member for Woodridge are high-fiving like schoolboys. They blow up Callide and they come in here and high-five each other. They oversaw 10 years of underinvestment and pulled out \$500 million in the last five years before the Callide explosion. They high-fived in here. They make a mockery of this parliament. It has taken a change of government—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Waterford, you are warned. Member for Algester, you are warned. Member for Nudgee, you are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: They come in here and make a mockery of this place. They make a mockery of it. They ran our energy system into the ground for 10 years. They pulled out money. They ignored the findings of the Brady report. They tried to hide their underfunding. They tried to hide their security breaches. They tried to hide the workplace health and safety issues. It has taken a change of government to bring some accountability, yet they are in here high-fiving and disgracing this place. They are disgracing this place and they disgrace themselves as a result.

They are a lazy opposition. They are a lazy opposition and they have not paid attention. It is on the public record. If they had any resource or intellectual capacity, they would have found out. I have confirmed—it is on the public record—that I saw the photos on Thursday.

Youth Crime

Mr DALTON: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am waiting for silence in the House, member.

Mr DALTON: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Newly released figures have revealed the tide is beginning to turn on the youth crime crisis. Can the minister update the House on what this data means for Queensland?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. As we know, as we heard in his maiden speech, he has dedicated his adult life to fighting crime and community safety for over 20 years in Mackay. A large part of that time was in crime prevention and early intervention programs. I know

how passionate he is about safer communities. I enjoyed the visits I had up there and meeting some of the victims. To see the current data come out, as the Premier and others have pointed out, is a small step in the right direction. This is not mission accomplished and we are not popping the champagne.

In the central police region, which Mackay and Rockhampton are part of, we have seen over summer—December, January and February—a 25 per cent drop in unlawful use of a motor vehicle, which is 123 fewer stolen vehicles, and a 33 per cent reduction in robberies. The central police region also includes Rockhampton, as I said, and Mackay and Rockhampton are two seats in Central Queensland that have not voted for our side of politics for a hundred years or more. The majority of constituents in those seats voted for change and we are delivering that change.

It is not just about statistics. It is not just about the 123 fewer stolen vehicles on the spreadsheet. I do not have permission to mention her name, so I will not, but I remember the young mum the member introduced me to at a crime forum in Rockhampton just before the election who spoke about her stolen vehicle and not only about the financial impact but about the emotional trauma it brought on her young family. I will never forget that meeting, and I thank the member for organising that. Across Queensland we have seen a small step in the right direction, as the Premier and the Attorney-General have pointed out—an 8.2 per cent and 8.4 per cent reduction in unlawful use and break and enters respectfully.

I was not going to but I want to quickly turn to Cairns. I heard the member for Cairns interject on the Premier before. He was screaming across the chamber, interjecting, hot under the collar about crime in Cairns. I had a quick look on my phone at the QPS data page. The member for Cairns and I came in at the same time. We were sworn in in early 2018. In 2018 there were 887 cars stolen in Cairns in the first full year he was the member for Cairns. In 2024, that had nearly doubled to 1,558 cars stolen in Cairns. I am happy to go to the tape.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr PURDIE: I can never remember the member for Cairns wailing like a banshee, screaming across the chamber, outraged that the number of stolen cars in his electorate had almost doubled in the time that he was the member, but he is now. He is interjecting now.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr PURDIE: He is wailing across the chamber and interjecting across the chamber now he is in opposition.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Cairns!

Mr PURDIE: As I pointed out before, the only people in Queensland who are praying for crime to go up are those opposite. The member for Cairns was a mouse in government. He came down here and did not fight for his electorate and now he is interjecting. He did nothing at the time.

(Time expired)

CopperString

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Treasurer. When did the Treasurer inform QIC that they would be overseeing future stages of the CopperString project? Was it before or after he briefed the Premier?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the member for Waterford for the question.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, you are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the member for Waterford for the question because I do love a good CopperString question from those opposite. It reminds everybody in Queensland how they had lost utter control of this project. I think about all of those members who are still there, sitting up the front. The leadership team of the opposition were the leadership team when in government.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Cross-chamber chatter will cease.

Mr JANETZKI: They sat around the CBRC table signing off on blowout after blowout after blowout or secrecy after secrecy after secrecy. When we got into government we undertook a review of CopperString, because under them it had gone from \$1.8 billion in 2020 to \$5 billion in 2023 to \$6.2 billion by August 2023. Then after we came to government we discovered it was \$9 billion. What they had not properly done was get the total project cost. They had not properly estimated the

augmentation, the spur lines, what it would take to connect the renewables that will make CopperString work for North and North-West Queensland. They had not done any of it. Now they have the temerity to walk in here and ask questions about CopperString! They come in here and ask questions about CopperString.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118(b). The question was: when did the Treasurer inform QIC that they would be overseeing future stages? I ask you to draw the Treasurer back to the relevant answer to the question.

Mr SPEAKER: I will draw you back to the question under standing order 118(b) on relevance.

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, absolutely, Mr Speaker. Those opposite essentially want us to investigate and disclose their cover-ups, deceit and lies when it comes to CopperString. They basically want us to disclose their blowouts—their track record. That is basically what they are asking.

Mr Crisafulli: Can you believe it? The gall!

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, we undertook a review because we are determined to save CopperString. During the review a whole range of questions were asked and numbers were tested, re-analysed and double-checked because we could not believe the number those had left behind. I took the final confirmed figure to the Premier, together with the solution, because we are determined to save CopperString. With QIC and Powerlink working together, that is exactly what we will do.

Domestic and Family Violence, Legislation

Ms JAMES: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Will the minister inform the House how the Crisafulli LNP government is making Queensland communities safer by reforming domestic and family violence legislation, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms CAMM: I thank the member for Barron River, who is a fierce advocate in her community, attending victim rallies, meeting with stakeholders and particularly with victims of domestic and family violence in a region where we have seen skyrocketing numbers of domestic and family violence. Ten per cent of all of the state's domestic and family violence is in North and Far North Queensland.

The Crisafulli government took to the election a commitment, and that was around putting victims first and holding perpetrators to account. We have heard from many of my colleagues today about the first tranche of the Making Queensland Safer Laws and how we are seeing green shoots. That is what the new legislation that I will introduce into the House later today is all about. That is what those opposite failed to do—put victims first, hold perpetrators to account and give police and the front line the resources, the tools and the laws they need.

We also know that this occurs behind closed doors. Over the past decade we have seen many advocates come forward, members on both sides of the House, calling out domestic and family violence. Today we draw a line in the sand with the introduction of this legislation as we get closer to tomorrow, which marks Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month.

I want to quote the member for Ferny Grove, who made a comment last year: 'The conduct you walk past is the conduct you accept and condone.' I call on all men in this House, in our state, in our workplaces, to stand up and speak up against domestic and family violence.

The left faction of the Labor Party and the right faction of the Labor Party are at war. They would rather put party politics first and run a protection racket for one of their sitting members—the member for Stafford, who was involved in an alleged domestic violence incident, as reported by Channel 9 and as reported by the *Australian*.

I call upon those opposite. I call upon the women of the old guard. I call upon the Leader of the Opposition. I call upon the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. What is interesting is those opposite with their heads down and those who are trying to distract. I think those who have their heads down want accountability. I think they want to call out perpetrator behaviour. I think they believe that members of this House should be held to a high standard—not where women are at risk and not where children in the family home are at risk. I call on them today to call it out.

North Queensland, Water Security

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Local Government and Water. The Tablelands Regional Water Assessment has identified the North Johnstone diversion as one of the priority projects; however, it was not included in the short- or medium-term action list. Will the minister move this vital project to the short-term action list to expand agriculture development and provide water security to the Atherton Tablelands?

Ms LEAHY: I thank the member for Hill for his question. I know that he is a very good advocate for his region and water security. It is a priority for him and for many of his communities. He knows how important water development is for his region and North Queensland, because without water communities cannot go forward to prosper. I can assure him that it is a top priority for the Crisafulli government.

Unfortunately, it has not been a priority for those members opposite. For 10 years they resisted delivering water infrastructure projects. For 10 years they missed opportunities to provide water security and affordability.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I am trying to hear the answer. I am sure the member for Hill would like to as well.

Ms LEAHY: For 10 years they denied Queenslanders the opportunity to grow agriculture. We also know that vital funding for projects like the Emu Swamp—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, you are warned. I called for order and you immediately started to interject.

Ms LEAHY: We also know that Labor lost funding for important projects like the Emu Swamp Dam project in the member for Southern Downs' electorate. We heard a lot from the member for Southern Downs about that being his priority project. We also heard how they lost funding for dams like Urannah Dam. For nearly 10 years Labor sat on their hands and did little to drive water infrastructure delivery. We do know what they did drive up: \$6 billion in blowouts—Paradise Dam, the cost increased by \$3.2 billion; Lake Macdonald, the cost increased by \$138 million; Burdekin Falls Dam in the north, the cost increased by \$623 million; and Somerset Dam, the cost increased by \$950 million. We do know what they were doing: they were driving up blowouts. They were not driving water infrastructure. Those opposite have no respect for Queenslanders' money and it is a damn disgrace.

The Crisafulli government understands that additional affordable water will generate economic growth and more jobs. Prioritising water supply and affordability is key to getting Queensland back on track after nearly 10 years of Labor failures. That is why the Crisafulli government is committed to reviewing all 23 regional water plans across Queensland. I look forward to the member for Hill's advocacy on the North Johnstone diversion project as the Crisafulli government progresses our water security plan. The water security plan is part of my—

(Time expired)

Domestic and Family Violence

Ms MARR: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support. Can the minister outline for the House how the LNP Crisafulli government is taking action to support victims of domestic and family violence, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Thuringowa for her question. The member for Thuringowa has been on the front line of support for victims of domestic and family violence. As a police officer, she has seen firsthand what is happening in her community. I want to first talk about the laws we are introducing this week in parliament. We are introducing new laws to provide victims of domestic and family violence with greater protection by allowing police to issue on-the-spot 12-month police protection directions. This will give victim-survivors immediate protection and support. We are also rolling out GPS devices to monitor high-risk domestic violence offenders.

This is in stark contrast to Labor, which oversaw a 218 per cent increase in domestic and family violence related incidents over a decade. That is Labor's record when it comes to domestic and family violence in this state. Over the last 10 years there was a 218 per cent increase in domestic and family violence. Let's not just look at the record; let's look at what they said. On 1 May the member for Murrumba publicly said—

... violence of any kind towards a domestic partner, women or children is not tolerated—not now, not ever. Domestic violence is a scourge on society and it is everyone's responsibility to turn things around.

On 15 November he said, 'We do not tolerate violence against women and children.'

What we do know is that last year 9News reported that police were called to a domestic violence incident at the member for Stafford's home. The *Australian* said that police described it as a domestic violence incident. Now we hear that members of the Labor Party are at war with each other. Members of the left faction want the member for Stafford gone, but members of the right faction are running a protection racket. Members of the right faction are protecting him. Will the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Murrumba, stand by and condone that conduct, or will he stand up for victims of domestic and family violence? The question is will your own party continue to support the member for Stafford behind closed doors or will they stand up in support of the protection of women and children from domestic and family violence? That is the question for the member for Murrumba. It is a leadership question. The right faction is running a protection racket—we have heard those rumours—but the left want the member for Stafford gone. The protection racket is real. Will the Labor Party stand up or will—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs GERBER: Go outside and explain why the member for Stafford is still protected by the Labor Party.

CopperString

Ms MULLEN: My question is to the Treasurer. The Treasurer has said the scope of CopperString has increased, a fact disputed by Powerlink, which is responsible for planning and delivering the project. Can the Treasurer please explain the apparent inconsistency between his advice and Powerlink's?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. I think the honourable member should read the newspaper clipping a little more closely, because everything that was said in that clipping absolutely matches up with everything I have said about CopperString. Again those opposite are not paying attention. They are not doing the work that is necessary.

Mr Crisafulli: They are not working hard enough.

Mr JANETZKI: They are not working hard enough. I know the report that the honourable member is referring to, and everything in that report simply verifies everything I have said about CopperString. Those opposite had overseen CopperString going from \$1.8 billion, to \$5 billion, to \$6.2 billion, to \$9 billion, which is now the total project cost once all the additional augmentation, all the necessary—

A government member: Arteries.

Mr JANETZKI:—arteries that are necessary to deliver this important piece of economic infrastructure to the north and north-west of Queensland. I think about the wind assets around Hughenden, the wind there that blows at night that is really important to hook into CopperString, and I think about getting the north and the north-west to the National Electricity Market sooner. That is what we are doing. That is what we are delivering.

They never would have delivered CopperString. That project was doomed to fail under those opposite but we are going to save it because we have come with a solution. Powerlink's transmission expertise, coupled with QIC's infrastructure capability, can get this job done. Those opposite were building a highway with no on- or off-ramps, and that is effectively what Powerlink have said. To make CopperString work, you must get the on- and off-ramps right to deliver it. Those opposite did not do the work. Similar to what they are like now in opposition, they were not doing the work when it came to CopperString.

I think about the total project cost of \$13.9 billion and I think about all the blowouts that those opposite have overseen. I reckon if I had a dollar for every single one of the former government's blowouts CopperString would be paid for by now. I really think that. Across the length and breadth of that former government, blowouts and project overruns reigned because those opposite were incapable of delivering anything on time and on budget. That is the total opposite of what the Crisafulli government will deliver.

(Time expired)

Domestic and Family Violence

Mrs STOKER: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the minister outline for the House why it is so important that we as community leaders call out domestic and family violence in all of its forms?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute to respond.


Ms CAMM: I thank the member. It is important because we are leaders: we are leaders of our communities, we are leaders of this state and we are legislators. It is our job to bring forward not just policy but also laws that will hold perpetrators to account and that will put victims at their heart. What this government has inherited from those opposite is appalling: numbers going in the wrong direction when it comes to victim numbers; police starved of the resources they need; and a lack of leadership by those opposite. This is a sad opposition that has a protection racket for an alleged perpetrator of domestic and family violence who has never had to stand up and be accountable either in this House or outside this House for the high office that he holds. We hold a standard on this side of the House, and I call on the women over there if they are brave enough to hold the same standard.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.


PRIVILEGE

Correction to Record of Proceedings

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.42 pm): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. I wish to correct the record in relation to my last contribution. I believe I said the member for Thuringowa was a serving police officer. I was looking at the member for Mundingburra when I said that and I wish to correct the record in relation to that.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. AJ CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (3.42 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, the Evidence Act 1977, the Explosives Act 1999, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008, the Weapons Act 1990 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Education, Arts and Communities Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 [\[398\]](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes [\[399\]](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[400\]](#).

The Crisafulli government was elected on a platform of putting victims first. We meant what we said and we have spent the first six months in government doing just that. This legislation is the first step in ensuring victims of domestic and family violence, an increasingly insidious issue in our community, are put first. This is the first tranche of reform and it will give victims immediate protection, hold offenders to account and take steps to ease the re-traumatisation of victims during the court process.

This legislation will ensure real consequences for actions. The police protection direction, PPDs, orders will put on-the-spot constraints on domestic violence offenders and give immediate protection to victims. GPS monitoring devices will also be issued to high-risk perpetrators, protecting their victims by monitoring offenders 24/7. Expanding the video recorded evidence-in-chief trial statewide will support victim-survivors and mitigate the risk of re-traumatisation. VREC will facilitate evidence-in-chief by way of video recorded statement.

This is not an overnight decision; in the past decade we have seen offending rates and domestic violence orders, and the data demonstrates the breach of those on the rise. A change must be made, and this is the first step in what will be our government's commitment to better the protection of victims and hold perpetrators to account.

There is no denying that, in recent years, frontline domestic and family violence services, the Queensland Police Service and other first responders have been experiencing increasing significant demand for their services. The Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring frontline police responding to domestic and family violence have the tools they need to respond effectively to protect vulnerable people. We need to ensure police have the ability to 'immediately' put protections in place for victims. We also need to ensure they have the tools and ability to prioritise and respond to high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence.

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will enable our frontline police officers to offer immediate protection for victims and support police to respond to DFV effectively. The bill also aims to support our commitment to deliver an electronic monitoring pilot and strengthen the maintenance of the approved provider list for delivery of intervention order programs and counselling under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act.

This bill will also simplify, streamline and expand the video recorded evidence-in-chief framework statewide. It will clarify that a video recorded statement can be used in civil proceedings under the DFVP Act. In addition, the bill will make technical amendments to improve the maintenance of the approved provider list of DFV intervention order programs and counselling services.

Currently, police officers can issue police protection notices, which provide an aggrieved with protection until an application for a domestic violence order can be heard by a court. To support our frontline police, the bill introduces police protection directions, PPDs, as an additional tool for police officers responding to DFV. Police officers will be able to issue a PPD, which will provide an aggrieved with on-the-spot 12-month protection. PPDs will be used in certain circumstances, when a police officer considers after investigation that it is appropriate for a matter not to proceed to court. The bill also contains safeguards for the issuing of PPDs. Among other reasons, these safeguards are intended to (a) prioritise the safety of victim-survivors and (b) reduce the risk of misidentification of the person most in need of protection.

There are also circumstances where a domestic violence order made by a court will continue to be the most appropriate form of protection. A PPD will not be available in any of the following circumstances:

- (a) where the respondent or aggrieved is a child;
- (b) where the respondent or aggrieved is a police officer. This is to ensure DFV matters involving police are heard by a court and are not handled internally;
- (c) where the respondent should be taken into custody in relation to the relevant domestic violence. This acknowledges the seriousness of the matter and ensures that a person who is taken into custody goes before a court and is not released with a PPD;
- (d) where a DVO or recognised interstate order relating to the parties is in force or has previously been in force. This exclusion applies regardless of who was the respondent and who was the aggrieved. This is to ensure that parties who have a history of orders between them proceed to a court to have their relationship as a whole considered;
- (e) where a PPD against the respondent is in force or has previously been in force. A PPD will also not be able to be issued if there is already a PPD in place between the same aggrieved and respondent, listing the respondent as the aggrieved and the aggrieved as the respondent—that is, a cross-direction will not be permitted;
- (f) where the respondent has been convicted of a domestic violence offence within the previous two years, or a proceeding for a domestic violence offence against the respondent has started but not been finally disposed of. These safeguards recognise the significance of past domestic violence offending;
- (g) where the respondent has used, or threatened to use, an offensive weapon or instrument to commit the domestic violence. This safeguard recognises that a perpetrator's access to, or use of, weapons is a lethality indicator. Use of a weapon, particularly if used in the most recent violence incident, indicates a very high-risk of lethal violence. PPDs will also revoke a person's weapons licence and require they surrender their weapons. This is consistent with the effect a DVO currently has on a weapons licence;

- (h) where an application for a protection order, including via a PPN, against the respondent has been made but not finally dealt with. This will ensure that a PPD does not interfere with existing court proceedings; and
- (i) where a child is a named person on a PPD and conditions other than standard conditions are needed to provide protection.

When issuing a PPD, police officers will be required to seek approval from a supervising police officer. For a PPD which includes a cool-down condition, the supervising officer must be of at least the rank of sergeant. PPDs that include an ouster or no-contact condition must be approved by a supervising officer of at least the rank of senior sergeant.

If a supervising officer considers the matter should go before a court, they can approve the issue of a police protection notice instead of a PPD.

The bill establishes two pathways for a PPD to be reviewed once it is issued—a police review and a court review. A police review may be suitable on a police officer's initiative if the police officer becomes aware of circumstances, or reasonably believes there are circumstances, that were not known or considered when the PPD was issued and reasonably believes this may have affected the decision.

The aggrieved, the respondent, an authorised person for the aggrieved and a named person may also apply for a police review of a PPD within 28 days after the notice stating the grounds for the PPD is served on the respondent. The Police Commissioner may agree a longer period for the review to be started. The reviewing officer must decide the review within 28 days after the review is requested.

The aggrieved or respondent can also, at any time during the 12 months the PPD is in force, make an application for a court to review the direction. An applicant can seek court review whether or not they have applied for a police review. The court review is not an appeal against the police review. The court will be required to consider whether a protection order is necessary or desirable at the time of review, not at the time the PPD was issued. The court may make any order available under part 3 of the DFVP Act in relation to hearing an application for a domestic violence order. The court may also make an order setting aside the PPD or decide to dismiss the application for a protection order.

It is intended that PPDs will be enforceable in other jurisdictions as part of the National Domestic Violence Order Scheme. I will work with my colleagues in other jurisdictions to support interstate recognition and ensure victim safety. The government will also undertake a statutory review of the legislation changes after two years to ensure their effectiveness.

I will now turn to the framework for electronic monitoring of high-risk domestic and family violence perpetrators as a condition of a domestic violence order, as established by the bill. The new provisions allow certain courts prescribed by regulation to impose a monitoring device condition on a respondent in certain circumstances, if satisfied the condition is necessary or desirable to protect the aggrieved from domestic violence, or a named person from associated domestic violence, or a named person who is a child from being exposed to domestic violence.

While including electronic monitoring as part of a domestic violence order in the civil context is different to existing frameworks in place for electronic monitoring as part of bail or parole, it is intended that these provisions will complement existing electronic monitoring frameworks.

When making a monitoring device condition, courts will be required to consider making an ouster condition or a condition that prohibits the respondent from approaching, or attempting to approach, the aggrieved or named. A monitoring device condition is intended to complement each of these conditions.

To enable the pilot to capture 'high-risk' perpetrators of DFV, monitoring device conditions will only be available where the court is satisfied the respondent has either been convicted of, or is charged with, a domestic violence offence or an indictable offence involving violence against another person; or there is a history of charges for domestic violence offences made against the respondent. There will be certain considerations for a court deciding whether to impose a monitoring device condition. This will include the personal circumstances of the respondent and any views or wishes expressed by the aggrieved or a named person.

We know that giving evidence in court can re-traumatise victim-survivors of domestic and family violence. To assist in minimising this trauma, the bill simplifies, streamlines and expands the framework in part 6A of the Evidence Act 1977, which allows adult complainants in domestic violence criminal proceedings to give their evidence-in-chief by way of a video recorded statement. Currently, this framework only applies in the Ipswich, Southport and Coolangatta magistrates courts. The bill expands the framework to all magistrates courts statewide to enable all victim-survivors of domestic and family violence the option of providing a recorded statement instead of a written statement, and have that recording presented to the court as their evidence-in-chief instead of oral testimony.

In response to operational issues with the current legislative framework, the bill also makes a number of amendments to simplify and streamline the process for making a recorded statement. Those amendments include simplifying the language used by a police officer to explain the process and for a complainant to declare that their statement is true. The bill also clarifies that informed consent need only be obtained once, either before or at the commencement of the recorded statement.

We know that victim-survivors of domestic and family violence may delay reporting offending to police. If a matter is immediately reported, victim-survivors may be in a heightened state of distress and require further time before providing a detailed account to police. The bill removes the requirement to obtain a recorded statement as soon as practicable after the events to which the recorded statement relates. This will allow a victim-centric approach to when a police officer may take a recorded statement.

We also know that victim-survivors may make multiple reports to police over a period of time. The bill clarifies that multiple recorded statements can be taken. The bill also removes the requirement for a police officer who has successfully completed certain training to take a recorded statement. This will provide more victim-survivors across the state the option of making a recorded statement with a police officer who has completed other suitable training. These amendments ensure that the framework is still founded on victim agency and informed consent but make it more accessible and simpler for victim-survivors and police officers.

The bill makes a number of other amendments, including that an oral or written English translation must be provided if any part of a recorded statement is in a language other than English, and providing an example of an exceptional circumstance where an audio recorded statement may be used.

Following a domestic and family violence incident, victim-survivors may be required to give evidence in criminal proceedings as well as civil proceedings under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. Giving evidence in these civil proceedings can also re-traumatise victim-survivors. The bill clarifies that in a civil proceeding under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act, the court may have regard to a recorded statement. Admitting a recorded statement, instead of an affidavit, can also assist in minimising the requirement for victim-survivors to retell their story.

The bill strengthens the maintenance of the approved provider list. The approved provider list outlines service providers approved to provide court ordered intervention and counselling services to persons using violence. The amendments provide an ability for the chief executive to consider matters prescribed by regulation when considering the approval of a provider for an approved program or counselling. Criteria will be able to be prescribed by regulation in addition to the existing requirements for the approval of providers on the APL.

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will offer better protection for victims and hold domestic violence perpetrators to account, while supporting our frontline police when they are responding to domestic and family violence. The bill will also support our government's commitment to establish an electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk domestic and family violence offenders. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.00 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Education, Arts and Communities Committee


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee.

Before I call the Clerk to read the next order of the day, I inform the following members that they are still on warnings until dinner time at least: Aspley, Waterford, Nudgee, Algester, Mudgeeraba and Greenslopes.

**CRIME AND CORRUPTION (RESTORING REPORTING POWERS) AMENDMENT
BILL****Second Reading**

Resumed from 29 April (see p. 986), on motion of Mrs Frecklington—

That the bill be now read a second time.


 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (4.01 pm), continuing: I would like to continue my contribution by acknowledging that my remarks yesterday regarding public reporting powers were less specific than I intended and may have been misunderstood. Of course the Attorney is correct—she should not get used to me saying that—in saying that the CCC cannot publicly report on those matters within the scope of the High Court decision.

In my contribution yesterday I intended to highlight that it is my understanding that the CCC can still publicly comment on some matters, including those matters outside the scope of the High Court decision. For instance, it is my understanding that this includes matters of systemic corruption, general matters relating to public administration and a range of other matters, including public PCCC hearings and public reports published on the CCC's website or provided to the PCCC. However, as these points were not clear in my off-the-cuff remarks yesterday, I now correct the record to avoid any misunderstanding and apologise for my error.

I reiterate the opposition's support for these public reporting amendments. Of course, the opposition does have some concerns around the other amendments which the government has introduced at the last minute. Yesterday I commented on my concerns around the legislative pause regarding the respect at work provisions. These are law already. They are due to commence this year and they are about protecting people in the workforce. This is about workers' rights and protection for workers. This government has not only announced that they are opposed to those protections coming into force but now, at the last minute—without the opportunity for stakeholders to provide further comments through a committee process; without the opportunity for members of this House to have considered contributions to this debate—they are bringing in an amendment which will legislatively pause the commencement of those workplace rights.

I want to highlight the positive remarks made by stakeholders that represent workers when the laws were passed last year. Those stakeholders said that this means 'every worker in industries across the state can now rightfully expect their employer to actively enforce measures that ensure their safety and protection from discrimination, intimidation and harassment while at work'. How anyone could oppose that principle is lost on me. How anyone could say that they would want to remove those protections now that they are law is lost on me as well. Think about that for a moment. These are protections from discrimination, intimidation and harassment in the workplace. This government has said they are taking those protections away. What a disgraceful act, and what an assault on protections for workers.

I know those opposite say it is just the Labor Party carrying on at an election, but every election we say: if the LNP get in, they will attack workers, they will attack workers' rights. Today, our point is proven, as it is every single time the LNP get into government. They cannot help themselves—they attack workers, they attack workers' rights. Here we have it. It is not just words from them. This is a piece of legislation which will wind back workers' rights and workers' protections—and not just any workers' protections but workers' protections from discrimination, intimidation and harassment at work. What message does that send to the community, not only about this government's priorities but also about the type of conduct that they now condone? They are opposed to protections from discrimination, intimidation and harassment. They condone those things because they will not support the protections and they have reversed those protections with this last-minute amendment which has not gone through a committee process or been subject to stakeholder contributions. As I said, the opposition supports the CCC public reporting provisions. I encourage all members to do so.

 **Mr DILLON** (Gregory—LNP) (4.06 pm): When you grow up in regional Queensland, like I and a few others in this place have, there is a lesson you learn early and you learn it well: when something goes wrong on a property or in town you do not hide it, you do not cover it up, you own it and you fix it. Out there, if you do not face problems head on, they only get worse. A broken fence you ignore today becomes a paddock full of missing stock tomorrow. A sick horse you pretend is not sick does not get better, it gets worse. The same is true of government. When governments start covering up, dodging scrutiny and protecting their mates instead of protecting the public, it is not just a bad look; it is a disease

that sets in deep. That is why, on behalf of the people of Gregory, I am proud to support the Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025—a bill that finally drags government back into the daylight where it belongs.

In Gregory, we believe trust is earned and once it is lost, it is hard to get back. The Jackie Trad saga and the Peter Carne scandal were not just lapses of judgement, they were breaches of public trust—acts of a former government more worried about saving face than saving Queensland's reputation. From Tambo to Boulia, people read these stories and shake their heads because if any of us tried that behaviour in a local business or sporting group in Gregory we would not last five minutes—we would be out the door, and rightly so.

One of the most important aspects of this bill for regional Queensland is the restoration of past CCC reports and statements to the public record where they belong. For too long, public access to information about government misconduct was treated as a luxury for those within the Brisbane bubble, but in Gregory, from Duaringa to Birdsville, our communities deserve to know the truth just as much as anyone living near George Street. This bill ensures the daylight of transparency shines all the way from Brisbane to Birdsville allowing every Queenslanders, no matter where they live, to hold government to account.

For Queenslanders, government decisions are not just theoretical debates; they have real and lasting impacts. When a rural hospital is understaffed, when a road goes unsealed, when a government service is withdrawn it is regional and remote communities like those in Gregory that feel the blow sharply. That is why the clearer procedural fairness rules in this bill matter as well. They ensure that when allegations arise and decisions are made there will be fairness, timeliness and a transparent right of review. This is about restoring trust not just in outcomes, but in the integrity of the processes that created them.

Every Queenslanders, whether they are living on the coast, in the suburbs or in the vast heart of our state, should feel like they are part of the decisions that shape their lives. By tearing down the walls of secrecy and dismantling the perception of an untouchable Brisbane elite, this bill helps restore a sense of unique unity across our state. Through this bill, the LNP Crisafulli government is showing the people of Gregory and every regional and remote Queenslanders they are not forgotten, they are not outside the system, they are the very heart of this state and their trust, their welfare and their future matter.


From transparent access to information to stronger procedural fairness to real empowerment of the CCC, this bill is not just about repairing a broken system; it is about healing the state. The LNP Crisafulli government is restoring faith that no matter where people live, good governance, transparency and accountability are their birthright, not a privilege. Most importantly, it puts the power to table reports back where it should belong: with the independent CCC, not at the whim of politicians. There will be no more ministers picking and choosing what the public gets to see. There will be no more hiding reports in the bottom drawer after an election so history can be quietly rewritten by those who would rather Queenslanders forget.

In Gregory, the cost of bad government is not theoretical; it is a hospital wing delayed, it is a road upgrade cancelled, it is a rural fire brigade left waiting for resources. When government loses its integrity it is regional Queensland that bears that brunt. That is why restoring transparency is not a political luxury; it is a practical necessity. The people of Gregory expect—and have expected for a long time—better. They expect governments to live by the same rules and values they do. They expect openness and accountability. They expect honesty, even when it is uncomfortable. With this bill, the LNP Crisafulli government are delivering what the people of Gregory and the whole of Queensland deserve.

There is also the crucial inclusion in this bill of the provisions to preserve the critical evidence that was in danger of being destroyed through Labor's contempt for process and a continual demonstration of their contempt for victims. This will not only ensure access to justice but allow time for the debacle at the DNA lab to be righted without the stigma of failed investigations and prosecutions or appeals further prolonging the pain and anguish of victims.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity for her personal dedication and skill in developing this legislation and working so diligently in such a short time to bring to this House legislation and the power to right the DNA crisis but also to ensure that people can have confidence in this government and the processes at play for the CCC.

The people of Queensland from Birdsville to Brisbane have waited long enough for a government that treats their trust with the respect it deserves. It is about restoring the faith that no matter where people live in Queensland, good governance, transparency and accountability are a fundamental right. This bill is a crucial step in making things right. On behalf of the people of Gregory, I strongly support this bill.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.12 pm): I follow my esteemed colleague the member for Gregory, and I want to associate myself with his very observant remarks about the link between integrity or, as we are looking at here, the lack of integrity in the past decade of the Labor government, and the failings in delivery for places like the member for Gregory's electorate and like my electorate of Southern Downs. We see those failings of a decade of mismanagement and the poor priorities of a government focused on hiding from the people of Queensland things they did not want them to see. They left us with poor roads, hospitals falling apart, declining services and fewer police in our electorate. So I certainly agree with what the member for Gregory just said.

In this bill we are talking about enabling reporting of the CCC reports to parliament. I listened with interest to the contributions of members of the Labor Party in the course of this debate and I was astounded by the brazen hypocrisy of members who would, on the one hand, say that the LNP lacks integrity whilst ignoring what we all see, which is that they went to enormous lengths to hide from the public of Queensland things which they were entitled to know about the dodgy dealings of Jackie Trad and about the appalling conduct of Peter Carne.

It took an LNP government to come into this House and do what Labor could not do: move a motion to have those reports released. Within an hour or so they were with us, and what a disgraceful catalogue of misconduct they revealed. We can infer nothing else but that Jackie Trad is a bully. Her treatment of the director-general of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, according to him, was completely out of line. I hear the Labor Party wringing their hands over the treatment of workers, respect at work and so forth. However, what did they do about Jackie Trad? Not only did they do nothing about her, kowtowed to her and made her the leader of their band; they also sought to protect her not just in the report but to fund, at huge expense to the taxpayer, ultimately successful efforts to conceal from Queenslanders the things they were entitled to know.

So the Labor Party has absolutely no record to point to when it comes to integrity. Everything that the members opposite have said in relation to integrity in this House should be taken with a very big grain of salt. I particularly condemn them for the torrent of invective that they applied to the good Attorney-General and Minister for Integrity, the Hon. Deb Frecklington, whom I see is coming into the chamber now. What those opposite had to say was entirely hollow, and I will stand beside Deb Frecklington any day of the week rather than the record—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr LISTER:—and I mean that sincerely—of the Labor government that preceded us.

I heard members of the Labor Party talk about concern for the reputation of individuals who might be adversely named in these reports. They are very fond of quoting Fitzgerald. I remember very clearly at the time of the Fitzgerald inquiry Fitzgerald saying that society lives with the risk that persons may be accused and prosecuted wrongly and that their reputations may be damaged in the process. However, the expectation is that if they are innocent they will be found so. He made the specific point that it was folly for society to be unduly constrained by the fear for someone's reputation in deciding whether or not to prosecute them and that the prosecution should occur or the release of information should occur when it is merited in the public interest, and I am quite certain that this bill provides for that.


We heard a large amount about workers' rights and women's rights. I ask: where were the rights of the workers who had to endure the misbehaviour and misconduct of Peter Carne? What was the Labor Party doing about that? Nothing! It is another example of the difference between pronouncements, ideology and spin for the day because they want to 'tell the punters a story that they will believe' and actual action. The vast gulf between the two has been laid bare by this bill and the revelations that have occurred thanks to this government coming to power.

We talk about women's rights. This bill speaks to the vital issue of maintaining DNA evidence for all of those poor and misgoverned women—and I say that sincerely because for 10 years they were misgoverned by the former government, which laughed at the then LNP opposition when we suggested at that time that there needed to be an inquiry into the DNA debacle. Obviously even the prodigious spin capability of the Labor government, with their phalanx of busy social media propagandists and media people, was not enough to prevent that from happening, and aren't we glad that that happened?

Where was the Labor Party standing up for women then? Where was the Labor Party's protection of women who had been raped and sexually assaulted who knew that their perpetrators were out free because of a miscarriage of justice? It was talk, talk, talk. It is all the Labor Party ever does.

They talk about industrial relations. During my time here, which is briefer than some—I think I have been here for seven or eight years—I have never seen the Labor Party embark on any industrial relations legislation reform which did not have the sovereign purpose of enriching the trade union movement and entrenching the power of the union bosses, who decide who gets to sit in this place and who gets to be a minister or the premier when they are in government, at the expense of the rights and choices of workers. They did everything they could to marginalise alternatives—in fact, even outlaw alternatives such as the Red Union. We need to see this in the context of the Labor Party, which is nothing but a mouthpiece and a puppet of the trade union movement, who come in here and disingenuously say that they are for workers when in fact they use workers as a pawn to enrich themselves, to enrich the trade union movement and to make sure they are able to sit with the levers of government for as long as possible. I have said this so many times in the House I might as well have been talking to the wind because it is a language that the Labor Party does not understand.

I wholeheartedly support this bill. I reject the outrageous attacks on the Attorney-General and the arguments which those opposites have advanced which are entirely hypocritical when we set them beside their conduct and their actions despite what they say. I commend the bill to the House.


 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (4.19 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025. It is disappointing that we have to have this type of legislation because individuals who hold the high office of a member of parliament sometimes do the wrong thing. Having said that, what makes this even more extraordinary is the covering up of these issues by the previous Labor government. Over \$300,000 of taxpayers' money was spent to keep these reports in the shadows. When we say to our constituents in our electorates that \$300,000 was spent by the previous Labor government to keep reports about Trad and Carne secret, it does not pass the pub test. When residents are doing it tough and the state is spending this type of money to protect one of its own it is disgraceful and those opposites should hang their heads in shame. It does not pass the pub test and it is disgraceful.

We need to maintain high standards when it comes to DNA testing so that cases can remain open and ensure that justice is properly served in this state to protect women and women's rights and to ensure that those perpetrators who commit these heinous crimes are brought to justice, and this is exactly what some amendments to this bill do. I thank the Attorney-General for introducing this bill and for finally shining a light into a very dodgy era of Queensland politics when it comes to the Trad and Carne issues for which Queensland taxpayers were forced to foot the bill. It is a disgrace of biblical proportions.

Mr Mander: That's big.

Mr BOOTHMAN: That is big. The Queensland taxpayer is paying the bill of an individual who is actually quite well off. Trad could have afforded to pay her own legal fees but instead let the taxpayers pay for it while people are sleeping rough under bridges in Brisbane and in our parks. That amount of \$300,000 is disgraceful.

The allegations against Peter Carne were that he was an individual who was regularly drunk at work, harassing office staff, keeping a breathalyser on his desk and misusing a corporate card. I will say this: again Queensland residents would be horrified to know that the former Labor government ensured there was protection for these individuals. If this happened in the corporate world, the corporate world would hang them out to dry and our standards need to be the same. I applaud the Attorney-General for finally letting the light in on this saga which is a damning part of our Queensland history.

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (4.24 pm), in reply: I thank honourable members for their contributions to the debate on the very important Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025. As the debate on this important legislation comes to a close, I reflect on what it will achieve for the Crime and Corruption Commission, the public sector and the entire community. I start with one of the fundamental objectives of the CCC: to continuously improve the integrity of, and to reduce the incidence of, corruption in the public sector—put simply, to fight corruption. It goes without saying that such bodies need robust and effective powers if they are to be successful in this fight. We went to the election with a simple promise to restore the CCC's powers, and today we deliver on that promise for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

I am going to address some of the issues raised in the debate in relation to the CCC reporting amendments, but first I cannot ignore the shadow minister for integrity's comments that she was not intending to speak on this bill until we moved our foreshadowed amendments relating to the respect at work act. The fact that the shadow minister—or, you could say, the alternate minister—for integrity in this state did not intend to trouble herself to speak on a bill giving new powers to the state's foremost integrity body is really quite telling.

Ms Scanlon: That's not what I said.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection; it was the shadow minister for integrity.

A government member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Correct: the shadow minister for integrity, someone who spent \$125,000 to go around the world looking at a couple of art galleries! But, then again, even in government the shadow minister, like those opposite, was never bothered about integrity.

I will also respond to the member for Gaven's declaration that the opposition did not make a statement of reservation in the committee's report because it was 'acting in good faith' and criticised the government for circulating our amendments yesterday when 'there has been no oversight by the committee' of the amendments. The shadow attorney-general forecast amendments in her speech, but we are yet to see them circulated. First of all, the more significant amendments had been well canvassed prior to circulation yesterday. In fact, for the benefit of the shadow minister, I foreshadowed amendments to the RAW act in my ministerial statement on 14 March and the Premier and I then held a press conference on Monday to announce the urgent amendments required to save DNA samples caught up in Labor's DNA debacle.

Secondly, the hypocrisy of this is almost beyond belief: the member for Gaven says that she was appalled that we circulated these amendments more than 24 hours before we were going to debate them in consideration in detail. That stands in stark contrast to the actions and the record of those opposite. For example, since members opposite mentioned amendments to the RAW act, that bill was passed in the final sitting week of parliament before the 2024 election as part of a cognate debate with the Criminal Justice Legislation (Sexual Violence and Other Matters) Amendment Act. These two significant bodies of reform were afforded a total of three hours and 45 minutes for debate and consideration in detail. Labor then circulated 25 amendments to the bill which introduced significant changes to the Anti-Discrimination Act just a few hours before the debate, including updated definitions of 'discrimination', new attributes and definitions and expanded powers for the Human Rights Commission. These amendments were not subject to the committee process—were not subject to the committee process—and only 22 members of this House were afforded the ability to contribute to the debate. That is how Labor ran the show when it was in government. It had no integrity, so it is laughable that the member for Gaven thinks that the opposition is acting in good faith. How ridiculous!

Let me turn to the issues raised. Some members discussed the scope of the procedural fairness offered by the bill. The bill expands upon the current requirements under the Crime and Corruption Act and applies them to both reports and public statements. In particular, the member for Gaven referred to the comments by the Queensland Law Society that the bill does not require the CCC to give an individual who made a submission on a draft report or statement a further opportunity to review the updated report or statement to consider how their submissions had been reflected. The approach in the bill is consistent with the principles of procedural fairness at common law and, noting the CCC chairperson's advice to the committee, is also consistent with the approach taken by other anti-corruption commissions in Australia. Having said that, the CCC chairperson acknowledged to the committee there may be circumstances where it is appropriate for the CCC to afford further procedural fairness and there is nothing stopping the CCC from doing so. To mandate an additional layer of procedural fairness for each and every report or public statement is unnecessary and inefficient.

This leads me to another point in relation to the CCC's reporting powers touched upon by those members opposite. The powers to report and make public statements introduced by this bill are discretionary powers. Ensuring independent authorities have effective and appropriate discretionary powers is entirely appropriate and fundamental to their independence. Good laws are not prescriptive in how every possible scenario that could arise should be dealt with. Instead, they provide clear guidance on how discretion can be exercised to ensure that when the unexpected arises the law may operate flexibly and in a way that is appropriate and adapted to the circumstances of the particular case.

Much has been made by those opposite that we did not simply move to introduce a bill introduced by the member for Clayfield as a private member's bill or, conversely, that we did not support the former government's rushed bill and the recommendations of former chief justice Holmes. First of all, like the private member's bill, this bill takes a clear approach to restoring the CCC's power to report. However, it was not developed in a vacuum. Regard was had to important work done by the former chief justice. On this point, it is important to note that the former government's bill did not adapt wholesale the former chief justice's amendments either. Indeed, while the Holmes review recommended that the CCC be limited to preparing a number of discrete report types, the former government's bill did not do this. Instead, in introducing the bill, the former attorney-general indicated that the CCC raised concerns about the complexity different report types would present for them, particularly having regard to the complexity inherent in corruption investigations which often involve multiple subjects and individuals. The bill likewise has some differences. We have forged a new and improved path and continue to work closely with the CCC to develop a framework that is workable and puts trust in our CCC to act in the public interest.

I note the member for Gaven has made some virtuous comments about the level of scrutiny that elected officials should face. This appears to be a misconception by those opposite that the Holmes review recommended stronger scrutiny than what the bill will require. The member for Gaven must have missed the CCC chair's comments about this during the committee hearing. Let me remind her what he said—

The previous bill—

Labor's bill—

did not substantively hold elected officials to a higher standard of public scrutiny and accountability—

He went on—

In the CCC's view, the new bill in fact holds elected officials to a standard that is at least equal to, if not higher than, the previous bill.

It is a little embarrassing—and I think we are up to embarrassing No. 5 for the shadow attorney-general so far—but I will go on. This bill empowers the CCC to make public reports or public statements in more circumstances than the opposition's bill would have. I also would point those members to the criterion about whether standing and status of the person warrants greater public scrutiny. The fact the person is an elected official is an example of when this is the case.

I move now to amendments to be moved in consideration in detail. The bill contains a number of other amendments relating to the CCC, including some which I will move during consideration in detail as foreshadowed. Generally these amendments are operational in nature relating to the employment of agents and the service of notices via email. They will unlock efficiencies for the CCC in its everyday work. I make particular note of the amendment to tenure provisions for the CCC commissioners, including its chairperson. Again some of those opposite took issue with that statement, especially the member for Gaven who seemed a little confused. She says that we have snuck in an amendment out of nowhere to change the CCC chairperson's tenure from 10 to seven years and she is upset that there is no consultation about this. For the member's benefit, I remind her that the PCCC, in its five-yearly review of the act, recommended the government consider amending the act to provide for a single non-renewable appointment for the chairperson and ordinary commissioners that does not exceed seven years.

Ms Scanlon: Did you just forget to put it in? You forgot to put it in the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Order, members!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would like to take the interjection of the shadow attorney-general, but I would hate to call her out for verballing the CCC chair because that again would be embarrassing. The committee, which of course had a majority of Labor government members, made this commentary to that recommendation—

The committee notes, however, that long-term tenures and limited changes—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I know it is tough in opposition. They do not have help. I will continue—

The committee notes, however, that long-term tenures and limited changes at the executive level of an organisation can lead to a potential corruption risk and other issues relevant to a culture and environment of an organisation.

Ms Grace: Why is it an amendment? You forgot! You forgot to put it in!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Labor then passed a bill in August 2024 which ignored the committee's recommendation. I so badly want to take the interjections of those opposite. Labor then passed a bill in August 2024 which ignored the committee's recommendation and proposed to establish a fixed, non-renewable term of seven years for every CCC commissioner. The amendment has not yet commenced. The amendment I have moved does nothing more than properly implement the recommendation of the PCCC to ensure that commissioners may be appointed for up to seven years. Unlike the former government's bill—

Ms Grace: It's your bill! It is not the former government's bill; it's your bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for McConnel!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I know it is embarrassing for those opposite.

Ms Grace: No, it is embarrassing for you! How embarrassing!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Unlike the former government's bill, which would have locked both the committee and appointees into fixed seven-year terms—Mr Deputy Speaker, the member opposite continues to talk about how embarrassing it is for the former Labor government. I do not wish to take her interjection because this is a serious issue.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence to what was said. That is not the case. I take offence and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. Unlike the former government's bill, which would have locked both the committee and the appointees into fixed seven-year terms, this amendment will ensure the effectiveness of the bipartisan approach to appointments to these significant positions and provide appropriate flexibility.

As foreshadowed in my second reading speech, I also intend to move a range of unrelated amendments during consideration in detail. Some members on the other side criticised the inclusion of the amendments to the Youth Justice Act to be moved. These amendments are clarifying, technical amendments and are urgently required to support—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am trying to remember, in the Racing Integrity Bill, was it 44 extra amendments? It was the entire bill the member for McConnel had to amend. I do not think there should be too many interjections.

Ms Leahy: It was the Bill Byrnes bill.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: And she added 44 amendments into it. Back to this bill: these are clarifying, technical amendments and are urgently required to support our tough laws holding youth offenders to account.

Ms Grace: You botched it up. Unintended consequences.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: She wishes! We actually brought in reporting powers for the CCC, something those opposite refused to do. The member for McConnel is heckling these tough laws. The Youth Justice Act relating to a child's criminal history commenced on 28 February. It is entirely appropriate for those extraordinarily technical amendments to be moved here today. Unintended consequences have been referred to by various members throughout the debate and these amendments are designed to mitigate and minimise such potential. Taking decisive action when issues are raised is just what a responsible government does.

Some members, including the wannabe minister for integrity, the shadow minister and the member for Gaven, and in particular, as I said, the member for Algester, raised concerns about the pause to the implementation of respect at work legislation. I need to make this important point: the government is not removing protections for women or weakening safeguards against domestic and family violence. The government remains steadfast in its commitment to protecting women and addressing domestic and family violence. Existing protections under Queensland's robust—

Ms Grace: You can tell.

Ms Scanlon: By how quickly they are implementing them.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Well, I am not protecting a member of my side who should not be here. Existing protections under Queensland's robust legal framework will remain in place and the delay in commencement does not diminish these safeguards.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Order! Member for McConnel, the member on her feet is not taking interjections. You have had a good go. I ask you to stop interjecting.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your protection. The Queensland RAW act introduced two new prohibitions that mirrored similar provisions already in place in the Commonwealth's Sex Discrimination Act. Those relate to harassment on the basis of sex and subjecting a person to a hostile work environment on the basis of sex. The Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act also contains a positive duty on employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures in the area of work to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination on the grounds of sex, sexual harassment, harassment on the grounds of sex, subjecting a person to a hostile workplace environment on the grounds of sex and victimisation. The Commonwealth prohibitions and positive duty continue to apply to duty holders across Australia, including employers in Queensland. Work related discrimination law is also covered by a number of other federal discrimination laws, including the Disability Discrimination Act and the Fair Work Act as well as, at a state level, through the Queensland Industrial Relations Act.

The shadow minister said that questions needed to be asked about who is pressuring the government to make the changes. The shadow minister might not have been paying attention when I mentioned, in my ministerial statement to the House, that it was the Department of Justice that raised the concerns with me, after consulting other government departments, about the new protected attribute to stop discrimination on the basis of an irrelevant criminal record and the impact it could have on certain statutory decision-making schemes. The shadow minister was a minister—

Mr Krause: Poorly drafted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—and can now admit that it was poorly drafted—I take the interjection—and she knows it full well. Of key concern is whether the new attribute will undermine several high-risk discretionary decisions, including decisions relating to weapons licensing—wouldn't it be novel for those opposite to think that protecting women is a good idea—police protection notices and security provider licences. Again, let's continue to protect women. As I said in March, reforming discrimination law is a difficult and complex process that attracts significant stakeholder interest, which is why it should not have been rushed by the former Labor government. I am extremely concerned at the prospect of some very serious unintended and unwanted consequences.

We are also dedicated to honouring our election promise to engage with stakeholders to gain a deeper understanding of their concerns and ensuring that the legislation is carefully crafted to avoid any unintended consequences. Reopening consultation is not a waste of time. It is an investment in ensuring that these laws are robust, effective and enduring. Consultation is something that the former Labor government never did with our community.

I acknowledge the perspectives of those valued stakeholders who were disappointed by the decision to delay the commencement of the act and their concerns about the impact of the delay. I emphasise that this was not a decision to indefinitely delay reforms as suggested. Instead, it is a necessary pause to allow consideration of the broader implications of these reforms. The government is committed to working with stakeholders, including the Human Rights Commission, community organisations and legal experts to address these concerns comprehensively.

In consideration in detail I would like to talk more about the very important and urgent amendments in relation to the DNA debacle and why we had to very quickly move those amendments into this bill to ensure that there would be no destruction of that vitally important evidence. In conclusion, once again I thank all honourable members for their contributions to this debate. I very much thank the CCC and the chair of the CCC for their hard work as well as the department, the departmental staff and my staff who have put so much work into this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (4.45 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 1 (Short title)

Page 6, line 5, after 'Powers'—

insert—

and Other Legislation

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments [\[401\]](#).

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments [\[402\]](#).

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Pause please, Attorney-General. Manager of Opposition Business, do you want to speak to the amendment?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, we will come to you when the Attorney-General has spoken to the amendment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is good to know that the Manager of Opposition Business is so keen to talk to these amendments. Amendment No. 1 amends clause 1 of the bill to update the short title of the proposed act to the 'Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Act'.

Mr de BRENNI: I am indeed keen to speak to amendment No. 1 because it has not taken long for this Attorney-General and the Crisafulli LNP government to come in here and move amendments unrelated to the bill before the House. Amendment No. 1 deals with the short title of the bill and it inserts 'and Other Legislation' into the short title. Currently, under clause 1 the short title is—

This Act may be cited as the Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) Amendment Act 2025.

The Attorney-General wants to add the words 'and Other Legislation', which will mean that, if passed, the act will deal with a range of other pieces of legislation. We agree that that needs to occur, in particular in relation to the DNA issue and we note that we would have done that if we had remained on the Treasury benches.

The other elements relate to other matters such as the respect at work provisions and fixing up their botched Making Queensland Safer Laws, which they rushed through this House last year. This is not the only example but it is the prime example of how this government has had to come in here and fix up their own mess. It is disappointing that the first law officer of this state and the so-called Minister for Integrity has introduced these amendments without any consultation and without any advice.

I note that moving these types of amendments is not new, but to do so in relation to such significant issues as delaying respect at work elements is nothing less than shameful. There are other bills that have been introduced that the amendments could have been attached to, particularly for the Making Queensland Safer Laws. The government could have flagged those amendments or written to the committee. They could have written to the committee and asked them to review the matters. They could have done that before they came into this House. However, this government chooses to conduct itself with complete disregard for the opportunities for Queensland.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr de BRENNI: I take the interjection from the member for Logan. It is a display of contempt not just for this House but also for the people of Queensland.

(Time expired)

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I understand the concern of the former minister, the Manager of Opposition Business. In relation to two of the most significant of those amendments that the Manager of Opposition Business just referred to, I believe that on 14 March—and I stand to be corrected—I stood in this House and made a ministerial statement in relation to pausing the respect at work act. That is what I clearly did many weeks ago. The shadow attorney-general has had more than enough time to ask questions in relation to that, if she needed more consultation. It is quite obvious from her statements that she does not agree with it. It is a decision—I know it is difficult for the opposition to understand—

Ms Mullen interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Did you just swear? Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask that—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Attorney-General, direct your comments through the chair.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will. I am sorry. I took personal offence and I ask that the member withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I did not hear any comments directed personally at you.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: From the member for Jordan?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have not heard any personal reference to you, Attorney-General. If you could carry on with your address, that would be appreciated. Order, members to my left.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I just heard that she said I was obsessed, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Ms MULLEN: I withdraw.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for McConnel, I am the person in control of this House at this point. I do not need your assistance. In fact, I do not need any assistance from any member.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: There's an example of respect at work, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I do not need assistance from you in conducting the business of the House. Carry on with your address on this amendment, please.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. When I made a ministerial statement on 14 March in this House, those opposite got quite upset when I mentioned consultation. I made that statement on 14 March to give adequate notice to the opposition because I appreciate the difficulties at times of being in opposition—I was there for a very long time. It should come as no surprise to the Manager of Opposition Business that this amendment came into one of the next bills before the House.

In relation to the DNA debacle, both the Premier and I issued a press release. We did a media conference and gave notice to the opposition—and the people of Queensland and the victims—that we would be moving these amendments this week.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 1, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 2 to 21, as read, agreed to.

Clause 22—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (4.53 pm): I move amendments Nos 2 and 3 circulated in my name—

2 Clause 22 (Amendment of s 85AA (Giving notices by email))

Page 25, lines 11 to 13—

omit.

3 Clause 22 (Amendment of s 85AA (Giving notices by email))

Page 25, after line 13—

insert—

- (1) Section 85AA, heading, after 'email'—

insert—

—general

- (2) Section 85AA(3)(b)(i), 'the notice under this section; or'—

omit, insert—

under this section—

- (A) all notices for the investigation, operation or function; or

- (B) all notices of a particular type for the investigation, operation or function; or
 - (C) all notices given during a particular period for the investigation, operation or function; or
 - (D) a particular notice for the investigation, operation or function; or
- (3) Section 85AA(3)(b)(ii)—
insert—
- (D) a particular notice for the investigation, operation or function.
- (4) Section 85AA—
insert—
- (4A) To remove any doubt, it is declared that the chairperson may give the notice to a person under subsection (2) even if—
- (a) it is a notice to be given to a person that has entered into an agreement with the chairperson under section 85AB(2); and
 - (b) the notice is of a particular type to be given to the person by email under the agreement.
- (5) Section 85AA(5), after 'part 10'—
insert—
- or the Corporations Act

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (4.54 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 4 circulated in my name—

4 After clause 22

Page 25, after line 13—

insert—

22A Insertion of new s 85AB

After section 85AA—

insert—

85AB Giving notices by email—agreements

- (1) This section applies in relation to a notice that may be given under division 1, 2 or 4 in relation to an investigation, operation or function, other than—
 - (a) a notice requiring immediate production of a document or thing; or
 - (b) an attendance notice requiring immediate attendance at a commission hearing.
- (2) The chairperson may enter into an agreement with a person for the purpose of giving notices of a particular type to the person, under this section, by sending the notices to an email address specified in the agreement.

Examples of notices of a particular type—

- notices requiring production of financial records
- notices to produce a document or thing
- notices given under section 83

- (3) In deciding whether to enter into an agreement with a person under subsection (2), the chairperson must have regard to—
 - (a) whether it is appropriate to enter into the agreement; and
 - (b) the ability of the person to maintain the confidentiality of notices of the particular type proposed to be given by email under the agreement; and
 - (c) any involvement by the person in an investigation, operation or function to which notices of the particular type relate; and
 - (d) the number of notices of the particular type proposed to be given by email under the agreement; and
 - (e) any other matter the chairperson considers relevant.

- (4) The chairperson may give a notice to a person by sending the notice by email to the person's email address specified in an agreement entered into under subsection (2).
- (5) This section does not limit the operation of the *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, part 10 or the Corporations Act.
- (6) The *Electronic Transactions (Queensland) Act 2001* does not apply to the giving of a notice under this section.
- (7) To remove any doubt, it is declared that more than 1 email address may be specified in an agreement mentioned in subsection (2) for the purpose of giving notices of a particular type to a person under this section.

Amendment No. 4 inserts new section 85AB to allow the chairperson to enter into an agreement with a person in relation to giving notices of a particular type to the person. The agreement will specify the types of notices it covers and the email addresses or addresses to which the commission should send the notices. The chairperson must consider several factors when deciding to enter into an agreement. After the agreement has been made, the chairperson may send notices under the agreement without considering the factors each time a notice is given under the agreement. This will achieve operational efficiency for the commission, noting the volume of notices it sends to some entities, in particular financial institutions. The power to enter agreements under the new section is specified to interact with the other laws in the same way as the general provision.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (4.55 pm): I seek leave to move amendments outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendments Nos 5 and 6 circulated in my name—

5 Clause 30 (Insertion of new ch 8, pt 21)

Page 28, line 16, after 'Powers'—

insert—

and Other Legislation

6 Clause 30 (Insertion of new ch 8, pt 21)

Page 30, line 1, after 'Powers'—

insert—

and Other Legislation

Amendment No. 5 amends clause 30 of the bill to update the short title of the bill, which I have discussed. Amendment No. 6 amends clause 30 of the bill as well to update the short title of the proposed act.

Amendments agreed to.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 7 circulated in my name—

7 Clause 30 (Insertion of new ch 8, pt 21)

Page 31, after line 7—

insert—

474 Validation of particular agreements for giving notices by email

- (1) This section applies if, before the commencement, the chairperson purportedly entered into an agreement with a person for the giving of notices of a particular type to the person by email under former section 85AA.
- (2) The agreement is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid as it would be or would have been if the agreement were entered into under new section 85AB(2).
- (3) The giving of a notice by the commission to the person under the agreement before the commencement is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been if the agreement were entered into under new section 85AB(2).
- (4) Anything done by the person in compliance with a notice given by the commission under the agreement before the commencement is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been if the agreement were entered into under new section 85AB(2).

475 Existing agreements for giving notices by email

- (1) This section applies if—
- (a) before the commencement, the chairperson purportedly entered into an agreement with a person for the giving of notices of a particular type to the person by email under former section 85AA; and
 - (b) the chairperson and the person could have entered into the agreement under new section 85AB(2) if that section had been in force; and
 - (c) immediately before the commencement, the agreement was in effect.
- (2) From the commencement, the agreement is taken to be an agreement entered into by the chairperson and the person under new section 85AB(2).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 30, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 31 to 34, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (4.57 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 8 circulated in my name—

8 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

35 Amendment of s 36 (Replacement of s 231 (Duration of appointment))

Section 36, inserted section 231—

omit, insert—

231 Duration of commissioners' appointments

- (1) A commissioner holds office for a non-renewable term, of not more than 7 years, stated in the commissioner's instrument of appointment.
- (2) A person may not be reappointed as a commissioner.

Editor's note—

Legislation ultimately amended—

- *Crime and Corruption Act 2001*

I comprehensively discussed this amendment in my speech in reply on this bill. It relates to commissioners being appointed for up to seven years rather than for seven years, and these appointments cannot be extended and a person cannot be reappointed in the future. This fully implements a recommendation of the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee.

Mr RYAN: I note the Attorney-General's speech, but we need to explore a very critical amendment to the arrangements which are fundamental to the structure and stability of the Crime and Corruption Commission. It is concerning that something so critical relating to the appointment process has been brought in with limited notice. The Attorney-General has only given limited notice about this amendment. These amendments are outside the long title of the bill. Whilst we support many of the amendments, there are a few which we have concerns about and there are also a few, like this one, which we need more information about.

This amendment, in particular, is interesting. I am interested for a number of reasons. Not only do I have a keen interest in the CCC's role in supporting integrity and transparency in Queensland, but also I was a former member of the PCCC and a former member during times when chairs and other positions of the CCC were appointed. It is important that we have robust processes around those appointments. The question is: why was this amendment brought in in this way? Was it an oversight? Was it something that the government wants to rush through quickly? If it is either of those things then that is concerning, because this is fundamental to the structure and confidence in the CCC.


They could have put this amendment in another bill. They could have put it in a bill on its own. The question for the Attorney is: can she explain why this process was adopted for this amendment? Whilst amendments like these are important, I do not think that there is an urgency argument around this particular amendment. To move this amendment in consideration in detail for this bill is probably not justified on the basis of urgency. Was it an oversight? What is the basis for bringing the amendment in in this way?

As I have said, it is important that Queenslanders have confidence in their integrity bodies. The CCC does a very important job of holding all Queenslanders but particularly those in public roles to account, and it instils confidence in the community around public agencies and public officials going about their job the right way. I acknowledge the Attorney's contribution and her words, but some explanation about why it was brought in in this way would be welcome.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I very much respect the member for Morayfield's question in that regard. The reason is that the amendment simply implements a recommendation of the PCCC to amend the term from '7' to 'up to 7'. Whilst I do understand that it could be an amendment in a myriad of bills that we could introduce, given that it was raised with me and we had this CCC bill before the House, it made sense to put it in a bill that related to the CCC.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (5.01 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 9 circulated in my name—

9 After clause 34


Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Part 4 Amendment of other legislation

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (5.02 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 10 circulated in my name—

10 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Division 1 Amendment of Anti-Discrimination Act 1991

36 Act amended

This division amends the *Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*.

37 Insertion of new s 285AA

Chapter 11, part 10, after section 285—

insert—

285AA Delayed application of new burden of proof for complaints

- (1) This section applies in relation to—
 - (a) a complaint made before the relevant commencement that, immediately before the relevant commencement, had not been finally dealt with; or
 - (b) a complaint made after the relevant commencement in relation to an alleged contravention of the Act that happened before the relevant 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, as if section 47A of the amendment Act had not commenced.
- (4) This section is taken to have applied from 1 December 2024.
- (5) In this section—

former sections 204 to 206 means sections 204 to 206 of this Act as in force before 1 December 2024.

new sections 204 and 205 means sections 204 and 205 of this Act as in force from 1 December 2024.

relevant commencement means the commencement of section 7B of the amendment Act.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 1—Knuth.

NOES, 32:

ALP, 31—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (5.08 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 11 circulated in my name—

11 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Division 2 Amendment of Evidence Act 1977

38 Act amended

This division amends the *Evidence Act 1977*.

39 Amendment of s 162 (Application of s 94A to sexual offences and domestic violence offences charged before commencement)

(1) Section 162, heading, 'before'—

omit, insert—

after

(2) Section 162—

insert—

Note—

See also division 16.

40 Insertion of new pt 9, div 16

Part 9—

insert—

Division 16 Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025

172 Application of s 94A to sexual offences charged before s 162 commencement

(1) Section 94A applies in relation to a proceeding for a sexual offence charged against the defendant before the section 162 commencement.

(2) Subsection (1) is taken to have applied from the section 162 commencement.

(3) To remove any doubt, it is declared that this section applies in addition to section 162.

(4) In this section—

section 162 commencement means the commencement of section 162.

Note—

Section 162 commenced on 23 September 2024.

On 23 September 2024, the rule allowing for preliminary complaint evidence to be admissible in sexual offence proceedings moved from the Criminal Law (Sexual Offences) Act 1978 to the Evidence Act 1977. That rule was also expanded to allow for this type of evidence to be admissible in domestic violence proceedings. There was a transitional provision for when this relocated and expanded rule applied after 23 September 2024, but there was no transitional provision preserving the law prior to 23

September 2024. As a result, the amendment, as moved in this bill, puts beyond doubt that the preliminary complaint evidence continues to be admissible in sexual offence proceedings started prior to 23 September 2024.

It is astounding to hear those opposite go on about amendments and how we should not be moving them when I am standing here moving an amendment to tidy up their mess. It is quite simple: this is an amendment that is required and should be done, as is right and proper, because this change to the Evidence Act is required. Like I say, it is just a matter of cleaning up the mess from those opposite.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (5.10 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 12 circulated in my name—

12 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Division 3 Amendment of Forensic Science Queensland Act 2024

41 Act amended

This division amends the *Forensic Science Queensland Act 2024*.

42 Amendment of pt 7, hdg

Part 7, heading, after 'provisions'—

insert—

for Act No. 8 of 2024

43 Replacement of s 46 (Application of part)

Section 46—

omit, insert—

46 Application of part

(1) This part applies to a person who is employed by the department after the commencement as a staff member of Forensic Science Queensland, including a person who was a health service employee or public service employee immediately before being transferred to the department.

(2) However, this part does not apply or stops applying to a person mentioned in subsection (1) if—

- (a) the person is employed as an executive employee, including for any period the person is acting in, or seconded to, the position of an executive employee; or
- (b) a new certified agreement, applying to the person as an employee of the department, takes effect.

(3) A person to whom this part applies is an *initial FSQ employee*.

(4) In this section—

executive employee means—

- (a) a senior executive; or
- (b) a senior officer under the *Public Sector Act 2022*; or
- (c) a person employed in a position that is equivalent to a position mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b).

Note—

See also section 53 in relation to the amendment of this part and the validation of particular things done, or omitted to be done, before the amendment.

44 Replacement of s 50 (Application of public sector directive made after commencement)

Section 50—

omit, insert—

50 Application of public sector directive made after commencement

This part does not limit a public sector directive made after the commencement from applying to initial FSQ employees or in relation to the terms and conditions of employment of those employees.

45 Insertion of new pt 8

After part 7—

*insert—***Part 8 Transitional and validation provision for Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025****53 Application of amended part 7 from 1 July 2024**

- (1) Amended part 7 is taken to have applied from 1 July 2024.
- (2) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the employment of a relevant employee that would have been valid and lawful if amended part 7 had been in force from 1 July 2024 is taken to be, and always to have been, valid and lawful.

Examples of things done for subsection (2)—

- the payment of a particular benefit or entitlement to a relevant employee
- the approval or cancellation of particular leave for a relevant employee

- (3) In this section—

amended part 7 means part 7 as amended by the *Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025*.*Note—*

Part 7 commenced on 1 July 2024.

relevant employee means a person employed by the department as a staff member of Forensic Science Queensland from 1 July 2024.

Ms SCANLON: I want to be really clear. The Queensland opposition supports the important work being undertaken by Forensic Science Queensland. The opposition supports the legislation and framework which was agreed to by this House to establish Forensic Science Queensland. We established it. We support a world-class DNA lab to support Queenslanders—including victims of crime—seek the justice they deserve. We support employees and individuals working at Forensic Science Queensland. The Labor Party will always support working Queenslanders. To claim or state that we do not support the service or individuals who work in this organisation is false and misleading.

Queenslanders deserve to have confidence in their forensic science services, just like they deserve to have confidence in the justice system. As such, we support these amendments, but we are disappointed at some of the political commentary that has come from someone who is supposed to be the first law officer of this state but continues to not act in accordance with what most people in the legal fraternity would expect of someone in her position.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I would suggest it was those opposite who tarnished the reputation of the justice system in Queensland by denying there was ever a problem. The shadow minister can stand there with a straight face and try to rewrite history for as long as she likes, but this amendment is something that should have been done by the former government to ensure that the workforce that transitioned from Queensland Health to the Department of Justice could be paid properly.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (5.12 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 13 circulated in my name—**13 After clause 34**

Page 32, after line 21—

*insert—***Division 4 Amendment of Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000****46 Act amended**This division amends the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*.**47 Amendment of s 490 (When DNA sample taken from suspected person and results must be destroyed)**

Section 490(6), 'sections 490A and 490B'—

omit, insert—

sections 490A, 490AA and 490B

48 Amendment of s 490A (Modified destruction timeframes for analysing particular DNA samples)

- (1) Section 490A, heading, 'for analysing particular DNA samples'—
omit, insert—

—DNA samples taken between 13 June 2022 and 13 June 2025

- (2) Section 490A(2), '3 years'—
omit, insert—
7 years

49 Insertion of new s 490AA

After section 490A—
insert—

490AA Modified destruction timeframes—DNA samples taken between 14 June 2025 and 14 June 2027

- (1) This section applies in relation to a DNA sample and the results of a DNA analysis of the sample if—
- (a) the sample is taken from a person suspected of having committed an indictable offence; and
 - (b) the sample is taken during the period—
 - (i) starting at the beginning of the day on 14 June 2025; and
 - (ii) ending at the end of the day on 14 June 2027.
- (2) Section 490(1)(d) applies in relation to the DNA sample and results as if—
- (a) the reference to a proceeding for the indictable offence not starting within 1 year after the sample is taken were a reference to the proceeding not starting within 3 years after the sample is taken; and
 - (b) the reference to destroying the sample and results within a reasonably practicable time after the end of 1 year from the day the sample is taken were a reference to destroying the sample and results within a reasonably practicable time after the end of 3 years from the day the sample is taken.
- (3) A reference in this Act or another Act to section 490 includes a reference to section 490 as modified by this section, if the context permits.

50 Amendment of s 490B (Modified powers and destruction requirements for review of particular DNA samples)

- (1) Section 490B(7), definition *review period*—
omit, insert—

***review period* means the period—**

- (a) starting at the beginning of the day on 4 December 2023; and
- (b) ending at the end of the day on 4 December 2030.

- (2) Section 490B—
insert—

Note—

This section commenced on 4 December 2023.

51 Amendment of s 898 (Validation for particular DNA samples affected by modifying sections)

Section 898—

insert—

Note—

This section commenced on 4 December 2023.

This goes to the heart of these very urgent amendments we need to do and it is in relation to the preservation of essential DNA. It is vitally important that we have a world-class lab. We know that the Queensland DNA lab debacle is one of the world's largest failures of a justice system—it has been reported on many times by many experts—affecting over 40,000 cases over a 15-year span. It brought the Queensland FSQ and DNA lab into disrepute.

The former Labor government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to the table to even admit there was a problem. It was unbelievable when the shocking failures were laid out so clearly. Day after day we came into this House and asked questions of those opposite, who refused to take accountability. The failings of the lab left the cases of thousands of victims hanging in the balance. After 12 months of the LNP raising these issues, Labor had not even completed one per cent of the work required. Victims were let down, both in the community and in the courts. Because of the failures of those opposite, victims have been left in limbo while their cases are languishing in the system.

The impact of these issues has been raised with me by the judiciary and all levels of the legal profession since I have taken on this very important role. In my first week as Attorney-General these issues were raised with me by the judges in Townsville. I find it hard to believe that the former government can question the concerns that victims of Labor's DNA debacle have, and that is why it is vitally important that this amendment be moved.

Ms SCANLON: I want to make it clear that we support this amendment because we support victim-survivors and victims in Queensland. We believe that individuals should be held to account and our justice system needs to work appropriately.

It is no secret there were issues at the DNA lab, but for the Attorney-General to suggest that none of those issues occurred under the LNP government is misleading, and the commission of inquiry very clearly outlined this. It is a very interesting rewriting of history by the Attorney-General, who was an assistant minister at the time. It was the former Labor government that established legislation for a new structure. It is also no secret that we also extended the periods of time DNA samples can be kept to ensure they were able to be tested and used in proceedings in our justice system. If we were still in government and found out it was taking longer than originally thought, then steps would have been taken to ensure those samples were kept for the appropriate length of time. As such we support these amendments, but the rewriting of history is disrespectful and shameful from someone who is supposed to be the first law officer of this state and the Minister for Integrity.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I have to call the shadow attorney-general out on that. To seriously stand here and try to place the problem back on a former government over a decade ago is just breathtaking. The gall! Dr Kirsty Wright, a renowned forensic scientist, was beaten up and criticised by those opposite. It is breathtaking and it is embarrassing for the shadow attorney-general to stand in this House and even mention Labor's DNA debacle.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (5.17 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 14 circulated in my name—

14 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Division 5 Amendment of Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024

52 Act amended

This division amends the *Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024*.

53 Amendment of s 2 (Commencement)

(1) Section 2(2), '1 July 2025'—

omit, insert—

a day to be fixed by proclamation

(2) Section 2(2)(a), 'in force on 30 June 2025'—

omit, insert—

commenced under subsection (1)

(3) Section 2—

insert—

(4) The *Acts Interpretation Act 1954*, section 15DA does not apply to this Act.

54 Amendment of s 51 (Insertion of new ch 11, pt 10)

Section 51, inserted section 285A—

omit.

Editor's note—

Legislation ultimately amended—

- *Anti-Discrimination Act 1991*

Amendment No. 14 inserts a new division 5 into the bill. Division 5 amends the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Bill to delay the commencement of the remaining provisions of the act. Those opposite have heard my statements in relation to this matter. They heard my ministerial

statement on 14 March in this House in relation to the government's position in relation to pausing the respect at work act. Those opposite have heard me talk about that in this House, and it really beggars belief that they still have this mock outrage.

A government member: Faux.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection. On advice from the Department of Justice, the government is pausing the commencement of Labor's botched laws to ensure critical policy work can be undertaken while—

Ms Grace: Table your notes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Table my notes? Do you mean these that I am reading off? Sure. The opposition want to speak to them. I know opposition is tough; I have mentioned that.

A government member: Write your own notes.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection. What happens in opposition, guys, is you actually have to do some work.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Those on my left will have an opportunity to speak to this amendment if they so wish, but at the moment the Attorney-General has the call.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In particular, one of the concerns raised by the Department of Justice in relation to Labor's rushed laws includes provisions whereby irrelevant criminal records could not be considered by decision-makers. For example, Labor's laws could, one, grant a gun licence to someone charged but not yet convicted of a serious offence such as domestic violence. On the eve of Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, I would suggest to those opposite that they should get on board in relation to protecting potential victims of domestic and family violence. Labor's laws could also, two, prevent authorities from suspending the licence of a security provider who has been charged but not yet convicted of a serious offence.

The pause will not remove protections for Queensland women currently in the workplace. This is because Queensland's RAW act introduced two prohibitions which mirrored similar provisions already in place in the Commonwealth's Sex Discrimination Act. These relate to harassment on the basis of sex—and, yes, I am repeating it because they did not listen the first time—and subjecting a person to a hostile work environment on the basis of sex. The Commonwealth Sex Discrimination Act also provides a positive duty on employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures in the area of work to eliminate, as far as possible, discrimination on the ground of sex, sexual harassment, harassment on the ground of sex, subjecting a person to a hostile workplace environment on the ground of sex and victimisation. The Commonwealth prohibitions and positive duty continue to apply to duty holders across Australia, including employers in Queensland. This includes the state's Public Service.

Work related discrimination law is also covered by a number of other federal discrimination laws, including the Disability Discrimination Act and the Fair Work Act, as well as at a state level through the Queensland Industrial Relations Act. The government is not removing protections for women or weakening safeguards against domestic and family violence. The government remains steadfast in its commitment to protecting women and addressing domestic and family violence. Existing protections under Queensland's robust legal framework remain in place, and the delay in commencement does not diminish those safeguards.

Ms SCANLON: Indefinitely delaying these protections is akin to condoning discrimination and harassment. The Attorney-General can try to justify her position as much as she likes to help her sleep at night; the fact is that these laws will delay protection for women, for victims of domestic and family violence, for people who have experienced homelessness and for workers in this state, and she should be ashamed.

I want to talk about some of the comments that have been made by a range of individuals, and I will start with Matilda Alexander from the Queensland Independent Disability Advocacy Network. She said that they have been waiting too long for these laws. She said that for the first time hate speech would have been unlawful on the basis of disability and that for the first time victims of crime and domestic and family violence would have been protected from discrimination. She said, 'Justice delayed is justice denied,' and that this delay 'will mean people with disability will continue to experience unfair discrimination, hate speech, abuse and harm'. Those are her words, not mine.

Equality Australia's CEO, Anna Brown, said that these 'uncontroversial changes' had already been through a 'full and comprehensive consultation process that took many years and reopening it is a waste of time and taxpayer money'. I heard the comments from the Attorney-General where she said it did not need to go to a committee because of consultation. These individuals spent a lot of time on these laws and they have now just been ripped up.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. I have not talked about a committee.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, there are methods you can use if you believe that is the case. You can write to me but that is not a point of order.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I shall do.

Ms SCANLON: I will clarify: the Attorney-General has made the conscious decision not to refer it to the committee, therefore inferring that she does not think it needs to go to a committee process. We also heard from the Human Rights Commissioner, who said that he was bewildered by the announcement. He went on to say—

To pause the implementation of all these changes due to a concern about one aspect of the reforms, with no notice and no concerns previously having been raised with us, is a disproportionate response. To claim the reforms were rushed and not consultative enough is additionally misleading.

The Queensland Council of Unions' Jacqueline King said that this was an outrageous betrayal of Queensland workers. She said—

We don't need any more consultation. We have been consulted to death over important reforms in this space on sexual harassment. We just need to get on and act on the legislation and do it.

The Labor Party will always stand up for workers' rights in this state and the LNP will always destroy them. The Premier went outside this House this week and tried to stand up at the Workers' Memorial Day service. Why didn't he talk to those individuals, to those unions, about why they are ripping up these protections? We will always stand up for Queensland workers. We do not support these changes so we will be voting against them.

Ms BUSH: I wish to speak to the amendment. I object to both the amendment and the way in which it has been introduced into this House. Rushing it through as an amendment, bypassing a committee process and not allowing a full debate and consideration of this, as I said yesterday, makes a mockery of this House and makes a mockery of the people who have worked so hard on this particular reform—all of the public servants whom we know worked so hard on this. Time and time again, stakeholders give up their time, their energy and their expertise to continue to come to committee processes and engage with governments in good faith, believing they are going to achieve substantial and sustainable reform, only to have amendments and repeal like this introduced in this way. That makes an absolute mockery of their time and of Queensland workers.

The respect at work legislation was worked on for over three years so it was not just a sudden afterthought. It was something that was substantial and considered, and obviously there was a high need there. Right now we know that there are Queensland workers right across the state who are subjected to bullying, vilification and harassment at work. We know that it affects women disproportionately as well as a range of other cohorts of people, including Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, the culturally and linguistically diverse, people with a disability and people who need stronger protections. That is why we were so proud to introduce this reform that is now being repealed today.

The respect at work bill introduced non-controversial changes, putting a positive obligation on employers to ensure that workplaces were free from harassment and vilification, and expanded the protected attributes to include particular people who we know are vulnerable, including victims of domestic and family violence. I sat in this House earlier today and listened to those opposite argue so passionately about protecting the rights of people who are affected by domestic and family violence, yet here we are now talking about walking back on that particular reform. Here is an actual practical opportunity where we could enhance the rights of Queensland workers who are experiencing domestic and family violence, yet here is a classic example of the government stepping away from that at the first opportunity they have.

This is a test for this government on where they stand and whom they stand with. Do they stand with Queensland workers who we know are subjected to bullying and harassment and who are asking for stronger protections, or do they stand with the Australian Christian Lobby? We know who is behind this. This is a test for the Premier. This is about having courage to stand up to a lobby group and do what is right for Queensland.

The question I have for the Attorney-General is: which stakeholders did she engage with before introducing this today? It is not good enough to say that she came in here on 14 March and made a statement and that that should foreshadow to the whole sector that changes were imminent. That is not good enough. Who were the stakeholders that the Attorney-General engaged with? What was their feedback? What is the plan moving forward to strengthen protections for workers in Queensland.

Mr NICHOLLS: I have heard some pious conversations in my time in this House, but what I have just heard from those opposite absolutely takes the cake. That is saying something, because I have listened to them all—back to the days of Beattie, Bligh and the rest of them. I have heard them all, but today I have just heard some of the most pious conversations from the member for Cooper and the member for Gaven because they sat on this legislation for a year after the *Building belonging* report was provided by the Human Rights Commission. They were so timid that they introduced changes three days before the death of a dying government.

I remember coming back in here for the debate on the third last day of the last sitting week of this House, and the then attorney-general got up and moved a passage of amendments arising from the recommendations of the *Building belonging* report that the Queensland Human Rights Commission had proposed, to be passed on three hours' notice. We hear the pious comments coming from those over there in relation to a sensible pause to assess the full application of the review into the Human Rights Act which makes perfect sense. It makes perfect sense. Those opposite did not have the temerity; they did not have the guts to stand up behind their belief. They waited until the last minute to bring it in, in the hope that they could weasel their way into an election victory that everyone realised was slipping out of their grasp, and deservedly so because that was the behaviour of the Labor Party.

Let's not stand here and listen to pious words from those over there about how they stood up for the rights of workers when all they did was avoid having a debate for 12 months. They knew they did not want to have it because of the effect it would have out there on the voting public, because they knew that the wokeism they were bringing in was going to drive them down the drain, even further down the drain. They were so afraid of it, they did not have the guts to stand up and have a debate in this House. They introduced—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield, that is the second time you have used unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw before you continue.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. They did not have the intestinal fortitude, they did not have the courage of their convictions and they did not have the belief in their own ability to bring the argument forward that they wanted to put it in legislation, bring it to a committee and have it debated. I will not have it. The people of Queensland will not have it. We see through the falsity of their position in respect to this legislation. We stood up when this bill was debated and expressed our concerns, and that is why we voted against it last time around.

It is perfectly sensible for the Attorney-General to take the steps she has. Humbug, I say, to those over there. They are completely without policy principle.

(Time expired)

Debate, on motion of Mr Nicholls, adjourned.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I go to the Leader of the Opposition for the motion, I remind the members for Aspley, Waterford, Nudgee, Algester, Mudgeeraba and Greenslopes that you are all still on a warning. If you want to vote on this bill, you had better behave yourselves.

MOTION

Crisafulli LNP Government, Health System



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.32 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. notes Premier Crisafulli promised the LNP health plan was the most detailed ever taken to an election.
2. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver 2,200 hospital beds by 2028 and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
3. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver 3,300 hospital beds by 2032 and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
4. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to deliver health projects on time and on budget and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.

5. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to not cut health services and condemns Premier Crisafulli for breaking that promise.
6. notes the member for Clayfield claimed the LNP had never promised 2,200 hospital beds by 2032 and condemns the member for Clayfield for not knowing the LNP election commitments.
7. condemns Premier Crisafulli for not having any timelines or costings in the LNP government's health plan.
8. notes Premier Crisafulli promised to appoint the member for Mudgeeraba as the health minister and, on behalf of the people of Queensland, the House thanks the Premier for breaking that promise.
9. notes the federal Liberal National Party opposition led by Peter Dutton is a major risk to health services in Queensland and Medicare which will make it harder for Queenslanders to seek the health care they vitally need.
10. notes that cutting, delaying, reducing services and breaking promises is the Liberal National Party way, both federally under Peter Dutton and in Queensland under Premier Crisafulli.

Queensland is growing rapidly. People have moved here in droves to enjoy our great lifestyle. Who can blame them? With that comes immense pressure on our services, especially health care. Our GPs are booked and busy and our emergency departments are busier than ever. The latest data shows almost 600,000 people presented to an emergency department between October and December. That is 2.3 per cent more than the same period the previous year, which is exactly why we need more hospital beds, better services and more access to health care closer to home. There was a plan in place, a big plan, to deliver just that. It was a plan that was the result of over 30 business cases and years of planning. This month it was torn up by the Crisafulli LNP government.

Queenslanders voted under the promise of 2,200 new hospital beds by 2028. That is the promise the Premier made. It was part of a pipeline of 3,300 new hospital beds by 2032—again a promise this Premier made. Three new hospitals, 11 hospital expansions and a brand new cancer care centre delivered on time and on budget—you guessed it, a promise this Premier made.

It was all part of what we were told was 'the most detailed health plan ever taken to an election', he said, a seismic shift, except the only seismic shift we have seen from this Premier and this health minister is a shift away from actually building more hospitals. This is a seismic broken promise.

First it was the Townsville University Hospital. That was a project to deliver a new clinical services building and an extra 143 beds by 2026. The contract for that expansion, which was already underway, was torn up and sent back to tender. We were told this was guaranteed to save money. Now it is back to the drawing board, no thanks to the advocacy, or lack thereof, of the three new Townsville LNP members.

Then it was leaked to the media that the Queensland Cancer Centre had been pushed off into the never-never. The brand new state-of-the-art facility and its 150 beds were confirmed to be delayed until at least 2031. It did not stop there. Next, work stopped at my local hospital in Redcliffe. The site was shut down, construction equipment packed up and workers made redundant by contractors. Some 204 four beds were due to be delivered at Redcliffe Hospital by 2028. Now we do not know when they will be delivered.

That is the same story we are getting at hospitals right across the state. The new Toowoomba Hospital—who knows? The new Coomera Hospital—we don't know. The new Bundaberg Hospital—nobody knows. The Mackay Hospital expansion—nobody knows. The Prince Charles Hospital expansion—we don't know. The Cairns Surgical Centre—we don't know. The Robina Hospital expansion—we do know about that one; it has been scrapped entirely.

The LNP's claim that they have rescued the Health and Hospitals Plan is nothing more than an empty, slippery slogan and a fairy floss pamphlet. There are no timelines, no costings and no guarantees. All we have seen so far is dodgy, slippery, used-car salesman tactics to duck and weave around the truth, to slip out of giving Queenslanders a straight answer. It is not hard. When will these hospitals be built? When will we get the 2,200 new beds? Will it be by 2028, like the Premier promised Queenslanders? Anything less is a giant broken promise.

The LNP's cuts to health do not come as a surprise to me. I thought it was always a bit suspicious that the Premier put the former treasurer, the member for Clayfield, into that portfolio. As treasurer, he oversaw 14,000 job cuts, including doctors, nurses and midwives. At the time he blamed the Commission of Audit. They got Peter Costello to do the Commission of Audit. The Sangster review is nothing more than Commission of Audit 2.0—a plan to get out of their promises, to cut back on our hospitals, to deny our healthcare workers and Queensland communities the hospitals they deserve; a cover to break all of their promises.



Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (5.37 pm): I move the following amendment—

That all words after 'That this House' be omitted and the following paragraphs inserted:

1. notes the LNP health plan was the most detailed ever health plan taken to an election by an opposition.
2. notes the Sangster review revealed Labor's failed hospital plan was undeliverable.
3. notes comments by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia that Labor's failed hospital plan was a 'mirage of media releases', and that 'blind optimism and unbridled enthusiasm was never a plausible delivery strategy'.
4. notes the previous government cruelly deceived communities right across Queensland in relation to Labor's failed hospital plan.
5. condemns the Leader of the Opposition for refusing to release the cabinet documents as requested by this House yesterday.
6. condemns the Leader of the Opposition, and his Labor colleagues, for cruelly deceiving the people of Queensland by promoting a hospital plan that they knew was undeliverable.

There is no doubt the truth hurts. The truth hurts, and we saw it when Mr Sangster provided his plan—an independent review by someone from outside of Queensland, commissioned to provide a review. That is why it is so important that the three failed Labor health ministers stand up and explain what they knew, when they knew and why they did not tell the people of Queensland because I have heard a lot of complaints from those opposite. They have been running around like Chicken Little—'The sky is going to fall in on our head.' None of it has eventuated. The cranes are still swinging, the concrete is still being delivered and the plans are being drawn up. None of it has ever happened, but they have never explained what they knew and why they failed to do it.

I repeat the call I have been making for a week now: if they have the courage of their convictions, if they think they are right, go outside this chamber, stand up and front the media and produce the documents that justify their position. Even better, come into this place and ask me a question about it. They have put 209 questions on notice but they do not have the courage to stand up in this place and ask me a question. I get more questions from the crossbench than I get from those on the other side. They are happy to do it in the dark, but they are not happy to stand up and have the battle of policy in this place. They scurry around like little moles beaver away, hiding away and sniping from the sidelines.

When they stand up in here, what happens? We know the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Miller and the member for Inala get it wrong. They have to stand up and apologise. When they stand up, they get it wrong. That is their record in this place, and that is their record with the people of Queensland. They are unable to get their facts straight. They are unable to tell the truth in this place. They have to stand up—

Mr Bailey: Meltdown mode!

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member from Miller. When it comes to meltdowns, member for Miller, it was not anyone on this side who stormed out without failing to acknowledge the House. When it comes to meltdowns, we know who the master of meltdowns is in this place. We saw it right before our eyes. We did not need an action replay! When it comes to having respect for this House and for telling the truth, we know who can be believed and who cannot be believed.

Let's get down to it. Here are the questions they still refuse to answer: when did they know that there was no contract for the Robina Hospital expansion; when did the member for Gaven, who sat around the cabinet table, know that that contract had fallen over; when did the member for Cairns realise that all the money had been spent and there was none left over and there was no plan to relocate the helipad; when did the member for Cairns know that they had no secure site? They are failures and they deserve to be condemned.

(Time expired)

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you wave your arms around at me again like a football player and you will be the one getting the penalty. I am in the chair.



Mr HEALY (Cairns—ALP) (5.43 pm): I am not sure how the member for Logan would go on the paddock, but he is a great performer in here! I say from the outset that Far North Queensland is being left behind. Regardless of the member for Clayfield's personal attacks and lack of detail—there are no details whatsoever in terms of his portfolio; it is impressively disappointing—we are being left behind. It


is abundantly clear that those in Cairns, Cooktown or Townsville are not a priority when it comes to health care. Cuts to vital services, delays to critical infrastructure and the axing of successful workforce programs have all come in quick succession. Worst of all, promises made before the election are already being broken.

The first major blow was the axing of the Workforce Attraction Incentive Scheme. This absolutely fantastic Labor-initiated program offered incentives to attract health professionals to regional and rural areas—places that desperately need health professionals. The scheme had been helping to close critical workforce gaps across Queensland, including in Far North communities. Scrapping it was short-sighted and dangerous. AMA Queensland president Nick Yim called the move ‘perplexing’, and it is easy to see why. At a time when interstate and international competition for healthcare workers is at an all-time high, the Crisafulli government chose to cut one of the few tools actually helping regional areas attract staff. The consequences are real—longer waiting times, higher patient transport costs and city hospitals being overburdened with patients who should be able to get treatment closer to home. In Cooktown, this has already led to broken promises. The LNP committed to restoring birthing services in that town—a vital commitment for expectant mothers in the region—but there has been absolutely no progress or plan announced. The government blames—wait for it—workforce shortages, but the very first decision was to kill the program designed to fix that problem. It is hypocrisy of the highest order.

In Cairns, the situation is just as alarming. The Cairns surgical unit—a 32-bed surgical facility locked in under the former Labor government—is now in doubt. The new Premier admitted in this parliament that projects like this are undeliverable. Under his government, health insiders have confirmed that the project is likely to be rescope, and we know that is code for delays. This is a devastating development for Cairns—a city that continues to grow rapidly. The surgical centre was more than a campaign promise; it was an essential piece of infrastructure to ensure families in Cairns could receive the surgery that they need locally without being forced to travel south. Every delay and downgrade is a direct hit to the healthcare outcomes of our region. Meanwhile, just 30 minutes from another major hospital, the Gold Coast is being gifted a huge upgrade. Its new hospital is being expanded from 400 to 600 beds. The contrast could not be more stark. While the Far North watches its one and only surgical expansion project go under the knife, the south-east corner gets another \$1 billion-plus boost. Where is the fairness in that?

In Townsville, the picture is no better. The Townsville University Hospital expansion has been paused, with no clear timeline or guarantee of the promised 165 beds—no guarantee of money, no promise of a time; absolutely nothing whatsoever. There are all new members in those areas and we do not hear a thing. Instead, there is vague talk about revised master plans, future investments and potential decisions. I think all these things mean do not hold your breath. The community deserves answers and they deserve certainty. The LNP’s pattern is very clear: delay, review, rescope and cut. It is always regional Queensland that cops it first.

The reality is: this Premier promised no health cuts. He promised to match Labor’s plan for 2,200 new beds by 2028, but within months of taking office those promises have been broken. The LNP’s so-called review of three new hospitals and 11 expansion projects was nothing more than a plan to find excuses to cut and to slash. We are copping that in regional areas. When health projects are cut, it is always vulnerable Queenslanders who suffer most—seniors, kids, expectant mums and those living with chronic illnesses. These are the people who will pay the price as the LNP continue to break their promises to the people of regional Queensland.

 **Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (5.48 pm): Well, that was fascinating! I do not think they could organise action if it came with instructions, but let’s talk about the faith that Queenslanders have in the public health system, because it has dissipated under Labor’s decade in office. We have had record ambulance ramping; we have had a record number of Queenslanders waiting for elective surgery—over 60,000 of them; and we have had over 280,000 Queenslanders waiting to see specialists. Too many Queensland families and vulnerable people are waiting too long to receive the health services they need and too many healthcare workers are stretched beyond their limits. Our population is growing and aging and our health system must keep up.

Last week we actually did speak up very proudly. We shared the great news that our government is making the biggest investment in health infrastructure Queensland has ever seen, and Far North Queensland is front and centre. After years of delays, broken promises and total inefficiency from the former government, Cairns is finally going to get the hospital upgrades that we deserve. This is not just construction; it is real outcomes for local patients, families and health workers. Our Hospital Rescue

Plan will build new hospital beds and upgrade and expand existing ones to deliver 2,600 beds for our communities across Queensland alongside more investment in a bigger health workforce. This is the largest investment in hospital infrastructure—

Mr Healy: When? When will that happen?

Ms JAMES: I will take that interjection from the member for Cairns. We are going to have 64 new overnight beds by 2027. The Cairns adolescent acute mental health project will also invest in eight new beds, because he forgot those in his mental health ward. These will be critical to help with mental health issues with our youth and there will be a new plan and a design for—

Mr Healy: When?

Ms JAMES: It was not going to happen under the watch of the member opposite. There will be a new plan and a design for the surgical centre developed in collaboration with the hospital, because they were not consulted. It is really important that they are consulted so that we deliver the best results. They were saying that it was so discombobulated with one wing over here and one wing over there and it was going to be totally inefficient. There will be at least 40 new overnight beds in the surgical centre. We are also going to collaborate with local tertiary education providers for a future health and innovation precinct.

Mr Healy: When?

Ms JAMES: Faster than you will! Last but not least, we will be investing in a new multistorey car park because car parking is important. I know those opposite forgot it in the Wangetti Trail and with their plan for the hospital, but we will not forget parking because parking is really important. It is essential for people who are already in a stressed state at a hospital who need to find a park. Something that is even more mind-blowing than that is the fact that there has not been a new and safe location for the Cairns Hospital helipad, which is not operating to safe standards. The fact that the former government did not address one of the highest clinical and public safety risks for Cairns, which is the reconstruction of a new helipad away from the Esplanade site, is an accident waiting to happen.

Under the former government the Cairns Hospital was on track for a \$378 million cost blowout. This is what I will call Labor's 'no plan'. There was no plan to deliver the surgical centre. There was no plan for funding or a site for a car park. There was no plan to stick to costs. There was no plan for a helipad relocation.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: You have had your turn, member for Cairns.

Ms JAMES: There was no plan to consult with the health and hospital service on the surgical centre. There was no plan to reduce hospital waitlists. There was no plan to reduce ambulance ramping. There was no plan to reduce elective surgery waitlists and there was no plan to deliver what Far North Queensland needs. Our plan is clear and we will deliver easier access to health services for Queenslanders across our state. We will deliver the largest investment in hospital infrastructure that Queensland has ever seen—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: This is the last warning for you, member for Logan.

Ms JAMES:—and we will deliver 64 new overnight beds. We will deliver eight new adolescent beds in the acute mental health precinct. We will deliver at least 40 new overnight beds at the surgical centre and we will deliver a surgical centre in consultation with the experts on the ground. We will deliver a new multistorey car park.

Right across Queensland we are committed to delivering easier access to health services and after years of delays and broken promises under Labor, Cairns will finally get the hospital upgrades we deserve. This is not just construction; it is real outcomes for local patients, families and our health workers.



Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (5.53 pm): I have not heard someone say they were going to do so much since I listened to the Greens speaking at the polling booth, 'I'm going to do this. I'm going to do that. I'm going to do this, that and the other thing. It's all going to be done.'

The health minister's speech pricked my conscience. I am a very conscientious fellow, so it is pretty easy to prick my conscience. I thought I would start my contribution with an apology. I would like to apologise to the people of Queensland. I was here in 2015 as part of a new government—lots of people here were—and excited. I would like to apologise because we did not do a health infrastructure review in 2015. I am not one to blame-shift, but the reality is we did have a very good reason for not doing a health infrastructure review—but we should still apologise—because there was nothing to review. Not a single thing had been built. We could have done a 1 William Street review.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth.

Mr JKELLY: I will tell honourable members what else we did not review but we probably should have. It was nursing numbers. The infrastructure review would have been pretty quick. Let's face it: the health infrastructure review would have taken no time. However, to find the few nurses left in Queensland Health after those folks opposite cut, slashed and burnt them out of the health system would have taken us a long time.

I stand here and I will have this to the day I die as something I am very proud of: to be the only nurse in this parliament who voted for safe nurse- and midwife-to-patient ratios. As such, I am very excited to support item No. 8 of the motion that thanks the Premier for breaking the promise to vote to support the only nurse who did not vote for safe nurse-to-patient ratios. That would be the member for Mudgeeraba, and I notice she is not on the speaking list tonight.

Points 2, 3, 4 and 5 deal with broken promises, and I do not think any of us should be surprised or upset about broken promises from the Premier. This is a chap who came in here and voted to support the Path to Treaty process. I say to the member for Barron River that he did not promise—he did not make a promise—he did not say what he was going to do. He did something good—really good—he voted for the Path to Treaty but, of course, he did not actually do it when he got in here; he got rid of it. So we should not be surprised with broken promises because even when you—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, I am not finding that in amongst the 10 points. I will bring you back to the motion. Come back to health.

Mr JKELLY: Let's get to some other broken promises. Mr Speaker, thank you for your guidance. They also promised that there would be no new stadiums, yet now there is to be a new stadium. The reality is when we look at the rest of this motion, it goes to those cuts, and haven't we seen plenty of those and haven't some of them been very cruel? On the very day I stood outside the pill-testing clinic in Newstead with the local member and we called out this government for shutting down the pill-testing site against all advice, they tested a pill that would have killed the person who bought it. How many people out in the community are still exposed to these sorts of risks? They are the sorts of cuts that this motion is dealing with.

What about the cuts to the hours of the nurse-led clinics? That is certainly affecting the member for Gladstone's electorate. What about the cuts to the regional workforce attraction fund? Honestly, how are they going to fix the obstetrics waiting times or the lists or everything they promised if they are not able to attract people into these regional areas?

What about the incredibly cruel cuts to the gender clinics? There was no reason to do that. There were no safety issues put forward. There was a constituent of mine sitting in that clinic waiting for an appointment and they had been waiting for months, and they were cut on the very day that this government made that decision. It was a very cruel cut. There are plenty more examples I could be talking about. I support our motion.



Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (5.58 pm): I rise to support the amendment to the motion moved by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. As we all know, our community deserves access to high-quality health services that meet the growing needs of our population. It is the Crisafulli government that is committed to delivering 600 new health beds for the Coomera Hospital, and that is what the community is asking for.


This vital expansion is essential for services including increasing surgery capacity, expanding maternity health services and improved operating theatres, along with a much needed intensive care unit. These enhancements will not only improve patient outcomes but also alleviate pressure on the existing health networks in our region. Specifically, I am excited to highlight the additional 196 beds at Coomera compared to what the Labor Party committed to, which was 404, along with an extra 82

additional beds for the Gold Coast region. These initiatives represent a significant investment in our local health infrastructure and a proactive approach to ensure that our community can access care when they need it.

As the Gold Coast continues to grow, we must also grow our health services to ensure that the services adapt to the needs of our local population. By expanding hospital capacity, we are taking the necessary steps for the health and wellbeing of all Gold Coasters. Furthermore, the Crisafulli government understands that accessing health care is not just about facilities but also allowing the community to easily access these facilities through better master plans that deliver better public transport systems to these hospitals, ensuring all citizens—all of our residents—can access these facilities with ease. Additionally, the construction of a multistorey car park will further enhance access for patients, families and healthcare workers alike. This is a forward-thinking Crisafulli government that is working for the northern Gold Coast and Gold Coast residents.

What is the alternative? Given the former Labor Party's record, the alternative is that we face significant cost blowouts, escalating from about \$1.3 billion to an estimated \$2.254 billion, along with delays to upwards of six months. However, the crucial requirement of 600 new beds was overlooked. As I said, Labor promised 404 beds. Our region needs those beds. As the member for Coomera regularly says in this chamber, our region is one of the fastest growing regions in Australia. His electorate is way over capacity—way over quota—which highlights the fact that we need proper healthcare services.

Labor promised us this big picture. It promised that it was going to deliver all of these beds, but it failed in the fine print. It promised the world, but it failed to deliver. On election day last year northern Gold Coasters voted for change because they were sick and tired of broken promises by the Queensland Labor Party. They wanted change. They want health services on the northern Gold Coast. They want strong health services on the northern Gold Coast. They do not want to be promised the world when services are never delivered. That is why the Crisafulli LNP government is going to deliver the health services that the northern Gold Coast and the Gold Coast as a whole needs. Labor can promise the world, but all it does is underdeliver.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (6.03 pm): It is wonderful to rise in support of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition because we know that, when it comes to health services and health infrastructure, it is only because of Labor governments that any health services or infrastructure are advanced in this state. The only reason the new Bundaberg Hospital will be delivered is because of the work of this now opposition when we were in government and what we have done to embarrass the government of today through our work in opposition. Let us go through the history of the new Bundaberg Hospital all the way back to when we first announced it in 2020 and the then member for Bundaberg—the then member for Bundaberg—said that that hospital location was too big. He said that the hospital location was too big and that we needed to go to a smaller location, and he was supported by his comrade in arms the member for Burnett, who also said that the land was too big for a brand new hospital. Imagine that—too big!

Government members interjected.

Mr SMITH: I am very glad the member for Hervey Bay is sitting right next to the member for Burnett, because who could forget the report in the *Fraser Coast Chronicle* under the headline 'Build best hospital here, not Bundy says coast councillor'? The member—

Mr SPEAKER: I know you are in full flight, but, member for Hervey Bay, you have caught my attention. You are interjecting from a seat that is not your seat. Member for Burnett, just keep yourself a little under control.

Mr SMITH: That highlights how ill-disciplined the member for Hervey Bay is when he starts going against his own political party saying that they should not build new infrastructure in Bundaberg; it should go to Hervey Bay instead. In fact, the member for Hervey Bay said that they should bulldoze the TAFE in Hervey Bay, abandon the hospital site and then build the new hospital on the TAFE grounds. In fact he said—

No amount of ad hoc construction at the Hervey Bay Hospital can substitute for a well-considered strategic service and capital masterplan.

That throws out the rescue plan, doesn't it, that says at Hervey Bay there will be an expansion by 2026 with 35 overnight beds and services including an inpatient unit and ICU? The member for Hervey Bay does not support the rescue plan, and he is on record. That is what he said. Let us go to the history of health care in Bundaberg when during the last term the member for Burnett said that it

was time to break the back of unrealistic workplace entitlements. We on this side remember that and so do the nurses in the hospital. What did we also have? We put a question on notice to the health minister in December: when will the new Bundaberg Hospital be delivered and will it be on budget, just like Wide Bay Health had told me it would be? The response was that it is under review. However, it was highlighted in this House by the member for Toowoomba North when he said—

I hear the member for Bundaberg squawking. He might want a six-level hospital to be built, but if we had the \$9 billion we might be able to build him a six-storey hospital.

...

Unfortunately, that \$9 billion is not available ...

He let out of the bag what the LNP's plan was when it was under review, and do not just take my word for it, Mr Speaker; take it from the *Bundaberg Today*, which reported—

Mr SPEAKER: That is a prop.

Mr SMITH:—and I table that.

Tabled paper: Extract from the *Bundaberg Today*, dated 21 March 2025, titled 'Hospital build is on life support' [\[403\]](#).

I table that so that every single member can see just what the LNP government's plan was for the new Bundaberg Hospital. Let me just go a little bit further. With regard to the member for Burnett, can I just say that I love the member for Burnett. He is one of my favourites and I know that deep down he loves me too. On 2 April when live on ABC Radio he was asked—

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burnett, I know there is a bit of provocation.

Mr SMITH:—by the host—

... so you've said it won't be smaller with less services. Does that mean then the more than 400 beds promised will actually be delivered?

The member for Burnett replied—

... And let me remind you, the new hospital only has 120 new beds.

This bloke does not even have an idea, because then he went on to say that the rest of the beds would be in the old hospital. When they talk about wanting to run a split hospital, he went live on radio and cut 300 beds from the new Bundaberg Hospital. You cannot make it up because it is on radio. You can listen to it. I actually put it on when I want to go to sleep. I get very como and drift away. The radio host then said—

Sir, can you guarantee it will be a level 5 hospital?

The member for Burnett beat his chest and said—

I'm not prepared to make that call today ...

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr SMITH: He would not even make the call. That is why the health minister had to hold his hand in a presser the next day down on the Speaker's Green.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mr SMITH: The only reason there is any new Bundaberg Hospital on its way is because of the embarrassment that we have put on this health minister. He was a disgrace as a treasurer and is a disgrace as a health minister. We will deliver that hospital for the people of Bundaberg.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Burnett, you are warned.



Ms DOOLEY (Redcliffe—LNP) (6.08 pm): Today we have seen yet another desperate attempt by the opposition to rewrite the narrative on health, but Queenslanders are smarter than that. The people of Redcliffe are smarter than that. They know exactly who broke the health system and who is now working to fix it. I call on the opposition leader to apologise to the people of Redcliffe for the disgraceful scare campaign that he ran day after day outside my hospital with his Labor colleagues and CFMEU colleagues telling people in my electorate that we would not deliver the Redcliffe Hospital expansion plan.


I had to report some of his CFMEU mates who worked on that site to the local police for their threats to me personally. They even harassed and subjected doctors and nurses working at the hospital to unnecessary false claims. Let us be clear: Labor's so-called Big Build was never about patients. It was always about press conferences, flashy brochures; it was about headlines, not hospitals.

Under Labor we saw nearly \$7 billion in cost blowouts and project delays that left communities like Redcliffe and around Queensland stranded. Yet we still have three failed Labor health ministers sitting opposite—the members for Murrumba, Woodridge and Waterford—all now in hiding, refusing to explain how they got it so wrong. The truth came out in black and white in the Sangster review, an independent expert report led by someone who has delivered more than 135 hospitals across Australia. What did he say? He said that Labor's hospital expansion plan was 'an exercise in futility'. Not one project was actually deliverable in its current form or within its budget. But it gets worse: industry experts like Infrastructure Partnerships Australia described Labor's plan as a 'mirage of media releases' and the Queensland Major Contractors Association warned back in 2022 that trying to build 11 hospitals at the same time was completely unachievable.

Labor did not just overpromise, they knowingly misled Queenslanders. They failed to plan, failed to budget and failed to act when the facts became clear. When was the former health minister told the projects were falling apart? When did the former treasurer realise that the budget was blown? Why was appropriate consultation not done with my local elders before shovels were put in the ground and why did they not listen to the clinicians at Redcliffe Hospital about their concerns around design and infection control floors? Even the executive director of Redcliffe Hospital has welcomed the review to get it right. These are questions that Labor refuses to answer.

While Labor let hospitals crumble, they also failed to fund basic repairs. The Queensland Audit Office has confirmed that we now need \$2 billion just to fix the maintenance backlog caused by Labor's neglect. Compare and contrast that to what the LNP Crisafulli government is doing. We have launched the largest health infrastructure program in Queensland history—over 2,600 new beds across 14 major hospital projects and more expansions right around the state. That is more than 400 extra beds than Labor ever promised. This will include an additional 210 new beds for my Redcliffe Hospital. But we are not stopping there. Our Easier Access to Health Services plan is bringing overdue reform. For the first time ever Queenslanders can see real-time emergency wait data and performance data across all 25 major hospitals and seven satellite health centres. We are also committed to installing new CTs and MRI scanners in hospitals around rural Queensland, including Charleville and Ayr, and we are fixing regional maternity services.

Queenslanders were promised better and for 10 years Labor delivered less. Let us not forget ambulance ramping. That is the legacy of the opposition: broken promises, chaos and cover-ups. Thanks to Minister Nicholls and the LNP government we are seeing a new direction: a credible, deliverable plan that will get Queensland's health system back on track with our Hospital Rescue Plan.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (6.13 pm): I was waiting to follow the member for Theodore—and wasn't that riveting—because I was very interested to see what the Gold Coast LNP members said, particularly the southern Gold Coast members of parliament. They have been very quiet in this debate despite the fact that there are 114 hospital beds that are being axed.

Mr Nicholls: 200 more beds than you had planned for.

A government member: Where are your 114? Where are they?

Mr Nicholls: Where are the 114 you promised?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from those opposite. I would love to hear them comment about how they are going to justify to southern Gold Coast residents why they are axing 114 hospital beds in Robina. I take the interjection from the Minister for Health: where are they? Nowhere under the LNP because you have committed to scrapping them.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, member for Clayfield. Member for Gaven, you will address your comments through the chair. That will help.

Ms SCANLON: The LNP members sit on their fat margins on the Gold Coast and have their foot on the brake.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms SCANLON: No more obvious than that is the member for Mudgeeraba, who was very interested in health last term, less interested now that she is the minister for stationery and petty cash. In her own electorate she had 114 beds that Labor had committed to. Now the LNP are in government they have said, 'No, we are not going to do that.' Those are beds that would provide critical relief in the short term while Coomera was being built, but the LNP has said it will not deliver.

Mr Nicholls: They are not built! There are no contracts.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. They are not being built by the LNP. All we have heard from the LNP is that they are scrapping those 114 beds from Robina and then pausing the Coomera Hospital. I find it interesting to hear from the member for Theodore and those other southern Gold Coast MPs about the Coomera Hospital. Let us remember who started that process and who actually committed to building this hospital. I want to remind everyone that it is on the public record: Labor always said this was the first stage of this project, there would be multiple stages, which was much more detail than we ever got from the LNP even though the health minister came in here and said that they published the most detailed ever health plan taken to the election. I have no idea what that health plan was because it certainly did not include any information about the Coomera Hospital at that point. They went to the election saying they would deliver 2,200 hospital beds by 2028 and now they are trying to nervously walk all of that back because, of course, we have the ex-Newman government treasurer now in the health portfolio wanting to cut a whole lot of hospital beds and health services across the state.

Mr Nicholls: Provide the evidence!

Ms SCANLON: The health minister asks for the evidence. The LNP has announced it is scrapping 114 hospital beds in Robina. That is the evidence. You might not like it—obviously you do like it because it is your own plan—but that is the evidence. I do not know what those southern Gold Coast MPs are going to say to all of those residents who need additional hospital capacity. They are not interested in expansions of health services on the southern Gold Coast. We know that because they have a track record for not supporting health services on the southern Gold Coast. None of them supported the Tugun Satellite Hospital when Labor built it. They were just infatuated by the name. They did not match the commitment so it would not have existed had those opposite come into government. Just like the mental health rehabilitation unit at the Gold Coast University Hospital would never have been built if the LNP had come into power. I find it interesting that people like the member for Bonney go there and take happy snaps. He says he supports it now. Where was the support when we went to the campaign? He did not match us so it would not have been delivered. He stands up at all of those housing projects trying to con Queenslanders that they are doing something while at the same time axing affordable housing projects on golf courses in his own backyard and in places all across the state.

It is only Labor governments that can be trusted to deliver health and hospital services. The track record of the LNP is to gut health services in this state and this review is really just an attempt to do it all over again. We know that because why else would you put the member for Clayfield in the position, the very person who was responsible for those 14,000 job cuts to the Public Service. He still has not apologised to those Queenslanders. I support the Labor opposition motion.



Mrs POOLE (Mundingburra—LNP) (6.18 pm): I rise to support the motion as amended by our Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. I commend and thank him for the work that he has put into the Crisafulli LNP government's Hospital Rescue Plan. Before I start, I would like to say that I cannot wait for the day that I, too, have a fat margin. On 24 April 2025, an article in the *Townsville Bulletin* was headed—

What was triumphantly described by Labor in 2022 as the 'biggest expansion program ever seen in a state budget' has been exposed as one of the state's biggest lies.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mundingburra, that is unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mrs POOLE: I withdraw—untruths. On 26 October, Queenslanders voted for a fresh start. They voted for easier access to health services and we will deliver a Hospital Rescue Plan. How did we get to the stage we are at now? The government commissioned an independent review into the program, led by an independent expert, Sam Sangster. Sam's health infrastructure credentials are unparalleled in Australia, having now led client-side planning and delivery of more than 135 hospitals, with a total project value in excess of \$28 billion. The review reveals Labor's negligence and failure of oversight in delivering the multibillion dollar hospital infrastructure program. Sangster stated—


In each case continuing with the currently scoped and programmed projects is an exercise in futility.

The review provides 42 recommendations to get the program back on track and to improve health infrastructure delivery more broadly.

The Crisafulli government is funding and delivering Labor's false promises. The Hospital Rescue Plan will deliver more than 2,600 new beds across the state, which is 400 more than Labor promised, across 14 major hospital projects. It is the largest ever investment in health infrastructure in Queensland. The plan sets out a credible path forward for delivering those projects to better meet local needs and create value-for-money outcomes.

What does that mean to the people of Townsville and the Townsville University Hospital? It highlights Labor's failure: a \$500 million cost blowout from \$530 million to over \$1 billion and a delay of at least two years. They ignored the advice and included only 70 per cent of clinical requirements. What does that mean? It means no pharmacy, it means no sterilising department and it means no link bridge between the existing hospital and the proposed expansion. What does that mean? It means you are going to have to put everything on a trolley, wheel it out, take it down in the lift, take it out through the car park, wheel it up the road—look out for that speed bump—go over the next speed bump and then into the next hospital. This is critical infrastructure that cannot be left out of a new build.

Queenslanders deserve a health system that they can rely on. Our health professionals do an exceptional job. We see that day in and day out. They deserve a better system so that they can continue to deliver the world-class health care that they wish to deliver. I commend the amended motion to the House.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (6.23 pm): I rise to support the motion and oppose the amendment moved by the government. This may as well be called the 'LNP hospital cuts plan' because that is what it is. Six months of broken health election promises and cuts is the clear record of the Crisafulli LNP government. Like Campbell Newman, who according to his biography Premier Crisafulli said was 'special', the LNP promised much to get elected. They promised transparency. They promised 2,200 beds by 2028. They promised openness, no health cuts and honouring the 2024 state budget, to name a few. Do members remember those? I do. The LNP had a plan to get elected, but it was not the same plan they intended to implement once they were in power. As soon as the election was over, the Crisafulli government started dropping their election promises as if they were red-hot coals on their bare hands.


Not only have they broken election promise after election promise after election promise; incredibly, only last week this current short-term health minister actually denied that the LNP even made their 2,200 bed promise in the first place. In a new low in Queensland politics, health minister Nicholls attempted to mislead Queenslanders and journalists when he said, 'I've heard that said, but I've checked and that commitment has not been made.' Straight after those words came from Minister Nicholls, on that night's TV coverage the then LNP health spokesperson, Minister Bates, said, 'Certainly, we have matched the Labor government's promises for beds.' Last year, widespread reporting from multiple media outlets was also clear and consistent that the LNP election promise was that if elected they would match Labor's commitment of 2,200 beds by 2028. It has taken less than six months since the Crisafulli LNP government was elected not only to betray the trust that Queenslanders placed in them but also to actually attempt to dishonestly rewrite history and deny altogether their own election promises to Queenslanders. It has taken less than six months for this hapless health minister to be humiliated by the truth.

This pathetic attempt from a reluctant minister would not have happened in isolation. It is likely it would have been endorsed by Premier Crisafulli himself. We all know that a fish rots from the head down. One of the Crisafulli government's first acts in office was to pause health infrastructure projects across the state. They did not share with Queenslanders that they would be doing that. The member for Mundingburra ought to look at her own side which put the hospital expansion back on the never-never. In fact, it was this government that self-sabotaged their election commitment to provide 2,200 beds by 2028 with that six-month and ongoing pause on health construction. This is a clear sign that Premier Crisafulli was never committed to keeping his election promises on health to Queenslanders.

Last week, only four days before that, the struggling health minister was again humiliated—that is two humiliations in four days. In answer to 10 questions on notice, mainly on the important issue of the Women and Girls' Health Strategy, health minister Nicholls, who oversees the largest department in the state, refused to answer the questions on the basis of 'the significant burden' involved and that it was an 'unreasonable diversion of resources'. What century is it? Since when is information about Queensland Health's Women and Girls' Health Strategy a significant burden or an unreasonable diversion of resources from the largest department in Queensland? What century is this out-of-touch health minister living in? To me, it sounds more like the 18th or 19th centuries. It is not the current century or even the 20th century, that's for sure. But the embarrassing saga involving health minister Nicholls's answers to questions on notice gets worse. When a journalist asked the very same question as one asked on notice, miraculously the beleaguered health minister was able to answer in just 48 hours even though, apparently, he could not do so with 30 days notice and the largest department in Queensland at his disposal.

The disdain for the parliament by health minister Nicholls is revealing. His refusal to answer parliamentary questions on notice and conform to standing orders shows the low standards that this health minister has and that this is a return to the bad old days of 'here we Joh again'. Being caught and humiliated twice in four days shows that these attempts are as inept as his unsuccessful attempts to sell off Queensland's power and port assets when he was Newman's treasurer. But wait—there's more. I refer to the Speaker's ruling this morning. The minister knows well and truly how humiliating that is.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (6.29 pm): There once was a time in this parliament when the opposition would move a motion and they would be excited and take it to the government. However, today we saw the Leader of the Opposition move his motion and then scurry out, as he always does, with his head down. There was no excitement. There was no get-up-and-go.

Mr O'Connor: He barely looks like he has dressed for the occasion.

Mr BLEIJIE: He cannot even put on a tie to debate his own motion. He cannot even dress for the occasion. That shows the sloppiness of the opposition leader. His heart is not in it. We know it and they know it. His heart is not in it. We know that the backbench of the Labor Party are waiting to tap him on the shoulder and then it will all be over. Members will be surprised to hear this from me: for a fleeting moment I actually felt sorry for him. I said 'fleeting' because I want him to stay there. I want him to stay as the opposition leader. If his performance in the last six months is an indication for the future, I think we will be okay.

Queenslanders overwhelmingly rejected the Labor Party and they have been trying to rewrite history since October. They are trying to say that they had delivered a grandiose hospital plan. Again, as I said this morning, it would be like the planning department delivering vacant blocks of land that kangaroos and their joeys are bouncing around on morning and night and saying that that was their plan for housing. It is the same for the hospital plan. They did not build it. They did not fund it. They just had a glossy brochure to say they were going to do things.

Our plan is a rescue plan, and it is called a rescue plan for a reason. It goes through how bad it was under the Labor Party. They had a plan but it was undeliverable. Mr Sangster, who wrote the report, said on multiple occasions that their plan was undeliverable. They think they are still in government. They think they are still delivering these hospitals from opposition.

I say to the opposition: get excited about a 5.30 motion like we used to. We would take it up to the then government but they are all here heads down, not wanting to be here, depressed and watching movies on their phones and iPads. Get excited about the 5.30 motion like I am now! I am as excited about the 5.30 motion in government as I was in opposition.

The member for Murrumba talks about the Redcliffe Hospital. Let's go to page 14 of the Hospital Rescue Plan. It states the hospital had 'more than \$1 billion cost blowout, delayed at least two years, inadequate planning that ignored clinical advice and no paediatric outpatients'. Mr Sangster also states in his report on the Redcliffe Hospital that they failed to deal with the issue of the scar tree. That scar tree ended up costing Queensland taxpayers \$54,000 a year because they forgot—

Mr Nicholls: A day.

Mr BLEIJIE: I have been corrected by the health minister—it cost \$54,000 a day because they failed to consult with the local Indigenous community and planned to put a hospital right on top of an Indigenous scar tree. What was the plan to deliver the hospital? They could not deliver it because they could not get rid of the tree and they did not change the hospital. We have redesigned the hospital around the scar tree. Guess what? It will be delivered, and I thank the member for Redcliffe for her contribution tonight.

They talk about the health minister. Thank God competence has again been restored to the health department with a competent health minister tackling the issues that the Labor Party failed to address. They talk about their hospital plan. They had 10 years. Again, they are thinking they will deliver all this because they still think they are in government. They perpetrated a con job on the people of Queensland because it was a fake hospital plan they took to the election. It was undeliverable.

The attack on the finance minister today was disgraceful. On the day we introduced DV laws—a DV victim herself and a decorated nurse of over 40 years—the Labor Party named her in a motion. It is disgraceful how the Labor Party attack women—it is childish—yet they still allow the member for Stafford, who has his own questions to answer, to sit over there. It is disgraceful.

The Hospital Rescue Plan will deliver hospitals and will deliver more beds. It is what Queenslanders overwhelmingly voted for. That is why we have introduced the Hospital Rescue Plan.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 31:

ALP, 31—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

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

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

AYES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 31:

ALP, 31—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

1. notes the LNP health plan was the most detailed ever health plan taken to an election by an opposition.
2. notes the Sangster review revealed Labor's failed hospital plan was undeliverable.
3. notes comments by Infrastructure Partnerships Australia that Labor's failed hospital plan was a 'mirage of media releases', and that 'blind optimism and unbridled enthusiasm was never a plausible delivery strategy'.
4. notes the previous government cruelly deceived communities right across Queensland in relation to Labor's failed hospital plan.
5. condemns the Leader of the Opposition for refusing to release the cabinet documents as requested by this House yesterday.
6. condemns the Leader of the Opposition, and his Labor colleagues, for cruelly deceiving the people of Queensland by promoting a hospital plan that they knew was undeliverable.

Proceedings suspended from 6.42 pm to 7.40 pm.

CRIME AND CORRUPTION (RESTORING REPORTING POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from p. 1038, on amendment No. 14—



Mr POWER: Before the debate was adjourned, we were discussing amendment No. 14. This is the government attempting to delay the respect at work initiatives that were passed by the previous government. Specifically, those initiatives were about protecting someone in a work environment from being subject to hostility by someone on the grounds of sex. That is what this government is attempting to delay. Also, businesses were to be proactively responsible for ensuring a workplace free of sexual harassment.

Bringing forward these ideas for discussion and debate was the end of a three-year process, as has been pointed out. I have had extensive meetings myself with constituents and other groups about these respect at work laws. I am very supportive of these values that should be held in the workplace. When the delay was originally announced on 14 March, the Human Rights Commissioner, Scott McDougall, said he was 'bewildered' by the decision. We were all bewildered.

We wanted to hear from the Attorney-General the justification for this. It seems there was a dual justification that was entirely contradictory. Firstly, it was said that these protections were already in place—that they were simply a mirror of the Commonwealth legislation and that no Queenslander had anything to worry about. On the flip side, they were described as incredibly destructive, that they needed to be examined and paused, and that more consultation was needed.

What was especially disappointing was the comments of the member for Clayfield. When asked whether someone should be subject to a hostile work environment on the grounds of sex and whether there should be laws making businesses proactively responsible to ensure a workplace of freedom from sexual harassment, the member for Clayfield described that as 'woke'. We can see the creeping Trump features that have dominated the federal parliament now being force-fed to Clayfield. Peter Dutton's style of campaigning should not be pushed upon the people of Clayfield—where respect for women in the workplace is held up as something that is destructive, not something that is respectful, not something that is careful, not something that is conservative and not something that is absolutely Australian. Instead, we see the member for Clayfield introducing these types of terms from the worst of American politics. We need to ask young women who are in the workforce in Clayfield: is that the type of leader they want?

(Time expired)

Mr JKELLY: There is only one place I enjoy being more than in the Queensland parliament, and that is marching with my comrades in the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union on Labour Day—and won't this be a topic of discussion on Monday! I want to pick up the comments of the member for Logan. I was shocked, as a former union official, as a former union delegate, as a nearly 40-year union member—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No quarrelling, member for McConnel.

Mr J KELLY: To me it was quite shocking to hear that raising concerns for women, or anyone for that matter, being sexually harassed and intimidated at work is being labelled as 'woke' or 'wokeism'. I thought we had moved a lot further along than that in the tone of our debate. I got a letter not long ago from a good friend of mine for many years Jacqueline King. I am sure members all got the same letter. This quote stood out to me—

These changes align Queensland's anti-discrimination laws with other Australian jurisdictions and shift us closer to a culture of prevention rather than punishment after the fact.

I think we should all consider that. The LNP were elected on a platform of improving community safety. Workplaces are actually part of the community as well. Unfortunately, some of us spend a lot more time in our workplaces than in our community. It is vitally important that, if you are going to improve, campaign on and deliver community safety, you need to deliver that in workplaces as well.

I was shocked to find out that Queensland is behind other Australian jurisdictions. With the LNP in charge Queensland workers better get used to that. We are not going to be winning too many state of origins with this LNP government in power. We are certainly not going to be winning too many awards. It is to the detriment of Queensland workers that the LNP are in charge and are taking us back in this particular manner.

By putting through these amendments, we are preventing a real change in culture that could be happening in our workplaces. Quite frankly, as a union official I do not want to go and support people who have been sexually harassed or intimidated at work. I would much rather never get that call. I would much rather we have a culture, just as we have built in workplace health and safety, where we do our utmost to prevent injuries and death before they occur. We have that opportunity to do this here. It seems like we are squandering that opportunity. Sadly, Queensland workers will suffer once again under an LNP government.

(Time expired)

Mr McDONALD: I rise tonight to speak on this respect at work amendment, and hasn't it been interesting? I must say that this is Labor politics 101. We talk about support for workers, yet the fear and control that the Labor Party has put in place through a number of policy decisions over the years comes out to play again tonight. In contrast, our Attorney-General is moving very considered and calm amendments to this bill to delay things, not to lose any rights for workers—

Ms Mullen: Delay.

Mr McDONALD: Exactly. I take the interjection from the member for Jordan. It is about delay. It is about a pause. As the first law officer of the state said in a ministerial statement a number of weeks ago, this is about a respectful pause to consider this legislation and to make sure there are no unintended consequences of the legislation that was rushed through by the former government in the dying days of the Miles government.

Again, I support the Attorney's amendment. It is a calm and considered amendment to make sure that we do not have any unintended consequences. We are not playing politics. This is about people.

Mrs Poole: People over politics.

Mr McDONALD: I take that interjection from the member. This is about people over politics. I am proud to be a member of the Crisafulli government that has offered and promised a fresh start for Queensland. For those Queenslanders who supported a fresh start, we are doing what we said we would do. This is a very responsible move by the Attorney-General to make sure that there are no unintended consequences. I must say to those opposite who want to jump up and talk about this debate: do not cause fear in the community or for workers because that is what you are doing. You should not be doing that. There is absolutely no basis to that. This is another example of talking about things instead of having a solution.

Get on the side of the people and support those Queenslanders who supported a new government, a fresh start. Let's make sure we continue to be a calm and considered government putting real solutions in place for Queenslanders—not the fear and control that those opposite want to govern by. Please, let's be sensible about this. Let's make sure we put people over politics and put real and genuine solutions in place.

Mr BERKMAN: I need to take this opportunity to spend another three minutes on amendment 14. At the outset let's just call this what it really is. This is nothing more than a capitulation by this government to the hard right of the LNP.

Government members interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: It has to be clear-eyed to start with. This is a watered-down version. The initial bill was already a watered-down version of what the Human Rights Commission recommended in the *Building belonging* report. That version of the report still allowed religious institutions, including schools, to discriminate and to carry on with discrimination in these religious settings in a way that would not be allowed in other contexts.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There is too much noise in the chamber.

Ms McMillan interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: I will take the interjection from the member for Mansfield. It is straight up and down taking direction from the Australian Christian Lobby. I have to be honest: I was a bit disappointed that Labor was not prepared to take on the churches in the lead-up to the election and that we did end up with a watered-down version, but for this government now to pause the introduction of those protections that were included in their respect at work amendments is truly disgraceful.

For all of the crocodile tears and posturing about how much they care for victims of domestic and family violence earlier today, they are now going to remove those very protections that would have applied to people who might be discriminated against on the basis of domestic and family violence. The last thing a person experiencing domestic and family violence needs is to risk discrimination at their workplace. The last thing a person experiencing homelessness needs is to be stripped of protections in their workplace.

I am truly baffled by the Attorney-General's commitment to work with stakeholders. I would first of all ask: why not work with them now? Why can we not just leave these protections to commence when they are supposed to? Secondly, if the protections are so unnecessary and duplicative, are we hearing nothing but hollow platitudes about how she will work with stakeholders in the future? It is

absolute nonsense. A ministerial statement is no substitute for the opportunity for submitters to engage in a committee inquiry process to give detailed perspectives on their views and to outline why it is they think these protections should remain.

I have nearly run out of time. Far out, the member for Clayfield banging on about wokeism in his electorate, of all electorates! If there was ever a blue electorate in this state that was going to reject Trumpism and the rot that Dutton is bringing to politics, it is surely his.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the former member for Sandgate is in the gallery and I would like to acknowledge his presence here in the House.

Ms GRACE: They belled the cat tonight, because when the health minister got up—the health minister, mind you, who is really about mental health and all of that in the workplace, the home and the family—and called this wokeism, I thought: it is absolutely unbelievable that that is what they really believe about these changes.

This morning we heard from some of their female ministers. I have not heard from many of them tonight, but this morning we heard, through all of their feigned tears, about domestic and family violence, how it is out of control, what is happening and how we need to protect the workplace, yet we are tonight indefinitely delaying laws that have been passed by this House. There is no plan. There is no ‘give me time to have further talks with stakeholders’ because they are already covered anyway. They cannot have it both ways. You cannot say ‘you’re already covered’ and then say ‘we’re not going to do the laws’. Which one is it? They are missing the point. The Attorney-General and all of those members over there are missing the point. This is about prevention. This is about strengthening existing obligations on businesses, government and organisations to prevent discrimination and harassment.

We heard enough from the Minister for Youth Justice earlier today with her crocodile tears about domestic violence, sexual harassment, abuse and safety in the workplace, yet here they are voting against the very laws that will protect those women. Not one of them is getting up here tonight to defend what they said. It is so hypocritical it is not funny.

As I said, they belled the cat in relation to that with the health minister—the health minister—in this state getting up and talking about these amendments as wokeism. As a woman in this place, having to listen to that and seeing the crocodile tears from those opposite is an absolute disgrace. The Attorney-General stood up and said that Labor never consulted. There were four years of consultation to get to where we were—four years of consultation! Stakeholders came forward and went through the committee process, and now we have amendments being brought into this place to pause the laws indefinitely. My question to the Attorney-General is: how long is this pause going to be? What prevention are we going to offer women in the workplace? What are we going to tell stakeholders? Will the minister please answer the question? What is the timeframe in her mind in relation to these delays?

Ms ASIF: Not only is the government introducing rushed amendments; they also continue to not listen to workers. They continue to not listen to the women and men of Queensland, those who have been calling for these laws to be in place. The former government consulted on these laws for years. The *Respect@Work* report talks about the fact that 77 per cent of workers are harassed at work. These are not just statistics; these are people who have been impacted by harassment at work. Almost every woman and one in four men are harassed at work. This amendment pauses the laws that were due to come into effect. It is shocking.

What is even more shocking is that the health minister, someone whom Queenslanders should be able to rely on when it comes to these things, stood in this place and called it wokeism. I do not understand. What is woke about the fact that you want to protect women and men in this state from harassment, sexual harassment and racism in the workplace? This is shocking. It is horrific. I expect better, even from those opposite. Queenslanders put a lot of trust in us in this place to protect them. I have been out in my community talking to women and men who, quite frankly, cannot believe these laws are being delayed. There has been ample consultation. There has been lots of consultation on this. There has been report after report. These laws were due to come in. The Human Rights Commissioner had a lot to say about this. He said—

To pause the implementation of all these changes due to a concern about one aspect of the reforms, with no notice and no concerns previously having been raised with us, is a disproportionate response.

He also said—

Overwhelmingly, the Commission heard that discrimination and harassment cause significant harm and that the system as it stands ...

needs to change.

What else do these laws that are being delayed do? We also do not know for how long they will be paused. Is it indefinite? When will they be put in place? There are no answers. I cannot support this amendment. I do not think the opposition can support this amendment. We will be voting against it. I am very disappointed not only at this decision by the state government but also the manner in which this announcement was made. Did you tell anyone this was going to happen?

Mr SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair.

Ms ASIF: I am sorry, Mr Speaker. I am not sure if the minister consulted or reported on this. This is appalling. The men and women of Queensland deserve better.

Mrs Frecklington: Yes, they do deserve better.

Ms ASIF: They do. They deserve better than how you are performing. I could not agree more with the member for Logan. This is nothing but leaning into words, far rightism, and I cannot support this amendment.

Mr KATTER: I shut down my TikTok account a couple of years ago, but my wife went on to look at some things that were put on about me the other week. She said, 'There's some horrible stuff said about you on that TikTok. Crikey, there are some vitriolic people on there. Why would people dislike you so much?' I think I am a pretty well-behaved bloke and I am pretty compassionate, but there are other people with separate sets of standards out there judging me. That is fine, but I do not know these people in the Human Rights Commission. I did not elect them, but they are going to be judging and arbitrating on what I say in the workplace. They will be looking over my shoulder and someone might take offence at something I do.

I act in good faith; most of us do. Most people in the workplace are trying to be good. We do not need to legislate everything on the planet. Most of us operate with goodwill so we do not need to come in and intrude on everyone's lives and look over everyone's shoulder every day of the week and see what we are saying and then have someone in the Human Rights Commission who I do not know telling me, 'You shouldn't be saying that because this government decided on some rules and standards that we all agree to.' I did not agree to them. I have a separate set of standards to all of these people on TikTok who are abusing the hell out of me. I have a separate set of standards.

I am sure I would agree with the member for Clayfield. There is a wave of wokeism. People might not agree with my values. If I come in and talk about abortion, I hear, 'That's terrible and disgusting.' Well, they are my values and I should have the ability to say that. It might be offensive to the Human Rights Commissioner or someone at work, but that is how we learn to live with each other and appreciate each other. There should be a level of tolerance there. I do not want these people watching me in the workplace, bearing down on me.

I think the position that has been taken on this to remove that out of it has been a strong move. It was a scary thing put in the parliament when this came in. We in the KAP are glad to see the end of this. The more intrusions from these outside influences imposing these so-called new values on us and into our laws—and there is a large influence of this wokeism coming into this parliament and our laws—the more the KAP are going to oppose it.

Ms BOURNE: I come into this chamber as a new member and a woman to discover that important legislative changes to Queensland's Anti-Discrimination Act, which were due to commence on 1 July this year, have been abandoned on a whim by the LNP after years of work and consultation with stakeholders. These laws were set to introduce a new positive duty on employers to eliminate discrimination, sexual harassment and other objectionable conduct in the workplace, requiring employers to take reasonable and proportionate measures to prevent such unlawful behaviour.

Not only are the LNP rushing through amendments; they are not listening to the experts by delaying these important respect at work laws. This seems to be becoming quite the pattern with this government—'Let's not listen to the experts.' The Human Rights Commissioner is bewildered, all the stakeholders that were consulted are bewildered and, quite frankly, I am bewildered as well. The Australian Workers' Union's Stacey Schinnerl said that one in three Australian workers have experienced sexual harassment in the workplace in the last five years. She went on to say that all workers deserve to be safe from sexual harassment at their work. The Queensland Council of Unions' General Secretary, Jacqueline King, said that the passing of the respect at work legislation in 2024 was a historic milestone for workers' physical, mental and emotional safety, placing a crucial onus on every Queensland employer to stamp out sex-based harassment and discrimination in the workplace.

I do not know about other women in this chamber, but I do not think there would be too many of us who have not been a victim of some sort of sexual harassment in the workplace. I know I have. It is not on and in no way is it acceptable in any workplace. As a victim of domestic and family violence, I

feel ashamed that the LNP would choose to do this to such an important piece of legislation that was consulted on so thoroughly. Why shouldn't businesses, organisations and government agencies have a legal requirement to prevent harmful conduct, rather than respond to problems after they occur? This is completely unacceptable. Shame on those opposite who use domestic and family violence in such a political way in this chamber. I oppose this amendment and the opposition will be voting against it.

Mr MELLISH: Not only are the government introducing rushed amendments; they also continue to fail to listen to the experts, with this bill delaying important respect at work laws. When the delay was announced, the Queensland Human Rights Commissioner, Scott McDougall, said he was 'bewildered' by the decision. What has the government got against including in the definition subjecting someone to a work environment that is hostile on the grounds of sex and making businesses responsible for proactively ensuring a workplace is free of sexual harassment? This is what the member for Clayfield has called wokeism. Is he going to come in here in a 'Make Ascot Great Again' hat? You would think what is going on in America would steer him away from that sort of language, but for the member for Clayfield—

Ms Fentiman: He won't answer questions about women's health either.

Mr MELLISH: Absolutely. He will not answer questions about women's health; I will take that interjection from the member for Waterford. For someone who is supposedly from the moderate wing of the former Liberal Party over there to come out with that sort of language on an amendment such as this is pretty disappointing. As the Human Rights Commissioner said—

Overwhelmingly, the Commission heard that discrimination and harassment cause significant harm and that the system as it stands lacks a preventative focus, instead relying on people who have been impacted by discrimination and harassment to bring complaints in order for the law to be enforced.

He went on to say—

I am very disappointed, not only at this decision by the state government but by the manner of its announcement and the lack of engagement with my Commission and the many other stakeholders who have been preparing for the changes.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Quarrelling across the chamber will stop.

Mr MELLISH: This goes to a creeping arrogance we are seeing from those opposite. We are hearing the member for Currumbin laughing at the moment about these important amendments.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, I will not warn you again.

Mr MELLISH: We are hearing from this government that these rushed changes are without consultation and not going to the committee. We are hearing particularly from the Attorney-General a creeping arrogance coming in. We see it with the Queensland Redistribution Commission and we see it here today. This government are testing it to see how far they can go. We oppose this amendment.

Mr BUTCHER: Mr Speaker.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Attorney-General.

Mr Butcher: Oh! I've been duded.

Mr SPEAKER: Are you disputing my ruling?

Mr Butcher: No.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you have the call.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I have been asked a few questions here and I have been listening to the repetition in the speeches, with the same notes being handed around to many speakers. There are some things that I want to put on the record in relation to this amendment. Firstly, I will read a quote—

While the Anti-Discrimination Act is a broad-based piece of discrimination law at the state level, work related discrimination law is also covered by a number of federal discrimination laws, the most predominant in terms of work related discrimination being the Sex Discrimination Act and the Disability Discrimination Act, as well as the Fair Work Act and the Queensland Industrial Relations Act in terms of general protection laws and discrimination in those fields.

That is a direct quote from the General Secretary of the Queensland Council of Unions, Ms Jacqueline King, during the very short committee process examining the Queensland Labor Party's respect at work bill. Ms King also told the former committee—before the former Labor government rammed its bill through parliament—that there should be further consultation with stakeholders with regard to religious occupations exemptions in Queensland. I go on and I quote Ms King—

Ms Scanlon interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I beg your pardon. I will take the interjection; I am happy to take it. I am quoting from the General Secretary of the Council of Unions. I have not mentioned that but she has so I will go on.

Ms Scanlon interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: When you interject, if you do it a little louder, we can take it. I will go on continuing to quote Ms King. She said—

I think there needs to be a communication process where people can come together a little bit more closely.

That was from the head of the Queensland Council of Unions. The former government even ignored the advice of their own union paymasters in legislating these ill-considered changes to Queensland's anti-discrimination laws. I will go on.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The shadow treasurer wants me to take her interjection but I will read another quote from the *Building belonging* report at page 130. It said—

After in-depth consultations, consideration of submissions and legal research, we have concluded that the current sexual harassment laws in Queensland are working well, and substantially cover the situations that Respect@Work sought to address in the federal jurisdiction. For this reason, we recommend that the sexual harassment provisions of the Act remain unchanged, and that education and awareness about the law and its coverage is increased.

I will go on. Because the Human Rights Commissioner has been verballed by those opposite in this chamber, I would like to make a direct quote from the Human Rights Commissioner, who said—

I also appreciate your desire to take a robust approach to the reforms. You rightly point out that the RaW Act, as passed, was not afforded the full consultation process, as it was an alternative iteration of the draft Anti-Discrimination Bill 2024 (AD Bill) released for public consultation in February 2024 while the RaW Act was subject to a parliamentary committee process. I also appreciate that many amendments were moved during the consideration in detail stage of its debate in the Legislative Assembly, and those elements—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The cross-chamber—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, you are warned.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will continue quoting the Human Rights Commissioner who said—

... while the RAW Act was subject to a parliamentary committee process. I also appreciate that many amendments were moved during the consideration in detail stage of its debate in the Legislative Assembly, and those elements were not subject to legislative scrutiny.

We all in this House have one goal, and that is to protect women, to protect children and to protect Queenslanders—we all have that goal—but from these quotes—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are now warned.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: These quotes are from the head of the Council of Unions and I have just read in the chamber the other quote, and it would be appear there is the acknowledgement that there was not the consultation. Those opposite so misleadingly informed the House—a member opposite said 'for four years'. When? With whom? Certainly not with the government departments of which so many of them purportedly were ministers.

I think we have given more than adequate time to the debate of this amendment. I have been able to put to rest the arguments, or lack thereof, around consultation because it is very clear that that did not happen, and it is very clear, from the quoted words of Ms Jacqueline King, General Secretary of the Queensland Council of Unions—

Ms Fentiman: She supported the bill.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Shadow treasurer, I will take that interjection. That is because it is the Labor Party that moved it. These are her quotes directly from the committee report.

I have been listening to the debate. It is all becoming repetitious. Therefore, under section 88, I move—

That the question be now put.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 53:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 33:

ALP, 31—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 53:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 33:

ALP, 31—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clauses—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (8.20 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 15 circulated in my name—

15 After clause 34

Page 32, after line 21—

insert—

Division 6 Amendment of Youth Justice Act 1992

55 Act amended

This division amends the *Youth Justice Act 1992*.

56 Amendment of s 6 (Meaning of criminal history of a child)

(1) Section 6(1)(d), after 'orders'—

insert—

, other than interim orders,

(2) Section 6(4)—

insert—

interim order means an order made by—

(a) a magistrate under section 252D(5); or

(b) a court under 252E(3)(c) or (4).

57 Amendment of s 439 (Criminal histories)

- (1) Section 439(1)(b), after 'commencement'—

insert—

to the extent the finding of guilt formed part of the child's criminal history under former section 154

- (2) Section 439(1)(d), from 'judicial officer'—

omit, insert—

judicial officer—

- (i) in relation to a community based order for a child, includes a decision, finding or order made, or action taken, under former section 245, 246, 246A or 247 before the commencement; or
- (ii) in relation to a child's contravention of a supervised release order, does not include a decision, finding or order made, or action taken, under former section 252D, 252E or 252F before the commencement.

These amendments to the Youth Justice Act are clarifying in nature to ensure the appropriate information—in particular, in relation to restorative justice agreements and breaches in variations of community based orders—is captured on a child's criminal history. Let's remember that under those opposite a child's criminal history was not tendered to the court when they became an adult.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer to sessional order No. 13 relating to dress standards in the House and I draw your attention to the Leader of the Opposition.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have order in the House. Attorney-General, you have the call.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: What we are talking about here is a child's criminal history being tendered in a court. As I was saying, let's not forget that under those opposite a child's criminal history was not even tendered to the courts when they became an adult. That is unlike the provision in our new Making Queensland Safer Laws. It is a shame that some of those opposite have the audacity to criticise our amendments, given the effect they are having on some sentences. We know that youth crime is out of control in Queensland. We know there has been a decade of hardcore criminals. I will give a few more of the comments that we have heard from magistrates to assist those opposite support this amendment. One stated—

The laws have really been a game changer because his criminal history with regard to the court will follow him. They won't be blind to your past which happened previously.

One teenager was told by a magistrate that he is in a different world now that he is 18. They went on to say—

You are the first person I have sentenced under this new regime which means I do now look at your criminal history and you have an appalling criminal history.

That is taken into account when sentencing. We know that those opposite had to be dragged kicking and screaming to support the original Making Queensland Safer Bill. This bill simply amends the Youth Justice Act to clarify the transitional approach and scope of certain entries on a child's criminal history to better align with the position pre-commencement.

Ms FARMER: The opposition will be supporting this amendment because we have to mop up the sloppy approach they have had to the Making Queensland Safer Laws. The Making Queensland Safer Laws were rushed through at the end of last year because if they rushed them through youth crime was going to go down by Christmas. It was actually going to be zero by Christmas. That is why we had to rush those laws through. Hundreds of stakeholders submitted to the committee. They said, 'Could we please just have a bit more time to make sure there are no unintended consequences and no loopholes? Please give us a bit of time.' We moved to have a bit more time, but that was not allowed. The laws were rushed through because we had to have zero crime by Christmas, which, of course, was never going to happen.

Then they brought in the second tranche just a couple of weeks ago because they forgot to put a whole lot of things in the first tranche. Basically, the second tranche has a whole lot of other technical issues, so they have to fix up those. I heard the Attorney-General talk earlier about one of the amendments and she was questioned about why she was putting it in in such a hurry. She said, 'This was the next piece of legislation and it made sense to do it.' It sounds like a good argument, but the other legislation was introduced a couple of weeks ago. It is still before the House. They are so bereft of any organisation or any kind of order about this—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance in relation to the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the member to speak to the particular amendment before us.

Ms FARMER: If they were on top of their game, this amendment could have been included in the bill that was introduced just a few weeks ago and that the committee is looking at now. They stuffed it up so much the first time that you would think they would have learned. We have to fix up all these things in the second bill. They must have realised in the last couple of weeks, 'No, we have forgotten this other thing.'

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I will bring you back to the amendment. You are supposed to speak to the amendment.

Ms FARMER: The amendment fixes up a mess that they did not even realise existed until a couple of weeks ago. We will support it because they are so sloppy. Could we actually make sure that they have everything right when we pass the next bill so we do not have to keep coming back with amendments they forgot?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: The Attorney-General has the call.

Mr de BRENNI: I move—

That the member for Gaven be heard.

Division: Question put—That the member for Gaven be heard.

AYES, 32:

ALP, 27—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McMillan, Mellish, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

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

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The main reason I rose to my feet is the shadow minister, the former youth justice minister, was talking about how all of these amendments were fix-ups. They are: they are Labor fix-ups. The evidence amendment is a Labor fix-up, the DNA amendments are a big Labor fix-up and the youth crime and youth justice amendments are a decade-long Labor fix-up. That is exactly why. The point of this bill, the CCC reporting powers bill, is to make one of the biggest Labor fix-ups we have ever seen.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I wonder whether the Attorney-General is speaking to the amendment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am responding—

Mr SPEAKER:—to the amendment. We are close to a finish.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In relation to the amendment that we are dealing with here today, I have heard what the shadow minister has said. I do note that she does not necessarily have the support of everyone because, even when the division was called, a few members opposite were missing. That is probably because they are—

Ms Mullen: Can't speak to it.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Because you do not want to speak to it, sorry?

Ms Scanlon: You won't let us speak to it.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You are welcome to. Jump up.

Ms FARMER: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance as to whether the Attorney-General is actually speaking to the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you will speak to the amendment.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The amendment is in relation to the Youth Justice Act. This debate is getting extremely repetitious. Therefore, under standing order 88, I move—


That the question be now put.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (8.35 pm): I move—


That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (8.36 pm): I move amendments Nos 16 and 17 circulated in my name—

16 Long title

Long title, after 'amend'—

insert—

the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991,

17 Long title

Long title, 'and the *Crime and Corruption and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024*'—

omit, insert—

, the Crime and Corruption and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024, the Evidence Act 1977, the Forensic Science Queensland Act 2024, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024 and the Youth Justice Act 1992

Amendments agreed to.

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


Motion agreed to.

TRUSTS BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 14 March (see p. 583), on motion of Mrs Frecklington—


That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (8.36 pm): I rise to make what will, I expect, be a fairly brief contribution to the debate on the Trusts Bill. We had a very lengthy introductory speech from the Attorney-General which I think covered off on just about anything and everything that might be discussed about this bill. There is very little about this bill that is especially contentious, so there is little in addition to the committee report that I would add. While it is a relatively uncontentious bill, it is incredibly technical. As the Attorney-General mentioned when introducing the bill, it is a very important bill. It is the kind of legislation that is likely to stick around with us for a very long time and it is one of those areas of law that does not tend to matter to you until it does and then it really matters; the detail matters. Let's all be honest, it is pretty dry material, but it is important. I think I am one of, I will accept, far too many lawyers in this place who have had to endure all 11 of the Priestley 11 including equity and trusts. This is an area that clearly is important for anyone with a legal background to be familiar with.

It is noteworthy, though, that the Queensland Law Reform Commission's review of this area, the review of trusts law in Queensland, was completed 12 years ago. It is a piece of legislation that we want to deal with, that we want to get through. I do struggle a little bit with the suggestion and the fact that the committee was required to deal with this as an urgent piece of legislation. After waiting 12 years we then, as a committee, the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, had to deal with it in only 2½ weeks. As always, I take my hat off to the committee secretariat for all of the work they did in getting the report prepared—and to my fellow committee members. We had 2½ weeks to deal with that. It was introduced on 18 February. We had a grand total of 2½ weeks to report back by 7 March including, mind you, the period during which everyone in South-East Queensland was bracing and battening the hatches, getting ready for ex-Tropical Cyclone Alfred to come through. Anyway, we got through it. Everyone put their skates on, we got the report done and we reported back on 7 March. Here we are now more than seven weeks later debating the bill that was so urgent we only had 18 days during which to conduct an inquiry.

The truth of it is that the report was considered urgent because there is nothing else going on. The government has no agenda. In fact, it is interesting to look at the *Notice Paper* because, having completed the crime and corruption bill, we are now down to a lonely two bills left on the *Notice Paper* which I think speaks to the complete absence of any urgency or any real agenda in what this government is putting forward. We spent I do not know how many hours the last sitting or the week before that debating a bill that changed a single digit in an act. On the one hand we are dealing with really significant last-minute amendments that are tacked on the back of the crime and corruption reporting powers legislation that we have just completed and on the other hand we are spending all those hours—a complete committee inquiry and all those hours—to change a single digit to extend a trial period for electronic monitoring devices so we can strap GPS monitors to kids' ankles. We need to contrast that with this bill which had to happen in such a big hurry 13 years after the review made the recommendations that we are now legislating.

I will leave it at that because, again, there is not a great deal that is especially contentious about the bill, but we cannot just settle for the idea or be satisfied as a parliament with the idea that—and I have made the same criticism of the former Labor government in the prior seven years that I have been here—parliamentary process goes out the window whenever it is convenient for the government of the day or whenever the timeframes that the government wants to meet are the priority rather than the process. We already have an extraordinary democratic deficit here in Queensland without an upper house where whoever takes the clear majority on the government benches can literally do whatever they like. We are not just talking about the policy and the legislative program; we are talking about the rules of engagement, the rules of how this place operates. I have said it before and I will say it again: anyone who wants to feign respect for this institution needs to at least uphold those most bare minimum of standards that are enshrined in the state Constitution Act and our standing and sessional orders.

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (8.42 pm): Not everyone thinks trusts are exciting. Some might even say that they are a little bit boring but, as any parent who has watched too much *Bluey* can tell you—and I confess I am one of those parents—boring things are important. Bandit thought packing the swim bag with hats, sunscreen, goggles and the rest was boring and a constraint on his spontaneity but, when the kids found themselves forced into the ever-shrinking shade, unable to open their eyes underwater and without their favourite pool toys, they learned the hard lesson that often doing the boring things right is important, because sometimes they really are.

As I used to tell my students in equity and trusts at Central Queensland University back when I was teaching there, trusts are economically and personally really important. They are useful and necessary to having a diverse and thriving economy. Do you have superannuation? Whether it is in a big fund or a private one, you use trusts. When a person passes away, trusts are the way that their assets are distributed in accordance with their wishes. The testamentary trust is a vital mechanism in the law of wills and estates. Family businesses so often depend on them. The agricultural sector of our economy absolutely finds them vital. Commercial trusts are an important vehicle for growing our economy, whether they are conducting business or holding assets efficiently.

Australia-wide, in 2022 there were almost a million trusts that lodged tax returns. That is almost as many tax returns as were lodged for companies and it represents one trust for approximately every 28 people in this country. I accept that a few years have passed since then and we are talking about Queensland alone, but it gives you a sense of the scale and of their economic importance. So this bill matters and I would suggest that it is a lot more interesting than it seems. It replaces the Trusts Act

1973 with modernised and simplified trust legislation and it is aimed at streamlining and enhancing the law of trusts in Queensland to meet modern needs and address some gaps in the law as it presently stands.

If we wanted evidence that those opposite do not understand the economic significance of having a trust regime that really works, that is easy to understand and that operates efficiently and fairly, then take a look at the timeline for the implementation of this reform. The Queensland Law Reform Commission was asked to look into the detail of what was needed in the law of trusts way back in 2013. That request was made following considerable feedback given to the then LNP government about the ways in which Queensland's trusts regime was archaic and inaccessible for ordinary people. After all, at the time it had not been reviewed or updated for a period of some 40 years. The then attorney-general, the member for Kawana, referred the matter to expert lawyers at the Queensland Law Reform Commission, and they did a fine job of reviewing the act clause by clause, critically examining it and recommending the precise changes that were needed to maximise clarity and productivity.


That review was delivered in December 2013. Twelve years have passed—12 years. That means that it is more than 50 years since this area of law got the attention it deserves and it tells us everything we need to know about how Labor either does not understand or does not prioritise the hard work that is needed to make the law clear and accessible—the hard work that is needed to streamline our economy as a route to help people prosper—that it did absolutely nothing with it. A decade-old Labor government came and went and this work was not completed. In fact, it did not even start it, and that is in the context of all of the heavy lifting really having been done by the Law Reform Commission. Now we are just a few months into a new LNP government and already our Attorney has done more with this than three Labor attorneys over three terms could muster.

Here is some of the detail of what the bill does. It does not codify all of the aspects of trust law, but it supplements and clarifies the common-law position. It grants broad powers to trustees to deal with trust property and imposes new minimum statutory duties on trustees to exercise care, diligence and skill that a prudent person of business would exercise in the managing of the affairs of other persons. The role of trustees is a really serious responsibility and there is no sensible reason those standards should be any less. The bill provides clarity on a range of important matters under trust law like restrictions on the appointment of trustees, the appointment and discharge and removal of trustees, the devolution of trusts, trustees' duties and the general powers of trustees. It provides guidance concerning: the maintenance of trust property, indemnities and the protection of trustees and other persons; the remuneration of trustees; court powers; and charitable trusts and gifts by particular trustees for philanthropic purposes. The bill also includes an ability for the District Court to hear applications for certain matters involving trust property, subject to the jurisdictional limit of the court, which at the present time is \$750,000.

The bill will provide for a court to be able to modify a charitable trust's terms if the original purpose becomes impossible or impractical to fulfil, ensuring that those funds are used for a charitable purpose as close to the original intent as is possible. There are also some other changes that reflect comments from the community and the legal profession that were flushed out in the course of the committee's consideration. For example, the bill ensures that if a person is appointed as both an executor and a trustee of a will the person's renunciation of or failure to apply for probate of a will does not affect any express trust that has been established under that will. Finally, the bill responds to a technical issue that was raised by the Queensland Law Society by including a regulation-making power so that there is enough flexibility in the listing of certain entities as eligible recipients. What that really means is a streamlining to ensure there is consistency in the way this part of the bill or the act will operate as between the state and the Commonwealth approach.

There is an important point to make here and it is that this is really important micro-economic reform. It really matters that this is a bill that is able to be easily understood, that we are doing the work that is needed to make sure we are ever improving the efficiency of every aspect of our economy. It is about getting those one percenters that together drive more productivity and more opportunity that feeds the prosperity of ordinary households. It is yet another piece in the puzzle of setting the conditions for the economic growth and the success of this state. It is about us getting the rules of the game right so that this is a productive and efficient place in which to trade, a place in which the laws are simple enough and clear enough for people of all walks of life to be able to understand and use them and attractive for people to be able to invest in all that Queensland has to offer.

That matters because it is when all of the pieces of that puzzle come together it will increase every Queenslanders' purchasing power and their prosperity. It is for that reason I have great enthusiasm for this bill, not just because boring things are important but because this is important micro-economic reform.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (8.51 pm): This bill, as we have heard, is a reintroduction of one the previous government brought to the House. However, it lapsed prior to the election. Briefly, the bill rewrites trust laws in Queensland, completely replacing the 1973 act with what is described as new, modernised and simplified trusts legislation. This followed an extensive review by the Queensland Law Reform Commission. The department stated that the bill largely retains and re-enacts many of the existing provisions in the act in modern drafting and plain English, all the while continuing the application of well-settled trusts laws.

There was extensive consultation undertaken by the QLRC in developing this bill during a review conducted from January 2012 to February 2013. Yes, it was a long time ago and in its first version last year there were only five submissions. However, in reintroducing this bill the government has provided a consultation process so brief it is quite indefensible. The bill has changed since then, maybe only in a small way, maybe not. Who knows. The explanatory note has no section outlining the differences, with the minister stating that this bill substantially, although not completely, reflects the lapsed bill. The minister, however, does note a set of changes from the old version of the bill, including in response to concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society, the Society of Trust and Estate Practitioners, or STEP, and the Public Trustee of Queensland, and also there was a small technical amendment requested by the Queensland Freemasons. Whether this was all of the changes we do not know. As STEP pointed out, the consultation period for this bill was ridiculously short. It is worth quoting them in detail, especially as this involved volunteers. They said—

... in reality the time-frame for making submissions is so short as to be illusory.

...

We are told that that 2024 Bill 'largely mirrored the current Bill being considered by the committee with some key amendments'.

There is no indication of what those 'key amendments' are.

Then they go on—

The present Bill is 221 pages in length. We have been given:

...

three business days to make whatever additional submissions we might wish to make.

They continue on—

Our volunteers have not had the capacity to do a clause-by-clause comparison of the 2024 Bill and the present 2025 Bill.

...

Our silence should not be taken as support for the Bill in its present form; it simply reflects what is possible in a volunteer organisation—


I reiterate—

... a volunteer organisation on three business days' notice.

We are disappointed that such an important piece of legislation is being treated in this way.

They were right to be disappointed—and so should we all, given that literally on one hand the government is asking what is it going to take to retain volunteers and then on the other it is putting them through this type of duress.

The QLRC, as I said, began its review in 2012. The bill has been over a decade in the making, hence there is no reason to rush now at the last moment. The Queensland Law Society also raised that three days for consultation on a 221-page bill with no detail on what has been changed does not amount to meaningful consultation. The committee report was published on 7 March and while it considered issues raised by submitters it made no recommendations for change. This is not the way to conduct business if we want to engage and listen to Queenslanders. The bill should have come with a page-by-page comparison with the last version of the bill or the consultation should have been four weeks at a minimum. I want to thank the committee and secretariat who had to conduct such a rushed inquiry and the submitters, including those volunteers in those organisations who had such a thankless task in trying to respond in three business days. Really, we must do much better. Thank you.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (8.55 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Trusts Bill 2025, a piece of legislation that represents a significant and long-overdue reform of Queensland's trust law. This bill is not only necessary and timely, but also foundational to ensuring that our legal framework for trusts reflects modern community values, commercial practices and the evolving needs of Queenslanders across generations. For too long, Queensland has operated under the Trusts Act 1973, legislation that, while once adequate, has over the decades become outdated, overly complex and increasingly misaligned with contemporary legal, financial and social contexts. The Trusts Bill 2025 replaces that act with a modern, simplified and accessible framework underpinned by extensive legal research and public consultation.

The journey to this reform began more than a decade ago when the Queensland Law Reform Commission undertook a comprehensive review of trust law in Queensland, with its final report delivered in December 2013. That review laid the foundation for many of the policy objectives and legislative principles that are now embedded in this bill. Further momentum was provided by the 2024 inquiry conducted by the former Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee. That inquiry was thorough and consultative and provided valuable insights into how a reformed trust law should operate in practice. The Housing, Big Build and Manufacturing Committee's report, tabled on 2 August 2024, informed the bill that was introduced in 2024 but did not proceed. Importantly, many of the provisions of the lapsed Trusts Bill 2024 have been incorporated into this current bill.

Given the urgency of progressing this reform, the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee was tasked with an expedited review of the current bill. The committee appropriately focused its efforts on new, amended or previously unexamined provisions, while adopting earlier recommendations where relevant. The Trusts Bill 2025 is built around three core aims: modernisation—updating language and structure to make trust law more accessible and intuitive for both legal professionals and laypersons; simplification—removing obsolete provisions and streamlining procedures; and legal clarity and fairness—ensuring that the law supports the practical realities of trust administration today while preserving fairness and flexibility.

Trusts are a common mechanism for managing property and assets. Many Australians use them and, indeed, some members of this House have appropriately declared themselves as beneficiaries of trusts which reminds me that I should have advised the House at the beginning of my contribution that I am a beneficiary of a trust and that this is declared on my register of interests. In an era where public trust is fragile, we must ensure that our legal frameworks keep pace with modern expectations. Australians deserve to have confidence that their trusts are being administered transparently and in the genuine interests of their beneficiaries, not used as vehicles to conceal wealth or evade scrutiny.


Debate, on motion of Mr Russo, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.00 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Federal Election

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (9.00 pm): If you live in suburbs such as Mount Cotton, Sheldon or, in fact, in any of the suburbs across the Redlands, Queensland or Australia, this election is more important than ever and that is why it is so important to think about the dangerous and out-of-touch policies being pushed by Peter Dutton and the Liberal National coalition. Firstly, while families and businesses are trying to keep up with the costs of living and operating, Peter Dutton wants to build risky outdated nuclear technology right next door. He has just revealed his plan to build nuclear reactors in the suburbs of South-East Queensland. He has not asked you. He has not laid out a plan for community consultation. There is no plan for nuclear waste and there is no guarantee for your safety.


Then there is his plan to make essential medicines more expensive. Under Labor we have made over 300 medicines cheaper. We have demonstrated how we will strengthen Medicare because you should not have to choose between putting food on the table and filling a prescription. Peter Dutton's own track record shows that he opposes Medicare. A Dutton government would see you paying more at the pharmacy, more at the GP and more at the hospital. Why punish the elderly, the sick and the working families who are already doing it tough?

If that doesn't make you stop and think, you should not forget about his approach to your tax. Dutton wants you to keep less of what you earn. At every opportunity he has had, he has voted to block cost-of-living relief and he will go even further if elected. There will be more tax on your wages, less support for your kids' education and less support for your family's health.

This election the choice is stark. Peter Dutton's plan is for risky nuclear reactors in your backyard, higher prices for medicines and more tax on working people. That is not the sort of vision I want for the community that I call home. It is the sort of Trump-inspired Australia that the next generation that will call the Redlands home definitely does not want.

This election, choose a candidate that is on your side. Choose a plan to improve wages for working people. Choose more affordable health care and medicines. Choose help for every family to make ends meet. Choose Darcy Brown and Anthony Albanese.

Redland Whitewater Centre

 **Mr FIELD** (Capalaba—LNP) (9.03 pm): I rise to update the House on some very exciting developments for the Redlands region, which is part of Henry Pike's seat by the way. Last month, as part of the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Delivery Plan, the Premier announced that we will deliver the brand new state-of-the-art Redland Whitewater Centre at the Birkdale Community Precinct. The centre will have the eyes of the world on it as we host the paddle sports for the 2032 games. After the games, there will be ample opportunities for local residents to enjoy the facilities, which will act as a hub for outdoor recreation, emergency services training, adventure tourism and water-based activities.

The once-in-a-generation opportunity of the Olympics has brought unprecedented investment into the Redlands, with a joint \$100 million from the state and federal governments for Redland City Council to deliver this tremendous venue. Not only will it bring a world-class facility to our region; it will also create local jobs and attract visitors to our economy. When you put these kinds of facilities anywhere, infrastructure has to follow.


It is clear that this project has accelerated the plans for transport infrastructure in my electorate of Capalaba, which has been at a standstill for the past decade under the neglect of Labor's Don Brown. We all heard plenty of talk from the former member for Capalaba on the topic of infrastructure but, as local residents will often tell me, very little was actually delivered. Voters at the election backed me to deliver for our local area and to crack on with the job of cleaning up the mess that Queenslanders had been saddled with by the former Labor government. The plan for the 2032 Brisbane Olympic Games has been put back on track and we are full steam ahead to deliver a games that Queenslanders can be proud of for generations to come.

With an ambitious proposal such as this, there will always be those in the community who have strong feelings, and I have spoken to many local residents about their concerns regarding this project. I am confident that the long-lasting benefits of this new venue will become clear once we get to experience the world-class recreation, tourism and employment opportunities that the Redland Whitewater Centre is set to offer. Recently, I hosted Alexandra Hills State High School's captains for lunch and they are excited for what is about to come.

The strong level of cooperation between all levels of government on this project has been wonderful to see. I will continue to advocate in any way I can to support this project, including the infrastructure that is needed. Let the games begin!

(Time expired)

Federal Election, One Nation

 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (9.06 pm): I rise to speak about the dangerous alliance between Peter Dutton's federal LNP and the toxic One Nation political party in the 2025 federal election. Let's start with who One Nation really is: a party that has spent decades spewing division and hatred. Standing up in Australia's Parliament House, Pauline Hanson declared that Australia was in danger of being 'swamped by Asians'. She did not stop there. She also called for a ban on Muslim migration, targeting people just because of their religion, vilifying an entire community based on nothing but fear and prejudice. This is the legacy of One Nation: a party that thrives on tearing apart the fabric of our successful multicultural society.

One Nation are a threat to everything we hold dear in Queensland. They have pushed anti-immigration policies, attacked multiculturalism and tried to normalise far-right ideologies that have no place in our diverse state. In electorates like Rankin and Moreton, multicultural communities have built vibrant lives; however, One Nation's toxic ideology threatens to sow discord and fear. They are a menace to our social cohesion and any party that aligns with them should be ashamed.

Let's contrast this with a moment of principle. In 1998, John Howard made the right call—he put One Nation last on the Liberal how-to-vote cards. John Howard put One Nation last. Who else put One Nation last? Scott Morrison put One Nation last. However, what did Peter Dutton do? He decided to give his preferences to One Nation. In Rankin, a vibrant multicultural community, the LNP have given One Nation their second preference. In Moreton, a fantastic multicultural community, they have given One Nation their third preference, just after Family First.

All members here would know that LNP members sing a different tune when they turn up to multicultural events. When they turn up to multicultural events, it is all, 'We support multiculturalism. We support everybody.' Maybe what the LNP says needs to line up with what it does on election day.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): One moment, member for Stretton. Could I remind the members to my right to please address your remarks through the chair. Thank you.

Mr MARTIN: Maybe the LNP should take their own advice.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr MARTIN: Maybe the LNP should do what Scott Morrison did. Maybe they should do what John Howard did, and put One Nation last. That is what they would do if they had any self-respect. I am proud to be part of the Labor Party. We will always put One Nation last. We have never wavered and never compromised because we know what is at stake. We stand for unity, for inclusion and for a Queensland where every community is valued, not vilified.


Mr Mander interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton!

Mr MARTIN: We will keep fighting to ensure that One Nation and their dangerous ideas are relegated to the dustbin of history where they belong. On Saturday, vote for Jim Chalmers in Rankin and Julie-Ann Campbell in Moreton and put One Nation last.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I have asked you to address your comments through the chair. The next interjection you will be on a warning.

Keppel Electorate, Youth Week; Small Business


 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (9.09 pm): Last month students from high schools across Keppel came together to give voice to our next generation. It was Youth Week and the students from St Brendan's College, Yeppoon State High School and St Ursula's College joined me in the Keppel electorate office boardroom. These students, each leaders in their own schools, represented their schools with pride.

It was interesting to make them do just a little bit of work for their lunch. They raised the voice of Keppel's young people. The students were asked to identify challenges for the future. I assumed I would hear about future career choices, potentially the environment or maybe just some students hoping to survive year 12. However, universally our young leaders spoke of cost of living—the impact on themselves, their families and their friends. They spoke about housing—the costs of renting, the high price of homes and home ownership. One of the Post-it notes said, 'Will my generation ever be able to afford a home?'

These priorities are not accidents. These priorities are reflections of the conversation that families are having around the kitchen table in our communities. We have experienced a period of inflation and of house price increases. Queensland has the lowest home ownership rates in the country. After a decade of failed interventions, our Crisafulli LNP government has taken decisive action to add supply into the marketplace which provides opportunities for young people for families and individuals within our communities to share in the Australian dream. It is a fresh start that secures Queensland's housing foundations.

Small business is really big business, and in the Keppel electorate we have some 3,926 businesses, of which 3,800 are small and family businesses. For many, small businesses provide their first job. They teach skills. They provide gifts and donations for local charities, for school sports and for events, and they are the reason that so many choose to remain in their community. In May we come together, and I encourage everyone to thank their brilliant small businesses and make sure they support the small local businesses who support their community.

Fall of Saigon, 50th Anniversary

 **Mrs NIGHTINGALE** (Inala—ALP) (9.12 pm): I want to start by making some observations about how incredibly rude some members in this chamber are. The absolute lack of respect is just screaming across the chamber tonight.

Mr Mander interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Everton, you are now on a warning.

Mrs NIGHTINGALE: Today members of my community have gathered in solemn reflection, to mark a moment that has profoundly shaped generations. Fifty years ago, on 30 April 1975, Saigon fell to communist forces. For many, this date is not just a moment in history; it is a living memory of loss, upheaval and extraordinary courage. This day marked the end of the Vietnam War, but for millions it was the beginning of a long and uncertain journey, fleeing violence, persecution and repression.


Some took to the sea in fragile boats, facing storms, piracy and starvation. Others spent years in refugee camps, unsure if they would ever find peace again. The human cost was staggering: with an estimated 224,000 South Vietnamese soldiers losing their lives, over 600,000 wounded and more than 400,000 civilians perished. These are not just numbers; they are lives, families and futures lost. Yet from that immense suffering came remarkable resilience.

To the Vietnamese-Australian community, your journey did not end when you arrived on these shores. Here, you rebuilt. You raised families. You opened businesses. You became leaders. You brought strength, culture and compassion, and our nation is richer because of you. On behalf of the people of Inala, I thank you.

I also wish to pay tribute to Dr Cuong Bui, former president of the Vietnamese Community in Australia—Queensland Chapter. One of the first Vietnamese refugees to arrive in Australia after the war, he was a pillar of strength for so many. His recent passing is felt deeply, especially on this day. As we honour the past we must also face the present, because the pain remains and the fight for freedom in Vietnam continues.

We must not forget those who still pay a price for fighting for democracy. One of those is Pham Doan Trang, a courageous journalist and human rights advocate who was imprisoned for doing what we so often take for granted: writing freely and dreaming of a better future. Her bravery reminds us that democracy must never be taken for granted. As parliamentarians, we must speak out whether the threat is overt or it comes in the form of the slow erosion of our rights, like we have seen in this place with the silencing of elected voices on vital issues such as reproductive freedoms. Today we remember the fallen and honour those who have fought for democracy.

Redlands Electorate, Anzac Day

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (9.15 pm): I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the schools, service organisations and community members who came together to mark Anzac Day in my electorate of Redlands. In the lead-up to Anzac Day I had the honour of attending remembrance ceremonies at Victoria Point State High School, Thornlands and Redland Bay state schools, as well as being represented at Redlands District Special School.


This year marked 110 years since Anzac soldiers landed at Gallipoli—an event that shaped our nation's identity and forged the values of courage, mateship and sacrifice. It was heartening to see the Anzac legacy alive and well in our school communities. Seeing our young people reflect on the meaning of Anzac Day and the service and sacrifice of our defence personnel gives me great hope for our future that, through their voices, the legacy of our Anzacs will live on.

For me, Anzac Day began with a dawn service that was swiftly moved into a nearby hall as a huge storm swept across the foreshore. Thank you to the Redland Bay RSL for their flexibility in delivering the service. Students, parents, veterans and community members braved the weather to pay their respects. To close out my day I joined the Karragarra Island community for their dusk Anzac service. As the sun set over the bay, residents gathered barefoot on the sand to pay tribute to those

who served and died for our country. A canoe glided across the water, wreath on hand with silence all around. The service was simple, powerful and deeply moving. I also give a heartfelt thankyou to Redlands Florist, which arranged the beautiful wreaths for the Anzac Day ceremonies I attended across Redlands. Their stunning arrangements were a beautiful tribute to honour the memory of our Anzacs.

Finally, I want to acknowledge an exceptional young leader from our community, Cadet Sergeant Aiden Foster of Victoria Point. He was awarded the Cadet Gold Commendation for drafting and designing a national training package that will now be implemented across all Australian Army cadets. This is a remarkable achievement. Aiden serves in the 136 Army Cadet Unit under the leadership of Officer Commanding Captain Paul Golle, one of our local Redland City Council councillors. The commendation was presented by Brigadier David MacCammon, Commander of the Australian Army Cadets, and Lieutenant Colonel Amanda Stowell, both of whom travelled from Canberra to personally recognise Aiden's outstanding contribution.

Nudgee Small Business Awards

 **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (9.18 pm): I really enjoyed hearing the member for Redland's contribution. She was talking about something that really mattered to her and her electorate. That sort of tone is a tone we can set in here of respect. It would be nice if it was returned by some of those individuals opposite. I acknowledge the words and passion of my colleague who was speaking about something that mattered to his electorate when he was rudely interjected on.


Tomorrow signals the first day of May and the beginning of Queensland's Small Business Month—an opportunity to celebrate our local small businesses and the incredible contribution they make to the local community and the broader economy. It also signals the start of the Nudgee Small Business Awards—something I started in the wake of COVID when our local community and businesses needed some encouragement. They were going through a really hard time, so I started these awards and called on our locals to support and lift up small businesses. Many small businesses are owned by local people in our community who employ local people in our community. These businesses also support local charities, our local schools and fundraising efforts with generous donations and raffle prizes.

I was heartened by the community response in the first year I ran the Small Business Awards. After thousands and thousands of votes from my local community poured in for that first year, I continued the awards and the community involvement has continued to grow year on year. Those votes have continued to grow significantly, and the 2025 Nudgee Small Business Awards are now in their fifth year. For many businesses, it is an encouragement. Anyone who has owned or worked in a small business knows how incredibly hard everyone there works. My father owned a small business, my grandparents on both sides owned small businesses, my uncles and my aunts all owned small businesses. The work is never done.

For other local businesses, my Nudgee Small Business Awards are an opportunity to advertise what they are doing. Locals equally love them for this reason as they get to learn about the new businesses that have opened and what they can access in their own backyards. These awards also strive to acknowledge the employees who help these businesses thrive. These employees leave a lasting impression on the customers who use their services and buy their goods. I look forward in particular to reading the testimonials of local voters for who they think should win the best employee. We receive heartfelt stories about local workers so they deserve a spotlight this month too alongside our fantastic local businesses.

I look forward to sharing congratulations with each of the winners of the awards at the end of the month. We also award and celebrate hardworking community organisations. Those locals who vote for these businesses go into the draw for a number of vouchers to local businesses. The Nudgee Small Business Awards are just another way that I support our local business community. I look forward in the coming month to see who will win.

Southport Electorate, Activities

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (9.21 pm): Tonight I want to take a moment to highlight some of the things that are going on in the CBD of the Gold Coast at Southport. First, I have to mention Fire Baby, an incredible new venue about to open in the heart of our CBD. Right there on Welch Street, it is the brainchild of my old school mate from Keebra Park, Dr Michael Read. I have to say that it is shaping up to be something pretty special. There will be room for up to 500 people, two massive pizza ovens, rooftop bars, a bakery, a chargrill that you cannot jump over and more. I think it will rival some

of the biggest and best venues on the Gold Coast in terms of its fit-out and its floor space. Michael has poured his heart and soul into this project and I think it is exactly the sort of venue that Southport has been missing for some time.

I want to mention our new youth member for Southport, Levi Knight. Levi is also school captain at Benowa High and he has a genuine passion for our community, particularly an interest in the challenges facing young people today. He has taken a keen interest in the education system and the importance of equipping young Australians with the necessary life skills and knowledge required to live full and resilient lives.


The Southport citizens Anzac service did not exactly go to plan this past week, being called off by torrential rain. However, in true Gold Coast spirit, many locals still turned up to lay wreaths and pay their respects. I joined Kevin Lloyd-Thomas, our local RSL president, and a few others who braved the weather for what became a series of meaningful and private moments of quiet reflection.

I also want to give a quick shout-out to Liz, Bughy and the crew at Gold Medal Gymnastics. They recently received almost \$100,000 through the Gambling Community Benefit Fund for new equipment, and they are already putting it to good use. They have some serious talent coming through and I am sure there may even be some future Olympians in the making.

This year marks my 11th year as a participant in the CEO Sleepout with Vinnies. This year my fellow ambassadors have raised the bar and set as our target \$1 million. Every cent raised on the Gold Coast stays on the Gold Coast, and I commend everyone who will participate again this year on 10 June at Cbus Super Stadium.

There is a lot going on in Southport. It is, as I always say, the engine room of the Gold Coast. It is a community that I am incredibly proud to represent and one that just keeps showing up.

Hinchinbrook Electorate, Flood Events

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (9.24 pm): This evening I rise to give the House an update on the recovery efforts across the Hinchinbrook electorate. Most people in this House would be well aware that at the start of this year we had devastating floods that encompassed the whole of the Hinchinbrook electorate from the northern beaches right through the Hinchinbrook shire and into the lower part of the Cassowary Coast Regional Council area. Since then, North Queenslanders who live in the Hinchinbrook electorate have become very resilient and have done their best to get back on their feet. One thing that North Queenslanders do well is they band together and get the job done.

On the surface, our towns are back to normal. The streets are clean, the grass is growing, the lawns are mown and the drains have been cleaned out. People are flocking back as we are starting to enjoy this beautiful cool weather. However, a lot of our small businesses are still hurting. A lot of our agricultural businesses are still hurting. Our sugarcane crop has lost between half a million to a million tonne of sugar cane, with the latest crop predictions that around 3.3 million tonnes, which equates to about \$50 million, will be missing from the Hinchinbrook electorate alone.

We have had great support from the state government. We have had great interest from ministers who have come up and worked hard to make sure we can access the grants available through the federal government and QRIDA to ensure we can get the industry back on track. Even the opposition's shadow ministers, as well as the Leader of the Opposition, have come up to Ingham to visit at times.

We can do better, though. With regard to small businesses, right now they are doing it tough. We have had some early interaction which has then moved forward to some state and federal funding being allocated for the small businesses that lost power for up to five days when the Ingham substation was turned off by Ergon. There is now financial support for those small businesses that lost perishable stock. We still have people who are homeless and people who are trying to get back into their homes. Insurance companies are doing their best and tradespeople are doing their best, but it does highlight the fact that we need more public housing in times of crisis like this.

The Bruce Highway was cut for no less than 19 days at the Seymour River or the Gairloch Washaway, highlighting the fact that the fit-for-purpose road we expect in North Queensland just does not exist along the Bruce Highway. We will continue to work with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to unlock funding to make sure these projects can be seen through to fruition.

While I am on my feet, I want to make the House well aware that the good people of Paluma and Hidden Valley are still isolated, not able to access the east coast through the eastern route through Mount Spec Road. We continue to work to advocate for a quick and speedy opening of this road so that businesses and people can get back to normal and start living their lives again.

Women in Sport



Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (9.27 pm): The world of sport is undergoing a game-changing transformation, capturing unprecedented attention and recognition thanks to some wonderful trailblazing women in sport. We marvelled at the Matildas' unprecedented streak in 2023 and the marvels of the Hockeyroos, and all of our swimmers like Ariarne Titmus, and you will go a long way to forget Bree Rizzo nee Masters winning the Stawell Gift off scratch.

The trailblazers, superstars and teams get the headlines, but their influence trickles down to the grassroots. Following these great examples of athletes, more girls and young women than ever are participating in sport at all levels. The other afternoon with the Rugby League event, we learned there are now 80,000 participants in Rugby League in Queensland, and women in Rugby League is growing at 13 per cent year on year. There are now 12,000 ladies involved in Rugby League. Of course, on Thursday, we have the Women's State of Origin, game one—go, Queensland!

However, despite these positives, by the age of 14, girls' participation in sport drops at twice the rate of boys'. Think of how many Sam Kerrs, Ali Briggishaws and Ash Barties who are missing out on up-and-growing sport because we did not give them the same opportunities. There are many factors which influence girls participating in sport, like social and peer pressures, but we need to do better.

I am pleased to be part of a government that has announced a \$250 million Games On! package for the 2032 Olympics, and it is great to see our solutions in infrastructure and participation in sport right across this state.

Thank you to all the parents and volunteers, managers and coaches who are developing our champions of tomorrow. It is wonderful for me to be in our local community cheering on the Gatton Hawks local girls teams or the boys, of course, as well as all those juniors down at touch football, netball, cricket or soccer—the list goes on. It is just wonderful to see them develop. I am proud to be part of an LNP government that has \$50 million for the Games On! program leading up to the 2032 Olympics. Just imagine if we can inspire, through all of our help, all of those youngsters to come along and see the champions of tomorrow winning for Australia in 2032.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Grace, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young