



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, 27 August 2025

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	2461
Absence of Members	2461
PRIVILEGE	2461
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2461
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2462
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2463
SPEAKER'S RULING	2464
Tabled Papers Out of Order	2464
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	2464
Royal Flying Doctor Service	2464
Visitors to Public Gallery	2464
MINISTERIAL PAPER	2464
Revocation and Dedication of Protected Areas	2464
NOTICE OF MOTION	2465
Revocation and Dedication of Protected Areas	2465
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2465
Daniel's Law	2465
Daniel's Law	2466
Labour Productivity	2466
Skills and Training	2467
Carmichael Coalmine	2468
Sunshine Coast, Marine Incident; Country Roads Connect	2468
Social and Affordable Housing	2469
Primary Industries Prosper 2050	2470
WorkCover Board; Member for Cairns	2471
NOTICE OF MOTION	2473

Chief Health Officer, Appointment	2473
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2473
Hospitals, Wait Times	2473
Hospitals, Wait Times	2474
Workplace Behaviour	2474
Hospitals, Wait Times	2475
Workplace Behaviour	2476
Hospitals, Bypass	2477
Domestic and Sexual Violence	2477
Hospitals, Ramping	2478
Women, Safety	2478
Hospitals, Ramping	2479
Senior Office Holders, Integrity	2480
Emissions Reduction Targets	2480
Victims of Crime	2481
Hospitals, Private Investment	2482
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 27 August 2025, titled</i>	
<i>'Private Partners Critical'</i>	2482
Community Safety	2483
Influenza, Vaccination	2483
Order of Business; Bills, Declared Urgent and Allocation of Time Limit Order	2484
COMMUNITY PROTECTION AND PUBLIC CHILD SEX OFFENDER REGISTER (DANIEL'S LAW) BILL	2485
Message from Acting Governor	2485
<i>Tabled paper: Message, dated 27 August 2025, from the Acting Governor</i>	
<i>recommending the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register</i>	
<i>(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025.</i>	2485
Introduction	2485
<i>Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register</i>	
<i>(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025.</i>	2485
<i>Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register</i>	
<i>(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, explanatory notes.</i>	2485
<i>Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register</i>	
<i>(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights.</i>	2485
<i>Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register</i>	
<i>(Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, statement relating to override declaration.</i>	2486
First Reading	2489
Referral to Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee	2489
APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL	2490
Appropriation Bill	2490
Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)	2490
Appropriation Bill	2490
Education, Arts and Communities Committee	2490
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, undated, titled 'Who's the Chair?'</i>	
<i>.....</i>	2493
Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee, Report	2496
MOTION	2504
Chief Health Officer, Appointment	2504
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	2516
Resolved in the affirmative.	2516
Amendment agreed to	2516
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	2516
Resolved in the affirmative.	2516
APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL	2517
Appropriation Bill	2517
Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)	2517
Appropriation Bill	2517
Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee, Report	2517
Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.	2520
Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.	2520
Third Reading (Cognate Debate)	2520
Long Title (Cognate Debate)	2520
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2520
Second Reading	2520
<i>Tabled paper: Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 5, 58th</i>	
<i>Parliament—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2025, government response.</i>	2521
<i>Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2025, amendments to be moved by Ms Corrine McMillan.</i>	2525
<i>Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments.</i>	2525
<i>Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in</i>	
<i>Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments.</i>	2525

	<i>Tabled paper:</i> Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of reservation by the member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Nick Dametto MP	2546
ADJOURNMENT		2555
	<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 26 August 2025, from Board Chairperson, Yarranlea Limited, Yarranlea Primary School and Outside School Hours Care (OSHC), Ms Adrienne Innes to the Premier and Minister for Veterans, Hon. David Crisafulli regarding use by the school and OSHC at Griffith University’s former Mount Gravatt campus.. ..	2559

WEDNESDAY, 27 AUGUST 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Members



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Ipswich that she will be absent from the House from 26 to 28 August, inclusive of those dates. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Inala that she will be absent from the House on 27 and 28 August. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 5 June 2025, the Leader of the House wrote to me alleging that the member for McConnell deliberately misled the House on 20 May 2025. I consider the member has made an adequate explanation. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter. I have circulated a detailed statement about this matter and seek leave to incorporate it into the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 5 June 2025, the Leader of the House wrote to me alleging that the member for McConnell deliberately misled the House on 20 May 2025.

The matter relates to a statement made by the member while asking a question during Questions without Notice.

Specifically, the member stated:

'I repeat: my question is to the Minister for Youth Justice. On 9News last night the minister referred to stakeholders and journalists calling for the public release of Expert Legal Panel advice as a 'Labor stitch-up'. Does the minister treat workers the same way she treated journalists in her press conference yesterday.'

The Leader of the House argued that this statement was deliberately misleading because the Minister for Youth Justice did not use the words 'Labor stitch-up' during the 9News segment that was referenced. He provided the segment for me to view.

I sought further information from the member for McConnell about the allegation made against her, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The member provided the transcript from the interview in which the journalist stated:

'The Minister also falsely suggesting that journalists were only asking about the secret advice because of Labor Party influence.'

The member also noted that she did not state that it was a direct quote, and that any issues with the question were dealt with at the time in the House.

Standing Order 269(4) requires that in considering whether such a matter should be referred to the Ethics Committee, that I should take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter.

The definition of 'stitch up' in the Macquarie Dictionary provides:

'Colloquial a situation which has been engineered to cause someone to be regarded unfavourably or to be incriminated falsely: a political stitch-up.'

Based on the transcript of the interview and the submissions put forward, I am of the belief the member has made an adequate explanation.

Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

I note that this matter was raised by the Leader of the House yet concerned the Minister for Youth Justice. In the future, I will not be considering matters raised by third parties. The member who believes their rights or privileges have been interfered with is the appropriate complainant when it comes to matters of privilege.

Finally, I remind members that when I request submissions on a matter of privilege that the date provided is a strict deadline. Should a member not be able to meet that deadline, they should contact me and seek an extension accordingly.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the member for McConnel [\[1122\]](#).

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, in a letter dated 6 June 2025 and received on 10 June, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 20 May 2025. I consider this matter to be a dispute on the characterisation of a policy and is in the realm of both technical and trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter. I have circulated a detailed statement about the matter and seek leave to incorporate it into the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

In a letter dated 6 June 2025, received 10 June, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 20 May 2025.

The matter relates to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition during Matters of Public Interest.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition stated:

'Since then the LNP has hiked rego by 24 per cent. For the average household, that could be almost \$160 extra. I recently spoke with some young Queenslanders about the impact this would have on them. Many did not even know it was happening, because there had been no media release, no press conference—nothing at all, just a Premier making decisions in darkness, without any accountability.'

The minister argued that this statement was deliberately misleading because the price of registration is only increasing by CPI, which is the norm in terms of vehicle registration costs. However, because the Opposition put in place a temporary reduction to vehicle registration while they were in government, the price increase will seem greater when the reduction expires.

I sought further information from the Leader of the Opposition about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Leader of the Opposition argued that registration is increasing by the stated amount once you combine the loss of the discount that was offered by the former government and the current government's increase based on indexation. He further argued that it was a policy decision for the government whether they continued to offer the discount.

Standing Order 269(4) requires that in considering whether such a matter should be referred to the Ethics Committee, that I should take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter.

This appears to be a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 4 April 2022 when he stated: 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, it is not in dispute that the cost of registration will be increasing. The minister and the Leader of the Opposition may disagree on the way the increase is characterised, but ultimately it is a dispute on the characterisation of a policy. As such, I consider this matter is within the realm of being both technical and trivial.

Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Leader of the Opposition and member for Murrumbidgee [\[1123\]](#).

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 11 June 2025, the member for Aspley wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads deliberately misled the House twice on 1 May 2025. With respect to the first matter, I consider this to be a matter where the member and the minister hold differing viewpoints on the words 'fixing' and 'ignored'. With respect to the second matter, I consider this to be a matter where the member and the minister are using semantics and differing opinions to engage in political debate. I consider both matters to be technical and trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matters for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to these matters. I have circulated a ruling for each of these matters and I seek leave to incorporate the rulings in the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 11 June 2025, the member for Aspley wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads deliberately misled the House on 1 May 2025.

The matter relates to an answer to a Question without Notice.

Specifically, the minister stated:

'We are fixing the section between Old Toorbul Road and Saint Road, increasing capacity and making it safer—something that those opposite ignored for the entire time they were in power.'

The member argued that this statement was false and misleading because the Bribe Island Road project was commenced under the former government.

I sought further information from the minister about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The minister submitted that it is the current government who has put the project to tender, commenced construction, and will complete the project. He also submitted that there has been no major works done on that stretch of road since 2010. The minister also stated that he had been advised that funding provided for the project by the former government was inadequate to progress to the delivery stage.

Standing Order 269(4) requires that in considering whether such a matter should be referred to the Ethics Committee, that I should take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter.

This appears to be a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 4 April 2022 when he stated: 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, it is clear that the planning phase of the project was commenced under the former government, and the building and delivery phase is being delivered under the current government. The member argues that commencing the planning stage and assigning a portion of the required funding equates to 'fixing', whereas the Minister argues that the additional funding and commencing the construction on the project equates to 'fixing'. Further, I consider that whether the lack of work on the road since 2010 equates to 'ignoring', is a matter of opinion. This is a debate of a political nature where the member and the Minister hold opposing viewpoints.

As such, I consider this matter is within the realm of both technical and trivial.

Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

SPEAKER'S RULING – ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 11 June 2025, the member for Aspley wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads deliberately misled the House on 1 May 2025.

The matter relates to an answer to a Question without Notice.

Specifically, the minister stated:

'What else did those opposite ignore for the 10 years they were in power? They ignored the Bribe Island Bridge. Those opposite had 10 years to deliver a solution for the Bribe Island Bridge and they did nothing.'

The member argued that this statement was false and misleading because the Bribe Island bridge project was commenced under the former government with a business case, including concept designs released in January 2024.

I sought further information from the minister about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The minister submitted that it is the current government who will commence construction and will build the new bridge. He also submitted that funding provided for the project by the former government was inadequate to progress from the planning stage.

Standing Order 269(4) requires that in considering whether such a matter should be referred to the Ethics Committee, that I should take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter.

This appears to be a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 4 April 2022 when he stated: 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

From the evidence put forward, it is clear to me that the planning phase of the project was commenced under the former government, and the building and delivery phase will be delivered under the current government.

The member argues that commencing the planning stage and assigning a portion of the required funding equates to doing something, whereas the Minister argues that the fact there has been no new bridge under the Opposition, and there was insufficient funding for a new bridge, means the opposition did nothing. This is a debate of a political nature using semantics and opposing viewpoints.


As such, I consider this matter is within the realm of both technical and trivial.

Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads and member for Buderim [\[1124\]](#).

SPEAKER'S RULING


Tabled Papers Out of Order

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Yesterday, the member for Cooper purported to table several certificates. The certificates are joke certificates, designed to disparage members and public servants who appeared at estimates hearings. They contain reflections that, if said in the House, could on objection be ordered to be withdrawn. The certificates also use the Legislative Assembly's emblem in a manner that breaches the guidelines for the use of the Legislative Assembly crest and other insignia. The emblem cannot be used in an overtly political way nor can it be used in such a way as to bring the House into odium, contempt or ridicule or that may compromise the integrity of the parliament.

In this respect, I refer members to part 5.3 of *The guide to the code of ethical standards and rules relating to the conduct of members*. In accordance with previous rulings about the tabled documents needing to be appropriate and in accordance with the rules, I have ruled the purported tablings out of order and not to be tabled.


SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Royal Flying Doctor Service

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I remind members that tonight we will celebrate an evening with the Royal Flying Doctor Service on the River Deck. As an ambassador of the RFDS, I am honoured to host the event to support and raise awareness for the ongoing work of the service.


Every two minutes, someone needs the Royal Flying Doctor Service. The RFDS is a national not-for-profit organisation that connects rural and remote communities to essential primary health care and 24-hour emergency medical and retrieval services. Over the past 97 years, they have expanded access to these services for specific populations that are outside the reach of regular health care. I look forward to seeing members at the event this evening.

Visitors to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this afternoon by students and teachers from Wishart State School in the electorate of Mansfield, Our Lady of Fatima Catholic Primary School in the electorate of Algester and Saint Patrick's School and Sacred Heart Parish School in the electorate of Warrego.

MINISTERIAL PAPER


Revocation and Dedication of Protected Areas

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (2.06 pm): I lay upon the table of the House a proposal under sections 29, 30 and 32 of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 and a brief explanation of the proposal.

Tabled paper: Revocation of state areas: Proposal under sections 29, 30 and 32 of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 and an explanation of the proposal, relating to the Powrunna State Forest, Black Mountain National Park, Burrum Coast National Park, Main Range National Park, Ngalba Bulal National Park, Tewantin National Park and Eumundi Conservation Park [\[1125\]](#).

NOTICE OF MOTION

Revocation and Dedication of Protected Areas

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (2.06 pm): I give notice that, after the expiration of at least 28 days as provided in the Nature Conservation Act 1992, I shall move—

1. That this House requests the Governor in Council to:
 - (a) revoke by regulation under section 30 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* the setting apart and declaration of the entirety of one State forest;
 - (b) dedicate by regulation under section 29 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* the revoked area of the one aforementioned State forest as one new national park (scientific);
 - (c) revoke by regulation under section 32 of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* the dedication of the entirety of one national park, part of four national parks, and part of one conservation park;
 as set out in the Proposal tabled by me in the House today, viz—


Description of areas to be revoked

Powrunna State Forest	An area of about 2,737 hectares, described as lot 13 on SP352347, for dedication as the new Dhuny Yumba (Home of the Wombat) National Park (scientific), as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Black Mountain National Park	An area of about 2,977 hectares, described as lot 1 on SP309118, as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Burrum Coast National Park	An area of about 9,329 hectares, described as part of lot 25 on plan NPW642 (to be described as lot 26 on SP355148), as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Main Range National Park	An area of about 0.0615 hectares, described as part of lot 1 on AP23636 (to be described as lot 2 on SP353107), as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Ngalba Bulal National Park	An area of about 3,139 hectares, described as lot 21 on SP154458, as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Tewantin National Park	An area of about 1,002 hectares, described as part of lot 7 on AP23639 (to be described as lot 517 on SP346210), as illustrated on the attached sketch.
Eumundi Conservation Park	An area of about 0.7358 hectares, described as part of lot 351 on plan NPW791 (to be described as lot 1 on SP339677), as illustrated on the attached sketch.

2. That the Speaker and the Clerk of the Parliament forward a copy of this resolution to the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation for submission to the Governor in Council.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Daniel's Law


 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (2.08 pm): Our government is committed to putting victims first. After a decade of decline under Labor, Queenslanders now have a government that believes the rights of victims come before the rights of offenders. We are listening to victims, we are listening to Queenslanders who are crying out for change and we are delivering what we said we would do.

Today we take the next step in our commitment to deliver Queensland's first public child sex offender register. This afternoon, Minister Purdie will introduce legislation to establish the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register in Queensland. It is part of our plan to restore safety where you live. The legislation will be known as Daniel's Law. We are delivering it in honour of Daniel Morcombe.

For more than 20 years Daniel's parents, Bruce and Denise, have fought to keep children safe through unimaginable tragedy. They join us today. The heartbreaking loss of their son in 2003 to a convicted child sex offender has brought about great social change, but more needs to be done. In recognition of Daniel's legacy, Daniel's Law will take steps to put the safety of our children and most vulnerable first. Daniel's Law will establish a tiered system to allow parents and members of the community to access the information they need to protect their kids. It is about transparency and accountability. It is about keeping kids safe. If you commit horrible crimes, you cannot hide. Queenslanders deserve to know who you are and where you are to protect our kids. Monsters cannot be allowed to lurk in the darkness. We will ensure the worst repeat offenders are dealt with.

Daniel's Law will also introduce new offences to prevent the misuse of information in the public register. Before the election, we promised we would pass this legislation this calendar year. We will do that, just as we promised. We will continue to strengthen our laws and do everything we can to make sure there are fewer victims of crime. Our government will do all we can to protect children and put the rights of children, victims and parents ahead of dangerous predators.

Daniel's Law

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.10 pm): This government is focused on delivering for Queensland: delivering safer communities and delivering for the next generation. Today we will do just that by introducing legislation to establish the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register—finally putting the rights of children ahead of the rights of paedophiles.

This landmark legislation is only possible because of the strength and steely determination shown by Bruce and Denise Morcombe in the face of unimaginable heartache. Few people could forget the day their son Daniel went missing—7 December 2003. It was a sunny Sunday on the Sunshine Coast. School was out. Christmas was just weeks away, and Daniel was on his way to buy presents for his family. The 13-year-old never made it to the shops. The boy with striking blue eyes was stolen from the bus stop and murdered by a predator—a convicted child sex offender. It took another eight years to bring Daniel home. His family never stopped searching.

For Bruce and Denise it is a pain that never dulls. It has been 7,934 days since Daniel disappeared. Their campaign to keep other Aussie kids safe has been relentless. For more than a decade they have called for a public child sex offender register. We listened. The former government failed to act. We will never know how many lives a public child sex offender register will save. We will never know how many emotional scars it will prevent. If it saves one life or stops one child from being abused it will be worthwhile. Six years ago on 27 March 2019, while in opposition, we moved a motion—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk government to implement the LNP's plan for a public child sex offender register.


We said at the time—

The introduction of a public child sex offender register will give every parent an effective tool to protect their child from paedophiles. The register will put innocent and vulnerable children before the interests of paedophiles living in our communities.

However, Labor refused to support it. The motion was defeated 47-42. Twenty-five current Labor members sitting in this House voted against it. The opposition leader and his deputy—the member for Woodridge—the member for Waterford, the member for Gaven, the member for Miller and the member for McConnel all voted against a public child sex offender register. All of them voted to put the rights of sex offenders ahead of the rights of children. Today we are righting that wrong.

Ten months after being elected, the Crisafulli government is doing what Labor could not and would not do in 10 years. This government is putting the rights of victims ahead of the rights of offenders.

Labour Productivity

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (2.13 pm): After a decade of declining productivity, the Crisafulli government has driven productivity growth in its first 10 months in government. We recognise the critical need to turn around poor productivity, particularly in the building and construction sector. It is why the first bill I introduced was a bill that re-established the independent Queensland Productivity Commission, which Labor had axed. It is why our first referral to the Queensland Productivity Commission was to investigate productivity within the construction industry.

The QPC's interim report, released last month, paints a bleak picture of an industry weighed down by union indulgence, stifling regulation and a stretched labour market. The findings expose

inefficiencies that threaten Queensland's housing supply, infrastructure delivery and economic competitiveness. The commission has identified a marked decline in productivity, which has led to the construction of fewer new homes, higher rents and significant delays and cost blowouts on major projects.

Since 2018 construction productivity has declined by nine per cent. It means that for something to be built today it takes nine per cent more output than it did seven years ago. That equates to 77,000 fewer homes built in Queensland since 2018. Labor's productivity crisis is at the very core of our state's housing affordability challenges.

It also threatens the successful delivery of major generational infrastructure projects. The QPC's interim report confirmed what the industry was telling the former government for years—concerns that were ignored. The report identified complex regulations and suboptimal procurement practices as major contributors to lagging productivity by making construction more difficult and more expensive. It forecast that by 2029-30 Labor's Best Practice Industry Conditions would cost the Queensland community up to \$20.6 billion, with fewer homes built and entrenched higher rents.

The interim report validates our decision last November to suspend BPICs for all new government projects. We look forward to the commission of inquiry into the behaviour of the CFMEU in Queensland shining a light on what has previously been hidden. While weak productivity is not isolated to Queensland, last week's federal economic reform round table discussion on this issue more broadly across the nation showed we are leading the nation when it comes to reform efforts. Submissions on the QPC inquiry close on Thursday, and the government will be given three months from 24 October to respond to its findings before the commission publishes the final report.

Queensland stands ready to help the national productivity push. After 10 years of decline under Labor, the first 10 months of the Crisafulli government have already proven that we are focused on delivering for Queensland.

Skills and Training



Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (2.16 pm): National Skills Week is another reminder of the 10 years of decline and skills shortages under Labor and the 10 months of delivery under the Crisafulli LNP government. Our commitment to fixing Labor's skills shortage has been marked today with a showcase here at Parliament House, exhibiting the skills and training we are delivering for Queensland's future. It was a great privilege to host some of our dedicated TAFE trainers and teachers at parliament, showcasing the many training options available at TAFE Queensland.

I was thrilled to see so many parliamentary colleagues take up my invitation and try their hand at some of the trade skills on offer at TAFE, including bricklaying, electrical circuits, welding and carpentry. I thank the TAFE Queensland team for attending and sharing their passion for training in this state. National Skills Week recognises the flexible avenues to training and employment, and I note one of our own, the member for Townsville, took one such pathway, having earned a bachelor's degree in engineering before pursuing a trade as an electrical apprentice.

Unlike Labor, who spent a decade presiding over a skills shortage, we want more Queenslanders to see training as a pathway to building the lifestyle they deserve, just like the member for Townsville. Those opposite mounted a disgraceful scare campaign about our commitment to TAFE and to training, but we have spent the last 10 months saving TAFE after Labor presided over 10 years of decline.


We have already delivered a Skilling Queenslanders for Work program, which cuts red tape, simplifies compliance and opens the door for more organisations to deliver results. Our revamped program will change lives by getting Queenslanders ready for a job, rather than just getting them through a qualification. We have saved 336 full-time-equivalent positions within TAFE Queensland after those opposite left them unfunded beyond 30 June 2025.

We are delivering more free and subsidised training, with \$10 million supporting free apprenticeships for under-25s over the next two years. We are delivering state-of-the-art training facilities, including \$201.1 million to deliver a TAFE excellence precinct in Rockhampton and TAFE centres of excellence on the Sunshine Coast, in Moreton Bay and on the southern Moreton Bay islands. We are delivering up to \$50 million to leverage the National Skills Agreement, working to build the VET workforce, deliver initiatives to close the gap and support best practice initiatives at TAFE Queensland.

As we look towards the opportunities of the 2032 games, the Crisafulli LNP government will continue to deliver more training opportunities as we work to address the skills shortage Labor left

behind in sectors like housing, health care and construction. After a decade of decline in TAFE and in skills training under Labor, we have spent the last 10 months delivering a TAFE which will build the workforce to deliver the homes, hospitals and major projects Queensland needs.

Carmichael Coalmine

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (2.19 pm): I rise to highlight a significant milestone for Queensland's resources sector and for the hardworking mining families across Central and North Queensland. Thanks to the stable and serious leadership of the Crisafulli government, Bravus Mining & Resources has committed \$50 million to expand its Carmichael Mine in the Galilee Basin—laying the foundation for half a billion dollars in further investment and 600 new jobs. The initial expansion will deliver critical infrastructure like expanded worker accommodation, a new water dam, rail maintenance facilities and more.

This is what confidence looks like. This is what certainty brings. It was made possible because the Crisafulli government backed this critical industry for Queensland. On this side of the chamber, we are proud to stand with Queensland's hardworking coalmining families. This is unlike those opposite, who have the member for Cooper siding with the Greens and attending anti-coal workshops. While we are securing investment and creating jobs for regional Queensland, the member for Cooper was the headline act at an event where the sole aim was to make a plan to stop coalmining in this state. It gets worse for the opposition. When the *Townsville Bulletin* approached the opposition leader for a response to these concerning revelations, his spokesman got Queensland's high-quality coal confused with the lignite mine down in Victoria. It is laughable, if it were not so serious.

Let us not forget the shadow resources minister. He took not one, not two, but six months to meet with a Queensland coal-producing company. While Labor is divided, directionless and driving an anti-mining agenda, the Crisafulli government is getting on with the job. We have drawn a line under the chaos. Gone are the days of overnight royalty changes. Those rates are staying as they are. Gone are the days of uncertainty for our coal industry, because there are 400 coal-fired power stations under construction around the world and we want to supply them.


Gone are the days of playing games with Queenslanders' livelihoods. We back the hardworking Queensland families who rely on a strong mining sector. We are rebuilding Queensland's reputation as a place to invest, and this \$50 million commitment from Bravus proves our plan is working. It will deliver more work for suppliers in Townsville, Mackay and Rockhampton. It will deliver more jobs for apprentices and contractors and real opportunities for young people right across regional Queensland.

Those opposite never supported the Galilee Basin. When it came to the final approvals for the Carmichael project, Labor moved the goalposts, stalled, obstructed and delayed at every turn. They tied the project up in red tape, refused to make a decision and let inner-city activists dictate their agenda, putting Central and North Queensland jobs on the line. In 2019 they were so divided, all while thousands of workers waited for certainty—although, I will admit their approach did have one very positive outcome: it cost Bill Shorten the Lodge.

Even after Queenslanders handed down their verdict, the ghost of Jackie Trad loomed large over those opposite, whispering the same old talking points into the ears of the member for Woodridge that have been rejected by Queenslanders time and time again. It is spooky stuff. Spookier still is the fact that Labor has never been on the side of coal communities. They could never have delivered this investment, these jobs or this certainty for regional Queensland because they cannot deliver for the resources sector when their party room is divided, their policies are confused and their backbenchers are sharing the stage with the Greens.

Only the Crisafulli government has the unity, the vision and the resolve to back Queensland's resources sector and to deliver for mining families in Townsville, Mackay and Rockhampton. We are backing the industry that powers our economy. We are backing the workers who keep this state moving. We will continue doing what Labor never could: delivering results, real jobs and real investment for regional Queensland. On this side of the House, we know that Queensland does not start and end in Brisbane.

Sunshine Coast, Marine Incident; Country Roads Connect

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (2.23 pm): Members would be aware of the tragic incident that occurred in Mooloolaba this morning where a boat has capsized. On behalf of Sunshine Coast members and the government, I want to acknowledge the

passing of Mr Rob Smith, a well-known boat captain in our community. We send our thoughts and prayers to his family and friends.

Last week during community cabinet in Emerald, alongside the Premier and the member for Gregory, I was pleased to announce that 22 projects have been funded under the Country Roads Connect Program—a key commitment made by the LNP at the last election, aimed at improving the connectivity and resilience of Queensland's regional road network after it was left to rot under a decade of Labor. From Rockhampton to Richmond, the Maranoa to the Whitsundays and all the way up to Wujal Wujal, we are delivering regional road upgrades for our regional towns that were failed for far too long by the former Labor government.

The program is a \$100 million funding program that delivers targeted investment to pave regional unsealed roads which would otherwise become impassable during weather events. Sealing these roads ensures that critical roads are not cut off in times of disaster, allowing graziers and growers to get their produce to market more reliably.

We are backing our rural and remote communities by working in partnership with councils that know their roads best and understand the unique and complex needs of their regions. These country roads are the arteries of our rural and regional communities. It is the difference between kids getting to school safely, farmers and industry having reliable freight access and emergency services being able to get to people in their times of need. We look forward to working with councils to deliver these targeted investments that will make a real difference to the lives of regional Queenslanders.

Some 22 projects have been funded under this program, so I am not going to sit here and name them all. What I will say is that each of those projects represents a significant positive impact on a community. I have met with or visited a number of those local councils and I congratulate them all on this outcome. I share their excitement and I cannot wait to see the projects get underway. I will be working alongside those councils to get those projects out of the ground as quickly as possible.

We are delivering for Queensland and the Country Roads Connect Program is delivering safer, more dependable roads that support families, producers and small businesses right across regional Queensland. After 10 years of decline, the Crisafulli government is delivering for Queenslanders. We are delivering more in the first 10 months than those opposite ever could. The Country Roads Connect Program is the latest example of that.

Social and Affordable Housing



Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (2.26 pm): After 10 years of housing decline under Labor, the Crisafulli government has made a strong start to deliver change in just our first 10 months. Under Labor, just 509 social homes were delivered on average each year, leading to the social housing waitlist growing by 81 per cent over their time in office.

Our changes to properly manage existing public housing tenancies just this week revealed that Labor even allowed high-income earners and property owners to live in social housing while thousands of eligible vulnerable Queenslanders waited for a safe and secure place to call home. I can update the House that, as of today, in just 10 months the Crisafulli government's pipeline of social and affordable homes under contract or construction has more than doubled since Labor's last budget. We are on track to deliver more than 1,500 homes this financial year alone, as we ramp up our annual delivery to more than 2,000 social and community homes per year by the end of this term of government.

The former housing minister, now shadow housing minister, likes to make claims about 1,000 homes being cut. The member for Gaven's interest in these projects stopped when it came to actually funding them. Not a single dollar was allocated to any of the homes they claim this government has cut. You can't cut funding that didn't exist.

These projects were not supported by their communities. They were not supported by their councils. They were hypothetical houses designed to be more about creating a political fight than about actually giving vulnerable Queenslanders somewhere to live. We are focused on actually getting things built, at a scale never before seen and in the right locations across our state. Just last week in Emerald I saw exactly what this looks like, alongside the member for the Gregory—an 18-home social housing development across four levels in what we think will be the tallest building in town. I did joke with locals that we are bringing a little bit of the Gold Coast to Emerald, but the member for Gregory asked me to stop pretty quickly and hurried me off. This one project, though, will be big enough to provide a home to around a third of the number of people in this region on the social housing register. Housing one-third

of the people on the register in that region in one project is extraordinary. That is the difference between spin and delivery.

As the Treasurer outlined earlier, we have a housing crisis because we inherited a productivity crisis. The Queensland Productivity Commission's interim report was released recently and it could not have been clearer: productivity was going backwards and housing supply with it. Queensland has the least productive job sites in the nation. That means that, because of the building and construction sector that Labor oversaw, 77,000 fewer homes have been built that could have been built since 2018. Imagine how housing would look in Queensland if we had an extra 77,000 homes right now.

The Crisafulli government's housing targets are ambitious because Queenslanders deserve nothing less. A million new homes with 53,500 new social and community homes by 2044—two years earlier than these targets were promised by Labor. Our message to Queenslanders is simple: after a decade of decline, there is now a growing pipeline of new housing across this state. There is a clear plan and funding certainty to get homes built. Productivity will be restored. Communities across our state are starting to feel the difference of 10 months of LNP delivery after 10 years of decline under Labor. We are just getting started with our work to give more Queenslanders a place to call home.

Primary Industries Prosper 2050

 **Hon. AJ PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (2.30 pm): At the Ekka two weeks ago the Premier and I proudly launched the Crisafulli government's long-term plan for growing Queensland's primary industries: Primary Industries Prosper 2050. I would like to thank industry stakeholder representatives Jo Sheppard, Mike Guerin, Dan Galligan, Colin Fruk, Mick Stephens and David Bobbermen for being there for its launch and, more importantly, for their work in co-designing this exciting vision with our government.

It is a prime example of what 10 months of delivery looks like. Prosper 2050 is critical to delivering our ambitious target of growing the primary industry sector's value to \$30 billion by 2030. It is the largest strategic collaboration between primary industries and the government in more than a decade. More than 3,200 Queenslanders have now had their say, and I am pleased to report they are resoundingly supportive and ready for change. This is just the start.

We have established three regional industry and government working groups. They bring together key primary industry and government representatives from across the regions, to provide critical advice and input into the development of seven five-year regional action plans. Last week I attended both the first meeting of the Southern Downs Regional Group in Toowoomba and the first meeting of the Central Region Group in Emerald. Each of the regional working groups will identify regionally focused initiatives to support all of Queensland's primary industries including opportunities for industry and private sector co-investment within each region.

A separate industry working group will share statewide and regional industry actions and support the development of the regional action plans. Collectively, these working groups bring together key industry and government representatives and they will be critical to delivering the vision of Prosper 2050. It really is where the rubber hits the road.

There was no better place to launch Prosper 2050 than at the place where the city meets the country—the Ekka. It is one of the most important events on the calendar in promoting Queensland's understanding of our primary industries and the communities they support. For me personally it is an event I never miss. It also provided a backdrop for the celebration of the achievements of the bible of the bush—the *Queensland Country Life*, which for 90 years has been farmers' go-to newspaper. I place on record my congratulations to the Queensland team.


At this year's Ekka, the Department of Primary Industries continued to celebrate and promote Queensland's hardworking primary producers. Six thousand Ekka-goers made their own cardboard farmer-style hats to wear at the show. They quickly became the talk of the Ekka. We were thrilled to see so many young visitors keen to learn about locally produced food and fibre and leave their own messages for our producers.

Without a doubt, the popularity of the Ekka reflects the success of primary industries and the rural and regional communities they support. In 2023-24 Queensland's primary industries contributed \$22.66 billion in gross value of production to the state's economy and employed 376,000 people, or nearly 13 per cent of the workforce. In the same year, we exported \$13.16 billion worth of agriculture and food products to over 130 countries.

As we all know, Queensland's agriculture, fisheries and forestry sectors are the backbone of many of our regions, supporting more than 41,000 businesses and 70,200 people in 2023-24. Events such as the Ekka are so important because half of our state's population, or approximately 51 per cent, live in regional and rural Queensland. Many of those communities are not only built on the back of primary industries but are pivotal to the future as a major employer and economic generator.

As the Premier said at the launch of Prosper 2050, we are delivering a fresh start for Queensland's agricultural industries which play a massive role in driving our state's future. More has been achieved for Queensland's primary industries in the last 10 months than Labor ever delivered in their 10 years of decline. We are backing primary producers with a clear plan to grow our agricultural sector with more jobs and more opportunity for regional Queensland. We are committed to making these industries more profitable, productive and sustainable for future generations.

WorkCover Board; Member for Cairns

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.35 pm): During budget estimates, the member for McConnel tabled copies of posts on the personal social media page of a WorkCover board member. In response, I immediately wrote to the chair of WorkCover Queensland, asking her to undertake a fulsome review of the circumstances—

Ms Grace: You squibbed it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I did—and requested that she take any appropriate action she deemed necessary. I table a copy of the letter I sent to WorkCover.

Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 31 July 2025, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, to the Chair of WorkCover Queensland, Ms Chloe Kopilovic, regarding two social media posts made by the Deputy Chair [\[1126\]](#).

Ms Grace: You tabled it yesterday.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member. On Monday, 25 August, the chair wrote back to me outlining the findings of her review, noting that she had also obtained independent external legal advice. The chair has spoken with the board member concerning his obligations under the WCQ code of conduct and has received a commitment that he will abide by them. She has also recommended he undertake appropriate action. Before I table the letter from the WorkCover chair, I note point 4 in the chair's letter to me where she says—

I have identified a shortcoming in the induction process for new board members. Rather than a physical copy of the Code of Conduct being provided to each board member at their induction, it was supplied to them in a bundle of materials (accessible via a hyperlink in the Directors Induction Manual).

Ms Grace: You've got to be kidding.

Mr de Brenni: What, he can't read his emails!

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. We are achieving a high threshold with this type of behaviour. Point 4 continues—

Moving forward, I have confirmed with the Corporate Secretary that a physical copy of the Code of Conduct will be provided to the board member at their induction.

Mr de Brenni: He's pretty good at Facebook but not his emails.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection about the Facebook post from the Manager of Opposition Business. I table a copy of those.

Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 25 August 2025, from the Chair of WorkCover Queensland, Ms Chloe Kopilovic, to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, regarding two social media posts made by the Deputy Chair [\[1127\]](#).

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! One person has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: Further, and separate to the chair's investigation, I can inform the House that further investigations into inappropriate social media posts have been undertaken. In the process of those investigations, a post was uncovered stating, 'Some great one liners.....' with a video attached. I reviewed the shared video and have come to the view that the so-called 'great one liners' are highly inappropriate, deeply offensive and misogynistic. The 'great one liners' in the shared video included quotes like—

The young couple next door to me have recently made a sex tape. I mean, obviously they don't know that yet.

...

I always worry when a woman sees me naked for the first time that she's just going to scream and run out of the park.

...

The other day, a woman described me as a bit of a looker. Well, voyeur was the actual word. There's no need to split hairs, is there?

...

I went to see the stalactites at Cheddar Gorge and our guide asked us not to try and crack one off. She wasn't even that attractive. Still managed. It's very dark.

...

I was actually thrown out of Weight Watchers for making sarcastic comments at the weekly weigh in. As you can imagine, I accepted the decision with huge Grace, because they threw her out as well.

Then there was this so-called joke about killing a sex worker—

I accidentally filled the escort with diesel. She died.

I cannot understand why the Labor member for Cairns thought these horrific and sexually violent statements were 'great one liners' or why he posted this material at a time when he was an assistant minister in the former Labor government. I table a screenshot of Michael Healy's Facebook post sharing this video 'Nine minutes of one liners' and his quote, 'Some great one liners.....'

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 1 April 2021, from the Facebook page of the Member for Cairns, Mr Michael Healy MP, in relation to 'Nine Minutes of One Liners' [1128].

I look forward to seeing the Leader of the Opposition outline what action he will now take today with respect to the member for Cairns, his shadow minister for jobs and training and shadow minister for tourism. Yesterday the member for McConnel stood in this place demanding the immediate sacking of the WorkCover deputy chair.

Ms Grace: Yes, you can do it. You haven't done it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member. The member for McConnel stated—

Can members imagine what would have happened if the CFMEU or any other person on that board had made those Facebook posts? They would have been gone in one second. The Deputy Premier would have acted immediately. He would have sacked them.

I look forward to the member for McConnel holding her shadow cabinet colleague—he is sitting diagonally behind her—to the same standard she demanded yesterday in the House whilst I was speaking about Facebook posts and demanding—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We are not having quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr BLEIJIE: Whilst I was delivering my ministerial statement I took the interjections about the Facebook posts from the member for McConnel, so I again say that I look forward to the member for McConnel holding her shadow cabinet colleague, who sits diagonally behind her, the Labor member for Cairns, to the same standard she has demanded of others in this place. The member for McConnel demanded that I act; I did, straightaway. I wrote to the—

Ms Grace: You did nothing. You did nothing.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. What is the member for McConnel going to do about the member for Cairns and his misogynistic, sexist and physically violent posts—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, address your comments through the chair. Member for McConnel, there is some provocation but you have not stopped. If I call your name again you will be warned.


Mr BLEIJIE: I would hope that the loud interjections from the member for McConnel are not excusing the behaviour of her shadow cabinet colleague, who is sitting behind her. The member for McConnel demanded I act, and I did straightaway. I wrote to the independent chair of the WorkCover board. The chair investigated, obtained independent legal advice and counselled board members. As I understand it after speaking to the chair of the WorkCover board, having spoken to board members—including, I might add, to female union members on the board—they are satisfied with the action the

chair of WorkCover has undertaken. I repeat: the female union members on the WorkCover board are satisfied with the action that the chair of WorkCover has undertaken with respect to this issue.

Now that I have raised these highly inappropriate issues posted by the member for Cairns, it is up to the Leader of the Opposition to act on the Labor member for Cairns and hold him to the high standard the member for McConnel, also his shadow minister, demanded of others in this place. This is now a test of leadership for the opposition leader.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Chief Health Officer, Appointment

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.42 pm): I give notice that I will move—


That this House:

1. notes media reports that:
 - (a) a selection panel via a merit-based process recommended Dr Krispin Hajkowicz to the Chief Health Officer role.
 - (b) after Dr Hajkowicz was informed of the successful selection panel outcome, the role was withdrawn from Dr Hajkowicz by the government.
 - (c) health minister Nicholls had informally endorsed the appointment of Dr Hajkowicz as the new Chief Health Officer.
 - (d) ministers in the Crisafulli LNP government intervened to block the appointment of Dr Hajkowicz as the Chief Health Officer.
 - (e) the Public Sector Commission stated: 'the Department of Health is required to ensure that the person selected for employment is the eligible applicant best suited to the position'.
2. notes the Chief Health Officer is a Public Service appointment by the director-general of Queensland Health, not ministers or cabinet.
3. acknowledges and endorses the merit-based selection panel recommendation that Dr Krispin Hajkowicz was the most meritorious candidate.
4. agrees to summons the director-general of Queensland Health to produce to the Assembly all selection panel documents related to Dr Hajkowicz and the Chief Health Officer role by Wednesday, 3 September 2025.
5. requests the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee investigate the Chief Health Officer appointment process including any political interference by the LNP government and report to the Legislative Assembly by 26 September 2025.
6. condemns the Crisafulli LNP government for its latest integrity scandal which has resulted in the Chief Health Officer role not having a permanent appointee, affecting health outcomes in Queensland.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 3.44 pm.

Hospitals, Wait Times

 **Mr MILES** (2.44 pm): My question is to the health minister. Drune joins us in the gallery today. Her brother Rhiike tragically died after his category 1 specialist outpatient appointment was not scheduled in the clinically recommended time due to the volume of patients waiting. Will the minister take responsibility for the failures under his watch that contributed to this tragedy?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for the question. Of course, I and the government express to Drune—who I believe is in the chamber today and who has also earlier today, I believe, stood up with the Leader of the Opposition—our deepest sympathies over their loss. These are terrible, tragic and heart-wrenching circumstances. I am aware of the circumstances surrounding Rhiike's loss and I am aware there is currently an investigation being conducted with respect to the circumstances around his loss. I am also aware that the member for Algeester wrote to my office on 22 June with respect to this matter. My office acted immediately with respect to that and contacted Metro South, the relevant health service. A departmental liaison officer also contacted Drune on the 23rd, had a discussion and then acted in terms of providing the contacts and outreach that so tragically were required in these circumstances.

These things, as I say, are heart-wrenching and none of us—none of us—should in any way, shape or form be dismissive of the claims or the concerns that are raised. I say to Drune: thank you for coming into this chamber and for the bravery you have shown in standing up and bringing these matters to our attention. The system is not perfect—far from it. In the 10 months I have had the privilege of

having this job I have learned it is staffed with very good people—really well-meaning people who do their very best under often very difficult and challenging circumstances every day. It is also the patients and consumers who turn up and do their very best under challenging circumstances, often frightened and unsure of what the future will hold.

Today I met with one of those people for 45 minutes and spoke to that person about that person's experience with their child in our system, and again we reach out to those people. I say to anyone—the Leader of the Opposition, the shadow health minister, the member for Algester—let us know. We will do our very best to fix it. My wife is an OT. We know about the challenges that young people face. We need to do better. The system needs to do better. Please let us know and we will do our best to do better.

Hospitals, Wait Times

Ms ENOCH: My question is to the Minister for Health. Of the 27,672 category 1 patients on the specialist outpatient appointments waitlist, can the minister advise how many are right now waiting longer than clinically recommended?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for the question. As the member well knows, the member was part of a government that for a decade was in charge of Queensland's health and hospital systems. Over that period, we saw the ambulance ramping rate increase, or blow out, we saw the elective surgery waiting list increase and we saw the specialist outpatients list increase as well. This government has made a commitment to deliver better health services and easier access to health services, and that is why this year we are investing \$33.1 billion into the health budget. However, that is not enough. More needs to be done. After 10 months we are delivering sustainable and noticeable improvements, particularly around elective surgery.

With respect to the specialist outpatients list, I can advise the member that the patients waiting within the clinically recommended timeframes improved by 0.5 per cent between May 2025 and June 2025. It is a small number but it is an improvement in the number of specialist outpatients waiting within clinically recommended times.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: This is an important subject and I am providing the information that was specifically asked by those opposite. There has been an increase in patients waiting within clinically recommended timeframes of 0.5 per cent. Despite this, the waitlist continues to grow. There is no gilding that lily. That is the case.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We were specifically seeking the number waiting longer than clinically recommended. I understand the minister has indicated how many are waiting within the clinically recommended time. We are asking how many are waiting longer.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order to address the point of order from the Manager of Opposition Business. The minister is clearly being responsive to the question as asked. He is providing detailed information and he should be allowed to continue to provide that response.

Mr SPEAKER: As I heard it, the minister was speaking directly to the waiting list when the point of order was raised.

Mr NICHOLLS: This is an important subject. It consumes an enormous amount of this government's time, my time and the office's time as we deal with these numbers. As I was saying, we have seen an increase in patients waiting within clinically recommended timeframes. We are seeing more patients on the specialist outpatient waitlist. I have said that. That is clearly the case. We have seen 69,000 initial specialist outpatient appointments provided in June 2025. That is an increase in patients being seen of 8.6 per cent, or 5,484, compared to a year ago.

(Time expired)

Workplace Behaviour

Ms JAMES: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the Deputy Premier advise the House of the importance of acting swiftly when issues of workplace culture are raised, and is he aware of any instances where this has not occurred during the decade of decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: The answer to the honourable member's question is: you bet I am, and I thank the member for this opportunity because it is a really important question. This government has delivered

for Queensland in 10 months, compared to the inverse 10 years of decline under the Labor administration. We saw time and time again the Labor administration lecture everybody—particularly in the last 10 months, I might add—about workplace culture, bullying and misogyny but then, when the member for Stafford had a domestic incident in his house, they came in here and defended the member for Stafford.

The Labor Party have the ability to defend women when it suits them and not defend their blokes when it suits them politically, and that is what we have seen in the Labor Party. They want to have the high moral ground on lecturing people in a grandiose way about moral values and workplace culture, but then they do not practise what they preach. When we raise issues—as I have just done in my ministerial statement—listen to the objection and the rhetoric from the member for McConnell. She wanted to basically say, ‘How dare the LNP raise these issues in here because it’s against the Labor Party.’ That is what she wants to say.

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is not correct. I take offence and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Mr Speaker, let me give you some contrast in how we have dealt with these workplace issues in the last 10 months compared to the Labor Party. In Geoffrey Watson’s report into the CFMEU Queensland, he made it quite clear that he was just scratching the surface of the CFMEU, which the Labor Party protected and enabled for 10 years and that had successfully cultivated a culture of violence in the CFMEU. Female public servants were locked in an office with CFMEU officials. In 2015 when the Labor government was elected, the CFMEU waltzed down to the public servants and said, ‘We now own the government. We tell you what to do.’

For 10 years, the CFMEU were protected by the industrial relations minister, the member for McConnell. For 10 years they were protected by the Labor Party. In fact the member for McConnell appointed Kurt Pauls, who was a CFMEU official, to the Workplace Health and Safety Board only six months after the court imposed significant penalties on him and personally fined him \$30,000. Mr Speaker, you are not going to believe who the member for Springwood appointed. We all know his name—Jade Ingham. He was appointed on the board of the QBCC in the People and Culture Committee.

It is this Crisafulli LNP government that is turning the tide on workplace bullying culture. The question is: what is the opposition leader going to do about the member for Cairns? He has done nothing in the last 20 minutes. There are so many questions for the Leader of the Opposition to answer. What is the answer?

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a CFMEU demonstration [1129].

Tabled paper: Further photograph depicting a CFMEU demonstration [1130].

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Wait Times

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Health. Brendon joins us in the gallery today. Just yesterday he waited 16 hours in the transit lounge of the QEII Hospital for an ambulance. Does the minister take responsibility for Brendon’s 16-hour wait in the QEII transit lounge?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. To Brendon, who is in the gallery and joining us today, I do apologise for your 16-hour wait, because 16 hours is too long to wait in an emergency department for treatment and that is what we are working to do better at. That is why, Brendon, you might care to know that we have introduced a rule that says no-one should wait in an emergency department for more than 24 hours if at all possible. That is because all the advice that we receive from emergency management specialists is that longer waits in emergency departments lead to poorer outcomes. People who present in emergency need to be treated, need to be moved to an acute ward or, alternatively, need to be sent home for treatment.

Mr MILES: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. For the benefit of the minister, Brendon waited in the transit lounge for 16 hours to be transferred out of the hospital.

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the Leader of the Opposition. Transit lounges are an important part of it, and I will come back to transit lounges. No-one should be waiting in an emergency department for more than 24 hours, and that is why we have the 24-hour rule. That is supported by the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine and by the doctors at every emergency department I have visited through the state, and I have visited most of them.

In relation to transit lounges: Brendon, the transit lounges are there to facilitate speedier discharge and that you had to wait there for 16 hours, again, is unacceptable. I would welcome the opportunity to meet with you to understand what happened so that we can take steps to improve it. I would welcome that opportunity because we are always looking to do better, as I indicated in my answers to the first two questions I was asked by the opposition earlier today.

We are always looking to do better. That is why this year—and I am not sure if Brendon is aware of this and it would not surprise me if you are not because not many people read the budget papers in detail—we have established another \$55 million to invest in increasing the size of transit lounges and also invest in people because lounges by themselves do not solve the problem. We are investing in people to help those who want to discharge more quickly and to ensure they have a place to go. Importantly, we are not going to send people out to sit on the side of the road waiting for a lift home or a place to live in. We will always provide proper and appropriate clinical care.

Only three weeks ago I was up at Ipswich where we are doubling the size of the transit lounge and putting \$10 million into increasing its size. This is something that the people who run the Ipswich Hospital said they have been asking for for more than three years. We are delivering it. We are not just talking about it; we are investing and we are delivering. Brendon, I am happy to chat to you about your problem.

Workplace Behaviour

Mr DILLON: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the Deputy Premier advise how the Crisafulli LNP government is addressing trends in misogynistic workplace behaviour across Queensland, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any circumstances where trends have not been addressed during a decade of decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Gregory for the question. The answer is, of course, yes—again. We are, in 10 months, trying to overcome what was 10 years of a culture of decline in workplaces across the state. I want to thank the honourable member and government members for the work they are doing in that regard.

Let me start where I finished my ministerial statement. In the post I was speaking about, the member for Cairns said, 'Some great one liners.' I did not have time to get to them all. I want to read a few more from that post. Considering that yesterday all the Labor members wore purple—and I understand purple is a symbol of support for the LGBTIQ+ community—I want to start with this particular one-liner that the member for Cairns enthusiastically posted on his Facebook site: 'A Christian friend of mine said that sex between two men was wrong in their eyes. I said, "You're quite right. It's supposed to be up the [expletive]." Again, yesterday they came in here wearing purple and hosted people. Are they going to call it out? Are they going to call out that their shadow minister is posting this material on his Facebook page? I doubt they will. They will protect their shadow ministers, like they always do. They believe it is only others that can commit these 'sins' and be against all this sort of thing. No, they will not.

Another post read, 'As a family, we could not decide whether to have Nanna buried or cremated, so in the end we let her live.' Another one read, 'It is tradition in our family that we always have a Christmas jumper—and then it's just my job to talk them down.' We are talking about not only misogyny but also suicide and mental health. There is not a one-liner from the member for Cairns that has not covered one of the issues that the Labor Party have lectured people on for 10 years, and they have not even said anything in half an hour since I raised these issues. Nothing! Silence! It is not good enough.

The opposition leader is clearly not up to the job. He stood by and let the member for Stafford for weeks stay in this place and voted with him on a motion—not condemning him but supporting him. Where is the shadow minister for women? What does the shadow minister for women think about of all this? Has she spoken to him? Has she dragged the member for Cairns out the back and given him a talking-to like Jackie Trad used to do? No, they all sat there. He has not even left the chamber to make inquiries or anything. It is disgraceful. When are the Labor Party going to practise what they preach when it comes to what they lecture everybody else on?

Here is another thing: are we going to see the member for McConnel, who was the industrial relations minister for many years, enthusiastically back our royal commission into the CFMEU which is so needed in this state in relation to the culture of bullying and misogyny on our worksites? We did a bit of digging and it was a bit of a 'Where's Wally?', only 'Where's Grace?' because when the last protest

against a royal commission into the CFMEU took place, look who is in the front row—the member for McConnell, opposing the royal commission into the CFMEU. What a disgrace—for 10 years!

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Bypass

Mr BAILEY: My question is to the Minister for Health. Brendon was told he was not going to Logan Hospital because it was on bypass and was instead transferred to the QEII Hospital. Can the minister advise if the Logan Hospital was on bypass due to an inundation of flu presentations?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Miller for his question. I say to Brendon, as I say to everyone, thank you for raising this matter and thank you for letting us know. We cannot fix these problems unless we know about them. Again, I would welcome the opportunity to understand Brendon's circumstances and to provide him with a detailed answer with respect to his situation and what he experienced, and obviously what he felt was a less-than-satisfactory experience in the health system.

On the broader issue of bypass, I had a look at the figures. I will get some more detail later today in relation to bypass regarding that, but I do not have the exact date that the member is talking about, the time that it occurred or the circumstances, all of which would enable me to answer the question that the member for Miller has asked. If he were able to provide those details, I would be able to provide him with a greater response.

I can say this: in the broad, in this year there have been fewer occasions of bypass in Queensland Health than there were last year—fewer occasions of bypass and fewer tier 3s than there were last year, under the former government. I can also say that the duration of the tier 3s is substantially lower, and, if memory serves me, tier 3 escalations under the former Labor government last year averaged above 70 hours. This year, while a tier 3 is always going to put strain on the system, the tier 3s are now down in the 50 hours on average. We have reduced tier 3s from, on average, in the 70 hours to, on average, in the 50 hours. That directly feeds into the bypass question which was asked.

Of course, what we are most interested in is not statistics and playing around with funny numbers, as the member for Miller seems to want to do. What we are most interested in is delivering care to people like Brendon. I would think that an opposition member who was asking a question would provide more detail to enable a proper answer to be given. I would think that they would write to the health minister and say, 'Here is the situation. Can you provide me the detail about it?' I would also think that an opposition that presided over a decade of decline in our health system would have at least some shame to admit their complicity in the failures that people like Brendon have experienced.

Domestic and Sexual Violence

Mrs STOKER: My question is of the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the minister outline how the Crisafulli LNP government is leading by example when it comes to reducing the scourge of domestic and sexual violence, and is the minister aware of any examples in which this has not occurred during a decade of decline?

Ms CAMM: I thank the member for the question. We here are committed to bringing perpetrators to account and to putting victims first. I have been working very closely with the Minister for Police, the Attorney-General and the Minister for Victim Support because we are committed to implementing reform after a decade of decline by the Labor Party and those opposite. The Crisafulli government is delivering, and we will be debating legislation later today in this House that I am very proud of and on which we have worked collaboratively.

What the Deputy Premier has revealed today that was posted by the member for Cairns is nothing short of disgraceful and disgusting. I thought I had seen it all from those opposite who sat in silence, particularly the women. I have been lectured to by the women of the Labor Party for the last nearly five years. I urge and encourage the new women of the Labor Party who have come into this House to speak up—to have the courage of their convictions that those who are apparently their leaders do not. Go and look at that Facebook post. It is beyond disgusting. It is about killing a sex worker and about sexually assaulting women in parks. Many in this House—on both sides—have spoken about the fear and the reality that women face every single day in the community. The post is also about filming people having sex. With regard to one that was not quoted, I can barely bring myself to say the words, it is so abhorrent and disgusting.

We have heard those opposite, particularly the member for Waterford, speak about how women on this side of the House should speak up more for women's rights, for equality and for respect at work. Well, we are, and we will continue to each and every day. The women opposite were too afraid to sit next to the member for Stafford, who was then removed from the party, not because of an alleged domestic incident at his home but because of a return-to-work plan that he apparently failed to adhere to that we still have not seen tabled in this House. The member for Cooper is the first to jump on social media and make a post about men's words in this House, about the way they portray and engage women. I ask those opposite—the member for Gaven, the member for McConnel and the member for Waterford—if they have the courage of their conviction to stand up for women. They can put as many posts on social media as they want and they will mean nothing today if the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Waterford do not remove the member for Cairns for his conduct.

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Ramping

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Minister for Health. Whistleblowers have told the opposition that police are being forced to transport sick and injured people to hospital due to an unavailability of ambulances. I table a photo of the PA Hospital just last night.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting ambulance and police vehicles [\[1131\]](#).

Why are police off the beat acting as pseudo paramedics?

Mr SPEAKER: I will give the minister a chance to look at the photo.

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for the question. There is a photograph of a hospital and it has two police cars in it. Thanks very much. That does not justify anything. We have another claim by those opposite. At least the first questions were proper questions with proper patients who are here today and, again, I want to thank them for their presence today. I welcome their contribution to fixing the health system because it does need fixing. Previously I was looking up in the gallery there in relation to Brendon. I am advised that Brendon is actually up in the chamber, so my apologies if I was looking the wrong way.

Let me deal with what we are doing with the Queensland Ambulance Service in relation to the member for McConnel's situation. Firstly, ambulance response times are almost identical this year to what they were last year—that is, code 1s are being answered within about 8.3 minutes, if memory serves me correctly. Code 1s are being answered promptly. The Queensland ambulance commissioner continues to provide information on a daily basis about demand on the QAS services.

There are many reasons why the QAS might not be engaged in delivering people to emergency departments. For example, there are often cases where people present as mental health consumers and the first person who is called is the police and the police transport people to our emergency departments. They are not transported in ambulances because the call is made to police officers who actually pick those people up and, for the safety of the individual—which is the primary driver not only from the health service's perspective but also for the broader safety of the community—that person is transported in a police vehicle to the emergency department for treatment as is appropriate.

That is one of the issues that we face after a decade of neglect under Labor—that there is no appropriate triaging system for mental health consumers who turn up at our hospitals. That is why as part of our Hospital Rescue Plan we are investing hundreds of thousands of dollars in triage entry for mental health consumers to divert mental health consumers away from other Queensland Health emergency department presentations because the worst thing you can do is have a mental health consumer in an emergency department where children and others are presenting. That is the clinical advice and the clinical evidence. That is why our health plan provides funding to divert those consumers. This year we have also put \$1 billion more over four years into equipment for the Queensland Ambulance Service. This is a record budget funding uplift.

Women, Safety

Miss DOOLAN: My question is to the Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism. Can the minister detail how the Crisafulli LNP government is prioritising safety for women, and is the minister aware of any approaches that have not prioritised the safety of women during a decade of decline?

Ms SIMPSON: I wish to thank the member for Pumicestone for the question on a serious issue. Certainly, with 10 months of the Crisafulli government delivering versus 10 years of Labor decline, it is

important we talk about how we are delivering as a Crisafulli government in regard to women's safety, in regard to respect for women and in regard to significant issues that not only need legislative address but, as we have heard, need to be called out and put on the record.

Before I unpack this question and the answer to it a little more, I acknowledge that our youngest ever female member of parliament, the member for Pumicestone, came into this place after a pretty rugged battle. It was appalling to see her predecessor and the Labor hacks go after her as a young woman. They say one thing about respecting women and they do the complete opposite when it is somebody who is not from their side of the fence. There is no respect for women across Queensland when they have no respect for the person who is now our youngest ever female member of parliament.

Let's talk about 10 months of delivery under the Crisafulli government versus 10 years of Labor decline in regard to safety for women. We have significant domestic violence reforms. They are before the House and I cannot talk about them in detail because of the rules. However, we are focused on ensuring these reforms bring about the changes that are necessary to help keep women and all those who suffer from domestic violence safe. My colleagues and the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support are determined to provide better support for victims who have faced appalling circumstances.

One of the most appalling circumstances has been the DNA lab debacle failure. My colleague the Attorney-General will continue to rectify what we have seen with respect to that because, when there is more than 400 days of delay for rape kits to be tested, that is a failure of women's safety when the offenders are still on the street and that is due to the failure of Labor. To compare and contrast: the member for Waterford, as the worst ever minister for women and now as the shadow minister for women, presided over the CBRC when money was diverted from cutting the DNA backlog. It was appalling, and there is still silence in regard to that debacle. She knew about this and failed to act. In fact, she made it worse by diverting funds from the frontline.

We have also heard in regard to the member for Cairns—

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Ramping

Mr J KELLY: My question is to the Minister for Health. Is the Crisafulli LNP government's approach to reduce ambulance ramping to park patients in transit lounges for almost a full day?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the question as asked by the member for Greenslopes. I would say that it is seeking an opinion and is hypothetical. I seek your guidance as to whether it should be rephrased.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is a matter of fact whether or not it is the government's policy in relation to this matter. I submit, therefore, that the question is in order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just have a quick look at the question. Member, it is borderline argumentative. Could you rephrase the question please?

Mr J KELLY: Given the statements from the minister today about the increase in the size of transit lounges, is this part of the Crisafulli government's strategy to manage the increasing problems with ramping related to the delay in hospital builds and the cancelling of projects?

Mr NICHOLLS: Yesterday I was too quick in lauding the prospects of the member for Greenslopes. I am sorry to have to inform the House, but he has reverted to form and he is following in the footsteps of the member for Miller. I wait for either of them to take offence to that statement and ask me to withdraw. Let me deal with it.

The member talks about ambulance ramping. Who were the masters of ambulance ramping? Who set ambulance ramping on the path to 45 per cent and left a mess that we are still clearing up? I can tell honourable members who it was. Three of the four former failed health ministers who presided over the health department for a decade are still sitting on the Labor opposition benches, and have they ever apologised for their failure? Have they ever delivered what they said they were going to do? The member for Waterford was going to reduce it to 28 per cent within 12 months, and what did that percentage do? It went up and up. Did they have a plan for it? No, they did not. I was asked earlier by the member for McConnel about hospital times and about police delivering patients to emergency departments. I have here a photo from 2022 showing police vans in the emergency department ramp at the PA Hospital.

Mr SPEAKER: No, do not use that as a prop, thank you very much. You can table it, but do not use it as a prop.

Mr NICHOLLS: Those opposite speak with a forked tongue when they ask these questions. They presided over the failure. I was asked about ambulance times. I can report the ambulance times. I knew I had it in the paperwork in front of me. For June 2024, code 1 response times were 8.8 minutes. For June 2025, under the LNP Crisafulli government, after just 10 months, we have 8.2-minute response times. We are getting more ambulances on the road faster and we are getting people into hospitals quicker and giving them better treatment.

When it comes to transit lounges, hospitals around the world acknowledge the need for transit lounges. They are clinically required in order to move patients who have received their period of care from the hospital acute bed to a place where they are securely and clinically looked after until they can return to their home or community accommodation. That is what transit lounges do. Ask any hospital administrator, any discharge nurse or any doctor what they think should happen and they will say 'move people out' and 'more transit lounges please'.

(Time expired)

Senior Office Holders, Integrity

Mr HUTTON: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. Will the Attorney and Minister for Integrity outline how senior office holders must demonstrate a high standard and hold themselves to account, and is the Attorney aware of any examples where these standards have not been met during a decade of decline?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The answer is yes, like the Deputy Premier so ably said. I want to thank the member for Keppel for his question because, as we have heard in this House so many times, the standard you walk by is the standard you accept. Today is a day for leadership. It is a leadership question for the Leader of the Opposition. It is a leadership question for the former minister for women. Today is a distressing day for the women of Queensland, who have been failed by the former Labor government. The Crisafulli government has been doing everything we can in the last 10 months to stand up for women, to fix the broken systems, but the standard you walk past is the standard you accept.

The member for Cairns in 2021 put up a post and basically said, 'Have a bit of a laugh about this.' The year 2021 is important. It is important for many reasons, but it is important because of two names I want to say in this House: Doreen Langham and Kelly Wilkinson, both set alight by their partners. This is one of the lines that the member has endorsed as a 'great one liner': 'I accidentally filled the escort with diesel. She died.' That, member for Cairns, is no laughing matter when in 2021 two women—it was topical—lost their lives because of fire. They lost their lives because their partners decided that that was what was in their best interests. It was not, member for Cairns.

Those opposite sit there with their heads down. We on this side of the chamber—the women on this side of the chamber who stand up each and every day for women who suffer through domestic violence—do not post selfies on our Facebook pages and say how bad the opposition is on this issue. We stand side by side and shoulder to shoulder with the women who are subjected to domestic violence. The member's head should be down. I say to the member for Waterford and I say to the member for Murrumba: show some leadership on this issue.

The member for Cairns thinks it is a laughing matter. I have looked at this post. I find it disgraceful. I find it disgraceful that the senior members of the Labor Party have sat here silently all of question time and have allowed this member to still sit in this chamber.

(Time expired)

Emissions Reduction Targets

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. Extraordinarily high coal royalties have countered the costly rollout of renewables to achieve net zero. Given the negative outlook for coal producers, will the Treasurer advocate to drop net zero targets and reduce royalties to reverse the decline of investment in Queensland coal?

Mr JANETZKI: I want to thank the honourable member for the question. There is a little bit to unpack in that question and I will take it piece by piece. Let me start with the coal industry in Queensland. We heard the resources minister speak earlier today in his ministerial statement about the additional investment we are going to see from Bravus. Over the next couple of years there will be an additional \$50 million and 600 jobs that will open up a pipeline to \$500 million worth of investment. We have seen that news greeted warmly by everyone in regional Queensland who stands to gain from that

expansion, particularly small and family businesses. We know that small and family businesses have a lot to gain from mining expansions, and that was a significant show of confidence in the industry in Queensland. That is the kind of investment we want to see more of. The resources minister has made that abundantly clear not just in the coal industry but within the expansion that he wants to see in gas exploration and development as well, with the additional tenements that are being opened up. We know that there are expansion possibilities and we are a government that is open for business.

With respect to emissions—and I note the honourable member's question—we will approach emissions reduction in the Queensland way. We will do that in the Queensland way. We have said that we will run coal for longer and invest more into gas, both in generation and in firming renewables. We also want to see additional investment into renewables with respect particularly to the private sector. We want to see more generation, and we have made that abundantly clear. In October I will be presenting our Energy Roadmap. I have laid out the signposts, but we will be completing that work and delivering it to the Queensland people in October. I look forward to that Energy Roadmap being made public.

Again with respect to emissions, we have said that we will do that the Queensland way. When it comes to emissions reduction, we have seen land management and agriculture bear the significant load of emissions reduction in Queensland already. We know that we have overshot our 2030 targets already. We are at 34 per cent emissions reduction. We know that we have done that already and we know that the significant emissions reductions that will come will come from generation of energy and also transportation, so we will be continuing to chart a course towards net zero by 2050 as we committed to before the election. We will be doing it the Queensland way, however. I am looking forward to sharing more of that Queensland way when I announce the Energy Roadmap in October.

Victims of Crime

Ms MARR: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. Can the minister outline the steps the Crisafulli LNP government is taking to reduce the retraumatisation of victims, and is the minister aware of any behaviours that could retraumatise a victim of crime during a decade of decline?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Thuringowa for her question. I know how important it is to her to protect victims of crime, including from retraumatisation. Supporting victims of crime includes addressing retraumatisation, and that is not just through the justice process; it is also about the culture that victims see in the leaders of this state, and that culture is on full display right now when it comes to the female leaders of the state opposition. It is a disgraceful culture that we see on display right now.

The Labor member for Cairns shared vile commentary about women—vile commentary making jokes about sexual violence, jokes about the degradation of women, jokes about violence against women—and he called them 'great one liners'. It is not funny. Violence against women is not funny. All their heads are down right now. Where is the opposition's shadow minister for women in this conversation? Where is she standing up against a member who is making vile commentary around women? It is chilling to see, because there is nothing funny about rape or sexual violence. There is nothing humorous about degrading women. For any victim of crime seeing Labor MPs promoting this filth and the retraumatisation that could happen to them sends a chilling message.

A victim's trauma is not a punchline, member for Cairns. It is not a joke, yet this is not an isolated incident because we have seen Labor members rally around the member for Stafford when the member for Stafford was accused of an alleged domestic violence incident. We have seen them rally around him and protect him. We have seen them protect their union mates in the CFMEU despite the misogynistic culture in the CFMEU.

This is a culture within the Labor Party—it is a culture—and where is the shadow minister for women? Where is she in this debate? She is standing shoulder to shoulder with the man who is doing this—shoulder to shoulder with the member for Cairns. Time and time again Labor leaders have walked past this culture.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mrs GERBER: Make an apology!

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, we have a point of order.

Ms FENTIMAN: I take personal offence. We are in question time. There has been no opportunity—

Mr SPEAKER: You are taking personal offence. It is not an opportunity—

Ms FENTIMAN:—for anyone to comment and I ask her to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER:—for a speech. The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw. Time and time again Labor leaders have walked past this culture. The member should put her money where her mouth is. If he is still there tomorrow, then he should not be!

Hospitals, Private Investment

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for Health. It was revealed today that at an exclusive developer breakfast the minister let slip that the Crisafulli government has a secret plan to privatise hospital builds. Can the minister categorically rule out private investment in Queensland's public hospitals?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the question as asked by the member for Waterford, there are a number of aspects in relation to imputations and inferences in relation to some of the words used and I would also ask that the member authenticate some of the elements contained in her question.

Ms FENTIMAN: I table an article about the health minister's speech that outlines that private partners are critical.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 27 August 2025, titled 'Private Partners Critical' [\[1132\]](#).

I am happy to rephrase the question. My question is to the Minister for Health.

Mr SPEAKER: Just wait for a moment. Could I see a copy of the original question? I am going to allow the question.

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Waterford, the former health minister, for that question. I say yet again: what another surprise from the Labor Party—a question about an article appearing in the *Courier-Mail* this morning. I think I have worked their strategy out: they all get together about 9.30 to 10ish or so on a Wednesday—

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I know; sorry.

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: No, no: as Mr Sangster found out today, they only work 2½ days a week anyway, so delivery on the Hospital Rescue Plan does not occur on Wednesdays. That is the day off. So they get together at about 9.30. They knock off for smoko at about 9.45 and then they gather again and say, 'Anyone read the paper yet?', and they say, 'Comrade, that assumes we can read,' so there we go. They say, 'No, no it's alright. It's only words of one syllable and they've usually got less than four letters in them, so we'll be able to make our way through it.' Then they say, 'There's a story in the paper there'—and a very good story it is. I have my own copy of it, in fact—I thought this might be the case—and it has a very good picture, underneath which are the words—

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Miller!

Mr NICHOLLS: There is a picture, which is obviously how it gets through the Labor caucus in the first place, of an artist's impression of the under-construction Coomera Hospital. There it is—'the under-construction Coomera Hospital'. Never were truer words printed in the *Courier-Mail*—'under-construction Coomera Hospital'—because that is what we are building.

Unlike Labor, just a short jog down memory lane will take us to Labor's record when it came to privatisation. I know that there are members on this side—although he is missing at the moment—saying, 'Who sold the assets?' Who sold the assets, because we have not forgotten about it? Who sold the assets: Queensland Motorways, Abbot Point, QR National, Port of Brisbane, Forestry Plantations, Cairns and Mackay airports—although the member for Cairns might be using that a bit sooner than he thought he would—Brisbane Airport, wind and energy assets which they could not build and had to have a special program for, gas assets, Golden Casket, Powerdirect, SunGas, Sun Retail, Allgas?

Mr Bailey interjected.

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

Mr NICHOLLS: What else did those opposite do? Labor signed up for the Mater Springfield public hospital services provided by the private sector but failed to fund them. The member for

Waterford signed up for mental health beds provided by Mater but failed to fund them. We will deliver health services where Queenslanders need them.

(Time expired)

Community Safety

Mr LISTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. Can the Premier explain how the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering stronger community safety across Queensland, and is the Premier aware of any approaches that did not keep Queenslanders safe during a decade of decline?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for Southern Downs for his question. He has been a fierce advocate for community safety in his electorate and I want to acknowledge the work that he has done in that space.

You have heard me speak a lot, Mr Speaker, about making Queensland safer. It is important to us. It is a priority to us, and it will always be so. We have done it across a range of different areas that matter to Queenslanders. Today I want to address the issue of community safety that matters most to every single parent—that is, the safety of their children. To be joined in this place today by two of the greatest Queenslanders ever in Bruce and Denise Morcombe on what truly is a significant day for this state means a great deal to all members of this House. We are acting to create Queensland's first-ever child sex offender register. That is important. After a decade of decline it is important that we ensure community safety is front and centre.

The honourable police minister and I have joined the Morcombes before, but it was a contribution in this House from the police minister which I think is most pertinent today. This is a register that could have been protecting kids for over half a decade. Those opposite had the opportunity. They had the opportunity in 2018 and they chose not to embark on it and chose not to make it a priority. They had multiple opportunities afterwards to do so. Today is a day for looking forward. This is important because if you believe that the rights of parents and kids come before the rights of predators and monsters, you will back this in; you will right the wrongs from half a decade ago. That is what leadership is.

Leadership is doing what you say you are going to do and leadership is making the tough calls when you have to make them. Sometimes those tough calls emerge when you do not realise: comments that have been made, standards that have been breached, trust that has been eroded. That is when leaders matter. Today is a really important day of leadership. A number have called out behaviour that has fallen well short of this. I am afraid there are only two options: one of two people should not be sitting there tomorrow. It is either the person sitting opposite me or it is the person who has used some of the most horrible, grubby, misogynistic, disgraceful attacks. One of them cannot be in the chair. It does not work both ways. You cannot have both; otherwise, leadership counts for nothing in this state. It is time for the Leader of the Opposition to make his mind up on who is not going to be in the chair tomorrow.

(Time expired)

Influenza, Vaccination

Mr BUTCHER: My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. The Premier has said that Queenslanders should discuss vaccinations with a GP. Does the Crisafulli LNP government recommend that appropriately qualified pharmacists and nurses should not be advising Queenslanders about vaccinations?

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

Mr NICHOLLS: The Crisafulli government is investing more and has run a program supporting flu vaccinations and is achieving success that those opposite could not. We are spending more money on promoting the flu vaccine, we have funded \$25 million that those opposite did not, and we have been consistently saying that you can get a free flu vaccine at more than 2,500 locations throughout Queensland. You can get it from your GP, you can get from it a health clinic or you can get it from your chemist. On top of that, we have also made permanent the pharmacy scope of practice for community pharmacists practising with acute conditions. We are expanding access to health services and promoting easier access to health services, all while we are fixing up a decade of decline under Labor. That decade of decline under Labor saw hospital ramping reach the worst it has ever reached. It saw the failed capacity expansion program—

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take the interjection from the member for Miller, who is on a warning.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Miller, you were on a warning. You continued to interject. I am going to ask you to leave the chamber for one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Miller withdrew from the chamber at 3.43 pm.


Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have the call. There are 35 seconds remaining.

Mr NICHOLLS: We are funding more; we are delivering more. We are running the program more and we are empowering pharmacies more than those on that side did in a decade—a decade of decline under Labor that saw our health system reach a crisis, that saw Queenslanders vote decisively on 26 October to deliver a fresh start. In 10 months we have delivered more than they were able to deliver in 10 years. That is what effective government is. That is what delivering for Queensland is all about.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

PRIVILEGE

Comments by Member for Cairns

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (3.44 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. With respect to the matter raised by the Deputy Premier, I have reviewed my social media and the post that the Deputy Premier has referred to. It was a comedy sketch posted by the BBC. It was posted on my private page on 1 April four years ago. I did not watch the whole video. The content of the video posted by the BBC is not appropriate and not a laughing matter by any means. I do not support or agree with the statements in the video. I apologise to the House and to the people of Queensland about the post I shared. Violence and misogyny in the community is totally unacceptable and always has been. We all know it should not occur. I know it should not occur. I subscribe to this, we all subscribe to this, and I apologise once again.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the member for Cairns rising on a matter of privilege, he is now straying into a matter of personal explanation and I suggest to you that perhaps there is a more appropriate time for him to make his speech.

Mr SPEAKER: It is done. You are finished, member for Cairns.


Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, there was definitely some unparliamentary language in there. I ask you to withdraw that.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw.

MOTION

Order of Business; Bills, Declared Urgent and Allocation of Time Limit Order

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (3.47 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That for today's sitting, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, the House will continue to sit past 9.30 pm to consider government business until the adjournment is moved by the Leader of the House at 11.30 pm, to be followed by a 30-minute adjournment debate.
2. That, under the provisions of standing order 137:
 - (a) the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill, with the minister called to reply to the bill by 5.00 pm on Thursday, 28 August 2025 and all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 28 August 2025;
 - (b) the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill, with the minister called to reply to the bill by 8.40 pm on Thursday, 28 August 2025 and all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 9.00 pm on Thursday, 28 August 2025.
3. That, if all stages have not been completed by the time specified in 2., Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill, including clauses and schedules en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill, without further amendment or debate.

In addressing this motion, we know that the debate on the estimates committee hearing reports takes significant hours in the House. It is an important and healthy part of our parliamentary democracy and is absolutely essential. We had a very important estimates process with significant reforms that were implemented by the Liberal National Party state government, but it also means that if we are to

continue to progress important legislation on behalf of Queenslanders then sensible adjustments to the sitting program can and should be made.

The Crisafulli LNP state government intends to debate and pass both the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill this week. As such, this proposed motion is allocating reasonable additional sitting hours for today to allow further time in relation to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As I said, this is important legislation.

The government wants to ensure that additional time is allocated to allow members to contribute to the debate on what is a significant public policy issue. As a government, we also want to ensure that in sitting weeks we are utilising the efficiency of our sitting days to maximise the opportunities for the parliamentary work that is undertaken here. By extending the hours tonight, we are certainly giving this House more time to deliberate on the business that matters to Queenslanders. We know they are significant issues. They have been very topical and more needs to be done when it comes to domestic and family violence here in Queensland. That is why this week we will be passing that legislation and also, as I said, giving additional time to members to debate the legislation.


The Crisafulli LNP state government already has a strong record of delivering significant legislative outcomes, which have been achieved through calm, considered, methodical and fulsome debates. That is the standard we have set and we will continue to set. As such, I commend this motion to the House.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COMMUNITY PROTECTION AND PUBLIC CHILD SEX OFFENDER REGISTER (DANIEL'S LAW) BILL

Message from Acting Governor

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (3.50 pm): I present a message from the Acting Governor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): The message from the Acting Governor recommends the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

COMMUNITY PROTECTION AND PUBLIC CHILD SEX OFFENDER REGISTER (DANIEL'S LAW) BILL 2025

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, JOHN KENNEDY BOND, Acting Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—


A Bill for an Act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 for particular purposes

ACTING GOVERNOR

Date: 27 August 2025

Tabled paper: Message, dated 27 August 2025, from the Acting Governor recommending the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025 [\[1133\]](#).

Introduction

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (3.51 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I also table a statement of exceptional circumstances. I will nominate the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025 [\[1134\]](#).

Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, explanatory notes [\[1135\]](#).

Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[1136\]](#).

Tabled paper: Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, statement relating to override declaration [\[1137\]](#).

Daniel Morcombe's name is synonymous with child safety, but to his loved ones he is so much more: a son, a brother, a twin—a 13-year-old boy with striking blue eyes who loved animals and his family. Daniel went missing from a bus stop at Palmwoods on the Sunshine Coast on 7 December 2003. The young teen was simply on his way to buy Christmas presents when he was abducted and murdered by a predator—a repeat child sex offender. After years of searching and an incredible undercover police investigation, Daniel was finally found in 2011.

Despite their own grief, Daniel's parents, Bruce and Denise, who are present in the chamber this afternoon, started the Daniel Morcombe Foundation to give back to the community that had supported them from the day that Daniel went missing. They have been fierce advocates for child protection, dedicating their lives to ensure no one else endures the same pain. We will never know how many lives they have saved or how many predators they have stopped. Today, because of their advocacy, we move to give our children even more protection from the monsters who lurk in the shadows.

I am pleased to introduce the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, fulfilling the commitment made by the Crisafulli government prior to the 2024 election, as part of a suite of reforms to restore safety in our communities. This particular commitment strengthens sex offender laws with the establishment of a new three tiered public sex offender register to protect the most vulnerable in our state and to keep Queensland children safe from sexual harm. Today we are delivering on that commitment, alongside a promise made to Bruce and Denise Morcombe in honour of their son Daniel. I introduce this bill, to be known as Daniel's Law, affirming our commitment to place the safety of children at the centre of our justice system.

I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 to establish the Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register, the public register. This bill acknowledges the incredibly important work Bruce and Denise Morcombe have undertaken through the Daniel Morcombe Foundation to keep kids safe, providing educational resources and ensuring communities are equipped with the relevant tools and strategies they need to feel empowered. I take this opportunity to again acknowledge the contributions of Daniel's parents, Bruce and Denise, whose unwavering commitment and determination have been instrumental in shaping this legislation. This bill aligns with that work, particularly in empowering parents, families and the community with the information they need to take protective action.

The commitment expressed through this bill brings Queensland in line with Western Australia and South Australia by increasing public access to information to help keep Queensland children safe. This government recognises that any risk to the lives or sexual safety of children is unacceptable. For too long, Queensland families have felt left in the dark. These reforms establish a public register that will enable police to publish photographs and certain details about missing reportable offenders, provide the opportunity for the community to view images of certain offenders residing in their general locality and empower parents, guardians and those exercising parental responsibility to know if a person who has or may have unsupervised contact with their child is a reportable offender. The public register will ensure Queensland families have access to information to make informed decisions when it comes to protecting their child or children.

The objectives of the bill are twofold: firstly, to increase general community awareness and vigilance by making particular information about certain reportable offenders more accessible to the public; and, secondly, to provide a proactive tool to enable parents, guardians and the community to have the information and agency necessary to act, including at an individual level, to reduce risk and better protect the lives and sexual safety of Queensland children. The bill will meet these objectives by establishing a new framework under the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 to enable three tiers of information disclosure.

The public register will be administered by the Queensland Police Service and the Police Commissioner will retain discretionary powers to determine whether to publish or provide information about reportable offenders who are subject to the public register. In line with the government's commitment, the proposed laws will create a three tiered public register, modelled on the scheme operating in Western Australia, with some adjustments to ensure it is fit for purpose in a Queensland context. This public register is the first of its kind in Queensland.

The first tier of the proposed public register will comprise a website displaying photos and certain personal details of reportable offenders who have failed to comply with their reporting obligations or the conditions of a supervision order made under the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003

and whose whereabouts are unknown to police following investigations to locate the offender. Offenders who choose to evade their obligations and fail to comply with their requirements pose a significant risk to our communities. This will not be tolerated and will no longer be shielded by secrecy. This information will be available to all members of the public to keep the community informed while police remain vigilant in their search and investigations.

The Police Commissioner will retain ultimate discretion about the details published about a missing reportable offender. Generally, information published will include a reportable offender's name, photograph, year of birth and a unique Queensland Police Service identifier, a QP number, with Policelink contact details in the event members of the public wish to report sightings or provide information to police. Once located, the offender's details will be removed. This ensures the tier remains accurate, relevant and focused squarely on those offenders who continue to pose a risk by evading the law. In this regard, the introduction of tier 1 may also serve as an incentive for offenders to comply with their reporting obligations to avoid or promptly end their details being published.

Under tier 2, any Queensland resident will be able to request facial images of certain reportable offenders residing within their locality. For the purposes of the public register, 'locality' has been defined in the bill to mean the general locality where the person resides, which will usually be the suburb or town in metropolitan areas. Given Queensland's vast geographic distances and diverse contexts, there may be circumstances that require a different approach to be taken that encapsulates adjoining suburbs or towns to the person's residential address. For example, in regional locations not divided by suburbs or towns, a person's locality may reflect the shire within which the person resides. Therefore, the bill provides flexibility in the application of locality to accommodate likely situations that may arise and require a broader application.

This ensures that a person will only receive photographs of offenders they may be most likely to encounter in their daily lives, so that they may stay vigilant when moving around their local area. Not all reportable offenders will have their image made accessible on request—only those who are considered to present a high potential for harm because of their offending history against children. This will include: a reportable offender who commits a further reportable offence against a child, listed in schedule 1 of the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004, after receiving notice of their reporting obligations—in simple terms, that is a reportable offender who is a repeat offender; a reportable offender whose reporting obligations are imposed for the remainder of the offender's life; and a reportable offender who is subject to a supervision order or temporary supervision order made under the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003.

A serious risk to the life or sexual safety of even one child is unacceptable. The bill ensures that where police identify or receive information that a reportable offender who does not fall into these categories demonstrates a known serious risk to the lives or sexual safety of a child, or children generally, the Police Commissioner is empowered to include their photograph in a request made by a person within their locality. The photographs will be provided in a controlled manner for the purposes of enhanced public awareness and safety. Where providing a photograph may be contradictory to this purpose, the Police Commissioner may exercise discretion to a person's request. This is an important element of the bill to ensure tier 2 strikes an appropriate balance of community safety and the protection of children.

Tier 3 expands on the parent and guardian disclosure scheme operating in Western Australia. Queensland's tier 3 will allow a parent, guardian or person having or exercising ongoing parental responsibility for a child to apply to confirm whether a person who has, or will have, unsupervised contact with their child is a current reportable offender. This contact includes any form of communication, whether in person or by electronic means, that will capture reportable offenders who may be subject to the public register.

Under existing laws, the Police Commissioner is permitted to give information about a reportable offender to a person, including a parent or guardian of a child, if it is reasonably necessary and appropriate to reduce a risk to the lives or sexual safety of one or more children generally. This power may be used where police become aware of changes to a reportable offender's contact with a child to ensure the child's parent is aware of the reportable offender's status. While subject to a supervision order or interim supervision order made under the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, a reportable offender is generally restricted from having unsupervised contact with a child without permission. A parent, guardian or caregiver can be informed of a reportable offender's supervision order at any time.

Introduction of this information disclosure tier seeks to supplement these existing powers by establishing a proactive framework that will allow parents, guardians and a person exercising ongoing parental responsibilities to seek information so that they may take appropriate action to prevent or cease unsupervised contact with a reportable offender. The potential devastating impact on the life and sexual safety of a child where a parent or guardian does not have access to this information cannot be quantified. The third tier ensures parents and guardians have the information and agency to remain best placed to protect their children.

As I said before the election, every parent has the right to determine, based on relevant information, whether their children may be at risk, and I am proud to be part of a government that is making that right happen. This tier will give parents and guardians the confidence that they can take proactive steps to protect their children.

Importantly, the public register will not release information: about an offender who is under the age of 18 years, or was under the age of 18 years at the time they committed a child sexual offence and has not reoffended as an adult; about an offender who is a participant in a witness protection program; or where a court has prohibited the publication or release of personal information about the offender. This is to protect the safety and identity of vulnerable offenders, and police will continue to monitor these offenders in the community using the powers provided to them under the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000.

The bill balances the increased accessibility of particular information about certain offenders with the introduction of targeted offences aimed at deterring its misuse, including for acts and incitement of vigilantism. Consistent with models in Western Australia and South Australia, the bill includes: an offence carrying a maximum penalty of 10 years targeting conduct intentionally inciting the intimidation or harassment of an offender identified through the scheme; an offence carrying a maximum penalty of three years targeting conduct that is likely to incite the intimidation or harassment of an offender identified through the scheme; and an additional offence carrying a maximum penalty of three years for the unauthorised sharing of information obtained through the scheme. Acts of vigilantism will not be tolerated, and the creation of these offences makes this clear.

Delivery of the public register requires a careful and considered approach in balancing community safety and achieving the policy intent to make particular information about certain child sex offenders accessible to the community and empower parents, caregivers and the community to make informed decisions to protect Queensland children from the risk of future victimisation and harm.

The Queensland Police Service will engage broadly with the community, victims and offenders through a public awareness campaign in the lead-up to the commencement of the public register. This will target a variety of channels and delivery methods, consistent with any other newly introduced framework in Queensland. Explanatory materials will be delivered in consultation with targeted government agencies and key sector stakeholders to assist victim-survivors and their families in understanding the public register, its purpose, how it may affect them and how to find out more information about the public register.

The bespoke website that will administer the scheme will include a contact email address for any person to direct queries about the public register and will list other available avenues for impacted persons to get in touch with police—for example, by phoning or visiting a local police facility or contacting their original investigating officer. This approach is consistent with the operating model in Western Australia, in which victims are not proactively engaged in the administration of the scheme. Western Australian police have advised that to date there has been no known instance of a victim being identified as a result of a publication or disclosure under the scheme.

Noting that the operation of the public register could give rise to many different kinds of civil claims, such as defamation or negligence, liability provisions have also been introduced in the bill. For example, publishing an offender's details may result in a criminal offence where identifying information about a child victim is published contrary to section 194 of the Child Protection Act 1999. Consistent with the approach in Western Australia, the bill provides express protections for individuals administering the public register and affords immunity to the state also.

As I have stated, the Crisafulli government's objective in establishing the public register is clear: to allow public access to information about child sex offenders in order to protect children and put the rights of children and families ahead of sexual predators. The amendments will impose limitations on human rights, most prominently on those persons classified as reportable offenders.

The public register is necessary to prevent children from being subjected to the devastating harm that results from sexual offending, and the state has a positive obligation under a number of rights, including the right to life, to protect an individual from real and immediate risks to their life. The bill maintains the paramount purpose of the public register and the importance of protecting children from the devastating and life-long harm which results from sexual abuse. Therefore, the bill makes clear that the Human Rights Act 2019 has no application on the substantive provisions designed to facilitate Queensland's new public child sex offender register.

The required statement about exceptional circumstances for the override refers to the child safety crisis gripping our communities in the light of horrific abuse allegations as symptomatic of the urgent need for the government to do more to protect children and justify the override of human rights. Consistent with operationalising the scheme as intended to meet its core purpose and in line with the human rights override declaration, a disclosure of information in the way proposed engages the rules of natural justice such that the offender, the known victims and other affected persons would be required to be afforded the opportunity to be heard on the proposed disclosure. If an opportunity is not afforded to an offender, there is the potential for the decision to have an adverse impact on the offender's reputation, such that the offender could apply to the Supreme Court for a declaration.

Therefore, the only way to achieve the public register's purpose is to clearly exclude the operation of the rules of natural justice in this legislation. The exclusion of natural justice requires a clear statutory intention, which can only be achieved by excluding the relevant decisions from judicial review and procedural fairness, except in cases of jurisdictional error, and this has been adopted in the bill.

The bill mandates an independent statutory review of the efficacy of the public register that is to be conducted as soon as practicable after five years from commencement. This ensures the framework remains subject to appropriate legislative scrutiny and provides an opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the approach to ensure it operates as intended by striking the right balance between promoting community safety and protecting the rights of children and families in Queensland.

Before I close, I wish to once again acknowledge the outstanding advocacy and drive of Bruce and Denise Morcombe, whose relentless push to have a safer Queensland for our children has driven this reform. Their courage and resilience in turning one of the most tragic crimes in this state into a never-ending commitment to improving the safety of all children is nothing short of extraordinary. Daniel's Law will ensure their son's legacy lives on. I also take this opportunity to commend the dedicated members of the Queensland Police Service, in particular those within the Child Abuse and Sexual Crime Group and the Child Protection and Investigation units across the state, who work each day to protect our children and community from sexual predators.

While the public register cannot completely negate the risk of sexual offending against children, it provides an invaluable opportunity to raise public awareness and impart important information about safeguarding children. These reforms empower parents, guardians and people with parental responsibilities with the additional tool to make informed decisions to help keep their children safe. This is a necessary step in ensuring we are leaving no stone unturned in the fight to protect our children. Alongside the proposed public register, the Queensland Police Service will remain relentless in targeting those who do harm to the most vulnerable members of our society.

The Crisafulli government will always act to ensure the safety of Queensland children and Daniel's Law advances the commitment to take this necessary and progressive action. I commend the bill to the House and urge all members to support its passage because children should be protected from known sexual predators.

First Reading

Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (4.13 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 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee.

APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL


Appropriation Bill

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Appropriation Bill

Education, Arts and Communities Committee

Resumed from 26 August (see p. 2451).

 **Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (4.14 pm): I rise to speak on my first estimates as a new member in this chamber. I want to begin this speech with a single word—disrespect. Disrespect stands for more than just poor manners. In this chamber it means deliberately ignoring stakeholders, refusing engagement, silencing people and evading critical transparency. It reveals a pattern of dodging accountability. From a government that promised transparency and accountability, coming up to almost a year in office, what we see is not respect for Queenslanders but an endless string of broken promises and deliberate avoidance. What we see is disrespect. Let me give a few clear examples.

In terms of education, I stand firmly with our hardworking teachers and school staff—the men and women who shape the future of our children each and every day. Education is not just another portfolio; it is the backbone of opportunity for families. It should be a government's highest priority and yet this government has shown those very people nothing but disrespect.

After months of failed negotiations and two rejected enterprise bargaining offers, more than 50,000 Queensland teachers were forced to take strike action—the first in over 16 years. This was not because they wanted to, but because they had no choice. If you cannot respect the people on the front line of education, how can you possibly claim to respect the future of Queensland?

The arts sector thrives on independence, integrity and respect for creative voices, but what we saw this year was unprecedented interference. A minister of this government personally directed the Library Board to rescind a fellowship—a fellowship awarded after an independent, transparent process, judged by respected experts. That disrespect for the decision of the judges triggered the resignation of 12 Queensland literary award judges. Let me be very clear: when government ministers interfere in independent art decisions they do not just disrespect judges; they disrespect writers, artists and the principle of cultural freedom itself.

The same pattern of disregard extends into our communities. The Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships failed to meet collectively with the Queensland Coalition of Peaks—one of the most important representative bodies in this state. This is blatant disrespect for First Nation voices and for genuine stakeholder engagement. On top of that, when we examined the Closing the Gap Priorities Fund we discovered that \$37 million out of \$108 million has already been spent without any formal guidelines or criteria. That is not accountable. That is not respect. That is reckless.

When I entered this parliament, I did so as the 100th woman elected in Queensland. I take enormous pride in that. I see it as a responsibility to carry forward the work of those women who came before me, who fought to create space for women in leadership, in public life and in decision-making, and yet what we have seen from the government is a total disrespect for Queensland women.


This government remembered to rebrand what was once the Women's Budget Statement into the LNP's own colours, but somehow forgot to include the words 'gender equality'. Was that a mistake or was it deliberate? Either way, it shows just how out of touch this government is with women and girls across our state.

Promises have not been honoured. Publicly funded IVF for women with complex medical conditions was due to start on 1 July—backed by \$42 million in investment from the previous government. It has not commenced and it is unclear what advocacy was undertaken by the Minister for Women. The Respect at Work laws, designed to keep women and girls safe from harassment in the workplace, have been indefinitely paused. Again, it is unclear what the Minister for Women advocated for. This is not what respect looks like. This is negligent. This is avoidance. This is disrespect on full display.

In closing, when I say this government is showing disrespect I do not mean it lightly. It is not one moment or one oversight; it is a pattern—disrespect to teachers, disrespect to judges and the arts, disrespect to First Nations communities and disrespect to women. The people of Queensland—

Government members interjected.

Ms BOURNE: I am not taking those interjections. The people of Queensland deserve better. They deserve respect—real respect—grounded in listening, in accountability and in action. Until this government recognises that, Queenslanders will continue to see them for what they are: a government that promised transparency but delivers only disrespect.

 **Mr DAMESTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (4.20 pm): I rise to give my contribution on our estimates committee report for 2025. I am a proud member of the Education, Arts and Communities Committee. This is my third term being involved in a committee that looks after the education portfolio and it is something I hope to continue to do way into the future. It is something that is dear to my heart.

Making sure young Queenslanders are ready not only to go into primary school but also to go into high school and then to become productive members of the community is something I think every Queenslanders should be invested in. I just heard the contribution from the member for Ipswich West. I have a different opinion on how our committee runs. I think it is a great committee. I think we get along quite well. I think the estimates committee process that we went through this time was quite different to previous years. Having the Speaker as the chair and having the Clerk of the Parliament there really seemed to pull things up significantly compared to previous years.


Although as a crossbench member I would always ask for more time to ask questions during estimates hearings, I thought I got to ask some important questions this year. I got to ask questions about child safety, particularly in the education system. There have been some harrowing and concerning cases of child abuse in early learning centres over the last few months. I was happy to hear the response from the minister that early childhood workers will now undergo mandatory child safety training every year, that they will conduct a trial of CCTV surveillance in some of the childcare centres, and that there will be a review into blue cards. That will always have the support of the KAP. We need to find ways to protect children but also we need to ensure we have people working with children who need employment.

I would always like the opportunity to ask more questions about the budget in estimates rather than play political games. I am concerned that there is a significant amount allocated in the education budget to youth justice schools. When I asked a question around that, I was told that that was a question better placed with the youth justice minister. I would hope that the Department of Education has a good idea and a plan in place to deliver those youth justice schools, because they seem to be one way to turn kids away from a life of crime.

I also asked some questions around blue cards. We are always concerned in the KAP not only about the effectiveness of the blue card system but also about who the blue card system is trying to protect. I asked a question about tuckshop volunteer workers and parents attending school functions and events, fetes and sports days. Tuckshop workers need a blue card but a parent does not need a blue card. Parents can easily interact with children at sports days or fetes or events. That shows that there is some inconsistency in the blue card system. There are gaps. Like I said, I question the relevance of the current system.

We had a chance to talk about Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships and the issues faced by those discrete communities. Although \$180 million is committed in this year's state budget for some great water projects, that is where it seems to stop. We would hope that there would be more than just water projects to help remote Indigenous communities into the future.

I did ask an interesting question about the government's proposal to commit \$20 million over four years to help women get back into the workforce. I might have been mischievous with my line of questioning. I appreciate that the minister is in the House at the moment. We asked a number of questions. Who would be eligible to apply for this? Would it just be women or people who identify as women? It was interesting that the minister said—and I am paraphrasing—'We won't be checking birth certificates.' I would hope that everyone will take the opportunity to find a way to tap into this funding to get back into the workforce. I truly believe that women do need a hand to get back into the workforce after childbirth, but males who are in that same position should also get the same opportunities as women in this state.

 **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) (4.24 pm): In my

contribution to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee report on the Appropriation Bill, I first place on record my thanks for and acknowledgement of the significant contribution that both the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker made in this year's estimates in the transparent approach the Crisafulli government is taking to the estimates process. I also thank those committee members who participated on the day. I thank them for their questions particularly across my complex but important portfolio.

As I explained to the committee, the former Labor government oversaw the creation of a billion dollar residential care system. It is one of the reasons I made the decision very early in the term to make a recommendation to government to call for a commission of inquiry into the child safety system, and that commission of inquiry is broad. I note that the commissioner is well underway with that work and will be conducting forthcoming hearings for a period of almost three weeks in Cairns and Far North Queensland to give those people opportunities to present to him.

What we inherited from the previous Labor government was nothing short of a system in crisis. I note that the opposition members' statement of reservation quotes me as saying during the estimates process that the residential care road map was 'a road to nowhere'. That is correct. The residential care road map does not go anywhere. Therefore, we are not proceeding with it. We are undertaking significant reform while the commission of inquiry is underway. We are not leaving that reform for 18 months. We are taking a continuous improvement approach.

When I look at the number of children in residential care, for children under the age of 12 we have seen an increase from 146 to 686 children. The cost to the taxpayer represents an individual child and the trauma imposed upon that child from the design of this system and the reliance on this system. We are undertaking forensic audits into some of those unlicensed for-profit providers to get to the bottom of their costs and pricing.

I also outlined to the committee the important work that has been undertaken into the review of DVConnect. I was very pleased to report to the committee the work my department had undertaken in the service performance of the crisis 24/7 response that DVConnect operates on behalf of the state government. We will continue to work very closely with that organisation. Performance is the key to ensuring taxpayers' money is respected and that the return on investment is in supporting victims and also persons using violence who seek help to get that help when they need it.


We also touched on a number of election commitments. Across the portfolio I am very pleased that we are continuing with the government's program around neighbourhood centres and renewal as well as many other government election commitments such as the Men's Shed election commitments. I was pleased to hear from multiple members that there are currently negotiations of contracts underway with my department.

We are also delivering a domestic and family violence strategy that will focus on the next decade, with an investment plan associated with that that aligns closely with our commitment under the national partnership agreement. I am very pleased to say that I have just signed off on that work plan with the federal government. We will be engaging broadly with stakeholders as part of our domestic and family violence reforms.

As part of our funding around domestic and family violence—and I will have more to say about this in the coming weeks—it is certainly my intention to support particularly First Nations women in their voice and advocacy because of the over-representation that they experience from domestic and family violence. I had a very productive meeting recently in Cairns and Far North Queensland.

I also want to place on record my thanks not just to members of parliament who were there on the day but also to my officials and the director-general. I do not think it is appropriate that non-government members politicise public servants at the level they do, but I thank them for their professionalism.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (4.29 pm): Estimates is supposed to be about accountability. It is about ministers answering questions and giving Queenslanders the transparency they deserve. What we saw from the Minister for Women were refusals to answer, contradictions and a complete lack of action. When asked about access to abortion, an issue of profound importance to women in this state, the minister tried every trick in the book to avoid answering.

Mr LISTER: Mr Deputy Speaker, it appears the member's contribution has ceased.

Ms FENTIMAN: No, I am still going. That was awkward—

Mr LISTER: I seek the call, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I ask for your guidance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Just one moment, member for Southern Downs, while I seek some advice.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs—

Ms PEASE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the actions and words of the member for Southern Downs and I ask him to withdraw. Might I also add—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you may not add, member for Lytton, because I am in the midst of making a ruling on another point of order. I have heard your subsequent point of order. I would ask that you just resume your seat for the moment. I am going to make a ruling on the first point of order. I will then come to your point of order. If you have another matter after that, we will proceed with that.

Ms PEASE: My point of order is one whole—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lytton, I have asked you to resume your seat. You are now warned. I gave you a very direct instruction just then and you continued to speak. You are warned under the standing orders.

Member for Southern Downs, I have heard your point of order and your seeking of the call. I have sought advice. The member for Waterford had not resumed her seat. Her microphone was still on. I will ask the member for Waterford to continue her contribution in a moment.

Member for Southern Downs, the member for Lytton has taken offence at comments. I am not sure what they were, but she has taken offence. I did hear you say something. I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr LISTER: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lytton, do you have another point of order?

Ms PEASE: I did. May I make that order of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You may.

Ms PEASE: I was threatened by the member for Southern Downs.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice around that. That is a matter of privilege. As the Speaker has given guidance to the House, the proper process for that is to write to him about those matters. Member for Waterford, continue with your contribution.


Ms FENTIMAN: It was a very long, awkward pause, but I did not even get to the 17 seconds—thanks to the member for Southern Downs—that the Minister for Women took to finally answer my question in the estimates committee. The question was simply, ‘What public statements have you made about abortion and a woman’s right to choose?’ There was a long, very uncomfortable silence, and only then did she read a note scribbled from her chief of staff. It was appalling. It was embarrassing. The Minister for Women could not tell Queensland women where she stands on a woman’s right to choose. Even after that really awkward silence and the chief of staff finally scribbling something and passing it to her, she could not bring herself to say to Queensland women where she is on the record. Let me just remind you all that she voted to keep abortion a crime in this state. She also voted against expanding access to termination drugs for women in rural and regional Queensland. What is clear is that the Minister for Women is doing nothing to advance the rights of women when it comes to their reproductive health.

What else became abundantly clear through estimates was that women’s economic security is clearly at the bottom of this minister’s to do list. It is so far down her list that she forgot she even chaired the women’s economic security team. I am not making this up. This is not trivia. The women’s economic security team is supposed to be driving women’s economic security, tackling the gender pay gap and ensuring women can participate fully in the economy. If the minister has to be told by her chief of staff whether she chairs a team or not, then it is pretty clear she is not leading it. The *Courier-Mail* agrees. They reported that the minister appeared to be reading notes, at first insisting that the Treasurer chaired the team and then backtracking again after her staff scribbled the correction. Even more extraordinary is that her admission was later airbrushed from the official *Hansard* record. I table the *Courier-Mail* article titled ‘Who is the chair?’

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, undated, titled ‘Who’s the Chair?’ [\[1138\]](#).

When the minister delivered rehearsed answers to her own Dorothy Dixers, all she wanted to talk about were serious allegations of women being harassed at work by the CFMEU. Let me be clear that sexual harassment is never okay, but let's not pretend this was about the women. If the Minister for Women was a genuine advocate for the workplace safety of women and girls in this state, if she truly wanted to end sexual harassment in the workplace, then where was her advocacy when her own government indefinitely paused respect at work laws to keep workers in this state safe from sexual harassment? Where was her advocacy when women stood up and called out the government for this behaviour? Whether it is women's safety at work or women's economic security, this minister and the LNP government are failing Queensland women.

It is not just about her poor performance at estimates: it reflects the weakness of their policies. They like to claim they have suddenly woken up to the fact that women here in Queensland can vote, but I think the women of Queensland see through this. The truth is that the LNP is not serious about closing the gender pay gap. They are not serious about supporting women to return to work. This minister is responsible for one new policy: supporting women back into the workforce. There is no start date, there are no guidelines and there is no information. What has she been doing for nine months? They are not serious about driving real reform. They are not serious about closing the gender pay gap, and they are not serious about gender equality because those words have been airbrushed from the SDS. Suddenly it is 2025 and gender equality is a little bit too controversial for the LNP government. It was an embarrassing performance by an embarrassing minister.

 **Miss DOOLAN** (Pumicestone—LNP) (4.36 pm): I rise to speak on the estimates process, which has shone a spotlight on the Crisafulli government's strong and practical initiatives to support young people, families and communities not just in Pumicestone but right across Queensland. As someone who has experienced the impacts of bullying firsthand, who has seen domestic violence tear families apart and who knows the cost when communities are left behind by unfunded programs, I do not take lightly the privilege of serving on the Education, Arts and Communities Committee. With that privilege comes the duty to hold our own government accountable and to ensure the laws we pass reflect community expectations and deliver real outcomes for all Queenslanders.

Over the past 10 months this government has been focused on delivery. One of the most pressing issues we face is the bullying crisis in Queensland schools. That is why I asked the education and arts minister how this government is tackling it. He confirmed that we are investing \$33 million in five new fully funded initiatives: establishing rapid support squads in bullying hotspots; creating a new Anti-Bullying Stakeholder Reference Group to co-design future campaigns; delivering more chaplains and student wellbeing staff in hundreds of schools; launching a dedicated crisis hotline for parents and carers; and developing updated professional development resources for teachers and teacher aides and support staff. This is targeted, practical action that will make schools safer.

I also asked about behavioural changes in schools. My mum has been head of department of behaviour at multiple schools in Moreton Bay, and she would come home exhausted from her daily struggle to organise teacher aides and provide her staff with the support they desperately needed. That is why I am proud that our government has now delivered a permanent \$44 million Behaviour Boost, giving teachers more support in the classroom, restoring order and letting them get back to what they do best: teaching. Estimates also revealed the shocking extent of Labor's neglect. They left Queensland schools with a \$441 million backlog in maintenance and repairs after a decade of decline, with kids and teachers left to pay the price.

This Crisafulli government is focused on delivering what we said we would do—as opposed to those opposite, who talk the talk but could not walk the walk. For example, the former government and the former member promised a new tuckshop for Banksia Beach State School. They had four years to deliver it, but the community was kept waiting. I am proud to be part of a government that delivers on its promise. That is why Banksia Beach State School will get a new tuckshop, just like we said they would.


The time for talk is over; the time for delivery is now. What we have achieved in 10 months is more than the Labor government could do in 10 years. We are fixing Labor's mess. Our budget has funded over \$206 million in renewals and more than \$571 million in maintenance. Right here in the Pumicestone electorate I am proud that more than \$122,000 has been allocated across five local schools for essential maintenance.

It will not all be fixed in a year but, as the minister said, we are up for the job and we know that more needs to be done. The minister also outlined these investments: \$12.7 million to strengthen the regulatory authority in early childhood; \$12.3 million to expand the Queensland Virtual Academy; and

\$32.6 million to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes. This is what delivering for Queenslanders looks like in our education sector.

Domestic and family violence is one of the most heartbreaking issues in my electorate. I asked the Minister for Families what services are being funded locally to support victims. I was reassured to hear that CADA, the Centre Against Domestic Abuse, has received more than \$6.3 million to deliver frontline services and that across the Moreton Bay region our government is investing more than \$10.3 million to respond to domestic and family violence. That investment is, sadly, needed and it demonstrates our unwavering commitment: protecting victims, supporting frontline workers and holding perpetrators to account.

This is what good governments look like: a budget that reflects community expectations and a government that keeps Queenslanders safe—safe from bullies, safe from domestic violence and safe from the consequences of Labor's neglect. Queenslanders voted for a government that has respect for their money. Our revitalised and reformed estimates process gives Queenslanders insight into how we are funding our promises—a foreign concept to those opposite. This is what delivering real cost-of-living relief looks like. Families sending their kids to school can now access \$100 through our Back to School Boost, delivering real cost-of-living relief for families. I thank the Speaker, the Clerk, the committee secretariat and my colleagues for their support throughout this estimates process.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeester—ALP) (4.41 pm): Artistic expression is vital to a healthy democratic society. It is why there has been a long-held view that politicians should remain at arms-length from the processes surrounding artistic endeavours. What was revealed in estimates, however, is incredibly alarming. The Chief Executive Officer of the State Library confirmed to the committee that the arts minister had personally directed the Library board to rescind the 2025 black&write! writing fellowship which had been awarded following an independent process utilising well-regarded and trusted judges. The *Brisbane Times* reported this decision as an extraordinary overreach that undermines the independence of Queensland's arts sector. What was the minister's response? He would 'not rule out taking similar action in the future if it is deemed necessary'.

The *Courier-Mail* described the fallout as the largest mass resignation of literary judges ever seen in Queensland. Twelve judges—highly regarded and experienced judges—walked away in protest. They knew that their independence had been compromised. They knew that the integrity of Queensland's literary awards was under attack. What was the minister's response? He brushed it aside with chilling indifference, saying, 'If they choose not to be judges ... we will find other judges.' These words reveal the true mindset of this government.

It was also confirmed that it was the minister's decision to cut two long-planned-for First Nations cultural centres—projects in Cairns and Brisbane. The minister was unable to answer a very simple question regarding what consultation had occurred prior to his decision to cut these centres. Instead, he blamed everyone else, including those who had attempted to establish these cultural centres in the past.

When it came to naming the new QPAC theatre, it was revealed that the QPAC board, after careful consideration, recommended to government that it be named after Oodgeroo Noonuccal, one of Queensland's greatest poets and truth-tellers. The minister personally vetoed that decision and replaced it with a public competition that excluded any First Nations options for the public to vote on. QPAC's CEO stated—

... community members could nominate alternative names and that that is what occurred and that there were a number of First Nations names put forward as part of the public voting.

Okay, what were they? The minister agreed to release all data and submissions from the naming poll in question on notice No. 511. To ensure transparency, I call on the minister to publish that today.

When it comes to the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, I have to say—and many others have agreed—that I have never seen such a poor performance from a cabinet minister in this place. The minister was unable to answer even the simplest of questions and in fact deliberately wasted the committee's time to, I can only assume, avoid scrutiny of her portfolio.


For the record, I absolutely believe that everybody deserves access to clean, safe drinking water, and I recognise the work of the state and federal governments to support water infrastructure in three discrete Indigenous communities in Queensland. It is why the previous Labor government invested over \$180 million for water infrastructure in remote Indigenous communities, including \$62 million announced just last year in partnership with the federal Labor government. My concern is that the minister was unable to speak to any other topic. She was unable to provide real-time data on the Closing

the Gap targets, even though her charter letter is explicit about her responsibilities in this space. She made several attempts at answering a very simple question about whether she personally had undertaken cultural capability training since becoming minister. She told the committee that she had undertaken the training, even though there is no indication of it in her ministerial diary extract. I call on her today to provide details regarding the date and location of the formal training.

However, the two most concerning revelations were the treatment by the minister of the LNP's Closing the Gap Priorities Fund and the significant reduction in staff working in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships unit. It was revealed that the minister had spent \$37 million without any guidelines or criteria in place and that she recommended the projects to government for consideration based on the feedback she had received. This is a \$37 million spend based simply on private conversations and her personal preferences—no transparency, no accountability, a virtual slush fund. There have been millions of dollars already spent, and to date there are still no guidelines or criteria for how the remaining \$71 million will close the gap in Queensland.

To add insult to injury, the director-general advised the committee that, of the 412 FTEs reported in the budget against Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships, only 198.76 FTEs were actually working in that area. The rest were FTEs in strategic policy and legislation which, it was noted, services the whole department. This is yet another example of covering up the real story by this hapless minister.

It was also revealed that seniors were worse off under this government, with both the Minister for Seniors and her director-general unable to advise the committee of any new cost-of-living relief for seniors living in Queensland. Censorship, lack of support for seniors, cover-ups and a slush fund—this is the hallmark of this LNP government.

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (4.46 pm): I was able to sub in on this committee, and I want to thank the committee for having me. I thank everybody for the work that was done. It was my first committee experience and I am very grateful for it. As a mum raising my kids in Redlands and as the local member, I know how much parents care about the quality of our schools. They want their children to be safe and supported and given the opportunity to succeed. I rise to contribute to the Appropriation Bill 2025 reporting on the estimates hearings of the Education, Arts and Communities Committee.

When the Crisafulli government came to office, we inherited an education system under real strain. The comprehensive review of infrastructure renewal revealed a \$441 million backlog of maintenance, with one-third of school assets at the end of life. That was the former government's legacy. This government is fixing the mess, delivering a record \$22.4 billion investment in education.

During estimates, I asked the minister to outline the specific commitments for Redlands in this year's budget. His response confirmed that more than \$7.6 million will be invested in 2025-26 for building and maintaining the education infrastructure across my electorate. It is quite a big list, but I want to state it again for the people in Redlands: \$348,000 to refurbish the tuckshop at Redland Bay State School; \$880,000 for rectification to the school's resource centre that was damaged during TC Alfred; \$100,000 for external painting to blocks J and F; \$160,000 for a playground upgrade at Macleay Island State School; \$250,000 each for two roof replacements at Victoria Point State School; and \$130,000 for new fencing at the Redland District Special School as part of a much larger transformative project to meet the growth in enrolments at that school.

This budget delivers 12 new learning spaces at the Redland District Special School, which is growing rapidly, with enrolments expected to rise from 233 in 2025 to around 284 by 2028. They will also receive a new admin and staff building, a basement car park, a safe drop-and-go zone, a relocated sports precinct, a lift for accessibility, modern amenities and the removal of aging buildings. At Scenic Shores State School, funding for stage 2 has been secured through the \$814.8 million statewide commitment for new schools. Scenic Shores opened in 2024 with 101 enrolments and has already grown to 222 in 2025, with capacity to reach 636 students.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): The time for the debate on this estimates report has expired.
Report adopted.

Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee, Report

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): The question is—

That the report of the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee be adopted.



Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.49 pm): I rise with pride to speak to the committee report that is before us. I would like to, first of all, start on the matter of Emu Swamp Dam which the opposition made much of in the course—

Mr Head: Hear, hear!

Mr LISTER: I take that acknowledgement from my good friend the member for Callide, because he understands the importance of water in our communities. This is no laughing matter. I saw, to great disappointment, that the opposition members of the committee who have affixed their signatures to a statement of reservation which misrepresented me and falsely claimed that I had sought, without avail, an answer from the Minister for Water on how the project would proceed and where the funds are. That is a very disappointing thing to see. It is quite shameful, in fact. I would invite the members of the committee under whose signature that statement was published to withdraw that when their turn comes to speak in the course of this debate. I am particularly talking about the member for Lytton who I see is in the chamber. I think it is very important that I not be misrepresented on that matter because Emu Swamp Dam is not a concept, it is not a glib catchphrase to be bounced around in this chamber; it is a mechanism by which the people of the Granite Belt went without water, except that which could be trucked up the hill from Warwick, for 18 months.

I saw my community, the one in which I actually live in Southern Downs, amongst the many communities I am privileged to represent, do it extremely tough. It was not just a question of not enough water; it meant that for those who live outside of the town, which is about half of the population of the Granite Belt area, who rely on the ability to go into town to pump water from a standpoint into the back of their utes so they would have drinking water at home, that got cut off.

The tourist industry on the Granite Belt suffered grievously because well-meaning Queenslanders felt it would be best not to travel to Stanthorpe because 'we know they are having trouble with water at the moment'.

The drought was extremely difficult for the horticultural industry, which is the lifeblood of the community of Stanthorpe and the Granite Belt which employs so many people and which feeds us and provides economic and food security for the community.

Emu Swamp Dam—and this is something which the members of the opposition disingenuously omitted from their statement of reservations—has not proceeded because the government, which they supported—the former Labor government—in 2022 advised the federal Labor government to withdraw the \$200 million-odd funding for Emu Swamp Dam; ditto for Hells Gate Dam and ditto for Urannah Dam. Those members who were present at the time will remember the colourful speech I gave in this place, excoriating the Labor Party. Well, I am here to do it again because, for the Labor Party to make light and try to score political points off the water disadvantage that their successive governments imposed on the communities that I represent is nothing short of disgraceful.

I know that, unlike the former Labor government, the Crisafulli LNP government takes water security seriously. Not only does it actually build stuff, it does not pay triple what it should and it listens to the communities who need the water.


I might just say, on the topic of water, while the minister is in the chamber here, I want to thank the minister for the government's increase in funding to river improvement trusts of which there are two in my electorate of Southern Downs. They were facing the loss of funding because the former Labor government had not funded them over the forward estimates. When we talk about water and support of this government for communities relating to water, there is no comparison. Labor builds shoddy dams. If they build dams, they have to be pulled down, or they do not build dams at all. My community will never be deluded into thinking that the Labor government have been their friend. They had years and years to build Emu Swamp Dam.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr LISTER: I heard the interjection from the member for Pine Rivers. I see her laughing. She thinks it is a funny matter. It is not. I ask the members of that committee—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr LISTER: I am not taking your interjections, member for Pine Rivers. I invite those members of the Labor Party who signed the statement of reservations in this report to denounce in their contributions what they said, to retract the false accusation that they made in there, and I will look very much forward to seeing that occur during the course of this debate.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (4.54 pm): The recent budget estimates hearing revealed in no uncertain terms a government more interested in spin than substance, particularly when it comes to our small business sector. In fact, the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business seems more interested in lampooning these days as a DJ, so perhaps—may I call him—DJ Crony Connect should focus more on his job and spend less time dropping beats and more time dropping the answers that small businesses are seeking.

The minister could have shown that the LNP government values and understands a sector that contributes \$131 billion to our economy. He had an opportunity to show Queensland's 495,000 small businesses that this government listens and understands our small businesses which contributes over \$131 billion to the economy and creates nearly 1.1 million jobs. Instead, what we saw was evasion, excuses and a refusal to confront the real issues facing small and family enterprises across the state.

Perhaps the most damning of all was the evidence given by the director-general himself, a former Howard government minister's chief of staff who, as I recall, gave a clear intent to apologise for the failure in delivering on-time payment to small businesses in his own department—yes, that is right, this new department. He stated, 'I think 88.23 per cent was the department's response to achieving the payment of small businesses on time.' He went on to state, 'I do not actually think that that is good enough for the department.'

This is no small matter. Between the third and fourth quarter of last financial year, 11 departments increased their number of late invoices to small businesses. That is money Queensland's small operators are owed—money that they rely on to pay staff, order stock and keep the lights on. When confronted, the minister squirmed and sought to shift responsibility elsewhere. This is not leadership. This is buck-passing. Small business owners deserve a clear answer and a plan. They got neither.

The government promised a fresh start, but this department has gotten off to a false start on late payments in his own newly created department to guarantee this policy.

Of course, Minister Bates's budget statement was, 'The era for jobs for mates is over,' yet the LNP's new Small Business Advisory Council looks like an LNP family barbecue with a name tag printer. Clearly, resident DJ Crony Connect did not get that memo—


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Order! I will pull you up there, member. Can you please use correct titles.

Ms PEASE: Thank you very much. The minister clearly did not get that memo. The appointment of Mr Phil Di Bella, a well-known LNP donor, who publicly argued for the abolition of penalty rates, was appointed to the new council. The minister claimed the council was a 'good cross-section' of the community—just not regional communities; he got rid of all of those members. He also claimed he was not aware that Mr Di Bella was an LNP donor. This is cronyism dressed up as consultation. Obviously, our resident minister only plays requests from his mates.

If the minister's advisory group was embarrassing, the CCTV grant program was humiliating. In Bundaberg, the government used a small local business as the backdrop for its \$40 million Secure Communities Partnership announcement, yet when the business owner later sought to apply, he was told that he was ineligible.

I asked the minister directly was he aware that the Premier had stood beside a business and encouraged them to apply, only for that business to be ruled out? His response was a masterclass in waffle. He spoke about criteria, about value for money, about processes, but never once accepted responsibility. I spoke personally to the owner of that small business in question. He was used by the Premier for a press conference and discarded when the TV cameras left, shutting the door in his face. This story is an analogy for this government—all spin and no substance.

The hearing also laid bare the consequences of the government's reckless cuts to renewable energy projects and health infrastructure in the regions. When I tabled a report from the Clean Energy Council noting that local cafes, pubs and suppliers all benefit from large projects, the director-general could only concede the point. The minister, however, refused to answer whether he had provided any advice to colleagues about the impact that these cancellations may have on small businesses. Regional economies are crying out for support, yet this government chooses ideology over industry. I walk into townships and regional cities in this state and each and every time they raise these issues with me.

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (4.59 pm): I rise to make a contribution to debate of the Appropriation Bill, specifically the report by the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee. I start by thanking the committee members and parliamentary staff for their

contribution to budget estimates, and I thank the member for Southern Downs for his leadership of the committee. I reiterate my comments on the day and thank the Speaker and Deputy Speaker for their role in this year's budgets estimates process.

My department is new and at the time was just nine months old. As it is a new department, I welcomed examination by the committee. While my department is new, I am still surprised that those opposite failed to grasp the simplest of issues associated with customer services, open data and small and family business—the key focus areas of my department. Nowhere in the title or remit of my department does it mention energy, yet the member for Lytton opened with questions that should have been on the member for Waterford's list of questions for the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership more than a week earlier. The same thing occurred in the second session, when the member for Lytton started asking questions that should have been directed to the health portfolio. Ignorance is bliss—totally and utterly clueless. It is no wonder the member for Cooper is stalking her for her job. It is incumbent on those opposite, truly, to be more prepared and ensure they do their homework and ask questions to the right portfolio committee. This distinct lack of interest or understanding is not surprising, given the Leader of the Opposition did not once even mention small or family business in his budget reply speech—not once.

For the benefit of those opposite in the House, my new department is responsible for some key priorities of the Crisafulli government—in particular, how we are putting small and family businesses first and how we are putting the building blocks in place to become Australia's most customer focused government. These vital goals require a dedicated and professional approach—something sadly lacking from those opposite.

I thank the committee for their examination of the more than \$130 million allocated for our Small and Family Business First Action Statement. It delivers for small and family business owners with initiatives like free cybersecurity support, through a partnership with the Crisafulli government and Cyber Wardens, delivered by the Council of Small Business Organisations Australia known as COSBOA. It fixes Labor's botched \$15 million appointment of a company that went broke before it delivered any small business cyber training. In fact, many questions are still to be answered by the members for Bundamba, Springwood and Murrumba—and the involvement of the member for Woodridge. We will come back to that in future sessions. I thank the committee for their examination of the Small Business Support Network and the Crisafulli government's additional \$16.8 million to reverse Labor's decision to simply axe the program on 30 June this year. They were going to cut it—unbelievable.

The Crisafulli government's first budget also tackles an important element of Labor's crime crisis, with our \$40 million Secure Committees Partnership Program. The member for Lytton's question on small business payments and the Crisafulli government's On-Time, Every-Time Payment Guarantee was again in the wrong session completely. I reiterate: it is important for the opposition to do their homework.

Having a minister responsible for customer services is a first for Queensland. One department—my department—is now coordinating more than 240 outlets across Queensland to deliver face-to-face customer service on behalf of multiple government departments. In addition to customer service, the Crisafulli government will also end the piecemeal, short-term thinking that is Labor's legacy when it comes to delivering and upgrading digital systems over the past decade. We have invested \$1 billion in a Government Digital Fund, which is a first for Queensland.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: The opposition says it is a bold agenda. Yes, it is. After a decade of Labor's failure to invest in ICT systems, a bold agenda is well and truly required. It is bold indeed, but we will take a calm, methodical and professional approach to tackling the number of internal and customer-facing ICT systems that need to be renewed, updated or replaced. The reality is: when it comes to the items that were before the committee, the member for Lytton was absolutely missing in action.



Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (5.04 pm): The LNP government promised us an estimates reform process and, straight out of the gate, all of those elements that were promised were instantly broken, and that is entirely true to form. The government's tactic of interjections was so bad, often with multiple points of order from government MPs on the same matter—sometimes multiple interjections from the same MP on the same matter. In four hours of questioning time, we saw 29 minutes lost over the estimates timing purely through interjections. In a one-hour block on disaster recovery and volunteers, government members made 21 interjections.

Here are some of the things that we learned through the estimates process. We learned that there is no commitment in the forwards for a second fire station in Bundaberg, despite the land being purchased and it now being unencumbered. Not only are the Fire Department now mandated to have political branding right through their department, the minister's office—her chief of staff, in fact—was directly interfering with the department's longstanding policy and procedures—respectful policies and procedures that public servants had in place. Through that interference, they removed recognition of our First Nations people from a plaque at the Drayton Fire and Rescue Station.

In one of the strangest birthday presents I have ever seen, the minister's chief of staff provided the minister with the wrong response in order to answer the question, and she preceded at length to inform the committee about the politically charged style guide changes—until it was pointed out, after a prolonged period of time, that she was entirely lost. It gets worse. There was an Aboriginal elder engaged for that opening and, as a result of this email exchange with the minister's office, that elder's attendance and their respectful acknowledgement needed to be cancelled. This was news to the minister's office, apparently, despite evidence tabled in this place that highlights that it was at their own hand.

We learned that the minister could not recall if she had ever met Kristen Hilton, who is overseeing cultural reform work at QFD. This is important work that will fundamentally improve the culture and make sure there is a fit-for-purpose complaints management system. Never in the eight months of her ministerial leadership has the minister even bothered to reach out and meet with Ms Hilton. This is a role designed to make sure that there is adequate protection for victims and that perpetrators are held to account. The minister has squandered any opportunity to play a role in creating a better workplace for many thousands of heroes on our front line.

We learned that 30 per cent of the station officer roles—leaders in our local fire and rescue stations right throughout our communities—are currently unfilled. I am so pleased to hear today that the member for Southern Downs has finally found his voice again on Emu Swamp Dam—something that he has been considerably quiet on and something on which I still see no funding whatsoever or commitment from this government.

Despite being told by the Minister for Trade that the 'jobs for mates' era was over, we saw them shell out for mates in disaster recovery and even the previous member for Gregory, Lachlan Millar, where we learned that this minister had no intention of fulfilling a dying friend's wishes. If you ever needed any more evidence that the member for Warrego's words are hollow, look no further than her response. It was on full display for all to see. Spoiler alert: it is still unclear how she handled that conflict, because the member for Warrego's performance in estimates was anything but clear.

We saw the political protection racket for National Party Senate candidate Andrew Cripps continue. Time after time we saw that the minister was obstructionist, argumentative and cagey in her responses. She refused to rule out whether she wanted the inquiry into volunteering in Queensland to deliver three to four recommendations with no cost to government—something she has personally already told the sector. Whoopsadaisy! We also learned that the EVAC continues to be in the freezer, with the minister insisting that it was not her responsibility but still insisting that she answers the questions on those things. The Minister for Emergency Services said it was with her. Who is misleading the House?

Despite talking a big game while sitting in Western Queensland about overinflated insurance premiums and carbon capturing—protecting the GAB—when this minister comes into this place there is no protection at all; she does not stand up for these matters. It would seem that she does not care. She passes the buck and she obfuscates at every single opportunity. We absolutely saw that with Troy Thompson when she refused to even come back with information despite promising to do so. Then she said at the end of the session, 'I never said I was going to do that.' What a joke!



Hon. A LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (5.09 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the budget estimates committee report for the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee. I do want to thank all members of the committee and also the committee staff for their work with estimates.

What we see after 10 years of Labor decline is that in 10 months of the Crisafulli LNP government, we are delivering for local government, water, fire, disaster recovery and volunteers. Despite our government's efforts to significantly increase the time for questioning and budget scrutiny, Labor overlooked vast sections of the portfolio. Very few questions were asked by Labor on water policy—issues such as the bulk water pricing, water pricing relief for irrigators or clean drinking water for Indigenous communities. There were no questions from Labor on local government partnerships and

funding or disaster infrastructure and there were no questions on vital support for our frontline fires and volunteers such as the \$15.7 million investment in the presumptive workers composition scheme. Labor did not fund this. This selective absence speaks volumes about Labor Party members. We did not even have a question from the member for Lytton about the fires and her electorate includes Whyte Island, the major training facility for our fires. She did not even represent her electorate.

While the Crisafulli government delivers outcomes and infrastructure for communities, the Labor opposition are trying to run away from their 10 years of decline. Labor's misrepresentations in their uni politics, ChatGPT statement of reservation is a new low.

Mr Lister: It looked like it was out of a scrapbook.

Ms LEAHY: I will take that interjection from the member for Southern Downs.

When it comes to the fire station builds Labor claimed they were committed to building the second Bundaberg fire station. However, Labor forgot to look up their final 2023-24 budget, which does not commit a single cent to this station. Contrast this with the Crisafulli LNP budget: an increase of 2.6 per cent on Labor's last Queensland Fire Department budget.

Further, Labor prefers to manufacture the vision rather than focus on service delivery. My office updated our plaque guidelines to ensure acknowledgement of country is not incorrectly included when land claims have not been determined. This is about ensuring respect. I note the member for Springwood lost his temper and had to withdraw while we were discussing this matter in estimates. In terms of our plaque guidelines we worked with firefighters to include a dedication to our fallen firefighters whose legacy we seek to protect. The exact words are, 'This station is dedicated to the memory of Queensland firefighters who gave their lives in the line of duty.' Labor's appalling disrespect for our fallen firefighters was on display in the estimates committee hearing. Yet Labor dived further into their hall of fame of failed projects with the retrofit deluge systems. The key word here is 'retrofit', the step that had to happen only because Labor commissioned appliances without deluge systems in the first place.

Extraordinarily, the former minister for disaster recovery appeared unaware that state recovery coordinators were not required to be on the state recovery coordinators register and attacked their performance. It seemed that Labor forgot that they had appointed state recovery coordinators who were not on the register. One of those just happens to be the current CEO of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, yet Labor members continued an offensive line of questioning that was directly critical of current public servants.

So eager to jump the gun on the volunteers inquiry after Labor's 10 years of decline in the volunteer sector, the opposition sought to pre-emptively discredit our response to the inquiry. This is totally inappropriate and disappointing for all those volunteers who have volunteered their time and effort to inform the inquiry. No wonder the volunteer numbers declined under Labor in the last 10 years. We will let the inquiry do its work.

When it comes to local government, Labor could not bring themselves to talk about the equal partnership in the sector. They could not talk about red-tape reduction or depreciation. Labor could not even talk about the Works for Queensland program that we have made a permanent program. Labor presided over 10 years of decline. The Crisafulli LNP government in 10 months have focused on delivery.

(Time expired)



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (5.14 pm): Budget estimates are meant to be a test of government. They are meant to show whether ministers can front up and explain themselves and what their departments have been doing. They are meant to give Queenslanders confidence that decisions are being made in their best interests, not in the interests of the government itself. However, what we saw was just that: a government interested in itself. They were so determined to cover their tracks, they were dodging and creating confusion. Clearly it is a government that says one thing and does another.

I do want to talk about integrity. In hearings in the first week of estimates one of the government's senior ministers claimed that the 'jobs for mates era' was over. That was the promise. However, when the Minister for Small and Family Business was asked about his new hand-picked reference group, who was on it? LNP donors! That was who he picked, people who have handed over tens and tens of thousands of dollars in donations. The minister told the committee he did not know about those donations, but Queenslanders know what that looks like. They know that when a donor ends up on an LNP advisory body it looks like business as usual for this government. It looks like mates looking after


mates. That is the problem with this government: they say one thing in here and out there, but their actions tell a completely different story.

Then there were the answers or the lack of them, and I know that the shadow minister and others have pointed to this. The Minister for Fire was asked straightforward questions. I can inform the minister that I did not lose my temper. There is no evidence of that. Her embarrassment should not be deflected onto me. Her fumbling responses, her embarrassment, were for her and are for her. It is not just embarrassing for this minister; it is also embarrassing for the Queenslanders who rely on this minister to direct the department every single day to ensure they remain safe. If a minister is not willing to explain her own decisions, how can anyone trust them to deliver on them? Accountability demands clarity.

Then we turn to respect. Every sitting day in this House we begin with an acknowledgement of country. It is not a formality; it is a commitment. It is an act of recognition that everybody in this House submits to. It is an act of recognition of their enduring place in this nation's and this state's history. However, what came to light at estimates was deeply troubling. This minister ordered acknowledgements be stripped from plaques on buildings built in this state. She stripped fire station plaques of acknowledgement of those traditional owners. Even worse, she forced a welcome to country ceremony to be cancelled. The public servants were the ones who were forced to deliver that news, not the minister, not her office. There was no courage in her convictions. She did not want to own that decision, and rightly so; it would have been embarrassing. She forced public servants to go and apologise to elders for decisions made by her office. That is not progress. That is winding back the clock. Queenslanders expect better.

Finally, there is the issue that goes to the heart of transparency, the Troy Thompson report. The city of Townsville and everybody who lives there were left in limbo by this government and its minister. All that community has asked for is clarity and this is a government that had the opportunity to provide it.

The minister was asked directly whether the CCC report had been handed over and she would not say. She simply would not say. Let us be clear: if she had the report, she could have said so. We did not ask her to tell us what was in it. If she did not have it, she could have said that too, but this minister, like this government, chooses secrecy. Queenslanders expect a government to say what it means and mean what it says, and we on this side of the House will keep exposing LNP hypocrisy and we will keep demanding answers, because accountability is not optional, and neither is respect.

 **Mr BAILLIE** (Townsville—LNP) (5.19 pm): I rise to speak to the 2025-26 budget estimates on the Appropriation Bill 2025 which I was fortunate enough to participate in on the last day of a two-week-long process as a member of the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee. The estimates process is an important process and is an opportunity to interrogate the budget and ensure accountability and transparency when it comes to the planned government expenditure. I want to thank the Speaker and Deputy Speaker as well as the Clerk and the Parliamentary Service staff for their assistance in keeping the estimates process running, as well as all of the departments and public servants that put in a power of work to support the estimates process. I want to thank all of my parliamentary colleagues for their participation in the estimates process—in particular, the Leader of the House, whose contribution was even recognised by the Manager of Opposition Business, who said—

In our estimations he has probably set a record for the most time in attendance at estimates hearings by any MP ...

I think that speaks volumes to the Leader of the House's commitment to the estimates process.


This was my first estimates process, and I understand that this may have been a bit of a different process to what has been carried out in previous years. I did find it bemusing that a member of the now opposition—a member of the former government for several terms—suggested to me that, really, there was no need for government questions during the estimates process and we should consider just having opposition questions as it would be a better use of time and resources. True story. I am reliably informed that, during its decade in government, Labor never initiated an estimates hearing process where only the opposition was afforded the opportunity to ask questions.

Thankfully, as government members did have the opportunity to ask questions, I took the opportunity to dive a bit deeper into the budget and ask questions about what it meant for my community. For example, I asked Minister Minnikin, in his role as the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business, about the \$40 million allocated to the Secure Communities Partnership Program, which recognises the impact Labor's youth crime crisis has had on small businesses and their staff in Townsville and which includes funding for enhanced security measures for small businesses such as CCTV and bollards. It is a program that was launched in

Townsville with around 200 small and family business representatives, and I can advise that it has been extremely positively received in Townsville. Given the recent news coverage of small businesses targeted by crime just this week, this support cannot come soon enough.

In addition, as a former small business owner I was particularly interested in the \$44.7 million investment over five years to help small and family businesses with a suite of initiatives including cutting red tape, simplifying procurement processes, standardising contracts and delivering a five-business-day On-Time, Every-Time Payment Guarantee, with immediate payment for invoices under \$10,000. This will make a real difference to the strength of small businesses in Townsville and, indeed, right across Queensland, because we know how important cash flow is for small and family businesses.

In the afternoon of our hearing I asked Minister Leahy, in her role as Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, for an update with regard to what is happening with Townsville City Council and about the continuing support to North Queensland's recovery efforts following the historic rain and flooding earlier this year, and I thank the minister for the insights she provided during that hearing. For years Labor did not care about the regions. Labor's idea of regional engagement was to issue a press release from Brisbane. Labor was all about the headlines, and it appears nothing has changed. I say that because it appears that Labor confused the estimates report and its statement of reservation with its scrapbook, with newspaper clippings, cobbled together and proudly attached, of the few baseless newspaper articles it could accomplish. That is just another reason Queenslanders voted for a fresh start. After a decade of decline under Labor, a fresh start is what this budget delivers. It delivers the resources to deliver safer communities, stronger small businesses and enhanced disaster response and resilience. That is why I commend this report to the House.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.24 pm): I want to touch on a point raised in the speech by the member for Townsville, who said that they were just a bunch of newspaper clippings scrapped together and that they were baseless. Maybe he should go and read the newspaper article where local Bundaberg firefighters made comments addressing the LNP leaving them behind and not funding a second fire station. I will be sure to let every single firefighter in Townsville know through the union that the member for Townsville thinks that when they raise their concerns in the media they are simply 'baseless', so there we go. The member for Townsville has just made it very clear that he does not support local firefighters across Queensland when they speak out in the media, because if you speak out against this LNP government, according to the member for Townsville, it is 'baseless' and he will try to gag your comments. We will make sure that every single firefighter throughout Townsville knows what the Troy Thompson supporter thinks.

I will now move on to another so-called baseless newspaper article, but this one is actually a Facebook post. The then LNP candidate for Bundaberg, on the first day of the official election campaign in 2024, stood proudly alongside then shadow minister Mickelberg and then leader of the opposition, and now Premier, David Crisafulli to announce the Secure Communities Partnership Program. They were in Bundaberg with Mr Warren West, who was sadly a victim of crime in his business Network Car and Truck Rentals. One would think on day one of the election campaign, when the alternative premier comes to Bundaberg and stands side by side with a victim in a press conference with the then LNP candidate, that when the grants opened up Mr West would be the first one to get the funding, but he has been told that he is not eligible. The very victim of crime that the now Premier, David Crisafulli, stood up with on day one of the election campaign is not eligible for funding under this LNP government.

I am sure that the member for Townsville just thinks Mr West's comments are 'baseless'. Maybe the member for Townsville should go and talk to victims of crime throughout regional Queensland and not just repeat comments and lines made by his scriptwriters. It is very clear that that is still on its website today. Those opposite still have the picture of Mr West on the website promoting their failed community safety program that he is not even eligible for. That is the LNP. That is the Premier. The Premier said during the campaign that when he says something it means something. Apparently, all it means is that he will say anything in regional Queensland and then he will do nothing in Brisbane to help those in regional Queensland. That is the record of this LNP.

I turn again to the media article that the member for Townsville said was 'baseless'. In this article, local firefighters reached out to the media themselves to say that they were not just concerned by this budget but were alarmed at the fact that this LNP government did not commit to the former Labor government's commitment of \$11.5 million to construct and deliver a second operational fire station in Bundaberg. What we have since seen is the LNP refusing to be honest and up-front with our firefighters and refusing to commit the money that we would have had in this year's budget. We put \$2 million into

the previous year's budget, we bought the land and we made a commitment, yet the LNP has walked away from our firefighters. This screams Campbell Newman, doesn't it? Who remembers Campbell Newman and the way that he treated firefighters? Now the member for Townsville is saying that their concerns are 'baseless'. Let me tell him: everyone throughout Townsville who is a firefighter will know that.

Why is it that the LNP will not commit to our firefighters? Why will it not come clean? We know why. The truth was revealed when the member for Pine Rivers asked the commissioner about the plan for the second fire station. The commissioner said that there was no plan to deliver a second fire station in the forward timetable. If we are taking those words 'forward timetable' and we are talking about the forwards in the budget, that is to the end of 2029. So there will be no second fire station in this term of government under the LNP. The member for Townsville thinks the concerns of our firefighters are baseless. I am going to fight for them every single day.

Debate, on motion of Mr Smith, adjourned.

MOTION

Chief Health Officer, Appointment



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. notes media reports that:
 - (a) a selection panel via a merit-based process recommended Dr Krispin Hajkowicz to the Chief Health Officer role.
 - (b) after Dr Hajkowicz was informed of the successful selection panel outcome, the role was withdrawn from Dr Hajkowicz by the government.
 - (c) health minister Nicholls had informally endorsed the appointment of Dr Hajkowicz as the new Chief Health Officer.
 - (d) ministers in the Crisafulli LNP government intervened to block the appointment of Dr Hajkowicz as the Chief Health Officer.
 - (e) the Public Sector Commission stated: 'the Department of Health is required to ensure that the person selected for employment is the eligible applicant best suited to the position'.
2. notes the Chief Health Officer is a Public Service appointment by the director-general of Queensland Health, not ministers or cabinet.
3. acknowledges and endorses the merit-based selection panel recommendation that Dr Krispin Hajkowicz was the most meritorious candidate.
4. agrees to summons the director-general of Queensland Health to produce to the Assembly all selection panel documents related to Dr Hajkowicz and the Chief Health Officer role by Wednesday, 3 September 2025.
5. requests the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee investigate the Chief Health Officer appointment process including any political interference by the LNP government and report to the Legislative Assembly by 26 September 2025.
6. condemns the Crisafulli LNP government for its latest integrity scandal which has resulted in the Chief Health Officer role not having a permanent appointee, affecting health outcomes in Queensland.

There is a sickness in Queensland. The symptoms are many, but the cause of the illness is but one: it is a lack of integrity. Because of the inappropriate interference of Premier Crisafulli, Queensland does not have a permanent Chief Health Officer. We have not had one for many days, weeks or months. This is a sick and sorry outcome, especially when one considers that Queensland has one of the lowest flu vaccination rates in the nation. We have hospitals full of flu victims, the vast majority of them unvaccinated.

Our hospitals are under enormous stress. How could this happen? There is no surprise, no mystery, that the winter months are when flu season strikes. Ekka time is almost synonymous with it. Queensland could so easily have been better prepared. It is hard though when you have a Premier and Deputy Premier who refuse to say whether they have had the flu vaccine. It is hard when you have a Premier and Deputy Premier who will not just come out and say it straight and urge people to get the freely available vaccine. That is a failure of leadership. It is hard when you have a government that spends three times more on advertising itself than it spends on a flu vaccination campaign. That is a failure of priorities. That is a government that governs for itself and not for everyday Queenslanders.

It would have helped if we had had a permanent Chief Health Officer who could have filled the leadership vacuum left by the Premier and his deputy. The minister says Queensland Health was following the law, and to a certain extent he is right. There was an international merit-based recruitment campaign overseen by an expert panel. The panel selected their preferred candidate. The

director-general approved the appointment. The preferred candidate was informed he was to be appointed Chief Health Officer. We understand the health department had communications materials and photos ready to announce the appointment publicly. But then the law was not followed. Then the Premier decided he knew better. It has been confirmed that at least one other senior minister was in on it too. The Deputy Premier refused to say yesterday if it was him, but it was his office backgrounding the media, disparaging the successful candidate. The Premier, a medical genius, decided the expert panel got it wrong so the preferred candidate was no longer the preferred candidate. The director-general, who owes his position to his LNP masters, caved to the inappropriate intervention of the Premier and Queensland continues to be without a Chief Health Officer.

We have heard no believable, sensible or rational explanations from those opposite as to why they interfered in the appointment of the Chief Health Officer. But they are under scrutiny. The Premier, the Deputy Premier and their government have been found out, caught out and called out. The Public Sector Commission stated that the appointment of the Chief Health Officer was not a matter for politicians. The health minister yesterday said it was a process set out in legislation. The boss of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Mr Barbour, when asked about the matter, declined to comment given that in the fullness of time these may be matters he has before him for investigation.

The Premier promised his would be a government of integrity, transparency and accountability, but we are witnessing the opposite of that. This is a Premier and a government that deliberately intervened to stop the appointment of a Chief Health Officer who had been selected after a rigorous, merit-based recruitment process—the same Premier and government that appoints its LNP mates to highly paid jobs with no merit-based process at all. That is the sick and sorry state of this government. There is an ill wind blowing across the institution of our democracy, an ill wind that emanates from the very top of 1 William Street.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Clayfield, I did not mention the warning list. The member for Lytton is the only one who is on it.



Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (5.36 pm): I move the following amendment—

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

- '1. notes the Chief Health Officer is a public-facing role;
2. notes the Chief Health Officer is one that requires stability;
3. notes the Chief Health Officer is one that requires longevity;
4. notes the Chief Health Officer is appointed by the chief executive of the department under the provisions of the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011;
5. notes the recruitment process for a Chief Health Officer is underway;
6. notes governments should be held to account for issues affecting health outcomes in Queensland.'


We heard from the Leader of the Opposition in relation to sicknesses in Queensland. The sickness in Queensland is the sickness that has been bequeathed to Queensland Health by those opposite. After a decade of decline they have left the Queensland Health system in a failing state. We heard the Leader of the Opposition talk about vaccination and vaccination rates. I have said and I continue to say on a number of occasions that the former Labor government failed to fund free flu vaccines in Queensland for the 2025 flu season. They failed to put money in the budget that enabled that system to roll out. One of our very first actions was to do that. We are spending more, and doing it for longer, on promoting free flu vaccines in Queensland—\$675,000. We started a month earlier and we will finish later.

It is interesting to note the history of the success of free flu vaccinations in Queensland. Flu vaccinations in Queensland hit a peak in 2022 of 36 per cent—the first year after COVID when COVID and flu vaccines were available jointly. What happened a year later in 2023 under the Labor government? The vaccination rate went from 36 per cent to 31 per cent—a five per cent decline. What happened the following year when there were free flu vaccinations? It was 29 per cent. It fell yet again. It is with a sense of disbelief that I listen to those opposite talk to us about failures in free flu vaccination. What we are now seeing is a very rapid uptake in terms of vaccinations in Queensland.

The position of Chief Health Officer is an important role. As I said in my ministerial statement on Tuesday, one did not need to be a crystal ball gazer to understand that the Labor Party would seek to raise this issue as a diversion from their own failures, as a diversion from the decade of decline, as a diversion from their failure to actually even ask me a question during health estimates. That is what we have faced this whole week.

As I indicated in the amendment to the motion, Queensland Health's campaign to recruit a permanent Chief Health Officer is ongoing. As those opposite well know, this is an appointment that is made by the chief executive; it is not an appointment made by cabinet. That is a matter that will be dealt with under the Hospital and Health Boards Act, as the motion indicates.

Importantly, what this motion seeks to do is divert attention from the Labor Party's failures, whether it is their failures around ambulance ramping, whether it is their failures around elective surgery, whether it is their failures around specialist outpatients, whether it is their failures to properly budget and their \$12 billion overspend or whether it is their failed capacity expansion program that we are in the process of remedying. They are diverting attention from their failure to provide real-time data, their failure around birthing bypass at Cooktown and Biloela, their failure to actually properly sustain the capital investment in the budget and their failure to properly deliver promises that they made on the eve of the election around perinatal mental health beds. This motion and the actions of the Queensland Labor Party this week indicate that they are desperate to avoid their record and their decade of decline being made public to Queenslanders. The motion should be voted down and the amendment accepted.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (5.40 pm): There you have it: a health minister who is proud that Queensland trails the national average on vaccination rates in every single age group. Look at him go! He is proud that we are a national basket case when it comes to vaccination rates and he is proud that this government spends three times more on self-promotion than on health promotion. The health minister has dusted off the old speech he has been giving for the past six weeks, which is not even relevant to the motion. That shows how lazy this health minister is.

The fact is that today is the 256th day that Queensland has lacked a permanent Chief Health Officer under this government. The Chief Health Officer scandal dogs this government day in, day out. It is entirely an own goal by a dysfunctional government that is incapable of a simple merit-based appointment without political interference by Premier Crisafulli and a weak and ineffective health minister, who gets rolled by the Premier and the Deputy Premier. The paper-thin spin, the leaks against itself and the fake reason put forward by Premier Crisafulli all pong to high heavens. There can be no logical reason to vote against this motion and for the amendment, as the motion introduces much needed transparency to this scandal and lets the sun shine in.

Let us be clear about what has happened. The hard work of a panel of medical experts with extensive medical experience and skills running a global search has been vaporised by Premier Crisafulli and this weak health minister and consequently the director-general of Queensland Health due to political interference. That is clear. Anyone who read the article in the *Courier-Mail* can see that that is clear. The successful candidate, who has devoted, I might add, a lifetime to saving lives, has been knifed by Premier Crisafulli, who clearly does not want actual expertise in the Chief Health Officer role.

The so-called reasons trotted out by the Premier to justify this scandal are an embarrassment and clearly a confection. Whatever the circumstances four years ago, they are totally irrelevant nearly half a decade later and expose the Premier to the question: what was the real reason? Was it due to reasons leaked to the media from within the Crisafulli government that Dr Hajkowicz had 'save Victoria Park' corflutes and political party signs on his fence? I suspect that is the exact reason. It is a political reason that is irrelevant to the job and not in conformity with the act. I question the involvement of not only the Premier but also the Deputy Premier, who refused to answer a direct question about his involvement yesterday during question time. His paws are all over it. Everyone is entitled to their own civil views, but those views are irrelevant to their ability to do a specialised health job like the Chief Health Officer role.


This Chief Health Officer scandal has brought Queensland Health as an organisation and our state into disrepute across the country, because it shows that Queensland Health and this government are not interested in integrity or in the best people for leadership roles and would prefer political quick fixes. Minister Nicholls needs to clarify his role in relation to this scandal. Did he support Dr Hajkowicz for the role? He talks about everything else rather than addressing the question. He has been very quiet. He is a weak minister who has clearly been rolled by the Premier and the Deputy Premier, who are actually running key parts of his portfolio.

The Public Sector Commission has been clear that Queensland Health is required to ensure that the successful applicant is the eligible applicant best suited to the position. Make no mistake: the Director-General of Queensland Health is now in a very difficult position, having offered the role to the best candidate and then rescinded it after being heavied by Premier Crisafulli. The director-general will need to explain how and why he reversed the decision to give Dr Hajkowicz the role and whether that

was in conformity with the law. Scrutiny will only increase. Let us be clear: the Crisafulli government's fall guy in this matter will not be the Premier and it will not be the Deputy Premier. You watch them! The director-general needs to be very careful.

As for the Premier saying that he was only offering an opinion and that he was trying to respect Dr Hajkowicz while denying him the role, that is an absolute dishonest disgrace. They should table the documents and they should let the health committee investigate this. What do they have to hide? Government members of parliament are all complicit in this scandal by voting against the opposition's motion—every single one of them.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (5.45 pm): What a pleasure it is to rise and speak in the Wednesday night debate. When on the opposition side we used to spend a lot of time discussing things on a Wednesday and here we are now, so it is a pleasure to support the amendment and oppose the motion moved by those opposite. I speak as a health professional. People may not be aware that I am someone who—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LANGBROEK: I am still registered; I take the interjection.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Surfers Paradise is the only one who has the call.

Mr LANGBROEK: Yes: class 2, division 2, honours, Bachelor of Dental Science from the University of Queensland. I could have got into medicine. The member for Moggill sometimes questions whether I could have got into medicine. I got 980 and I could have got in, but there were reasons I chose to be a specialist of the head and neck and a specialist of the mouth. That is what I chose to do.

All jokes aside, I support the amendment moved by my honourable friend the member for Clayfield. It is very important to look at the role of the Chief Health Officer. In my time in this place we have had two outstanding chief health officers, Dr John Gerrard—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: I could have been. Importantly, we know that it is a public-facing role that requires stability, as the member for Clayfield mentioned. It is about providing leadership and advice on the direction of statewide medical services, supporting medical officers at all stages of their careers, working to build and strengthen Queensland's medical workforce and having a strong commitment to delivering high-quality patient care within a sustainable health system. That is very important.

It is also important for us to look at Labor's record over the last decade before we look at their method of distracting and diverting from the real issue, which is what this motion is about. They are distracting from their own decade of decline. We have heard about ambulance ramping and what they promised to do. We know that in her last year as health minister the member for Waterford promised to reduce ramping to 28 per cent. Under Labor there were issues like the elective surgery waitlist that almost doubled, from 35,385 to 64,171 in September 2024, peaking at over 66,000 in December 2024.


In budget matters, Labor overdrew its health slush fund by \$12 billion—not \$12 million—in unfunded commitments. There was no money to operationalise Mater Springfield, which I have heard the member for Clayfield and honourable minister speak about. There was no money to deliver on health workers' entitlements and there was no money to deliver the 2025 free flu vaccination program, which of course the minister has subsequently done. We have heard that the capacity expansion program blew out by \$7 billion, with undeliverable projects and fictional timelines. That has led to a review of infrastructure within Health and we are also considering doing that in Education because of issues like BPIC causing costs to blow out.

Contrast that with what we are doing in government and what the member for Clayfield—the minister—has done. Our \$1.75 billion commitment over four years is the largest investment in surgery in Queensland's history. We are aiming to drive ambulance ramping down to 30 per cent by 2028. We have a multibillion dollar Hospital Rescue Plan, and we are growing the health workforce. I was just in a meeting with the vice-chancellor of QUT, and they will be bringing in medical students. There will be 48 students in our first new medical school in 20 years—Bond University on the Gold Coast started its medical school some time ago.

It is really important that we get the facts about what is happening here. When we were in opposition, we used to hear from the member for McConnell that we were supposedly whingeing and whining. What I seem to hear from those over there is a lot of whingeing and whining, a lot of personal attacks. It is very disappointing to hear that from those opposite. They are just making up stories.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: I take that interjection. It is important to acknowledge that we are delivering after just 93 days what Labor could not deliver in over 3,500 days.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Alger—ALP) (5.50 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition, because it cuts to the very core of public trust and integrity in government and because of people like Drune from my electorate of Alger who today very bravely shared the deeply tragic story of the death of her brother Rhiike after a number of failures by Queensland Health. Before the election the now Premier talked a big game about integrity. He repeatedly said that what he says is what he means. He promised Queenslanders that under his leadership appointments would be based on merit, not mateship, and that the days of political interference in the Public Service would be over. What have we seen since the election? We are not even a year into its term, yet this government is embroiled in another integrity scandal involving the appointment of a senior public servant.

For those following along at home, here is a recap of the recent debacle surrounding the appointment of the Chief Health Officer. A clear merit-based selection process to appoint Queensland's next Chief Health Officer was conducted. An independent selection panel did its job and found that Dr Krispin Hajkowicz was the best person for the role. He was told of his success. The health minister informally endorsed him. Some media outlets reported that Dr Hajkowicz had even had his official photos taken. Then, all of a sudden, the Premier, by his own admission, reached into the process and blocked the appointment. The Premier confirmed in this place that he had made that decision about the Public Service position, stating it was all because the position is a forward-facing one and Dr Hajkowicz had in the past stepped down from the same position. What? Has the Premier forgotten that a number of his own frontbench, who also hold forward-facing positions, have stepped down from their portfolio responsibilities in the past? Obviously that fact did not stop them from being appointed to his cabinet. Seriously, how are the double standards!

Let's be absolutely clear: the Chief Health Officer is not a political appointment; it is a Public Service appointment made by the chief executive of Queensland Health. The role is meant to be independent of political meddling. That safeguard exists precisely so that when the health of Queenslanders is on the line decisions are made by doctors and health professionals, not by politicians or political operatives protecting their own interests.

The selection panel had determined, after taking everything into account, that Dr Hajkowicz was the most suitable candidate. By every rule, every standard and every principle of integrity he should have been appointed, but this Premier and allegedly at least one other government minister thought they knew better. Before the election, the Premier stood in front of the cameras and claimed he would restore trust. Instead, he has trampled all over trust in Queensland. He claimed he would let the experts do their jobs, and now he has not only blocked the experts who sat on the selection panel and the expert who is the director-general of Queensland Health but also blocked the very expert selected to be Queensland's next Chief Health Officer. That is why this motion matters. It acknowledges the legitimacy of the independent selection panel's decision. It demands transparency by ordering the release of all relevant documents, and it seeks accountability by referring this political interference to the health committee.

Queenslanders, like Drune and her brother, deserve a government that respects process. They deserve a government that values expertise. They deserve a government that tells the truth and keeps its promises. Instead, they have a Premier who said one thing before the election and now does the complete opposite in government. We have seen this over and over again from this Premier and his government. When he said that he would not be interfering in Public Service appointments, we thought it was interesting and that maybe he was trying to be a little bit different from Campbell Newman. All we have seen, though, is he is being exactly like Campbell Newman, but in such a guarded and sneaky way. He is more calculated and more slippery. Queenslanders are on to it.

This is a betrayal of trust. It is a betrayal of integrity. It is a betrayal of every Queenslanders who believed David Crisafulli when he promised that he would do politics differently. For those reasons I commend this motion as put by the Leader of the Opposition to the House and, of course, condemn this government for its latest integrity scandal.



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (5.55 pm): I rise to address the amended motion, as moved by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. There is no-one more qualified in this House to speak about the role of Chief Health Officer than I, and this is based on my clinical and professional background, and the roles and the experiences—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will go back to the member for Moggill, please.

Dr ROWAN: I know the member for Surfers Paradise might try to claim that mantle. The role of Chief Health Officer is one that requires experience, dedication, stability and a vision for public health, which encompasses not only communicable diseases but also non-communicable diseases. It also requires broad experience in both hospital-based settings and primary care and a detailed understanding of bureaucracy.

The role of Chief Health Officer also entails supporting public health relevant to disaster coordination, emergency response and emergency preparedness activities for Queensland, as well as responding to communicable diseases and other health threats. It is also well known that the position has responsibility for leading health information campaigns and being the public face of such campaigns to address issues related to chronic diseases and emergent health trends in order to reduce the future impacts on the state's health system and to raise awareness about issues related to personal responsibility for health outcomes.

Health is one of the most fundamental responsibilities of any state government. It is a responsibility that governments must be held accountable for. The people of Queensland expect that when they are unwell, when they or their family members are in need or when emergencies arise they will be able to access world-class health care without delay, yet for a decade Queenslanders were let down by a state Labor government that was not focused on the fundamentals.

The truth is the former Labor state government presided over a health system in decline. Ambulance ramping hit record levels, with paramedics forced to wait hours to off-load patients instead of being back on the road saving lives. Under Labor, over 60,000 Queenslanders were waiting for elective surgery and more than 280,000 were waiting to see specialists. These were not just numbers; they were families in distress and patients in pain, and the frontline staff were struggling with a system under significant strain. The members opposite have now fallen quiet because they know their record in health is one of complete and utter failure. They failed patients, they failed clinicians—they failed them all. They led to terrible—

Ms Grace: No, you had a waiting list for the waiting list. We remember.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Dr ROWAN: I hear the members for McConnel and Pine Rivers interjecting, but they know their record was one of failure when it came to not only patients here in Queensland but also health clinicians. Health clinicians told us all the time about the disastrous situation in Queensland under the former Labor government.

Labor spent 10 years ignoring the voices of patients and clinicians. They promised hospital capital expansions, but they knew they could not deliver that infrastructure. They announced projects without planning, without budgets or without comprehensively listening to experts.


The independent Sangster review confirmed what many already knew: that Labor's so-called hospital expansion plan was 'an exercise in futility'. That is what was said about their plan. Not one of Labor's projects was deliverable within the proposed timeframe or budget. That was not just incompetence; it was negligence, and Labor were held to account for that at the last state election.

We see the sheer hypocrisy of those opposite. They parade themselves as being champions of accountability, transparency and openness, but, if we look at scandal after scandal of the former Labor government, they failed to do those things here in Queensland. They forget about their own track record in terms of what they failed to deliver for patients here in Queensland.

The current government in Queensland is being accountable, and that is why the contrast could not be any clearer. After 10 years of Labor decline, the government here in Queensland is delivering in just 10 months. We are backing our words with record investment, real reform and visible results. We have a billion dollar commitment over four years when it comes to surgery—the largest in Queensland's history. Already, the elective surgery waitlist has seen the biggest drop since 2015 off the back of our \$100 million Surgery Connect Surge program announced in February. In the year ahead, this will deliver 30,000 surgeries, stabilising and then reducing the waitlists that Labor allowed to spiral.

The LNP government here in Queensland will continue to tackle the challenges left by the former Labor government—record ambulance ramping and record surgical waitlists. I certainly commend the amendment to the motion moved by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services.

(Time expired)

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (6.00 pm): Anybody familiar with my CV will know that I could have chosen any number of sporting codes to become a professional sportsperson. I turned down that many rock'n'roll groups that wanted me to be their lead guitarist. I did not go and see *Top Gun* because the skills that I showed at the Picnic Bay pinball parlour meant that I had jet fighter skills well beyond anything that was on *Top Gun*. I turned all of that down and became a nurse because I wanted to be a nurse.

None of that is relevant to why I am the most qualified person here to talk on this debate tonight. Perhaps nobody in this chamber can relate more to how the person who missed out on the CHO's position feels than I can tonight. Right here in this chamber just yesterday, the health minister gave me a promotion. Members all heard it. I know why he wants to replace the member for Miller, the shadow health minister. He has worked nonstop exposing the many failings of the health minister so it is hard to keep up: shutting down pill testing and gender clinic services; failings in spinal units; cutting the health workforce attraction fund; cuts and delays to the building program; spending three times more on self-promotion than health promotion; and, of course, exposing the dodgy process that is at the heart of this motion.

Members heard it all here yesterday. After the health minister gave me a promotion, probably what members did not see was how chuffed I was. I raced out and started working on my business cards. I got some photos commissioned. I even rang up to inquire how I might get some time on the government jet, but we all know we cannot get a ride on that plane because the Premier is flying on it nonstop. He is on 'Hypocrisy 1' every day. We all know where this story goes. As quickly as I was promoted, today I was demoted. Members all heard it. First he came for the CHO and now he has come for Joe. I think more than anyone else in this debate I can sympathise with the good doctor.

The health minister endorsed him publicly and photos were taken. It seemed like the expert panel's choice of CHO was going to proceed, but then the extreme wing of the LNP swung into action. This is not some fringe group of extreme political nut jobs; it is the political nut jobs who make up the leadership team of the Premier and Deputy Premier.

Intervening in a merit-based selection process demonstrates the lack of integrity at the heart of this leadership team. We have to ask ourselves: why did they intervene? Were they perhaps hoping to attract a better candidate? Perhaps they were hoping that after Carolyn Kennedy got home and started raving about how great Queensland is RFK would chuck in his job and move over here to take over the top job. He certainly seems to share the same views on vaccination as the leadership team of the LNP.

Last night I met Scott McDougall for the first time at the Wear it Purple Day event. Just for the record, I know what a woman is, I know what genes and chromosomes are, I know that sometimes genes and chromosomes do things that mean people need to see health professionals, I know what a health professional is and I know that we should let health professionals provide advice and expert care to people who seek their support, no matter what. For the record, I also know what a bigot is.

I come back to Commissioner McDougall. I have to admit that there have been many occasions when Commissioner McDougall's advice has made me uncomfortable or made me angry, but it has made me think and rethink. The key thing is that he does not care how I feel. He gives his advice and he calls his advice out based on his experience in human rights law and practice. If I am smart, I will consider that deeply. The CHO is also someone who has to provide frank, fearless and independent advice. I am concerned about what the political interference in this position might mean for public health in Queensland. A good independent CHO might have said, 'Maybe we should flip it and spend three times more on health promotion than self-promotion.'

Let us be really clear about what happened here. A merit-based selection process was interfered with by a bunch of politicians. That should be deeply concerning. None of this had to happen; under this government this has happened. How many times have we sat in this chamber and heard this government banging on and on about integrity? Remember the laptop issue? They went on and on about that. They would even talk about it when they knew it was not true. The irony of the integrity at the base of that!

An opposition member: Nothing on the laptop.


Mr J KELLY: Nothing on the laptop. The Chief Health Officer scandal is a prime example of the glaring lack of integrity at the centre and core of the leadership of the LNP.

(Time expired)

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers and member for Buderim, quarrelling across the chamber will cease.

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (6.05 pm): I am happy to come into this House any day of the week and talk about holding governments to account when it comes to health in Queensland. It is great that I have a fantastic relationship with the Minister for Health, Tim Nicholls. He is working incredibly hard fixing the very long list of failures from those opposite.

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr HEAD: I will take the interjection from the member for Scenic Rim. Unfortunately, I do not have time to talk about all of the failures, but I will talk about a few. In terms of the Moura aged-care expansion project for the wonderful community of Moura, the previous Labor government got money from the federal government to build that facility back in 2019. They had over five years to get shovels in the ground. People would have thought building the aged-care expansion when the federal government already had money on the table for those opposite to do it would not have been too hard a task, but Labor failed to get that project moving. They had nearly 10 years in government. By contrast, in 10 short months, under Minister Nicholls and the Crisafulli LNP government, shovels are in the ground to deliver on that project for the Moura community.

Another failure that we inherited is the crippling doctor shortage in Queensland.

Mr Smith: The same with Bilo.

Mr HEAD: I will take that interjection. Do not worry, member for Bundaberg, I will get to that and talk about another Labor failure. If the member wants me to talk about more Labor failures, I will happily talk about them all night.

We talk about the critical doctor shortage. I know that the Moura community asks about this. There has been some more stability there in recent times, but the permanent doctor has some leave at the moment and that community has been without a doctor. That permanent doctor is entitled to some leave. Under Labor, that community did not have a permanent doctor for many years. Under the Crisafulli government they have had the most stability they have had in a very long time. Across the North Burnett we have inherited crippling shortages.

Mr Power interjected.

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


Mr HEAD: Another community that has often come to me about doctor shortages is the community of Gin Gin. Again, we see more stability in that community now than we have seen for a long time. We know that with the problems we inherited we have a long way to go before we get to where we need to be. All of these communities deserve permanent doctors. I know that that is what the minister supports and is working hard to deliver.

The biggest disgrace of those opposite in the near decade they were in government was the maternity crisis in Queensland. We saw 37 maternity wards closed or placed on bypass by those opposite. That is 37 across the state. There were many across Callide. The most recent was the bypass at Chinchilla. They said it was a bypass, but it was a couple of thousand days under their watch. I would say that a bypass for a couple of thousand days is not a bypass; it is a closure. This week marks three years of bypass of the Biloela maternity ward, and that is frankly not good enough. That community deserves a maternity ward. We have committed to reopening it. The minister and his team and the CQHHS are working hard.

Those opposite like blaming staff as the only reason for that bypass. The reality was that they did not even have a facility that could support a maternity service because they failed to maintain the facilities at that hospital. They want to blame a lack of staff, but they could not even maintain the hospital. Now we have to upgrade that hospital. We have a renewed surgical theatre and birthing suite there that is now ready to go, so now it can attract staff to Biloela who are needed to reinstate that maternity service. I am going to keep fighting to make sure that commitment is delivered, and I know we will deliver that.

It would be remiss of me to talk about Biloela health without mentioning something incredibly sad for the Biloela community. Dr Richard Tan OAM was a doctor in that community who served for many decades. He passed away yesterday and the community is grieving. He emigrated from Malaysia and studied medicine at UQ. He had medically served Biloela since 1968 until he passed away. He was 84 years of age and was a true champion of rural health. He performed over 10,000 operations and delivered 3,000 babies throughout his career. My thoughts go out to Dominique, the family and the broader Biloela community on Dr Richard Tan's passing.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (6.10 pm): The promise to put doctors in charge has not lasted long, has it? It is very telling who is not speaking on this motion today. We know the Premier has very little respect for the role of Chief Health Officer. Who could forget what the then opposition leader said about the then Chief Health Officer—that she was a ‘punch drunk bureaucrat’ and was ‘power hungry’. This is a man who we know likes control and likes discipline, but the appointment of the Chief Health Officer of this state is important. It is not a plaything of this Premier or his cabinet. It is a role that is supposed to be appointed by the Public Service, even if that does not support the ideology of those sitting opposite.

I want to be really clear: we all know that this went through a merit-based selection process and that did its job. It informed the government that the successful applicant was to be Mr Hajkowicz. We understand that he was verbally offered that role. Then it somehow was blocked, not because he lacked merit. In fact, we are unclear about the exact reason that suggestion was blocked. All we have to go by is media report after media report which indicates that there has clearly been political interference. Those opposite were very keen to sprout the recommendations of the Coaldrake review about ‘undue influence’ when they were in opposition. It seems as though those standards are very different now that they are in government.

Why would the job offer now be withdrawn if it were not for some form of interference? I have never seen a director-general make a decision and communicate that verbally with someone and then suddenly change their mind. We are seriously expected to believe that this had nothing to do with media reports of Mr Hajkowicz or his family's alleged view against the stadium at Victoria Park or his political beliefs, despite the fact that media must have got that information from somewhere within government. Then we are also expected to believe that it had nothing to do with those media reports that senior government ministers ‘intervened’.

The health minister's amendment to this motion notes that there is a recruitment process underway, so there is another recruitment process—taxpayers' money being spent again—because there has been some sort of decision which, on the face of it, appears to be influence because the first recommendation by independent experts was not supported.

We have hospitals that are full of flu victims at the moment—the vast majority of those unvaccinated. Our hospitals are under enormous pressure. Others have already outlined why it is important that we have a permanent Chief Health Officer, to make sure the advice and public communication is being provided to Queenslanders. What is very clear is that this government is not interested in real health outcomes. They have spent three times more on political advertising than on a vaccination campaign. All of the shadow cabinet here have been up-front about our flu vaccination status, but I am the only Gold Coast MP so far who has publicly come out in support of having the flu shot. I am particularly interested in what perhaps the member for Coomera thinks about getting the flu vaccination and those other Gold Coast members of parliament—

Mr O'Connor: I've had mine.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney. He has had his. That is good. What about the rest of the cabinet? Their Premier and Deputy Premier have said that apparently it is now a decision between them and their health practitioner: your body, your choice, right, except for when it is about women!

It does not stop there. The LNP's obsession with privatising our hospitals will have consequences too. When I am talking about Gold Coast MPs, I want to talk about some of the media reports today about those opposite now wanting to look at privatising the Coomera Hospital. We have already seen under their plan a decision to axe those additional hospital beds in Robina—axing those beds in Robina.

Mr Nicholls: It was your deal with Australian Unity at Robina.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the health minister.


Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Health, you have had your turn.

Ms SCANLON: He was critical of hospital beds in Robina, but now when they are in Coomera it is a different story.

Mr Nicholls: That you failed to deliver with Australian Unity, a private provider. Come on—be consistent.

Ms SCANLON: It is not really making an awful lot of sense, member for Clayfield. While those opposite are playing political games, they are axing new hospital beds in Robina and nurses are being treated like enemies. Queenslanders deserve a permanent Chief Health Officer. They deserve a government that is not at war with health workers and they deserve integrity. That is what they were promised and that is not what we are getting from this government.

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (6.15 pm): I rise to support the motion as amended by the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. Those opposite are so quick to forget a decade of decline under their watch. They are so quick to try to shift blame and take the focus away from their many failings.

The amended motion notes that 'governments should be held to account for issues affecting health outcomes in Queensland'. That includes the former Labor government. We on this side of the chamber do not forget and Queenslanders do not forget. We do not forget the worst health minister on record, the member for Waterford—and that is quite the accomplishment noting the many failures of her predecessors. We do not forget that ambulance ramping numbers went up and up under her watch, despite the member for Waterford's promise that they would fall below 28 per cent within a year of her appointment. They never did fall below 28 per cent, and swanning around the state, taking selfies and soft portrait photos with little old ladies and babies did not help the member for Waterford. It was the member for Waterford who promised to reduce the outpatient waiting list to 248,905 again within 12 months but left the list with nearly 39,000 more Queenslanders on it.

It was ultimately Queenslanders who paid the price for the member for Waterford's failures—Queenslanders who were left waiting for important surgery as the surgery waitlists continued to balloon. It was Queenslanders who were left to foot the bill for Labor's failure to manage the capital program across the health portfolio. We knew before the election that the capex program was going to be blown out. We did not have any idea how many more billions of dollars it was going to be blown out by—a budget black hole under the former Labor government that the Minister for Health now has to try to plug. Money that could have been better spent getting Queenslanders off waiting lists or fixing ever-expanding maintenance backlogs was squandered by those opposite.

We on this side of the House will not soon forget the fascination of those opposite with glossy brochures and media ops, all while Queensland's health assets were left without funding for critical maintenance and repairs across our hospitals and health facilities. Labor failed to plan and failed to budget, with insufficient funds allocated to complete the delivery of their own health commitments.


We saw Queenslanders repay the member for Waterford for all of her many failures in the health portfolio by being the only health minister that all of Queensland sacked. Not content, however, with letting sleeping dogs lie, we see the member for Waterford lining up again—this time for the member for Murrumba's job. If the member for Waterford has Jackie Trad doing her numbers again, perhaps the member for Murrumba will manage to survive Christmas, despite the predictions of the Minister for Health this morning. Only time will tell. If you are going to challenge to be the leader, member for Waterford: (1) do not believe your own publicity; (2) learn how to do numbers; and (3) do not get Jackie Trad and Mark Bailey to ring around and do your numbers for you. If you want to win, do not get them to do your numbers.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, that was totally unnecessary. You are now warned.

Ms BATES: In stark contrast, while those opposite are enveloped in their own internal factional squabbles, we on this side of the House got on with the job, delivering more for Queensland in 10 months than we saw in 10 years of decline under Queensland Labor. We are delivering \$1.75 billion in the budget over four years, the largest investment in surgery in Queensland's history. We are delivering a \$1.7 billion investment to drive down ambulance ramping, including \$1 billion for the Queensland Ambulance Service. We are delivering the biggest investment in health infrastructure this state has ever seen, with the Crisafulli LNP government's \$18.53 billion Hospital Rescue Plan. We are delivering more healthcare workers and clinicians, growing Queensland's health workforce by over 4,500 FTEs in 2025-26, including 3,350 clinicians.

I take this opportunity to recognise the exceptional results we are already seeing within the health portfolio. We have seen the elective surgery waitlist decrease significantly, with its largest drop since 2015. We have delivered our Hospital Rescue Plan to reverse Labor's decade of decline and get Queensland Health projects back on track. We are working to free up beds and reduce ambulance ramping and we are listening to frontline healthcare workers. We have delivered real-time health data and we have listened to Queenslanders, including our health practitioners. That is why we are putting doctors and nurses back in charge of their own hospitals.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (6.21 pm): The member for Mudgeeraba spent almost her entire contribution talking about my time as the health minister. It must eat her up inside that she never got to be the health minister. As I was listening to the member for Mudgeeraba it occurred to me that she has something in common with the CHO: she also got sacked by the Premier before she got the job. You would think she might have some sympathy for the CHO.

Let's talk about what has happened with the Chief Health Officer appointment and the inappropriate political interference we have seen from those opposite. Here are the facts. There was a proper, independent, merit-based panel that went through the process and chose the best candidate. That was Dr Krispin Hajkowicz, an expert in infectious diseases with decades of experience. He was told, 'Mate, you've got the job.' Then out of nowhere he got a phone call and he was told, 'Sorry, the job is no longer on the table.' Why? Because this Premier, David Crisafulli, thinks he knows better than a panel of experts that undertook an extensive recruitment process, interviewed many candidates, and found that Dr Hajkowicz was the best candidate, the most suitable. But this Premier knows best. He has admitted that, despite having an independent panel recommend him, he gave advice to the director-general that he did not think this candidate was the best.

We have heard the health minister time and time again say, 'No, under section 52 of the Hospital and Health Boards Act it wasn't us; it's the director-general.' Why has the Premier admitted that he gave advice to the director-general to not appoint the person who was recommended? He does not think the director-general of Queensland Health takes 'advice' as a direction? This is such inappropriate political interference in a public sector role. Why does this Premier think he knows better?


We have heard from the Public Service Commissioner, Mr David Mackie, who said that the Department of Health is required to ensure that the person selected for employment is the eligible applicant best suited for the position. They did determine he was the best person for the position, but it was this Premier and the Deputy Premier who had other ideas. The Premier and other ministers have inappropriately interfered in a public sector appointment—inappropriate interference that could give rise to corruption. That it is exactly the opposite of what David Crisafulli promised.

Ms Bates: Says Jackie Trad's best mate.

Ms FENTIMAN: What message does that send to every doctor, nurse and member of the Public Service, member for Mudgeeraba? You promised they would be back in charge. The experts said Dr Hajkowicz was the best person and now this Premier says, 'No, we're not going to listen to the health experts, no matter how qualified they are.' This should send a terrible message to every public servant: it does not matter how qualified you are and it does not matter how many decades of experience you have; if you do not fit this Premier's politics, there is no job for you.

While the LNP is busy playing politics with people's careers, we still do not have a permanent Chief Health Officer—at the height of a deadly flu season. Hundreds of Queenslanders have had their elective surgeries delayed because Queenslanders have not taken up the flu shot. I wonder why—because no leaders in the government have encouraged people to get their flu shot. For a Premier to stand up and not even disclose whether he has had a flu shot and to tell people that it is a matter between him and his doctor is the biggest lack of leadership. When it comes to public health, you have to lead by example. He has failed to do that.

Elective surgeries for 185 patients were postponed at four hospitals across the state. Queensland Health reported that 90 per cent of the nearly 44,000 people who contracted influenza this year were unvaccinated. We have a Premier who is refusing to encourage Queenslanders to get vaccinated and we have no Chief Health Officer to step into the breach and encourage Queenslanders to get this vaccination, so we are calling this out. It is why we are moving that the director-general produce the panel documents relating to this appointment and we are asking the committee to investigate. It is not leadership; it is arrogance.

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (6.26 pm): It is a pleasure to rise to address the motion and the amendment, and it is a pleasure to follow the member for Waterford. I thought that after her performance during question time and her protests, which were

quite loud and vociferous, she might have led by example and repudiated the actions of the member for Cairns. She has clearly repudiated similar actions in the past. She had an opportunity. She made the point during question time that she did not have an opportunity in question time. Now she spent five minutes on her feet speaking about standards and, to quote the member for Waterford, 'a lack of leadership'.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order: relevance.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I cannot hear the member for Springwood's point of order.

Mr de BRENNI: The point of order is that the minister must be relevant to the motion or the amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, that is a fair point of order. Member for Buderim, you have a motion in front of you.

Mr MICKELBERG: I will rebut the contribution of the member for Waterford, who said that this was the biggest 'lack of leadership' and that we needed to 'lead by example'. Those were her words, not mine. Incidentally, I agree with them. There is a lack of leadership in this House tonight, and it comes from those opposite. The member for Cairns should be condemned for his actions—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MICKELBERG:—and for those opposite to come in here and ignore them—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MICKELBERG:—says everything Queenslanders need to know.

Mr de BRENNI: Sit down! Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Springwood, what is your point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: Apologies, Mr Speaker. My point of order is in relation to relevance. Just a moment ago you ruled on relevance and instructed the minister, and he intentionally ignored your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Moggill, do you have a point of order?

Dr ROWAN: My point of order was that the outburst by the Manager of Opposition Business was unbecoming.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, you have made your point on that issue. We are debating a motion. If you could bring yourself back to that, it would be appreciated.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Speaker. It begs the question of why they have come in here and sought to distract from their record on health and their standards of public behaviour. The simple fact is that Queenslanders are living with a decade of Labor failure. We had 10 years of Labor failure on health and the worst ambulance ramping in the country; that is what those opposite presided over. It begs the question of who has the most to lose from a conversation about Labor's record on health. Could it be the now opposition leader, a former minister for health? Could it be the now deputy opposition leader, a former minister for health? Could it be the next opposition leader, the member for Waterford, a former minister for health? They all presided over a decade of failure and it is Queenslanders who paid the price.

Whether it is ramping or the outpatient waitlist, the reality is that those opposite failed Queenslanders. I brought the plight of Darrell and Stephanie Massie from my electorate to the parliament in 2022. Stephanie had a fall at home and broke her hip and her femur. She sat ramped for five hours when she should have had emergency treatment immediately, given the nature of her injuries. Darrell, her partner, was a victim under two Labor failures in the health system. He too sat ramped for seven hours with a huge haematoma—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I can hear those opposite interjecting. When I brought up the story of a victim of Labor's health crisis, the member for McConnel said I was coming in here and making things up. Mr Speaker, I can tell you that the people of Buderim and the people of Queensland know Labor's record when it comes to health. They know that those opposite want to hide from their record, which is why they come in here and move these motions which are full of baseless allegations; they are

assertions without facts. Those opposite know that their record is shameful and they are ashamed of it, and they should be. Queenslanders passed judgement on that in October last year.

I want to contrast our approach with that of those opposite—people like the member for McConnel, who says we come in here and make stories up, or the member for Waterford, who failed to take responsibility. She promised she would bring ambulance ramping down to, I think, 28 per cent but she failed because it went up to 45.5 per cent under the member for Waterford.

Ms Bates: Worst in the nation.

Mr MICKELBERG: I take the interjection from the member for Mudgeeraba. She was the worst health minister that Queensland has seen, with the worst ambulance ramping in the nation. Contrast that with the approach taken by the now Minister for Health, the member for Clayfield. When confronted with questions today in relation to an individual by the name of Drune, he gave an empathetic response with a commitment to address the concerns. That tells Queenslanders everything they need to know about our government's focus on delivering. We have been in government for 10 months and we have delivered more than those opposite could with their decade of Labor failures. The people of Buderim know it and every Queenslanders passed judgement in October. Those opposite should listen to the voices of Queenslanders. That is why I will be supporting the amended motion. I call on all members of the House to reject Labor's scurrilous attacks and scare campaigns.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—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, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 32:

ALP, 30—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, J. Kelly, King, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Sullivan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—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, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 32:

ALP, 30—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, J. Kelly, King, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Sullivan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

1. notes the Chief Health Officer is a public-facing role;
2. notes the Chief Health Officer is one that requires stability;
3. notes the Chief Health Officer is one that requires longevity;
4. notes the Chief Health Officer is appointed by the chief executive of the department under the provisions of the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011;
5. notes the recruitment process for a Chief Health Officer is underway;

6. notes governments should be held to account for issues affecting health outcomes in Queensland.
Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.40 pm.

APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL


Appropriation Bill

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Appropriation Bill

Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee, Report

Resumed from p. 2502.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee's report on the Appropriation Bill. Before I start, I would like to pass on my sincere condolences to the families and friends of the two Victorian police officers who were slain as they were going about their duties, keeping our community safe. It is terrible and horrendous news.

With regard to the estimates process, I wish to thank the committee members, the ministerial and departmental staff and the ministers, who gave very informative responses to the questions asked. I wish to thank the Speaker and Deputy Speaker for their unbiased approach to managing this year's estimates hearings. This year's estimates process was adjudicated with the highest level of impartiality, reinforcing the decision by the Premier to revolutionise estimates by creating an open and transparent process.


As the last government speaker to this report, I would like to remind those opposite of the ratio of time allocated to both government and non-government members to ask questions. Non-government members received 2,207 minutes, while government members received 1,488 minutes—about a 60-40 split. This year's estimates process was held over nine days, compared to the estimates hearings in 2024 which were held over eight days. In 2023 and 2022 they were held over seven days. That shows just how willing, open and transparent the Crisafulli government is.

During the hearing process there were some interesting questions asked by those opposite. Some contained imputations while others were argumentative or hypothetical. I do remember a hypothetical question asked of the acting director-general of the department of local government. I know that the director-general is a very talented individual, but he certainly is not Nostradamus.

During this process we learned how focused the Crisafulli LNP government is on small businesses under the stewardship of the member for Chatsworth. As someone who comes from a small business background, he is very interested in and has a real passion for small business.

To highlight the importance of the 495,000 small businesses in Queensland, this year's budget allocates \$130 million of new funding for small businesses as part of the Small and Family Business First Action Statement. These funds include: \$40 million for the Secure Communities Partnerships Program to implement crime prevention measures and improve community safety for small businesses; \$19 million for an apprenticeship support program; \$16.8 million to extend the small business support network; and, of equal importance, a refocus by the Small Business Commissioner on reducing red tape, which is very important when it comes to dealing with cybersecurity and the advancement of AI. It is very important that we embrace AI. That was something the minister was very clear on. Also during this process we found that cybersecurity is becoming a huge issue. Recently some figures came out for the 2023-24 financial year that 36,700 calls—

(Time expired)

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (7.45 pm): I rise to speak to this report in place of the member for Inala. I am standing in her stead here, looking at the notes she has prepared. I know that she will be listening to this. Thank you, member for Inala, for this opportunity. I did not get to see much at all of these particular examinations, but I have read through the notes and the report and I do find it fascinating. There is one thing I do want to know—

Mr Smith: What about Emu Swamp Dam?

Mr WHITING: I was just about to say that we will be talking about the member for Southern Downs here, so, Deputy Speaker Lister, you will have to separate yourself from this. How many times from this corner of the chamber did we hear that call in the last term, 'What about Emu Swamp Dam?' I am going to say it as well. What about Emu Swamp Dam? From what I understand, there is no money as yet for Emu Swamp Dam. Am I right: it is not appearing? There is nothing there. What a shame!

I say to the member for Southern Downs, whom I am addressing in the third person here: I am sorry, but we are going to keep on bringing this up. Deputy Speaker Lister, your strong voice reminded us of this so many times. Member for Southern Downs, we are going to hold you accountable for this. I think it is a legitimate issue. So many times we heard the bellowing from here, what about Emu Swamp Dam? We will now take up the mantle of asking the same question of this government. The member may not be able to ask it, but we will be asking it: 'What about Emu Swamp Dam?' I might leave it at that. I do not want to make the Deputy Speaker feel more uncomfortable than he is at the moment.

I will repeat what I said in the House when talking to other reports: what we learned through the estimates process is that the LNP cannot keep their promises and they cannot keep their word. Instead of delivering the fresh start that they promised, what they have delivered is the same old stuff from the LNP—the cuts, cancellations and chaos. Now add in a healthy dose of self-entitlement as well.

I will call on the member for Bundaberg again. Am I right in saying that the land for the second Bundaberg fire station is there but there is no money to build it? Is that correct?

Mr Smith: No money.

Mr WHITING: It is not there—cuts, cancellation and chaos. The land was bought for the fire station, but what we learned from estimates is that the money is not there, and that is an absolute shame. For the stretched firefighters the call-outs are still coming, but this government's answer is to do nothing for them. As I said: cuts, cancellation and chaos.

Speaking of cuts and chaos, one of the things that was discovered during this estimates hearing was that under Labor 205,000 small businesses were eligible to receive a \$650 energy rebate but under the LNP I am informed that is gone. There is not a dollar of energy bill relief in the first budget. Now that is cruel cuts—

Mr Head interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Callide, your interjections are not being taken.

Mr WHITING: Do not get me started, please, member for Callide. One of the other things that we did discover is that disaster recovery has been turned by the LNP into jobs for mates. Meetings with state recovery coordinators used to be with impartial public servants. That is out the door. Now we will be seeing meetings with known LNP operatives. Once again, it is a salve to their sense of self-entitlement.


One of the other things that was discovered by this estimates is that life-saving safety upgrades for Rural Fire Service appliances have been stalled. There are no new appliances ordered under this budget. Every one that will be delivered this year has been funded by Labor. As I said, I was not there but I have read the report and what we have seen is another litany of cuts, chaos and cancellation. It is the same old LNP. I will finish by saying 'Emu Swamp Dam'.

(Time expired)

Mr HEAD: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): I call the member for Callide. He jumped first.

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (7.50 pm): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Member, thanks for the provocation earlier. I am happy to talk further in this House about the estimates process, especially about the fantastic Minister for Local Government and Water and the great work that she and the Crisafulli LNP government are doing. The minister spoke through the estimates process in great detail about the significant investment we are putting towards water security in the electorate of Callide, with \$18.6 million out of a total of \$29.7 million to progress the Barlil and Cooranga weir developments to get them through to final design so we can get on with the job of delivering on that commitment. It is a fantastic thing for the Mundubbera community for a weir to be built on the Boyne River. It is something that the growers there have been calling for. It makes good on an undertaking that was made many years ago.

Here is some history for the House: I think when the latest unit at the Tarong Power Station was built, meaning more water to be taken from Boondooma Dam, growers lost some water security downstream. It has taken three decades to see a government in Queensland that can actually deliver that project and, of course, it has to be an LNP government because unfortunately we know that Labor do not build water infrastructure unless they are dragged kicking and screaming, as they were with Rookwood Weir. We know their record. When they go it alone and try to build some water infrastructure we see things like what happened with Paradise Dam.

My constituency and the constituency of the member for Burnett know very well about the failures of Paradise Dam and the heartache it has caused but the minister also outlined the work that has been happening. There is now a coordinated project to reinstate Paradise Dam to its proper level. That is a great thing for the Wide Bay.

Mr Bennett: Works have started.

Mr HEAD: I take that interjection. Works have started to progress that rebuild of Paradise Dam. This is something that should have happened many years ago but Labor, once again, do not like backing in water security in Queensland. They do not like backing in the regions. It takes an LNP government to get on with the job and deliver important water security. There have been 10 years of delays and 10 years of failures but only 10 months of significant delivery under a Crisafulli LNP government. That is a fantastic contrast.


My constituency often talks about how it is great to see government. We have ministers who spend a lot of time in regional Queensland—I have the Minister for Primary Industries in Mundubbera—talking with growers about Cooranga weir and the benefits it will bring. He will be there soon in the Mundubbera community. I am looking forward to hosting you, minister.

I will move on to other matters in the North Burnett. The local government minister is also working hard with local governments to fix the likes of the challenges that the North Burnett community are facing with a 25 per cent rate rise. The council has outlined in detail the significant challenges they have faced over the last decade that has led to that rate rise. As I have said to the community, there are a lot of different levers between local, state and federal governments that need to be pulled to help that situation but I know this minister is working hard with local governments to do the right thing to make sure it is not the state that is causing further pain—not only for local councils but, in turn, their ratepayers.

Finally, it is fantastic to also see a government getting on with the job and delivering things that were meant to be delivered under the previous government but never were. The community of Biggenden knows this all too well. They were meant to have a new fire shed built many years ago. I think it was either in 2017 or 2019 that an agreement was signed. The local show society at Biggenden gifted land to the state in a lease arrangement for a new fire station to be built at Biggenden and it was never built. We had a great meeting with the minister and the Fire Department recently to talk about that important upgrade. I know we will have shovels moving soon and a tender process is imminent. I am looking forward to seeing that fire shed built at Biggenden and of course at Bell, as well. I know great work is happening there—another fire shed that was meant to be built many years ago and wasn't. That is why it is fantastic to be part of the Crisafulli government and an LNP team that is getting on with delivering for Queensland. We have only been in government for 10 months and we have already delivered a lot more for the people of Callide than we saw under a decade of decline under the previous Labor government.

Mr Baillie interjected.

Mr HEAD: I take that interjection. We are kicking goals.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (7.56 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the 2025-26 budget estimates for the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee portfolio areas. I start my contribution by reflecting predominantly on the fire portfolio. As members of this House would know, I have some passion for the fire portfolio and some awareness of the great reforms and the great people who make up the Fire Department and their contribution to the Queensland community.

I am disappointed to see confirmation in this year's estimates that the second fire station at Bundaberg will not proceed during this term of government. This will have an outrageous impact on the Bundaberg community. This project was advocated for by local firefighters. The member for Bundaberg supported their advocacy and, as a result of their advocacy, a plan was put in place to deliver that fire station. That plan started with the acquisition of a significant block of land in east Bundaberg. To hear through this estimates process that there will be no commitment from this government to build that fire

station within this term of government is not only disappointing from a community safety point of view; it ignores the pleas of local firefighters in Bundaberg. I know that the member for Bundaberg will continue his advocacy on behalf of those firefighters in the Bundaberg region.

I am also disappointed to see the scrutiny around the removal of the acknowledgement of traditional owners from the plaque at the Drayton fire station. I am concerned that that will become a permanent position of this government, notwithstanding it was government policy for those acknowledgements to be included. The committee report quotes the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Languages Policy Action Plan that provides guidance to departments around the inclusion of those statements. A very diligent public servant provided frank and fearless advice directly to the minister's office. She wrote—

Thank you for checking in on this one. I have spoken with Angus—

who is the minister's chief of staff—

and advised of the ... Policy Action Plan ... He was aware of the policy and has reaffirmed the Minister's position to remove the Acknowledgment ...

This was contrary to the advice of those public servants and contrary to the government policy.

I am concerned about this direction. The Premier is also concerned about this action because at the LNP state conference on the weekend he said—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Morayfield, I ask you to resume your seat, please. The time for this debate has expired.

Report adopted.

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)



Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (8.00 pm): I move—

That the bills be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bills read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)



Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (8.01 pm): I move—

That the long titles of the bills be agreed to.

Question put—That the long titles of the bills be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 30 April (see p. 1016).

Second 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) (8.01 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

In April of this year, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 was introduced into the Legislative Assembly. The bill progresses legislative amendments primarily to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and the Evidence Act 1977. It also makes consequential amendments to other acts.

The bill includes three key reforms. The first is to establish police protection directions, PPDs, to provide a new tool for police responding to domestic and family violence. The bill also supports the

Crisafulli government's election commitment to establish an electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence. Thirdly, the bill simplifies, streamlines and expands the videorecorded evidence-in-chief framework and clarifies that a videorecorded statement can be used in civil proceedings under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. Finally, the bill makes technical amendments to the approved provider list to improve the maintenance of the list.

Following its introduction, the bill was referred to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee, and I thank the committee for its thorough consideration of the bill. The committee received a total of 75 submissions. I extend my thanks to those stakeholders, organisations and individuals who made submissions and took part in public hearings in Mackay, Cairns and Brisbane. They provided valuable input for the committee's consideration. I especially thank the victim-survivors who shared their own experiences of domestic and family violence, and I acknowledge and am grateful for their courage in sharing their stories.

I am also pleased to inform the House that on 20 June 2025 the committee tabled its report on the bill. The committee made seven recommendations including that the bill be passed. In addition to recommending passage, the committee's other recommendations covered: one, the development of guidelines to assist police officers in administering police protection directions, PPDs; two, a further amendment to ensure PPDs are provided to the Family Responsibilities Commission; three, the statutory review proposed in the bill to consider whether proposed safeguards against misidentification are effective; four, considered implementation and fulsome and meaningful evaluation of the electronic monitoring pilot; five, embedding more detail in the primary legislation if the scheme is to be extended or made permanent following the pilot; and, six, Queensland Police Service domestic and family violence training materials to be co-designed with domestic and family violence specialist providers being regularly reviewed and for police officers to take refresher training. I would like to take this opportunity to table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 5, 58th Parliament—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, government response [\[1139\]](#).

I am pleased to advise the House that the Crisafulli government supports or supports in principle all of the committee's recommendations. I foreshadow that during consideration in detail I will move amendments concerning the PPD framework. Broadly, these amendments will: respond to recommendation 3 of the committee's report; support the Queensland Police Service to operationalise the PPD framework; support courts to have visibility of PPDs; and clarify the court review process for PPDs. I will now provide a detailed overview of the bill, starting with the PPD framework.

Currently, Queensland police officers can issue police protection notices providing victim-survivors with short-term protection until the matter can be heard before a court. The court can then make a protection order for up to five years. PPDs will provide a new tool for police officers responding to domestic and family violence. This will enable frontline officers to offer immediate 12-month protection for victim-survivors without the need for the matter to go through the courts.

PPDs may contain standard conditions in addition to no-contact, ouster, return and cool-down conditions. To issue a PPD, a police officer must seek the approval of a supervising police officer. The supervising officer must be a rank of sergeant or senior sergeant, depending on the conditions of the PPD. If a supervising officer believes it would be more appropriate for the matter to go before a court, they will be able to approve a police protection notice in place of a PPD. PPDs will only be used where a police officer, having investigated, considers it appropriate for a matter not to proceed to court. This will remove the necessity for operational police officers to prepare for and attend court.

Police may issue a PPD if they reasonably believe the respondent has committed domestic violence, a PPD is necessary or desirable to protect the aggrieved from domestic violence and it would not be more appropriate to apply for a protection order on the victim's behalf. Before issuing a PPD, police officers will have to consider several matters including any views or wishes expressed by the aggrieved and the criminal and domestic violence history of the parties.

The bill provides for circumstances where a police officer will be unable to issue a PPD, which I will refer to as exclusions. One exclusion is where the respondent has been convicted of a domestic and family violence offence within the previous two years. Another exclusion is where either the respondent or the aggrieved is a child. Broadly, the exclusions are intended to safeguard against PPDs being used in circumstances where court consideration of a matter would be more appropriate.

I understand that misidentification of the person most in need of protection was raised as a concern during the committee process, and I acknowledge the severity of consequences if a PPD wrongly identifies the person most in need of protection. The bill includes several safeguards intended

to protect against misidentification including particular exclusions. Firstly, a police officer will not be able to issue a PPD if they cannot identify the person most in need of protection. If police attend an incident and are unable to determine who is in most need of protection, this is an exclusion for the issuing of a PPD. Consistent with the current approach for police protection notices, an officer will not be able to issue a PPD against both parties. Before making a PPD, a police officer will also be required to make a reasonable attempt to locate and talk to the respondent and consider any views or wishes expressed by the aggrieved.

In its report, the committee acknowledged the significant risks associated with misidentification of the person most in need of protection. The committee expressed its support for the proposed safeguards included in the bill, stating it was satisfied the safeguards would be sufficient to mitigate these risks. The committee also recommended that the effectiveness of these safeguards be considered as part of the statutory review proposed by the bill. As indicated in the response I have tabled here today, the government supports this recommendation.

The bill includes two review pathways for a PPD after it is issued. A respondent or an aggrieved may apply for either a police review or a court review. Neither review affects the operation of a PPD while it is underway. The police review will be available to parties for 28 days after the PPD is issued. The purpose of the police review is to ensure the PPD provided a level of protection that was appropriate in the circumstances at the time the PPD was issued. This includes circumstances that existed at the time but were not known or considered by the officer issuing the PPD in the first instance. A police review must be undertaken by an authorised reviewing officer who is a rank higher than the approving officer for the PPD and who was not involved in investigating the domestic violence that led to the PPD being issued. The reviewing officer may decide to confirm or revoke the PPD and take another action such as issuing a police protection notice or issuing a new PPD.

The court process will operate in a similar way to the current process for a police protection notice. The respondent or aggrieved may apply to the court for a review of a PPD at any time during the 12 months it is in force. The court review operates independently of the police review process and is not an appeal of any decision made by the police on review. This means an applicant does not need to have sought a police review first. The court, upon review, will consider whether a protection order is necessary and desirable at the time of the review, not the time police attended and issued the PPD.

The court may make any order available under part 3 of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. The court may also make an order setting aside the PPD or decide to dismiss the application for a protection order. If a court makes an order setting aside the PPD, the direction is taken never to have been issued and will not appear on the respondent's domestic violence history. During consideration in detail I will move an amendment to give courts an additional option to end a PPD. This will allow for circumstances where keeping a record of the PPD on the respondent's history is considered appropriate. If the magistrate dismisses the application for review, the PPD will continue in force unaffected.

The bill creates a new offence for contravening a PPD, with a maximum penalty of 120 penalty units or three years imprisonment. This mirrors the maximum penalty for a contravention of a police protection notice. Domestic and family violence is to be treated seriously in all contexts, whether a PPD, a PPN or a DVO has been issued. A PPD is a serious response to domestic and family violence which provides a year of protection to the aggrieved. A longer period of protection can still be sought from the courts at any time.

During consideration in detail I intend to move amendments to the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008. This amendment will respond to recommendation 3 of the committee's report and provide for the Family Responsibilities Commission to be notified of PPDs in relevant circumstances. Ensuring the Family Responsibilities Commission retains visibility of domestic and family violence occurring in welfare reform community areas will support early intervention in a culturally safe environment.

I will now provide an overview of the framework for electronic monitoring. The bill supports the Crisafulli government's election commitment to pilot GPS monitoring for high-risk domestic and family violence offenders. The provision outlined in the bill will allow specific courts to require the electronic monitoring of a respondent to a domestic violence order. The cohort eligible for the electronic monitoring pilot will be limited to respondents who have convictions or charges for a domestic violence offence, or an indictable offence involving violence against another person or have a history of charges for domestic violence offences made against them. This cohort is intended to capture high-risk perpetrators

of domestic and family violence. When deciding to impose electronic monitoring conditions, courts will have to consider a range of things including the views and wishes of the aggrieved or named person.

While including electronic monitoring as part of a domestic violence order in the civil context is different to electronic monitoring as part of bail or parole, it is intended these provisions will complement the existing frameworks. I note the committee was satisfied that the provisions for the electronic monitoring pilot detailed in the bill achieve a fair balance between the intended purpose of the scheme and any potential limitations to human rights. I intend to move amendments to the electronic monitoring provisions during consideration in detail. These amendments concern how prescribed entities are asked for information by a court considering whether to make a monitoring condition. Further amendments will concern the admissibility of electronic monitoring information in non-domestic violence matters where the court considers it would be in the interests of justice to admit the evidence.

The bill amends the Evidence Act 1977 to simplify and streamline the videorecorded evidence-in-chief framework, or VREC for short. Importantly, the bill expands the scheme statewide. VREC is a key component of our efforts to support victim-survivors of domestic and family violence. The existing VREC framework allows adult complainants in domestic violence summary criminal proceedings and committal proceedings to provide their evidence-in-chief by way of a videorecorded statement. This approach offers significant benefits. It can reduce the trauma for victim-survivors by minimising the need of extensive oral testimony in court; it allows for a more detailed account to be captured in a comfortable environment like their home; and it can assist in the recall of details closer to the time of the alleged offence, potentially reducing contested matters. The current framework has been operating as a trial in Magistrates Courts in Ipswich, Southport and Coolangatta. The bill will ensure victim-survivors across the state have the option of giving evidence in this way.

The amendments to the VREC framework seek to clarify that a complainant's evidence-in-chief may be comprised of more than one videorecorded statement. This recognises that victim-survivors may make multiple reports to police over a period of time. The bill omits the requirement for a recorded statement to be made 'as soon as practicable' after events. This is a crucial shift towards a victim-centric approach, acknowledging that victim-survivors may be in a heightened state of distress and require more time before providing a detailed account to police. Many submitters to the committee supported allowing police officers to take statements at the most appropriate time for victim-survivors.

The bill also removes the requirement that a VREC statement must be taken by a trained police officer. While this caused concern among several submitters to the committee, the Queensland Police Service has assured that suitable training can be affected through internal policy and guiding principles, allowing for greater flexibility in workforce capabilities while still meeting the needs of victim-survivors appropriately. The Queensland Police Service is developing a combined PPD and VREC training package, with frontline officer training to commence before 1 January 2026. To increase flexibility, amendments are also being made to the translation requirement to allow for either an oral or a separate written English translation if any part of the recorded statement is in a language other than English.

The bill simplifies the requirement for the complainant to declare the truthfulness of their statement, replacing the need for an acknowledgement or declaration under the Oaths Act 1867 with a simpler declaration at the end of the recording. The intent is not to diminish the importance of swearing evidence but to enable a police officer to explain the process in simple language. Safeguards remain if the complainant knowingly provides false information.


The bill streamlines the process for obtaining informed consent. It provides that informed consent need only to be obtained once, either before or at the commencement of the recorded statement. This change avoids unnecessary repetition for victim-survivors, ensuring the framework is more streamlined while retaining important safeguards. The bill retains the existing requirement to obtain informed consent, which requires the police officer to explain key matters including that the statement may be used as evidence-in-chief, disclosed to the accused and that the complainant may be required to confirm its truthfulness in court.

Further amendments are made to significantly address the admissibility of recorded statements. The bill introduces an example of exceptional circumstances where an audio recording, as opposed to video, may be admitted. This example indicates that such a circumstance exists where a technological error or failure prevents the production of moving images. Finally, the bill clarifies that a court can consider a recorded statement in civil proceedings under the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. This is a crucial clarification, as victim-survivors often need to give evidence in both criminal and civil proceedings. Admitting a recorded statement in civil proceedings instead of a written statement or

affidavit minimises the requirement for victim-survivors to retell their experiences, thereby reducing further trauma.

The bill proposes amendments intended to improve the maintenance of the approved provider list. This list is for service providers approved to provide court ordered intervention and counselling services to persons using violence. The bill will allow the chief executive to consider whether service providers meet certain criteria when determining whether they can be added to the list. Criteria will be prescribed by regulation in addition to the existing requirements for the approval of providers on the APL. We know it is important to get this right, and we will consult with the domestic and family violence sector in developing the criteria.

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will support our frontline police when they are responding to domestic and family violence while providing safety to victim-survivors and facilitates government's commitment to establish an electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk domestic and family violence offenders. Additional amendments to be moved will build on this government's commitment to victim-survivors of domestic, family and sexual violence. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (8.22 pm): The Queensland Labor opposition remains committed to ending all forms of domestic, family and sexual violence in our state. Domestic and family violence continues to cause deep and lasting harm in our communities. It is pervasive, often hidden and happens far too often. We acknowledge the hard work of the Queensland Police Service, who work day in and day out to keep our communities safe from violence. We have heard from police that they are under increasing pressure when it comes to managing their workload and that responding to domestic and family violence constitutes a significant part of this workload.

The Queensland Labor opposition supports measures that address pressure on our frontline police. We want to ensure they can effectively respond to domestic and family violence. However, any new measures must prioritise, first and foremost, the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. Reforms must be evidence-based and they must be backed by experts. The LNP promised this. They said that they would listen to the experts. They said that they would be open and transparent. They said that they would put victims first. This bill breaks those promises.

Through consultation, the committee process and the estimates process we heard from the domestic violence sector and victim-survivors that elements of the bill have the potential to risk victim-survivors' safety. At estimates, when asked if the domestic and family violence sector did not support the bill's introduction of PPDs, the director-general responded, 'I understand that is true ...'. This shows the LNP is refusing to listen to the experts, ignoring the domestic and family violence sector and their concerns. We share these concerns. We are concerned this bill will increase the risk of misidentification. We are concerned that this bill will have unintended consequences for victim-survivors due to the removal of court oversight and we, as a Labor opposition, are concerned that this bill will misrepresent data surrounding the victims of domestic and family violence, skewing victim numbers to suit the government's agenda.

I now turn to a number of issues with the bill, firstly PPDs and misidentification. The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 outlines a framework for police protection directions, PPDs. They are intended to be issued on the spot by police responding to domestic violence incidents and will be in place for 12 months. Unlike a domestic violence order, the issuing of a PPD will not require court oversight. In practice, this will place police officers in the position of making significant legal decisions without judicial input.

The Queensland Police Union called for the introduction of PPDs to address workforce impacts of responding to increased numbers of domestic and family violence incidents, to better manage police workload and to increase police efficiency. The Miles Labor government listened to police and considered progressing reforms to address these issues; however, we included increased safeguards and planned for a trial of police issued directions prior to a statewide commencement. This was to ensure reforms did not result in any unintended consequences that would impact a victim-survivor's pathway to safety. It put domestic violence victim-survivors' safety at the centre of any reform. Many victim-survivors do not support the bill as currently drafted. I was contacted by a domestic violence stakeholder who shared the voices of victim-survivors of non-fatal strangulation. They said—

We spoke with a number of victim-survivors ... they unanimously opposed the introduction of the framework in its current form ... those women do not feel listened to nor heard.

We agree with the sector that PPDs as currently drafted increase the risk to victim-survivors. The peak organisation QCROSS stated that they strongly oppose PPDs because they are an efficiency

measure that does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. We share the sector's concerns of misidentification of the person most in need of protection. We know that domestic and family violence is incredibly complex and that the individual in most need of protection might not be the one identified, due to the circumstances at the time.

I have heard from the domestic and family violence sector across the state who repeatedly raise concerns surrounding the misidentification of the person most in need of protection. The Queensland Police Union stated that the acceptable level of female respondents in domestic violence cases is between seven and eight per cent. However, recently the opposition uncovered that the current level of respondents who are female is 31.1 per cent in Queensland. For reference, that relates to question on notice No. 490 of 2025. More work needs to be done to reduce misidentification and, unfortunately, this bill will only increase the potential for misidentification to occur and the severity of consequences. QCROSS stated in its submission to the committee—

... PPDs are likely to significantly increase the risk of misidentification occurring, placing some victim-survivors at greater risk and without protection.

We also know that certain communities and vulnerable cohorts are more likely to experience misidentification. For First Nations communities, those with a disability, those afflicted with poor mental health or those from culturally and linguistically diverse communities, the risk of misidentification is already increased. An example we heard from the stakeholders during the public hearing of the committee is that language barriers and visa conditions place refugee and migrant women at increased risk of misidentification. Under the current system, misidentification would be addressed when a PPN progresses to court for consideration of making a domestic violence order. The new PPD framework removes this oversight. If misidentification occurs, the consequences would be solidified as an order becomes permanent for 12 months. The Women's Legal Service raised this during the committee process, saying—

... misidentification often happens due to a lack of information and a need to respond in the moment ... that will be crystallised even more when that response in the moment then becomes a 12-month order.

Under this bill, misidentified victim-survivors will be left without protections that they need, placing them at increased risk of further violence and severe consequences. They may be subject to criminalisation, housing instability and homelessness, loss of employment, custody issues and loss of access to children. They may face social stigma and isolation. The most severe consequence of misidentification is leaving victim-survivors exposed to further violence, and this could be fatal. Almost half of women murdered in domestic violence related homicides were misidentified as the person using violence. Let me repeat: almost half of women murdered in domestic violence related homicides were misidentified as the person using violence. During the committee process, QCROSS shared with the committee—

The consequences of misidentification can be severe and potentially fatal.

They further stated—

Where a person is misidentified, that means they will be left without protection at that incident. They can then become criminalised. They can have their reputation ruined. We know that the consequences for their safety and wellbeing can be severe.

The bill lacks the necessary safeguards against misidentification and has unintended consequences. That is why the Labor opposition will move amendments and I table those amendments, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights for the benefit of the House and all Queenslanders so that all Queenslanders know that safeguards should be in place before moving forward.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, amendments to be moved by Ms Corrine McMillan [\[1140\]](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments [\[1141\]](#).

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Ms Corrine McMillan's amendments [\[1142\]](#).

I now turn to the lack of court oversight. Further to the risks of misidentification, we are concerned that this bill may result in a number of unintended consequences because PPDs remove the requirement that a domestic violence matter be heard in court. Stakeholders raised concerns about missed opportunities from the removal of the court's involvement.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Can we have quiet in the chamber. If you want to have a conversation, please take it outside.

Ms McMILLAN: In their submission the Women's Legal Service stated that 'the removal of the court process removes the oversight and additional time and space to identify and address complex issues' and they stated—

... attending court is a way that many victim survivors get support. Many victim-survivors are connected with support services at court that they may not otherwise contact, and receive free legal advice to help them better understand their rights and options.

The Queensland Law Society shared—

... the fact respondents will not come before the court presents additional problems, including the loss of opportunity for the court to link parties with other services, including behaviour change programs.

They also observed that there were significant impacts on victim-survivors with respect to having agency and their views considered when making an order. The Queensland Law Society said that the court process improves this as—

The court can then balance the views and wishes of the aggrieved in considering whether to make an order and with what conditions.

Going to court allows for the view of victim-survivors to be adequately considered. It provides an avenue for victim-survivors to receive support and legal advice so they can fully consider the order that is being made. There are certain provisions associated with court orders. Information sharing exists between the courts and other bodies to provide support and keep victim-survivors safe. Importantly, data is captured by Queensland courts for domestic and family violence orders and breaches. It is critical we have public information surrounding the number of victim-survivors of domestic violence to continue to inform our approach and response to domestic and family violence and for services to understand, adapt and advocate for sufficient resourcing and funding to support victim-survivors and persons who choose to use violence.

Without going to court, PPDs risk opportunities for victim-survivors to access support, for information sharing and for victim-survivors to be counted in reported data. PPDs present an increased risk to victim-survivors' safety. This bill lacks the necessary safeguards against misidentification and has unintended consequences. That is why the Labor opposition will seek to move amendments to address this matter.

I now turn to the review process of PPDs. With the introduction of a 12-month protection direction, the consequences of misidentification will be solidified with the potential for severe repercussions to the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. While the bill provides methods for a PPD to be revoked or become a DVO through a police review process and a court review process, the onus is on either the aggrieved or the respondent to initiate this process if they believe there was a mistake or the review requires police to become aware of circumstances that could impact the issuing of a PPD.

The severe trauma victim-survivors have faced and the fear of repercussions and further violence are huge barriers for misidentified victim-survivors seeking a review. That is why we will move an amendment to automatically trigger a police review for women identified as persons using violence. Our amendment will provide necessary safeguards to ensure that if misidentification was to happen then it is quickly identified and addressed. Further, we will ensure that the views and advice of experts are considered by requiring all police reviews of PPDs to seek advice from a domestic and family violence specialist. This will provide oversight and enhance the police review process to ensure PPDs and the conditions imposed keep victim-survivors safe.

I now turn to consent. It may be necessary for police to issue a police protection notice against the wishes of the victim-survivor to ensure their safety. However, currently when a matter is heard in court there is the opportunity for a victim-survivor to have their voice heard and reflected within the protection order and the conditions it imposes. There is the opportunity for victim-survivors to obtain legal advice and understand the implications of a protection order. They may have time to consider what conditions might be necessary to ensure their safety and wellbeing and the safety and wellbeing of any children. The current drafting does not require victim-survivors to consent to a PPD. The Queensland Law Society shared why this lack of consent is problematic. They stated—

It is just taking away their right to be heard and their right to have their wishes and views heard in terms of their lives.

As PPDs can impose conditions further than the standard conditions of a PPN, there could be a number of negative impacts on victim-survivors if consent is not provided, whether it be care of their children, relationships, financial stability, housing or further implications. It is vital that victim-survivors have agency in a protection direction that will be in place for 12 months. That is why we will move an amendment to require that police gain the consent of victim-survivors for issuing a PPD.

Several stakeholders support consent being required to issue a PPD. Settlement Services International said—

On the option of not having informed consent, there is a huge risk ... SSI would definitely support the idea of having a consent process embedded into this.

The government promised to put victim-survivors first and that means ensuring victim-survivors are heard. This amendment does exactly that. Without consent, we risk silencing victim-survivors and damaging trust in the system.

I now turn to support services. There are ramifications with the removal of court oversight over a protection direction. As I explained earlier, a key one of those is that the courts are a way for many victim-survivors to gain access to support including counselling and legal advice. This is important for their safety, healing, recovery and moving forward after domestic violence. We are concerned that PPDs will remove this opportunity for victim-survivors. That is why our amendments will require police to provide information about support services as outlined by the current act. Without this amendment, there is a significant missed opportunity for victim-survivors to be supported during their recovery from the trauma of violence and as they rebuild their lives.

I wish now to turn to information sharing. The Labor opposition believes that the police should have the ability to share information with the Family Responsibilities Commission just as there is that ability through the DVO process currently. This will ensure that appropriate supports are available when needed in certain situations. I note that the government amendments address this issue of information sharing, which is an issue that was raised very clearly throughout the consultation process by First Nations communities and also by the opposition and is very clearly described in the statement of reservations provided by the Queensland Labor opposition.

Every victim-survivor of domestic violence deserves to be counted and I now wish to speak about publicly reported data. We have heard in this House and across Queensland, through the media, that the Premier has staked his leadership on driving down victim numbers. However, that means he needs to make meaningful change to reduce violence through early intervention, support and behaviour change programs, not by manipulating data on how victims are counted.

Currently, Queensland courts publish information regarding DVOs and breaches of DVOs. With the introduction of a new protection order—PPDs—there will be an impact on the number of DVOs issued, yet this bill as drafted has no reporting requirements on PPDs, allowing the LNP to manipulate victim data to suit their own agenda. We will not let this slide. We are, therefore, seeking to move an amendment to require that the number of PPDs, contraventions of PPDs and cases of misidentification be captured by the Police Commissioner and published monthly. The LNP Crisafulli government promised to increase transparency and accountability. They might want to try to muddy the waters, but our amendments ensure there will be clear, transparent and up-to-date victims data that counts every victim-survivor.

In relation to the independent review of PPDs, the bill requires that the effectiveness and impacts of PPDs be reviewed two years after commencement. This is a good thing. We welcome that review provision; however, we believe that this review should be completed independently and consider the key issue raised by stakeholders, experts and victim-survivors of misidentification. We will move amendments to ensure this and recommend that the review be undertaken by a university, for example.

In summary, the Labor opposition cannot support the introduction of PPDs without sufficient safeguards against misidentification. Our amendments provide for this through an enhanced review process that includes advice from domestic violence specialists. Our amendments also require that the aggrieved or victim-survivors consent to a PPD, provide victim-survivors the opportunity to access information and support, ensure similar information sharing of PPDs to DVOs occurs and ensure every victim-survivor is counted. Without these amendments, this bill removes opportunities to better support victim-survivors, to disrupt cycles of violence and to prevent it from happening again. We believe that with these additional safeguards the bill should proceed, because it will support our hardworking police to do the job they signed up to do: protect our community.

We have heard from the sector and from victim-survivors. They do not support the introduction of PPDs as currently drafted. A victim-survivor shared with me their letter to the minister. They said that, while the bill may be well intentioned, 'it has been designed, reviewed and advanced with very little input from the people who live with the consequences of these decisions, the survivors'. They said—

Too many of us were silenced by our abusers for years—made to feel small, irrelevant and voiceless. And now to watch decisions being made about us without us feels painfully familiar. It mirrors that same powerlessness, the same erasure, only this time it is being done by a system that claims to be on our side.


We want protection that works.

We want justice that doesn't harm us again.

And we want a seat at the table when our lives are on the line.

The Crisafulli LNP government promised to put victims first. They promised to listen. They promised to listen to victims and to the experts. This bill breaks those promises. We acknowledge that more needs to be done to support police in responding to domestic and family violence, but we cannot accept these measures that risk the safety of victim-survivors.

As I stated at the beginning, we support our hardworking police, and I take this opportunity, once again, to thank them for the work they do each and every day on the front line to keep Queenslanders safe. I urge all members to review the opposition's amendments and support them to ensure adequate safeguards are in place for all.

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (8.44 pm): I rise today to contribute to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Every Queenslander deserves the right to feel safe in their home, but for too many women, children and families home is where the danger is greatest. Domestic and family violence leaves scars that last long after the incident, scars that can never be fully healed. Victim-survivors show extraordinary courage, but they should never have to fight a broken system at the same time as they are fighting for their safety.

I speak from personal experience when I say that our frontline police officers see this reality every single day. They are the ones who knock on the door at two in the morning not knowing what situation they will walk into. They are the ones who comfort children clinging to their mothers. They are the ones who take the statements from frightened victims, knowing the perpetrator may be lurking nearby.

For the last 10 years under the former Labor government, calls for service for domestic and family violence grew by 20 per cent year on year, increasing by 218 per cent from 2014 to 2024. While the numbers exploded, Labor ignored the pleas of our police and their unions, who were warning them that our front line could not sustain a system that was breaking. They could not protect vulnerable victims. Labor ignored the voices of police, the unions and victim-survivors, who begged for change.

Right now, police respond to a domestic and family violence incident every three minutes. Last year alone, the number of calls for help soared to more than 200,000. At present, the equivalent of 2,481 full-time police officers are dedicated to this important work. If nothing changes, by the year 2032 the number of officers will need to be more than double—5,747 officers—just to keep pace.

In some districts like Logan, as has been reported in the media, there can be up to 200 unresourced calls for service at any one time, which means there are no police available to attend. Often around 80 per cent of these calls are domestic and family violence related. That is not only unsustainable; it is unacceptable. While police are drowning in paperwork, victims are left hanging on the phone in fear. The longer it takes police to protect one victim, the longer it takes them to get to the next victim, and that victim could be your mother, your aunt or your sister.

The Crisafulli government is not prepared to continue doing the same thing and expect a different outcome. This bill delivers real reforms that put victims first and finally gives police the tools they have been calling for.

First, police protection directions will give officers the power to provide immediate, on-the-spot protection. No longer will victims be forced through lengthy retraumatising court processes just to secure their safety. The burden shifts where it belongs—onto the perpetrator. Critically, police protection directions can be issued in the moment, when victims are most vulnerable, when danger is at its highest.

Second, expanding the use of videorecorded evidence-in-chief means victims only need to tell their story once. This reform gives them dignity. It gives them a voice.

Third, we will impose the electronic monitoring of high-risk perpetrators. Victims deserve to know that their abuser is being watched, and police deserve to have the ability to intervene before violence escalates. This is not about surveillance for its own sake; it is about prevention, about stopping the next assault before it occurs and about saving lives. Together, these reforms will return more than 265,000 police hours to the front line. That is the equivalent of 134 full-time officers back on the road responding

to calls for assistance, and that means faster responses, stronger protection and fewer victims left waiting in fear.

I also want to address the issue of misidentification. While it is rare, even one victim wrongly treated as a perpetrator is one too many. This bill builds in clear safeguards, oversight and review to ensure the person most in need of protection always receives it. For example, 100 per cent of cases involving female respondents are reviewed, and all police interactions in circumstances where police are exercising a power are recorded by officers on their body worn cameras, which also have the capacity to be monitored remotely in real time by supervisors.

The QPS recognises the concerns about misidentification and has adopted processes to make sure that the person most in need of protection obtains the protection they need. This is supported by data which revealed that in 2023-24 police initiated the vast majority of applications for protection orders. In that year 84 per cent of all applications—23,429 applications out of a total 27,857—were lodged by the police; and 97 per cent of those applications were confirmed by the court, with only three per cent being dismissed or withdrawn. This evidence indicates that police overwhelmingly get it right. I am confident that the measures that have been undertaken and the future safeguards in the bill will mitigate the risk of misidentification in relation to domestic and family violence victim-survivors.

As I have indicated, the bill will amend part 6 of the Evidence Act to expand the use of videorecorded evidence statewide and to clarify its use in civil domestic violence proceedings. This will provide all magistrates courts with the option of recorded statements being provided by a victim-survivor of domestic violence instead of a written statement and having that recording presented to the court as their evidence-in-chief instead of their oral testimony.

The framework for electronic monitoring of high-risk domestic and family violence perpetrators as a condition of a domestic violence order will become an additional tool in the fight against violence. Courts may make this condition on an order if satisfied it 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.

The appropriate use of these reforms will be supported by significant investment in training. This will be centred on identifying the extent of offending and the person most in need of protection. Specifically for the PPD framework, the QPS will invest in a new training package and system changes to facilitate the PPD rollout by 1 January 2026. These reforms will be accompanied by the enhancement of the QPS record-keeping system to appropriately record the PPD forms and processes. Further updates will also be rolled out to allow the electronic service of documents to occur.

It is important to remember that behind every statistic is a real person—a woman finally finding the courage to leave, a child hiding in their room praying the abuse will stop, an elderly Queenslanders suffering in silence. They are the reason we are here today. This bill says to victims: we hear you, we believe you and we will act to keep you safe.

Labor had their chance and they failed. They ignored the warnings from our frontline policing experts. Their distrust and disdain for police left victims wanting. They allowed violence to rise unchecked. For Labor, it was business as usual. For us, it is anything but.

The Crisafulli government is determined to do better with strong laws, real resources and a victim centred approach. The reforms in this bill are not just about legislation. They are about lives. They are about restoring faith in a system that has too often let people down. They are about making sure that when a victim picks up the phone and calls for help that call is answered, and answered with urgency, compassion and actions. That is what Queenslanders expect. That is what victim-survivors deserve and that is what the Crisafulli government will deliver.

I call on those opposite to put victims first by supporting this bill, supporting our police and standing with the thousands of Queenslanders whose lives depend on us getting this right.



Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (8.52 pm): Domestic and family violence has no place in Queensland. It is insidious, it is far too prevalent and it destroys lives. On an issue as serious as this, the parliament should always strive for bipartisanship. Victim-survivors deserve nothing less than a system that is safe, effective and guided by evidence and not politics. The Labor opposition approaches this bill in that spirit. That is why, as our shadow minister has outlined, we have circulated amendments. We want these laws to work. There are reforms in this bill that, if done properly and with adequate safeguards, could help both victim-survivors and our hardworking frontline police. Equally, there are other elements that pose risks that cannot be ignored—risks that if mishandled could mean the difference between life or death.

Before I begin with the substance of the bill, I want to address some of the last-minute amendments that have been rushed through by the LNP regarding the governance of Forensic Science Queensland. These changes are allegedly a response to recommendation 14 of the report on operation matters at FSQ which outlined that the review of the act should be 'comprehensive'. Instead, what we see tonight, at the eleventh hour, are changes that seem to hand extraordinary discretion to the Attorney-General. This bill now provides the Attorney-General with the ability to 'suspend the director for any reason or none'. It also significantly broadens eligibility for appointments requiring only that the Attorney-General be satisfied someone is appropriately qualified, removing those previous requirements of expertise.

Given this government's track record of jobs for mates, one cannot help wonder why these provisions are being rammed through without proper scrutiny. Victim-survivors and frontline workers deserve confidence that FSQ's governance is robust and independent, and not the subject of political whim.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Pause the clock. The previous speaker from the government side was listened to in silence. I expect the same for opposition speakers.

Ms SCANLON: The amendments also appear to make some fairly significant changes to the principle of natural justice and, again, one wonders why these changes are being rushed through without adequate scrutiny.

I will come back to the substance of the bill. In response to some of the comments made by the police minister, I want to place on the record that I and everyone on this side of the House has enormous respect for the Queensland Police Service. My dad was a police officer for many years on the Gold Coast, and I know firsthand the pressures they face and the sacrifices that they make. Responding to domestic and family violence accounts for an enormous proportion of their workload and Labor will always back reforms that respond to that pressure. Reforms to ease workload must never come at the expense of victim-survivor safety. That is a line in the sand.

The most significant part of this bill is the introduction of police protection directions. The government says these PPDs will ease police workload, but the experts are clear that, without safeguards, they risk doing more harm than good. The Queensland Law Society stated plainly—

The consequences of being improperly named as the respondent to a police protection direction will be dire. Victims who are misidentified will not have the benefit of a protection order and may face consequences relating to their housing situation, employment and contact with their children.

QCOSS also put it bluntly—

... the consequences of misidentification can be severe and potentially fatal. Where a person is misidentified, that means they will be left without protection at that incident.

That is the evidence from the very people this government promised to listen to. In fact, during estimates, when the director-general was asked whether it was correct that 'the prevention of domestic and family violence sector do not and did not support the new police protection direction laws', the director-general stated, 'I understand that is true, yes.'

We know that misidentification is not hypothetical. According to the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board annual report, in almost half of the cases of women killed in domestic and family violence related homicides, the woman had previously been identified as the person using violence. Moreover, in nearly all domestic and family violence related deaths of Aboriginal women reviewed, the deceased had been recorded both as the respondent and aggrieved prior to their death. This is not simply a statistic; it reflects a pattern where victims have been misidentified, increasing their risk rather than keeping them safe.

Of course, there are many instances where the person most in need of protection is identified correctly, and we acknowledge the significant steps that have been taken to address misidentification through the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and the commission of inquiry, but we need to ensure sufficient safeguards are in place because in cases of misidentification—and hopefully they are few or none—the consequences are devastating.

Before the election, Labor was developing reforms to PPDs, but our approach was different to the one that is being put forward. We were designing a trial so the unintended consequences could be identified and fixed. We built in stronger safeguards and ensured victim-survivor safety was at the centre. This government's approach strips away court oversight, denies victims access to legal advice and referrals and leaves no formal role for victims' voices. As the Queensland Law Society explained,

court processes provide checks and balances, both parties are heard, legal representatives are present, judges weigh the facts and the victims can be linked to support services.

One area of the bill that does deserve some scrutiny is the expansion of videorecorded evidence-in-chief. This framework was first introduced by Labor as a pilot to reduce trauma for victim-survivors, and we support the expansion statewide. The way the government has chosen to expand it raises some red flags because, at the same time as broadening its use, the bill strips away a number of critical safeguards.

First, it removes the requirement that a specialised trained police officer take the statement. That safeguard was there for a reason. Stakeholders warned that if statements are taken by officers without specialist training then the quality and fairness of that evidence can be undermined. The Queensland Law Society cautioned that removing this requirement risks 'compromising the integrity of the statement and the trial process', because poorly handled evidence can be challenged in court, and that retraumatises victims all over again.


Second, the bill removes the requirement for the statement to be sworn. That safeguard gave weight and reliability to the evidence, protecting both the victim and the integrity of proceedings. Without it, the evidentiary value is weakened.

Third, the bill waters down the consent requirements. Under the current arrangements, survivors provide consent multiple times in different forms so they remain fully informed and in control. Under this bill, consent would only need to be given once, informally and verbally. As the Women's Legal Service and others pointed out, that raises serious questions about whether victim-survivors will have the opportunity to truly exercise their agency or whether in the heat of the moment they agree without advice or support.

These safeguards were not red tape. They were protections—protections for victims, for police and for the justice system itself. As stakeholders put it plainly, removing them risks undermining the very purpose of the reform, which is to make the process safer and less traumatic for victim-survivors. Labor supports the framework. We know that it works, but if it is to be expanded we hope that the government addresses some of these concerns.

As the shadow minister has already outlined, there are a range of measures that we think the government could implement that would make this bill better. The shadow minister has outlined recommendations around a specialist review, around requiring victim-survivor consent, around referrals to make sure that people are getting the appropriate information and support that they need, and around information sharing and public reporting, because we think it is important that we really understand the data and the evidence if these reforms are going to be passed through the parliament. These are not obstacles; they are safeguards and they are what experts, advocates and survivors themselves are calling for.

Domestic and family violence is too serious to be distilled down into political slogans. The government promised to listen to experts. It promised to put victims first. It promised transparency. On this bill they have broken all three of those promises. Labor supports reforms that are evidence-based, reforms that support police and reforms that protect victims. That is why we support the expansion of videorecorded evidence-in-chief. That is why we support the idea of PPD-style tools—but only with proper safeguards, oversight and transparency, because getting this wrong is not measured in talking points; it is measured in lives lost. Victim-survivors deserve a government that never forgets that.

 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (9.02 pm): If we do what we have always done, we will get what we have always got. There have been too many Queenslanders harmed by domestic and family violence. Domestic and family violence is a scourge that all of our communities tragically know all too well. In Keppel we have run campaigns in support of White Ribbon Day and 'Not in our town' campaign, and we have had male leaders step up and speak to our young lads and to our community on how violence is never the answer. A former mayor even once wrote a song to this end, and St Brendan's College runs an annual 'Not now, not ever' domestic violence walk. I cannot deny that the sight of a thousand young men and their teachers proudly wearing their DfV shirts inspires me, yet it is not enough.

In my life I have been witness to the devastating effects that acts of domestic and family violence have on individuals, on their families and, more broadly, on my community. There is nothing quite as debilitating, with that sense in your gut of utter despair, as having a young boy, a cheeky kid, who was so full of life and so much fun, yet one day in your class he turns quiet, he becomes an introvert and he is lost to his classmates all because of the events that are occurring under the roof of his family's home. I say 'debilitating' because you know that every agency is working hard, yet for this little boy you also know that his life is forever changed. It is for these kids that I am here, because I want to make a

difference. I want to make a difference for victim-survivors and their families who are at the front line of this scourge.

It was the solemn duty of the Education, Arts and Communities Committee to undertake the study of this proposed bill and to hear from the victims, the agencies and their very proud supporters—all of whom work to ensure that domestic and family violence survivors have their voice heard. I would like to acknowledge the bravery and the tears that were shed by witnesses to our inquiry. I would like to thank particularly our committee secretariat team—Janette, Lynda and Andrew. Quite often they were the first ones to be exposed before others to the retelling of danger, to the expressions of pain and to the sense of security that had been forever lost by so many of the people who came before us.

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill seeks to restore safety for our victim-survivors and put victim-survivors first. This bill will hold perpetrators to account and will work to restore safety where you live for all Queenslanders. New initiatives can be scary, yet inaction is not an option. Victim safety is at the heart of these reforms, with GPS trackers to be placed on high-risk domestic and family violence offenders, as well as giving the police the tools they need to offer immediate protection to vulnerable people.

A further way this bill supports victim-survivors is through the implementation of a GPS electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk DFV perpetrators. This was an election commitment of the Crisafulli government. The pilot that will run for two years will place GPS electronic monitors on high-risk domestic and family violence perpetrators and allow victim-survivors to elect whether they wish to carry their own GPS enabled safety device.

We as a committee witnessed the use of this technology and how it provided a coordinated approach to the management of perpetrators and real-time data to inform the safety of DFV survivors. In one case, we watched a replay of a scene of a perpetrator who saw a former partner, a DFV victim-survivor, in her car driving in the opposite direction on a major road. He made a U-turn and he started to follow her. The victim was notified. She was supported to drive her car and find a safe place, and police were able to directly engage with the criminal, who had been driving madly. When the police got to him he was driving wildly up and down the streets, street by street, looking for her because he had lost her car. I wish no-one ever needed this protection. However, in an imperfect world, I am glad this targeted support could be used to make a difference for this survivor.

This bill also allows for police protection directions. Drawn from the Tasmanian model, they were enhanced with the experience and the advice of the Queensland Police Service and the Queensland Police Union. These directions will reduce the stress placed upon vulnerable people on their days of greatest challenge. Under the current legislation, police officers can issue police protection notices, which provide victims with temporary protection until an application for a domestic violence order can be heard by a court.

Apprehension, unknown outcomes and stress—this legislation, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, will provide a victim of domestic and family violence with immediate 12-month protection and reduce the trauma of an already challenging time. We know that giving evidence in court can retraumatise victim-survivors. This bill enables the Magistrates Court to allow adult complainants in domestic violence criminal proceedings to give their evidence by way of videorecorded statement. The committee heard how the use of video evidence in court proceedings can assist in reducing a victim-survivor's trauma from engaging in and needing to give live evidence in court proceedings.

Domestic and family violence is a scourge that all of our communities know too well. We must do new things and work with all of our hearts to make a difference for domestic and family violence survivors and victims. I commend this bill to the House.



Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (9.10 pm): Domestic and family violence remains one of the most confronting and heartbreaking challenges in Queensland today. As legislators, we carry a deep responsibility not just to respond to it but to make sure that our systems, our laws and our services work in the best interests of those who rely on them so much. People experiencing domestic and family violence often turn to police first. For many it is a moment of fear, crisis and desperation. I begin by acknowledging the remarkable work being done by our frontline police officers in Queensland today. Their commitment to community safety, particularly in DFV situations, is nothing short of extraordinary.

The nature of domestic and family violence—often private, emotional and complex—makes it one of the most difficult issues for police to manage on the ground. I have heard that firsthand from my twin brother, who tells me it is one of the most challenging things they have to attend to because you never know what you are going to get. In 2023-24 alone the Queensland Police Service responded to

more than 192,000 DFV matters. In some parts of the state, officers report that domestic and family violence now represents up to 90 per cent of their daily workload. This speaks not only to the scale of the issue but also to the increasing pressure placed on our frontline services. Police officers are stretched and time poor. They are often the only support system available to people in their moment of crisis, and they deserve tools that enable them to do their job effectively while ensuring victims remain at the centre of their response.

This bill contains a number of important reforms and we welcome several aspects of it. We support the GPS pilot for high-risk offenders, the expansion of videorecorded evidence-in-chief to better support victim-survivors giving testimony, and the technical amendments that aim to improve the operation of the approved provider list. Today I want to focus on one part of the bill that has rightly attracted substantial scrutiny, as we have heard tonight already: the introduction of police protection directions, or PPDs.

Under this new framework police officers would be able to issue a 12-month protection direction to someone they reasonably believe has committed domestic violence. On the surface it may appear to be a practical response, a way to ease pressure on our courts and provide immediate protection without delay, but reforms of this nature cannot be judged on efficiency alone. They must also be judged on safety, integrity and fairness. Throughout the committee process, in consultations and at estimates we heard from a range of experts and stakeholders, people with deep expertise in domestic and family violence, who expressed strong reservations about the proposal. Their concerns were not about police having the wrong intentions: their concerns were about what can happen when decisions are made too quickly, without proper oversight or safeguards in place and without the voice of victim-survivors guiding the process.

One of the most serious issues raised is the risk of misidentification. We have made some progress in recent years to reduce the occurrence of victims being misidentified as perpetrators, but we are still far from where we need to be in this space. Recent figures show that over 31 per cent of those listed as respondents in DFV matters are women. This does not necessarily mean they are all misidentified, but it does indicate that something is not working as it should. The danger is that, under pressure and in complex and fast-moving situations, police may get it wrong. That is not a criticism of them at all; it is a reality that we must prepare for as part of this bill. If a woman who is a victim is misidentified and placed on a 12-month order the consequences for her can be devastating. It can affect her housing, her ability to work, her access to her children but, most importantly, her safety. In some cases it can increase her risk of harm or potentially worse.

That is why we believe the bill should include a mandatory review mechanism, particularly in cases where a woman is named as the respondent. This review should involve a senior police officer and a domestic and family violence specialist to ensure that, where misidentification has occurred, it can be addressed swiftly and fairly.

We also believe that victim-survivor consent is a missing and vital part of the proposed framework. As it stands, there is no requirement for the aggrieved person to consent to the PPD being issued. That removes a fundamental element of victim agency. It denies them the opportunity to express whether this is the right course of action for their situation. At worst, it can create further harm for them. The sector has been very clear that victim-survivors need to be heard, not overridden. As we have heard tonight from the shadow minister, we are therefore proposing amendments to require consent from the aggrieved person before a PPD is issued to ensure police action aligns with the needs, safety and wishes of the person who is most at risk.

A further area of concern is the removal of court oversight. Currently, when a police protection notice is issued it leads to an application for a court ordered domestic violence order. That process, imperfect as it may be, brings structure, scrutiny and crucial opportunities for connection to legal assistance, support services and, where appropriate, referrals to behaviour change programs. Under the PPD model, much of that support could be bypassed. There is a real risk of victim-survivors missing out on the assistance they need simply because the system becomes more administratively efficient. We propose that if a PPD is issued police should be required to provide referrals to appropriate services, including housing, counselling, legal assistance and health supports, to ensure those victims do not fall through the cracks. Where appropriate, there also needs to be an obligation for referrals for perpetrators to behaviour change programs that might help stop the cycle of abuse.

The bill also raises questions around data transparency. PPDs would not be captured in the same way as a court ordered DVO, and that shift may affect the visibility of DFV trends in Queensland. A drop in recorded DVOs, for instance, could be misrepresented as a reduction in violence when it


simply reflects a change in recording practices. We are therefore calling for the publication of clear, regular data around PPDs, including the number issued, the number breached and the number later revoked due to misidentification. This transparency will help ensure Queenslanders, especially victim-survivors, can have trust in the system and the data we use to drive change.

In addition, the two-year review of the PPD framework should be conducted by an independent external body to ensure that the evaluation is rigorous, impartial and focused on the outcomes for those who are most affected.

We also ask the government to consider how information sharing will work under this new model. One important example is the Family Responsibilities Commission, which provides culturally responsive support and case management for First Nations families, particularly in Far North Queensland. Currently, court issued orders can trigger appropriate responses through that system. PPDs, however, may not, and that gap could have serious consequences for those people. We believe that the bill should include provisions for appropriate information sharing with the FRC and other relevant bodies to ensure coordinated responses are maintained.

In all of this, it is important to note that the opposition is not opposed to the concept of police issued protection directions. In fact, when in government Labor and the then minister, Mark Ryan, had begun examining how such tools might work but with clear parameters: as a trial, with strong safeguards and under very careful evaluation. We support efforts to reduce the administration burden on our police officers, but we do not believe it should come at the expense of victim safety, legal oversight or accountability. The reforms in this bill, particularly around PPDs, need to be done right. If we get it wrong, we risk causing more harm to those we are trying to protect. If we get it right—with consent, oversight, proper referral pathways and transparency—it could become a valuable tool that balances immediate protection with long-term safety for victims.

In conclusion, we call on the government to consider our proposed amendments in good faith. They are not about pointscoring; they are about strengthening this bill, responding to the advice of experts and delivering a more effective and safer framework for those affected by domestic and family violence. To our police, thank you. To our frontline services, we see your tireless work day in, day out. To those who have experienced and are experiencing domestic and family violence, we hear you and we are committed to doing things better. Let's not miss this opportunity to get it right tonight.

 **Miss DOOLAN** (Pumicestone—LNP) (9.20 pm): I rise to speak in support of this important Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, which represents one of the most significant reforms in domestic and family violence protections our state has ever seen. Domestic and family violence devastates too many lives and too many communities across Queensland. It does not discriminate by postcode, background or income level. Every member in this House would have spoken to victim-survivors who carry the trauma of violence, and every one of us has a responsibility to act.

This bill is about action, and I am proud to be part of the Crisafulli government that is delivering meaningful change for Queenslanders. This bill is about ensuring the protections we put in place are practical, immediate and effective. It is about giving police the tools they need when they need them to keep women, children and families safe.

For the first time in Queensland, police will be empowered to issue police protection directions, PPDs. Under the reforms, police will be able to issue on-the-spot 12-month police protection directions to provide immediate, long-term protection to victim-survivors and reduce trauma through exposure to judicial processes. The directions will instruct the respondent to not commit domestic violence against the aggrieved or a named person for a period of one year or face a maximum penalty of three years imprisonment. It may also include cool-down, ouster, return or no-contact conditions. The measure will be subject to several safeguards to complement the existing domestic and family violence framework and does not replace standard investigative processes.


This bill tackles another barrier to justice: the trauma of having to retell painful stories again and again in court. Victim-survivors deserve dignity and compassion. We in this House know that under Labor within the last decade domestic and family violence related incidents have risen by approximately 218 per cent, resulting in police officers responding to a DFV incident every three minutes. That is why this legislation is so vital to expand the use of police body worn camera footage as recorded evidence in domestic and family violence proceedings. It will strengthen cases, reduce reliance on victims reliving these experiences and help deliver justice more swiftly.

Further, this bill delivers on our commitment to pilot electronic monitoring for high-risk perpetrators. By the end of this year, there will be capacity for 150 GPS monitoring devices, increasing

to 500 devices in the coming year. This ensures the most dangerous offenders are monitored 24/7, giving victims peace of mind and holding perpetrators to account.

While these statewide reforms are essential, I want to highlight the frontline work being done in my electorate of Pumicestone. We are fortunate to have the Centre Against Domestic Abuse—CADA—based in Caboolture, led by Holly and her incredible team. They are on the ground every single day supporting victim-survivors with counselling, court services and health and wellbeing support. They also work side by side with Queensland police through their innovative PRADO model, embedding specialist police workers in stations. This partnership has delivered outstanding outcomes and is a model of best practice. CADA has received more than \$6.3 million in funding to deliver these critical services, and across the broader Moreton Bay region our government has invested over \$10.3 million to respond to domestic and family violence. That level of investment is sadly necessary because the need in our community is so great, but it also demonstrates this government's unwavering commitment to protecting victims, supporting frontline services and holding perpetrators to account.

I want to acknowledge the victim-survivors who have shared their stories and courageously advocated for reform. Their voices have shaped this bill. I want to acknowledge the police, the service providers and the community organisations which do the hard work every day to prevent violence, respond to it and support recovery. This bill will not on its own end domestic and family violence, but it is a major step towards it. It strengthens protections, it reduces trauma, it keeps perpetrators accountable and it ensures that the police and service providers are better equipped to save lives. For the people of Pumicestone and for all Queenslanders, I am proud to support this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (9.25 pm): I rise today to make a contribution on this bill and to outline serious concerns I hold with the introduction of police protection directions in their current form. Labor will always welcome reform that works towards ending violence in our communities and we will always support measures that back our hardworking frontline police, allowing them to respond better to domestic and family violence. However, we will not support reforms that risk the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors of domestic and family violence.

Before I go into more detail on that, I would like to address some of the accusations raised in question time and respond at my earliest possible opportunity. After question time, I watched the video the member for Cairns shared and found many of the jokes in that video highly offensive. I say that knowing what women endure and knowing the stories they have told me—how they are robbed of opportunities because of their sex; how they are underrated, overlooked, belittled or taken for granted; how they face violence at home every day; and how they face unwanted sexual advances at work, on the street or on the way home. I have shared these views with the member for Cairns and he has apologised to me for sharing it, he has apologised to this House and he has apologised to the community. I understand that he has been counselled by the Leader of the Opposition.

Coming back to some of the concerns that we have with this bill, I would like to remind those opposite that Labor was already working closely with police and the domestic and family violence sector on how police protection directions might be used, but we were determined to ensure the safety of women was paramount. We were determined to get this right, and that meant building in significant safeguards around misidentification, requiring consent from victims—

Ms Camm interjected.

Ms FENTIMAN: I would say to the minister that women are best placed to determine what is best for them and how to keep themselves safe. The fact that these PPDs mean that police can issue orders, including ouster orders, when women victims do not consent is highly problematic. We should be empowering victims and listening to victims. In fact, that is what those opposite stand up in this place almost every sitting day—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Pause the clock. We are going to have silence like we have had for the last hour, otherwise people will start to be warned.

Ms FENTIMAN: If those opposite are serious about empowering victims and keeping them safe, then let us actually make sure that women and victims consent to the orders that police can make on the spot. I do not think that should be controversial. Why don't we have consent in these PPDs? We should be empowering and trusting women to make the best decisions for their safety and their kids' safety. It is highly problematic that we are introducing PPDs without victims' consent.

What we see here is a government that has completely ignored the women who work on the front line each and every day, keeping women and children safe: the domestic and family violence sector. Those counsellors and social workers who hold so much risk, who work so hard every day, are pleading with this minister and this government to put in place safeguards so that women are not misidentified as perpetrators and so that women can give consent to the orders made. Some women actually need the perpetrator, their partner, to be able to access their house for various reasons.

Under this PPD, police can make an on-the-spot PPD with an ouster order. If you are a shiftworker, you need your partner. You want the violence to stop, but you need your partner to be home to look after the kids when you are not there. How does that work if there is an ouster order in place? Why are we not including consent, and why are police not actually listening to victims?

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, your interjections are not being taken.

Ms FENTIMAN: This is not just something that I have thought up, member for Currumbin. This is what the sector and victim-survivors are saying. If you read the submissions that were made to the committee—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I hope that was not a reflection on the chair, member.

Mrs Gerber: Of course not.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. You will remain silent.

Ms FENTIMAN: The Queensland Council of Social Services, member for Currumbin, says that PPDs are nothing more than ‘an efficiency measure that does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors.’ That is the peak body for community services.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, you are now warned.

Ms FENTIMAN: The peak body for community organisations in Queensland that is now the peak body for the domestic and family violence sector is saying this does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors, and those opposite, very clearly, are not inclined to listen.

When the very people who work day in and day out with victims of domestic and family violence say these laws will not keep women safe, the government should listen. The Women’s Legal Service has said that misidentification already occurs because police are required to make decisions in the moment without all the facts. So, rather than a PPN that then has to go to court where women can give evidence and a magistrate can oversee things, we are giving police more power without any evidence that issues around misidentification have improved whatsoever. The Queensland Law Society stated—

The consequences of being improperly named as the respondent to a police protection direction will be dire.

My local domestic and family violence service, the Centre for Women & Co, made it clear in their submission to this inquiry that misidentification is already a serious problem. They said—

Our service has supported numerous victim-survivors who were incorrectly identified as respondents following single incidents, while the person using violence manipulated the system to avoid accountability.

This is exactly what this bill risks entrenching—a system where perpetrators exploit gaps in process, and victim-survivors are left silenced, criminalised and unprotected.

When the frontline organisations raise concerns like this, our parliament must listen. I have sat across the table from community organisations right across the state and heard truly heartbreaking stories—stories of women who, through no fault of their own, have been misidentified as the perpetrator. They face criminalisation, housing instability, the loss of employment and the weight of social stigma. I urge the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to sit down with these same organisations who work with women to read the DV Death Review Board reports and explain how this will make things safer for women.

Right now, a domestic violence order comes before a court. Victims have their say. They can receive legal advice. They can be referred to vital support services. Conditions can be carefully considered. Information can be shared with bodies like the Family Responsibilities Commission to ensure ongoing support.

Going to court is a weighty process. Community organisations have told me it makes perpetrators take the situation more seriously, knowing that a judge is involved and evidence is heard. PPDs strip


all of that away. This is why the Labor opposition is moving amendments to strengthen the legislation with responsible evidence-based safeguards that put victim-survivors first. Our amendments, circulated by the shadow minister, introduce a safeguard against misidentification.

We are also calling for the voices of victim-survivors to be respected through an amendment that requires their consent. I do not think in 2025 it should be controversial to get a victim-survivor's consent before issuing orders that are about their safety. Let's actually empower women. Our amendments will address the gap left by the removal of court oversight by making it mandatory for police to provide referrals to vital services such as counselling, housing support, sexual assault services and legal advice.

We also want to see information-sharing protections maintained and transparency through the public reporting of police protection directions, contraventions and misidentification cases, because every victim of domestic and family violence deserves to be seen, deserves to be counted and deserves a government that will listen to those experts on the front line who are working with women and children every day. These amendments are commonsense safeguards. They reflect what we have heard from experts, frontline workers and survivors themselves, and they are the very protections that Labor was working on when we were in government.

These PPDs, whilst I am sure well intentioned, ignore the voices of victim-survivors. They ignore the experiences of victim-survivors. They risk masking the true severity of domestic and family violence and, most dangerously, they risk putting women and children in harm's way.

I think victim-survivors' safety should always be the priority, and that is why the Labor opposition cannot support the introduction of police protection directions as they are currently drafted. We do believe better reform is possible. We believe reform can be achieved, reform that protects survivors and, at the same time, supports our hardworking police, but unfortunately this bill is not that.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (9.35 pm): In making a brief contribution to the bill, I want to commend the minister for swiftly bringing forward this reform to the parliament so early on in the term of the new government. It deals with some matters which have been raised many times over the last several years as there has been a greater and greater focus on the scourge of domestic and family violence in Queensland. The main issue I would like to speak about relates to the establishment of police protection directions—PPDs—but before I do that, I also want to thank the committee that undertook the consideration of this bill, in particular the member for Nicklin who undertook to substitute for me on a number of occasions during that process and used his extensive experience as a police officer in helping the committee to be informed about the provisions of this bill. That was in relation to public hearings in Mackay and Cairns, and also the committee visited the parliament of Tasmania and consulted with stakeholders in Tasmania where these very initiatives have been put in place, and the member for Nicklin was able to assist with that as well.

The establishment of a framework for police protection directions—PPDs—without filing an application before the court deals with an issue that has been raised many times with me in my time in this place, and that is the inability often on the part of police to immediately protect a victim of domestic or family violence. The PPD framework will provide immediate and ongoing protection for a victim-survivor upon its being issued. It informs the perpetrator of the consequences associated with breaching the protective conditions of the PPD.


Very early on in my time as a member here, there were serious concerns raised by police in Beaudesert, where I represent, that the system for domestic violence orders and enabling protection for victims was completely inadequate to enable immediate protection, and the main reason for that was that police were unable to act without actually receiving a complaint from victims. One of the ways that police at that time were seeking to remedy that was to make domestic violence a specific criminal offence. We have gone a long way down the road since then and we now do have a criminal offence for coercive control which goes one part of the way to dealing with that issue. However, these immediate PPDs also enable greater, swifter action to provide immediate protection for victims. We welcome that. It will last for a period of 12 months, not going before a court before that period expires unless it is challenged.

I want to touch on the issue that was always raised back then and that was the fear of victims of domestic and family violence about making complaints to police to enable protection orders to be given. The police did not actually have the power to do it immediately, but even in terms of going to court, there was a great fear—and still is, I am sure—on the part of victims in terms of being able to give evidence to police or to the court to enable an order to be made.

In the bill there are considerations that police need to heed before they issue a PPD. They include: the principles of administering the domestic violence act, that is, the safety, protection and wellbeing of people who fear or experience domestic violence including children; the criminal and domestic violence history of both parties; whether the respondent may cause serious harm to the aggrieved or a named person if the respondent commits further domestic violence; whether a court ordered protection order may be better in the circumstances; whether either party has a conviction for a domestic violence offence; and whether a respondent is not present at the same location as the police officer. Importantly, any views or wishes expressed by the aggrieved have to be considered by police before the issuing of a PPD. In addition to that, officers who issue PPDs must also obtain approval from a supervising officer who must be authorised to approve PPDs.

I want to go back to one consideration that must be taken heed of—that is, the views or wishes expressed by the aggrieved. I have heard members from the opposition speak about how there must be consent for these orders to be given. When you consider that police need to consider the views of the aggrieved in that situation and that the intent of the bill is to provide immediate protection in circumstances where there may be coercive control, and because of that there may not be the ability for the aggrieved to actually give consent, we are going as far as we can not only to enable the wishes of the aggrieved to be taken into account but also to achieve the overriding aim of seeking to give immediate protection to the aggrieved and people who may be impacted by domestic violence and who may benefit from the issuing of a PPD. Members should not buy into the argument that consent is not considered at all in this bill. It is something that needs to be taken into account by police when they are considering making a PPD.

The last thing I want to speak about is the proposed amendments to the videorecorded evidence framework. The proposed amendments are intended to minimise the distress and trauma experienced by victim-survivors when repeatedly speaking about their experience. The amendments to the Evidence Act will achieve that. They received broad support and I think that is another good step along the way to supporting victims in some of their lowest hours. I know that we have moved a long way in the last decade in terms of dealing with these matters, especially when it comes to how they are dealt with in the courtroom and the judicial system. This is another positive step along the way. I want to commend the minister again for bringing this bill to the parliament so quickly in the term of a new government. I thank the committee for their consideration. I give my support to the bill.

 **Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.42 pm): The bill before us was referred to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee for thorough consideration on 30 April 2025. I would like to begin by thanking fellow committee members and the amazing staff who support our committee. They provided us with incredible support during what was, at times, harrowing evidence. I would also like to thank our very hardworking frontline police officers. Domestic violence has no place whatsoever in our community. Every home should be a safe one.

As a member of that committee, I had the opportunity to hear directly from frontline services but I also read some 75 submissions. I thank all of those organisations who contributed. The professionals who work every day with those impacted by domestic and family violence shared their insights on how this legislation will function in practice, not just in theory, and how it will affect the lives of those it is intended to protect. That is why I rise today to speak clearly and firmly against the proposed introduction of police protection directions, PPDs.

PPDs would allow police officers to issue protection orders on the spot—similar in scope to domestic violence orders but with a crucial difference. These orders would remain in effect for up to 12 months without any court oversight. Let me be clear: this places responding police officers in the role of judge and jury, making decisions with profound and long-lasting consequences without the checks and balances our justice system demands. I have contributed to a statement of reservation outlining my concerns, and I strongly urge every member of this House to inform themselves fully before casting their vote.

As noted in that statement, the Queensland Labor opposition recognises the enormous challenges facing the Queensland Police Service in responding to domestic and family violence. We thank them for their dedication and the work they do to keep our communities safe; however, gratitude must not blind us to the risks. Out of the six committee members, three of us submitted statements of reservation. That alone should serve as a red flag—a signal that the concerns raised by stakeholders are not fringe or minor; they are significant.

Services on the front line have warned us that PPDs may enable systems abuse. We have heard that perpetrators, often skilled at manipulation, may present as the person most in need of protection

while the true victim-survivor is misidentified. Let's be honest: victims from marginalised groups often lack confidence in the system and do not have the resources or support to challenge that misidentification. A review process, while technically available, does little to help those who have already been silenced by fear or disadvantage.

The requirement of a senior officer to approve a PPD has been presented as a safeguard; however, stakeholders remain unconvinced. They know, as we do, that this is not sufficient judicial oversight. We know that misidentification is already occurring in Queensland and that we do not yet have the appropriate systems to detect and correct that. Victims are being labelled as perpetrators and the impacts are devastating—criminalisation, potential imprisonment, loss of children and barriers to employment and housing. Let me share one stark and sobering fact: nearly half of all the women murdered in domestic and family violence incidents had at some point been listed as a respondent in a protection order. Let that sink in. Who is most at risk? It is our most vulnerable—First Nations women, culturally and linguistically diverse communities, people with disabilities, neurodivergent individuals, those living in rural and remote communities, LGBTQIA+ communities and people facing mental health challenges or addiction.


Our role as members of parliament is to be the voice of those who cannot always speak for themselves. Our job as a committee was to listen to those stakeholders. It is not me who has decided that PPDs are not best practice. It is listening to and respecting those expert voices on which I base this opinion. During estimates we saw, once again, a blatant display of disrespect. This government has chosen politics over evidence, ignoring the clear evidence of experts in the domestic and family violence sector and introducing PPDs despite sector-wide concern. This move, unsupported by those on the front line, shows a worrying disregard for expert advice, a minister not listening to those on the ground and a dangerous prioritisation of political agendas over community safety. Our duty in this chamber is to act on—

Government members interjected.

Ms BOURNE: Our duty in this chamber is to act on what we have heard. PPDs may be well intentioned, but intention does not protect people; good legislation does. Strong systems and a skilled and confident workforce is what protects victim-survivors. Let's not rush to implement a tool that could do more harm than good. Let's take the time to get this right for the sake of every victim-survivor who needs us to stand up and speak out today.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Ipswich West, when you are being provocative, members in the House are entitled to make comments, so when you freeze and look at me for guidance, that is a different opportunity.

Ms BOURNE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.49 pm): It is exceedingly difficult for me to refrain from commenting back on a day when we have been talking about domestic and family violence in this House, considering the sheer lack of understanding of the real world by some submitters. I do want to start with this.

I cannot let the shadow attorney-general's words go unchecked. Earlier in this debate she referred to some amendments circulated by the Minister for Families in relation to FSQ. I am simply amazed that Labor would dare mention FSQ in this chamber. I note the former minister who was responsible for the shambolic failure to properly run the organisation did not. The amendments will ensure FSQ is accountable to government, as it should be. The shadow attorney-general may want to brush up on some of her basics. She might like to read over the Acts Interpretation Act 1954, particularly schedule 1 in definitions which I will quote. The term 'appropriately qualified' is defined in the Acts Interpretation Act 1954. It states—

appropriately qualified—

...

- (b) for appointment to an office—means having the qualifications, experience or standing appropriate to perform the functions of the office.

I think I learned that in Law 101. However, I will move on to the substance of this important bill.

Domestic and family violence is a scourge on our society that affects far too many people in our communities. We know the struggle for safety, healing and true accountability does not conclude with that initial call to help or the first statement given. It is an ongoing journey through a system that must strive to minimise further distress and truly empower victim-survivor voices. We also know the very

system designed to protect victims can at times become another source of trauma, requiring them to relive their most horrific experiences in a public forum. The reforms that we are proposing here today in this bill are another crucial step towards making our justice system more supportive of those victim-survivors, one that aims to minimise the trauma and retraumatisation that can occur at all stages of their engagement with the criminal justice process.

I would like to take a moment to thank all those individuals and organisations who have made contributions during consideration of this bill as well as the members who contributed to the committee's report. I would especially like to thank the victim-survivors who shared their own experiences. I am grateful for their courage in sharing their stories.

Of course, submissions to the committee highlighted the urgent need to put victims first. The statistics alone paint a chilling figure: a staggering 218 per cent increase in reported DFV occurrences in the last decade with the Queensland Police Service responding to over 130,000 calls for service in the last financial year alone. They are not just numbers; they are real victims and real people. That is why the Crisafulli government is standing up and taking action and doing what this government is all about, and that is making Queenslanders safer.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the contributions of my colleagues, in particular, the Minister for Families as well as the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Both these ministers understand the seriousness of this scourge in Queensland and both of them are standing up and taking a stand because, as many members have said, doing nothing is no longer an option. We know that has been done for a decade and we cannot continue down that line. Both of those ministers have spoken in detail in relation to the amendments establishing PPDs and the electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk perpetrators of domestic and family violence. So the primary focus of my contribution will be the amendments to the Evidence Act, which fall within my portfolio responsibility.

The bill amends part 6A of the Evidence Act, which allows adult complainants to give their evidence-in-chief in summary criminal proceedings and committal proceedings by way of videorecorded statement, or VREC for short. This approach offers significant benefits to victim-survivors. The framework is founded on the victim agency and informed consent, ensuring the statements are made with the complainant's understanding and agreement. It helps reduce trauma by limiting the need for a victim to repeatedly retell their horrific experiences in court. The ability to provide this VREC statement in a comfortable location such as their home at a time appropriate to them rather than at a police station can also alleviate some of the trauma, stress and anxiety associated with reporting DFV.

The ability to make a VREC statement instead of a formal written statement can reduce the time it takes to obtain statements, thereby ensuring police have the capacity to respond. Currently, this framework has been operating as a trial at only three locations: the Magistrates Court at Ipswich, Southport and Coolangatta. The bill, thanks to the Crisafulli government, will expand the scheme statewide, ensuring all victim-survivors across Queensland have this option available to them. The expansion is a direct response to the need for consistent and compassionate support for all Queenslanders. We believe that a victim-survivor's location should not determine the quality or the type of support they receive from our justice system.

The bill also makes a number of important amendments to simplify and streamline the VREC framework. We are responding to operational issues within the current legislative scheme to make VREC more accessible for victim-survivors and more streamlined for police officers to operationalise. For example, the bill removes the requirement to make a recorded statement as soon as practicable after an event. We know that some individuals may not report incidences immediately or may be in a heightened emotional state that makes it unsuitable to provide a statement at that time.

At this juncture I want to talk about people who are suffering under coercive control, and I have spoken about this in this House many times over many years. It was actually the LNP in opposition that first started talking about making coercive control a crime in this great state. Victims of coercive control often cannot give consent straightaway because their perpetrator is controlling them. They need assistance to get away from their perpetrator. They need to get away from their perpetrator. That is what coercive control is.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Ms Farmer: Thank you to the Labor government.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection from one of the former ministers on that side of the House who refuses—we have not heard beep from the failed former minister for children who said in this House words to the effect that we should leave children in domestic violence situations. I


have never heard anything so idiotic. We should be protecting our children. Seriously, Mr Speaker, it is unbelievable. It actually makes my blood boil—the lack of practical understanding of what actually goes on outside of a textbook. Honestly, it is quite breathtaking.

I really do want to thank very much the Minister for Families, the Minister for Police and the minister for victims, who have all worked exceedingly hard. It is difficult to try to fix a system that is completely and utterly broken. It is even harder to fix the system when we have an opposition that refuses to acknowledge that we have a scourge and we have a problem in this great state. They say the words—and I will acknowledge that one member in this House has stood up and said she has counselled the member for Cairns. Where is the Leader of the Opposition? That is right; I will state that he has had to get legal advice.

Mr Minnikin: That's leadership!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That is leadership right there, isn't it?

Today is a significant step forward in our commitment to support DFV victims and to support our police officers and our children of this state. It is another significant step forward, most importantly, in supporting victim-survivors of DFV. We have a victims minister in this state. I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the victims minister because for the first time we have a government in this state that is acknowledging victims. Today marks another important milestone in the Crisafulli government's pledge to keep Queenslanders safe.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (9.59 pm): I rise to speak to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. As we know, the objectives of this bill are to establish a framework for police protection directions, PPDs, to improve efficiencies for police responding to domestic and family violence; to support an electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk DFV perpetrators; to simplify, streamline and expand the VREC framework; to clarify that a VREC statement can be considered in civil proceedings; and to make other technical amendments to the DFVP Act to strengthen the maintenance of the approved provider list. The opposition has made it clear that, while we support most elements of the bill, we do not support the amendments relating to PPDs, and it is those that I wish to speak mostly about.

At the outset I state that I have the greatest respect for police and for the job that they do. I cannot praise police enough for the work that they do and the frustration that I know they are experiencing with the numbers of DV complaints they are dealing with every shift. I cannot talk about police in general without talking about my local police at Morningside station, headed up by Senior Sergeant Dave Buttrum, and at Carina Police Station, headed up by Senior Sergeant Brendan Jorgensen. They represent the police officers across the state who every day are dealing with an increase in domestic violence and with the frustration of having so much of it to deal with on top of their existing workload. I know how challenging that is. I know how frustrating it is that domestic violence is increasing and note the committee report's reference to the fact that there has been a 218 per cent increase over the last decade.

Those opposite have been talking amongst themselves and it has been reflected in their comments—there has been a lot of shrieking and screaming, particularly from the Attorney-General, and I imagine that we are going to have it from the member for Currumbin in a minute as well—but it just defies logic and defies our very existence that people who have not been in this parliament over the last 10 years and longer have not seen the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* taskforce report and the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce being implemented with hundreds of millions of dollars in funding through successive tranches of legislation, including the coercive control legislation. It defies belief that these people are pretending that they were sitting in this House when all of that was happening but were not here and which they supported to a great extent.

Turning back to the police, I can understand how much police want to put systems and processes in place to try and streamline how things happen. They want to manage their workload better. There was this quote from Shane Prior during the committee hearings—

On average, each DV incident involving the issue of a police protection notice is taking frontline officers anywhere between four and six hours to complete.

However, the experts and the victim-survivors have told us that the proposal around PPDs in this legislation is just not the answer and in fact could be damaging to victims. They say that if we put this amendment in place there will be severe consequences impacting the very victims we are intent on saving—the victims of domestic violence. The experts say that the amendments will most likely increase the risk and consequences of misidentification of the person most in need of protection, leaving

victim-survivors without protection and putting them at risk of further harm; that there will be unintended consequences due to the removal of court oversight; and that they will misrepresent the data surrounding victims of domestic and family violence. The Attorney-General can shriek all she likes about whether the opposition do or do not know what we are doing. This is from the experts and from victim-survivors. Stakeholder after stakeholder told the committee about these factors.

Mr Stevens: Who?

Ms FARMER: From QCOSS. That member clearly did not even read the report before he spoke to the legislation. QCOSS referred to it as an efficiency measure that does not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. Jules Thompson from Broken Ballerina noted that perpetrators of DV fool everyone. Marabisda and Whitsunday Counselling and Support talked about the high possibility of misrepresentation of the person most in need of protection. Other stakeholders referenced the fact that it may not actually achieve for police the efficiencies in time and effort that was hoped for. The North Queensland Women's Legal Service said it believed that the proposed framework has the potential to increase demand on QPS resources, converse to the bill's objectives.

In fact, it was noted in the committee report that the overwhelming majority of stakeholders did not agree with PPDs because of the very reasons outlined above, yet what is scary is that, despite that overwhelming evidence and despite all of the comments from experts and the submissions from people working on the front line and from victim-survivors who said, 'Do not do this,' the government is forging ahead. Why does it think it knows better than experts? Why does it think it knows better than victim-survivors or people who are working on the front line? This is a pattern of behaviour from this government. The Premier said before the election, 'We will listen to the experts. The experts should be back in charge,' but there is no example of any legislation we have put through this parliament where the government has listened to experts. We are passing laws that have significant impacts on those at whom they are aimed and we must know there is evidence behind them.

We have seen the government ignoring youth justice experts, and the clear evidence that has been given by experts is not to do what it has done and it has had to go and clean up. We have had the case of the Chief Health Officer, where the expert decision from an independent panel was ignored because the Premier did not like the sign the guy had on his front fence. Time after time we are ignoring evidence and we must listen. I acknowledge that there was work already starting to happen in the last term—

Mr DILLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I hesitate to rise to a point of order and would seek your guidance, but I feel the member is straying outside the long title of the bill here in discussion of matters.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): What is your point of order?

Mr DILLON: Relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you; I appreciate that. The member might have talked about a couple of matters, but I consider that she was talking about experts and referring it to other matters at the time. I understand the point of order, but the member is being relevant in that context.

Ms FARMER: I want to acknowledge the work that was already starting to happen in the last term. I appreciate that the member for Morayfield, as the former minister for police, tried to address that demand on police, which we acknowledge is a huge challenge, but do so in a way that would achieve a positive impact. That is why we will be moving amendments that will safeguard against misidentification and ask for the experience of victim-survivors to be supported and to address the gap left by the removal of court oversight.

I want to also turn to another aspect of this legislation, and this was something that was expressed by a number of submitters to the committee. Sisters Inside expressed concern, for instance, that granting greater powers to police will encourage reactive responses and does not effect the greater community-wide change that is necessary to address systemic entrenched issues. As a former minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence and a long-time advocate on this issue, I know that the most critical things that can be done to address domestic violence are early intervention and prevention. I know how critical it is that we change attitudes towards women and promote healthy relationships. We need to start when kids are young and make sure they are growing up normalising healthy relationships no matter who they are—no matter their gender, their sexual preference, their shape or size. We have to have respectful relationships.


I acknowledge the matter that was raised this morning about the Facebook post of the member for Cairns. As has already been referred to, the Leader of the Opposition has counselled the member for Cairns, who has apologised. None of those things that were outlined in that post are acceptable to

anyone in this House. All of us must be able to uphold the highest standards. With the laws we pass and the policies we put in place, we must move communities forward, and that is why we cannot have a minister for communities who is transphobic. We cannot have a pause of respect at work laws. We cannot pause—

Ms CAMM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I believe the member is referring to me and I take personal offence and I ask her to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, the member has taken personal offence.

Ms FARMER: I withdraw. We cannot pause respect at work laws. We cannot pause gender affirming. We cannot refuse to count victims of DVO breaches as victims. We cannot have an education minister who stands up at a special education leaders conference and talks about occupational therapists as a good source of dating. You cannot have people who are community leaders speaking this way. We have to set standards here with laws that are based on evidence from experts. We need to uphold the highest moral standards and we need to model positive, respectful relationships and language in everything we do. People in glass houses should not throw stones.

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.11 pm): Terror, violence, control—that is what thousands of women live with every single day. This bill is for them. It is for the woman who jumps at the slammed door and keeps a phone under her pillow; for the woman who wonders if today will be her last; for the survivors who found the courage to seek help only to be retraumatised by the system; for the woman who has been isolated from her family and friends; for the children who deserve a safe home; and for the woman who has been subjected to violence. We heard shadow ministers stand up in this House and in their contribution to this debate, a debate that is about protecting women from violence, excuse the behaviour of the member for Cairns by saying he has been counselled so there is nothing to see here. He has been counselled so we can stand by and walk past this behaviour—nothing to see here. That is the culture of the Labor Party. They think that it is okay; that he has been counselled so there is nothing to see here. In the same breath the member for Bulimba talked about standing up—

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Bulimba and member for Chatsworth, there will be no cross-chamber chatter or yelling. Next time it will be a warning.

Mrs GERBER: Being counselled is the consequence for the behaviour of men on the Labor side of parliament who continue to talk about violence against women as a joke, as a funny one-liner. The consequence for them is they were counselled; everything is okay, there is nothing to see here. They have made these statements in a debate that is meant to be about protecting women and children from violence. It is absolutely mind blowing that they think that it is acceptable.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, you are warned.

Mrs GERBER: This bill is for every Queenslanders who has lived in fear of their family or a partner. I want to address the comments of the shadow minister for women in relation to consent. The shadow minister for women drew an analogy to try to justify her amendments requiring police to have consent to issue a PPD. She tried to justify her amendments by saying the male perpetrator might need to come back home after a night shift and watch his kids. Oh my goodness! Those children deserve to be protected too, shadow minister for women. That is how Labor treat victims of domestic and family violence. I am going to read a comment from a submitter to the committee, because the shadow minister for women needs to hear this. One submitter said—

I had a school friend come over and she asked, 'Why is your dad bashing your mum?' I told her, 'They're just fighting.' It was normal for me, but she hadn't seen that before.

The shadow minister for women is happy for a male perpetrator to come home and continue to do it, on the basis of her amendments.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find that highly offensive and I ask her to withdraw.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw. The fact remains that the shadow minister for women gave an example to justify her amendments in relation to consent and the example was that the male perpetrator who works a night shift might need to come home and look after the kids, the same children that could be subjected to the domestic violence in that house.

Ms Fentiman: Talk to the Gold Coast domestic violence service, Minister.

Mrs GERBER: Do not listen to the other submitters that talk about it, no. Let us not listen to everyone else, let us just cherry-pick. Our Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill delivers three major reforms. First, it establishes police protection directions. These give frontline officers the power to act decisively, to offer 12 months of immediate protection for Queenslanders in danger, women and children in danger; protection that can mean the difference between safety and tragedy. Second, the bill launches the Crisafulli government's election commitment to trial electronic monitoring of high-risk domestic and family violence perpetrators. Our message is clear: these high-risk perpetrators will be trapped, they will be monitored and they will be held accountable because victim-survivors should not have to live in fear of their abuser's next move. Third, this bill strengthens the ability for victim-survivors to give their evidence in a way that minimises any further trauma. Expanding videorecorded evidence across the state means fewer survivors will have to relive their trauma in a court to bring their offender to justice. I note one of the trial sites for this is the Coolangatta courthouse in my own electorate of Currumbin.

These critical reforms are about restoring power to those who have been stripped of it by the people who they trusted to love them. I want to take a moment to thank each of the submitters who took time to share their lived experience. It was their input and courage that informed the recommendations of the committee and their stories really did leave a mark on me. Sadly, we know that the reality is that too many Queensland children grow up with violence in the home. We know violence in the home should never be normal. It should never be accepted. We do not accept it, unlike the shadow minister for women who used it as an excuse to justify why PPDs should have to have consent.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I once again take personal offence. The minister continues to misunderstand what I said and misunderstand the experience of victim-survivors and I ask her to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Do you withdraw?

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw, but I direct the Minister for Women to look at *Hansard*, because it is pretty clear what she said. The reforms in this bill are important for victim-survivors. For too long under Labor victims of domestic and family violence were left waiting hours, or even longer than that—days—for help. Sometimes that help never came. In fact, in the last decade under Labor calls for service to domestic and family violence surged by 218 per cent. Under Labor, the system was left to buckle under its strain. We saw a decade of decline under Labor. This government is taking decisive action to protect women and children from domestic and family violence. We are committed to restoring safety where you live and putting the victims of crime first by holding perpetrators to account. This bill is just another way that we are doing that.

Police protection directions will ensure victims do not have to wait. They will deliver 12 months of immediate protection. That means that when a woman calls for help, police will not just take a report, they will be able to take action that very same day to keep her safe and the children who might be in that house safe. These directions are about protection. They are enforceable, they are immediate and they are reflective of the serious nature of an offender's actions. They can compel good behaviour, prohibit contact and prevent offenders from using others to continue their abuse. It sends a clear message to perpetrators: if you choose violence there will be consequences, unlike the member for Cairns whose consequence was his being counselled.

A government member: Not cancelled.


Mrs GERBER: I take the interjection—not cancelled. He has just been counselled. The second major reform of this bill is the GPS electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk perpetrators. For too long the burden of safety has been on the victim. For too long she has had to change her name, her number, find a new home—live in hiding. The Crisafulli government is flipping that burden. We are putting the responsibility on the perpetrator where it belongs.

Under our legislation, high-risk offenders will be tracked and monitored. They will know that the law is watching and that their movements are being scrutinised. As part of our pilot, 150 devices will remain available to selected courts, and victim-survivors themselves will have the option to carry a GPS enabled safety device, putting another layer of reassurance in their hands. This provides victims with a tangible opportunity to regain control. Most importantly, the technology is not standalone. It is designed to complement safety planning that has been undertaken by specialist domestic and family violence services. This pilot is about strengthening the system around the victim.

The third reform is the expansion of videorecorded evidence-in-chief across Queensland. This is a victim's firsthand account of what happened. It is critically important to ensure that victims are not retraumatised by what they have been going through. In fact, many victim-survivors submitted to the committee that they found reliving their experiences in a courtroom just as traumatising as the violence itself. This reform changes that for victims.

In the time that I have left, I want to acknowledge the Red Rose Foundation. Tomorrow outside this parliament they will gather to honour a victim whose life was taken over the weekend through domestic and family violence. Her name was Carra Luke. Her life mattered. She will be remembered.

Domestic and family violence is a scourge in our community and has absolutely no place in Queensland. The Crisafulli government will continue to take decisive action to protect women, to protect children and to protect Queenslanders from domestic and family violence. Through our reforms involving perpetrators, PPDs and GPS monitoring and by not retraumatising victims, we are taking just one step towards delivering that for Queenslanders.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (10.21 pm): Tonight I rise to give my contribution to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. From the outset I will say that there is no place for domestic and family violence in Queensland and everything must be done to reduce it in the community. Over the past 10 years in this state we have seen the numbers grow, so I think we must go back to the drawing board. In this case, it would have been appropriate to do something that is being done with child safety at the moment—that is, have a full inquiry into domestic and family violence before changing any legislation.

I believe we have got it wrong in this state. We have not addressed the root causes of domestic violence. We are not looking at the family unit and trying to understand why people are becoming increasingly more violent and attacking their loved ones, the people they are supposed to love and look after. Why are Queenslanders, Australians and people across the world turning on each other in their households? The household used to be a place of love where you looked after your family and raised your children. Unfortunately, each year in this country, more and more we see the family unit being pulled apart. Everything from federal legislation through to state legislation puts a wedge in the family unit. I think that needs to be understood before we start changing legislation.

In the past I have been criticised for my commentary around domestic and family violence and I will make similar commentary tonight, expecting the same criticism. During the committee hearings I saw a lack of representation of men who have been affected by domestic and family violence, and that continued as I listened to the contributions made this evening. While I admit that the legislation has been touted as legislation to protect all Queenslanders, it seems to have taken what the Labor Party has described previously as a gender-lens approach to fixing domestic and family violence in this state. During our committee hearings and committee travel, time and time again when we sat down and spoke to QPS officers we heard that it is mostly men who are creating the problem. Unfortunately for us, the KAP seems to have become a bit of a safe haven for men looking for representation in this House. Men have come into my office saying that they live in fear because of the weaponisation of the current DVO system.

One of the objectives of the bill is to create efficiencies for the QPS, and I acknowledge that up to 60 per cent of their day can be chewed up through domestic and family violence call-outs. Improving efficiencies might sound like a fantastic idea to help the QPS on the front line—and they do a fantastic job—however, I think allowing police to hand out a PPD following a small assessment of what has happened in the house that day will have very dangerous consequences.

If we ask people what they argue about, the first thing most people will talk about is money. By applying a PPD that lasts for 12 months, you automatically lose your weapons licence. I will talk about that in a second. A person who holds a blue card or a yellow card has the responsibility of notifying the agency if they no longer qualify for either of those cards. Whether it is a female or a male who is recognised as the perpetrator through incorrect identification, you could have a situation where a scorned lover or a family member tries to make the other person lose their job. Having a blue card taken off you may mean you are no longer the breadwinner of the house or you may no longer have an opportunity to put money in your bank account every week. That is a concern.

We understand the PPDs will be administered by QPS officers and they will have to be signed off by higher ranked officers. We understand that within 28 days there will be an opportunity to have that reviewed by the police. I have all the faith in the QPS system so do not get me wrong when I say this: I highly doubt that higher ranked officers will overturn the decisions of other officers. In my experience of many other matters, I have not seen that happen very often.

It is likely that if someone wants to have a PPD overturned then they will have to go to court. The problem with going to court is that if you fail in your pursuit to have the PPD dropped then it automatically qualifies you for a five-year DVO, which would be disastrous for some people. Most people will decide to wear the 12-month PPD as they see no other option. As I said, it is problematic to move away from the current system. A court deciding whether or not a domestic violence order is applied provides an opportunity for natural justice to run its course. It gives everyone an opportunity to gather their evidence and put it before a magistrate who is trained to look at both sides and for both sides to have proper representation. In a situation where the QPS is called out under the new PPD system, I would almost suggest that someone should ring a lawyer before the police turn up because that is what they will need on the side of the road, in their front yard or in their living room if this goes through.

Earlier I mentioned that weapons licence holders will be affected. The firearms industry was not consulted throughout this process. Amendments are going to be made to the Weapons Act in Queensland that will mean that if someone is given a PPD on the spot at their house then they will lose their firearms licence, effective immediately. This will put a regulatory burden on the Weapons Licensing group. It will also put extra stress on that person. I can tell the House that if there is a call-out and police need to make an immediate decision, some police officers are prejudiced against weapons licence holders. If there are two people in the house and the police have to decide who needs the most protection, I would bet my bottom dollar they will put the PPD on the person who holds the weapons licence. I can almost guarantee that that will be the case. That is a concern.


As I said earlier, I have had people in my office in tears. They were firearms owners and sporting shooters. They had an ex-partner who wanted to inflict as much pain as possible so put in a fictitious or false claim of domestic and family violence. That was done so that the person would lose their weapons licence when one of the only things they really enjoyed doing in life was sport shooting.

Once again, I will say that we see this as problematic because the root causes of domestic violence are not being addressed here. I think this will only throw fuel on the fire, as they say, and exacerbate an already out-of-control problem. The people of Queensland deserve a full inquiry into domestic violence to gain a full understanding of what the causes are. For too long there has been a gender lens attached to the domestic violence industry—and I will call it that. I have walked into domestic violence centres in Townsville and talked about the male victims only to be ushered out the door because as far as some organisations are concerned they do not exist. That is a real problem.

I believe that the regime we are about to implement has some deep issues. I will applaud, though, the implementation of putting GPS tracking devices, or monitoring devices as they are best known, on high-risk perpetrators. That will help some victims out there who really need to know where the high-risk perpetrator is so they are protected. That is something I will applaud in this legislation.

Most of what I have said tonight is set out in more detail in my statement of reservation. In her opening speech, the minister said the committee backed this legislation. Yes, the committee voted and it was backed. I cannot say exactly who voted for it and who did not, but I can definitely say I have a statement of reservation, which I will table as part of my contribution.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of reservation by the member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Nick Dametto MP [\[1143\]](#).

 **Mr LEE** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (10.31 pm): I rise to speak to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill makes amendments to legislation as listed in the amendment bill's table of contents. I speak principally today about the bill's amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and the Evidence Act 1977. This bill amends the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and provides victim-survivors with immediate protection against respondents. The bill proposes to amend the Evidence Act 1977 to expand the videorecorded evidence-in-chief framework.

Domestic violence in all its forms is a blight on our society. Hervey Bay is not impervious to the menace of domestic violence. That is why I am currently collaborating with our local DV Alliance, Centacare and the Wide Bay Women's Network to explore a case management approach, including emergency accommodation.

The Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety reports a 218 per cent increase in domestic and family violence over the last decade. The Queensland government's Domestic and Family Violence Death Review 2023-24 states that in 2023-24 there were 16 DFV related events in Queensland which, sadly, resulted in the deaths of 19 people. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Personal Safety survey, in 2021-22—

An estimated 4.2 million people aged 18 years and over (21%) have experienced violence, emotional abuse, or economic abuse by a cohabiting partner since the age of 15.

Women are more likely than men to experience violence, and it is often under-reported. The Queensland Police Service's 100-day review report highlights the extent to which our frontline police officers are confronted with cases of domestic and family violence. The QPS Deputy Commissioner, Cameron Harsley APM, has stated that police officers across Queensland respond to a DFV related situation every three minutes.

Clause 19 of the bill provides for the power to issue a police protection direction if they reasonably believe: the respondent has committed domestic violence; a police protection direction is necessary or desirable to protect the aggrieved from domestic violence; none of the exclusions under new sections 100C or 100D apply; and it would not be more appropriate to take action that involves an application for a protection order. A police protection direction must have the approval of a supervising police officer who was not involved in investigating the relevant DV event. The approving officer must hold the rank of sergeant or above and be approved by the Police Commissioner to issue police protection directions.

A police protection direction takes effect when it is served or when a police officer tells the respondent about the direction and its duration. The police protection direction will continue for 12 months from the day it takes effect or until another type of order or notice is made and takes effect.

There is a conceivably small risk of misidentification. However, the bill does provide safeguards: internal police reviews; requirements for documentation and justification; a potential judicial oversight if the direction is challenged; a proper identification of the person in need of protection; and the approval of a senior police officer. The bill requires the minister to ensure the police protection direction provisions are reviewed two years after commencement.

Clause 31 of the bill creates a new offence for contravening a police protection direction, which carries a maximum penalty of 120 penalty units or three years imprisonment. The bill provides that the Police Commissioner must keep a register of PPDs, including PPDs that have been revoked.

New section 192A provides that the statutory review must include consideration of several matters, including whether the police protection direction provisions have improved the efficiency of the exercise of police powers under the act and remains appropriate. The bill also inserts a new part 3—monitoring device conditions—into the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. This bill then provides conditions on the imposition of electronic monitoring of high-risk DFV perpetrators and includes, but is not limited to: the respondent is an adult; the court is satisfied that the condition is necessary to protect the aggrieved from domestic violence or a named person; the respondent is not already subject to a monitoring device condition for another purpose, such as for bail or parole; and further matters for court consideration that may be prescribed by regulation.

The electronic monitoring pilot program will be limited to select courts, which will be prescribed by regulation. Court locations will be determined prior to the relevant part of this bill commencing. 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 a named person. The pilot will be limited to courts prescribed by regulation.

New section 66G provides that evidence of the imposition of a monitoring device condition or other evidence directly or indirectly derived from the imposition or use is inadmissible in any proceeding other than a proceeding for a DFV offence. New section 66H provides that the electronic monitoring conditions are subject to a sunset clause of two years after the commencement of the bill. This is to allow sufficient time for an evaluation of the pilot before considering further expansion or making the provisions permanent.

This bill will also amend the Evidence Act to mitigate the stress and trauma experienced by victim-survivors from repeatedly speaking about their experience. This bill will expand the videorecorded evidence-in-chief—VREC—provisions for use statewide in both civil and DFV proceedings. The bill removes the requirement that a VREC statement be taken as soon as practicable. This is to recognise that complainants may need time to provide a statement.


The bill provides that complainants can make multiple VREC statements to police. This is to recognise that complainants may need to provide multiple statements over time. The bill inserts a requirement that if any part of a recorded statement is in a language other than English the recorded statement must contain an oral translation of the part in English, or a separate written English translation must accompany the statement.

Clause 45 also removes the statutory requirement that only police officers who have successfully completed a DFV training course may take a videorecorded evidence-in-chief statement. This will provide the QPS more flexibility in meeting the needs of victim-survivors.

Clause 46 provides that complainant consent is only required once, either prior to or at the time of stating the recorded statement. Section 103F(2) also contains a list of matters a police officer must explain to a complainant before or at the time the recorded statement is taken.

The bill amends section 103C of the Evidence Act to expand the application of the VREC framework to summary criminal proceedings and committal proceedings for DFV in all Queensland Magistrate Courts. At present it is only applicable to the Magistrate Court in Ipswich, Southport and Coolangatta. This will allow all courts within Queensland to hear those proceedings.

I commend the Domestic and Family Violence and Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (10.40 pm): Queenslanders experiencing domestic and family violence trauma, both emotional and physical, seek a safe space to heal, rekindle trust and rebuild their lives. This requires space from the perpetrator. The DFV protection legal system currently provides a seven-day police protective notice, PPN, after which a court is required to make a longer domestic violence order, DVO.

The bill provides police the power to issue a 12-month police protection direction, PPD, which serves to both immediately protect victims and provide longer term protection. This is welcome by some, including the DFV Community Advocacy Group and City Women Toowoomba who submitted that delays in protection can put women and children at further risk. This was a key recommendation from the Queensland Police Union. However, organisations including the Queensland Council of Social Service, QCOSS, and the Queensland Law Society, QLS, say the bill appears to prioritise the efficiency and reduction of administrative burden on police officers rather than safety.

At first, I could not understand why as I felt that anything that ensures perpetrators stay away from victims could only be a positive. However, QCOSS explained that, based on evidence and feedback, they strongly oppose this because misidentification at DFV incidents is an ongoing and significant concern, referencing the feedback from DFV organisations of women being wrongly identified as perpetrator, linguistic and cultural barriers and the overcriminalisation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. QLS also raised similar concerns, as well as increased breaches of orders and impacts on the family law system.

Submitters felt many police may not have access to the training required to determine who is the perpetrator or the victim, which a full court process would identify, and that removing the requirement for perpetrators to go to court could lead to further traumatisation. Legal Aid Queensland argued that it would not provide the opportunity for either party to seek legal advice or for evidence to be tested and there would be no prospect of either party exercising their right to a fair hearing. Also raised was that going to court is a form of justice for victims, no matter the outcome. There was also concern about the potential for victim-survivors and their children to lose the opportunity for referrals to support services at court.

DV Connect said that it is essential that any proposed reforms include transparent and accountable review mechanisms. I note the bill includes a requirement that the minister ensure the PPD provisions be reviewed two years after commencement. Also called for was a pilot in at least two locations—one rural and one regional—for a 12-month period, with a comprehensive and vigorous evaluation model, and an oversight panel with independent DFV specialists.

I want to go to the improvements to the monitoring of perpetrators, which has again been welcomed by many. The bill establishes a framework to allow courts to place a monitoring device condition on a respondent in certain circumstances when making a DVO. This is intended to focus on victim protection and enable police to respond to electronic monitoring alerts. This was raised with my office by a resident who was a victim-survivor years ago. She also raised the need for a personal alarm that is linked to the system to give an indication when a perpetrator is in range. This occurs in Tasmania. This would also provide for rapid responses during emergencies.

As noted, on their own these measures cannot keep victim-survivors safe but they complement existing integrated safety planning to deter respondents from breaching DVO conditions which, as we have sadly seen, have not deterred perpetrators in a number of horrific cases. While many submitters support this, QCOSS raised significant concerns and urges legislators to work closely with the DFV


sector and victim-survivors to co-design the electronic monitoring pilot, if it goes ahead. I hope that it incorporates personal alarms that have been requested many times.

Lastly, the bill also amends the Evidence Act to simplify, streamline and expand the videorecorded evidence-in-chief, VREC, framework statewide. Giving evidence in court can be traumatic to victim-survivors and obtaining a complainants evidence-in-chief close to the time of an alleged offence and in a location such as a home rather than a police station can assist them in recalling more details about the offending and alleviate some of the trauma and anxiety. This was broadly supported.

In closing, I had thought the proposed amendments in this bill would all be welcomed. However, I was wrong. In learning about the risks raised of potential further traumatising of victim-survivors, I make a plea to the government to work with QCOS, the DFV sector and victim-survivors to reduce any risks as well as address concerns raised.

I thank the committee and secretariat in preparing the report and the ongoing willingness of Queenslanders to submit to these inquiries in an effort to reduce domestic violence and trauma. I also give gratitude to all who worked so hard in one of the most complex areas overwhelming our communities. My police are spending literally 70 per cent of their time behind closed doors in DV matters. Our police do an outstanding job. The efforts of our victim-survivor advocates do not go unnoticed nor unappreciated.

I say to anyone out there who is a perpetrator, struggling with anger management, substance abuse or mental issues or anyone who knows someone who is, please ask for help. Every single bit of abuse is preventable and it is up to all of us to see an end to domestic and family violence.

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (10.46 pm): I have learned at least two important things about domestic and family violence in my life so far. The first is that it can touch people from all walks of life. I have lost count of the number of times that someone has said to me, 'I never thought it could happen to my sister' or 'I never thought it could happen to such a strong and educated woman', but it can and it does touch people from all walks of life. The second is that, despite more awareness than ever, fewer taboos and record resourcing for support and education services, crisis help and more police attention than ever before, it remains a stubborn problem.

I would like to take a moment to acknowledge the difficult and important work that is done in this field by organisations in my local area like Maybanke and the Centre for Women & Co that I have got to meet through the Red Rose Rally that has been organised for the last six years in Cleveland by Ms Anna McCormack. She is a passionate advocate on this issue and has been for a very long time. The Redland Community Centre also provides valuable support in this space. Each provides, in its own unique way, help for those people in our community who face violence at home, with a range of financial help, counselling, refuge and housing services and advice.

Police, support services and victims tell us that the current system is not working, and the numbers bear that out. Calls for DV help surged 280 per cent during the term of the last government. Yes, that reflects the fact that there is more willingness to speak up on this issue on the part of victims, and that is a very good thing, but despite all of the effort that has been made in this area, there are still far too many people experiencing this.

This government has worked with all of the people involved in making a difference in this space to find a new approach for delivering fast protection for people who are at risk. The bill does not change the standards of proof for domestic violence offences nor does it change the way police go about investigating matters of this kind. What will change is that police will be able to issue protection orders more quickly and flexibly.

There are checks and balances put in place for review where that is considered necessary, and there are extra protections provided in the bill for where children are involved. I am not going to go into a line-by-line analysis of the criteria that need to be satisfied to get a police protection direction. Others in this chamber have already done a fine job of that task. Suffice it to say I am really pleased that this is directed at getting protection in place quickly and flexibly so that police officers can get safety structures in place and then get on to answering the next call for help in our community because we know there are far too many of them.

The bill provides the framework for the piloting of the use of GPS trackers on high-risk perpetrators. These can be applied by a court order and will only be available where the court is satisfied that a person has been convicted of or is charged with a DV offence or an indictable offence of violence or where there is a history of DV charges arising from violence against this particular respondent.


There is a range of practical matters that would be taken into account too. I would not want anyone to think that we have not built in the flexibility that is needed for these to work in a practical sense on the ground. Once a tracker is on a high-risk person, the person who has experienced the violence can then choose to carry their own GPS enabled safety device if they wish. This is a pilot, and it is set up for a two-year period for it to be tested. It will help us know whether it is the missing piece of the puzzle in making a big difference on this issue. Here is what we do know. We know that more of the same will not do. We need to be prepared to innovate, to try new things if we want to see a different result in our community.

The final feature of the bill that I would like to mention is that it makes provision for all Magistrates Courts to allow adult complainants in domestic violence cases to give their evidence-in-chief by a recorded video statement. That is already in place in situations, for instance, where a child is giving evidence, but this step is to ensure that victims of domestic violence are not being retraumatised by having to give evidence of their experience over and over again.

It makes it possible for this to be done in languages other than English too and for translation to occur so that people who have come from other places or who do not have strong English language skills can still get proper protection under the law. It does not abrogate the right to cross-examine where that arises. What it does do though is reduce the number of times a person needs to relive a difficult experience to the absolute minimum that is needed to ensure fairness of the justice system.

Domestic violence is never okay—no matter who does it or where it happens. This bill is an important step in the right direction, using new orders to get more calls for help and protection answered and in place, to enable the trial of new technologies to prevent this behaviour and to collect evidence where it arises from high-risk offenders. It is to minimise the trauma of the justice process as much as it is possible to do so without undermining the reliability of the outcomes of the justice system.

It is an important step. I believe it will make a difference. I commend the government for its willingness to innovate, to try new things, to make sure that we do not face more of the same well into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (10.53 pm): I rise to speak on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and to support the amendments to be moved by the shadow minister during consideration in detail. Domestic and family violence is a plague on our society. It destroys lives, tears families apart and leaves lasting trauma in its wake. The scale, severity and impact of this violence in Queensland is of a deep and ongoing concern to every member of the Queensland Labor opposition and to every Queenslanders who believes in safety, respect and justice. We in opposition are unwavering in our commitment to ending violence, but we also recognise that this work is complex. It cannot be solved with legislation alone. It requires sustained, long-term, whole-of-society change.

Ending violence fundamentally requires addressing gender inequality, challenging outdated attitudes and building a culture of respect. Laws play a critical role, but they must be informed by lived experience, grounded in evidence and always prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors.

I acknowledge the significant reforms already delivered in recent years. These reforms have not happened in a vacuum. These reforms were shaped through extensive consultation with the domestic and family violence sector, with frontline service providers, the Queensland police and our courts. These include the commencement of coercive control laws introduced by the former Labor government, the implementation of the *Hear her voice* reports from the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and *A call for change: Commission of inquiry into Queensland Police Service responses to domestic and family violence*.

These reforms laid a solid foundation for a more responsive and supportive system. Any new legislation must build on this progress, not undermine it. That is why we on this side of the House approach this bill with caution. While we support reforms that improve responses to domestic and family violence, there are deep reservations about key aspects of this legislation—most notably, the introduction of police protection directions.

Police protection directions, as outlined in this bill, are 12-month, on-the-spot police issued protection orders issued by police officers without court oversight. Unlike domestic violence orders, the police directions are issued without court oversight. The bill proposes to give police the power to issue these orders directly at the scene of a domestic violence incident.

Let's be clear: I respect and support the Queensland Police Service. I acknowledge the dangerous and often distressing circumstances they face in responding to domestic violence, but new

powers must be balanced with appropriate safeguards. They must enhance safety, not compromise it. We cannot risk the safety and dignity of victim-survivors in the name of expediency.

The majority of stakeholders consulted during the committee process opposed the police protection direction framework because they are an efficiency measure and do not prioritise the safety and wellbeing of victim-survivors. Their concerns were serious, consistent and evidence based. Key amongst them was the risk of misidentification—the wrongful identification of a victim-survivor as the perpetrator.

This is not a theoretical concern. The call for change commission of inquiry identified misidentification as a systemic issue in Queensland. Despite improvements in training and policy, misidentification unfortunately still persists, especially for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women, culturally and linguistically diverse women, women with disabilities and the LGBTIQ+ communities.

DVConnect, the Queensland Law Society, Women's Legal Service Queensland, QCOS and the Victims' Commissioner have all sounded the alarm. The consequences of misidentification are severe. It can leave a victim without protection, it can criminalise them, it can expose them to further system abuse, and it can carry a lifelong stigma. QCOS highlighted this issue. Almost half of all women killed in domestic violence related homicides have previously been misidentified by police as the respondent. That fact alone should stop us in our tracks because these are not just statistics; these are lives lost.


There is also concern that, once a police protection direction has been issued or has previously been in force, another cannot be issued naming the current aggrieved as the respondent. In simple terms, cross-directions are not permitted, even where misidentification is later identified. This risks locked-in, flawed decisions without a remedy. Further, even where a person has been convicted of a domestic violence offence within the past two years, police can still issue a new police protection direction at the same time as commencing proceedings for a new offence even if both relate to the same pattern of abuse. This loophole alone has the potential to put victim-survivors in serious danger, including the risk of death.

Critically, police protection directions bypass the courts. This removes essential oversight. Judicial oversight ensures access to legal support, it allows victim-survivors to be heard, it holds perpetrators to account through structural intervention and it enables decisions to be made with context, not just in the heat of the moment. The Queensland Law Society aptly stated—

The emphasis on police operational efficiencies in this Bill appears to be inconsistent with the main objective of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 itself.

The act is about safety, not speed; protection, not productivity. Alarming, the bill does not require the consent of the aggrieved person before a police protection direction is issued. While the views of the victim may be considered, there is no obligation to do so. By removing judicial oversight and consent provisions, the victim-survivor is denied a say in the outcomes that concern their safety and wellbeing. It risks retraumatising them and it undermines the very principles of trauma informed, survivor centred justice.

Police protection directions also reduce the standard period of protection from five years, as recommended in the *Not now, not ever* report, to just one year. This is not progress; this is a step backwards.

 **Ms DOOLEY** (Redcliffe—LNP) (11.02 pm): I rise tonight in strong support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is about putting victims first. It is about holding perpetrators to account. It is about restoring safety in the very place where people deserve to feel safest: their own homes and their own communities. As the member for Redcliffe, this bill is not just about changing legislation; it is about changing lives for victim-survivors in my community and putting protections in place in a timely manner.

Over the past decade calls for help relating to domestic and family violence, DFV, have increased by a staggering 218 per cent. That figure is not only shocking; it is completely unacceptable. I remind the House that behind every single one of those calls is a person in crisis: a mother who is afraid for her safety and that of her children, a child who does not feel safe at home, or a neighbour who hears shouting and does not know what to do. In Redcliffe, just like every community across Queensland, families are living with this reality. This bill seeks to address this with better protections for victims.

I have listened to many in Redcliffe who have confided in me that, when they finally found the courage to ask for help, they were told to 'wait until Monday' or 'come back when the court is open to make your statement'. It takes incredible courage to ask for help, so imagine being told to wait. This is

unacceptable and it cannot continue. This bill will change that. The introduction of PPDs means that a victim-survivor in Redcliffe can receive up to 12 months of immediate protection—in not hours or days but immediately. This will be life changing and potentially lifesaving.

It means that if a woman in Margate fears for her safety tonight police will have the power to act. It means that if a child in Woody Point calls for help the response will be swift. These new protections are not just stronger; they are also carefully designed. Safeguards are built in to ensure justice is fair and to ensure we protect the person most in need. Training will be provided to our law enforcement agencies. PPDs can be reviewed both by police and the courts, and that balance ensures victims are prioritised and respondents are treated justly.

One of the most significant changes this bill introduces is the GPS electronic monitoring pilot for high-risk offenders. I know from conversations with many victims in my electorate that their greatest fear is often not what happens in the moment but what happens after. What happens when the abuser is released? What happens when they wait outside the school gates? With GPS monitoring that fear can be met with real action. Offenders who are deemed high risk can now be tracked, and if they come too close to a victim's home authorities will know and can alert the victim. Victims themselves will have the option of carrying their own safety device, offering peace of mind that help can be summoned immediately. For families in Redcliffe who told me they do not feel safe walking to their car or picking their children up from school, this bill seeks to change that. This reform is practical and real.

While stronger laws and tougher protections are essential, we know that legislation alone is not enough. Victims and their families need practical, on-the-ground support to help rebuild their lives. That is why I am so proud that the Crisafulli government is delivering funding to the Miracle Mums Movement, a local grassroots initiative in my electorate of Redcliffe that supports women who are victim-survivors of DFV. The Miracle Mums Movement was created by the remarkable and brave Lou Smith, and it provides women with not only immediate crisis support but also the tools, mentoring and encouragement they need to start over through peer mentorship programs.

I also want to give a shout-out to Lewis Land Group's Queensland general manager Chris Allison, whom we know locally from the Bel and the Komo, who has also invested in Lou's vision of the Miracle Mums Movement with corporate funding. This is our incredible community of Redcliffe, where private enterprise meets government to support grassroots solutions and support. This funding is not just an investment in a program; it is an investment in the women and children of Redcliffe. It shows our government's commitment is not just words, but action.

I also want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the extraordinary work of our local police in Redcliffe and right across the Moreton Bay district, especially the Vulnerable Persons Unit and Senior Constable Keith Morris, our local Serious Crime Investigation Team alongside other DFV focused units within the QPS, and external supports to identify high-risk victim-survivors. I also acknowledge and thank our incredible local organisations which have been on the front line of this issue for many years, including the Centre Against Domestic Abuse, CADA, and PRADO, which provide specialist services and support to women and children across our region. I was honoured to be with them for the official opening of their new office in Sutton Street, Redcliffe recently. CEO Holly and her team are legends and quite literally lifesavers.

The Encircle Redcliffe Neighbourhood Centre has been a longstanding trusted provider, offering counselling and wraparound support for victim-survivors. I acknowledge the Zonta Club of Redcliffe for their legacy and advocacy. I am a longstanding member of the steering committee of Moreton Bay Says No to Violence, auspiced by Encircle and supported by the City of Moreton Bay. This movement continues to play a leading role in raising awareness and mobilising community action through our peaceful rallies. In May this year, which was Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, I attended and spoke at our flagship event, the Moreton Bay Says No to Violence event. With over 500 people, we stood shoulder to shoulder with community leaders and frontline workers.

This Sunday I am attending another great local initiative, the Real Men Rally, which is an event organised by local Sean Gordon and fully supported by our Moreton Bay mayor, Councillor Peter Flannery. It is calling our community to come together and stand up for women, for everyone, so we have the right to live safely and free from violence. Everyone is welcome. It will be held at Kayo Stadium in Redcliffe from 9 am to 11 am. Check them out on social media at realmenrally.org.

While police continue to do everything possible, addressing DFV requires a collective effort and cannot be achieved by law enforcement and legislation alone. It is everyone's responsibility to play a role in preventing, identifying or reporting incidents of DFV. It is heartwarming to hear stories of women who now feel safe and have regained their confidence to lead their lives because of the support they


have received through CADA, Encircle and DVConnect and by engaging with new initiatives like Miracle Mums.

Protection is not only about physical safety but also about emotional and psychological safety. We know that going to court can retraumatise victims. That is why this bill expands the use of the videorecorded evidence-in-chief so that victim-survivors only have to tell their story once. For a young woman like Emily in Redcliffe who has already endured the trauma of violence, this change will mean she does not have to relive those moments every time she seeks justice or engages with a service provider.

This bill also strengthens the approved provider list. This means that, when courts order intervention programs or counselling services, those services must be provided by accredited services. This matters because if we want to break the cycle of violence we must ensure that perpetrators are held to account in a way that is consistent and effective.

This bill is not the end of the journey; it is the start. It is the Crisafulli government making victims and safety the heart of these reforms. Together, let's create a Queensland where safety is restored, victims are supported, perpetrators are held to account and police are given the tools and the laws they need to do their jobs. I want to put on the record my thanks to Minister Amanda Camm for her leadership and work to bring this bill to the House. I thank the committee for their work in reviewing it. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Before I call the next speaker, I remind the member for Ipswich West to acknowledge the chair when you enter the chamber, please.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (11.13 pm): I rise to speak on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I have been sitting here listening to the various speeches that have been made. I can honestly say that I have changed what I wanted to speak about here so many times because this is something that touches every single one of us. No-one in this House has the moral high ground to determine whether they are more for victims or less for victims or whatever. We all want to see a victimless society, particularly when it comes to domestic and family violence. I do not doubt for one minute that those opposite want exactly what we want on this side. It really is a matter of how we go about ensuring that. For anyone to suggest that we do not care about these victims, or that someone is more for perpetrators than for children, families, women or men, is simply incorrect. We all want this to work and we all want a society free of the scourge of domestic and family violence.

There are four main areas in this bill. The first one where we are going to try something new is this framework for police protection directions which are aimed at improving efficiencies for police responding to DFV without a court proceeding. That is probably one of the areas where we believe that we should go with it, but we need safeguards. I will talk more about this because that is one area that most people got up and spoke about, particularly with misidentification. The bill supports an electronic monitoring pilot program for high-risk DV perpetrators. That is something we can look at. It will be reviewed in two years time, and hopefully independently.

The bill will introduce a videorecorded evidence-in-chief framework. This is about trying to make this more user friendly but we cannot do it by throwing out safeguards. We need to ensure that victims do not have to tell their story again. These safeguards include: that really qualified officers take these sworn statements; ensuring that the statements are sworn; and ensuring that the people giving the statements are giving their consent right through the process and they know exactly what is happening. I come from a non-English-speaking background in the Italian community where I grew up and I know that some of these women were sometimes in these positions but it was taboo to talk about it. For one of these women to actually ask for support and report it goes against every cultural bone in their Italian body. The last thing we want is for them to not know exactly what they are doing in consenting. We need to ensure they are getting someone who knows what they are doing. This is what we are talking about: real people, real situations.

The bill is also strengthening the maintenance of the approved provider list for the court's use. There is strength in a court ordering someone to take an approved intervention program. There is strength in that and we should not lose that strength.

We all want a world free of domestic and family violence and I know we have all probably seen cases. We want the protection of all victims, especially women and children. There is no place for domestic and family violence in our society. Unfortunately, we also have to acknowledge that this is not the case. The *Not now, not ever* report in early 2015 made 140 recommendations that have been implemented. This is a journey. Yes, we want to try new things and we have tried 140 new things from

that report. For anyone to get up and say that nothing has happened over a particular period of time is absolute rubbish and an insult to the women and all of those people working out there to help those victims of domestic and family violence and survivors.

This parliament has done a mountain of work, so do not come in here and say that nothing has been done. That is furthest from the truth. The interjections that have been made are insulting and baseless. We implemented the *Not now, not ever* report—a comprehensive report that was commissioned under the previous government and advanced by both sides of this House. Comments to the contrary are just not correct. As I said, we all know of cases.

I will add that the Leader of the Opposition speaks for our Labor team when we say that misogynistic comments have no place in a modern Queensland. I know today the member for Cairns has unreservedly apologised to all of us and he has been provided counsel. Advice will be sought on next steps and those will be acted on appropriately. It is expected of us all that we live our values and lead by example.

I say that our police do an excellent job, and it is not an easy job. I speak with many of them. They deserve the training and support to do their job well, especially when dealing with First Nations individuals and people from non-English-speaking backgrounds.


Domestic and family violence does not discriminate. It can happen anywhere, as so many reported cases demonstrate. It is frightening. In my life, I have not seen much of it, but when I have, let me tell you, it shakes me to the very core. You get that breathlessness, that trembling, when you witness it. It is frightening. This bill, let me say, will not solve all the issues, but we do not want to make the matter worse either. We want to ensure that misidentification does not happen and that the impact on vulnerable groups is not great. It is essential that we listen to the experts and implement the necessary safeguard. There is ongoing concern regarding the use of PPDs, and in many instances it may make matters worse and that is the last thing we want to see. Some of the amendments that we are moving requiring safeguards are there to ensure that this happens as minimally as possible. I know those opposite say there are safeguards already. We and the majority of experts believe that we need to do more and hence we will move those amendments.

DFV are often extremely complicated situations. You cannot make a full analysis just by attending an episode. There are probably not two that are the same and there is probably not one solution. That is why it is so important that we listen to the experts, that we listen and receive the victim-survivors' consent because we want our community to be safe now and secure into the future, and we cannot afford to have lives lost.

It is so important that we ensure the right decision is being made. There should be gender centred review by a senior police officer and DV specialist and consent required, not just taken into consideration, because this ensures that the best decision is being made. That is what we are here for—for the best outcome.

In these situations, emotions are normally really high for victims. This may be interpreted incorrectly, as evidence given by expert organisations during the committee process suggested; meanwhile, the perpetrators are calm and collected. Let me tell you, I have seen some Italian women who have been victims and they have not been calm and collected. The judgements made on that, that misidentification, is a real issue and it should be regularly reported on as data. Transparency should also be in place. There should be an independent review done as well.

We have heard from so many organisations, including QCOSS, QLS and the Women's Legal Service. Yes, it is important that we try to implement it, but it must be based on evidence. It must be expert-led, and the main factor should not be a reduction in administrative burden and paperwork. It should be based on the advice of what will be best for the victim-survivors because all of us want that. We in this House, all of us, owe victim-survivors more than just a reduction in administration and paperwork. The safeguards we are moving are very sensible. I urge those opposite to support those safeguards.

 **Mr VORSTER** (Burleigh—LNP) (11.23 pm): I rise to support the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill puts victims first. It holds perpetrators to account, and it helps restore safety where every Queenslanders deserves it—right in their very homes. The reality of this scourge—and we have heard it described as a scourge—is confronting. Calls for help in domestic and family violence matters have increased by more than 200 per cent in the past decade. Behind those numbers are people, mostly women, living in fear, children robbed of security and families torn apart. It is incumbent on all of us here to be honest about the challenge we face. Domestic and family violence is not just criminal behaviour; it is a cultural rot that must be confronted head-on.

For far too long, it was left to fester. Under Labor, victims were failed. They were left waiting for help. They were let down by systems more concerned with process than protection. This bill draws a line. It ensures police can issue immediate 12-month protection orders, it pilots GPS monitoring for high-risk offenders, and it also expands the use of recorded evidence to reduce the trauma of a court appearance. Each measure is about putting the rights of victims first, something that the former government would not do.

Let me acknowledge those who have stood on the front lines long before this bill—NGOs, community legal centres and specialist DFV organisations that are often the very first call for help. They provide shelter, guidance, advocacy and hope in the darkest of moments. In particular, I want to single out Ross Lee, President of My Community Legal Inc. on the Gold Coast, and his management committee for their tireless work on behalf of victims.

The Queensland Police Service also deserves the recognition of this House. Across the state, officers confront the harsh realities of domestic and family violence every day. They are the experts. They are the experts that we should be listening to.

I want to make very special mention of a friend of mine, retired detective inspector Marc Hogan who headed the Gold Coast District Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Taskforce. In 2017, Mark and his colleagues were formally recognised for their leadership in prevention and community engagement. Their work and the dedication of officers who followed set a benchmark for the kind of policing we now seek to support and strengthen with this bill.

I also want to acknowledge the courage of victim-survivors who have chosen to champion change when many others simply could not because of the trauma, fear or risk of speaking out. Closer to home, I think of Suzee Dearlove from Varsity College who has turned her own horrific story into a beacon of strength. Her work at Varsity College and in the media has been nothing short of remarkable. Her story, which she shared with me, left an impact on me personally, and I know her story has left an impact on many others as well. Suzee's advocacy brings hope to those still struggling, and she deserves the thanks of this House.

My sincere hope is that these reforms do more than just respond to violence. I want them to deter it. I want perpetrators to think twice before raising a hand or sending a threat. If these measures can spare even one family the horror of domestic violence, they would have been worth it. This is the fresh start that Queensland had voted for, because they had been waiting for action. After a decade of decline under Labor, Queensland were desperate for change. I am so very grateful to our Attorney-General and to Minister Camm for progressing these laws and to Minister Purdie for backing them in because it demonstrates that in just 10 months the LNP can be relied on to deliver the reforms that Labor could not or would not act on. That is the contrast: a decade of decline versus 10 months of delivery. This bill proves the difference. It shows that we are a government actually prepared to confront hard truths to back our police and support our frontline services and, for goodness sake, to put the safety of victims first.

During the course of this debate, I have heard plenty of coulda, woulda, shoulda from those opposite. They claim that they were working on reforms in this space. They had 10 years to deliver reforms! Ten years they had to deliver reforms! I lament those victims who were put in difficult situations because the former Labor government was not prepared to do the heavy lifting, the hard work and what was necessary to put victims first.

This is a government that is interested in the welfare of victims but it is also a government that is interested in reducing the number of victims in the first place. This trial of GPS monitoring is a fantastic initiative. It will ensure we can keep a vigilant eye on those with a propensity to commit the most heinous of crimes. I am sure—although we will never know—that lives will be saved because of the reforms progressed by this government. I feel the amendments proposed by those opposite are merely a way for them to stand in opposition to our reforms because they are not prepared to put victims first. They are hopelessly divided as a caucus and they will not do what is necessary. It is an act of obfuscation, and that is why I commend this bill to the House.

(Time expired)

Debate, on motion of Mr Vorster, adjourned.


ADJOURNMENT



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.31 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Greenbank High School; Member for Cairns

 **Ms MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (11.31 pm): A Greenbank high school is coming thanks to the strong support of our local communities. The member for Logan and I have been advocating for a high school in this region; however, we also understood that with limited population we needed to bide our time. We also consistently raised the need to begin planning for a high school in the area because we understood that growth was coming as a result of the Greater Flagstone Priority Development Area.


In 2022 we got a commitment for the education department to begin that work when I backed this up with a survey in 2022, to which I received 700 responses, all expressing their support for a school in the area. In 2024 the member for Logan and I made a very clear commitment that a re-elected Labor government would secure and purchase land for a new high school. There was no commitment from the LNP, so following the election we launched a community petition calling on the Crisafulli LNP government to meet our commitment and purchase land for this high school.

Our community supported our calls for action and we received more than 850 signatures to our petition, which we then presented to the Minister for Education. Initially his office made it clear in the media that Park Ridge State High School had enough capacity for Greenbank students. The minister himself said in the House on 24 June that he was not sure how, following our petition, he was magically supposed to deliver the land. Except that on 27 July, a Sunday afternoon, rather quietly the minister did just that: he announced the purchase of land for a new high school in Greenbank. It is like he did not know what his own department was doing, including the fact that the selected site had been zoned for the high school in the developer's plans and earmarked by the education department for this purpose. Perhaps he also did not know that Labor had previously included a specific land acquisition fund in the education budget, which obviously was then used to purchase the land in Greenbank.

Whilst we wait for the minister to catch up, I thank our incredible Greenbank community for stepping up and supporting our petition, putting pressure on the government to act. We know just how important this school will be for what is a growing population. With estates such as Everleigh and Covella coming on very strongly in the Greater Flagstone PDA, we know that these schools are growing, including Everleigh State School and Greenbank State School, and the high school will be a very important addition.

Finally, whilst I am on my feet I express my support for the position taken by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to the member for Cairns. I have since watched the video in question. There are a number of jokes that certainly do not meet the expectations of the communities we seek to represent. Misogynistic jokes are never funny and can never be excused. I have spoken with the member for Cairns to express my disappointment. I know that he has apologised unreservedly to the House, to his colleagues and to the community.

Mines Rescue Service

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (11.34 pm): Queensland Mines Rescue Service is an incredibly important organisation to the mining industry and our regional communities. They have hundreds of dedicated and highly specialised members and volunteers across our state. They are the first ones on site in the face of a mine disaster, and they often work with authorities during other incidents as well. They put their lives on the line for their colleagues and communities. This year they achieved something incredibly special for which they deserve recognition. They are now eligible and recognised under the National Medal. The National Medal recognises long and diligent service by members of recognised government and voluntary organisations who risk their lives or safety to protect or assist the community in enforcement of the law or in times of emergency or natural disaster. It is awarded by Australia's Governor-General.


In June this year, as the Assistant Minister for Resources, I attended the Mines Rescue 2025 Awards presentation evening, alongside the member for Mackay, Nigel Dalton, when for the first time a National Medal was awarded to over 50 Mines Rescue Service members. Congratulations to Anthony Leyshon, who is the first Australian to have received this award as a Mines Rescue Service volunteer. I give a shout-out also to Darren Prince for 30 years of service and to Clive Hanrahan and Mark Freeman for an incredible 40 years of service. Further to the National Medal, more than 80 individuals were recognised for their years of dedicated service, from five years to 40 years, with Queensland Mines Rescue Service medals.

Aside from emergency response, the Mines Rescue Service also provides expertise to the mining industry to assist with managing risk and ensures high safety standards are maintained. These awards are a great reminder to all Queenslanders, especially those working on mine sites, of the volunteers and team members who prepare and are on standby to provide response efforts if and when they are needed, no matter the risk.

I would like to thank all Queensland Mines Rescue Service team members and volunteers throughout Queensland for their dedicated service. To show my appreciation for their service, I am wearing their tie in parliament tonight.

A reminder of the importance of this organisation is the 50-year anniversary of the Kianga Mine No. 1 disaster in September this year. Thirteen miners from the Moura community tragically lost their lives in that incident. Over a two-decade period, many more miners lost their lives in this community in underground mine explosions. Queensland's Miner Memorial Day is in Moura this year to mark this solemn occasion. Both the Minister for Resources and I are planning on attending this event. It is a moment to stop and reflect on the many who have tragically lost their lives while supporting their families and working in the industry that provides so much for our state. Every miner deserves to come home in one piece.

West End State School, 150th Anniversary

 **Dr O'SHEA** (South Brisbane—ALP) (11.37 pm): This month I had the privilege of attending West End State School's fiesta in celebration of the school's 150th anniversary. The day commenced with Pop Goonts giving a beautiful and heartfelt welcome to country. Later, I had the great honour of ringing the school bell at the same time and on the same day the school was opened in 1875 by the then premier of Queensland, the Hon. Arthur Macalister.


The 150th anniversary of the West End State School is an important landmark. Schools are the bedrock of our community, and a good education can be life changing. Education opens up new worlds to us, and the breadth of opportunities ahead for all the amazing students at the school now would have been unimaginable 150 years ago.

In my speech that day, I shared the experience of Natalie Funnell who, at 92, would be one of the school's oldest living former students. Natalie loved her time at West End State School in the late 1930s, describing it as a 'magic school'. She remembers writing on a slate with a slate pencil and using a wet sponge to erase her work, hearing the air raid siren going off during the Second World War and running to hide in trenches dug behind the school, and her Friday treat of the beautiful ham rolls from the general store across from the school where Mick's Nuts now stands.

Over the years the school has cultivated a range of incredible talent including Natalie's brother, Air Marshall Ray Funnell AC, who became chief of the Royal Australian Air Force, as well as the internationally acclaimed poet and author, Mr David Malouf, and composer Joff Bush, who famously writes the music for *Bluey*. I would like to thank all the teachers and principals, supported by an incredibly hardworking P&C, who have worked so hard over the years to bring the school's vision to life by empowering every student to achieve their personal best to make the world a better place.

The school also serves as a centre for our vibrant multicultural community, with its 1,450 students representing over 60 nationalities. Those children and their parents have built a common bond of friendship across language and cultural barriers. We would not have the special close-knit community we have in West End if we did not have West End State School, the values of which are summed up by the school motto: 'We all smile in the same language'.

Mudgeeraba Electorate, Projects

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (11.40 pm): After 10 years of dragging their feet and delays from the former Labor government, it has been 10 months of constant delivery under this Crisafulli LNP government. I am proud to be part of a Crisafulli LNP government that is doing what we said we would do and getting on with the job of delivering for Queensland, particularly in my community, the electorate of Mudgeeraba.

Earlier this month we saw the much anticipated installation of new school zone flashing lights at Gold Coast Springbrook Road for Mudgeeraba Creek State School, Gooding Drive for Merrimac State School and Eden View Drive for King's Christian College. I am pleased to note that, weather permitting, even more school zone flashing lights are on their way for the Mudgeeraba electorate at Star of the Sea on Gilghai Road in Merrimac.

In similar news, I was excited to see the installation of a pedestrian crossing on Railway Street, in addition to a new footpath that has been built on the eastern side of Railway Street to provide access to the bus stop beside the Ampol service station. My community and I have spent the past decade calling for a pedestrian crossing to be installed on Railway Street and, within just six months of the LNP forming government, it was sorted. A decade of Labor inaction was sorted in just six months under an LNP government. The delivery of those sorts of local projects is just another example of the stark contrast between the decade of Labor decline and the past 10 months of proactive LNP delivery.

Just this month, I joined rural fire brigade crews from across South-East Queensland and Northern New South Wales as part of their annual training exercise in anticipation of the bushfire season. More than 150 dedicated Rural Fire Service volunteers ran through five different response scenarios, practising important procedures for responding to emergency situations in our local area. As part of the day, I was proud to officially hand over the keys to the new dual-cab Mudgeeraba 52 fire truck, which will support our local crew for many years to come. As always, I would like to take the opportunity to thank and acknowledge the tireless volunteers in my local rural fire brigades at Mudgeeraba, Bonogin, Gilston-Advancetown, Lower Beechmont, Beechmont, Clagiraba, Numinbah Valley, Springbrook and Tallebudgera Valley who serve our community diligently and generously.

Speaking of the Mudgeeraba Rural Fire Brigade, I was pleased to see the long-awaited new fire-risk sign at the bottom of Monaro Road in Mudgeeraba. After Labor removed our old sign and left our community waiting for more than 12 months, the Crisafulli LNP government has delivered with a state-of-the-art electronic fire-risk sign now displayed. It is clear that, after a decade of decline across Queensland under the former Labor government, we have spent the past 10 months delivering for Queenslanders and the Mudgeeraba electorate has benefited.

Ipswich West Electorate, Railway History



Ms BOURNE (Ipswich West—ALP) (11.11 pm): Ipswich West has a proud and rich railway history that remains close to the hearts of many in the community. It is no surprise that people love seeing trains from days gone by as they remind us of Queensland's pioneering spirit. Recently, along with the Deputy Speaker, I had the privilege of attending the 160th anniversary of the first train to leave Ipswich in 1865.

In partnership with the Australian Railway Historical Society, a special steam train travelled from the North Ipswich rail yards to Queensland's first railway station at Grandchester, formerly known as Bigge's Camp. The Australian Railway Historical Society, ably led by the Queensland division president, Mr Steve Lamprecht, is a dedicated group of volunteers committed to preserving our railway heritage. I congratulate them all for their tireless work.

The North Ipswich Railway Workshops, established in 1864, were Queensland's first railway workshops and an essential part of the state's first railway line from Ipswich to the Darling Downs. The line from Ipswich to Grandchester opened in 1865 and was expanded by 1885. These workshops sit within my electorate and are a vital part of our history.

Recently I advised the government on why the community strongly opposes any sale of this historic land to developers. This site represents more than railway history; it carries deep war time significance as well. In 1915 workshop employees gathered to honour the 300 men who left to serve in World War I. Sadly, 28 of those men were killed, with more dying in service. The Ipswich Railway Workshops War Memorial, unveiled in 1919, stands as a lasting tribute to their sacrifice.

The workshops also created a unique community and workplace culture. Workers took pride in their environment, establishing cooperative ventures, sporting clubs and even personal gardens, turning an industrial site into a place of belonging. Preserving this history is vital. The Queensland Museum currently manages the front part of the site, while Queensland Rail continues to operate behind it. This remains the oldest continuously operating railway workshop in Australia. Ipswich's railway legacy is a treasure we must protect. I urge the government to honour and safeguard this heritage for generations to come.

Burleigh Electorate, Parking Fees



Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (11.46 pm): Behind closed doors and without community consultation, the Gold Coast City council resolved to increase parking fees in Burleigh Heads. They did so at the very worst possible time. At a time when the council should be providing relief to businesses already struggling through the disruption of light rail construction, they instead hammered their

customers. The fallout has been significant. Visitors are threatening to boycott Burleigh, taking with them the spending that sustains local jobs and supports our vibrant village atmosphere.

It is not just the increase in charges up to 50 per cent; council has also extended regulated hours. What was once nine to five is now 7 am to 7 pm—a shameless cash grab, a direct tax on our coastal lifestyle. Council has put a price on a morning surf and a walk along the beach. Very few things in this life are free, but they have seen fit to snatch even these simple joys from locals. The consequences of these changes are real and the community is speaking up.

I thank Reverend Ralph Mayhew from Burleigh Village Church for speaking up for his elderly parishioners. I acknowledge the parishioners of Infant Saviour Catholic Church. There, the 80 to 100 parishioners at the 7 am Sunday mass are being slugged a fee to park. I raise these examples to refute denials made in council chambers yesterday, denials that these church services were even occurring. Those denials diminish the voices of locals, the vulnerable and the faith community. I say: these people matter and local businesses matter. They count. They deserve to be consulted before council makes decisions that upend their lives.

There is hope. Working together with locals like Linda Robson, Kellie Shotton and Sarah-Jane Green, I launched a petition to demand a review with consultation and propose a simple '30 minutes free' parking model to bring back the locals. I thank Councillor Josh Martin and Councillor Dan Doran, who opposed these changes from the very start and who have supported the tabling of the petition. I extend an olive branch to those councillors who voted for those changes, dismissed the petition or declared that there would be no change before the petition was even tabled. They now have an opportunity to stop, to rethink and to do the right thing.

I acknowledge that changing one's mind is never easy, but they can do so knowing their communities will have their backs, despite any pressure they may feel. Constituents will respect councillors who listen, who admit when a mistake has been made and who put people before revenue. This lifestyle tax should never have gone through. Burleigh deserves better, and let's hope compassion and common sense prevail. They say local government is closest to the people. The people are speaking and it is time to listen.

Griffith University, Mount Gravatt Campus



Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (11.49 pm): I rise this evening to speak about an issue of concern in the Mansfield electorate—the uncertain future of the Griffith University Mount Gravatt campus, including Yarranlea Primary School and the much-loved aquatic and sporting facilities. The David Crisafulli LNP government has failed to provide any certainty for this state owned land. Griffith University is vacating the site and returning it to the state. Allowing the closure of these community facilities without a plan is short-sighted.

Yarranlea Primary School holds a lease until 2034. Families enrolling their children in 2026 rightly expect they can complete their education there, yet the government has refused to give them that assurance. That uncertainty is unfair and distressing for local families. It was the former Newman-Crisafulli LNP government that first closed Yarranlea State School in 2013 as part of their savage program of cuts to Queensland schools. Today, under David Crisafulli, history is at risk of repeating itself.


By contrast, the former Miles Labor government stood with Yarranlea. The former deputy premier confirmed that Labor would guarantee Yarranlea's right to remain until 2034, work with the school on a longer term tenure and ensure they had a say in the future of the site. In contrast, this government have ignored parents, they have ignored teachers and they have ignored thousands of families who rely on the pools and sporting facilities at Mount Gravatt. The community is looking for reassurance.

I have fought hard for local families. I have written multiple times to the Minister for Natural Resources requesting he guarantee Yarranlea's secure tenure, protect their outside school hours care and safeguard the sporting and aquatic facilities. I have also written to the sports minister calling for a plan to keep the pools open for school carnivals, swim squads and learn-to-swim programs. I have met with Griffith University and Yarranlea to discuss solutions. Parents and Yarranlea's chair of the board have even written directly to the Premier, David Crisafulli, demanding urgent action—and I table that letter—yet they have not received a clear response.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 August 2025, from Board Chairperson, Yarranlea Limited, Yarranlea Primary School and Outside School Hours Care (OSHC), Ms Adrienne Innes to the Premier and Minister for Veterans, Hon. David Crisafulli regarding use by the school and OSHC at Griffith University's former Mount Gravatt campus [1144].

I am urging the government to stop dragging their feet, guarantee Yarranlea's future and secure an operator for the aquatic and sporting facilities. This is about protecting local jobs and ensuring school choice for local families. I will continue to fight for Yarranlea, for our sporting clubs and for every family in the Mansfield electorate until this LNP government stops failing the Mansfield community.

Parliamentary Friends of Road Safety

 **Mr FIELD** (Capalaba—LNP) (11.52 pm): I rise this evening to speak on the Parliamentary Friends of Road Safety launch this afternoon with Transurban. It is a privilege to co-chair this group with the member for Mount Ommaney. Together, we share the belief that road safety is an issue that rises above politics. It is not about one side of the chamber or the other; it is about saving lives and protecting families. That is why it was wonderful to see many members of this House attend the function this afternoon to speak with stakeholders about the work they are doing in their communities across Queensland and the nation.


Mr Deputy Speaker Krause, as you are aware, this issue is deeply personal to me. My family's lives were forever changed when my son Matt, his partner Kate, and my unborn grandson Miles were tragically killed by an out-of-control teen offender. Our loss will always stay with us, as will the loss for every family who has had a loved one taken from them.

Driving is something many of us take for granted, but it is also one of the greatest responsibilities we carry each day. Each time we get behind the wheel, we owe it not just to ourselves and our loved ones to get home safely but also to every other road user—drivers, cyclists and pedestrians alike. Last year, 302 people were killed on our roads and thousands more were seriously injured. That is why the theme of this year's Road Safety Week—'We're one team, Queensland'—is so important: because no matter who we are, where we come from or what role we play in society, we all share the same roads. When we remember that, we drive with more patience, we take that extra moment to slow down, we reconsider sending that text message while on the road and we make choices that protect life rather than endanger it.

This parliamentary friends group is about fostering that culture of responsibility and care. It is about supporting the advocates, the experts and the organisations which are leading the way in keeping our roads safe. It is about making sure that here in parliament we listen, learn and work together to reduce harm and save lives.

That is why I am sure it is welcome news that the government has announced almost \$7 million to install and maintain flashing school zone signs across 100 high-risk school zones to keep Queensland kids safe, along with an investment to improve roads across our state's rural and regional communities. It is up to everyone who gets behind a wheel to stop, think and understand that the decisions they are about to make may change their lives forever.

Education, Future Schools

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (11.54 pm): The rolling teachers' strikes in Queensland are not a surprise to anyone with continuing conditions that are unacceptable, including the violence in our schools. Over the years, I have raised the issues brought to me by our fabulous teachers, principals and students, including the increasing use of anti-anxiety medication to get through the day, as well as potential solutions through simple, innovative approaches.


In 2019 in Noosa we hosted Pasi Stahlberg, then of the Gonski Institute and now at the University of Melbourne, and Peter Hutton, one of the founders of Future Schools. They shared models that delivered comparable academic results with far less stress on everyone. This included Peter's experience when he was principal of a state school, Templestowe College in Victoria, where they utilised a loophole to deviate from the state curriculum to provide individualised learning programs for the benefit of all students. The school grew from 250 to 1,250 students and is a working example of how you can customise learning, reduce disengagement and improve outcomes and teacher conditions without segregating students. In 2023, they were awarded the Australian Secondary School of the Year.

With waitlists for flexi schools and alternate forms of education continuing, it may be years before we have enough of these. With parental consent required, often the children who need individualised programs the most are not given permission. The comprehensive review of school resourcing, conducted by the Department of Education, raised the need to ensure that each of the nearly 600,000 Queensland state school students has the resources to succeed. However, they also need learning customised to them, which is possible by tweaking the current system as demonstrated by Templestowe. A by-product reported of Future Schools is better behaviours and increased

responsibility by students and more time for teachers to do those endless administrative tasks—even marking papers in paid time versus after-hours; the better conditions they are seeking.

As Peter said, we can make small, effective changes starting on Monday. Broader reforms to avoid using loopholes to develop individualised learning require us to focus on what is sought—that is, happy, healthy and engaged teachers and students in a system that is inclusive of learning diversity. Not everyone wants to go to higher education; they seek pathways to their future. I express gratitude to my schools, which are doing great work in this space. That includes Sunshine Beach high, where certificate I construction students are building tiny homes for our most vulnerable, and Noosa district high's FlexiSpace for students to follow their identified passions, including to become jillaroos, Michelin chefs or even a future prime minister. Please support our teachers and students by moving into the future and not bandaiding outdated systems.

Toowoomba North Electorate; Crisafulli LNP Government, Achievements

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (11.57 pm): This week we saw the *Courier-Mail* bring the Bush Summit to Toowoomba. It was a great event and it was fantastic that the Treasurer was there. For 10 years under Labor we have seen a decline. Toowoomba has been under a lot of pressure with its water supply. The previous government would give nothing to them. This Treasurer has given \$54 million, 20 per cent of the project, to make sure our water supply is secure going forward. That was a really good announcement for the people of Toowoomba. They can have some surety that it will now be secure.

Importantly, there is also a pumped hydro aspect to this. All of the on-roof solar we have in Toowoomba will now have a battery developed for it with the pumped hydro project as part of this dam upgrade. After 10 years of the decline we saw under Labor, this government has delivered 20 per cent of this project in 10 months. That is a really great outcome.

Another project I have been fighting for for a long time is a tartan track in Toowoomba, but under 10 years of the previous Labor government we have seen absolutely nothing happen. The fact of the matter is that the athletes of Toowoomba have to leave town to compete. We have had plenty of people go to the Commonwealth Games and the Olympics, but there has been no facility in Toowoomba. In partnership with UniSQ and the Crisafulli government—in 10 months there is action straightaway; we are on it—there will be money injected for a tartan track to be built at UniSQ. We hope that council will come onboard and support that, because we really want this facility to be open to everyone.

Having it based where sports science and sports psychology are taught and being able to enhance an athlete's performance going forward with a top quality track will be fantastic for Toowoomba. In the lead-up to the Olympics, something else that is really important is that I believe this will be the highest altitude track in Australia. This means that, if you are trying to get a fast time, this will be the place you want to come and compete. I am looking forward to not only getting it built but also seeing some fantastic competition being held in Toowoomba in the lead-up to the Olympics. Our best sprinters, best runners and best athletes will go there to compete at this facility.

That is what 10 months of action under a Crisafulli government can achieve after 10 years of absolutely nothing happening under the former state government. The only thing they managed to do in 10 years was take the money we had provided for the range crossing, build it, close it, and then we had to repair it. In 10 months we have had that repair done and the road is now back fully open. I look forward to the next 10 months of delivery by the Crisafulli government in Toowoomba and the Darling Downs.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 12.01 am (Thursday).

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dametto, de Brenni, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Head, Healy, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Perrett,

Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Sullivan, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young