ISSN 1322-0330

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

Tuesday, 16 September 2025

Subject — Page

PT WEIR
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

JM MATHERS
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

TUESDAY, 16 SEPTEMBER 2025

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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.

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

The Honourable P. Weir MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

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

Date of assent: 4 September 2025

A bill for an Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for the Legislative Assembly and parliamentary service for the financial years starting 1 July 2025 and 1 July 2026

A bill for an Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for departments for the financial years starting 1 July 2025 and 1 July 2026

A bill for an Act to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, the Evidence Act 1977, the Explosives Act 1999, the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008, the Forensic Science Queensland Act 2024, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008, the Weapons Act 1990 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Nature Conservation Act 1992 for particular purposes

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

Yours sincerely

Governor

4 September 2025

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 September 2025, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 4 September 2025 [1226].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Absence of Member

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Keppel that he will be absent from the House from 16 to 18 September, inclusive of those dates. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

Papua New Guinea, Anniversary of Independence

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, today we honour Papua New Guinea's 50 years of independence, united in spirit and celebration. Since 2007, the Queensland and Papua New Guinea parliaments have participated in a twinning partnership under the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association's Pacific Partnership Program. This twinning relationship has provided support for strengthening our parliamentary institutions and the capacity of our parliaments as legislative bodies. Not only is PNG our twin, it is also our neighbour and friend. Today's anniversary provides an opportunity to reflect on and commemorate our shared history and ongoing connection.

Members of Parliament; Languages Other Than English

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, members of parliament are entrusted with the important role of advocating for the many diverse communities within Queensland and to serve as positive role models. As Speaker of the House, I aim to empower all members to voice the views of their constituents whilst also maintaining the highest standards for the contributions made by all members within the parliament.

Whilst English is the official language of the Queensland parliament, there are many precedents of contributions to debate being in another language. However, I need to emphasise to all members that it is the practice of members intending to speak in a language other than English to advise the Speaker prior to making the contribution in the House and to additionally provide a translation so the Speaker is aware of what is being said and thus able to ensure that what is being said is in order.

I have received correspondence from the Leader of the House about the member for Sandgate's contribution in a language other than English during the adjournment debate on 28 August 2025. I am informed that the member did provide to the parliamentary attendants a piece of paper with a translation which was taken to Hansard and later that evening a translation was also forwarded to me which has been verified. I accept that the failure to provide a translation to the Speaker in advance of the contribution was a matter of privilege suddenly arising. I understand the legitimate apprehension held by members in the circumstances. However, I do not intend to take further action in respect of the matter, except to treat it as an opportunity to educate all members about the appropriate practice moving forward. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to the member for Sandgate, Ms Bisma Asif MP, speaking in a language other than English [1227].

Visitors to Public Gallery

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by Dr Rachel Carling, former member of the Victorian state parliament.

I also wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Stanwell State School in the electorate of Mirani and the YMCA junior campus in the electorate of Redlands.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, sponsored and lodged by the Clerk—

Barron and Mitchell Rivers, Saltwater Crocodiles

4,728 petitioners, requesting the House to enact legislation to remove salt water crocodiles from the Barron and Mitchell Rivers and any other fresh water rivers and streams [1216] [1217].

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

Savannahlander, Repairs

Mr Katter, from 9,371 petitioners, requesting the House to urgently ensure the repair of the Savannahlander rail line to full operation [1218].

Alfie's Table, Queensland Landmark

Mr Miles, from 603 petitioners, requesting the House to recognise the cultural significance of 'Alfie's Table' and declare it a Queensland Landmark [1219].

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

Homelessness

5,022 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that the government declare a state of emergency for people experiencing homelessness, and deploy all appropriate measures to provide shelter and support [1220].

Mount Nebo Road

417 petitioners, requesting the House to return the Mount Nebo Road to main road status [1221].

Land Valuation

1,583 petitioners, requesting the House to review land valuations and the land tax thresholds that are resulting in increased taxation and increased rental costs [1222].

South Kolan, Police Station

672 petitioners, requesting the House to increase the number of police officers and administration staff for the South Kolan Police station [1223].

Vaccination, Members of Parliament

791 petitioners, requesting the House to require all members to declare if they have or have not been fully vaccinated against COVID-19 and against this year's flu strains [1224].

Circumcision

622 petitioners, requesting the House to add male circumcision for children to the Queensland Criminal Code Act 1899, section 323A [1225].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

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

29 August 2025—

1168 Community Protection and Public Child Sex Offender Register (Daniel's Law) Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights: Erratum

1169 Public Report of Ministerial Expenses for the period 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025

1170 Public Report of Office Expenses for the Office of the Leader of the Opposition for the period 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025

1171 Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report 7, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 5 March 2025 and 24 June 2025

1172 Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2024 to 25 November 2024

1173 Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 26 November 2024 to 30 June 2025

1174 Right to Information and Information Privacy—Annual Report 2023-2024

2 September—

1175 Queensland Government: Queensland: State of the Environment 2024—Summary

3 September—

1176 Queensland Government: Queensland Multicultural Policy: Third Progress Report 2022-23 to 2023-24

5 September—

1177 Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 13, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 June 2025 and 28 July 2025

1178 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 14, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 20 May 2025 and 24 June 2025

1179 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 15, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Office of the Information Commissioner

1180 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 16, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Queensland Child and Family Commission

1181 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 17, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Office of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner

1182 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 18, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Queensland Ombudsman

11 September—

1183 Response from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Hon. Purdie), to an ePetition (4226-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 35 petitioners, requesting the House to ban dash cams from being used or sold in the state of Queensland

12 September—

1184 Consolidated Fund Financial Report 2024-25

1185 Queensland Treasury Holdings Pty Ltd—Consolidated Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2025

1186 Brisbane Port Holdings Pty Ltd—Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2025

1187 DBCT Holdings Pty Ltd—Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2025

1188 Queensland Lottery Corporation Pty Ltd—Financial Report for the year ended 30 June 2025

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Magistrates Courts Act 1921:

1189 Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2025, No. 111

1190 Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2025, No. 111, explanatory notes

1191 Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2025, No. 111, human rights certificate

Acts Interpretation Act 1954, Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2017, Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Act 2014:

1192 Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Regulation 2025, No. 112

1193 Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Regulation 2025, No. 112, explanatory notes

1194 Education (Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority) Regulation 2025, No. 112, human rights certificate

Education (Capital Assistance) Act 1993:

1195 Education (Capital Assistance) Regulation 2025, No. 113

1196 Education (Capital Assistance) Regulation 2025, No. 113, explanatory notes

1197 Education (Capital Assistance) Regulation 2025, No. 113, human rights certificate

Queensland Community Safety Act 2024:

1198 Queensland Community Safety (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 114

1199 Queensland Community Safety (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 114, explanatory notes

1200 Queensland Community Safety (Postponement) Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 114, human rights certificate

Statutory Instruments Act 1992:

1201 Statutory Instruments (Exemptions from Expiry) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 115

1202 Statutory Instruments (Exemptions from Expiry) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 115, explanatory notes

1203 Statutory Instruments (Exemptions from Expiry) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 115, human rights certificate

Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003:

1204 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2025, No. 116

1205 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2025, No. 116, explanatory notes

1206 Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Regulation 2025, No. 116, human rights certificate

Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2024:

1207 Assisted Reproductive Technology (Postponement) Regulation 2025, No. 117

1208 Assisted Reproductive Technology (Postponement) Regulation 2025, No. 117, explanatory notes

1209 Assisted Reproductive Technology (Postponement) Regulation 2025, No. 117, human rights certificate

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Act 2024:

1210 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 118

1211 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 118, explanatory notes

1212 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 118, human rights certificate

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Act 2003:

1213 Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 119

1214 Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 119, explanatory notes

1215 Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 119, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Community Safety

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.37am): Our government is committed to restoring safety where you live. A decade of decline under Labor left behind a youth crime crisis. Under Labor, offenders were taught there were no consequences for their actions. Our government is delivering for victims of crime.

We made Adult Crime, Adult Time law by Christmas, but we have not stopped there. We said we would continue to do everything we could to see fewer victims of crime in Queensland. We are delivering on that promise. In North and Far North Queensland, we have delivered an unprecedented boost to police resources. We have put more boots on the ground with the State Flying Squad joining local police to take down serious repeat offenders in Townsville and Cairns. It is one of the largest crime crackdowns ever in this part of the state. Hundreds of offenders have been arrested, with officers also completing additional patrols, bail checks and weapons searches. As part of that work, officers have arrested 27 serious repeat offenders. One in five of the serious repeat offenders in the region have now been arrested—one in five.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I take the interjection from the member for Cairns and welcome him still there in that role. Among them are some of our state's worst teen offenders, facing charges for dozens of alleged crimes. These repeat offenders will now face serious consequences under our Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. After a decade of weak laws and fewer police resources under Labor, we are giving our police what they need to restore safety where you live.

Trade Mission, Japan and India

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.39 am): I recently returned from a trade mission to India and Japan. We want the world to know that Queensland is open for business. After a decade of decline under Labor, it is critical that we strengthen our relationships with partners like India and Japan. Trade, tourism and training were at the forefront of this mission. In India, Taste of Queensland Week promoted our produce and celebrated the partnerships between Queensland and Indian companies. The Study Queensland Education Showcase explored how we can share our skills with India and promoted the opportunity for students to study in Queensland.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am not sure why the member for Logan is not passionate about India and Japan. I am unsure why he would be interjecting when we are talking about our important trade partners.

Mr McCallum interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, I caution you. Premier, would you come back to your ministerial statement, please.

Mr CRISAFULLI: In Japan, we reinforced the importance of our resources and critical minerals industries to deliver jobs for Queensland. The trade mission also gave us the chance to emphasise our ambition to host the Quad Leaders' Summit. Hosting the Quad would bring leaders from the United States, India and Japan to our great state and to promote all that we are doing at the moment. On the runway to the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, there are opportunities right across the state. We must take advantage of this unique opportunity to maximise investment in Queensland. Our government is committed to promoting Queensland as a go-to destination for investment and supporting businesses from the regions to the cities. The visit was also an opportunity to thank two nations whose diaspora play a vital role in the identity of our state. Our industries, our businesses and our communities have all benefited from the migrant story. In Queensland, that diversity is our strength.

Illicit Smoking Products

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (9.41 am): Healing Labor's health crisis and cracking down on crime are key components of the LNP Crisafulli government's actions, and have been for the last 10 months. After a decade of decline under Labor, Queensland Health is now taking strong action to shut illegal chop-chop shops for three months. Landlords will be empowered to kick out dodgy tenants who are caught selling illicit tobacco and vapes.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We are off to a bad start. We are going to start on a warning list very early, I can tell.

Mr NICHOLLS: These new powers in the dismantling illegal trade bill will be introduced later today and are the latest instalment in the Crisafulli government's nation-leading crackdown on this dangerous black market. Queenslanders know that under Labor those illegal operators were allowed to flourish, operating in main streets and strip shops the length and breadth of the state. Hundreds of illegal stores operated in plain sight, selling dangerous and addictive products to our kids; in effect, dealing death under those opposite. As a result the vaping rate—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to your ruling in respect of ministerial statements. On 24 June this year, you instructed the House that ministerial statements should be temperate in language. I submit to you that the health minister's language is not in accordance with your ruling. I would ask you to rule whether or not he is acting in accordance with standing order 62.

Mr SPEAKER: In regard to the point of order, I have listened to the Minister intently. He is talking to matters that are directly under his portfolio in his statement so, Minister, you have the call.

Mr NICHOLLS: Hundreds of illegal stores operated in plain sight selling dangerous and addictive products to our kids. As a result, the vaping rate amongst Queensland's high-schoolers tripled and honest, small and family businesses suffered while the crooks cheated the system right under their very noses.

Under Labor's existing laws, Queensland Health enforcement officers are only able to shut down illegal stores for three days—no more than a mild inconvenience—a long weekend for those illegal operators and criminals. Under our new laws this will increase to three months, significantly disrupting operations and profit generation.

We are also supporting honest landlords by giving them clear statutory powers to terminate a lease when their tenant is stocking and selling illegal tobacco and vapes. However, not every landlord acts in good faith. Those who are part of this criminal network, or those who choose to turn a blind eye, will face new criminal and civil penalties with prison terms of up to a year and fines of over $800,000.

The Crisafulli government's crackdown on illegal chop-chop shops has been welcomed by the very landlords dealing with the legacy of Labor's failures. The CEO of the Shopping Centre Council of Australia said that the new laws are 'strong, clear and will give landlords the backing and protections they need'. He also went on to say, 'These laws will be a model for other jurisdictions.' Cancer Council Queensland have said, 'These reforms are essential to safeguard decades of progress and tobacco control and ensure stronger protections for Queensland communities.'

It is time to stop the game of Whac-A-Mole and start cutting illegal chop-chop shops off at the knees. That is what these new laws will do. We are pulling out all the stops to help keep our kids safe and to support honest business operators. We are hitting illegal sellers harder and closing them for longer. When they get a closure notice, closed means closed. We are empowering honest landlords to give them the boot and we will punish those landlords who do not. This is about shutting down the illegal tobacco racket which has put our kids at risk for far too long. This is about delivering for Queensland.

Trade Mission, United Kingdom, Switzerland and France

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.46 am): The Crisafulli government is restoring Queensland's reputation on the world stage as a place that encourages investment with both our longstanding allies and friends, as well as exploring new opportunities to deliver more jobs and secure a great future for our great state. I am happy to report that late on Sunday night I returned from a trade mission to the United Kingdom, Switzerland and France, having spent 11 days advancing Queensland's key economic, defence and infrastructure interests abroad.

It was a great pleasure to be invited to address the Australian British Chamber of Commerce at the Defence Catalyst in London, a multiday symposium which brought together many of the leading voices in the defence industry and government from across Australia and the United Kingdom. The eminent speakers included the current and former secretaries of state for defence, senior Ministry of Defence civil servants in the UK, business leaders and also the Western Australian defence industry

minister and South Australian treasurer. It was clear that, by the presence of the Australian states at the Defence Catalyst—something noted by many of the attendees—that we are looking to play a much more hands-on role when it comes to defence investment and procurement, particularly with the opportunities arising from AUKUS Pillar 2.

I was pleased to advocate on behalf of the Queensland government and also to spruik the government's landmark $180.6 million Sovereign Industry Development Fund which is designed to advance our sovereign manufacturing capabilities by encouraging investment in the defence industry, biomedicine and biofuels. I was also pleased to attend the Team Australia stand at the Defence and Security Equipment International—DSEI—exhibition in Excel, London attended by over 45,000 industry and government representatives from more than 95 countries. I am reliably informed it is the first time the Queensland government has sent a minister to the DSEI. There were more than 50 personnel from 29 Queensland businesses represented at DSEI, demonstrating the significant impact our state is making in keeping the world safe through strength. Meetings in the UK also included fantastic engagements with ministers in the Starmer government, including Lord Peter Hendy, the Minister of State for Transport, and Ms Stephanie Peacock, the Minister for Sport, Tourism, Civil Society and Youth.

I was particularly honoured to present a copy of the 2032 Delivery Plan to Minister Peacock on a tour of the London Stadium in Stratford, a great example of legacy infrastructure coming as a result of investment for the games, London having hosted them in 2012. It was great to see the significant housing investment and urban renewal on a site that prior to the games was brownfield. It was a dumping ground for refrigerators but is now an urban community with housing, restaurants and homes for Londoners and it is a great legacy for the host city.

I also pay tribute to Sir Hugh Robertson, who served as minister responsible for the games in 2012 and who is currently an IOC member, as well as Lord Colin Moynihan and Lord Hugo Swire. They were all very generous with their time and provided extraordinary insights into the delivery of the games and the creation of legacy for their great city.

Mrs Frecklington: Did they make you a lord?

Mr BLEIJIE: I am not taking the interjections from my honourable colleagues behind me. The Olympic and Paralympic Games was a key component of this trip, so I was particularly delighted to accept an invitation to Lausanne, Switzerland from the International Olympic Committee to provide an update on the progress of the implementation of the Crisafulli government's 2032 Delivery Plan. I have to say there is excitement all around the world about how far the games and the legacy have progressed under this government in a short 10 months of delivery compared to 10 years of decline and decay under the former mob. It is fair to say that the IOC, including President Kirsty Coventry, were pleased to hear about the significant milestones, and we have lots more announcements about legacy coming. I made clear our government's commitment to rowing in Rockhampton directly to the head of World Rowing, Jean-Christophe Rolland, and also presented President Coventry with a copy of the new intergovernmental agreement signed by Minister Catherine King and me.

I also visited Paris, France, which most recently hosted the games in 2024, with much of their infrastructure currently transitioning into legacy mode, including their athletes villages and the Adidas stadium, both of which I visited. I was pleased to meet the minister for sport in France who was on the Paris organising committee before being the minister for sport.

Finally, can I acknowledge the significant work of the following individuals and their teams in ensuring the trade mission was a success: His Excellency the Hon. Stephen Smith, Australian High Commissioner to the United Kingdom; Her Excellency Ms Lynette Wood, Australian Ambassador to France; Mr Richard Cowin, UK Consul General to Queensland; Ms Ticky Fullerton, CEO of the Australian British Chamber of Commerce; as well as 'Team Queensland', which included my Deputy Director-General, Ms Leah Kelly; Mr Don Roach AM; and Mr Ross Buchanan, Queensland's Agent-General to the UK and Europe; and Mr Aydan Rusev in my ministerial office, who worked so closely with Minister Bates's TIQ team. I have to say on behalf of the Crisafulli government: Queenslanders can be proud that they have a government that is unafraid to advocate on their behalf on the world stage and that will at every opportunity spread the word that Queensland is now open for business so that we can deliver the best games and the best legacy the world has ever seen.

Energy Roadmap

Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.52 am): The Crisafulli government's five-year Energy Roadmap will deliver affordable, reliable and sustainable power for Queenslanders. The road map that we will deliver on 10

October will set aside the former government's ideological bias and preoccupation with flashy announcements instead of policies with substance. Rather, our plan for Queensland's energy future will be geared towards economics and engineering—towards what works. It will include coal generation for longer, more gas and support for low-cost energy production in wind and solar with more dispatchable supply for firming and storage including gas turbines, pumped hydro and batteries.

Our Energy Roadmap will save thousands of jobs that would have otherwise ended under Labor. It will align with the priorities of Queensland families, businesses and industries, encourage private sector investment and focus on what the state government can deliver. To do so will be a vital enabler of our standard of living and the growth of our state and our economy. To do so successfully, we require a sensible plan. After a decade of decline under Labor, the Crisafulli government is focused on delivering the realistic, achievable and responsible plan for the state's future that Queenslanders voted for. There will be no more announcements without depth and no more undeliverable, unsustainable or underbudgeted pipedreams like Labor's Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro project that blew out from $7 billion to $36.8 billion; or Labor's claim that Borumba pumped hydro was expected to be online by 2030, despite an independent report finding that there would be less than one per cent chance of any power being delivered by that deadline; or the underfunded CopperString project that Labor would never have delivered.

The Crisafulli government's Energy Roadmap will clearly outline our actions for the next five years. Since the election we have been listening to communities and consulting widely with industry stakeholders and peak bodies at our energy round tables, the last of which will be held next week. We have examined the operations of our generators, transmission networks and retailers to ensure they are geared towards delivering Queenslanders the affordable, reliable and sustainable power they need.

The 2025-26 budget allocates more than $5 billion for our state owned energy businesses to invest across the energy supply chain. After Labor's lack of maintenance was exposed by multiple failures at the Callide Power Station, we increased the electricity maintenance guarantee to $1.6 billion over the next five years to ensure our generators are properly maintained. We are making additional investments in storage and firming capacity including $479 million into the Brigalow gas peaker plants. We have also committed a record $2.4 billion towards CopperString to unlock the full value of North and North-West Queensland.

I recently travelled the length of the transmission line, meeting with stakeholders, councillors, suppliers, other local businesses, and regional and remote communities. They are all as keen as we are to move this project forward. The Energy Roadmap will provide more detail as to how we will progress this nation-building project. The road map will provide certainty to industry, communities and investors, delivering a pragmatic approach for Queensland's energy future after a decade of Labor mismanagement.

Training Awards

Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.55 am): The Crisafulli LNP government is restoring confidence in our training sector, backing Queenslanders to build their skills and seize new opportunities. We saw that showcased at Saturday's 2025 Queensland Training Awards state final. The awards celebrate the people powering Queensland's future workforce: our apprentices, trainees, teachers and employers making a real difference. The awards provided a platform to honour the most passionate, innovative and ambitious individuals, employers and organisations in the training sector and I was proud to attend.

I was reminded once again of the transformative power of training, providing purpose and motivation, restoring confidence and providing new opportunities—none more so than Therese Stanton, an exceptional example of someone who has overcome the odds and pursued their passion through training. I first met Therese at the south-east regional final at the Queensland Training Awards back in July. Therese lived many lives before her world was turned upside down by a stroke in her early 50s. Therese trained as a nurse but unfortunately due to her stroke, she never actually got to practise, but Therese did not give up. After a long road to recovery, she returned to study at TAFE Queensland and is now back in scrubs at the age of 62. On Saturday I was pleased to congratulate Therese as Queensland's 2025 Equity Student of the Year. I know that the member for Nanango is very proud of her constituent.

I also want to commend Kayla Gagai and Jessica Bichsel, two outstanding young women who have been named Trainee of the Year and Apprentice of the Year respectively. Kayla is a First Nations woman from Cairns who completed a certificate IV in youth work and is now employed as a full-time

youth worker with the Vocational Partnerships Group. As our Apprentice of the Year, Jessica Bichsel is changing the face of construction. She is using her carpentry skills to construct sets for films, TV and theatre and she is using her voice to mentor and champion women in male dominated trades. Of course, these inspiring individuals only excel with the support of great teachers, trainers, training organisations and employers. The awards also recognise their efforts.

Emerald engineering teacher Andrew Abbas was named VET Teacher or Trainer of the Year and Andrew's employer, CQ University Australia, was recognised as the Large Training Provider of the Year. The Crisafulli LNP government is committed to recruiting more passionate teachers like Andrew through our $2 million TAFE teacher recruitment drive and we want those trainers to teach with the best technology and facilities. That is why the Crisafulli LNP government is investing more than $201 million to build four TAFE centres of excellence across the state, including a new $61.1 million TAFE excellence precinct at CQ University, Rockhampton North campus.

With more than 700 nominations received, I want to congratulate all Queensland Training Award nominees, finalists and winners across all 14 categories. In 2025 the majority of our winners hailed from outside the south-east corner, demonstrating the depth of talent and expertise across all corners of our state. A number of winners will go on to represent Queensland at the 2025 Australian Training Awards to be held in Darwin this December and I wish them all continued success.

Multiculturalism

Hon. FS SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (9.59 am): Queensland is home to proud and diverse people and is built on the enduring values of mateship, democracy, respect and a fair go for all. These are not just words; they are the essence of who we are as Queenslanders and as Australians. Every Queenslander has a right to belong, to be safe and to feel safe. We all come from diverse backgrounds but have a shared future together as Australians where we respect each other's heritage. In Queensland, when people's safety and wellbeing are at risk due to threats and violence, the democratic values of peace, mateship and a fair go must be prioritised. The Australian way is respecting the right to have different faiths and the right to practise those faiths, and the right to hold different political views and the right to practise those views peacefully.

With reference to safety and social cohesion in recent weeks, I want to thank the Queensland police for its quick action and concern for communities that have come under threat. I also have personally met with and spoken to Muslim leaders, Indian leaders, Afghani leaders and Jewish leaders. All of them shared with me their concerns and fears for their communities. All of them are worried for their children. All of them are seeking peace and safety. That is why they came to Queensland. That is why many families came to Queensland—to live in peace and to thrive. As Premier Crisafulli has previously said, we are better because of people who have come here and become Aussies.

Queenslanders are good neighbours. We are good at helping others in hard times. We must not lose sight of that. We need to be aware of the propaganda being spread on social media. Free speech comes with the freedom to talk and the responsibility to listen. However, it is not a freedom to spread hatred or incite ethnic, religious or political violence. Hate speech and bigotry are being normalised on social media and young people in particular are at risk of being saturated by extremist propaganda from across the spectrum. In a recent article in the *Australian*, Chloe Shorten, Chair of the Centre for Digital Wellbeing, pointed out that it takes only seven minutes for a child to find extreme content on YouTube, no matter the original search platform.

Building social cohesion is a responsibility we all share, and that is why we have two important grant schemes under the Crisafulli government in my multiculturalism portfolio that will soon be released with practical tools to help strengthen the work of communities to build these bridges of social cohesion. Social cohesion is not just a phrase; it is the safeguard of our democracy and preservation of the Australian way of life.

Youth Justice

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.02 am): The Crisafulli government is committed to restoring safety where you live. Queenslanders should feel safe in their homes, where they work and in their communities, and that is why our government has hit the ground running in delivering our comprehensive plan to fix Labor's youth crime crisis and reduce the number of victims of crime in this state. Alongside our stronger

laws, we are delivering Gold Standard Early Intervention and intensive rehabilitation and crime prevention programs, and I am really proud to update the House today that we are delivering on our commitment to boost early intervention investment with the first $10 million of the $50 million Kickstarter grants rolling out the door. These grants provide up to $300,000 to Gold Standard Early Intervention programs that are delivering education, life skills and support for youths to divert them from a life of crime. The Kickstarter program is part of the Crisafulli government's $115 million commitment to deliver Gold Standard Early Intervention programs right across the state. These programs are tailored to meet the needs of local communities right across the state and prevent crime before it starts. They are working with youth demonstrating early signs of criminal behaviour, providing holistic intervention to put them back on the right path.

I want to talk about some of those programs that we have recently announced and in particular those in Townsville. I was in Townsville last week with the incredible members for the Townsville region—the members for Mundingburra, Thuringowa and Townsville—where we have rolled out $670,000 worth of early intervention investment. There are three new Kickstarter programs across the region—Townsville Fire, Silver Lining Foundation and NQ Ummah Care. These programs will provide the region of Townsville with the Gold Standard Early Intervention that we promised.

The second round of the Crisafulli government's Kickstarter grants closed just last week, and that is not all: our proven initiatives, which are part of the Crisafulli government's Gold Standard Early Intervention program, allow for Gold Standard Early Intervention organisations that are meeting the proven key performance indicators of reducing crime, re-engaging in education or training or, where appropriate, a job and engagement in the community, to apply to receive ongoing funding for the great work they are delivering. Expressions of interest are now open for proven initiatives as part of the Crisafulli government's early intervention initiative, and they close on 20 October 2025. This is yet another step towards delivering safety where you live and our commitment to Queenslanders for fewer victims of crime. Our Making Queensland Safer plan will put youth back on the right track and deliver fewer victims of crime in this state after a decade of decline under the Labor government.

Forensic Services

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (10.05 am): I am proud to be part of the Crisafulli government that is fully committed to fixing Labor's DNA debacle. We know that Labor prioritised demountables over DNA testing, leaving victims unsupported and without answers. As we know, justice delayed is justice denied. As an incoming government, we acted quickly and were determined to ensure the needs of Queensland victims were at the forefront of our decision-making.

To clear Labor's huge testing backlogs, we have implemented an unprecedented $50 million two-year program to outsource thousands of Queensland DNA samples to Bode Technology, a world-class forensic lab in the United States. Bode Technology has provided forensic testing across the United States for more than 25 years and has the capacity and technology to process our thousand major crime samples and 175 sexual assault kits per month. I am pleased to confirm that the first shipment of 171 samples has been sent to Bode Technology, with larger shipments to commence in the coming week.

FSQ Director Mick Fuller and I got to see the facility firsthand in the United States last week when we met with the CEO of Bode Technology, Mr Mike Cariola, and his leadership team. Bode is the largest private DNA laboratory in the United States with a strong history of working with over 400 law enforcement agencies worldwide. Bode tested tens of thousands of DNA samples from the 9/11 attacks, which shows how trusted it is by the American public. After seeing the processes and technologies at the lab, we have every confidence that this outsourcing will help clear Queensland's backlogs and finalise the cases with confidence.

While in the US we also met with and visited the leadership group at the Virginia Department of Forensic Science in Richmond. We got to see how a state-run lab can deliver both timeliness and transparency while maintaining scientific rigour. Its culture of accountability provided a strong contrast to the dysfunction that we had inherited from Labor. The FBI lab at the Quantico marine base is one of the largest and most advanced crime labs in the world. We had the honour of touring its operations and to see the discipline with which it conducts its work, underscoring the standards we should be aspiring to here in Queensland. With the learnings we have gained, we are focused on rebuilding FSQ and I look forward to delivering these critical reforms for our justice system. Restoring trust in our scientific

services and justice system is vital to ensuring victims get the support they need and access to the justice they deserve. We are committed to placing victims at the centre of our justice system—something Labor failed to do in its decade of decline.

Youth Crime

Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.09 am): After a decade of decline, the Crisafulli government is delivering for Queensland. We are delivering safer communities by delivering on our commitment to give police the laws and resources they need to turn the tide on the youth crime crisis created by those opposite. I am pleased to provide an update to the House on the largest, most unrelenting crime crackdowns ever conducted in Cairns and Townsville. The locally-led, strategic, protracted, targeted policing activities have resulted in almost 1,100 offenders being charged with more than 3½ thousand offences—and we are not done yet. Criminals have been put on notice, especially those young criminals who are causing the most harm to our community. In total, 27 serious repeat youth offenders have been arrested on 232 charges across both districts. They are not kids who have simply made a mistake or just stolen a Kit Kat, these are the worst of the worst, including 19 serious repeat offenders in Far North Queensland on 156 charges and eight serious repeat offenders in North Queensland on 76 charges.

One of Queensland's most wanted youth criminals is now behind bars: a teenager who has been charged with almost 50 offences. Police allege he is responsible for a wave of home break-ins and car thefts. He is now facing tough new penalties under Adult Crime, Adult Time legislation introduced by the Crisafulli government. Another offender in Townsville was charged with 12 offences committed across four suburbs. These serious repeat offenders place the most demand on police, not to mention the impact they have on communities and individuals they target. The high cost, both financially and psychologically, can take years to recover, if at all. That is why police, during this surge, have made it a priority to target these individuals. Every time one of these repeat offenders is taken off the streets the entire community benefits. It means fewer stolen cars tearing through our neighbourhoods, fewer families waking up to find their homes broken into and fewer businesses forced to clean up after yet another crime. These arrests are not about statistics, they are about people: parents, children and the elderly who simply want to be safe in their communities. Our police should be congratulated on the critical work they have been undertaking. However, the job is not done. While those opposite hope and pray crime will rise, we will continue to act.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I rose to a point of order previously this morning with respect to your ruling around ministerial statements and referred to your instructions to the House that they be temperate in terms of his language. I submit to you that the Minister for Police is not observing or acting consistent with your ruling in terms of his language. I ask you to remind him of his obligations to not be in contempt of your rulings.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, it is a ministerial statement so I would remind you to keep your language temperate.

Mr PURDIE: The job is not done. We are seeing that consequences for actions and harsh penalties are acting as a strong deterrent to criminal activity. Every resident deserves the right to feel safe in their home and secure in their community. That is the most basic expectation of government and policing, and we are delivering. Police will continue to work relentlessly, both on the street and behind the scenes, to ensure those who cause the most harm are held responsible. Community safety is not negotiable and our commitment is clear: we will do what it takes to restore peace and security to our streets.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that we have in the gallery a number of members of the Rural Fire Service. I welcome them here today.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.13 am.

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr MILES (10.13 am): My question is to the Premier. Given the Premier's refusal to categorically support his Minister for Youth Justice at a press conference yesterday, I ask: does the Premier have confidence in the Minister for Youth Justice?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to unpack a few things for the Leader of the Opposition. Integrity matters to me and it matters to this House.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: The reason it matters to me is—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I just called for order.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The reason it matters to me is that I saw the results of what happens when it does not matter.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: For 10 years I saw the decline in health.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Algester, I just called for order. You are warned.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I saw what happened when a government does not believe in it, when it does not focus on it and I saw the decline in those services. I am determined to make sure that we do set expectations and that they are something that we adhere to. I put it in the charter letter because I want to see people treated with respect, particularly the Public Service.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to listen to the Premier.

Mr CRISAFULLI: It is important to me because it is vital that we turn around the services that those opposite left us. The fact that the Leader of the Opposition would choose this to be his first question shows that he understands when it comes to youth crime that there has not been—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: I just want to contrast something. On a day when the police minister will stand up and talk about the biggest crime crackdown and victim numbers falling—

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lytton!

Mr CRISAFULLI: We are for the first time addressing the backlog of elective surgery; when we are dealing with the cost-of-living crisis that Queenslanders are facing—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers!

Mr CRISAFULLI: When we are finally delivering housing, those opposite know that the government is doing what it said it is going to do. The Leader of the Opposition asks about my expectations. My expectations are high and I will make sure that there is a standard set and ministers are held accountable.

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, I caution you.

Mr Butcher interjected.

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

Mr Miles: Where is the fresh start?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I say to the temporary Leader of the Opposition—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Correct titles, please, Premier.

A government member: It was!

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take that interjection. I say to the Leader of the Opposition, I do support the minister because I have seen victim numbers fall for the first time in 10 years. That is refreshing.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: They can yell, but they know there are 5.7 per cent fewer victims of crime. To the Leader of the Opposition, we believe in integrity, we believe in accountability and I believe in making sure there are fewer victims.

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice. The minister's charter letter outlines the Premier's expectation that she 'engage with chief executive officers and departmental staff with the highest levels of courtesy and respect'. Will the minister guarantee to the House that they have never yelled at, hung up on or acted inappropriately to public servants as reported in the media?

Mrs GERBER: I do want to talk about our departmental staff and our public servants because the departmental staff and the public servants in both youth justice and victim support, as well as Corrective Services, on the front line of community safety, have a really difficult job to keep Queenslanders safe and they do that job—

Ms Scanlon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, member for Gaven.

Mrs GERBER: They do that job because they care. They do that job because they care not just about community safety but they care about rehabilitation.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Inala, I caution you.

Mrs GERBER: They are working on the front line of youth justice dealing with youth offenders or the front line of Corrective Services dealing—

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

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

Mrs GERBER: They are dealing with prisoners. They are dealing with that really challenging environment every day. I want to thank them for the amazing work they do, because they walk alongside me in delivering this government's agenda. This government is delivering fewer victims of crime. This government is delivering rehabilitation and early intervention programs to turn the tide on Labor's youth crime crisis. Let us talk about the real reason that those opposite are trying to sling mud and make it stick.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The precise question was about the minister's conduct and whether they had ever yelled at, hung up on or acted inappropriately to public servants. I ask you to draw her back to a relevant answer to the question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order to address the point of order of the Manager of Opposition Business. The minister is being responsive to the question as asked. Clearly, there were elements of the question that related to public servants. She is providing a response in relation to that. She is addressing her charter letter and she is being responsive to the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: I do think the minister is being relevant. The question was about the Public Service and the minister is speaking to that.

Mrs GERBER: What those opposite are trying to raise is simply not the case. Let us talk about the reason they are trying to sling mud and make it stick. The reason they are doing this is that they cannot attack me on my record.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Stop the clock. Member for Logan, you have had a good go already this morning. You are warned. Minister, you have the call. There are 53 seconds on the clock.

Mrs GERBER: This is because they cannot attack me on my record. The amazing public servants with whom I work are delivering for Queensland. Our record is fewer victims of crime, with a 5.7 per cent reduction in the number of victims of crime. We have early intervention programs that I have just announced are rolling out. We have Staying on Track, which is rolling out as we speak. We have Regional Reset—we have announced the first of those providers—and that will continue to roll out across the state.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: That is better. Minister, you have 11 seconds left.

Mrs GERBER: They cannot attack me on my record because in the first six months of the Crisafulli government we have seen the number of—

Mr Miles interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs GERBER:—serious repeat offenders fall by 17 per cent.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, you are now warned.

Mrs GERBER: We are delivering on our promises for Queensland, and my team and I will continue to do that.

(Time expired)

Community Safety

Mr DALTON: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. Will the Premier explain how the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering on the promise to restore safety where you live, after a decade of decline?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for Mackay for his question. Community safety is something that matters to him. He has dedicated his career to it and I thank him for his service.

The member is right: there have been 10 months of delivery, and that stands in contrast to a decade of decline. When it comes to youth crime, we are seeing the green shoots from those changes to the laws. Finally, for the first time in a decade, we are seeing victim numbers trending in the right direction. However, it is off such a high base and we have so much more work to do.

I want to focus on what the police minister spoke about and the flying squad that is going into communities and providing support to officers on the ground. We have more police for the first time. In fact, in one year we have increased the Queensland Police Service by more than double what those opposite could do in a term. That shows what happens when there are stronger laws, early intervention and resources delivered for police. I refer to the fact that the police feel as though they can make a difference. I thank them for what they are doing.

Today I want to reveal another statistic to the House. It is one where, again, Queenslanders can see green shoots. It is not yet a cause for celebration, but there are green shoots. The Insurance Council has revealed that in Queensland motor theft has fallen by more than anywhere else in the country. There has been an 11 per cent fall in motor vehicle theft and a 10 per cent fall in the total number of claims. It is the biggest fall in Queensland in a decade.

To contrast that with what happens when you get it wrong, in the same period Victoria had an increase of 59 per cent and a 70 per cent increase in their costs. What happened in Victoria? Dan Andrews happened in Victoria! They weakened the bail laws, they lifted the age of criminal responsibility, they did not back up their police and victim numbers rose. Where have we seen that playbook before? We saw it from there! They watered down the laws and crime went up every year for a decade. More people had their cars pinched in Queensland than in any other state, but now that is not the case because this government is taking action. Victoria is following their playbook. We say no.

We know that there is a cohort opposite who want to see the age of criminal responsibility lifted. We say no. We see a cohort opposite who think the only way to deal with this is to make excuses for offenders. We say no. If the Leader of the Opposition thinks for one moment that we are backing down on stronger laws, more police and early intervention then he has another think coming, because Queensland will not return to being the crime capital of this country.

(Time expired)

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr DICK: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. The *Australian* newspaper reported the minister had lost 11 staff in as many months because the minister swears at them, flies off the handle, is erratic and is chaotic. I table a copy of that article.

Tabled paper: Extract from an article from the *Australian*, undated, regarding the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Laura Gerber, and her staff members [1228].

Can the minister confirm that these reports about the minister's behaviour are accurate?

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mrs GERBER: Yes, it is, but that is okay. I start with the amazing people who work in my office. At the core of what we are delivering together are people who are genuinely committed to community safety, committed to Queenslanders and committed to delivering for Queensland.

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes.

Mrs GERBER: In my office I have staff who have been with me for over five years. In fact, one staff member has been with me—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, I just cautioned you. You are now warned.

Mrs GERBER: In fact, one has been with me since I was elected, helped me set up my electorate office and is now an adviser in one of my offices. I support all my staff. Unlike those opposite, I support my staff in whatever they want to choose.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs GERBER: I hear them laughing. It is a big joke right now to them.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to relevance. The question was about whether or not the media article that was tabled is accurate.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit that that is a frivolous point of order. The minister is being responsive to the question as asked in relation to the—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I heard the point of order from this side in silence. I expect to hear this one in silence.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I submit it is a frivolous point of order. The minister is being relevant and responsive to the question as asked, particularly with respect to the content as referenced by the member for Woodridge.

Mr SPEAKER: The question was around a media report. It is a broad article. Minister, you have the call.

Mrs GERBER: Let us look at the real reason they are trying—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I mean no reflection on you, Mr Speaker. I am seeking clarification in respect of my point of order on relevance. Were you ruling that the minister was being relevant in terms of the accuracy of the article or otherwise? I was unsure.

Mr SPEAKER: As I said, the question related to the media article, which was a broad article, and the minister is verifying it.

Mrs GERBER: The staff in my office work incredibly hard and they have my full support wherever they want to work, whether it is in my office or in other parts of the Crisafulli government. They have my full support.

Let's talk about the real reason those opposite are trying to make these allegations stick. It is because they cannot attack me on my record. They cannot come at me on my record. They are making spurious, personal allegations because they cannot attack me on my record. They cannot attack me on victims of crime because we have delivered fewer victims of crime in the first six months of the Crisafulli government being elected. That is why they are going after my staff.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Woodridge specifically referred in his question to the media reports about her behaviour, about her flying off the handle and about the office being erratic. My point of order is in relation to relevance. The question was whether or not those reports about her behaviour were accurate. I would ask you to instruct the minister to respond with a relevant answer to the question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again, in relation to the Manager of Opposition Business's point of order, I would submit to you that it is frivolous. You have ruled in relation to the minister being responsive to the question as asked. The material in the media article that the member for Woodridge referenced was of a broad nature and the minister is being responsive and relevant to the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: The question was around staffing and I find the minister is being responsive to the question, so there is no point of order. Minister, you have the call and you have 36 seconds.

Mrs GERBER: Like I said, my staff do an incredible job. Let's talk about the real reason these allegations, which I have said are clearly not true, are being flung around this chamber. They are doing it because they cannot attack me on my record. We have delivered fewer victims of crime. We have delivered a 17 per cent reduction in serious repeat offenders. We are delivering Gold Standard Early Intervention and rehabilitation programs right across the state. We are delivering what we said we would do, and I encourage them to ask a question about youth justice.

(Time expired)

Community Safety

Mr LEE: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering real outcomes when it comes to tackling crime, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to take action during a decade of decline?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member for the question. I know how committed the member is to returning community safety to Hervey Bay, and I welcome the opportunities to visit there with him. I remember before the election standing with Jayden and Lauren from Aquavue, which is a beautiful cafe right on the beach at Hervey Bay, who have repeatedly been victims of crime. I remember them telling us the crimes were costing them tens of thousands of dollars, coupled with the psychological effects and feeling unsafe.

The Crisafulli government has taken a vastly different approach to crime from those opposite. Those opposite proudly watered down the laws, as is the Labor way, which is what has happened in Victoria. We know it does not work and we are taking a vastly different approach. It is not only about returning that feeling of safety that people rightly deserve; it is about the hip pocket of Queenslanders. We are still in a cost-of-living crisis and we spoke before the election about the financial cost this has on Queenslanders. In a recent report released by the Insurance Council of Australia, it states—

Queensland saw the largest reduction in motor theft claims with total claims count down 11 per cent to 6,000, equating to $104 million in incurred losses, down 10 per cent from the previous 12-month period. This is the largest drop in both claims count and incurred costs the State has seen in more than a decade.

I repeat that last sentence—

This is the largest drop in both claims count and incurred costs the State has seen in more than a decade.

We know those opposite are hoping and praying there will be more victims of crime in Queensland and that crime rates will continue to rise. As we saw at estimates, after 10 years of their made-up metrics and as crime was going up they celebrated fewer arrests.

Ms Mullen interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I caution you, member for Jordan. That was uncalled for.

Mr PURDIE: After years of made-up metrics from those opposite and as victim numbers continued to rise year on year, they celebrated fewer arrests as being a sign of success. We are taking a vastly different approach. As we saw at estimates, they are trying to cloud the waters around metrics, around statistics. These are not made-up metrics. This is an independent annual report, and it states we have had the largest drop in the number of claims for stolen vehicles in more than a decade.

That is what happens when you reverse their overtly soft-on-crime regime, which they all boasted about in 2015. We are taking a vastly different approach. We are giving back to the police the laws that they need, coupled with the resources that they need, to return community safety right across Queensland. We are not done. The job is not done. We will continue to relentlessly throw everything we have at young offenders in particular.

(Time expired)

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice. According to detention centre rules, a young person cannot swear at or verbally abuse other people, and I table a copy of those rules.

Tabled paper: Webpage, titled 'Detention centre rules' [1229].

Can the minister assure the House that she follows the same rules of conduct and behaviour that the minister expects juvenile offenders to follow in youth detention centres?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will have silence before I call on the minister.

Mrs GERBER: I want to start by talking about some of the aspects of that question that relate to our youth detention centres. When the Crisafulli government first came into government, I made a decision to spend a full day in our Cleveland detention centre in Townsville.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I am trying to listen to the minister.

Mrs GERBER: I spent a full day in that detention centre. Whilst I have travelled across the state and visited all of our detention centres, I made a clear choice to spend a full day in the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre and to walk with both a female and a male youth there to understand the critical failures that the previous Labor government left us in relation to our detention centres. Staff assaults were at an all-time high under the previous Labor government. The recidivism rate out of the Cleveland Youth Detention Centre was one of the highest on record—96 per cent of youth released from that detention centre went on to reoffend. That is an absolute failure of the previous Labor government. It comes down to the policies and how the previous Labor government implemented those policies in those detention centres.

One of the policies that the Crisafulli government is implementing is detention with a purpose. Detention with a purpose means that violence against staff will not be tolerated. Detention with a purpose means that there is compulsory education within our detention centres. Detention with a purpose means that youths are rehabilitated within our detention centres. Under the Crisafulli government, we are getting our detention centres back to what they need to be, and these children have a future—

Mr de BRENNI: Notwithstanding the fact the Premier interjected on his minister, indicating that she would not answer the question and would not be relevant to the question, I rise to a point of order on relevance and ask that the minister be directed to answer the question about her conduct as it compares to the detention centre rules.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With respect to the point of order as raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, there are two parts to it. First, it is not an opportunity to provide commentary in relation to the matters of the House, which are under your jurisdiction and consideration. Second, the minister is being responsive to the question as asked in relation to conduct in youth detention centres. She is referencing detention with a purpose and talking about compulsory education and rehabilitation, and I submit to you that she is being relevant and responsive to the question as asked.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit to you that points of order are entirely about the order of the House and an opportunity for me or any member of this House to indicate to you where the House is not acting in accordance with the rules.

Mr Bleijie: There's a thing called frivolous points of order under the standing orders, too.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. We are not having a debate about a point of order. Minister, that question asked about your interaction with staff and your language used with staff. I ask you to address that. You have a minute left. I ask that you address that as it was part of the question.

Mrs GERBER: Mr Speaker, I am not entertaining the spurious allegations that those opposite are making. The reason those opposite are trying to attack me personally and fling mud is that they cannot attack me on my record. Our record in our detention centres is that we have introduced detention with a purpose, which is getting our detention centres back on track. We have introduced a staff workforce plan that has seen staff across the state, including in Cleveland, reach numbers of over a thousand—a 10 per cent increase on Labor's record at the same time last year.

The reason they are trying to fling these allegations, the reason they are trying to make this absolute rubbish stick, is that they cannot attack me on my record, and that is what I want to talk about. Let's face it: the question talked about policies within our detention centres. The Crisafulli government is delivering clear policies in our detention centres to ensure that we have rehabilitation and that we turn the tide on Labor's youth crime crisis.

(Time expired)

Police Resources

Ms JAMES: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the minister detail how the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering more policing capacity in North and Far North regions, and is the minister aware of any approaches that did not keep Queenslanders safe during a decade of decline?

Mr PURDIE: I thank the member. I am mindful of the concern in her community. Unfortunately, Far North Queensland and North Queensland were two of the epicentres of Labor's youth crime crisis. That is why we are taking a vastly different approach. The Crisafulli government is delivering for the people of Far North Queensland and North Queensland, particularly when it comes to restoring community safety.

One of the ways we are doing that is by backing our local police, who are doing an amazing job, not only with the tougher laws that we said we would deliver—and we did before Christmas—but also with the resources that we announced in the budget—$147.9 million—to make sure they have the kit they need to keep themselves and the community safe and to get home safe. We have also launched the largest crime crackdown ever seen in Far North Queensland and North Queensland, with over 50 police from the south-east assisting those amazing frontline local police.

This is a locally-led operation, with the assistance of squads like the PSRT, essentially the riot squad; the Tactical Crime Squad—the local Tactical Crime Squad and the Tactical Crime Squad from Brisbane; Polair, with the recently bolstered resources for Polair; the State Flying Squad, which we have spoken about before; and the Dog Squad. Even the Railway Squad have been sent up to Far North Queensland and North Queensland to help with this operation.

It is across multiple parts. With Operation Marshall there will be high-visibility patrols. We want our police in shopping centres, parks, sporting venues and licensed venues, providing that high-visibility policing deterrent. We also have overt and covert strategies which have seen a large number of SROs, the most serious causing the most harm in our community, arrested and put behind bars. In fact, 1,100 offenders have been arrested on over 3,500 offences just in the last five weeks. This is a prolonged, protracted, strategic and relentless operation, and it is not going to be over anytime soon. It does not have an end date.

Those opposite thought crime was a short-term political problem. We on this side know that there is a community safety problem and our police need resources to drive it down. Similarly, not only did we make Jack's Law permanent but we expanded it to apply everywhere, because we know that we need to break the culture of young people carrying and using knives. Just in the last five weeks our police have wanded over 3,000 people and have seized 21 weapons. That is 21 weapons taken off the streets. We do not know what those weapons may have been used for or how many lives may have been saved. That is an example of the achievements you can get when you back our police and give them the resources they need to do their job.

Let me be quite clear: crime is still too high. We have a long way to go. We have had a decade of decline, a decade of those opposite proudly watering down the laws, but we will not give up. We will continue to support our local police and send all the resources they need to make sure they have the backup to return community safety to where you live.

(Time expired)

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr BUTCHER: My question is of the Minister for Corrective Services. The Prisoner Information Booklet states, 'Queensland Corrective Services does not tolerate any form of violence, bullying or harassment'. I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Extract from document, undated, titled 'Queensland Corrective Services: Prisoner Information Booklet' [1230].

Will the minister abide by the same standards in respect of the minister's behaviour and conduct?

Mrs GERBER: Absolutely. What I really want to address is that this is the first question the member for Gladstone has asked that talks about our corrective services officers and safety. In our corrective services system under those opposite, some of our prisons were operating at over 150 per cent capacity. What do you think operating a prison at over 150 per cent capacity—that is overcrowding—does to our frontline QCS officers and their safety? How do you think their safety is in our correctional facilities if they are operating in a work environment that is over 150 per cent capacity? I will tell you what it does. Prisoner-on-prisoner assaults and prisoner assaults on staff skyrocketed

under those opposite because they failed to invest in the infrastructure that was needed to keep our QCS officers safe on the front line. They failed to do that. Why did they fail to do it? They failed to do it because they simply do not prioritise community safety.

Mr Miles: So you built that prison in 10 months, did you?

Mrs GERBER: I take that interjection. Let's talk about the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. That business case was funded in 2014 under an LNP government. Those opposite had 10 years to build it and deliver it. Did they deliver a single new prison in Queensland for the safety of our correctional officers? No, they did not. Those opposite did not deliver a single new prison in 10 years.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am trying to hear the minister. The only one who has the call is the minister.

Mrs GERBER: They had multiple opportunities in those 10 years to build and deliver the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, yet they failed. On top of that, that facility suffered blowout after blowout.

The reason it is so critical that we invest in our prison infrastructure and invest in building the infrastructure that is needed in order to keep the community safe is that effective rehabilitation in our prisons can only happen if we stem Labor's overcapacity issues. Effective rehabilitation can only happen in our prisons if they are not operating in an environment of overcrowding and overcapacity. That is the legacy of the Labor government. That is the mess that the Labor government left us to clean up.

We have had 10 months of delivery, whereas those opposite had 10 years to deliver safety for our corrective services officers and 10 years to deliver the prison infrastructure needed, and they failed to do that. Now they come into this House and try to fling mud because they cannot attack my team and our hardworking QCS departmental staff on their record. They cannot attack us on our record, so they are trying to attack us personally. We are delivering safety where Queenslanders live.

(Time expired)

Victims of Crime

Mrs POOLE: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How is the Crisafulli LNP government putting the rights of victims ahead of criminals when it comes to the sentencing of violent offenders, and is the Attorney aware of any approaches that did not meet community expectations during a decade of decline?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the honourable member for Mundingburra for her question. As a senior sergeant in the Townsville district and now a member of a government, she has dedicated her entire adult life to fighting crime. The member understands that we need to put victims first. We need to do everything we can to reduce crime in this great state and make sure those victims who have been attacked, had their homes broken into or had their cars flogged are put first—I am sorry, Mr Speaker, I should have said had their cars stolen—because it is important that we as a government put victims of crime first.

We heard from the honourable Premier and police minister this morning about the very early green shoots we have seen in relation to victim numbers, which are down 5.7 per cent in the first six months compared to last year. We are talking about a decade of failures that the Crisafulli government is trying to fix up. We have been in for 10 months; we have spent 10 months delivering. As soon as we got into government—and I thank the hardworking Minister for Youth Justice—we introduced the first tranche and then the second tranche of our Making Queensland Safer Laws. It is all about driving down crime.

It also includes examining sentences that were handed down. Queenslanders were rightfully appalled when Emma Lovell was murdered, and we must ensure that her killer is held to account. As I announced yesterday, an application has been launched with the High Court of Australia to seek special leave to appeal a judgement delivered by Queensland's Court of Appeal on 15 August this year. It is an extraordinary step, but this government will do whatever it takes to defend the rights of victims. When I spoke to Lee Lovell I reiterated the Crisafulli government's commitment to do all we can to ensure that the murderer who took Emma's life is held to account.

The challenge we face is that this offending happened under Labor's watch and under their weak laws. Because of their weak laws this teenager will be out of detention earlier. As I have outlined, our first act as a government was to bring in our Making Queensland Safer Laws. Under those laws Emma's murderer would have been sentenced to life in prison.

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Ms ENOCH: My question is of the Minister for Youth Justice. At a Building a Better Public Service event the Premier said—

> And central to that is an independent and public service that feels empowered to do its job.

Does the minister endorse the Premier's comments, and is the minister's reported conduct disempowering the Public Service?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask whether that question would be more appropriately put to the Premier as opposed to the purview of the minister's portfolio responsibilities.

Mr SPEAKER: I will have a look at that question.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier and member for Woodridge! The question asked the minister whether she endorsed the Premier's comments, as I heard it. The minister can respond to that.

Mrs GERBER: Yes, of course I do. Let's talk about the reason these questions are being asked in the way they are. It is because those opposite cannot attack us on our record. If they wanted to they could have asked me a question about victim numbers, youth justice programs or rehabilitation programs, but they did not. They are not asking about those things because they know we are delivering on what we said we would do.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The cross-chamber quarrelling will cease!

Mrs GERBER: We have delivered fewer victims of crime in this state. Yes, it is a small decrease, but under those opposite victim numbers increased year on year. Those opposite denied the youth crime crisis. Those opposite made our detention centres breeding grounds for repeat young offenders. We have been given a mandate to—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There is too much noise on both sides of the chamber.

Mrs GERBER: Queenslanders have asked us to deliver change. Queenslanders have asked us to deliver safety where they live. They want to see fewer victims of crime in this state. We are hard at work delivering those reforms. The reason these questions are being posed in the way they are is that those opposite cannot attack us on our record. Our record is that victim numbers are down 5.7 per cent across this state. Our record is that the number of serious repeat offenders has reduced 17 per cent. In Far North Queensland our record is that we have had one of the largest police blitzes carried out not just in relation to youth offending but also serious offending, ensuring those youth criminals who would otherwise be on the streets of Far North Queensland are receiving consequences for their actions.

We are delivering those reforms and tough new laws—Making Queensland Safer Laws and Adult Crime, Adult Time—in conjunction with our early intervention and rehabilitation plans, policies and programs. That is in stark contrast to those opposite, who were unable to deliver effective rehabilitation. Our detention centres saw recidivism rates, particularly in the far north at Cleveland, reach 96 per cent. Ninety-six per cent of the youths who went into Cleveland went on to reoffend. That is a complete failure of those opposite. We are getting on with the job of delivering the safety, early intervention and rehabilitation measures that Queenslanders voted for, including our strong new laws, with more boots on the ground, more police, more early intervention, more rehabilitation and strong new laws to keep Queenslanders safe and, most of all, fewer victims of crime.

Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering key infrastructure in the fight against crime, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to deliver during a decade of decline?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Lockyer for the question. I know that, as a former police officer, he knows firsthand how important it is to invest in the infrastructure that our state needs to keep our community safe. One of the critical pieces of infrastructure the Crisafulli government has invested

in and delivered in the first 10 months of us being in government is the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre. I was at that centre on the first day of its commissioning with the member for Lockyer to take him through that centre and talk about the game-changing rehabilitation that is happening there. It is a state-of-the-art centre. It is providing safety where you live by ensuring we address the critical overcrowding in our prison system that the previous Labor government left.

I want to reference a comment the member for Lockyer made to me about how pleased he was to see our hardworking correctional officers in his schools and his local shops and businesses in their uniform, contributing not just to community safety but also to our local businesses and schools. Our QCS officers do an incredible job on the front line of community safety, but what we saw under the previous Labor government was a litany of failures. In fact, the business case for the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre was first funded by an LNP government back in 2014-15.

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Cross-chamber chatter will cease. Member for Ferny Grove and member for Toowoomba North!

Mrs GERBER: What followed under 10 years of Labor was a decade of blowouts and delays. In fact, the Labor government waited until 2019—five years after the business case—before even committing to the Lockyer Valley correctional facility. At the time, they announced that it would cost $618 million and had an expected completion date of 2022-23. What did we see? We saw that by June that year the cost had already blown out to $654 million. Then by June 2022—just before Labor had originally said it was going to open—the former government changed the goalposts and said that the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre would now cost $861 million and would not be complete until the end of 2023. In the very next month, they pushed it back to April 2024—and guess what? Surprise, surprise: there was another cost blowout.

The real kicker here is that when we came to government we discovered that critical systems were incomplete. The electronic security system was only 10 per cent done, the mechanical services were at 18 per cent and the fire services were at 20 per cent. That is the legacy of neglect by those opposite—a decade of failure to deliver. In 10 months we have delivered the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre.

(Time expired)

Mount Isa, Copper Smelter

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. The Premier said that it would be a sovereign risk if the Mount Isa copper smelter were to close and the mines minister has declared it a critical asset. If Glencore cease smelting copper, will the Premier immediately introduce legislation to place the smelter into government appointed administration to facilitate alternative private ownership, ensuring continued mineral production in Queensland?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to thank the member for the question. I want to acknowledge the genuine way that he has engaged with me and the minister inside and outside this House. I also want to acknowledge the three Townsville-based members for their genuine interest in this, because it is so important to many of the people they represent.

I want to speak about another relationship, though—and it is a really important one—and that is between the state and federal governments. To see the way the mines minister and the federal minister—Minister Last and Minister Ayres—have worked together shows how important this is, and it is important. It is really important. I want to explain why it is important and why I have personally raised it with the Prime Minister on many occasions, and I want to thank him for understanding how significant this is.

It is important because that smelter underpins a proud city that has been built on the back of people who go to work hard. It is important because there is an entire corridor where we are building a major asset and there are people who want to bring on new mines, and that smelter matters. It is important because there are fertilisers that are developed there, and without that smelter that falls away. There are a whole heap of people who live in Townsville who work there as well as agricultural people who need that facility. It is important because there is a refinery at the end of the line and it will close, too.

I want to make a couple of points to Glencore. Firstly, our offer has been on the table for some time and the federal government have now got to a position that they also have an offer on the table. There is not a cigarette paper of difference between what the federal government want to achieve and what we want to achieve. I say to Glencore that partnerships are about the good and the bad times, and they have done very well out of Queensland—very well. What we are asking Glencore to do is come to the table and negotiate but understand that they also have a responsibility, and I will tell you why.

That asset is an asset of national significance, of course, and it is important for the broader community, including those people who mine and manufacture fertiliser and all the way through from Townsville to the west—absolutely. That is why we have been willing to invest and step up to the plate to put an offer on the table, but they have to do something, too. Glencore cannot allow that asset to fail because they do very well out of Queensland, out of mining and out of refining. I see a future for copper smelting, and Glencore has a role to play.

The member has asked a question—and it is a fine question—and I say to the member that we will not rule anything out. Glencore need to know that, because if they take a decision to close that and put it into care and maintenance that is their decision. It is not the federal government's decision, it is not the state's decision and it is not the council's decision. That will be Glencore's decision.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am sorry—I know those opposite—

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: Glencore have a responsibility and we all stand as one to deliver it.

(Time expired)

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Delivery

Mrs YOUNG: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the Deputy Premier update the House on support received for the Crisafulli government's 2032 Delivery Plan, and is he aware of any alternative approaches which would return Queensland to games delay and decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. It is an important question because, as the members for Redlands, Oodgeroo and Capalaba would know, the whitewater centre is part of the legacy for that beautiful part of Queensland. It is the LNP Crisafulli government that will deliver the legacy. We have always said that the games is not just about the two weeks of the Olympic Games and the two weeks of the Paralympic Games; it is about the legacy after—the billions of dollars of infrastructure and road and rail and what Queenslanders get for it.

As I have just travelled to the United Kingdom, Paris and Switzerland, I can say that there is excitement right around the globe for the 2032 Delivery Plan. Look at this photo. Members and colleagues would not imagine the day I would be standing up with the Labour minister for sport in the United Kingdom—with that Labour minister holding our 2032 Delivery Plan, I might add, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a prop.

Mr BLEIJIE: I table Minister Peacock's wonderful support of that.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, holding the 2032 Delivery Plan [1231].

Look at the smiling faces in this next one, with Minister Mander, his counterpart Anika Wells, Catherine King and me after we signed the intergovernmental agreement. I table that.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, and the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Hon. Tim Mander, signing documents [1232].

Mr SPEAKER: Once again, Minister, that is a prop.

Mr BLEIJIE: We are doing deals with Labor because we are on Team Queensland and we will do what it takes and cooperate with who it takes to make sure we get the best deal for Queenslanders. When we announced the Delivery Plan, the member for Cooper, Jonty Bush, said—

I've not commented on the merits of Victoria Park, I accept that two independent reports have found this to be the solution and we now need to move forward and make sure we have the best possible Games we can.

That is what the member for Cooper said. I table a copy of that

Tabled paper: Extract from social media, undated, featuring comments posted by the member for Cooper, Ms Jonty Bush MP, regarding the 2032 Olympic Games [1233].

At the same time she was saying that, the Leader of the Opposition was attacking the Delivery Plan on Instagram.

Mr Speaker, I have to table another one as well. Even the House of Lords mentioned our Delivery Plan. I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Extract from House of Lords Parliamentary Debates (Hansard), dated 4 September 2025, regarding the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, and the 2032 Olympic Games [1234].

Honourable colleagues should read that. My lords and ladies, I would encourage you to read that transcript from the House of Lords. It appears that Labor federally and internationally are supporting our Delivery Plan. Members would understand my surprise, then, when I saw an anti-games forum held recently that the honourable shadow minister, the member for McConnel, attended. She attended the anti-games rally with the member for Cooper, Jonty Bush, and in this next photo the member for Cooper is wearing a 'Save Victoria Park' badge. I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 12 September, from the Facebook page of the member for McConnel, Hon. Grace Grace, regarding the 2032 Olympic Games [1235].

One minute the member for Cooper supports Victoria Park, and now she does not. This is about a lack of leadership. They do not know the opposition leader's stance on the 2032 games. That is why they support/not support QSAC. It is about leadership failure. The opposition leader cannot even get his own team to back his terrible QSAC plan. That is why it is a rabble over there.

(Time expired)

Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier withdraw the comments he made yesterday referring to the nation's broadsheet and award-winning journalism as 'a gossip column' after they reported the conduct of the Minister for Youth Justice?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the honourable shadow minister for the question. I believe the shadow minister's question is relating to ministerial accountability, transparency and treating staff with respect. I welcome that question from the honourable shadow minister and I will tell you why. The honourable shadow minister will know and will have read the Coaldrake review. When I was delivering the charter letters, I focused very heavily on that, particularly the element about how ministers must interact with the Public Service; it is important. I want to read—

Mr Miles: Yelling and swearing and hanging up on people.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. He was talking about yelling. I do hope he was not referring to the member for Waterford when he was doing that. I am going to read comments from the Coaldrake review. I have read the Coaldrake review twice and I will read this now. 'Comments—

Mr Miles: Have you read the *Australian*?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I have. The reason I read it twice is that I was determined never to see a culture like that those opposite presided over. It says the following—

Comments from interviews and submissions made to the Review suggest a range of reasons for this unsteadiness on the part of the public sector—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There was no preamble in the question asked by the member. The question was specifically about whether he would withdraw his comments alleging or describing the *Australian* as a gossip column. There were no other elements to the question but precisely that. I ask you to draw him back to a relevant answer to the question under the standing orders.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, the question did refer to that column in the media and your thoughts about that. I would ask you to address that in the time you have remaining.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I always listen and reflect to anyone who comes forward with information. I always do. I want Queenslanders to know that I take any allegations seriously and I will always look at that. I will read one of the results from the Working for Queensland survey 2024: 'We were shocked at the feedback about Minister Fentiman from Queensland Health staff.'

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is important for the dignity and order of this House that members adhere to your rulings, particularly those in the role of the Premier. You had just directed in relation to—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, you are warned.

Mr de BRENNI: You had just directed the Premier in relation to relevance and he immediately turned to irrelevant matters. I ask you to draw him back to a relevant answer to the question about whether he would withdraw those comments and criticism of the media.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, it was a specific question.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Yes, Mr Speaker, and, in regard to that element of the question, I will always listen and reflect on anything that gets raised with me. In the 2024 Working for Queensland survey, it states, 'We were shocked at the feedback about Minister Fentiman from Queensland Health staff.'

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the Premier has nothing relevant to say in response to the question, then he should not continue to contribute. I would ask you to draw him back to a relevant answer.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier has been responsive. He has actually answered the question. The opposition may not like the response to the question as asked, but he has provided an answer to the question as asked and he is also providing additional context.

Mr SPEAKER: I find the Premier has been relevant. The time for question time has expired.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. An honourable colleague in the opposition just reflected 'protection racket' which is a direct reflection on you, Mr Speaker. You had drawn conclusion to question time and the interjection was 'protection racket'. That is a reflection on you, Mr Speaker.

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

Mr SPEAKER: I did not hear that comment but, if it was made, I would ask that that person withdraw that comment.

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

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I could not hear what the Manager of Opposition Business just said.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There was no reflection on your ruling. There was an interjection in relation to the points of order taken by the Leader of the House. There was no reflection on you whatsoever, Mr Speaker.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With respect to an interjection about a protection racket, as indicated by the Manager of Opposition Business, I take personal offence to that and I ask that that be withdrawn by the relevant member.

Mr SPEAKER: It was not directed at you, Leader of the House. I will say once again, if that comment was made, I ask the person who made that comment to withdraw. If that is not done, I will be reviewing the tape because I will be seeing that as a reflection on the Speaker.

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker—

Government members interjected.

Mr MILES: I withdraw and I apologise to the Leader of the House.

Mr DICK: I withdraw as well.

Ms GRACE: I withdraw as well.

Ms CAMM: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Pine Rivers made some personally offensive comments across the chamber to me and I take personal offence. I ask for her to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: There are two matters. Member for Pine Rivers, I ask you to withdraw.

Ms BOYD: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: I also ask you to withdraw from the chamber for one hour because you were on a warning.

Whereupon the honourable member for Pine Rivers withdrew from the chamber at 11.17 am.

PENALTIES AND SENTENCES (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 2)

Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That, under the provisions of standing order 137:
   (a) the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill, with the minister called to reply to the bill by 8.00 pm on Wednesday, 17 September 2025 and all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 9.00 pm on Wednesday, 17 September 2025;
   (b) the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) be declared an urgent bill, with the minister called to reply to the bill by 8.00 pm on Thursday, 18 September 2025 and all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 9.00 pm on Thursday, 18 September 2025.
2. If all stages have not been completed by the time specified in 1., 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 briefly addressing this motion, I would like to respectfully make the following points: this motion is about ensuring the orderly and efficient management of business before the House this week and it relates to two significant pieces of legislation. The first is the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 which delivers important reforms, and these reforms are critical to strengthening community safety and ensuring justice for victims. The second is the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2025.

Both bills are substantial and important, and members will have the opportunity to contribute meaningfully to the debate on each of them. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is committed to ensuring the business of parliament continues to be managed in a way that is calm, methodical and orderly. This motion provides a clear structure for the week, giving certainty to all members about the time available. In doing so, it allows the House to progress not only this work but other work that needs to be debated throughout the week, as well as committee reports and other elements. It is important for the efficient and respectful manner in which we conduct business in the House.

Queenslanders rightly expect their parliament to operate efficiently and not to be impacted by unnecessary delay or disorder. The House has a duty to ensure its work is carried out responsibly and efficiently. This is a calm, responsible and methodical approach to managing this week's business and, as such, I commend the motion to the House.

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (11.20 am): I rise to respond to the time-limiting motion put to the House by the Leader of the House in relation to two bills: the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 and the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2025. Whilst we concur with the Leader of the House's remarks that it is important for the House to determine appropriate timeframes that provide an adequate opportunity to debate bills and for members to be heard on behalf of their constituencies, it is important as well that there be adequate time for consideration in detail to ensure the bills that are passed by this House have had adequate scrutiny.

Notwithstanding that, it is important for this to be on the record. We will agree to this motion to make the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 an urgent bill so that it will pass this week, but the House will recall, and the record will show, that on repeated occasions the Labor opposition—to ensure Queenslanders are not denied or delayed justice—sought to have this bill and these specific amendments dealt with by this House many months ago. In fact, it was not until the Labor opposition wrote to the Attorney-General in relation to these matters that the government had any intention of bringing these matters to the House.

On 19 May 2025—months and months ago—the Queensland Labor opposition wrote to the Crisafulli government, via the Attorney-General, proposing to move amendments to enact four key recommendations during debate on another bill. There was an adequate opportunity at that time—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The contribution by the Manager of Opposition Business appears to be straying into debate on the bill that is before the House.

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

Dr ROWAN: It is on relevance to the motion, and that some of the content is straying to debate on the substantive elements of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. I will take some advice. Manager of Opposition Business, this is not an opportunity to stray into the substantive nature of the bill, so please speak to the motion, which is a procedural motion around the timings for this bill.

Mr de BRENNI: Indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker. The motion is very much in relation to the time at which this bill will be debated and passed by the House. The precise point I am making—whilst being very careful to avoid covering any of the substantive content of the particular bill—is to address the timings. We have indicated that we will support the government's motion that the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be considered by this House and that the question be put by 9 pm tomorrow night. In considering the question that I presume you will put shortly, Mr Deputy Speaker, the House ought to be reminded that on many occasions the Queensland Labor opposition offered support to the government to have this bill considered months and months ago.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order related to addressing the motion before the House. I would submit to you again that the content is straying into substantial elements which relate to the bill before the House. There will be an opportunity for the Manager of Opposition Business to make those points in debate on the second reading. I would ask you to draw the Manager of Opposition Business back to the procedural motion that is now before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice about that again. Manager of Opposition Business, the bill before the House is at its second reading stage. I think you have made your point, which seems to relate to some other issue—not the actual issue before the House—but could you carry on, making your points relevant to the motion, which relates to the timing of the bill this week.

Mr de BRENNI: Indeed, Deputy Speaker. The motion before the House is that the bill be declared an urgent bill, to be considered by the House this week. My point—which is relevant to the motion, not to the bill—is that on several occasions the Labor opposition has moved a motion in this House and made a formal offer of opportunity, via the Attorney-General to the Premier, to have this bill considered earlier. The point I am making is that the Leader of the House failed—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Clayfield, I will pre-empt your point of order. Manager of Opposition Business, you have made that point three times now. I actually do not think it is relevant to the motion, which is about the timing for this week. You having made that point, I would ask you to move on, please, and continue your contribution relevant to the motion.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The motion that the Leader of the House has asked you to put also deals with the importance of time allowed for consideration in detail. I want to acknowledge that the Leader of the House has allowed for a period of time—by my calculations, if they are correct, an hour including the minister's reply. I acknowledge the Leader of the House for working with the Labor opposition on that. Consideration in detail is important. It provides time to ensure the detail of the bill is properly scrutinised. We will be using consideration in detail to do that in relation to both bills.

Relevantly, the Labor opposition particularly looks forward to the time that has been proposed by this motion for consideration in detail of the health bill. We acknowledge that consideration in detail is also an opportunity to ask the relevant minister with carriage of the bill questions about the detail of the bill. We think that is important, particularly in relation to the health bill and the health minister, who has carriage of that bill for which consideration in detail will occur, in accordance with this motion, if it is supported, on Thursday night. The Labor opposition looks forward to using that time to ask the health minister several questions because—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. A recitation of the standing orders and what the opposition intend to do on Thursday night is not a debate on the motion that is currently before the House. I would ask you to bring the Manager of Opposition Business back to relevance in relation to the debate, which is about the timing that has been proposed by the Manager of Opposition Business.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I have been listening intently to what you were saying. I think you were about to go into what you are intending to do in consideration in detail. This is about the timing proposed for the consideration in detail and the passage of the bill as a whole. Could you please keep your comments relevant to those procedural matters as you address this motion?

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your guidance. It is critically important that I remain relevant to the motion, and the motion specifically provides time for consideration in detail. I am explaining to the House why we intend to support this motion. We intend to support this motion because it is an opportunity during consideration in detail to ask the Minister for Health questions because it is apparent to all—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order—and it has been made on a number of occasions—is in relation to the substantive elements of the motion, which is a procedural motion in relation to the timings. There is an opportunity to go into those other matters with respect to not only consideration in detail but also the content of the bill. There will be another opportunity to do that throughout the debate on the bill later this week. In relation to the procedural motion—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Your point of order is on relevance.

Dr ROWAN: The point of order is on relevance, but my other point of order—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are warned under the standing orders. You know better than that. What is your other point of order?

Dr ROWAN: My other point of order is that we have made the same point of order on a number of occasions on which guidance has been given, and I would ask you to consider that matter specifically.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment please, member for Logan. I am trying to seek some advice.

Mr POWER: Mine is relevant to this point, by the way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I am ready to rule, but I will hear your point of order.

Mr POWER: Thank you. When we have these debates—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order? Is it to the Leader of the House's point of order?

Mr POWER: It is to the Leader of the House's point of order about relevance. When we have these debates it is the opportunity for the opposition to say what their priorities are in debating in the House—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. Member for Logan, that is not a contribution on a point of order.

Mr POWER: I seek clarification.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have a—

Mr POWER: I seek clarification.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, could you let me talk to you please? Could you tell me please what is the point you are trying to make in relation to the Leader of the House's point of order?

Mr POWER: The point of order is that in this debate we get to set the priorities for the—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is about relevance. That is the point of order. What is your point of order on relevance?

Mr POWER: It is relevant to set the priorities of the opposition with the coming debate of the House. That is the basis of this debate and that is what has been part of this debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Resume your seat, please. Thank you, member for Logan. Thank you, Leader of the House. Manager of Opposition Business, I was listening carefully before. I considered you were relevant, but I have a feeling you were about to stray from the motion again. However, I also would urge you to be cautious because I sense some repetition in your contribution, so avoid that, please. You may continue being relevant to the motion, but avoid tedious repetition, please.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I apologise to you unreservedly if I have been repetitive. It has been difficult given the number of interjections by the Leader of the House and the health minister and the points of order they have raised.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have made no interjections. I have raised points of order. I take personal offence to that because I have not been interjecting on the Manager of Opposition Business. I have raised valid points of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. I have heard your point of order. Manager of Opposition Business, the Leader of the House has taken personal offence to your comment. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, member for Clayfield. I asked the Manager of Opposition Business to withdraw.

Mr de BRENNI: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Clayfield, do you have a further point of order?

Mr NICHOLLS: I do. I take personal offence at the comments made by the Manager of Opposition Business in relation to me and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr de BRENNI: I withdraw. As I was saying before those points of order were raised by the members, the opposition will support this motion because of the importance of the opportunity to ask the health minister questions. As I said, it is clear that the health minister is not up to answering questions outside of this House on important matters in relation to his portfolio.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There are two points of order I wish to raise. One is on relevance. Once the Manager of Opposition Business commented that they support the motion moved by the Leader of the House, that is relevant. After that, everything strays into irrelevance in relation to the debate on the motion. Secondly, I take personal offence at the comments made by the Manager of Opposition Business. The fact that they cannot ask a question in question time is not my problem.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. It is not an opportunity to debate that matter. Manager of Opposition Business, the member for Clayfield has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw those comments, please.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. In relation to the other point of order, could you please confine your comments to the motion before the House, which is a procedural motion about the timing for the debate on this bill.

Mr de BRENNI: It is, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am precisely pointing out that the time that is allowed for consideration in detail is incredibly important because it is an opportunity for members of this House to ask questions of the Minister for Health that he refuses to answer outside of the House. That is why this motion is important.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Firstly, I again take personal offence at the comments made by the Manager of Opposition Business. Secondly, I raise again the question of relevance. This is now a further prosecution. Thirdly, on tedious repetition, this is now the fourth time that the Manager of Opposition Business has attempted to prosecute the same argument unsuccessfully.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield. Would you withdraw those comments that the member for Clayfield took personal offence to please?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a further point of order from the Leader of the House.

Dr ROWAN: My point of order is that when the Manager of Opposition Business withdrew previously and then made the same comment, that is becoming disorderly with respect to the member for Clayfield then having to rise again on the same point of order—that he takes personal offence. I would ask you to consider that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have those points of order in hand. Thank you, Leader of the House. In relation to the points of order made in relation to tedious repetition and relevance, Manager of Opposition Business, you have been given plenty of guidance. Whilst for the last part you have

remained relevant, you have continued to make comments that stray from the relevance to the bill and then you have been interrupted by points of order. Also I do take some validity and I have given you caution already about tedious repetition. Could you please wrap up your contribution or move on to a new point to make because you have made other points several times already.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. You are correct that I made those points a number of times because I believe they bear repeating so that the House takes note of those points. In the time that I have available—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please, Manager of Opposition Business. Could we get the clock going down to maybe one minute and 50 seconds? Take 10 seconds off, or 15 perhaps. No, 10 seconds.

Mr de BRENNI: That is very generous of you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I acknowledge your graciousness.

In conclusion, because the points that we have made have been clear, we support this motion. We put on record the irony of the government bringing this motion today when it had ample and repeated opportunities, as I raised earlier in my contribution, to declare these bills urgent and have them dealt with in the House in advance of today. I put on record the hypocrisy of the government in relation to its commentary around the declaration of these bills as urgent when it had repeated and multiple opportunities in this House to declare these bills urgent.

With the House having taken note of those comments and the position of the Labor opposition, we will ensure that, in accordance with the contributions that the Leader of the House made, we will support these bills to ensure they are passed by the House this week and there is appropriate and adequate time for members to speak to ensure the bills are passed. However, it is a matter of record that it is our position, particularly when it comes to the penalties and sentences bill, that this should have been considered by the House months and months ago.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

TOBACCO AND OTHER SMOKING PRODUCTS (DISMANTLING ILLEGAL TRADE) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I call the Minister for Health.

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (11.40 am): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. At the outset I commend you for the calm and methodical way in which you handled that debate over the last half hour. That would have tried the patience of Job, so well done to you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It certainly would have tried the patience of all of us.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister for Health. You have a bill to introduce, Minister for Health?

Mr NICHOLLS: I do, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I fear I may try your patience even more, so there you go. I present a bill for an act to amend the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014 and the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Dismantling Illegal Trade) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 [1236].

Tabled paper: Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Dismantling Illegal Trade) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes [1237].

Tabled paper: Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Dismantling Illegal Trade) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights [1238].

Today I am introducing the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products (Dismantling Illegal Trade) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill demonstrates the Crisafulli government's unwavering commitment to stamping out illegal vapes and tobacco in Queensland. These products are not just

illegal; they are dangerous, addictive and deliberately peddled by organised crime syndicates that care about only one thing, and that is their profit. Let us be clear: this is not just about cheap cigarettes and fruit flavoured vapes; this is about criminals targeting our kids with products that can cause serious, lifelong harm and addiction. Children as young as six years old have been caught with vapes and one-third of children aged 12 to 13 years old have already tried vaping. According to the Cancer Council's Generation Vape research, teenagers who vaped were five times more likely to take up smoking than their peers and 12-year-olds who had vaped were 29 times more likely to go on to smoke cigarettes.

These products are reversing decades of progress in reducing smoking rates among our young people. Cheap illicit tobacco keeps people hooked and tempts those who have quit to relapse. Vapes deliver a toxic mix of chemicals and heavy metals—many of them known carcinogens. The wide availability of these illicit products means more disease, more cancer, more chronic illness and more pressure on our public health system. They fill our hospitals with preventable illness, adding pressure to our health system, and the ramifications will be felt far into the future.

This is not only a health issue; it is a public safety issue. Organised crime groups are deeply embedded in this illegal industry, using profits to bankroll other dangerous criminal activities. Businesses are now routinely being threatened, with one retailer telling us—

Selling tobacco products has become dangerous for law-abiding retailers and staff, with ongoing fire-bombings and attacks on shop owners rampant.

Just yesterday we saw this play out on our streets once again. A tobacco store in Redbank Plains was rammed and burnt, with a neighbouring business also damaged by fire. Nearby business owners spoke about how frightening this was. Sadly, this incident is becoming far too common in Queensland.

Most disturbing of all is the emergence of dangerous new products including so-called 'supercharged' vapes in Australia. Vapes are being laced with nitazene, a synthetic opioid said to be 10 times more potent than fentanyl and 500 times stronger than heroin. A dose smaller than a grain of salt can result in death. This is nothing short of terrifying. Just across the border in New South Wales we have seen multiple overdoses and at least one death, simply from taking a puff of one of these supercharged vapes. We must act decisively to protect our kids, legitimate businesses and the health and safety of all Queenslanders.

Since coming to office, the Crisafulli government has delivered strong reforms to Queensland's tobacco legislation and the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation. I want to acknowledge the contribution of my good friend the Attorney-General in making some of those changes. We have raised the bar nationally by introducing the country's highest on-the-spot fines, we have empowered our enforcement officers to immediately forfeit and destroy vaping goods, and we have equipped Queensland Health with the tools to recover costs from those who flout the law. We are making the criminals pay, and these reforms are delivering results. Between November 2024 and August 2025, more than 420,000 vapes, 52.4 million cigarettes and 7½ thousand kilograms of loose tobacco have been seized. Over 140 interim closure orders have been issued and more than 3,000 fines have been issued. We are getting on with the job. These are not just numbers; they represent over $68 million of illegal products stripped from shelves and taken out of the reach of our children and young folk.

I commend our hardworking enforcement officers in our public health units on these outstanding results. To these officers I say that the LNP government has got your back and is backing you, and we are increasing your numbers by 25 per cent due to record funding in this year's health budget. I want to make special mention of the Metro North, Metro South, Central and Wide Bay public health units, which together seized over $20 million worth of illicit products as part of the incredibly successful Operation Appaloosa—the largest single action and recovery of illicit goods undertaken by a public health unit in the country. I also want to particularly recognise the officers in Wide Bay whose diligence led to the long-term closure of six stores, reducing the scourge of illegal products in that community. I also need to acknowledge the work undertaken by public health officials' colleagues in the Queensland Police Service, which in a recent joint operation with the Australian Border Force seized more than $70 million worth of illicit tobacco, cigarettes and vapes.

The Crisafulli government is making significant headway, but the illicit market is adaptive, resilient and increasingly sophisticated in exploiting loopholes and evading enforcement action. Illegally imported cigarettes, loose-leaf chop-chop tobacco and flavoured nicotine filled vapes are still, all too regrettably, being sold across the state. This bill delivers nation-leading reforms to give Queensland the toughest laws in the country and to start the fightback against these illegal operators that have been allowed to flourish for too long.

This bill strikes at the significant economic incentives that drive the illegal trade. It targets those who enable this trade behind the scenes such as landlords and company directors who turn a blind eye or quietly profit while illegal activity flourishes. It goes after the crooks who blatantly disregard our current laws. Importantly, this bill backs our enforcement officers by giving them the tools and the authority they need to act quickly and decisively against these dodgy operators. This has effectively been like trying to whack a mole, and we are giving our public health officers the opportunity to get whacking harder!

This government is determined to disrupt the supply chain by reducing the number of commercial properties available to those trading illegally. This is particularly relevant to landlords. The bill delivers several key reforms to achieve this—as I have said, nation-leading reforms that are right now being copied by New South Wales. The first reform is to support landlords who act in good faith by giving them a clear statutory power to terminate a lease where a tenant is using the premises to illegally supply or possess vapes and illicit tobacco. This statutory power applies when a closure order is issued and it means that landlords will no longer bear the burden of a closure order caused by their tenant's unlawful activity. The landlords will be able to get rid of that tenant.

However, not every landlord acts in good faith. Some are well aware of their tenant's conduct and choose to look the other way. To those landlords I want to be abundantly clear: this behaviour will no longer be tolerated. This bill puts those landlords squarely on notice. It introduces a criminal offence and a civil penalty aimed squarely at any landlord in Queensland who enables the illegal tobacco and vape trade to continue in premises they lease.

The criminal offence applies to the more serious behaviour where a landlord knowingly permits their premises to be used for the supply or possession of illicit tobacco or nicotine products. For an individual the maximum penalty will now be $166,900, one year's imprisonment or both. For a corporate landlord, the penalty is higher—it will be $834,500. The civil penalty applies where a landlord deliberately turns a blind eye to the illegal conduct, with landlords facing financial penalties of up to $834,500.

The introduction of a civil penalty is somewhat novel in Queensland. They are not used extensively throughout our statute book. However, it is designed to fill a critical gap in this particular industry because of the way it operates. It does this by targeting landlords who facilitate illegal activity through wilful blindness or reckless indifference. They cannot use that as an excuse. Importantly, the civil penalty gives landlords a clear commercial choice. If they suspect illegal activity at their premises they can either take action or turn a blind eye in favour of collecting rent, but if they choose to ignore the warning signs they do so at their own risk. Queensland Health will not hesitate to pursue a civil penalty that hits them where it hurts most: the hip pocket.

These changes will ensure landlords who hand criminals the keys to their shops are held to account. They will reduce the number of premises available for illegal supply, making it harder for the dodgy operators to do business. We make no apologies for taking this firm stance and decisive action. We intend to break the business model. We intend to empower honest landlords to ensure the dodgy ones do not get away with it.

I want to turn to closure orders. The bill also strengthens closure order powers to better disrupt repeat offending and deter noncompliant operators. Currently, interim closure orders can only be issued for 72 hours. We have heard that this short closure is no more than a mild inconvenience and just gives the dodgy owners a long weekend off. They open up again with a queue down the road. To ensure short-term closure orders are effective, the bill allows the chief executive of Queensland Health to close noncompliant premises for up to three months—increasing from 72 hours to three months on the directive of the chief executive of Queensland Health. This will significantly disrupt illegal operations and remove the ability of those operators to generate a rapid return to profit.

The bill also expands the power of the Magistrates Court by enabling magistrates to order a closure for up to 12 months, doubling the current maximum period. We expect our courts to be involved in stamping out this illegal operation and illegal operators in this pernicious trade. We will be making the operation of those laws clear and effective. These longer closure periods ensure our enforcement officers will not have to go to all the effort to close a store only to see it reopen days later. We are closing stores with the intention of bankrupting repeat offenders. We make no excuses for doing so.

We are also introducing offences relating to those people who breach closure orders. The bill makes it an offence to contravene a closure order by opening the premises to the public or supplying any products or services while the order is in effect. This means when Queensland Health issues a

closure order, closed means closed. There will be penalties of up to $33,380 for individuals and $166,900 for corporations who breach closure orders. Enforcement officers will also be able to issue on-the-spot fines.

We are also taking action to deal with what is described as compromised goods. The bill introduces another nation-leading reform. For the first time enforcement officers will have the power to seize what is defined as compromised goods. These are legal smoking products, such as legitimate cigarettes, that have become tainted by being found alongside illicit tobacco or vapes. There are no safe corners for those who try to profit from the illicit market. Anyone thinking of dabbling in the supply of vapes and illicit tobacco should know that even their lawful stock will be affected if it is associated with illegal products. There will be nowhere to hide.

We are also enhancing the current executive liability provisions. One of the matters raised with me in my discussions with our public health units is the extensive use of shell companies and the corporate veil to avoid prosecution. These changes that we are introducing will ensure company directors can be held personally liable for serious breaches of Queensland's tobacco laws by their companies. This is the case unless the executive officer can show that they did not know about the company's conduct or that they took all reasonable steps to prevent it.

The bill is supported by a suite of additional reforms designed to improve the overall effectiveness of the act and to ensure the act is responsive to current and emerging challenges. These include amendments to enable undercover and covert operations. Public health officers will be able to enter premises they suspect are engaging in unlawful activity and carry out those covert operations. The bill has an expanded scope of forfeiture decisions and enhanced powers relating to seizure, entry and request for information, enabling enforcement officers to carry out their duties more effectively.

In conclusion, this bill represents a bold and targeted response to the ongoing threat of illicit tobacco and vape supply in Queensland. Indeed, some of our proposed legislative amendments are so well regarded that they are being used as the blueprint for reform in other jurisdictions. Several of the reforms canvassed in our consultation paper released in May this year were just recently copied by the New South Wales Labor government. Premier Chris Minns in New South Wales is quoted as saying—

I've got a great concern that illicit behaviour will cross the border into NSW as criminals flee Queensland. We can't be in that situation.

We want to close the criminals down. The adoption by New South Wales of our nation-leading approach includes the three-month and 12-month closure offences, offences for contravening closure orders and a lease termination power. New South Wales is once again copying Queensland. This is a testament to Queensland's position as a nation leader in tobacco and vaping reform.

The amendments in this bill are widely supported. A joint submission from the Cancer Council Queensland, the national Heart Foundation of Australia, the Lung Foundation Australia, the Australian Council on Smoking & Health and the Queensland branch of the Public Health Association of Australia stated they commend the Queensland government for its continued leadership in tobacco control and for proposing a world-leading enforcement regime to combat the illicit trade of tobacco, vaping and other nicotine products—world leading! I want to thank these organisations for their work in the consultation on this bill and for their support of the bill. I recognise their contribution to public health outcomes here in Queensland.

The bill is also strongly backed by small business owners. We are looking after them as well. We know legitimate businesses are doing it tough because of the illegal shops operating with impunity. Licensed family owned businesses have told us that they have been forced to cut staff, reduce trading hours and stop supporting worthwhile community causes. They are losing out financially while watching the illegal tobacco and vape shops multiply and infiltrate the market. I want to ensure all those good, lawful, legitimate small businesses doing the right thing we have heard your frustrations, we are acting on your frustrations and we are delivering for you. The amendments in this bill directly target illegal operators. In fact, one small business told us the only 'tobacconists' that would be against these proposed amendments are stores selling illicit products. If you are a law-abiding business then these amendments will only provide further regulation, which is much needed in the industry.

This is true. Law-abiding businesses are paying their taxes and following the law while crooks are cheating the system, ripping off taxpayers and destroying the livelihoods of our honest retailers. To all illegal operators and dodgy landlords, my message is clear: we are cracking down. This bill will forcibly shut down the illicit supply chain and it will protect legitimate businesses and, importantly, the health and wellbeing of our children and young people. It will restore the progress Queensland has worked so hard to achieve in tobacco control.

Finally, I look forward to hearing the contributions from stakeholders during the committee process and to reading the committee's report on my return from three weeks leave. This is an important bill that will help take these dangerous products off the streets and out of the hands of our children. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (12.00 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Health, Environment and Innovation Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee.

Before we move to the next order of the day, I remind the House that the members for Algester, Gladstone, Inala, Logan, Pine Rivers, Greenslopes, Buderim and McConnel remain on warnings.

PENALTIES AND SENTENCES (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 20 May (see p. 1210).

Second Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (12.01 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The committee received 197 submissions in the course of its inquiry. I thank all organisations and individuals who made submissions and gave evidence before the committee. I would like to particularly acknowledge the victims who contributed to the committee's inquiry. I recognise their courage and advocacy and thank them for sharing their views and experiences. These changes to the Penalties and Sentences Act are significant and it was important for Queenslanders to be provided with an opportunity to contribute their views on the proposed changes. Ultimately, the committee made only one recommendation in relation to the bill: that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for supporting the passage of the bill.

The bill delivers on a number of important criminal justice reforms and reflects the Crisafulli government's ongoing and unwavering commitment to a fair and efficient justice system that prioritises victims of crime and delivers safety for our communities—things that were not a priority under the Labor government. A key focus of the bill is sentencing reforms to implement several recommendations of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council in its report titled *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*. I would like to again thank and acknowledge the work of the council and its secretariat. I thank the stakeholders, advocates and victims who provided feedback to the council during the course of its review. In addition to changes to the PSA, the bill also introduces a new offence for false representations in relation to government agencies and amends the Crimes at Sea Act 2001 and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000 to ensure a contemporary and effective justice system.

First I turn to the sentencing reforms. The bill amends the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to implement the four key recommendations from the report which were identified by the council as opportunities for immediate legislative change. These changes have been informed by key findings of the council and seek to prioritise victims of crime and meet community expectations through the sentencing process.

The bill implements the intent of recommendation 1 by introducing a new statutory aggravating factor to increase sentences for rape and sexual assault offences committed against children. This recommendation was made by the council in response to its finding that the sentences imposed for these offences when committed against children are not adequate. The amendment will require the court, when determining the sentence for an offender convicted of rape or sexual assault against a child aged 16 or 17, to treat their age as an aggravating factor unless the court considers it is not reasonable due to exceptional circumstances. This change reinforces a clear position that these offences are inherently more serious due to the higher level of harm experienced by children who are victims of crime, as well as the greater culpability of perpetrators who target our vulnerable children. I appreciate that stakeholders were generally supportive of the introduction of the new statutory aggravating factor as it clearly reflects community expectations that sentences should be higher in circumstances where these offences are committed against a child.

The bill also implements recommendation 2, which is that recognition of the harm done to victims be included as an express sentencing purpose in the Penalties and Sentences Act. This recommendation followed the council's finding that the current sentencing purposes of punishment, rehabilitation, deterrence, denunciation and protection do not adequately recognise the need to hold offenders accountable for the harm done to victims and that there should be greater acknowledgement of that harm as an important aspect of sentencing. The bill consequently expands the current sentencing purposes to include recognising the harm done by the offender to a victim of the offence as a purpose of sentencing.

I acknowledge that stakeholders who made submissions to the committee and who appeared at the public briefing had divergent views regarding the introduction of the additional sentencing purpose. While a substantial number of submissions supported the amendment, some stakeholders raised concerns, submitting that the amendment is unnecessary given the court must already have regard to any harm done to a victim. While I appreciate that the court must currently have regard to the harm done to a victim in the sentencing process, these amendments will allow the court to impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising that harm. That is, the reason for imposing the sentence can be in recognition of the harm caused to a victim of crime. This is because the Crisafulli government believes that the experiences of victims are paramount and the harm that is caused to them because of the offending should be expressly recognised by the court through sentencing.

Importantly, the amendment is not limited to only recognising harm caused to surviving victims, as would have been the case under the amendments Labor attempted to rush through the House when the bill was first introduced. Under the amendments Labor then suggested, the court would not have been able to impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the harm—

Ms Scanlon interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Under Labor's suggested amendments, because I am not sure that the shadow minister could hear me, the court would not have been able to impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the harm caused to victims. Victims are a priority under the Crisafulli government; victims are not a priority under the Labor opposition. For example, under those opposite, a victim who had been raped or tortured immediately prior to being killed would not be considered as they were not a surviving victim. Oh my goodness! What an 'oops' from those opposite. This failure or perhaps oversight by the former Labor government, in trying to rush through their changes merely to get a media grab, would have had unacceptable consequences for victims of crime and were changes that we could not support.

Under the bill, the court will be able to impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the harm caused to any victim, including a victim who is deceased. This is why it is important to have a government that prioritises careful drafting and proper consultation of significant legislative changes. We are getting it right. This reform enhances the visibility of harm to victims in the sentencing process and responds to concerns raised by victims and advocates that their harm is not sufficiently acknowledged in the sentencing process.

The bill also makes significant changes to the way that good-character evidence is used, giving effect to recommendation 5 of the council's report to qualify the court's treatment of certain types of good-character evidence when sentencing offenders for offences of a sexual nature. The council found that, while evidence of someone's character can play a legitimate role in sentencing, there are three problematic types of good-character evidence: character references; evidence of an offender's standing in the community; and evidence of an offender's contributions to the community.

Balancing a range of factors, including the divergent stakeholder views, the council found that the use of these types of evidence should not remain unrestricted. This is because this evidence often contains subjective and non-professional opinions about the offender's personality, standing or contributions, which are often relied on by courts to reduce their sentence. However, despite strong submissions which sought the complete abolishment of good-character evidence for sexual offences, the council expressly did not recommend a blanket prohibition on the use of these types of evidence. This is because, having regard to all the evidence before it, the council considered it was impossible to disentangle the problematic parts of the character evidence from other parts that may serve a legitimate and important purpose in sentencing. However, while the council recommended limitations on how good-character evidence is used at sentence, it recommended that some judicial discretion should be retained.

In accordance with the council's recommendation, the bill restricts the use of the problematic types of good-character evidence when sentencing offenders convicted of sexual offences. The bill provides that the court may treat an offender's good character to the extent it is established by these forms of evidence as a mitigating factor only if it is relevant to their prospects of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending. Even in circumstances where the court considers the good-character evidence is relevant to their prospects of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending, the court will still have the discretion to decide not to treat it as a mitigating factor and reduce a sentence. For example, where the court considers the offence is so serious in nature, having regard to the circumstances, the evidence of a person's good character should not mitigate or reduce the ultimate sentence imposed.

I appreciate that stakeholders who made submissions to the committee and who appeared at the public briefing also had strong divergent views about the amendments to good-character evidence. Some stakeholders supported the amendments, some considered that no changes are required and some advocated for greater restrictions on the use of good-character evidence. I understand that a number of these submissions were made by victims of crime, who told the committee that the use of good-character evidence during sentencing proceedings can be distressing and retraumatising. These divergent views are why it was so important for the bill to be referred to committee for consideration. I want to assure victims that we see them and we hear them. The Crisafulli government is absolutely committed to placing victims at the centre of our justice system.

The amendments set out in this bill are further evidence of the responsibility we have to support the rights of victims and to improve community safety. Importantly, these reforms were directly recommended by the council after 19 months of extensive research and wide consultation with both legal and non-legal stakeholders as well as sexual violence victims and victim support and advocacy organisations. The amendments to the PSA seek to carefully balance a range of competing interests, including the interests and circumstances of different victims. As the circumstances of each offence, each victim and each offender are infinitely varied, a complete prohibition on the consideration of good-character evidence for any purpose or particular categories may have unintended consequences.

In making their recommendation to restrict the use of good-character evidence, the council acknowledged the complexities of sentencing and the importance of retaining judicial discretion. Importantly, the bill amends section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act, which limits when a court can use evidence of an offender's good character to mitigate or reduce their sentence, to allow a sentencing court to use this evidence to make a full assessment of a person's character, including to increase or aggravate the sentence. Let's all remember this: the Labor opposition tried to rush through good-character changes by making amendments to section 11 as opposed to section 9! By amending section 11, the Labor opposition would have prevented the sentencing court from being able to aggravate or increase the sentence because of a person's character. This is simply further evidence of Labor trying to get cheap wins without thoroughly considering the implications of their rushed amendments. Comparatively, the amendments in the bill do not prevent the court from considering good character as an aggravating factor such as when the offender uses their standing or position in the community to facilitate their offending. This thoughtful and methodical approach by the Crisafulli government to implement the council's recommendations stands in stark contrast to Labor's approach, which demonstrated that their former government simple did not deliver for victims.

The bill also implements recommendation 23 of the council's report by clarifying that the court cannot draw any inference an offence caused little or no harm from the fact a victim impact statement was not provided to the court. Victim impact statements play an important role in sentencing, giving a voice to victims and offering a personal perspective for the court to take into account when imposing a sentence. However, victims may choose not to provide a victim impact statement for a range of reasons, including as a self-protective measure to avoid further distress.

The council recommended the amendment to section 179K(5) of the Penalties and Sentences Act because it was concerned the current wording may place pressure on victims to provide a victim impact statement through fear that choosing not to will result in the court assuming they have not suffered harm. I note that while many stakeholders supported the amendment, some raised concerns and submitted that the current provisions are sufficient to cover the concerns raised by the council and that the amendment is not necessary. I acknowledge that the Penalties and Sentences Act currently declares that it is not mandatory for a victim to give a victim impact statement, but this important amendment removes any concern in the interpretation of the provisions that may be placing pressure on victims to provide a victim impact statement and addresses concerns raised with the council by victims of crime.

Again, we are a government that sees and hears victims. It is harrowing for any victim to prepare a victim impact statement and to relive the very event that changed their life forever. There is no doubt that those victims who elect to provide a victim impact statement are brave. However, for those victims who cannot bear the trauma of reliving the crime inflicted on them, this change promotes their right to self-determination, their right to choose whether or not to give a victim impact statement and their right to privacy, to not disclose personal and sensitive information.

These sentencing reforms contained in the bill are the Crisafulli government's initial response to the council's report and implements all legislative amendments which were expressly recommended. We are committed to measured and methodical consideration and progression of the recommendations to ensure reforms meet community expectations and improve the experiences of victims as they navigate the criminal justice system.

The Crisafulli government has inherited a system from the former Labor government which failed to prioritise victims and support them through the criminal justice system. I am proud to be part of a government which is putting victims first and delivering reforms for Queensland, including through the bill we are debating today. The Crisafulli government has committed nearly $460 million in our 2025-26 budget for services that will ensure victims of crime receive the support they need. This investment includes: $50 million to deliver the new Victims Advocate Service—a one-stop shop for victims of crime to help them navigate the justice system and provide them with end-to-end support; $393 million to enhance support under the Victims of Crime Assistance Act 2009; $12.9 million for the expansion of the Victims of Crime Community Response program; and $2.6 million to support the establishment of a youth justice victims register as part of our Making Queensland Safer Laws. Complimenting these initiatives, as part of the 2025-26 state budget, the Crisafulli government is providing $2.6 million to increase the capacity of the Queensland Corrective Services' Victims Register to address existing high demand and support its effective operation. We promised to deliver change for Queensland, and that is exactly what we are doing.

I am happy to address the opposition's amendment, which I note the shadow minister has circulated. As the member would be aware, the changes to the Penalties and Sentences Act are significant, which is why the Crisafulli government is focused on ensuring that the criminal justice system is prepared for these changes. Unlike the former government, which tried to rush their botched amendments through in the same sitting week as the bill was introduced, we will not be thrusting these changes on the legal profession with no time to prepare. Importantly, a fixed date for commencement provides certainty to our courts and legal practitioners regarding when new sentencing purposes and principles will come into effect. This will ensure our legal practitioners can prepare submissions and the court can apply the rules that are in effect on the day of sentencing.

It is critical that the prosecution has sufficient time to ensure that information provided to the court appropriately reflects the new sentencing practices such as drawing the court's attention to the new statutory aggravating factor applying to offenders convicted of offences of rape or sexual assault against a child, ensuring their Crown prosecutors and legal practitioners are aware of the changes and are able to provide accurate and appropriate advice to the court on the use of good-character evidence, and ensuring that victims of sexual offences are aware and understand the changes, particularly as the council's report found that victims of rape and sexual assault want better information sharing.

The defence also needs sufficient preparatory time to ensure that any good-character evidence proposed to be used under the new restrictions is appropriately directed to the offender's prospects of rehabilitation and risk of reoffending. This may require the author of the reference letter to rewrite it and additional time for the defence counsel to speak with the defendant about the upcoming legislative changes. The court also needs to ensure sentencing decisions are made under the new requirements to ensure the intent of the sentencing reforms is realised.

The shadow minister will most likely say that QSAC consulted for 18 months, but they did not consult with the lawyers or barristers of Mount Isa, Townsville, Kingaroy, the Sunshine Coast—all these other areas that are unaware of the legislative changes. It is about drawing the attention of the court to the legislative changes coming in, consulting with the heads of jurisdiction about the legislative changes coming in and consulting with the Law Society and the Bar Association about the legislative changes coming in.

We remember consultation under the former Palaszczuk-Miles government. What did they do? They would call them in, pass a folder over and say, 'This is what we are moving today. You have been consulted.' I can tell members that that is why they are sitting on that side of the House. The Crisafulli government is putting victims first and restoring integrity to the criminal justice system in this great state. We are going to bring the courts, the lawyers, the barristers, the police, the DPP, Legal Aid, ATSILS and the amazing Public Service workforce in the criminal justice system in this great state along with us in relation to these legislative changes. It is important that we do.

I caution those opposite to not use the talking points for the rest of today and tomorrow and please listen to the considered response I gave with regard to the shadow minister's amendment. I am happy to hand that full response around to everyone.

I now turn to other elements of the bill. The bill amends the Criminal Code to criminalise conduct where a person falsely represents that they are a government agency or is acting on behalf of or with the authority of a government agency. The new offence continues to deliver on the commitment to make our community safer. The Crisafulli government is taking action to protect Queenslanders from government scams and other deceptive behaviours relating to government agencies to ensure those who deceive the Queensland public should and will be held accountable.

Importantly, the bill also amends the Crimes at Sea Act 2021 to realign that act with the provisions of the Commonwealth legislation. These amendments are largely technical in nature to bring the Queensland legislation in step with the national crimes at sea legislation. There are also technical amendments in the bill to the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024 to ensure the reforms made by that act operate as intended to strengthen Queensland's blue card system.

In conclusion, the bill continues the Crisafulli government's commitment to restoring community confidence, delivering a fair and efficient justice system and ensuring victims are prioritised during the criminal justice process. I again thank the chair of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, Marty Hunt, and government members Nat Marr and Russell Field for their assistance during the long and arduous committee process. I know that listening to the content of some of those hearings is extremely stressful. I acknowledge the opposition members on the committee.

I thank Eloise from my office, who has done a huge amount of work to ensure the amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act are done right. I thank all those in the Department of Justice who have worked immensely hard on this bill to get it right, particularly Jo Hughes and Trudy Struber. It is important that we get it right.

Major legislative changes are important. That is why they should not be rushed. That is why amendments brought in to get a media grab do not work for victims of crime, do not work for the courts, do not work for our court users and do not work for the people who have been subjected to these horrific crimes over the last decade because of the failures of the former Labor government. Today is a very important day for the criminal justice system. I very much commend this bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Before I call the next speaker, I acknowledge in the public gallery student leaders from the Coorparoo Secondary College. You are most welcome here, students.

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (12.26 pm): I rise to speak on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This government says that it puts victims first, but the truth is that it puts press releases first, politics first and victim-survivors of rape and sexual assault last. Those opposite sat on a report that recommended these changes for six months and they only acted when Labor forced them to do so. They then copied our reforms and then delayed their own commencement for another 165 days, despite the fact that we said we were willing to work in good faith and pass their own bill. This means more than 1,600 victim-survivors could face court without these protections. Survivors have waited long enough. Labor will be moving an amendment to deliver justice now. I table a copy of that amendment along with the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, amendment to be moved by Hon. Meaghan Scanlon [1239].

Tabled paper: Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Hon. Meaghan Scanlon's amendment [1240].

Tabled paper: Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Meaghan Scanlon's amendment [1241].

If this government cannot do its job, it should get out of the way and let those who can do it. Rape and sexual assault devastates lives. The question before us is simple: will this parliament put survivors first or will it put the government's timetable first? I heard some of the comments by the Attorney-General about thanking committee members for the long and arduous process and for listening to the content submitted by victim-survivors. I ask her: why, when she thanks those committee members, is her response to victim-survivors that, even though they have experienced that harm, they need to wait until November? That is the decision this government is making.

What we have seen from the Crisafulli LNP government instead is delay, denial and deception. They talk tough and they hold press conferences, but when it comes to doing the work that actually helps victim-survivors they vanish. As I said, they sat on this report for half a year. For six months there was no timetable, no plan, no urgency; there was just silence from those opposite, who promised Queenslanders action. The opposition refused to accept that silence as the final word. We took the report seriously because survivors did. We set out practical amendments grounded in what the Sentencing Advisory Council recommended and in what the front line told us was needed. Only then, when Labor forced the issue, did the government scurry into this House with a bill that effectively mirrored the very reforms we flagged.

Let's be clear about what *The ripple effect* was. It was not a desk exercise, as the Attorney-General herself talked about. It went for 19 months. It was shaped by the voices of survivors, by the experience of frontline workers and by the evidence of judges and lawyers. The Sentencing Advisory Council did the methodical work of listening, analysing and testing. That report, unlike some of the other reports that those opposite have done, is publicly available for people to see. That influenced these reforms. It is interesting that those opposite want to rush some law reform and not disclose those so-called expert reports, but when we have a publicly available expert report here they say, 'Oh, well, we need to take our time.'

They handed down 20 key findings and 28 recommendations, not four—it was not a media grab. Those recommendations were a road map for change. What was the government's response to that road map? It was to park it, to leave it on the Attorney-General's desk until political pressure made inaction impossible. On average, in that period, almost 1,900 rapes or attempted rapes were reported in Queensland. That figure is not a statistic on a page; it is a measure of human pain. Every week that passed was another week the system was not as strong as it should have been because this LNP government chose delay over delivery.

When the government finally moved, they brought in a bill that lifted almost word for word the four reforms Labor had already put on the table. We wrote to the Attorney-General in good faith. We offered bipartisanship. The next day the government introduced their own bill, with conveniently the same four planks, and then insisted survivors needed to wait until November for these changes to commence. We even offered to declare the bill urgent so that survivors would not have to wait, but they refused that as well. That is not leadership; it is credit-taking. It is not putting victims first; it is putting politics first.

Let me state plainly that Labor supports this bill because victim-survivors deserve these changes. First, it makes rape or sexual assault against children an aggravating factor. That reflects community expectations and common sense. It also demands care when the offender themselves is a young person. That is precisely why the Sentencing Advisory Council recommended a comprehensive clean-up of section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act to give courts coherent broad guidance. That broader tidy-up has not been adopted by the government, and it should be. I heard some remarks from the Attorney-General that this is the first phase of reforms. That is the first time I have publicly heard any commentary about the fact that there will be other reforms. What the Attorney-General should outline is what the public timetable will be for those reforms because victim-survivors have waited long enough.

Second, it limits the use of good-character references to reduce sentences in sexual offence cases. In practice, the so-called 'good bloke' defence meant a parade of coaches, employers or community figures telling the court what a fine, upstanding citizen the offender was, as though social standing could somehow outweigh a survivor's trauma. Harrison James, the co-founder of the Your

Reference Ain't Relevant campaign, put it simply: 'it hides the truth behind a polite façade'. Having listened directly to victim-survivors, the Sentencing Advisory Council heard how demeaning and distressing this was. This bill shuts that door.

Third, it requires explicit recognition of harm to the victim in sentencing. Too many survivors told the Sentencing Advisory Council they felt invisible in the courtroom—that the system treated their pain as peripheral. Recognising harm is not radical; it is basic justice. It tells survivors that the law sees them, hears them and believes their experience.

Fourth, it ensures that, if a victim impact statement is not filed, the court cannot infer that no harm was done. In their submission, the Gold Coast Centre Against Sexual Violence—an organisation that I have an enormous amount of respect for—said—

> ... sometimes victim/survivors may be fearful or too traumatized to write a victim impact statement, others do not want the offender to know the extent of the traumatic impact.

Not every survivor is able to relive their trauma in this way. No-one should be punished for protecting their mental health or their privacy. This reform ends that insult.

All of those reforms are good. All of them should be in place already. We offered to pass the bill months ago. We wanted these protections in place now, yet the government says, 'Wait until 1 November'—another 165 days, another 1,600-plus victim-survivors potentially walking into court without these laws. Timing is not a technicality; timing is justice. That is why Labor will move an amendment for these changes to commence on assent. We should not ask one more survivor to wait because a government needs to pad out its legislative program. Our amendment is simple and principled.

Mrs Frecklington: We are passing it tomorrow night. How is that padding?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General. We may be passing it tomorrow night, but it does not come into effect until November, so I suggest you look at your own laws or vote on Labor's amendment. We will bring forward commencement of part 4 amendments to assent.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

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

Ms SCANLON: In practical terms, that means that the day this bill is passed by this House and assented to the protections would apply. It is the cleanest way to end the delay. Members opposite must now choose: do they vote for action or do they vote for another 5½ months of excuses? The government's inconsistency on urgency, frankly, is breathtaking. They have rammed through youth justice changes using urgency motions—some of those changes dealing with offences where the advice provided showed there had been no recorded proven offences over the past five years.

Mrs Frecklington: Once again not supporting victims of crime.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General. I ask her to withdraw that comment because I take personal offence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: They rushed the Trusts Act when it suited them. They rammed through changes for the Olympics but, when it comes to urgency for victim-survivors of rape and sexual assault, suddenly, apparently, the calendar fills up. Suddenly the brakes go on. What makes this delay even harder to justify is that the government's excuse was—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members to my right!

Ms SCANLON:—the need for a full consultation process, yet that process, according to the Attorney-General's own comments just before, had already taken place—19 months QSAC took to consult on these reforms. Even their own members on the committee agreed. Frankly, if the Attorney-General or her staff wanted to somehow suggest to this House that we need to—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the shadow minister attacking my staff and I ask her to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not an opportunity to debate the point. Member for Gaven, the Attorney-General has taken personal offence.

Ms Grace: You cannot take personal offence on behalf of staff.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: You cannot reflect on my staff like that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you were personally offended by the remarks about your staff.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is not something that you can take personal offence to. In this case, there is no point of order.

Ms SCANLON: I want to be really clear: the Attorney-General should be the one who is held to account. If she could not figure out an amendment to demonstrate to the committee members why we needed to go through this long process, then that is a reflection on her politics, frankly. Surely, if she wanted to demonstrate—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask that the shadow minister withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Attorney-General has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. We went through this long process, and the only recommendation from the committee, which has a majority of LNP government MPs on it, was that the bill should be passed, proving that we could have done this some time ago. The truth is obvious: when politics calls, the government runs. When survivors call, the government stalls.

I want to touch on some of the submissions that were made during the committee process. I note the feedback from the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland about the retrospective application of some of these reforms. I appreciate their considered contributions, but I do not believe it is unreasonable that these changes apply to matters already before the courts. If a perpetrator of sexual violence committed such an act in the belief that they would later be able to rely on their community standing or so-called good-character references to reduce their sentence, I do not think that aligns with what Queenslanders expect of their justice system. That is why we will be supporting these reforms.

The Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council found there was not an insignificant number of matters where these references were given weight, and that reality points to a clear problem that needs to be addressed by these reforms. These reforms ensure that sentencing reflects the seriousness of the offending rather than the offender's reputation.

I note there were a range of submitters who wanted these reforms to go further. The Sentencing Advisory Council's terms of reference were obviously and deliberately focused on sentencing for rape and sexual assault. That focus delivered a report of real depth, but it does not place a fence around the voices we heard. If the Victims' Commissioner and groups like the 'your reference' network identify further problems, this government has the power and responsibility to keep listening and improving. The terms of reference are a floor, not a ceiling. No-one needs to wait for permission to listen. This is what our statement of reservation outlines, and we urge the government to consider this feedback from stakeholders and victim-survivors themselves.

As our statement of reservation outlines, there are still 24 recommendations left on the shelf. The Sentencing Advisory Council did not deliver a four-point checklist; it delivered 28 recommendations, and this bill delivers just four. That leaves 24 outstanding. They include the section 9 clean-up I mentioned earlier. They include measures to improve the consistency and transparency of sentencing. They include victim support improvements and system changes that would minimise retraumatising victims. None of that is beyond the government's capacity. What is required is attention and will.

No doubt we will hear excuses from those opposite—we have already heard some of them from the Attorney-General this afternoon—that courts need time; and that stakeholders need to be trained; and that systems need months to update. This parliament has seen this government move at lightning speed when the politics suited them. The same machinery that moved in days for other bills can move now for these survivors. The truth is that the bottleneck is not operational; it is political. In terms of the human impact, 'delay' is not a neutral word. When government says 'defer', what a survivor hears is 'endure'. When government says 'commence in November', what a survivor hears is 'come back later'.

We cannot measure trauma in calendar quarters. We cannot ask someone who has reported rape to wait for a commencement date selected for political convenience. We should cut delay, not cut and paste excuses.

If the government accepts Labor's commencement amendment, the system can be ready. The courts are capable of adapting quickly when parliament speaks clearly. We have seen them do that before. Practice directions can be issued, bench books can be updated and prosecutors and defence counsel will know the new parameters around character references. The Attorney-General could do her job and make sure those things were delivered. The 'aggravating factor' change for offending against children can be reflected in submissions and reasons. We can do this cleanly and professionally and we should, because victim-survivors deserve no less.

Nothing in these reforms, commenced now, removes the careful balancing act judges undertake every day. What they do is clarify the framework, make the recognition of harm explicit, close the door to irrelevant character spruiking and identify that offences against children are, as the community expects, more serious. Judicial discretion remains, but it is exercised within a clearer, fairer statutory setting.

On this side of the House, we are on the side of victim-survivors; we are on the side of frontline workers, who said again and again that character references demean the process and compound harm; we are on the side of a justice system that faces the facts and names the harm rather than looks the other way; and, yes, we are on the side of police, who carry so much of this work, and we owe them a system that makes their efforts count.

Commencement on assent is not a slogan; it is the difference between an offender getting a discount because a community figure gave a testimonial and that discount being rightly unavailable. It is the difference between silence being mistaken for a lack of harm and the law recognising that silence is not the absence of pain. It is the practical expression of putting victims first.

When we pass this bill, and when and if these laws are brought into force on assent, we should not pack up and declare victory. There are 24 outstanding recommendations that still need attention. Tonight the government should commit to a public forward program that addresses them in consultation with the judiciary, the legal profession, victim-survivor advocates and support services. Some will ask, 'What difference does a few months make?' In the months that have passed it has made a difference for all those cases heard without these protections in place—hundreds of cases. It makes a difference whether a survivor hears their harm named and recognised. It makes a difference whether a court is—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Members to my right, your interjections are not being taken.

Ms SCANLON: It makes a difference whether a court is misled by the absence of an impact statement. It makes a difference whether an offender collects a discount based on social standing. In other words, it makes a real difference to real lives.

In terms of consistency with Queensland values, Queenslanders believe in fairness. They believe the law should reflect the gravity of sexual violence and the dignity of those who survive it. They expect their parliament to do the right thing when the evidence in the case is clear. Commencing these reforms on assent is the Queensland thing to do—practical, no-nonsense and focused on outcomes, not optics.

I also note this bill contains a number of other provisions beyond the Sentencing Advisory Council related reforms, including technical amendments around crimes at sea, adjustments to the blue card framework, and the new Criminal Code offence for impersonating public officers or agencies. These are largely uncontroversial matters. The opposition does not oppose them, but let's be clear: they are not at the heart of this debate. At the heart of this debate is whether survivors of rape and sexual assault will be forced to wait further for protections that both sides of this House already support.

I say to the government: do not respond to this amendment with the politics of fear, claiming the sky will fall in if commencement is brought forward. We have heard some of that already this morning. The courts are capable; practitioners are capable; the system is capable. What it needs is a government that is willing to be capable of leadership. Please spare survivors the politics of spin—the suggestion that delay is somehow a virtue. Delay has a cost, and it is paid by those who have already paid enough.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The standing orders, particularly standing order 251, outline the opportunities and obligations for members to speak. Under no circumstance is the conduct of the member for Maroochydore in particular consistent with those. I draw to your attention to her disorderly conduct, particularly given that you have cautioned her.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I will control the House. I am aware of what has been going on. There have been interjections, some of which have been taken and some of which have not. I will continue to control the behaviour of the House.

Ms SCANLON: Law is not the only lever, but it is certainly a powerful one. When we change what is admissible, when we set statutory expectations around harm and when we clarify aggravating features, we send a message about what this community values. We tell survivors that we see them. We tell offenders that their standing in the community is not a shield. We tell the system that the days of minimising harm are over. Culture follows law when the law is clear.

To conclude, sexual violence ought to be a space for bipartisanship—not the choreography of blame but the choreography of progress. We all agree that these laws are good and we want them to be passed. That is why we offered urgency on the government's bill. We accept that they have more resources than we do to draft legislation. We accepted that we were prepared to put our amendments aside and go with the government's bill in good faith, but the government refused that offer of bipartisanship from the opposition. All the government needs to do is walk through the door that we opened to get this done.

This debate comes down to a simple test: compassion or credit-taking, action or delay, survivors or spin. Labor knows where we stand. We stand with survivors. We will move the amendment to bring these laws into effect immediately, because survivors deserve better than another 165 days of waiting.

Mr HUNT (Nicklin—LNP) (12.48 pm): With your indulgence, Mr Deputy Speaker, I will begin by acknowledging Nicholas Tatham, who is in the gallery today. Nicholas is the current youth member for Nicklin and he joins me today. G'day, Nicholas!

It is breathtaking to sit here and listen to those opposite lecture us on urgency for supporting victims. I was absolutely gobsmacked listening to that—'Get on with it,' 'Get urgent'—after we have had a decade of decline. For 30 of the last 33 years I have been a police officer on the front line with victims while this mob here have done nothing. They have watered down the laws. It is absolutely breathtaking.

I rise today proudly as chair of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee in strong support of the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The committee's report made one recommendation—that the bill be passed—and it reflects the balance this bill strikes between the sometimes competing rights of offenders, the protection of the community and, most importantly, the recognition of victims.

Before I turn to the detail of the bill, I want to reflect for a moment on my time as a detective in the Queensland Police Service. Over many years, I investigated sexual offences and sat with victims—often in the immediate hours after their trauma—while they gave harrowing statements. I stood beside them in courtrooms where they were cross-examined, where their accounts were challenged and where sometimes their credibility was doubted. I saw the impact on them as they gave evidence. I saw disappointment and sometimes devastation when verdicts did not go their way. All too often I saw how deeply the court process itself compounded the trauma, particularly when dealing with children.

It is easy in this chamber to speak of 'aggravating factors' and 'mitigating factors', but behind the clauses in this bill are real people—victims who live with lifelong impacts, families who feel justice was never served, and police, prosecutors and advocates who carry the weight of seeing that cycle repeat. That is why this bill matters. It represents a significant step forward in recognising harm to victims, in ensuring sentencing better reflects community expectations and in restoring faith in a system that too often feels stacked against survivors.

This bill arises from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*. That report, which was tabled in 2024, contained 28 recommendations. The government has taken a staged approach, implementing four of those recommendations now while committing to a broader review of section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act and the victim impact statement regime. In addition, the bill makes amendments to the Crimes at Sea Act and the working with children act and creates a new offence of impersonating a government agency. I will not deal with those areas yet; I will stick with this one.

I want to comment on the aggravating factor for child victims aged 16 and 17 in the bill. Currently, courts must consider aggravating factors in sentencing but the law has not expressly required them to treat the age of 16- and 17-year-old victims as aggravating. This bill changes that. It makes clear that rape or sexual assault committed against a child of 16 or 17 years must be treated as more serious, unless truly exceptional circumstances apply. This is an important recognition. Our community rightly expects that older children, while nearing adulthood, remain vulnerable and impressionable and offending against them is a grave breach of trust and deserves stronger penalties.

I move to the recognition of harm done to victims as a sentencing purpose. Until now, sentencing purposes under section 9 of the act focused on punishment, rehabilitation, deterrence, denunciation and protection. What was missing was an explicit recognition of the harm caused to victims. This bill fixes that. Courts will now be able to impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the harm done to a victim. This is not symbolic; it matters to survivors to know that the law acknowledges what was done to them, not what was done against the state. It shifts the sentencing closer to where victims have always asked it to be: recognising their pain and holding offenders directly accountable for that harm.

Perhaps the most debated element of this bill during the committee process was the restriction on good-character evidence in sentencing for sexual offences. For too long, courts have heard glowing references about convicted offenders being good blokes, pillars of the community or dedicated family men. For survivors sitting in the courtroom, hearing those words after enduring the trauma of a court hearing is devastating. It minimises their experiences and risks diminishing the seriousness of the offence.

The bill does not abolish good-character evidence outright, but it qualifies its use. From now on, character references, evidence of community standing or contributions to society can only be taken into account if directly relevant to rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending. Even then, the court retains discretion not to reduce the sentence, especially where the harm to the victim was severe or the victim was particularly vulnerable. This reform ensures irrelevant, subjective references no longer undermine justice. At the same time, it keeps judicial discretion where it belongs: focused on legitimate sentencing considerations, not sentiment.

Another significant amendment relates to victim impact statements. Some victims choose not to provide one—often because reliving the trauma is too painful or because they wish to keep their suffering private—yet there has been a perception that if no victim impact statement is provided the court may assume little or no harm was suffered. This bill makes it clear that that inference cannot be drawn. Silence will not be taken as an absence of harm. This is about dignity, choice and respect for victims. It removes pressure on survivors to relive their experiences simply to justify the legal process.

Beyond the four QSAC reforms, the bill creates a new offence of falsely representing a government agency, punishable by up to three years imprisonment. This ensures Queenslanders are protected from fraudsters and scammers misusing the credibility of government. The bill updates the Crimes at Sea Act so Queensland remains aligned with Commonwealth legislation and the national cooperative scheme. It makes technical amendments to the working with children act. Each of these provisions strengthens community safety and builds confidence in the justice system.

The committee heard from almost 200 submitters. Some argued that the bill did not go far enough, particularly on abolishing good-character evidence altogether. Others warned against eroding judicial discretion. That divergence tells us two things: first, there is no single view of justice in this space; and, second, the bill has indeed found that right balance. It avoids extremes and instead delivers a measured, practical reform that advances victims' rights while respecting fundamental principles of justice.

As someone who has walked with victims of sexual offences, I know the trauma that they carry does not end with the crime itself; it is compounded in interviews, in courtrooms and in appeals. No legislation can undo that, but legislation can and must make the process less brutal, more respectful and more just. I thank everyone who shared their story or views with the committee. I thank the Department of Justice, my fellow committee members and the stakeholders who contributed. I particularly thank the Attorney-General and her wonderful staff—I see Eloise over there—who did a great job by introducing this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hunt, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): This Premier vowed to restore integrity, transparency, honesty and openness. That is what Queenslanders were promised. 'Transparency drives ministerial accountability and accountability drives change.' They are not my words; they are his. The Premier told Queenslanders that the LNP had learned their lesson, that they

would be different this time, but what we have seen over the past fortnight shows that nothing has changed. The LNP are a shambles. Their team is divided, their leadership is weak and their words about integrity ring hollow.

The Chief Health Officer saga has continued to drag down the confidence Queenslanders have in our health system. This is an independent role that should have been independently appointed by the director-general, without inappropriate ministerial intervention. It was reported that the appointment went to cabinet. Then it did not. It was reported that senior ministers intervened. Then they did not. Then the Premier openly admitted to getting involved by calling the director-general to provide his opinion. There are serious questions to answer. Now we hear that the CCC has raided the Queensland Health offices for information and documents around the shambolic appointment process. That is confirmation that our state's corruption-busting body thinks this process stinks. Let's not forget that it was covered up until the *Courier-Mail* asked questions.

This is no small matter. It goes to the heart of public trust. How did Minister Nicholls respond? With a press conference last week that was so shambolic it would have been comical if the topic was not so serious. It was reported that the embattled health minister was asked about his knowledge and involvement in the investigation 20 times—20 times. Each time he responded in what I can only describe as a nervous, erratic and dismissive way. He was asked if he would stand aside during the investigation. He could not answer the simplest questions. He ducked, he weaved and he left journalists with more questions than answers. It seems today that, under this Premier, ministers who are under investigation will be let off the hook. That is despite the LNP calling for Labor ministers in similar circumstances to be stood aside. If the Premier does not do so, it is yet another failure of leadership. That was their position at that time. In fact, that was a direct quote from Minister Nicholls. If the minister felt so strongly then, he should stand aside today.

Yet again this morning the minister was grilled by the media and, while trying to hose down questions, the minister continued to just say nothing. He is just going to see how it plays out—no ownership, no accountability, no nothing. The botched CHO appointment is just another in a series of woes for the health minister. You would be forgiven for thinking it was his own colleagues briefing out against him.

First it was the Premier and Deputy Premier refusing to say if they had their flu vaccination, dog-whistling to the far-right anti-vax supporters amid an influenza crisis. That was at the same time our hospitals were at capacity because so many unvaccinated Queenslanders were coming to hospital sick with the flu—sick Queenslanders who could have got their flu shot for free. Maybe they had not heard about it because the minister and Premier chose to spend three times more advertising their so-called Hospital Rescue Plan, a plan that actually pauses construction and delays critical beds being delivered like the Queensland Cancer Centre.

Then major blowouts in the specialist outpatient appointment waitlist were revealed. That is the LNP's waitlist for the waitlist. Thousands more Queenslanders are waiting for urgent specialist outpatient appointments, some potentially life-saving. At estimates it was revealed that 315,409 patients are on the waitlist. That is an increase of 12,943 patients waiting longer than clinically recommended compared to the previous year.

It is having a particular impact on our regions, where access to services is more difficult than here in Brisbane. This weekend it was reported that ramping has hit a record high under the LNP's watch—a record 47.8 per cent statewide. These are people who have called an ambulance in their hour of need. Despite this government promising to fix things, sick and injured Queenslanders are being left on the ramp, queueing to get the care they need. At Mackay Base Hospital, ramping hit 52.3 per cent. In Rockhampton, ramping is at 48.3 per cent. At my local hospital, Redcliffe, ramping sits at 46 per cent. At QEII, ramping is at 70.6 per cent. In Ipswich, it is 67.9 per cent. Some of these hospitals had major expansions underway, some already under construction—hundreds of extra beds. Now many of those sit in limbo while the LNP government drags out the build time. The LNP used this measure to crown previous health ministers the worst ever. They called on them to resign. By the LNP's own standard, the member for Clayfield now holds the title of Queensland's worst health minister ever. By the LNP's own standard, the health minister should stand aside.

If that was not bad enough, then came the reports about the youth justice minister. Multiple stories have emerged about her going through staff at an alarming rate—'a revolving door', I heard one outlet report. Staff do not walk away from jobs they love unless the environment is toxic. Three experienced and loyal LNP chiefs of staff do not walk away unless the environment is toxic. The

behaviour has been reported as erratic and chaotic, with allegations that the minister shouts and swears at staff. That is not leadership; that is bullying and intimidation. The minister herself has stood in this House and condemned similar allegations, but I guess that is the trend with this LNP: 'Do as I say, not as I do.'

Where has Premier David Crisafulli been through all of this? Silent, missing in action. When confronted with scandal in his own ranks, the Premier's job is to lead, to set the standard and to act decisively, but this Premier has done none of those things. Yesterday it was reported that he refused to say whether the member for Currumbin was fit for the job. He was slippery with his answers yesterday, even when asked if the minister was meeting the expectations within her charter letter. Today the paper reported that the Premier had refused to say whether he had asked Minister Gerber to explain her conduct. He is disregarding the allegations as merely gossip, with no thought, regard or respect for those people who are saying they have been on the receiving end.

The *Australian* is not a gossip column; it is our national broadsheet. Award-winning journalists have reported on the minister's behaviour because it is genuinely in the public interest. This morning he refused to withdraw those comments and refused to acknowledge just how serious the allegations are. By attacking the messenger, the Premier tells Queenslanders all they need to know. His promises of integrity were just that—promises, empty words—because when it comes time to act, when integrity is tested, Premier Crisafulli folds.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Leader of the Opposition, I remind you to use correct titles. Using names without correct titles is not appropriate. You corrected yourself; thank you.

Labor Party, Integrity

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.10 pm): The biggest complaint, honourable colleagues, from the opposition leader is that the new LNP government have not fixed 10 years of Labor decline in our first 10 months. That is his biggest issue. He mentions health, he mentions youth crime but he does not acknowledge that he sat around a cabinet table for 10 years and voted against strong youth justice laws. In fact, he voted to weaken the youth justice laws in this state. He lectures everybody now on the four big crises in Queensland—cost of living, health, housing and the others. He would have everyone believe that these issues have all just happened. They have all just appeared overnight—a new government, and all these issues. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition—who, no doubt, is going to speak—was the treasurer of the state who oversaw the housing crisis, the youth crime crisis, the cost-of-living crisis and the health crisis. All four issues were overseen by the member for Woodridge.

Who could forget the member for Woodridge waxing lyrical about integrity over the last 10 years when he stood by the member for Miller and he stood by the member for Stafford, his good mate in the right wing of the Labor Party? He has not said boo about the member for Cairns—about the serious allegations that I raised last parliamentary sitting about the member for Cairns and his abhorrent Facebook post—the misogynistic, sexist and religious vilification. They now object that it is all okay for him to do it. He still sits in the shadow cabinet front bench and he ought not to. If the Leader of the Opposition was not as weak as he is, he would have dealt with the member for Cairns but he could not because the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—who is in the same faction as the member for Cairns—protects the members for Cairns.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Members to my left, order!

Ms Grace: Double standards!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for McConnel—double standards. Let me repeat what she said—I happen to have *Hansard* here—when she was talking about Greg Hallam she said to me, and I quote—

Mr Nicholls: She is Harvard educated.

Mr BLEIJIE: Oh, yes, Harvard educated—I take offence at that interjection. She is no 'Harvard educated' over there. It was a fake degree and she put it out there that she was 'Harvard educated' and she was not. It was a fake. She said: 'You squibbed it.' 'You've got to be kidding.' This was before she knew the member for Cairns had put all of these derogatory, misogynistic, sexist, religious vilification posts on his own Facebook. Remember the line that they said that he shared, the great one-liners that

he supported? 'Filling a prostitute with diesel'—that is what he shared on his Facebook post—and you have the hide, you have the audacity to point fingers at people on this side of the House. You have protected the member for Cairns behind you. It is a disgrace that you do not practice what you preach. You come in here and wax lyrical about everyone else but you have the hide—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Sit down!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you were so engrossed you did not notice me standing up.

Ms GRACE: I take offence, and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, thank you. Members to my left, I gave a number of verbal warnings. There was a lot of provocation and retaliation is understandable but please pay attention.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Two days ago, the opposition leader stood next to the member for Cairns and waxed lyrical about coming to Cairns—we will fight every day to protect Cairns. Well, that member for Cairns should not even been sitting in this parliament. He should have resigned. I table that.

Tabled paper: Extract from social media, undated, featuring a post by the member for Murrumba, Hon. Steven Miles MP, regarding Cairns [1242].

He should have resigned for the offensive comments he made on Facebook. Who could forget Queensland Labor MP Jim Madden not being expelled over bullying claims? Where were they then, when they protected the former member Madden? Where were they when the chief of staff of the minister at the time, Mick de Brenni, quit after a barney with the boss? Mick de Brenni said there was no physical altercation but I think it would be pretty rare to find a political office where there are not disagreements on a range of issues every day but you want to come in here and lecture people about their offices now. You have the hide and the audacity—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The standing orders clearly outline that contributions should be made through the chair. I submit to you that the conduct of the Deputy Premier is unbecoming of a deputy premier, or any member of this House.

Mr BLEIJIE: I am just getting started!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, thank you. I am clear on the point of order; was there any other point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: It is very difficult to hear you, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Was there any other point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: That is my point of order; comments should be directed through the chair.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, thank you.

Mr BLEIJIE: Here we go. Workplace disharmony rumours in former minister Lance McCallum's office—I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Article, dated 20 February 2023, from the *Australian* titled 'Queensland Labor MP Jim Madden won't be expelled over bullying claim' [1243].

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 22 September 2024, titled 'George Street Beat: Qld politics news and gossip' regarding the member for Bundamba, Mr Lance McCallum MP, and his staff [1244].

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 20 November 2016, from the *Sunday Mail* (Qld) titled 'Minister Mick de Brenni's chief-of-staff quits after barney with boss' regarding the member for Springwood, Mr Mick de Brenni MP, and his staff [1245].

Ambulance ramping when Labor were elected in 2015 was 15 per cent. It blew out 200 per cent to 46 per cent—do not lecture anybody about 10 years decline when we have got 10 months of delivery.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Woodridge, Deputy Premier, you used some unparliamentary language and I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.17 pm): For many months we have been witnessing the rotten underbelly of the Crisafulli LNP government: the jobs for mates; the deals for donors; and the dodgy appointments. Now we are seeing the soft underbelly of the Crisafulli LNP government: ministers who cannot handle the pressure; ministers who crack under scrutiny; ministers who fly off the handle; ministers who lose the plot all too easily and abuse those around them; ministers turning on each other and briefing against each other; ministers who cannot answer questions or who simply refuse to answer questions; and ministers who embarrass themselves and their government with train wreck media conferences.

In recent weeks we have seen all of the above, and we will continue to see it. What we have seen is a government and its ministers cracking under pressure. This is what happens when you have a team of second-raters, a team of ministers who are just not up to the job. The Minister for Health, the Minister for Youth Justice and the Minister for Natural Resources have all managed to embarrass themselves in different ways. In essence, they have become figures of scorn and ridicule. In short, they are a joke but it is not funny for Queenslanders, because the joke is on them. It is not funny because these bumbling, abusive and incompetent individuals are in charge of very significant areas of public administration.

Let's start with the Minister for Youth Justice. When they did the big refurb of the LNP ministerial offices, they must have put a replica of the main front door of 1 William Street on the youth justice minister's office. Honourable members know the door I mean: the big glass revolving door. It would have been something like that, given the heavy foot traffic leaving the youth justice minister's office. We have all seen the reports of the minister flying off the handle, abusing and yelling at people and even hanging up on the directors-general and commissioners. I reckon the minister should just hang it up, full stop, because the minister clearly does not have the temperament to be a minister of state in Queensland. The minister clearly cannot work in a civilised and professional fashion with the people around her.

Then there is the Minister for Health. What a sickly sight that press conference was last week. At the first blush of mild scrutiny, the minister folded, retreated and fumbled for an escape. Fortunately, he had a plane to catch, but it was too late; the damage was done. The health minister now carries the excess baggage of that pathetic performance with him wherever he goes. It was an important matter the health minister was being questioned about, the matter of a Crime and Corruption Commission examination of the minister's role in the Chief Health Officer appointment debacle. Since then we have become aware that the health minister is responsible for the worst ambulance ramping on record. By the LNP's own measure, Minister Nicholls is now the worst health minister in Queensland history. However, there is an upside, because I am looking forward to Deputy Premier Bleijie and Minister Bates calling on the health minister to resign.

Then there is the minister for resources. Approached by reporters for comments on a very serious issue, the minister brushed the microphones and questions aside without a single word. What was Minister Last being asked about? He was being asked about the future of 17,000 workers in North and North-West Queensland. He was being asked what the Crisafulli government was doing about those jobs, including workers who live in his own electorate, and what the Crisafulli government was doing to keep the Mount Isa copper smelter and the Townsville copper refinery open. Minister Last said nothing. There may be a reason for Minister Last's silence on this issue, because maybe the Crisafulli government is doing nothing. If that is the case, it will be a massive betrayal of those 17,000 workers and their families who are dependent on the future operation of the smelter and refinery for their future livelihoods.

Just to come first circle, I will go back to where I started: the cracks in the Crisafulli LNP government, the imploding ministers. The Premier should do a cabinet reshuffle because surely no other members of the LNP could be worse than these dud ministers, but then again the LNP never ceases to disappoint.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Before I call the next member, I would like to recognise the presence in the gallery of the youth member for Nicklin, Nicholas Tatham, who is shadowing the member for Nicklin. Welcome.

Laver, Mr B Sr; Rudd, Mrs J

Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (2.22 pm): It is with great sadness that I rise to inform the House of the passing of two Mudgeeraba stalwarts and members of Mudgeeraba's foundation families, Mr William 'Bill' Laver Sr and Mrs Joan Rudd. The farmer from Mudgeeraba, Bill, and his late wife, Margaret, had a profound impact on our community. It is well known, of course, that Bill was an Albert shire councillor, as the local council was then known, from 1965 to 1994 and served as its chairman from 1982 to 1994. His service to our community can be seen across the city, from the oval at Carrara Stadium, which first bore his name, to Laver Drive in Robina, which reflects his significant contribution to the planning and development of our city. In fact, Laver Family Park, which was donated to the Gold Coast community by Bill, still boasts two persimmon trees which were planted by his father, William Henry Laver, at the turn of the 20th century when the property was first purchased.

To this day there are numerous scholarships at schools across the Mudgeeraba electorate thanks to the Laver family's Laver Schools Scholarship Fund, including year 6 scholarships for leadership, academic, cultural and sporting excellence, which includes a second instalment in high school if the student continues to excel in their studies. The Laver Schools Scholarship Fund has also announced a brand new scholarship, commencing this year, to support a deserving Robina State High School graduate as they commence their university studies—yet another example of the Laver family's continued generous support of our community.

A proud National Party member and then LNP member, Bill was always willing to share his wisdom and guidance, and I am grateful for his many years of kind words and insights. You could not mention Bill without also mentioning his beloved late wife, Margaret. An inseparable pair, both made significant contributions to local life, most notably through their involvement in the Mudgeeraba Show Society. Bill served as patron of the Mudgeeraba Show Society and was one of the founding members. I am proud to also serve as patron of the show, though I have some way to go to match Bill's length of service.

Similarly involved in community life, lifelong Gold Coast local Mrs Joan Rudd would be known to many due to her involvement in the Gold Coast Hinterland Heritage Museum. The Gold Coast Hinterland Heritage Museum aims to preserve historical material and artefacts which reflect the growth and development of the hinterland region. A member of the pioneering Duncan family, the original cedar cutters in Springbrook, Joan served as patron and president of the museum, working to preserve the rich history of our local community. Joan was a staple of the museum, warmly sharing the history of our local area with visitors at open days and volunteering tirelessly at the museum every Sunday. Every year I would attend the Anzac Day service with Joan. I always enjoyed our discussions and her in-depth knowledge about our community.

Joan was involved in all aspects of hinterland life including the Mudgeeraba Show, having previously been named Miss Mudgeeraba and Miss Hinterland in a heated competition against 10 other young women. She and her husband, Jack, were a constant presence in the hinterland, volunteering at events and for causes throughout the year. From the church and the show balls of the fifties, which Joan described as a great way to get to know most people in the town, her involvement with the Mudgeeraba Street Party and the Mudgeeraba Show right through to her service through the Gold Coast Hinterland Heritage Museum, Joan constantly gave back. However, as was her way, she did not make a fuss of it, choosing instead to get on with whatever job needed doing, in her usual selfless manner. I am reminded of her belief that volunteering is the way communities do things. Her husband, Jack, shared a similar view that if you wanted things to happen, you had to volunteer to do it. Indeed, our community is richer for the selfless dedication of Joan and, indeed, her beloved Jack over the years and their community-minded spirit.

It is no secret that our community has evolved significantly over the years and families like the Laver family, the Duncan family and the Rudd family have been witness to it all. Our community is poorer for the loss of both Bill and Joan. My thoughts and my prayers are with their families and their loved ones at this time. Rest in peace. Vale, Bill Laver and Joan Rudd.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): I pass on our sympathies to your community for their loss. Before I call the next member I want to recognise the seniors and teachers of Our Lady Help of Christians from the very important electorate of Clayfield.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.27 pm): Under the LNP, promises made are now promises broken. The LNP said that ramping would be fixed if they were to get into government. They said that real-time data would improve the health care of locals in their hospital and health service. The LNP said that doctors and nurses would be put back in charge and be able to run their healthcare communities just as they should be run. The truth is that ramping is now at its worst on record under the worst health minister in history. By the LNP's own standards, the health minister, the member for Clayfield, is now the worst health minister in history.

In fact, we know that real-time data is not driving better outcomes for patients; it is only driving the threats of fines and warnings upon our health workers. The doctors and nurses who were told they would be in charge are now being directed how to best care for their patients, and that best care is to place them in corridors where there is not the medical instruments and equipment needed. That is a promise broken under the LNP. We know the reason they are doing this is for data. Last term the member for Burnett said that it was time to break the back of our Queensland health workers. Let me tell you: the LNP are breaking the morale of our Queensland health workers across this state.

Those of us on this side of the House do not see patients as data; we see patients as the mums and dads of our local community, as the grandparents of our local community, as the children of our local community who present to an emergency department and do not have the expectation of waiting in the back of an ambulance for hours and hours on end. This is not being made up by those of us on this side of the House; these are direct quotes from whistleblowers who are coming into my office or calling and telling me what is happening in the Bundaberg and Hervey Bay hospitals. Nurses and paramedics have come to me to tell me how they feel that their professional standards are being put at risk by the LNP as they are told to move patients from the emergency department to a corridor or a hallway of a ward that is not suitable for that particular patient and how they feel pressured by above from those in Brisbane to make that happen. Paramedics have said to me and to the shadow health minister that whilst they have a patient in the back of their ambulance in the waiting bay they are being called directly from Brisbane to move that patient into the waiting room because it does not look good on camera.

The LNP is worried about data and optics instead of the health care of patients, and we know that that is what the LNP stands for. It cannot deliver on the promises that it made before the election with this health minister in charge. In fact, the health minister should not even wait for the CCC investigation to step aside; just step aside now, health minister. The whistleblowers are talking about how in the Hervey Bay Hospital there are patients on stretchers in the foyer blocking the elevators. On that occasion visitors who wanted to see admitted patients had to weave through the stretchers with patients waiting outside of the elevator in the Hervey Bay Hospital. That is what health care looks like under this LNP and under this worst ever minister.

With regard to the Hervey Bay Hospital, during the election campaign the member for Hervey Bay said that he would deliver a brand new hospital for the people of Hervey Bay. In fact, he said not to build the new hospital in Bundaberg but to build it in Hervey Bay. As an article states—

He believes there's cause to press pause on the current commitment to build a Level 5 hospital ...

That was in Bundaberg. He also said that there were 'substantial health care, safety and capacity issues' in Hervey Bay. In fact, these were the member's words as quoted—

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

All we see from the member for Hervey Bay is him standing next to that ad hoc construction. By standing next to it he is effectively saying, 'How good it is that Labor are delivering on their projects for the people of Hervey Bay.' Where is this new hospital from the member for Hervey Bay? Why has he gone silent? Why is he not standing up for the paramedics who bypass him and come to me because they know that he will not stand up for them? I refer to those paramedics and those nurses who feel under pressure and who feel as though this LNP government is putting their professional lives at risk and putting the lives of their patients at risk. Health minister, do your job!

Queensland Manufacturing Month

Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (2.32 pm): Queensland's manufacturing sector is a sleeping giant and the Crisafulli government is waking it. Manufacturing is our state's fifth largest industry. It employs more than 180,000 Queenslanders, contributes $27 billion to our economy and generates more than $24 billion in export earnings. A strong manufacturing base means more local jobs, more sovereign capabilities and more regional opportunities. During Queensland Manufacturing Month it is important that we recognise the enormous potential this industry holds and the work that the Crisafulli government is doing to unlock it.

After a decade of decline under Labor, Queenslanders are now seeing 10 months of delivery, including our $79.1 million Transforming Queensland Manufacturing Program to help local businesses modernise, innovate and compete globally. This program will help manufacturers tap into new export opportunities and drive the next generation of high-tech, high-value jobs. There is also a $10 million investment to expand manufacturing hubs in the regions, with new hubs opened in Toowoomba and the Sunshine Coast, delivering on our election commitment. These hubs give manufacturers practical support like skills development, tailored advice and pathways to scale up and create jobs—promise made, promise delivered. We are also getting the Queensland Train Manufacturing Program back on track. This project will support more than 1,300 jobs over its life and recruitment is well underway.

Queensland Manufacturing Month is not just a chance to showcase what our industry is already achieving; it is an opportunity to look ahead, and later this month we will take another step forward when we launch the Transforming Queensland Manufacturing strategy. It is a plan developed with industry to ensure our manufacturers are globally competitive, future ready and equipped to seize new opportunities in both traditional sectors and emerging markets like defence, aerospace and critical minerals. Our message is clear: the Crisafulli government believes in manufacturing in Queensland and we are providing the support to match.

Earlier this month I had the privilege of joining the Women in Manufacturing breakfast in Cairns. This event brought together a network of leaders, innovators, tradeswomen and business owners and school students who are shaping the future of manufacturing in Far North Queensland. The Women in Manufacturing program is about making sure that those women see a future for themselves on the production floor, in the labs, working the tools and in leadership roles. It is about making sure that as we grow the manufacturing sector in Queensland women are also part of that story.

Queensland Manufacturing Month reminds us all that our state has the talent, the ideas and the drive. What manufacturers need is a government that backs them, and the Crisafulli government is doing just that with a clear plan focused on results. As a born and bred North Queenslander, I know how important manufacturing is to regional Queenslanders and I also know our manufacturing sector relies on the strength of our other great industries like mining to grow and sustain regional workforces. Last month I met with Jack Trenaman from SMW Group which builds truck trays for mines from its workshop in Rockhampton. He told me about how the Crisafulli government's support for the Bravus Carmichael coalmine expansion, which we announced last month, will benefit regional manufacturers like his business. He said our support for that mine expansion—

> ... means being able to sustain our workforce. Having that commitment from Bravus and other mines to build new trays here regionally in our Rockhampton facility ... means a spin off for all the regional communities with off site services that supply us, and the 30 to 40 trainees and apprentices every year that we're putting out there.

This is what the Crisafulli government is delivering. Queenslanders remember all too well the approach to the Carmichael mine taken by those opposite. During Labor's decade of decline, companies were tied up in red tape, projects sat on desks for years and major policies changed overnight as inner-city activists dictated the agenda. Labor never supported the Carmichael project and it never supported the great manufacturing jobs that people like Jack Trenaman are creating in Rockhampton off the back of it. The Crisafulli government is backing the industries that power this state. We are delivering opportunities to Queensland's regions. Whether it is the trains in Maryborough or advanced agtech in Cairns, we want more things made in Queensland by Queenslanders and we are waking the sleeping giant to create jobs in manufacturing and delivering a better lifestyle through a stronger economy for every Queenslander.

Bundamba Electorate, Health System

Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (2.37 pm): It is official: under the Crisafulli LNP government, Queensland has the worst ambulance ramping that it has ever had delivered by the worst health minister, by its own standards, that Queensland has ever had. This government is on the fast track to becoming the worst government that Queensland has ever had. In the 10 months that it has been in office, this government is already surpassing the former Newman government and is well on the way to surpassing the former Bjelke-Petersen government.

The latest health data has revealed that Ipswich has the fourth worst ambulance ramping in the state of Queensland. That is not good enough for the proud city of Ipswich. Over 69 per cent of the patients who are presenting at Ipswich Hospital are waiting longer than the recommended time—longer than what was promised to them by the now Premier when he was opposition leader. They are up there waiting on the fourth floor of the hospital. This is a direct result of this government wasting millions of dollars that should have been spent on healthcare delivery spent on ads instead. We have all seen the 'blue' ads on TV and heard them on the radio. Members of the government are out there patting themselves on the back about what a great job they are doing with taxpayers' money. Meanwhile, we see the real data and we have the worst ramping that we have ever had.

Those opposite spent over a quarter of a million dollars renaming satellite hospitals, like the Ripley satellite hospital in my community, and, of course, they did not spend any money preparing properly for the flu season. We had one of the worst flu seasons on record in modern times because there is a health minister who is asleep at the wheel and a Premier who will not even come out and say

whether or not he had his flu vaccination. Is it any wonder that our hospitals are under pressure? People are turning up in ambulances seeking health care and they are having to wait too long because of this government.

Labor was proud to deliver a new ambulance station in Ripley. It is now open and operational. We have expansions underway at the Ipswich Hospital worth over a billion dollars which were started by Labor. That will deliver an extra 200 beds. We have the expansion at Mater Springfield. We have a 90-bed subacute expansion at the Ripley Satellite Health Centre. All of this was started and funded under Labor, but now the LNP are trying to pass off these projects as theirs. People are not buying it. The health minister, when he is under pressure getting up in one of his train wreck press conferences, can say they are swinging cranes, but the cranes that are being swung are cranes that were funded under Labor. Labor is delivering for Ipswich.

The expansion of the Ripley Satellite Health Centre will deliver 90 subacute beds, but what will not be there is the multistorey car park. While the government are out there pretending a Labor project is theirs, what the health minister is actually doing is consulting with our community through a ministerial infrastructure designation about plans to cut the multistorey car park. When there is overflow into the South Ripley community down in Providence, it will be at the feet of this government and this health minister.

It is plain that the LNP is putting political spin above solutions. Whilst patients are being left to wait longer than ever, the CCC probe into the political interference of the LNP in relation to the axing of the Chief Health Officer appointment is escalating. This is an absolute shambles. We have health projects that are being put on indefinite pause, we have patients who are waiting longer than ever in ambulances to access the services that they desperately need and all we have from this government is spin and excuses.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise on a matter suddenly arising. The member opposite accused me of not stating whether I had received the vaccination. He is clearly wrong. I have said that many times and I will be writing to you in respect of that matter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): You understand there is a process for that.

Mr McCALLUM: Mr Deputy Speaker, for the assistance of the House and the member who just rose to his feet, I was referring to the Premier and I am very confident that the record will show that.

BUSHkids, 90th Anniversary

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (2.44 pm): I have the mic.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Members, order!

Mr BENNETT: What a privilege it is to stand and talk about the 90th anniversary of BUSHkids that will be celebrated this year. In 2025 the Royal Queensland Bush Children's Health Scheme, better known as BUSHkids, celebrates an extraordinary milestone—90 years of dedicated service to Queensland children and families.

Mr Power interjected.

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

Mr BENNETT: Since 1935 this not-for-profit organisation has been at the forefront delivering free essential services to children and families in regional, rural and remote communities. Over nine decades, more than 90,000 children and their families have been supported—a remarkable legacy of care, commitment and unwavering education. Today BUSHkids has grown to a staff of 180, delivering more than 500 services every week. Last year alone, 9,000 children were supported with life-changing services—living proof of the BUSHkids vision that all Queensland children should have the opportunity to reach their full potential no matter where they live. None of this would be possible without the extraordinary people who make up the BUSHkids family—passionate staff and a tireless and committed group of volunteers. Back home, in the Bundaberg and Burnett areas, I want to give a special shout-out to Judy Peters, Scott Lamond and the incredible Friends of BUSHkids for their energy, dedication and unwavering support that keeps this mission alive in our community.

Last week in the Bundaberg area we had the privilege of hosting the very first screening of *Seen—The Film*, as part of BUSHkids' 90th anniversary roadshow. Hundreds of people packed the Moncrieff theatre, showing overwhelming support for this important initiative. The evening was brilliantly

hosted by long-term BUSHkids advocate Scott Lamond. We heard powerful reflections from our community champions, including Judy Peters and Pastor Richard Cathie, highlighting why supporting parents is so critical to making our families stronger.

The documentary itself is deeply moving. It highlights the importance of parents looking after their own wellbeing and the profound, lasting benefits this has for children, families and entire communities. I want to personally acknowledge CEO Carlton Meyn and his dedicated team for leading this project and, once again, the Friends of BUSHkids Bundaberg and all supporters for making the evening such a tremendous success. Bundaberg was the first community to celebrate BUSHkids' 90th anniversary with a screening of S*een*. More events are planned across regional Queensland in the coming months as the roadshow continues, so be sure to keep an eye out for dates and locations. With the indulgence of the House, I ask members to please promote these events within their communities. I am sure their communities will be better for the viewing of this wonderful movie.

BUSHkids' 90th year is about not only celebrating the past but also building the future. From the new telepractice centre in Toowong, named to support the ongoing reconciliation action plan, to the soon-to-be-released model of care, this organisation continues to innovate, expand and ensure no child in Queensland is left behind. BUSHkids demonstrates the power of mission-driven teams, strong community partnerships and meaningful collaboration with governments, universities and other organisations. Their work is a reminder that supporting children and families is not just a job; it is a responsibility shared by all of us. From its beginnings under Governor Sir Leslie Wilson in 1935 to now celebrating 90 years under the patronage of Her Excellency the Governor of Queensland, BUSHkids has always stood for one simple truth: every child matters. Let us celebrate this proud legacy and support their future and continue to ensure that BUSHkids can do what it does best: giving every child, no matter where they live, the chance to thrive.

In closing, I give a shout-out to everyone who participated in the football match last night. It is great to see that, with everyone's participation, $11,000 was raised for BUSHkids. Thank you to the member for Chatsworth and all of the other members from all sides of politics.

Mr Crandon: And the photographer!

Mr BENNETT: I heard he took some 300 photographs! I thank Football Queensland for making Perry Park available for this great event. I was unable to join you last night, but I give a shout-out to all who put so much in to support such a great organisation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Burnett, for your advocacy for that group.

Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 4

Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (2.48 pm): I reiterate the member for Burnett's comments. It was a great night. It was a shame he could not make it. He missed my full volley from the edge of the box into the top corner. It was not a mis-hit at all and completely intentional! There was also an amazing assist from the member for Bundamba.

Under the LNP Crisafulli government, ambulance ramping has reached its worst levels on record. Ramping rates have reached all-time highs of 44.8 per cent in June and 47.8 in July. That is 47.8 per cent of patients—nearly half of all patients—forced to wait a minimum of 30 minutes before they can even be admitted to emergency departments. It is in this environment that this government has put a halt to the Prince Charles Hospital redevelopment on the north side. Just like the transport minister, it seems the health minister is quick on promises but slow on delivery.

Recently we saw the future of the southern Gold Coast derailed by the LNP. The Deputy Premier's review into stage 4 of Gold Coast Light Rail confirms that this government had no intention of delivering this project all along. It was doomed from the start. That is entirely on brand for the LNP. We saw the Deputy Premier, supported by the members for Currumbin and Burleigh, proudly announce the official cancellation of stage 4—happily posing for selfies, cutting the final stage of a project only to offer a handful of buses in return.

Does that sound familiar? I am getting flashbacks to Sunshine Coast rail. At least on the Sunshine Coast, before the announcement they had the time and the organisation to create some sloppy AI images of what a metro bus would look like. I have some pictures here. Unfortunately, they did not think to look at what side of a bus the doors are on so there are some pictures with doors on the right-hand side of a bus and some with doors on the left-hand side of a bus.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Will you table those, member for Aspley?

Mr MELLISH: I am happy to table those.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'The Wave' [1246].

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'North Coast Region: The Wave' [1247].

They call it the Wave, but under their plan what we would really see is a wave of pedestrian fatalities, with passengers exiting into traffic. Just as with that decision, the Deputy Premier has dumped this on the transport minister, who will have to clean up his mess. Stage 4 was not just an extension; it formed the critical next link in the Gold Coast light rail network, connecting the airport through the coastal corridor to the wider Gold Coast city. This transformative project has now been relegated to the LNP's ever-growing public transport graveyard.

Under the Deputy Premier's direction, his department ran a deeply flawed consultation process where it seems the outcome was predetermined. They even had to change the survey halfway through to exclude people from the northern Gold Coast and further afield—the very people set to benefit most from the light rail being connected to the airport. It was clear from leading survey questions that this review was never about finding the best solution. It was simply about justifying a political decision so that the member for Burleigh and the member for Currumbin did not have construction in their electorates during the next election. Cutting a viable, much needed piece of transport infrastructure to protect vulnerable members of parliament is exactly what we have come to expect from this government, but Queenslanders deserve better. If we are honest, this was not about what is best for the local community; it was about politics.

Some 13 million people visit the Gold Coast every year, injecting over $8 billion into the local economy. Stage 4 of the light rail project would have supported and expanded on this vital industry by providing a connection to the airport. Instead, the dashed hopes for a seamless transport link have thrown the Gold Coast Airport's master plan into disarray. Queensland Airports Limited's CEO, Amelia Evans, said dumping light rail meant that the 20-year master plan must now be altered and resubmitted to the federal government, costing them more time, funds and energy well before any expansion can even start. What a waste. Remarkably, in February the Deputy Premier's director-general, John Sosso, said that the department of state development was not in the business of pricing rail projects, but then miraculously they costed this project at $9.8 billion in order to kill it off. That figure was from the department of state development, which itself admitted that they do not know how to cost rail projects.

Let us delve further into the real reasons behind the cancellation. The respondents to the Deputy Premier's survey overwhelmingly said that they wanted to stop future development in Palm Beach, but cancelling public transport projects will not stop that development. The Gold Coast mayor himself confirmed that council's development plans for Palm Beach will not be affected by this short-sighted decision. The LNP is simply consigning the southern Gold Coast to be a car park for generations. They ripped up the rail line in the 1960s and now they have put a bullet in light rail.

Queensland deserves a public transport system that is reliable, accessible and integrated. Instead, the LNP is dragging us backwards. Infrastructure Gold Coast's Michael Kahler called the bus replacement plan a short-term option. He warned that, without the introduction of light rail, the Gold Coast will need another 580 bus services just to meet demand. This really sums up the LNP's plan for the southern Gold Coast: more buses stuck in traffic, more congestion and more frustration. This was a short-sighted decision and the southern Gold Coast will come to regret electing members of parliament who do not fight for them and do not fight for the Gold Coast.

Rockhampton, Youth Foyer

Mrs KIRKLAND (Rockhampton—LNP) (2.52 pm): Today I rise to speak about a matter of importance for my community and a matter of public interest: the plan to have a youth foyer in our region. We would love to have a youth foyer in Rockhampton. There is an urgent need. In the CQ area we have over 24,000 people and one-quarter of those live in Rockhampton. Many of them are facing housing instability and a lack of support to transition to living in our community.

In 2023, I attended a forum where we talked about homelessness. One of the key objectives mentioned was around youth foyers and, in particular, the one in Townsville. That caught my attention. Since then, I have pursued casually and now more formally the establishment of a youth foyer in Rockhampton. That vision was sparked in 2023 but it has been fuelled by an organisation called CQ Zero. I commend them and give them a shout-out because they have continued to lobby both myself and the state government about this.

A youth foyer provides safe and stable accommodation for youths aged between 16 and 25. To be part of a youth foyer, you have to be earning or learning. The foyer is staffed 24/7 by mentors who provide life skills training and help residents to transition into independent living. Successful foyers already exist at Logan, Townsville and on the Gold Coast. I mentioned Townsville earlier. Often our local youth are forced to move south, which means that they are unprepared and unsupported for living on their own. Many fall into hardship and are unable to secure housing or stay in school. In Rockhampton there are youths living rough in some of the drainpipes. They are eager to learn and are in training programs, but there is nowhere for them to stay. In Rockhampton we have over 31 crisis units but they are constantly full. Because of that, rather than a 12-week, stay people stay for six to 12 months. We need somewhere for those people to transition to.

A youth foyer is a solution for not only Rockhampton but also all of Central Queensland. It would offer up to two years of support. I am joined by my colleagues, the members for Keppel and Mirani. We call ourselves Team CQ. We are absolutely fighting hard to see that we get a youth foyer in our region. What better way to do that than to start a petition, which is what we have done. I encourage our community to get on board and sign that petition so that the youth in our region know that they matter.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Members!

Mrs KIRKLAND: Unlike those opposite, we care about the youth in our region and we want them to know it. For 10 years we have been waiting. For over a decade the community has been calling out for a youth foyer. Our youths know that the LNP care, that they matter and that their dreams are worth backing. The LNP are doing that with the release of eight new foyers across the state. We have already announced Hervey Bay and Moreton Bay and five are yet to be determined. Cairns will also be the recipient of a youth foyer. I see that the member for Cairns is nodding. He is excited about that. It is great news. In closing, I encourage all opposition members to get on board and sign the petition for a youth foyer in Rockhampton.

Hill Electorate, Road Infrastructure; Regional Industries

Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (2.57 pm): I wish to highlight two matters affecting the electorate of Hill. The first is the urgent need to upgrade the Kennedy Highway from Main Street through to the Golf Links Road and Grove Street intersections at Atherton. Every day that section is at choking point, creating red-hot anger among locals. With the Atherton Tablelands population exploding, the situation is getting worse as constant queues of vehicles back up on that section of the Kennedy Highway, creating dangerous conditions for motorists and significant congestion.

Over the years, I have had meetings with the TMR northern office as well as the current Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I acknowledge the minister's recent response in which he outlined the department's planned upgrades for a roundabout at the Golf Links Road intersection, combined with a new off-road shared pathway for pedestrians and cyclists. That is good news. However, the Grove Street intersection is not included in the planning. It must be included to fully fix the problem. At this stage, no funding has been allocated to the project, despite its urgency. On behalf of Atherton Tablelands residents, I call on the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to allocate urgent funding to get the roadwork underway and solve this problem once and for all.

The second issue is the devastating impact that poor government legislation and levies are having on our manufacturing and small mining sectors. Back-to-back governments have declared their commitment to backing both industries and regional Queensland. However, the reality is the opposite. The poorly thought out waste management levy is not fit for purpose for regional Queensland businesses that do not have access to waste management facilities at their doorstep. The emergency management levy, coupled with skyrocketing electricity prices that are driven by the net-zero fantasy, are also killing businesses. In addition, massive land valuation increases have sent council rates through the roof, strangling regional industries.

All of these government charges have sent a clear message to manufacturing businesses that they are not welcome in Queensland. Companies like the Northern Iron & Brass Foundry in Innisfail have been forced to reduce their workforce because of the government charges and levies. Northern Iron & Brass Foundry and I have made representations to ministers and to the Premier on these various issues, but the message is not getting through. If this is not addressed we will not be manufacturing anything in Queensland, as businesses will be forced to move interstate or overseas.

I have also raised the issue of small miners, who have also been hit hard by the emergency management levy, which is being charged on unused parcels of land and is going from $30 to a whopping $1,800 per mining lease. Most of these small miners are already volunteers for bushfire brigades, so they are effectively paying a levy on work they do themselves. This is absolute madness. Regional Queensland has the people, skills and resources to lead Australia in manufacturing and mining, but poor government policy and obscene levies are forcing businesses to the wall. If the government is genuine, it must immediately revisit these charges and work out a fairer system that rewards the manufacturing and mining industries rather than treats them like cash cows.

PENALTIES AND SENTENCES (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2717, on motion of Mrs Frecklington—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (3.01 pm): I rise today to speak on this bill not just as the shadow minister for police but as someone deeply concerned by the LNP's repeated failures to stand up for the very people they claim to protect: victims and survivors of sexual assault and rape. Let me be clear from the outset: the Queensland Labor opposition supports this bill. We support its intent, its direction and its core reforms.

Let's not pretend for one second that this bill is timely or that the government should be praised for acting now, because the truth is that it is too late. It has been too slow, and it has come after months of inaction and political cowardice by the LNP. We support the bill, but we will not rubberstamp it without fighting for victims to get the protections they need sooner, not later—not in November, not after another six months but right now. It is an absolute disgrace that the LNP has had every opportunity to move quickly on these reforms but it has chosen time and again to delay, distract and deprioritise the safety and dignity of victims in Queensland.

Let me remind the House exactly how we got here. In 2023 the then Labor attorney-general and member for Waterford tasked the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council with a crucial piece of work: to review how sexual assault and rape offences are sentenced in our state. This was not some bureaucratic box-ticking exercise; this was 18 months of hard work, consultation and listening—listening to victim-survivors, legal experts, frontline support services and the broader community. What they delivered was comprehensive. The end result was a powerful report with 28 recommendations aimed at reforming a crucial system in Queensland, a system where justice is too often out of reach for victims.

Where did that report go? It sat gathering dust on the desk of the Attorney-General for nearly six months. We had six months of silence, six months of victims waiting and six months of inaction by this government. It was not until Labor took the initiative and wrote to the LNP in May 2025 proposing urgent amendments that we saw any movement on this bill. In fact, the Crisafulli government introduced the bill the very next day, and it just so happened to contain the same four recommendations that we identified.

We reached out to the Attorney-General again that day offering our bipartisan support to declare the bill urgent and pass it that very sitting week. What did the government do? They ignored us. They chose delay. They chose to play politics. They had a golden opportunity to act, but they let it slip through their fingers. As we have heard today, they have had multiple opportunities now to bring bills forward and declare them urgent.

Today it has been 119 days since the date of our offer. That is 119 days when victims and survivors have been told, in effect, to just keep waiting. What exactly was the government waiting for? They have used urgency motions before, as I said, to pass youth justice changes, to replace the Trusts Act and to push their own political agenda in this place. When it comes to protecting victims of sexual assault, suddenly there is no urgency. Suddenly there is no rush. Suddenly the wheels of government grind to a halt. That is not leadership; that is embarrassing for this government.

What makes it even worse is that when this bill was finally presented it included a delayed commencement date for the key protections we are looking for. The reforms in part 4, which are some of the most important changes in this legislation, are not even scheduled to commence until 1 November

2025. That will be 160 days after we first offered bipartisan support to pass them immediately. How many victims will pass through the court system between now and then? How many will be traumatised by facing their perpetrators without the protections this bill will offer?

In 2023-24 alone, there were 3,898 recorded rape and attempted rape offences in Queensland—that is nearly 75 every single week—and the government is telling victims they must wait even longer for that help. The Labor opposition has put forward a reasonable and necessary amendment to ensure part 4 of this bill takes effect immediately on assent. That is what should happen. It is the right thing to do. These are not controversial reforms. They are not contentious in any way. They are supported by both sides of the chamber. Why wait? What is the justification for putting politics before the people of Queensland?

Let's talk about what is actually in this bill and what we have had to drag the LNP kicking and screaming to implement. Recommendation 1: courts will now be required to treat the age of a child victim as an aggravating factor in sentencing. That will mean tougher sentences for those who commit these vile crimes against our most susceptible—children. This should have been done two months ago. Recommendation 2: sentencing judges must now explicitly consider the lived harm of victim-survivors. This is critical. They must take into account their trauma, their suffering and also their voices. That should never have been in question.

Recommendation 5: the so-called 'good bloke' defence, or the use of character references to downplay offending, will now be limited to what is relevant—the risk of reoffending and rehabilitation. This is long overdue. Finally, recommendation 23: victim impact statements, or the lack of them, must never again be used to suggest a victim has suffered no harm. That is a grotesque misuse of silence and this change will help prevent it.

These are critical protections. They should be in place today. Instead of pushing these through with urgency, what did the LNP do? They stapled them to a bill that also deals with maritime crime laws, blue card reforms and false representation offences. This is a legislative patchwork that reads more like a desperate effort to justify parliamentary time than a focused commitment to justice here in Queensland.

What on earth do changes to the Crimes at Sea Act have to do with protections for victims of sexual assault and rape? Why is a new offence about impersonating a government agency being crammed into this bill? It is important for sure, but, to put it in context, it is like fixing a broken engine by repainting the car. This government is more focused on appearances than on action and more focused on spin than on substance.

That brings me to the heart of this matter. The LNP wants Queenslanders to believe that they are on the side of victims. Let us look at the facts. They sat on the QSAC report for six months. They ignored Labor's offer of bipartisan urgency. They made us wait 119 days to debate the bill. They inserted a commencement clause that delays these most important reforms until November. They refused to bring this bill forward with urgency despite having done so for lesser matters in this House.

You cannot call yourself a government that supports victims while actively choosing to delay these critical measures. You cannot claim moral authority when you are morally absent. Every member of this House has a choice—a choice between action and excuses, a choice between standing with victims or standing with delay, a choice between justice now and justice postponed. The Labor opposition has made its choice. We will support this bill, but we will move the amendment required to make sure that its most critical protections take effect immediately. Every week, every day, every hour of delays puts real people at risk of further trauma, further injustice and further pain.

We are not here to serve ourselves. We are not here to tick boxes. We are here to deliver real reform, real safety and real justice for victims. Victims do not need sympathy; they just need action. Let us give it to them today. I commend this bill to the House, but I urge every member to make sure they support our amendment. Let us not let victims wait any longer.

Mr FIELD (Capalaba—LNP) (3.12 pm): I rise to offer my support to the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The bill was referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee on 20 May 2025 and received 197 submissions from relevant stakeholders. On top of those written submissions, over 200 individuals also made a submission in support of the Your Reference Ain't Relevant campaign. Co-founders Harrison James and Jarad Grice created the campaign, utilising their own experiences as survivors of child sexual abuse, to advocate for meaningful change in the use of good-character references in sentencing

decisions. The courage that Harrison and Jarad have shown in driving change through this campaign is truly commendable. Following consideration of the submissions, the committee made a single recommendation—that is, that the bill be passed.

This bill amends a range of key areas within the portfolio of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. I thank the Attorney for her work in bringing this bill before the House. Among its objectives is the implementation of four recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*. The bill introduces a new offence for false representations relating to government agencies. Additionally, the bill also seeks to ensure that the blue card system operates as intended and brings the Queensland Crimes at Sea Act 2001 into line with the Commonwealth act.

I am pleased that the bill enjoys bipartisan support. I would also like to acknowledge the advocacy of members from both sides of the House on behalf of their communities. It is important for Queenslanders to see a mature and sensible approach from their elected representatives to sensitive issues such as sentencing for offences of a sexual nature.

The QSAC report into sexual offences sentencing sought to ensure that sentences under the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 adequately reflect community views. One key recommendation relates to the limiting of what is sometimes referred as to as the 'good bloke' offence. The term is used in cases where good-character references for an alleged rapist are used as a mitigating factor in sentencing, even when that character assessment is not relevant to the offender's prospects of rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending. It can also be the case that an offender's good character can assist them in committing an offence, particularly with a vulnerable victim such as a child under the age of 16.

Another recommendation of the report was to include harm done by the offender to the victim as a sentencing purpose. Previously, there were five purposes for which a court may impose a sentence under the act: punishment, rehabilitation, deterrence, denunciation and protection. This amendment will work towards meaningfully recognising the harm that victims have suffered and allow for a more consistent approach across the state in taking victim harm into account. Victim-survivors of sexual assault and rape, among other stakeholders in the state, have made it clear that the sentencing process for offenders was not working as it should and that change is needed.

The bill also amends section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act to introduce a new statutory aggravating factor. In determining sentences for offenders convicted of rape or sexual assault against a child aged 16 or 17, the court must now treat the age of the victim as an aggravating factor, unless the court considers it unreasonable due to the exceptional circumstances of a particular case. This will again look to adequately reflect the particular severity of harm that is done to the victim-survivors in the early stages of their development.

Following QSAC's advice, the ways in which a character reference may be used in sexual offence cases will be restricted to only if good character will improve their chance of rehabilitation and decrease the risk of reoffending. It also gives the court the ability to decide not to treat an offender's good character as a mitigating factor, with consideration given to the nature and seriousness of the offence. These amendments, acting on the advice of the Sentencing Advisory Council, will bring sentencing more into line with the expectations of Queenslanders. They will also assist in making the hugely distressing situation of sexual assault or rape court proceedings more equitable for the victim.

As well as acting on QSAC's recommendations, new section 97A is being inserted into the Criminal Code establishing a new offence for making false representations relating to a government agency. This includes a person making false representations that they are a government agency or are acting on behalf of or with the authority of a government agency. The legislation also provides that a person does not commit a false representation offence if they have a reasonable excuse.

The Queensland Crimes at Sea Act 2001 is being amended, with certain definitions being amended or removed, so that it aligns more closely with the Commonwealth act. This will also allow for smoother cooperation between state and federal governments relating to crimes committed in Australian waters.

Lastly, ensuring that our blue card system is robust and able to safeguard children in our communities must be a priority of any government. That is why we have also amended the working with children act to restore offences for which a suspension of a blue card must be issued. These offences were unintentionally removed from section 295 by the working with children amendment act. Further amendments have also been made to sections 609, 304B and 304C of the working with children act to update terminology and to improve clarity.

This bill is an important and necessary step to improving efficiency, effectiveness and fairness across the responsibilities of the Attorney-General and the Minister for Justice. The Crisafulli government has said consistently that we will put the rights of victims ahead of the rights of offenders, and we will continue to do that. Passing this legislation will ensure that experiences of victims and the harms that are caused by sexual assault and rape are properly acknowledged in court proceedings. Standing on the side of victims is something I will always commit to. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (3.20 pm): I rise to speak to the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Let me start with some context. In May 2023, under the former Labor government, the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council was asked to review the sentencing practices for sexual assault and rape offences. This was not a superficial exercise; it involved extensive consultation with legal stakeholders, experts in trauma informed practice, frontline service providers and, most importantly, victim-survivors themselves. These voices shaped the detailed, evidence-based report that was delivered on 16 December 2024.

The report made 20 findings and 28 recommendations, laying out a comprehensive blueprint for reform. Not all of those recommendations require legislation but four do, and it is these four that are the focus of this bill. They are (1) that sexual offences against children be explicitly treated as an aggravating factor in sentencing; (2) that the courts be required to consider the harm to victims as a core purpose of sentencing; (3) that the courts be limited in the way they can accept good-character evidence in sentencing for sexual offences, especially where that 'good character' was used to facilitate the offending; and (4) that a victim's decision not to provide an impact statement must not be interpreted as an indication that harm did not occur.

These are modest, targeted and long-overdue reforms. They are grounded in the lived experience of victim-survivors and backed by the expertise of legal professionals. They also reflect a growing community consensus that our justice system must do more to centre the voices of those impacted by sexual violence. What did the Crisafulli LNP government do when it received this important report? It did nothing—nothing for five months. There was no public response, no commitment to implement the recommendations and no plan to act. The silence was not just disappointing; it was telling. What happened next was that the Queensland Labor opposition took the lead.

On 18 May 2025, the opposition publicly committed to implementing the four key recommendations as a priority. We recognised the urgency and the community expectation that reform would not be left to gather dust on a shelf. On 19 May, just one day later, the shadow attorney-general wrote to the Attorney-General enclosing our draft amendments and offering bipartisan support to pass them without delay. Rather than take that offer in good faith, the government scrambled to reassert control of the narrative. On 20 May—two days after our announcement—the LNP government introduced this bill, reflecting the very same four Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council recommendations we had called for.

I welcome the fact that the government has finally taken action, but the timing makes one thing very clear: without pressure from the opposition, these reforms would still be sitting idle. The government was content to delay; the opposition acted. Even now the government continues to stall because, despite the urgency, despite the clear public interest, despite having had the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council report since December last year, the government has included in this bill a delayed commencement date for its most critical part—part 4, the section that amends the sentencing principles. Instead of taking effect immediately, these changes will be delayed until 1 November 2025. That is more than five months away. Between now and then, thousands of victim-survivors will come before the courts without the full protection and recognition these reforms would provide.

Let's talk about what that means. In 2023-24, there were reportedly 3,898 rape and attempted rape offences recorded in Queensland. That is more than 10 every single day. If that trend continues—and, tragically, there is no reason to believe it will not—by the time these sentencing reforms come into effect in November more than 1,600 additional victims of rape or attempted rape will have gone through our criminal justice system under the old framework. More than 1,600 victims may still hear their perpetrator described as a man of good character. More than 1,600 victims may feel erased if they choose not to relive their trauma through a victim impact statement. There will be more than 1,600 victims whose harm may not be appropriately weighed in sentencing. This delay is not just a matter of legislative process; it is a matter of justice. That is why the Queensland Labor opposition will move an amendment to bring forward the commencement of part 4. We believe these changes should take effect immediately.

The government has had the report for more than half a year and it has had our proposed amendments since May. There is simply no excuse to drag this out any longer. Stakeholders agree. The Queensland Law Society in its submission on this bill reinforced the importance of grounding reforms in evidence. While acknowledging the work of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council and the validity of the report's recommendation, the society also raised legitimate concerns about the risk of undermining judicial discretion. It emphasised that Queensland judges are already guided by established sentencing principles and are well placed to weigh character evidence appropriately. In serious cases, such evidence may rightly carry no mitigating weight at all. Judicial officers are highly trained to consider the context and the impact of offending and to apply sentencing in a way that upholds community expectations and protects victims. The Law Society warned that repeated legislative intervention risks creating rigidity where flexibility is needed.

I support the intent of these amendments, but I also recognise the importance of allowing courts to retain the discretion needed to deal with the complexity of individual cases. That balance must be respected. That said, these recommendations were not plucked from thin air. They came from an expert body after deep consultation and reflect the views of victim-survivors who told their stories in the hope of driving change. We owe it to them to act.

Let me make this clear: the Queensland Labor opposition supports this bill, we support the four Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council recommendations that underpin it, and we support the implementation of sentencing reform that recognises the gravity of sexual violence and the long-term harm it causes, but we do not support delay. We will not stand by while Queenslanders are subjected to a system that allows outdated principles to shape sentencing outcomes in sexual offence cases. We call on the government to go further and respond in full to the remaining recommendations of *The ripple effect* report and commit to a clear, transparent plan for implementation. Victim-survivors have waited long enough.

Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (3.30 pm): I rise to speak in strong support of the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This legislation strengthens Queensland's justice system and delivers long overdue reforms to how we address sexual offences. The Crisafulli government made a commitment to Queensland and all those whom I represent to deliver a fair and efficient justice system that places victims' rights at its core and strengthens community safety, addressing the shortcomings of a decade of Labor's ineffective laws. This bill is a testament to that commitment. Victims and survivors of sexual violence whose voices have not been heard will be heard today.

I begin by acknowledging the immense courage of victims and survivors who have shared their stories. Sexual violence leaves deep and lasting scars, not only on the individuals directly affected but also on their families, friends and communities. In preparation for committee hearings on the bill and writing my speech I read everything I could and listened to those who wanted to come forward. I read harrowing accounts of victims' suffering not only during the horrid offences committed against them but also their feelings of despair through the legal process. It has left me heartbroken yet fiercely determined to advocate for strong legislation that delivers justice and restores hope to those who have endured such pain.

This bill is another example of how the Crisafulli government is putting victims first, recognising that sexual offences committed against our vulnerable children are more serious. The effect of these crimes is profound, creating waves of trauma, fear and disruption that touch countless lives. This bill reflects our recognition of those impacts and our resolve to ensure our laws better serve those who have suffered, prevent further harm and reflect community expectations.

This legislation draws from recommendations by QSAC and has guided our approach to reforming the justice system. The recommendations emphasise the need for a victim-centric framework that prioritises the safety, dignity and healing of survivors while holding offenders accountable. By implementing these reforms Queensland is taking bold steps to address the systemic issues that have for too long allowed sexual violence to persist and its impacts to go unaddressed.

The bill delivers important, overdue reforms to good-character evidence in sentencing for sexual offences. For too long our courts have at times been swayed by problematic types of evidence such as character references or an offender's standing in the community when determining sentences. Labor's good-character amendments, which are proposed to be made to section 11, would see courts prevented from decreasing a sentence because of a person's good character. Additionally, Labor's proposed amendment to section 9 would only have acknowledged harm done to surviving victims,

excluding any recognition of harm inflicted on victims of unlawful killing, including suffering caused immediately before death. This would have prevented courts from imposing sentences that account for severe acts such as rape or sexual assault committed against a victim prior to their death—a significant oversight.

In contrast, our government is committed to ensuring these critical updates to the sentencing framework are accurate and effective while addressing the shortcomings of the previous proposals. This bill delivers clarity and fairness by restricting such evidence. From now on courts may only consider good-character evidence if it is directly relevant to the offender's prospects of rehabilitation or their risk of reoffending.

I want to emphasise that under these reforms a sexual offender cannot simply rely on claims of being a 'good bloke' to lessen their sentence. Character references or evidence of community contributions will only be considered if they speak directly to the offender's likelihood of rehabilitation or the risk of committing further offences. These are the appropriate factors for a sentencing judge to weigh, ensuring that justice is grounded in accountability and public safety. Even when such evidence is deemed relevant, this bill empowers courts with the discretion to decide whether it should mitigate a sentence. Judges will consider the nature and seriousness of the offence, ensuring that the gravity of sexual crimes is never overshadowed by irrelevant or superficial claims of good character. This change sends the powerful message that sexual violence will not be excused or minimised.

Queensland is proud to be the first jurisdiction in Australia to introduce these restrictions on good-character evidence. This landmark reform will fundamentally reshape our sentencing framework to better reflect the harm caused by sexual offences and the expectations of our community. It aligns with the QSAC recommendations by ensuring that the sentencing process is fair, transparent, focused on protecting victims and preventing future harm.

The bill expands the purpose of sentencing to include recognition of harm done by the offender to a victim. While the Labor government ignored victims, we are putting them first by making sure that a court can impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the impact of the offending on them and the harm it causes. This bill is about reforming legal processes and rebuilding trust. For too long victims and survivors have felt unheard or dismissed by a system that seemed to prioritise an offender's reputation over the harm they caused. By centring the experiences of victims and implementing the recommendations we are working to restore faith in our justice system. We are saying to survivors, 'We have listened, and we are acting to ensure your pain is not overlooked.'

This bill recognises the broader community impacts of sexual violence. The pain extends beyond individual victims to their loved ones, their communities and society as a whole. By strengthening our laws we aim to break this cycle of harm, deter future offending and foster a culture where sexual violence is unequivocally condemned.

For a decade Labor had the opportunity to strengthen our sentencing laws and place victims at the heart of justice, yet they failed to act decisively. Today they claim their amendments are not a political stunt. This is an outrageous betrayal of victims who deserve justice. Let us remind those opposite of their inaction for 10 years. Our government is fiercely committed to getting this right. We are dedicated to putting victims first, ensuring a robust sentencing framework that upholds justice and honours those affected by the vile and atrocious crimes of sex offenders.

In closing, I reiterate my gratitude to the victims and survivors who advocated tirelessly for change. Your courage has paved the way for this bill. I say to the Queensland community: know that this LNP Crisafulli government is committed to a justice system that upholds fairness, accountability and compassion. The Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is a significant step forward toward that goal. It ensures that our courts prioritise rehabilitation, public safety and the voices of victims above outdated notions of character. I commend the bill to the House as a bold and necessary reform for a safer, fairer Queensland.

Mrs McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (3.38 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the debate on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As a member of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee I sat through the public hearings. I had the privilege of working with committee members and those who gave evidence. We read through the submissions. Then obviously we go through this parliamentary process where we stand up and debate, put amendments forward, make sanctimonious contributions—blah, blah, blah. Victims do not want to hear these words: they want to see action.

There are members over there who stand up and say that for 10 years we did nothing for victims, but hang on. Back right up, because those of us who were on committees and did work and spoke to the victims sat through inquiry after inquiry and we actually made changes. We did things and we listened to victims and we passed laws, so anyone who wants to stand over there and say that for 10 years Labor did nothing in government should back up, because victims spoke to us, they told us what they wanted and we passed laws.

The government should listen to those committees and the work they did. These committees put victims through trauma—again and again. To say that we did nothing for victims is an absolute affront to victims of crime who have gone through this process. Believe me, I have tried to put trauma informed processes in place in this parliament to protect those who take the time to put in submissions just so we can talk and reference it in a debate. That is galling. Government members say that for 10 years we did nothing, but shall I stand here and rattle off all of the legislation we introduced and you all voted for? The government says that we did nothing, but please talk about what we can do for victims in this place.

Let us look at the bill. I want to lend a voice to the victims. We had people come forward and make submissions, and I thank the member for Capalaba for mentioning the Your Reference Ain't Relevant campaign and the work they do—tireless, independent, non-government funded work. Government members of the committee said to them in the inquiry, 'Isn't this amazing? Do you still welcome it as an important first step in the advocacy work?' but do you know what the response from Your Reference Ain't Relevant was? They said, 'No, because survivors are sick of first steps. The bill is a sort of half-measure and doesn't understand how abuse works.' I say to government members: how can you tell me you listen to victims but you just ignore that? We in this House have the ability to listen to victims.

These four recommendations came out of the QSAC report given to the government in December 2024. I looked forward to hearing the response to those recommendations, but it was silence—crickets. Apparently it went through cabinet, so there is the transparency that everyone asked for: 'Let's just shuffle it through cabinet so we don't have to talk about what our response is until prompted.' That is not listening to victims. We had an opportunity in December last year to put that road map forward, but we are still waiting for the rest of the road map and the rest of the recommendations. This addresses four recommendations of 28, by the way, so tell me how we are listening to victims—only four of 28! I guess those other 24 that relate to victims of crime are not important and can be shunted a bit further down the line.

This delay has an impact on someone who finally has the courage to report what happened to them. Only a very small percentage of people actually ever do that, so let's stop and think about all of those victims who cannot or do not report for whatever reason. Then there are those who do report but are told by the DPP, 'There's not enough evidence. The court case won't stand up. There's not really a chance.' That victim is not supported in these laws. Let us talk about the two per cent—by the way, that is the two per cent of the reported, not two per cent of all victims of sexual assault—who get to this little thin wedge of the criminal justice system where someone is actually found guilty.

In all of the sexual assaults that are happening, statistically, today—this hour, this minute—these are people who are looking for protection. QSAC offered options in December. There was suggestion of a private member's bill put forward earlier this year, yet it is now September and no-one who has gone to court since December has had the protection of this bill, and that is a shame.

That is the shame of this, because we talk and we talk, we have inquiries and we go through our committee process for something that was already consulted on for years. Yes, we need to go through the lawyers to make sure it is all good; I understand that. We need to make sure it is right and fit for purpose, so we give it to an advisory body like QSAC and they come up with a recommendation and we are given that recommendation. Then there are crickets and we wait and we wait, and those victims wait and wait. Those victims who get to court, who have been retraumatised, wait and wait. They did not get the protection of this bill that could have been there.

There were a few urgent bills passed last year, but this could not have been one of them because, as I think I heard this morning, we need to give defence lawyers a chance to get their things sorted out—because that is really important in the criminal justice system, isn't it! Defence lawyers! We can change laws in a matter of days about a whole sentencing scheme and defence lawyers do not need any preparation, training or advisement for that and we do not need to give magistrates time for that, but for this we apparently need to give the magistrates and courts time to figure out good-character evidence and when it is to be used. As I said, the number of these cases that actually get to the point where someone is found guilty and convicted and we get to the sentencing is a tiny fraction of what our courts are dealing with at the moment.

We can say at the end of the day that we are just fiddling around the edges with some of the things in the Penalties and Sentences Act, but it is a small but major part of a victim getting through that court process—that small fraction of victims who actually can get to that end and can get justice. I am not going to reiterate how devastating good-character evidence is.

This is absolutely needed and I support this bill and the objectives of the bill, but I would also like to say what many of the victims advocacy groups that gave evidence believe. They are in court with victim-survivors more than anyone in this room will ever be, so I will take their word for it when they say that they do not think this will change anything. That is the really sad part. We are all going to yell at each other and we are going to call it political hypocrisy—rah, rah, rah—but those who are in the space have said that this is not going to change anything because lawyers are good at words so they will provide good-character evidence but just cover it under rehabilitation prospects. Let us not think that lawyers are not smart enough to do that. That is what they do: they find loopholes and they use them. Let us not get morally outraged and give sanctimonious contributions because we are doing one thing. Let us do it now. Let us get it in place.

Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (3.48 pm): I of course prepared some notes for this speech, and I think it is important that we do so because we are dealing with a topic that is very sombre and serious and demands from all of us a bit of reflective thinking. However, I cannot help but reflect on the comments of the member for Macalister which I found quite extraordinary. The member for Macalister would have us believe that the former government acted in the interests of victims when in fact the only interest the former government had in victims was producing more of them.

Mrs McMahon: Better than using them as puppets. Have you got any strings or victims to pull on now, to call on, or are you just going to stand up there and give us your outrage again?

Mr VORSTER: I am not taking that interjection. I think to do so would be an outrage, because the former government let down thousands of victims of crime when they oversaw what must be the greatest scandal in the way justice is delivered in this state—that is, their failure to properly manage a forensics lab. The member for Macalister would talk about justice being served in a court. I think about those victims who did not get their day in court because there was no evidence to bring before the courts. What about those victims? What about those victims of rape who had to wait over 412 days to have their samples tested—398 days longer than the Queensland Police Service demands? What about those victims? When we have members opposite strutting into this House, trying to talk on behalf of victims, finally I call bogus because, as the member for Macalister—

Mrs McMAHON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I stand in this House as a child survivor and I take personal offence at the member's suggestion that my claims are bogus.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): It is very clear who the member was referring to. Is the member willing to withdraw?

Mr VORSTER: Absolutely. I am very happy to withdraw. When members opposite come into this place and try to point to a record of acting on behalf of victims, I cry foul. The truth of the matter is that we have far too many victims of crime in this state. It is something that our government is working hard to address. It is a big task because the numbers are so staggering. They have their genesis in the very laws that the member for Macalister lauded, for example, the watering down of the Youth Justice Act which created more perpetrators and more victims in the state of Queensland. I do not believe, as the member for Macalister does, that that track record is worth celebrating because it does a disservice to victims.

Turning my attention now to the bill, which is yet another step this government is taking to stand up for victims, I want to point out that this work will define where we stand. It begs the question: do we stand with offenders, letting reputation, connections or silence in the courtroom reduce their responsibility, or do we stand with victims, recognising their harm, their dignity and their right to see justice done? The answer under this government is we stand with victims.

As we have heard, the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council did review the state of sentencing for rape and sexual assault, and they found what victims already knew, that the law too often minimised their experiences. This bill fixes that. First, it makes offences against 16- and 17-year-olds an aggravating factor. Victims at that age are still children. They deserve the full protection of the law and their age must count against the offender at sentencing.

Second, it expands the very purpose of sentencing to include recognition of harm done to the victim. That is a profound shift. It says clearly to victims, 'The justice system sees you, acknowledges you and does not treat your pain as a footnote.'

Third, it reforms that so-called good-character evidence. For far too long in this state, offenders have stood in court with letters of reference or claims of standing in the community as though reputation should outweigh the suffering of their victims. That stops here. From now on, such claims only matter if they speak to rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending, and if good character enabled the offending, it can never ever be a shield. We will not let offenders hide behind their social standing while victims are left voiceless.

Fourth, it makes clear that the absence of a victim impact statement does not mean that there was no harm. Silence cannot and must not be held against a victim. Every survivor has the right to choose whether to speak, and that choice will not diminish the seriousness of their suffering. Each of these reforms has one message at its core: we stand with victims.

They say politics is about contrast. I believe our government offers Queensland not only contrast but also hope. It pays to explain what that contrast is because elections matter. Here lies the contrast. Labor rushed out half-baked reforms. Their version would have weakened the recognition of harm. Their version would have tied the hands of courts in assessing offenders' character. Their version excluded some victims altogether. It was legislation written for the cameras, not for victims.

This government chose a different path. We took the time to consult, we listened to survivors and advocates, we respected the committee process, and we wrote a bill that will stand up in a courtroom, not just in a media release. That is the disciplined, principled way the Liberal National Party governs.

When people ask what the LNP stands for, I will point to this bill. We believe victims should never be an afterthought. We believe the harm they suffer must be recognised. We believe their voices must carry weight in the courtroom. We believe in strong, trustworthy institutions that protect the vulnerable, not the powerful. That is the choice before this House: to keep victims at the centre or to let them slip back into the margins. This government has chosen. We stand with victims. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (3.56 pm): I rise to speak in support of Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The Labor opposition remains committed to justice for victims of rape and sexual assault. The Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 seeks to implement four recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report, *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*.

The bill will amend the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 limiting the use of good-character references in the sentencing of sexual assault and rape perpetrators, expanding the recognition of harm caused to a victim, delivering appropriate sentencing of an offender convicted of sexual assaulting or raping a 16- or 17-year-old child, and clarifying that the absence of a victim impact statement or other details of harm at sentencing does not mean that crime caused little or no harm. These changes to the bill are necessary and correct, but the Labor opposition is committed to ensuring victims receive the support they need sooner. Let's not forget that the government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to implement QSAC recommendations in this bill. It was not until the Labor opposition said we would take action that the government raced to slap something together. What the LNP government pulled together was a bill to address four recommendations from the *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* final report. Four! Four recommendations out of 28 handed down in that report. Of course, they are the same four recommendations detailed in the letter the Labor opposition wrote to the Attorney-General on 19 May where we said we would move these amendments.

When the LNP announced their intention to introduce this bill on 20 May, we wrote to them with another proposal: we would give bipartisan support for their bill if we could label this bill as urgent and deliver reform in that same parliamentary sitting week. It would deliver the support victims and victim-survivors deserve and deliver it quicker. But, no, of course the Crisafulli government could not accept that. The people of Queensland deserve more than a government who will talk the talk about putting victims first but will not walk the walk.

Now the report has been sitting on the Attorney-General's desk for almost six months. For six months victims and victim-survivors could have been benefiting from: tougher sentences for perpetrators of rape and sexual assault, particularly against children, as per recommendation 1; the recognition of lived harm to victim-survivors in the sentencing process, as per recommendation 2; the

ending of good-character evidence in sentencing, ensuring the process does not add to a victim-survivor's trauma, as per the fifth recommendation in the report; and ensuring the lack of a victim impact statement will not be taken as evidence of little to no harm being done, as per recommendation 23. For reasons unknown, the government is dragging its feet on these reforms and is willing to lump them in with a variety of other unrelated reforms, as if QSAC's recommendations are simply odds and ends that need to be squared away.

Victims and victim-survivors deserve so much better. The Queensland Labor opposition is proposing to remove the delayed commencement clause for part 4 so the amendments are effective from the assent of this bill. With 3,898 rape and attempted rape offences recorded in 2023-24—almost 75 offences a week—delaying the protections in this bill is unconscionable and has been unconscionable. When we delay these reforms, we risk victims having to face their perpetrators in court without the protections delivered by this bill. Victims do not need unnecessary added trauma in their lives, and the proposed amendment is a reasonable method for prioritising victim safety. This must be a priority.

It is extremely odd that a bill that tackles the issues of sexual assault and rape also amends the Queensland Crimes at Sea Act 2001 to align with relevant provisions of the Commonwealth Crimes at Sea Act 2000. Additionally, it also creates a new provision that a person who makes a false representation that they are a government agency or acting on behalf of or with the authority of a government agency is liable for up to three years imprisonment. It seems strange for this to be added to a bill focusing on the protection and safety of victims of rape and sexual assault. I note that the opposition will support the blue card related amendments and other consequential amendments. Protecting our children, of course, is of paramount importance and any enhancements made will be a positive step forward.

The Labor opposition supports this bill, just like we did months ago—the changes are measured and practical; they improve sentencing practices and respond to the needs of sexual assault and rape victims—but we will continue to hold the Crisafulli LNP government to account. We will advocate for these protections to be delivered for victim-survivors sooner and we will ensure this LNP government's rhetoric matches reality, especially when it comes to delivering safety and trauma informed responses for victim-survivors.

Hon. AJ STOKER (Oodgeroo—LNP) (4.02 pm): There are a few principles that guide us as a government when it comes to making our community safer. The first is that victims must always come first, not offenders. The second is that there must be consequences for actions. The third is that rehabilitation must be meaningful, with the support needed post sentence to really drive changes in behaviour once a person has done their time. That stands in such stark contrast to those opposite, who proudly, as one of the earliest moves upon their election to government a decade ago, watered down the youth justice system, championing the victimhood of young criminals and unleashing dire consequences. They created a generation of untouchables—people who knew that the courts would never rein them in while there was a Labor government in place—systemically under-resourced the police and failed to set a framework to focus the judiciary to their important task.

In such a short time, the Crisafulli LNP government has started to change the trend. Under Labor, crime statistics consistently climbed to the point where rates were up across just about every crime category across the state. Those young untouchables graduated into adult criminals, equipped for high impact of the worst kind the community in this state has seen. The morale of police plummeted as they were asked over and over again to prepare cases against defendants who would get little more than a slap on the wrist before being released into the community to do it all again.

After 10 years of Labor presiding over an ever-rising rate of crime, the steps we have taken as a new government in just 10 months have made a meaningful difference: adult time for adult crimes; gold standard rehabilitation and early intervention; the Staying on Track program to help behaviour change to stick post sentence; better equipment and resourcing for our police; more police on the beat—in fact, in just 10 months we have doubled the number Labor could add in four years; and genuine engagement with the crisis in the child safety system.

I could go on, but the impact of these changes is starting to show. It is just the beginning, of course. There is much more to do—particularly given the numbers are coming off such a high baseline—but a 5.7 per cent reduction in victim numbers in the first half of this year compared with the year before is such an encouraging sign. We have changed the trajectory of the crime rate. Instead of it climbing, as it consistently did under Labor, it is now down three per cent in the first eight months of

this year compared to the same time the year before. Of course, that reflects a much more difficult task. The task of undoing a person's decision to engage in criminal behaviour is a much more challenging one than preventing a person from embarking on that path in the first place.

With all of that in mind, I stand here somewhat in shock that Labor members' contributions in this chamber have had the tone they have had today. For instance, the shadow attorney complaining that this bill is not happening fast enough is pretty rich. Those opposite had 10 years to strengthen the sentencing arrangements for sexual assault, but they did not do it. They did not even ask the Sentencing Advisory Council to look at it until May 2023. That report was delivered in December of last year and now we have got to work. We digested the report and drafted a bill that reflects its recommendations. We introduced that bill and referred it to committee for consideration and reporting, and now we are debating it in this chamber. We are in the debate, and now they say it is not fast enough. They had 10 years.

We have engaged in a prompt and diligent process—no delay but also no cutting of corners. As Labor's proposed amendments show, rush jobs make a mess. Their demand for speed at the expense of care has led to their own amendments being rife with dysfunctionality in their drafting. They had a decade to do it properly. They did not, and now they come in here and bleat about delay. They also did nothing, I might add, about the 12-month delays in the testing of rape kits. People come in here and say how much they care and empathise with the horrific experience of victims of sexual crime, but they were so unable to govern effectively that they were prepared to allow those very victims to have their investigations hampered and to leave perpetrators out in the community, unable to be held accountable as a product of those investigations. They were content to allow charges to be unable to be proved in these cases because that DNA evidence could not be obtained. Honestly, I do not know how they can come in here with a straight face and complain about delay. We will not be lectured to about timeliness from the rabble opposite.

With the care that this important issue deserves, we are now delivering the reform that the sentencing laws surrounding sexual assault deserve. This bill recognises and acknowledges the harm done to victims of sexual assault; it often has a lifelong impact. It introduces a new statutory aggravating factor requiring courts to consider the age of victims aged 16 or 17 as an aggravating factor on sentencing for sexual assault or rape, because courts should impose higher sentences when offences are committed against a child. Those aggravating factors are already in place for children aged under 16, but a rape is a rape and it is not less of a crime because the age of the child is 16 rather than 15. This is an aggravating factor that should apply to all children, so we are extending it to cover 16- and 17-year-olds. Children are more vulnerable, including at those ages, and they deserve our protection. When a child is a victim of sexual crime, whatever the age of that child, they deserve to have our protection. Where a penalty is imposed, the seriousness of the conduct involved should be reflected in a more severe penalty.

The bill limits the use of evidence of good character in the sentencing of people for sexual offences of this kind. After all, it is a bit rich for a person who has been, for example, convicted at trial of rape or who has pleaded guilty to that offence to then trot out evidence to the effect that they are of great character as a way to mitigate their sentence because people of great character do not engage in rape. We will not allow that evidence to be used in cases of this kind unless that evidence directly relates to that offender's prospects of reoffending or rehabilitation.

The changes in this bill provide more substantial recognition of the harm that is inflicted upon victims of these crimes in terms of the way the sentencing process is undertaken. That is appropriate because of the intensity of the harm these kinds of offences can cause. It provides that the court cannot—must not—infer from the absence of a victim impact statement that there has been an absence of harm. This is important as a recognition of the difficulty that many victims of these offences face in reliving it through the justice process. For a range of reasons they may not feel able to contribute a statement of that kind and that should not be a matter that results in a person who has committed a serious crime receiving a lesser penalty.

The bill also engages in a number of technical kinds of reforms but things that must be done in order for the legal system to function properly. For instance, it corrects a number of technical errors in the blue card system that have been recommended by the Queensland Family and Child Commission and it establishes a new offence of falsely impersonating a government agency. I imagine that is an extremely important offence for us to have on the books in an age when people are being scammed by those who purport to represent credible agencies from time to time. That protection is quite important. It also harmonises Queensland law with some federal legislation that deals with crimes that are committed at sea.

Ultimately, there is a very good reason why the committee, after listening to people with a whole range of perspectives from our community, really did recommend just one thing in relation to this bill and that is that it be passed. That is because this is a reform that is much needed; it is careful and it is prudent. It has been done in a conscientious and timely way, not delayed, as those opposite would suggest, although again I am quite shocked that anybody who presided over the kind of inaction they did would talk about delay. It is proper, it is careful and it represents a recognition of the harm that victims of this kind of offending experience.

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.12 pm): I am going to have to mark down the LNP spin bot who wrote that speech because we just did not hear the words 'green shoots' once, and members know how much I love the words 'green shoots'. I guess they are having to take that out of their terminology because when it comes to ambulance ramping, there are no green shoots; there are zero green shoots.

Let me get back to this bill because like the members on this side of the House, I support the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Can I say it is offensive and distressing that anybody in this chamber who is a member of this House would try to gain some sort of political advantage around victims. The reality is every single member of this House, current and former, will have had victims of some sort in their electorate and they will have supported those people and done the best for those constituents. I know that has been my experience. So for people to try to claim the moral high ground around this subject is just nonsense and it is offensive. What I thought might have worked would be to take a bipartisan approach to this bill to try to get it through a little bit quicker. That is what the Labor team has tried to do here. However, that has been knocked on the head on every single occasion and it has been rejected previously. Now they have come in here at the last moment and declared this bill urgent.

Let's have a look. Last sitting week we declared another bill urgent. The Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was declared urgent and passed in one sitting. It was a bill that contained exactly two provisions of a fairly technical nature and it had sat on the *Notice Paper* for five months. Just to compare that bill with this one, I recall that in that bill the minister said in his explanatory speech—

> For some years, authorities for low-risk activities have been issued via an automatic process where non-discretionary criteria are met. This process is not being changed for the ... majority of authorities.

A bill that was dealing with something that was not being changed for the majority of situations was declared urgent, but we had to drag the government kicking and screaming to declare this bill urgent. Then when we put forward an amendment to try to get these provisions in place even faster, it looks like they will be rejected as well.

Let's have a look at what is contained in this bill. Let's look at what the LNP does not consider important enough to support our amendment to get this through: introducing a statutory aggravating factor for rape and sexual assault against children aged 16 and 17 years of age; expanding the sentencing purposes to include recognition of harm caused to a victim of an offence; qualifying the court's treatment of good character as a mitigating factor in sentencing persons convicted of offences of a sexual nature; and clarifying that no inference may be drawn from the absence of details of harm caused to victims. All of these provisions will put victims first. The LNP say they want to put victims first, but their actions in relation to this bill show that this is just false rhetoric.

These provisions arose because the Labor government tasked the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council to review the sentencing of sexual assault and rape offences in Queensland and to consider if any changes needed to be made. That happened in 2023. In December 2024 the *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* final report was handed to the Crisafulli LNP government. The LNP Crisafulli government that was elected on a platform of putting victims first then seemingly did nothing—absolutely nothing—with this report for five months until the Labor opposition pressured them to do so. Even after they started to move, the LNP refused to declare this bill urgent, which means victims of sexual assault and rape will wait longer for the changes this bill is bringing to be enacted and the 'good bloke' defence will continue to be rolled out. Despite all of this obfuscation and delay, Labor has again offered an amendment to speed up the implementation of this bill's provisions. I would encourage members to support this amendment.

I know David Crisafulli does what he says, he means what he says, he walks the talk blah, blah, blah—and there are a lot of other things he says. However, by supporting the amendment, he can actually not just say it; he can do it. He can do what he says; he can put victims first and maybe truly get some green shoots going on this one. Sadly, I think those opposite will play politics before they put victims first by opposing the amendment. That means that the almost 75 people who each week are

victims of sexual assault and rape are having these protections delayed and that is unacceptable. It means that every day of delay risks victims facing perpetrators in court without the protections delivered by this bill and it means every member who opposes the amendment is choosing to delay over victim safety. I would urge all members to actually put victims first and support Labor's amendment.

Mrs YOUNG (Redlands—LNP) (4.17 pm): Every survivor of sexual assault carries with them a trauma that never fully leaves them. For too long the justice system has not given the trauma the recognition it deserves. This bill will change that. It makes sure courts reflect the seriousness of sexual offending, especially when it involves children, and that victims are seen, heard and respected.

The Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 is about restoring faith in our justice system. It is about delivering sentences that reflect the harm caused and showing victims that their voices matter. Our Redlands community have spoken. They want better community safety. They want a system that puts safety first and puts victims before perpetrators. Parents want to know their children are protected, survivors want their trauma recognised and our community expect sentences that reflect the gravity of sexual offending.

This bill answers those calls. It does so by implementing key recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*. That report confirmed what survivors already knew: sexual offending leaves lifelong scars and sentencing in Queensland has not kept pace with community expectations. One of the most important reforms in this bill is the explicit recognition of harm as a purpose of sentencing. For survivors in Redlands, this matters. It means that when a young woman in Victoria Point or a teenager on Macleay Island goes through the court process the law requires the court to acknowledge their suffering. Their pain is not invisible. Their experience is not minimised. It will now be a central consideration in the sentence. This is a shift that says to survivors, 'Your harm counts and the law sees you.'

The bill also ensures the absence of a victim impact statement cannot be used to imply a victim was not harmed. This reform is simple but powerful. Some survivors cannot bring themselves to write down or relive their trauma. That choice should never mean that the offence is treated as if it caused less harm. For families in Redlands, this change provides reassurance. Survivors will no longer feel punished for choosing not to provide a statement. Their silence will not diminish the seriousness of the crime.

Another key reform addresses how courts treat so-called good-character evidence. Until now, offenders could rely on character references or their standing in the community to reduce their sentence, even when those very qualities had enabled their offending. That is not justice. This bill makes it clear that such evidence can only be considered if it genuinely relates to rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending. Even then, the court can decide not to reduce the sentence. In plain terms, being a 'good bloke' is no longer an excuse. For Redlanders this means offenders cannot hide behind their reputation at the local sport or community club or out in the community. The focus will rightly be on the harm they caused and the danger they pose.

The bill also introduces a statutory aggravating factor for rape and sexual assault against children aged 16 or 17. In the Redlands, parents tell me that while 16- and 17-year-olds are stepping into adulthood they can still be vulnerable to exploitation in sexual offending. This bill recognises that reality. It makes clear that when an offender targets a 16- or 17-year-old the courts must treat it as especially serious. For local families that means confidence their teenagers are protected whether they are at school, starting a job, playing sport or out with their friends. The message is simple: this kind of offending will never be minimised and sentences must reflect the harm caused to the victim.

This bill is not only about sentencing; it strengthens other parts of our justice system. By contrast, Labor rushed forward with changes on this issue chasing headlines rather than good law. Its amendments were poorly drafted and incomplete. Most concerning was its attempt to limit recognition of harm only to surviving victims which would have excluded the horrific suffering of those assaulted immediately before their death. That failure shows exactly why Queenslanders lost confidence in Labor's approach to justice.

The LNP Crisafulli government is doing it properly. This bill has been developed with care through consultation and with victims front and centre. It closes the gaps, it fixes the failures and it makes sure the law works as intended. The parliamentary committee considered it closely and recommended it be passed, and I am proud to support that recommendation today.

This bill matters to the Redlands. It matters to the survivor on Russell Island who wants the law to recognise her trauma. It matters to the parent in Thornlands who wants confidence in the blue card system. It matters to families in Redland Bay who want stronger protection for their children and peace

of mind that the system is on their side. It matters to every Redlander who expects the law to reflect fairness, common sense and community standards. The LNP Crisafulli government promised to put victims first. This bill delivers on that promise. It strengthens sentencing, it protects children, it ends excuses for offenders and it restores faith that the justice system is on the side of the victims.

Mr DAMETTO (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (4.24 pm): I rise to make my contribution on behalf of the Katter's Australian Party on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. In going through this bill in preparation to speak today, I had to refrain from using some of the words that I wanted to put into my speech as they were unparliamentary. When it comes to sexual assault victims in Queensland, everything should be done to protect them. Those who commit sexual assaults are the most vile creatures on this planet, as far as I am concerned. As I said, I had to refrain from putting worse language into my speech today.

This bill has a number of objectives. One is to implement four of the recommendations of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council report titled *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect*. This report made a number of recommendations and four are being addressed in this bill today. There are also some elements in this bill to ensure the blue card system operates as intended in Queensland. I will speak further to that in a second, but I would definitely say that if the intent of the blue card system is to protect children in Queensland then it is not only failing to do so but also stopping those in Queensland who need the most help to get into employment from doing so, which is also having a ripple effect throughout Queensland.

The bill also introduces a few new offences, one of which is false representation in relation to a government agency. This is very important, and I say this to my constituents all the time. With regard to dealing with departmental people—whether they are from the Department of Environment and Science or whether they are from the department of fisheries pulling people over to check their commercial catch—I make sure that the public understands that talking to one of these people is just like talking to a police officer. This bill demonstrates the powers these people have, especially to prosecute offences. Therefore, ensuring that people in Queensland cannot pretend they are a fisheries officer or falsely claim to be a departmental person is very important.

The bill also aligns the Queensland Crimes at Sea Act 2001 with relevant provisions in the Commonwealth Crimes at Sea Act 2000. I will not spend much time on that other than to say that federal government policies and legislation and state legislation must align, especially when police and federal agencies are working together on these issues.

There were 28 recommendations made in the QSAC report, and four of those recommendations are seen in the amendments that apply to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992. There will be a requirement for the courts to treat the fact that an offence of rape or sexual assault was committed in relation to a child as an aggravating factor when sentencing. This should never have not been the case. Anyone who sexually assaults a young person in Queensland should be treated as worse as possible when it comes to sentencing. It would be my preference to make sure they never see the light of day, but any provisions that suggested that age was not an aggravating factor should never have occurred.

The bill also includes recognition of the harm done to victims in the sentencing purposes—that is, recommendation 2—and qualifies the treatment of good-behaviour evidence. Other speakers in the House today have already raised this issue. When someone has committed a sexual assault or a sexual offence in Queensland, a good-character reference should never be taken into consideration in sentencing. The fact that someone is a good bloke or a great lady at the soccer club, works in the canteen, volunteers their time here or there or even turns up to work on time should not be taken into consideration when that person has been found guilty—not just charged but found guilty, as this only comes in to the sentencing component—of raping or sexually assaulting someone. Those people are the most vile creatures on this planet, as far as I am concerned, and it should not matter whatsoever whether or not they are a good person at work or they have been mates with someone for a long time. If you have raped someone in this state, you should be going away for as long as possible, as far as I am concerned.

Recommendation 4 ensures the court does not draw any inference from whether or not a victim impact statement has been given. We have heard today that victims should not be asked to relive the pain and the trauma of a sexual assault. Putting a victim impact statement together can cause a lot of those memories to come back to the surface.

In this state we have a Victims' Commissioner. There may be an opportunity for the Victims' Commissioner to be involved. Although it is not necessary for a victim impact statement to be submitted, there are many crimes that happen across Queensland, such as sexual exploitation, where there is not

a specific victim. I think that is a perfect opportunity for the Victims' Commissioner to be involved and put in a victim impact statement on behalf of the community in relation to child pornography or distributing vile content, which may seem like faceless crimes to Queenslanders because sometimes those people that are shown in those videos are not in Queensland, but they are not victimless crimes. There is a real opportunity for the Victims' Commissioner to become involved to prove to Queensland their worth.

While I am on my feet I will talk about the blue card system. This proposed legislation makes amendments to the blue card bill that was put through towards the end of the last term of the Labor government. For over 10 years the member for Traeger has been saying that the blue card system is not working here in Queensland: it is not serving the people of Queensland and it is not protecting the children that need protecting. There is a chance that the blue card system has stopped some perpetrators accessing children in their work places or when volunteering, but looking at the statistics there are plenty of paedophiles in this state who continue to access children in places like day care and childcare centres by working the blue card system and not being caught because they are careful. That is still happening even though the system is there. The same people who cannot volunteer at a school fete can go down to the school fete and be a predator at the back of the toilets in the dark in all the chaos. The blue card system is not protecting those kids.

There are good people in Indigenous communities across Queensland—on Mornington Island and Palm Island, just to name a couple—and those people need access to work. Someone who has a disqualifying offence that has nothing to do with sexual offending against children should have access to work, especially if it helps them get their life back on track, provides for their family and shows children in the community that if you work hard there is a future for you. We have all sat in this chamber and talked about people deserving an opportunity to move forward with their life. That is how the old judicial system worked, but not in the blue card system. Once you have a disqualifying offence, you cannot work with or around children or even volunteer.

This week we are celebrating Rural Fire Service Queensland Week by wearing yellow ribbons. If you want to be a volunteer firefighter, you have to get a blue card on the off-chance you may interact with a child during a scenario at a roadside incident when called in to help. Those people are the salt of the earth and should have access to the work that they love doing. Those volunteer hours need to be acknowledged, and we are doing that today. The blue card system is not helping everyone in this state. It is not protecting the children we are trying to protect. It is doing something, but it is doing more harm than good. There are a number of people who have been prosecuted, cleared in the courts but still the blue card system says they cannot volunteer or get a job with children. Natural justice has been able to run its course, but the blue card system denies them that opportunity. That should be considered.

Ms JAMES (Barron River—LNP) (4.35 pm): I rise today to speak on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I am proud to see the LNP Crisafulli government taking decisive action after 10 years of inaction by the previous government. I want to commend the Attorney-General, Deb Frecklington, and the many other ministers for working hard to deliver this bill to the House. This bill also reflects the tireless work of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council and the community, ensuring our laws better protect victims and hold offenders accountable. I thank them for their hard work, too.

This bill brings in new sentencing rules that much better match community expectations and puts into action recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's report on sentencing for sexual assault and rape in Queensland. Out of 28 recommendations, four key changes to the Penalties and Sentences Act are included in this bill. This bill recognises the harm done as a sentencing purpose; this bill ensures an offender's good character cannot be used to reduce a sentence unless it is relevant to rehabilitation or risk of reoffending; and this bill protects victims who are unable to provide a statement. This bill also makes sexual offences against 16- or 17-year-olds, who are at a very vulnerable age, an aggravating factor.

Ultimately, the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council found issues with the sentencing outcomes of sexual assault and rape offences, but particularly offences of rape committed against children, as well as the physical, emotional, psychological and social impact sexual offences have on their victims. Simply put, this bill puts these victims first, harsher sentencing for those horrible crimes, crimes that not only are heinous in nature but also have lifelong impacts on the victims. Of the victims and survivors who reported the impacts of child sexual abuse to the royal commission, 95 per cent of those reported mental health related issues, including depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder.

Sexual violence is not an isolated issue, it is a national crisis. In 2022 in Australia, 88 sexual assaults were recorded by police every day. One in five women have experienced sexual violence since the age of 15; one in 16 men have experienced sexual violence since the age of 15; and one in six women and one in nine men were physically and/or sexually abused before the age of 15. Far North Queensland is considered one of seven hotspots in the state and has some of the worst numbers for sexual violence. Cairns recorded 867 sexual offences and 280 rape related crimes in 2024. These stats horrify me and my heart goes out to all of these victims. These are women, men, daughters, sons—and many of them are minors. There were 867 recorded offences, however, there are thousands more that go unrecorded. Ninety-two per cent of women who experience sexual assault do not report it to the police. History has shown over and over that 'he's a good guy' could get someone off these charges or stop someone from pressing charges. Many victims will not put themselves through the trauma of court after the trauma of being raped and many victims cannot bring themselves to relive the moment to share the specifics around their rape.

This inability to testify was also used against them. Under these new laws, even if a victim is unable to provide a statement it does not lessen the seriousness of this crime. Absence of detail will no longer equate to a weak sentence. Unlike the former Labor government, we are making sure that we get these important changes to the sentencing framework right. 'He is a good guy' or 'he just made a mistake' will no longer be an excuse for sexual violence. Good character with good references will no longer mean lighter sentencing.

Weak blue card laws under Labor's watch meant the list of offences that required the chief executive to suspend a person's authority when charged was unclear, leaving gaps in protection for children. This meant that individuals who posed potential risks could continue to work with children while matters were unresolved: teachers, day care providers, coaches—adults our children are taught to trust. Under these amendments offenders cannot hide behind a blue card. The current amendments retain the necessary list of offences and ensure that the blue card system operates effectively to protect our children. Supporting this law means we are safeguarding our children.

We are putting victims first and sex offenders where they belong, which is behind bars. We are protecting our most vulnerable. This bill strengthens sentencing for sexual offences, ensuring the seriousness of those crimes is reflected in the penalties handed down. It recognises the lifelong harm caused to victims and ensures that even if a victim cannot provide a detailed statement that will not reduce the seriousness of the offence. This bill toughens sentences for sexual offences against 16- and 17-year-olds and stops offenders hiding behind 'good character'.

Victims come first. Men, women and children who have been through an unimaginable breach of consent have had their lives shattered. Those victims have had their dignity stolen and those crimes must never be excused, minimised or silenced. Many victims are afraid to speak up to retell their story and many victims are told that it was their fault or that they were partly to blame. The new laws will allow victims to come forward with or without a victim statement and to be listened to and protected by ensuring the 'he's a good bloke' card will not hold up.

To offenders who previously relied on good character to reduce sentencing: your actions are unforgiveable. These are crimes that can never be excused. They are crimes that have lasting impacts on the victims. To the countless people living with the consequence of sexual assault: this bill is for you. We see you, we hear you and we will do whatever it takes to break this cycle, because sexual violence is a violation, it is unacceptable and there are no 'ands', 'ifs' or 'they're a good person' about it. I fully support the bill.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (4.40 pm): Clearly, the member for Barron River is a huge advocate, which is very pleasing to see. Therefore, I hope she will vote in accordance with the amendment circulated by the member for Gaven and shadow attorney-general to allow these tremendous reforms to commence as soon as possible, rather than victims having to wait any longer for them. At the outset I want to be clear that, of course, the Queensland Labor opposition supports this bill, but we will not let the government simply pat themselves on the back and say, 'Job done,' while victim-survivors are told that they have to wait even longer for protections that have already been agreed to and, can I say, were agreed to months ago by both sides of the House. It is a shame that we are still here debating this nearly 10 months after the report landed on the desk of the Attorney-General and four months after I stood in this place, as did many members on this side of the House, urging the Attorney-General to put ego and politics aside. Instead of declaring these reforms urgent and working together to get it done for victim-survivors, those opposite have delayed debate on these reforms for 119 days.

I start by acknowledging the extraordinary courage of the victim-survivors who have shared their experiences throughout this process. Their voices have driven this reform. To every survivor who has advocated, spoken up or written submissions to the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council: thank you. Members will recall that in 2023, when I was the attorney-general, I asked the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council to undertake a major review of how sexual assault and rape offences are sentenced in this state. QSAC engaged in 18 months of extensive consultation. They received 28 preliminary submissions and a further 35 responses to their consultation paper. They held four consultation events, two in person and two online. They interviewed 26 legal stakeholders and eight frontline workers, and they sat down with victim-survivors themselves. Victim-survivors were interviewed, each of them sharing deeply personal experiences in the hope that it would lead to change. It was thorough, it was evidence-based and it was built on the voices of those most affected. This reform has been tested, it has been consulted on and it has the support of both sides of politics.

The result of that consultation was the *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* report, which was handed to the Attorney-General in December last year. It contained 28 detailed, evidence-based recommendations to improve sentencing practices and strengthen justice for victims. I want to thank the members of QSAC for their report and their hard work. The recommendations included limiting good-character references. In fact, QSAC stated that good-character evidence attracted the most submissions to their review from victim-survivor support and advocacy organisations calling for reform. Overwhelmingly, those submissions made it clear that justice will never be delivered if victims have to sit and listen to their perpetrator or abuser be called 'a good bloke', 'a great dad' or 'an outstanding community member'.

The ripple effect report could not have been clearer. It found that courts were placing too much emphasis on the type of penetrative conduct when assessing the seriousness of the offence rather than the harm to the victim or the culpability of the offender. When discussing whether she thought the court had understood the harm to her daughter, the mother of a victim-survivor told QSAC—

I felt like we were the ones being sentenced, not him…It was quickly mentioned that it has done harm to [my daughter] and her family… But not really acknowledging how it has changed our life forever.

QSAC found that sentencing for the rape of children did not reflect community views or the seriousness of the crime. Perhaps most shocking, in 91 per cent of rape and sexual assault cases good-character evidence was raised. In nearly one-third of cases it was given significant weight in sentencing. Too often this meant that offenders were described as being otherwise of good character or that their offending was out of character. Those excuses minimised the crime and retraumatised survivors. That is why this bill matters and it is why any further delay is unacceptable.

One quote from a victim-survivor in the QSAC report stuck with me. After hearing the good-character reference at sentence, a victim of the crime of intercourse of a child under 13 said—

I think it was all bull-

expletive; use your own imagination—

Because I don't care what he's doing now and how he's fixing himself. I want to hear about how [the court is] going to punish him for what he did. What he did, not what he's doing.

To those who came forward with courage, sometimes reliving the most traumatic moments of their lives: your voices have changed the law. You have made this parliament listen. The courage of those victim-survivors demands action, not delay. In the past this government have used urgency motions when it suited them politically, but when it comes to reforms for victim-survivors of sexual assault and rape, how is this not urgent? How do we not just get this done right now? We can have these provisions commence right now. It makes the government's inaction on this issue so hard to understand. If the LNP government truly believed in putting victims first, they would have acted months ago when this came before the parliament. They would have acted to have this dealt with urgently. They would have acted to have these provisions commence immediately.

Those opposite are asking victims to wait. They tell them to be patient. However, if the very culture within the ministerial office responsible for victims is one of chaos and disrespect, how can anyone believe that victims are truly their priority? Even now, as this bill finally comes to debate, the commencement date of these provisions is 1 November 2025. That is 165 days after Labor first offered bipartisan support to deliver these changes immediately.

Can we talk for just a minute about what these delays mean in the real world. Last year alone, there were nearly 3,900 recorded offences of rape and attempted rape in Queensland, which is more than 10 every day. Every day of delay is another day when survivors will be let down by a system that

is not delivering justice. The ABS tells us that in Australia one in five women—that is, 2.2 million women—have experienced sexual assault. Young women aged 18 to 24 face the highest risk. Two-thirds of women who experience sexual assault live with anxiety and fear well after the attack. These are not abstract statistics; these are our colleagues, our neighbours, our friends. They are women working in our offices, women in every community and, in fact, women sitting in this very chamber. Despite who they are to others, first and foremost they are women who deserve to be safe, respected and heard. Queensland women deserve a system that listens and acts without delay.

I am proud to have been the attorney-general who, as part of a Labor government, commissioned this review and began this work. Again, I am proud that it is Labor in opposition that is pushing to see it delivered in a timely way, which victims deserve. Today I say: we support this bill but we do not support any further delays. Victim-survivors deserve better. They deserve action, not excuses. That is why I am proud that the shadow attorney-general will move an amendment to ensure that part 4 of this bill—important reforms to limit the use of good-character references in sexual assault and rape cases—commences immediately and not months down the track. Victims should not be asked to wait one more day for these changes, let alone until the end of the year.

I again thank every victim-survivor who has spoken out, who has advocated, who has shared their story and who has carried the heavy burden of turning their pain into change. This reform belongs to them, and I urge the House to support the opposition's amendment to bring part 4 into effect immediately and finally deliver on reforms that survivors have waited far too long for. Protecting victims is not a partisan issue, and neither is justice and dignity. Survivors should not have to wait when both sides of the House agree on this much needed reform.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Before I call the member for Southern Downs, I want to acknowledge in the gallery the members of the Aspley youth advisory group. Welcome.

Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.50 pm): I rise to speak to the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. One of the things that I have found as an MP sitting in this place—and I am sure we have all found this—is that I learn a lot of things. We see different perspectives in the course of our committee work and when we are getting around the community as MPs. We are exposed to things that we might never otherwise come across. This is one of those times for me.

I heard the member for Waterford say this should not be a matter of partisanship. I have to ask then: why have I heard Labor speaker after Labor speaker falsely characterise this as being either something that the government were goaded into doing against their will or something which was held up interminably for no good reason? The QSAC report was only delivered to the government in December 2024 and the Attorney-General introduced this bill in May. I do not think that seems to be—

Ms Scanlon interjected.

Mr LISTER: I take the interjection from the member—I always remember her as the former housing minister. The lack of housing in my electorate is the most memorable part of my experience here.

Mr Head: What houses did she build?

Mr LISTER: What was that interjection from the member for Callide?

Mr Head: I don't think she built any houses.

Mr LISTER: Certainly none in my electorate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Members will address their comments through the chair.

Mr LISTER: I do not think that that is an unreasonable amount of time to take to have the bill drafted, following the recommendations from QSAC and taking into account the recommendations of the committee. The bill obviously deals with a number of other matters. There is the new offence relating to impersonating a government agency. I am sure we could all consider cases where our constituents had been disadvantaged by that kind of fraud, so that new offence is a good thing. This bill also realigns the state's Crimes at Sea Act with the current Commonwealth act, which is great, and makes changes to the blue card system, as indicated by the Queensland Family and Child Commission.

As we all know, the most important aspect of this bill is the implementation of QSAC's recommendations following the *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* report. The recommendations that were necessary to implement will: require the court to treat the fact that an offence of rape or sexual assault was committed in relation to a child as an aggravating factor in

sentencing; include recognition of the harm done to a victim in the sentencing purposes; qualify the treatment of good-character evidence in sentencing offenders convicted of sexual offences; and ensure the court does not draw any inference about whether the offending caused little or no harm to a victim from the fact a victim impact statement was not given, which is very important.

A lot of our discussions have dwelt on the matter of character evidence. I would like to join with all the members of the House here, who have said that sexual assault and rape is totally unacceptable. Any mechanism which alters the culture of society by taking away the assumption that somebody is an upstanding citizen or that because someone has made a contribution to society that somehow lessens their culpability or reduces the sentence to which they should be subjected is a good thing. We all agree on that.

I cannot put myself in the shoes of a sexual assault victim, but I have observed judicial processes involving youth offenders in the communities that I represent. I have heard laid on the table a lot of mitigating circumstances—the offender came from a bad home, they have been away for a while, they did not go to school, they do not have many opportunities, they have suffered trauma and so forth. The victim does not care about any of that; they just know that their home has been invaded for the third time. I imagine you could multiply that level of insult by 10 for victims of sexual assault. I am all for restricting the use of character references in mitigating the culpability of an offender who has committed a sexual assault.

Importantly, however, the Labor opposition should not be criticising our handling of this matter. The Attorney-General has been quite clear about the necessity for the implementation date to be specified rather than upon assent. It will be proclaimed in November. There are definite reasons for this. It is about: drawing the court's attention to the new statutory aggravating factor applying to offenders convicted of rape or sexual assault against a child; ensuring Crown prosecutors and legal practitioners are aware of the changes and able to provide accurate and appropriate advice to the court on the use of good-character evidence; and ensuring victims of sexual offences are aware of and understand the changes, particularly as the council's report found that victims of rape and sexual assault want better information sharing.

I heard members opposite say we managed to expeditiously push through measures to try to contain the youth crime crisis that we have in this state, suggesting that somehow there is an equivalency here and that, therefore, this could be rushed through. In layman's terms, this is proposing to significantly disadvantage those who are convicted of sexual assault and sexual crimes, which I think is a good thing; it is not eliminating an impediment to properly sentence youth offenders who come before the courts over and over again, like taking away some unnecessary obstacles in the sentencing principles for youth offenders. They are not the same thing. I only wish that we had the same commitment to expediting the course of justice from the Labor Party when they were office that they seem to be espousing now. Many of my constituents, particularly in Goondiwindi, have experienced significant crime, trauma and financial loss as a result of crime that has been perpetrated upon them over and over again.

I reject what the Labor opposition have been saying. Their talk of months stands uneasily beside the decade for which they were in power and during which these measures were not implemented. I congratulate the Attorney-General on this bill and I commend to it the House.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (4.57 pm): I rise to talk on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As has been stated clearly today, the opposition supports this bill because it is essentially what Labor had already called for in response to the QSAC recommendations, and in fact had offered quite a long time ago—over 100 days ago—to support through an urgency motion. Essentially, this bill contains the amendments that we put up with a few extra amendments added in to make this look like a more substantial bill—not that those additional amendments are not important, but I think we are all really clear on why they have been tagged on to the four clauses on rape and sexual assault, to which most of us are speaking, rather than or in addition to substantially dealing with all 28 QSAC recommendations. Clearly, the government felt like they had been caught out for not acting on it more quickly, for sitting on the QSAC recommendations. We support the amendments. We just want them to be implemented more quickly.

If I were a victim of rape or sexual assault and heard all of the self-congratulatory comments being made by those opposite about how much they care for victims, how they have the monopoly on caring for victims, how they have listened to victims and how they stand for victims, I would be even more enraged. I would feel even more damaged than I already was. I would feel even more that I was not seen, not believed and not heard.

These victims of rape or sexual assault who get to court are not statistics. They are the remaining two per cent of victims of rape and sexual assault who have managed to brave their way through the justice system after years and years of people not believing them, of people thinking it is their fault, of people asking what they were wearing, whether they were flirting, whether they were drunk or whether they were asking for it and of people saying that there is no point keeping on with it as it will be too much trouble. Many of them do not even tell their loved ones that they have suffered. They certainly do not tell the police. Even more of them simply cannot survive the years the justice system takes for them to tell and retell their story. Even more cannot survive a trial, particularly if their perpetrator has one person after another lining up to say what a good bloke he is. Thank goodness we are dealing with that issue today.

Debate, on motion of Ms Farmer, adjourned.

MANUFACTURED HOMES (RESIDENTIAL PARKS) AMENDMENT (POSTPONEMENT) REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (5.01 pm): I move—

That the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation, subordinate legislation No. 31 of 2025, tabled in the House on 20 May 2025, be disallowed.

This evening this parliament faces a simple but serious choice: do we keep faith with the residents of Queensland's manufactured home parks or do we give the minister a free pass on delaying the protections that were promised last year? Do we honour the reforms that this very House passed in 2024 or do we allow the Crisafulli government to hit the snooze button for another year?

This disallowance motion is about whether we allow a regulation to delay protections that we all voted for—another broken promise by this government made to thousands of Queenslanders now delayed at the stroke of a pen. If members want the short summary of tonight's choice, it is this: residents lose when we delay; park owners who do the right thing lose when we delay; and the government shows it is not ready to govern when it delays. I say to the member for Bonney: if are not prepared to govern, get out of the way and let those who are do the job.

Let us remember how these reforms were passed in the first place. They were not conjured out of thin air. They came from years of consultation, from submissions, from departmental analysis, from residents who told us in plain English what was wrong. They came from park residents who gave their time over a long and significant consultation period—park residents like those who travelled here today. I will take a moment to recognise some of those residents who are in the gallery: Sandy, Vera, Betty, Carol, Relma, Elinor, Roger, Sharon, Sue, Ian and Maggie. Thank you for your generosity and for taking the time today to come to this parliament where these laws were passed last year. The Labor opposition remain committed to delivering the protections that were legislated by this parliament. We are committed to holding the current government to account for the delays to the protections that you helped shape and you deserve to see implemented.

We have seen the minister scramble to appear to act but only after being called out in this House when I gave him notice that I would move this motion today to force him to do his job.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms SCANLON: No, that is exactly what happened. This is the second speech I have delivered in this parliament today talking about where progress has only happened after I and the Labor opposition called out the government's delays and inaction. It should not take the opposition giving notice that we will act for government ministers to do their job.

There are roughly 23,700 manufactured home sites across about 200 residential parks in Queensland. Around 38,000 Queenslanders call these parks home and a large majority are retirees, many of them age pensioners and many of them on fixed incomes. These are people who have worked a lifetime, raised families, volunteered in their communities, paid their taxes and deserve stability and respect.

While site rent increase limits now apply for existing home owners, without the now-delayed reforms new residents and future agreements remain exposed to less predictable arrangements. Residents told us that sales processes were too slow and too opaque, leaving people paying site rent

month after month while they tried to sell a home so they could move to aged care or close to family. They told us that site agreements can be inconsistent, complex and sometimes one-sided, leaving ordinary people feeling like they were signing away their rights when they moved in. These are not abstract, ivory tower complaints. They are kitchen table realities for many park residents on fixed incomes.

The 2024 act did several things, in stages. Some of those changes have already commenced, but core protections—practical, commonsense changes—were set to commence automatically on 7 June this year. The government is now delaying those protections for up to 12 months. I see the housing minister smiling. He thinks it is funny. These are not boutique, nice-to-have tweaks—

Mr O'Connor: Barely change your timetable.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Member for Gaven, can I ask you to take your seat for a moment, please. I am trying to listen to the member for Gaven. There will be no cross-chamber chatter.

Ms SCANLON: I take the housing minister's interjection—barely changing the timetable. I would say that a 12-month delay is pretty significantly changing of the timetable. These are important reforms to deliver fairness in this sector. The first is maintenance and capital replacement plans. Without these plans, residents are flying blind. They do not know which capital works are coming, when they are coming, what standard is expected or who pays. A proper, transparent plan means fewer surprises and fewer disputes. It means confidence that essential assets—roads, drainage, community facilities, utility infrastructure—are not left to crumble until a sudden expensive fix is demanded. It also means residents can see forward and understand what the park owner is or is not responsible for.

The second element was limiting bases for site rent increases to approved bases. The parliament voted to clamp down on the free-for-all of so-called market rent reviews that led to confusion and potential unfairness for new agreements. The reform would standardise approved bases and ensure consistency going forward. While I do appreciate that the minister has now conveniently identified a date for bases to come into effect, it is not clear why this delay or the longer delays to maintenance and capital replacement plans are necessary. Consider a resident whose park's communal facilities have been deteriorating for years. Residents keep being told that upgrades are 'in the pipeline'. With a mandatory maintenance and capital replacement plan, the pipeline would be a documented program—not a promise—and residents could see timelines and standards and insist on delivery. These are not outliers; they are the stories you hear when you visit parks and speak with resident communities.

Let me deal squarely with the claim that I expect to hear from the government that these matters are complex and more consultation is required to get them right and the irony given the member for Bonney said in this chamber when the bill was originally being debated that these reforms were 'merely tinkering'. If he thought that then, he should have the toolkit to finish these reforms now. Complexity is not an excuse for paralysis; it is a call to competence. If the Minister for Housing now truly believes these are too complex then he should acknowledge they are important reforms and stop pretending the delay carries no cost to residents.

I anticipate that, no doubt, the minister will want to blame someone else for his delays. He will probably try to blame me, despite the fact that we legislated these protections to come into effect in June. The member for Bonney took on the role of housing minister over six months ago now. It is his job to support the Public Service to deliver priorities that every member of this House voted on, including himself. No doubt the member for Bonney will try to squib responsibility once again. The fact is that it is his decision to delay these protections. If he cannot do his job then, as I said, he should move out of the way for someone else who can.

We passed the act in June 2024. The provisions that did not commence were due to start automatically in June this year. The government has had months. Instead of delivering, they tabled a postponement regulation on 12 May—

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I remind you that you are on a warning.

Ms SCANLON:—virtually at the eleventh hour. That is not the behaviour of a government on top of their brief. That is the behaviour of a government trying to shift a deadline they knew was coming. They knew it was coming because they voted for those laws. When a parliament votes on reform and a government uses a regulation to postpone it, it tests the trust of this House. It asks us to accept that executive convenience should trump legislative will. That may suit the government today, but it will come at the expense of park residents.

Disallowing this regulation restores the timetable this parliament set, not the agenda of those opposite. It sends a message that when this House passes protections for residents those protections are not optional extras to be turned on and off at the LNP's whim. It says to Queenslanders: the parliament meant what it said. It also says something about standards. If a government wants a different policy, bring in a bill. Face the House. Make your case. Do not use a postponement regulation as a back door to dump a promise to people you thought would not notice.

Mr O'Connor: We're not changing anything.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney who says that they are not changing anything. They are delaying the laws. I do not know whether the member for Bonney just does not understand his own regulation which is probably the case. It delays the reforms that were meant to come into effect in June.

The inconvenient truth for the member for Bonney is that the opposition noticed and park residents noticed. They noticed when this minister said protections could wait—that years of consultation, of working together with residents and industry to fix issues that threaten the security of people's homes, do not matter. That is why last month I gave notice to move this disallowance motion. Then no doubt what happened behind the scenes was that the Minister for Housing panicked and only after we raised this issue publicly did he then go to Executive Council to try to push through some of the reforms.

Mr O'CONNOR: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence. I had signed the regulation before the member moved the disallowance motion. I ask the member to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, you have been asked to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw. I take what the member has said though. Why on earth has the government moved a regulation to delay reforms if in fact they were planning on delaying reforms? The thing is that what went to Executive Council only dealt with some of those matters. There are still other measures in those laws that have not been adequately addressed by the government in the timeframe that this House—

Mr Ryan: It's still a delay.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection: it is still a delay. It is just a shortened delay on what those opposite tried to move originally. It is a complete shambles over there. What I found particularly interesting though were the explanatory notes for the subordinate legislation that the member for Bonney just mentioned. I quote what they say right at the end. It states—

> Industry stakeholders mostly preferred a six-month transition period between proclamation and commencement whereas consumer stakeholders preferred a faster commencement.

It is clear whose side the Crisafulli government is on when their document essentially says that they sided with what industry wanted and not what residents wanted.

Mr O'Connor: No. It's December.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. In effect, industry have got what they wanted. A six-month delay from when these protections were meant to come into effect is what is eventuating under the changes that the member for Bonney has put forward. The LNP have chosen to back industry rather than park residents. That is what their own document shows.

Mr de Brenni: Profit over people.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Springwood—profit over people once again. No doubt those opposite will change developer donations to assist their mates there, as well.

While we now have a timeline for some of these changes to commence by the end of the year—which, as the member for Morayfield said, still delayed—critical other elements are still deferred until next year. Even some of the changes the government has been forced to act on, such as the sales process, will still remain inconsistent and complicated while the minister kicks the can down the road on standardised sales agreement forms, which was the intent of those reforms to begin with.

To reputable park owners—and there are a number of them out there—I say what many of you already know: certainty works for you too. Clear rules are good for business. Predictable rent bases reduce disputes and legal costs. Transparent maintenance plans build trust with residents and protect asset values. Streamlined sales keep communities moving and reputations strong. Good operators have nothing to fear from a fair field and no favour.

To residents, I say this: you did everything right. You engaged. You made submissions. You told your stories. Parliament listened and acted. I know that there are many residents out there who want to see even more reforms in this space. At a minimum they want to see the laws that we actually voted on in this House passed and implemented. You are entitled to expect the protections to start on time.

This motion is about keeping our side of the bargain, making sure the laws that we passed actually reach those residents' front door. This debate is also a signal about housing more broadly. In a tight market, rules matter. Predictable costs matter. Speed and clarity in transactions matter. Commencing these provisions now is a modest but meaningful step towards a fairer, more functional part of the housing system for Queenslanders.

Those opposite will say, 'What's another six months or one more year?' For a cabinet submission, maybe not much. For a family on a fixed income, it can be an eternity. It is another summer of heat with no shade at the community centre still waiting on maintenance. It is another missed chance to sell while the market is there. Leadership is not about claiming credit; it is about doing the work. The test of government is not whether you can draft a postponement regulation and hope no-one notices.

Mr Stevens: Ten years.

Ms SCANLON: It is whether you can implement your commitments, the law the parliament has already passed in full and on time. The minister has been forced to reveal that these things can be delivered.

Mr O'Connor: If only you'd been the housing minister!

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney again. I was the housing minister and I passed these laws. You are the housing minister and you have delayed them. That is what the record will show.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me, members. Member for Gaven and member for Bonney, please direct your comments through the chair. There will be no cross-chamber conversation.

Ms SCANLON: The government has had the time. The excuses have run out. The cost of delay is borne by those most vulnerable. The housing minister cannot square his past dismissal of these reforms as 'tinkering around the edges' with his present plea that these are too complex now to deliver.

Mr O'CONNOR: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Ms SCANLON: They are your own words.

Mr O'CONNOR: I take personal offence. It was a cognate debate. I was talking about the botched rental reforms that were also fixed in that bill. I ask the member to withdraw. I take personal offence.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I did miss what you said. The member has taken offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I am happy to withdraw. I ask members to stand with residents, not with excuses. Vote to disallow the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation. Honour the law we passed. Keep faith with Queenslanders who trusted us to deliver it.

Mr WHITING (Bancroft—ALP) (5.17 pm): I echo the comments of the member for Gaven and I appeal to the government to stand on the side of residents. Stand with them. It is very clear what residents want in this particular case. I have been standing with these residents for over 20 years. It was in 1999, when I first ran for council, when I first met residents from home parks and heard the variety of issues that they faced at their parks. Ever since then it has been a pleasure to work with them and stand with them to see these reforms coming through. I want to acknowledge all the representatives in the gallery here today who are constantly fighting for a better deal in their parks.

The member for Mermaid Beach said we had 10 years. Let me tell the member what happened 10 years ago when we came to government. There was a tranche of reforms coming through for home parks. They had been delayed and bogged down by the Newman government and were going through very slowly. When we got in we fast-tracked those. I think that was one of two or even three tranches of reforms we made for this sector. A lot of work was done in those years to make sure that residents in home parks had a better deal. I am proud of the work we did over those 10 years, resulting in the bill that we passed last year.

I will begin by addressing why it is so important to start one part of the reform now: capital replacement and maintenance plans. The reform we brought in stated that park owners would be required to prepare maintenance and capital replacement plans for the residential park, and this would encourage park owners to be proactive about maintenance and capital replacement work. It would also allow home owners to engage with park owners, the department and other home owners on request about emerging issues or priorities.

Detailed requirements for these plans would be established in an approved form and regulation developed in consultation with key stakeholders. That is what we want to see happen now—not in June 2026 or December 2025. Home owners want to know now what is happening in their parks. Let me remind everyone that the parks are their villages, their communities. I believe they have every right to know when the roads are going to be upgraded, the drainage is going to be fixed or the air conditioning in the community centre is going to be upgraded. After all, these facilities are funded by their fortnightly rent, and the issue of what they get for the money they pay every fortnight goes to the heart of the matter for me.

We need to make sure there is better balance in the home parks sector. I believe the sector has not recognised that it needs to recognise the co-investment by home owners, and I thank Roger and other representatives from the area who have helped me develop this. Last week I spoke to one representative from a home owners committee who pointed out to me that the total investment by home owners in his park is about $140 million. Each year they contribute approximately $10 million in rent to the ongoing upkeep of that park. That is a co-investment. For home owners it is clearly not a case of 'buy and forget'. Our home park owners are not passive consumers. They have agency and they want to be active in how each of their parks operates and how it spends the income it gets from them. As we know, there are few legal or regulatory structures to ensure these home owners can continue to have an active say. Sometimes all they can do is go and beg the owners to take the spending actions they think are necessary.

It is harder to negotiate when you are locked into a legal agreement where you have to pay a certain amount of rent each fortnight and you cannot simply pick up your product and move it somewhere else in search of a better deal. That is the gist of the imbalance of financial and legal power we have in this case. I believe—and I said this previously when we debated this last year—that we need to shift the principles at the heart of the home parks sector. I will remind people what the committee in the last parliament stated in its report on the 2024 bill. As stated in the committee report—

> Finally, the committee believes a guiding principle for all stakeholders in this sector—home owners, park owners, as well as the state government—is that of 'co-investment' and partnership, and that principle should be reflected in future actions aimed at preserving, improving and enlarging the manufactured homes (residential parks) sector.

Can I suggest that, if you are applying the principle of co-ownership and partnership, you listen to home owners about when they want these provisions to commence. As the member for Gaven just said, they are very clear that they want these provisions to start as soon as possible. Let me emphasise again that the focus should be on the sector as a partnership between park owners and home owners. The sector should be viewed through the lens of co-investment and not through the lens of an owner-client relationship.

I believe the government needs to undertake a broad scoping review of the sector, because we are talking about consumer protections for a large group of Queenslanders. This sector provides homes for many people on middle or lower incomes, and this sector should continue to do that. That is why it is really important to have provisions for capital replacement plans and maintenance plans as soon as possible. There are a whole raft of things that need to change. I have addressed just one thing here tonight, but I think it is emblematic of the changes we need to see. The model and principle of co-investment and partnership in this sector needs to be recognised by government.

Going back to what the member for Gaven said, we stand with home owners. I do think the government needs to back home owners in these parks because, considering the financial and legal power of some of the corporations that now own these home parks, they need all of the backing they can get. Last year an *Australian Financial Review* article stated—

> The largest operation is Hometown Australia, the former Gateway Lifestyle business US operator Hometown acquired in 2018 for $685 million. Stockland, in 2021, paid $620 million to acquire Queensland operator Halcyon and has expanded the brand ever since. Last year—

this was in 2023—

> Mirvac spent $300 million to acquire a near-half stake in the Serenitas portfolio of 27 communities.

Consider the imbalance there. Corporations with their large financial capabilities are faced with home owners committees comprised of the retirees who live in these villages—all of whom are volunteers—trying to get what is fair from these billion dollar international companies.

I remind people that we are talking about a really large section of the retiree community within Queensland. Living Gems has started operating in my area. I think they have about 800 homes going in there. They are just down the road from a Stockland Halcyon development, which I believe will have 400 to 600 homes in the total development. The land lease sector is really large. It is very clear that the residents in those land lease communities need the government on their side. They are up against large companies with great resources and there are great profits to be made. They just want to be treated fairly. They want someone in their corner. We have a range of reforms that have come through, and it is hugely important that we back these residents and make sure they have these protections coming to them as soon as possible. That is why I am so glad to be here to support the disallowance motion moved by the member for Gaven, who I think is doing a tremendous job working with home owners and park owners.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (5.27 pm): I rise to speak to the disallowance motion for the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2025. This regulation is not, as those opposite would argue, a tidy administrative fix. It is in fact a deliberate choice to delay reforms this parliament already passed to protect some of our most vulnerable Queenslanders, and I want to acknowledge some of the park residents who are with us in the gallery today.

These changes improve fairness and transparency for close to 40,000 Queenslanders, giving them more certainty about future rent increases. Of the 40,000 manufactured home residents, most are older Queenslanders—they could be singles or couples on fixed incomes—who have invested their savings into a home and a community. They deserve certainty, they deserve fairness and they deserve a government that does what it says it will do.

In June 2024 we passed the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill to strengthen consumer protections, improve transparency on site rents, streamline the sale of homes and require park owners to plan for capital maintenance and replacement. I think that is all pretty uncontroversial. Some provisions have already commenced; others were due to commence automatically on 7 June this year. I would say to the current government and the minister that they have had more than enough time to finalise the forms, consult with stakeholders and make sure these provisions could commence on time.

Those on this side of the House got the amendments passed and through parliament. We did the heavy lifting, and the member for Gaven certainly did the heavy lifting. It is clear to me that this is simply the Premier and the member for Bonney failing in the basics of governing. When they realised the reforms were meant to start months ago, they thought they would move it down the priority list even further. Then, when we moved a disallowance motion to force them to act, they scribbled in a proclamation date in December. That is simply not good enough.

I understand the member for Bonney is now saying that he signed the executive order for Executive Council on the day the disallowance motion was given. It is very clear that, as soon as the member for Bonney got a whiff that this was coming, after we had consulted with the stakeholders and chatted to some of our passionate residents, he thought, 'Oh, my God, I had better sign that order and we'd better get this done.' It is not good enough. Why couldn't he have done the work to have it commence on 7 June as it was supposed to?

I am not sure if the member for Bonney has taken all of this time as the minister to understand the consequences of the delay of these reforms. There are still no standardised, simplified sales contracts. This means that the sales process stays slower and more complicated, making it harder for residents to sell their homes quickly and fairly when life circumstances change. By pushing other reforms back even longer, the government keeps the status quo that benefits park owners while residents wait yet again for the protections they were promised. Delaying means home owners remain exposed to inconsistent and often one-sided site agreements. Delaying means mandatory maintenance and capital replacement plans are not in place, leaving residents in the dark about future costs and capital works.

Ask Roger at Regal Waters in my community. He wanted certainty and clear rules around this back in June 2025, not June 2026. Delaying it even further means reduced transparency and weaker dispute resolution rights at precisely the time vulnerable people need them most. Ask Sharon at Ingenia in Waterford. She wanted a better dispute resolution process implemented back in June, not in December this year.

The government have said they need more time for forms and consultation. I am not kidding: they have delayed protections for some of Queensland's most vulnerable because they did not get their act together to get the forms right. Is that actually the reason the minister is giving for why this needs to be further delayed? There is a six-month delay because they could not get their act together on the forms, despite the fact that parliament passed these reforms last year.

Residents and park owners alike have been preparing for these changes. They are ready to go. If this government truly believed in these protections, they would have prioritised implementation from day one. They would have got onto those forms and they would be ready. Instead, they have reached for a postponement regulation that leaves residents waiting and worried for an unnecessary six months or more. Speaking to the manufactured homes residents in my community, they are worried. They have described palpable anxiety every day without these protections.

The impact on these residents matters. For the residents in my community and right across Queensland, these are not small administrative changes. They are life-changing protections from uncertainty and financial stress for people who need it most. The reforms that Labor proudly passed were carefully designed to lift standards across the sector. By contrast, this LNP postponement regulation sends the message that they simply do not care enough about lifting standards and having those protections in place.

Today, on behalf of all manufactured home residents in my community, I say that we have all waited too long. Our disallowance motion today is straightforward. Disallow the postponement. Let the protections commence now. Give residents the confidence that comes with clear agreements, faster and fairer sales processes, transparent planning for capital works and a stronger framework for resolving disputes. Residents deserve that confidence. That is what the House intended when it passed these reforms, and this is what Queenslanders were told would happen. This is what should have happened without further unnecessary delay. Our residents have waited long enough. I commend the disallowance motion and say to the LNP: just get on with it.

Mrs McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (5.33 pm): I rise to support the disallowance motion moved by the shadow minister. I speak on this motion tonight representing the hundreds and hundreds of residents in the Macalister electorate who live in manufactured homes. I believe I did declare at the time we were debating this bill that I was living in a manufactured home with my parents while I was between homes, so some of the issues that residents in manufactured homes were facing were very real at the time. In the electorate of Macalister, we have two Palm Lakes, we had until very recently two Living Gems before they were sold, and we have a Halcyon that is under construction at the moment. As well as that, we have our nearby residents at Palm Lake at Bethania and Ingenia at Waterford.

When we passed this last year after all of the committee's work, I must admit that it was the first time I visited my electorate at the conclusion of a parliamentary sitting week—in this case, it was a morning tea at Palm Lake—and a group of people applauded the work we had done in parliament: in this case, to get through the changes to manufactured homes. I was taken aback by how roundly supported these changes were. I acknowledge the amount of work that had gone into these changes and the amount of reviews that had happened that led to this fundamental point where we passed the laws last year. Home owners had been fighting for these changes for quite some time.

If we fast-forward to earlier this year in about May, I attended another morning tea at my Palm Lake home and that is where I encountered for the first time claims from residents that some of these reforms had not been put into effect. I had to get in touch with the shadow minister to find out what exactly was going on because we had passed the laws and there was an implementation plan. I read the committee report and I read the submissions, and at no time did any of the submitters or even the government department that provided the brief indicate there would be any issue with the implementation schedule. Government departments implement forms and those kinds of things all the time; they have people whose job it is to do that. I had to ask some questions about what exactly was being delayed.

I was at another Palm Lake for morning tea to chat to some of the residents about issues there and they asked me why these things had not been implemented. There were people who had bought into their manufactured home under the assumption that things like maintenance was taken care of and that the lawn bowls green that had been out of action for two years was going to be repaired. They then found out that the transparency in terms of the maintenance and upkeep—that we had passed last year—was still not in effect and was now going to be delayed until next year.

Every single time that we delay something, it has real implications for our local residents. In this case, it is about making good, informed choices when you buy real estate. It is the biggest investment one will ever make and you want to have as much detail as possible. We made changes to body corporate laws so people have greater understanding and transparency of what they are buying into—that is, the costs in body corporates—yet when people are buying into manufactured homes, they are paying a nominated rent but they do not know where any of that money is going in relation to the facilities they are paying for. Many of them are paying for pools, bowling greens and recreational halls. I had residents who just wanted the lights on their street working so they could walk in their village at night without fear of falling. There were pleas to the park managers and the park owners to try to provide some kind of timeline and details about the funding for that, but they were falling on deaf ears.

These might sound like small things in the grand scheme of Queensland. However, when this is your life investment, when this is where you have chosen to spend the rest of your retirement period, these are things that are important. These are the things that you want to know when you make that investment. Many of them got behind the various home owners associations throughout the state to make sure they had that level of transparency. I would just ask that we at least provide them with some level of certainty. We passed the bills. We passed the laws. There was a timeline. Let us try to stick to those timelines so our residents have certainty.

Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (5.39 pm): I rise this evening to express my disappointment, but sadly not my surprise, that the LNP has put the interests of manufactured home park owners over the rights and wellbeing of the often vulnerable people who live in these parks by delaying Labor's amendments to this legislation. As I have said before in this House, over the years I have heard many complaints about, and had meetings over, manufactured home parks—about poor upkeep of park facilities, poor communication with residents, unfair rent increases and confusion about site agreements, especially on exiting parks. Sadly, it is often for health reasons that residents leave manufactured home parks, because they simply cannot live independently any longer. Imagine being an age pensioner and told by your doctor that you need to go into care. You have to sell your manufactured home to pay the aged-care bond, but no-one wants to buy it because the park owner cannot be bothered fixing potholes, painting the facilities or trimming overgrown trees, and because deciphering what is actually in the site agreement is too confusing.

Under Labor leadership, we brought in changes last year to solve these problems. We capped rent increases and put a ban on dodgy market rent reviews. We made it unappealing for park owners to sabotage sales while continuing to collect rent from park residents who had gone into care or even from families of residents who had died. In fact, we put park owners on notice that if a resident could not sell up in 12 months then the park owner may need to buy the home back, in recognition that sales should not be hard in good parks, and we introduced compulsory park comparison documents for transparency. We acknowledged that some of our reforms might take more time to implement, so we gave park owners until June to get their affairs in order. Then the LNP pushed them back for their big-business mates.

We are here debating this today because the LNP want to push back our solutions further. They want to push back compulsory maintenance plans that give certainty and comfort to park residents. They want to push back achieving consistency in site agreements and simplifying them, taking advantage of residents who signed up on bad ones.

I am not suggesting that all park owners try to rip off their residents—of course there are some great owners out there—but we cannot forget that there was an evidence basis for making the changes Labor introduced last year. There were—and there are—park owners taking advantage of residents right across the state, putting profits before people. We did a huge amount of consultation on our changes and heard from thousands of residents in hundreds of parks. Now the LNP want to talk about it again. Why? I hope it is not to wind back these changes.

I said before that manufactured homebuyers take a different level of risk to most homebuyers when they invest in their home. It is our job to make sure they are protected from park owners on power trips. Improving the balance of power and clarifying rights and responsibilities of owners and residents will also free up the resources of QCAT, where aggrieved home owners are spending years waiting for verdicts after prosecuting their perceived breaches in complicated site agreements. This is a time in their lives when residents, particularly the ones in my area, should be putting their feet up and enjoying life instead of worrying about these issues.

I will conclude with a shout-out to one of the toughest home owner committees I reckon you will find anywhere—the team at Burpengary Pines, especially Lyn, Bruce and Barb, who have been fighting the good fight for many years. They deserve better than these LNP delays. For the residents of Burpengary Pines and the residents in the neighbouring Riverbend, I hope the postponement regulation is disallowed.

Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (5.42 pm): As we have heard from previous speakers, in the middle of last year the then Miles Labor government introduced staged reforms to help strengthen protections for residents, improve site rent transparency, streamline the sales process for residents and require park owners to maintain capital replacement plans. These are practical and important reforms that were based on the feedback of home owners. I want to pay tribute to the work of the member for Bancroft, who had been an absolutely tireless advocate in bringing that bill and those reforms before this parliament, and the member for Gaven, who was the minister at the time.

These reforms give residents stronger rights and protections. That is what they are about and that is what they deliver. In our Bundamba community, it means delivery for residents from the suburbs of Bundamba and Blackstone, for residents in River Terraces in Goodna, the Oaks in Goodna and the Palms in Redbank Plains. Only last week we turned the first sod on a Stockland Halcyon site in Whiterock, a suburb that sits next to the rapidly growing suburb of South Ripley.

Delaying these reforms any more than they already have been means that Queensland home owners remain exposed to inconsistent and potentially one-sided site agreements; very complex, slow and uneven sale processes; and, in my opinion, very lopsided limited dispute resolutions for longer than they need to be. Residents will not have access to mandatory maintenance and capital maintenance plans. That leaves them without the clarity they need for enjoyment of their home as well as their own financial planning when it comes to the investments they have made inside their communities. Residents will keep on dealing with more confusion and inconsistent site agreements instead of clear regulations and standardised forms. The sale process for manufactured homes will remain slow and complicated, which will make it harder for home owners to sell their home quickly and fairly.

The members for Bancroft, Macalister and Waterford all made mention of the very important point that it is not an equal negotiation. There is a power imbalance between these companies and individual owners. Park owners will be able to keep their already elevated power and flexibility, while home owners lose out on the protections they were promised and afforded by this parliament when the parliament passed these laws in June last year. Delaying them now is simply unfair to residents who have been waiting for this change. They have waited long enough. They have been calling for and fighting for this change for so long. They deserve to have these improved protections and the reforms that were afforded under the bill that was passed last year.

Thanks to some pressure from Labor, the Crisafulli government has been forced to act to a certain point. All of the reforms should be brought forward, but they are not—only some of them are—and some of the reforms will still be postponed until approximately, on my calculation, the middle of next year, meaning residents are again going to have to wait much longer.

The decision to postpone these reforms benefits park owners by keeping the status quo for longer whilst leaving residents without their long-promised protections. If the Crisafulli government cannot deliver on the reforms that were already passed by this parliament then, frankly, it is not just dragging its feet; it is proving itself incompetent to govern.

Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (5.48 pm): I rise today to support the disallowance motion on the government's decision to delay the commencement of vital reforms to the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Act. This is not about politics; it is about fairness, security and dignity for thousands of Queenslanders—many of whom are seniors, many of whom are living on fixed incomes—who call our residential parks home. In my own electorate, I have spoken with dozens of residents at Bayside—Over 50s Lifestyle Community, I have doorknocked and I have sat at kitchen tables and listened carefully to their concerns. These residents are not asking for luxuries. They are asking for certainty, they are asking for fairness and they are asking for protections that were promised to them when this parliament passed these reforms last year.

The reforms that Labor introduced in 2024 were carefully designed after a lengthy consultation involving more than 2,600 home owners across Queensland. The reforms would have standardised site agreements so that residents are no longer trapped in confusing or one-sided contracts. The reforms would have required park owners to prepare maintenance and capital replacement plans so that residents know what they are paying for and can plan for the future. They would have streamlined

the sales process so that residents can sell their homes fairly and quickly, without being financially trapped by ongoing site rent after they move. These protections were due to start in June 2025 but now, because of the government's postponement regulation, they have been delayed. For residents, this is not just a delay on paper. It means living with uncertainty about site rent increases; it means living with unclear and inconsistent site agreements; it means living with complex and drawn-out sales processes that can cause significant financial hardship. It means living without any guarantee of maintenance and transparency, leaving residents unsure about what their future costs might be and what their obligations might be.

These are not abstract issues. They affect the daily lives of residents, some of whom are here today with us, and I thank you for your contribution and for your attendance. Many of them are older Queenslanders who simply want certainty and security in their housing. I want to make clear: these residents are not agitators, they are not unreasonable; they are patient, community-minded people who simply want what they were promised. This delay also reflects a broader problem with the housing policy in Queensland under this government. At a time when housing stress is one of the greatest challenges facing our state—for renters, first home buyers or seniors in manufactured home parks—this decision sends the wrong signal. It tells the housing sector that reforms can be delayed. It tells the housing sector that residents' security can wait. It undermines confidence in a system where certainty is everything.

Housing is the foundation of people's lives. Without stability in housing, every other part of life becomes more difficult. I hear this when I visit residents in Wynnum, Manly, Tingalpa, Lota or Hemmant. I hear it from young people trying to get into the rental market, from families looking to buy their first home and from seniors in manufactured home parks, yet this government has chosen to add uncertainty instead of addressing it. If this government cannot deliver the reforms that were passed more than a year ago with widespread consultation and community support, then how can any Queenslanders have confidence in their ability to deliver on bigger housing challenges like affordability, supply and planning? Residents rightly ask: if over 2,600 home owners took part in the consultation for these reforms, why are their voices being ignored? Is this about trust? People were told protections were coming. They adjusted their expectations, they budgeted, they planned and they looked forward to a fairer, more transparent system and now those protections are being put on hold. Quite frankly, it is a breach of faith with the community.

This motion is about standing up for those Queenslanders. It is about ensuring the protections promised to manufactured home residents are delivered without any further delay. It is about sending a message that when parliament—the highest point in our state—makes a commitment to Queensland that commitment is honoured; however, we know those in government do not generally hold themselves up to that standard. I urge the House to support this motion—not for political gain but for Queenslanders in manufactured home parks because they deserve fairness, transparency and security in their homes now.

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (5.54 pm): I rise to support the disallowance motion because I want to see greater action on this issue. I want to urge the House to do the same by telling you a story about a gentleman in my electorate, a resident who rang me about his father who had, sadly, gone into care for dementia. He had put a significant part of his lifesavings into buying a manufactured home. That was something he had been proud of but not something he could continue to live in. His son, being a dutiful and caring son, wanted to take care of his issues and to follow his instructions to sell the house. That is one of the toughest things we think we will face in our lives to begin with; however, this was made so much worse when he could not sell the house because the estate—which was outside of my electorate—the manufactured home was in was continuing to sell houses and had no interest in helping the existing residents to sell their houses. What rubbed salt in the wound for this son—and I hope he hid it from his father—was that his father's money was continuing to erode, not only due to the cost of care in the dementia clinic but also because he was continuing to pay rent in a house he could no longer occupy. I took these issues to the previous minister and the minister took action to put these laws in place. We actually took this to extensive hearings, and I participated in them with some of the people who are in the gallery. We listened to what they said, we took it back to this place and voted on this bill to become law. Now it seems there is a rearguard action to delay them. I want to keep honour with that son who kept honour with his father. That is why I want the support of everyone in this House to vote for this disallowance motion and see these things put in place.

I am also very passionate about site rent increases that go well beyond the ability of residents to pay. We want to see some limits on that. That is because, unlike any other rental arrangement, the person involved has put in a massive capital investment, co-sharing, in effect, in the manufactured

home. They feel a loss of control in the place where they wanted to feel safe and secure. Now, members in this House, you can do something about that. You can move the disallowance motion that we have put forward today. I note that no-one on the other side is standing up to defend the minister's delays. No-one on the other side actually thinks that what is happening here is correct, or else they would defend it. I urge you to listen to those people in your parks, listen to the pleas of a son whose father is in dementia care and do the right thing and support the shadow minister's disallowance motion because it will make a difference by giving residents security in their houses.

I have a simple message: the bills that we passed last year after so much consultation are making a difference to give people in manufactured homes a sense of security about the very home they live in—in which they have invested with pride and built their community. You can do something today. I hope you do not let them down.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (5.58 pm): I rise to support the motion that the manufactured homes residential park amendment regulation be disallowed. This regulation delays the commencement of a crucial consumer protection reform passed by this very House. These reforms were hard fought for by residents and home owners, yet the government seeks to postpone their introduction for another year until 7 June 2026.

Manufactured home residents own their homes but rent the land from park operators. Their rights are governed by the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Act. In June 2024 the parliament passed amendments to strengthen consumer protections, improve transparency in site rent, streamline sales and require park owners to maintain capital replacement plans. Thanks to the pressure from the Labor opposition, the Crisafulli LNP government was forced to act.

On 4 September a proclamation was made fixing 6 December 2025 as the commencement date for some of these reforms. Those reforms are site rent increases, buyback obligations and park registration. However, many key provisions, including fair dispute resolution, streamlined sales, written site agreements and mandatory maintenance and capital plans—one of the key safeguards to give residents clarity on future costs and capital works—were scheduled to automatically commence on 7 June 2025. Home owners overwhelmingly supported these reforms but argued they did not go far enough, particularly around capping rent increases. Park owners, on the other hand, opposed these measures, preferring the status quo and arguing for better consumer education rather than real change.

On 15 May 2025 the LNP government made the postponement regulation which delays the commencement of the remaining reforms by a full year. This means home owners will have to wait until June 2026 for protections they were promised and which parliament legislated for in 2024. This means that key reforms are being delayed. They include residential park dispute provisions, requirements for written site agreements in the approved form, streamlined sales processes for manufactured homes and site agreements, and obligations for park owners to prepare and share maintenance and capital replacement plans. These are not minor administrative changes; these are core consumer protections designed to address longstanding inequities in this sector.

The Crisafulli LNP government has argued the postponement is necessary to 'finalise the regulatory framework' and 'consult with stakeholders', but these reforms were already the subject of extensive consultation in 2023 and 2024. Stakeholders were heard. Parliament decided. Residents were promised stronger rights and more transparency. The delay leaves home owners exposed to inconsistencies, potential one-sided site agreements, complex sales processes, limited dispute resolution rights for at least another year, and no access to mandatory maintenance and capital replacement plans. The imbalance remains. Home owners bear the risk of home ownership but lack land security and transparency from park owners. Many of these residents are older Queenslanders on fixed incomes.

Last week I spoke to a constituent whose parent lived in a manufactured home and had recently passed away. When they approached the park owner about purchasing the home, they were told it had no value and were offered a small sum. An independent real estate agent valuation supported a much higher value. The park owner dismissed this approach and said they did not want to be in manufactured homes and were going to redevelop the park. The park only has a handful of manufactured homes and no home owner committee. The family now faces an impossible choice: accept the low offer or take the matter to QCAT, a process that could take some time during which they have to keep paying site fees. This is exactly the kind of imbalance the 2024 reforms sought to address, but the postponement keeps this imbalance in place.

The LNP government argues that disallowing the postponement regulation would create confusion because some prescribed forms and regulations are not ready, but these are administrative matters the government had ample time to prepare for. It is unfair to make home owners bear the cost of government delay. This is about whose side we are on. We are on the side of the residents, many of whom are pensioners, who deserve fair treatment and transparency.

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (6.05 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate in respect of the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2025 and the disallowance motion in respect of that postponement regulation moved by the member for Gaven, the shadow minister for housing. In rising to contribute to this debate, I am rising on behalf of many residents of the Caboolture-Morayfield region—those residents of the Caboolture River Village, Halcyon Glades, Vantage Caboolture Riverfront, Palm Lake Resort at Beachmere, Riverbend Burpengary, Thyme Lifestyle Resort, Burpengary Pines Village, Green Wattle Burpengary, Pacific Palms Relocatable Home Park, Freshwater, Halcyon Promenade and GemLife Moreton Bay. There are many people in the region of Moreton Bay who are counting on this legislation to enhance their rights and protect them from practices which have been inflicted upon them in many respects contrary to their best interests. This postponement regulation delays protections for those residents.

I am disappointed that we are almost at the end of this debate—I am standing up on behalf of those residents and many members of the opposition have stood up on behalf of residents in their communities—but we have not yet heard from one government speaker about why they want to postpone this regulation. We have not heard from the member for Broadwater, who has significant numbers of park residents in his electorate, the member for Burnett, the member for Caloundra, the member for Coomera, the member for Hervey Bay, the member for Pumicestone or the member for Toowoomba North, who, coincidentally, has the largest residential park in his electorate. All of these members and many others have yet to rise to their feet to contribute to this debate about why they want to postpone protections for vulnerable Queenslanders.

Since I was first elected in 2009 I have been championing the cause for park residents alongside the member for Kurwongbah and the member for Bancroft. These are residents whom many would describe as battlers, but the member for Kurwongbah, the member for Bancroft and I describe many of them as our friends—people who are good community members who deserve protection from government against those park owners who in many respects are billionaires or, in most other respects, millionaires.

This is a true test of people's priorities. It is a choice between the billionaires and the millionaires or the battlers. That is the choice here. It is about the priorities of this parliament when it comes to protecting vulnerable Queenslanders. What we see this government doing is delaying those protections for vulnerable Queenslanders that were hard fought for and championed by many members on this side of the House—provisions relating to site agreements, prescribing the basis for site rent increases, sale agreements, precontractual disclosure documents and residential park comparison.

We will hear shortly from the minister, who will say, 'I've reduced the delay,' but he nonetheless signed the bit of paper that delayed those protections in the first place. He delayed them in the first place. He did not prioritise the battlers; he delayed them in the first place. Some of those protections which he says he has shortened the delay on are nonetheless excluded from the shortened delay and are still delayed for the full period, favouring park owners over park residents, with many of those park residents being vulnerable Queenslanders—battlers—in our community.

As I said, I have been championing the cause of park residents since I was first elected in 2009 and have developed great friendships with people, particularly those from Burpengary Pines Village. The member for Kurwongbah and I often hosted a barbecue. In fact, when the member for Bancroft was the local councillor, we would have our regular barbecues with the residents to catch up with them and to hear their stories. We got a consistent message from those residents, and that is that they felt vulnerable when it came to the power imbalance between the big owners of the parks and their own position. They felt vulnerable when it came to maintenance of park facilities. They felt vulnerable when it came to site rent increases. Until our government reformed the law at the time, many park owners would use almost cartel behaviour—ratcheting up site rents and then comparing those higher site rents to places on the other side of the highway. The member for Bancroft will remember this. The park owners used the example of the park on the other side of the highway to then ratchet up that site rent. It was cartel-type behaviour and it made those residents even more vulnerable in terms of their position when it came to living in those parks.

Those people deserved the protection of their government. When we were in government we enhanced those protections to support those vulnerable Queenslanders against the power imbalance with those park owners. Every single day this side of politics will stand up for those vulnerable Queenslanders. We even took the fight up to the federal government. When John Howard was the prime minister he changed the GST rules when it came to site rents, imposing GST on site rents. We took the fight up from Burpengary Pines Village and about 300 of those residents who were older Queenslanders—we have to think about this for a moment—held a rally in the local park where those 300 older Queenslanders took it up to the then prime minister, and we won. We beat the prime minister of Australia when it came to imposing GST on site rents. These are the types of Queenslanders we are supporting. We are supporting people who want to stand up for their rights, but they need the help of their elected representatives and they need the help of their government to help them take the fight up to protect their rights to ensure that those park owners do not take advantage of their vulnerabilities.

I implore this House to support the disallowance motion. Stop protecting the park owners over the park residents. Park residents deserve our support. They are the battlers in this, not the billionaires, and they deserve our support. This is about the priorities of this parliament. It is about the priorities of this government. It is about making sure that we put the battlers first. I am concerned that even with the shortened delay in respect of some of the provisions that the minister has signed—he did the paperwork and he delayed it, albeit he has now shortened the delay—that is an extended period of vulnerability for these park residents and this parliament should say no. It should say, 'We back the battlers over the billionaire park owners.'

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (6.13 pm), in reply: I rise to oppose the disallowance motion moved by the member for Gaven to the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2025. This disallowance motion relates to a regulation that is purely machinery in nature. Despite all of the claims that we have heard from those opposite, this is purely machinery in nature and is something that in fact the former government did on at least one occasion. It moved a postponement to the manufactured homes act to ensure that particular provisions did not kick in automatically like these provisions would have kicked in, and I will table that. It was from 2018 and I think it was the member for Springwood, but it is hard to tell as those opposite had a lot of housing ministers at that time.

Tabled paper: Housing Legislation (Building Better Futures) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2018 [1248].

Tabled paper: Housing Legislation (Building Better Futures) Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2018, explanatory notes [1249].

That is something that the former government did when the work needed to be done to get these processes right. This disallowance motion does not change the reforms underway to better protect residents in manufactured homes communities across Queensland. What it does ensure is that the remaining provisions of the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Act 2024 are implemented in a staged, structured and consultative way. Despite the claims that we have heard from those opposite, we cannot just pass an act with requirements for detailed pieces of work to be put into regulation and expect those to just appear. These are provisions that always required detailed regulation and forms to be created so that they could operate effectively. That consultation cannot happen all at once. You cannot just go out to the sector, particularly the stakeholders who are in the chamber with us tonight, and just throw all of these bits of regulation on them at once. You have to do it in a staged way. These provisions were always planned to be delivered in a staged way, and I will come back to this in a moment.

The staged approach was actually put in place by my predecessor who was the member for Gaven—the person moving this disallowance motion. The member for Gaven is moving a disallowance motion to the process that the member for Gaven had in place. It is extraordinary! This motion before the House is nothing more than just another Scanlon scare campaign—and we have seen these time and time again from the member for Gaven—creating fear around the victims of domestic and family violence and pensioners accessing our crisis accommodation program.

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence to the outrageous comments made about domestic and family violence victims and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The member was making claims around the IHR, the Immediate Housing Response program, which were debunked by the director-general at estimates. I refer the member to the transcript if she needs a reminder about her disgraceful scare campaign about access to our emergency accommodation program. The member was making scare campaigns around social housing eligibility checks and a ridiculous claim out of estimates that we are somehow going to sell a thousand social homes.

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. While the defence from the member for Bonney is interesting, this is not remotely relevant to the disallowance motion that has been proposed.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Member for Bonney, I would ask you to come back to relevance.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, and now the latest scare campaign is for the residents of manufactured homes. The member for Gaven has never seen a scare campaign or an opportunity to play politics that she has not jumped at. We are getting on with the job. We are cleaning up the member's mess and doing the work that Labor could not—

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence to those comments and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. We are getting on with the job of doing the work that Labor could not be bothered to do in its decade in power.

When the amendment bill was introduced last year the LNP supported it, under my very wise counterpart here in the sports minister when he was the shadow minister, and that is because these reforms matter and they deserve to be delivered in a way that achieves outcomes for the people that they affect. I am very proud to represent four manufactured homes communities in my own electorate—Settlers Village and the Pine Ridge caravan park in Coombabah, Seachange in Arundel and the Harbourside Gardens Lifestyle Resort in Biggera Waters—and I am very proud to stand here on behalf of everyone on this side who are all very proud to represent many residents in these communities in every corner of our state. We have listened to their concerns. These residents want clarity, they want certainty and they want confidence that the regulator and the system are acting in their best interests.

This afternoon I took the chance to meet with the Queensland Manufactured Home Owners Association, and I want to acknowledge President Roger Marshall and Secretary Sue Gregor, who are in the gallery today with some other committee members. I want to thank them for the important role that they play in supporting residents and engaging constructively with our government. Their insight helps ensure we get these reforms right, both for park owners and for residents. That is what we are delivering—reforms that improve transparency and consumer protections in residential parks supported by meaningful consultation that we are undertaking in a calm, considered and methodical way by engaging with the sector and residents. Unfortunately, what we are seeing today does nothing to benefit the manufactured homes sector. It is a political stunt—a scare campaign designed to create controversy where none exists.

Last year the former minister stood in this House and said that these reforms will give investors, seniors and operators the confidence to invest in these sorts of housing. She said that she looked forward to working with stakeholders to develop the regulations needed to support implementation. She even said in her introductory speech on the Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Bill 2024 on 21 March 2024—

> The package includes safeguards to ensure park operators can adjust to the reforms, including phased implementation and further consultation with the industry on park comparison documents, and maintenance and capital replacement plans.

We are doing phased implementation. Bizarrely, it is what the member for Gaven is now opposing. My department has confirmed that the staged implementation timeline has not substantially changed from what the failed former—now shadow—minister was briefed on during her time in the role that I now hold. The hardworking public servants advising me are the exact same public servants who briefed the former—now shadow—minister. Regardless of the change of government, the phased implementation was always going to occur.

We have heard a lot about June. We have heard that all this was going to kick in in June. A postponement regulation would have been introduced regardless of the change of government to ensure the provisions did not automatically, arbitrarily commence. I have some receipts on this. Firstly, I have a deputy director-general brief from 5 July 2024 on the implementation approach for these reforms. It includes improvements to park maintenance and standards to commence in late 2025. I will table it for the benefit of the member.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Department of Housing, Local Government, Planning and Public Works: Briefing note (for action)—Deputy Director-General [1250].

I also have an email to an adviser in the former minister's office which outlines this implementation timeframe, and it includes in the bottom section 'reforms proposed to commence in December 2025'. That is after June, meaning a postponement regulation would have had to be moved whoever was in this role. I will table that, too, for the benefit of the member for Gaven, who seems to have forgotten it.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 18 July 2024, from the General Manager Strategic Policy and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing, Local Government, Planning and Public Works [1251].

We are doing the work. We are consulting properly and delivering these reforms for manufactured homes across Queensland. Before this disallowance motion was raised by the member for Gaven, I had signed the proclamation commencing most of the remaining provisions of the act, along with the supporting Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2025. Governor in Council approved these changes the following week.

The facts are simple: stage 1, to require that park owners publish comparison documents and register new parks before opening, has already commenced under this government. Stage 2, to update and streamline the sales and precontractual disclosure process and introduce new requirements for sales agreements, site agreements and site rent bases, is now locked in to commence in December. Stage 3, to require parks to publish maintenance and capital plans, will commence next year after detailed consultation with residents, representatives and park owners.

What exactly is the shadow minister trying to disallow? The work is underway. The reforms are being rolled out. This motion is not just unnecessary; it is disruptive. We have seen what happens when reforms in the housing space are rushed. We all remember the botched rent reforms under the member for Gaven—the so-called once-a-year rent cap that was riddled with loopholes. Landlords were able to bypass the cap by evicting tenants, increasing rents and putting new tenants in, completely undermining the intent of the policy. The member should remember, because it was a cognate debate with the very legislation we are discussing tonight to fix up her botched, failed reforms. It resulted in confusion and uncertainty. It smashed investor confidence. It was pushed through without proper consultation. That is the result of not doing the work. It meant that the member for Gaven was pouring fuel on the fire of the housing crisis that was burning across Queensland.

We will not repeat Labor's mistakes. The provisions that would automatically commence if this disallowance motion were to pass are complex. They affect tens of thousands of park residents and hundreds of park owners across Queensland. They require careful, considered consultation to ensure they are workable and effective. We are focused on ensuring stability in the market and we are doing that by listening to the sector. We are delivering reforms that reflect what many stakeholders need, not just what fits a political narrative—like so many decisions made by the member for Gaven. Let us also remember that Labor had 10 years to introduce these reforms. In relation to the reforms they are so passionate about today, they had 10 years to consult. They had 10 years to introduce them to this parliament and now, after a decade of inaction, when this act was passed without the work being done for the required regulations within months of an election, they now want to criticise a measured, staged rollout. It is ridiculous.

This disallowance motion undermines the very process and staged implementation that the former, now shadow, minister once supported. All this postponement regulation does is delay the automatic commencement of the provisions that require regulation to function—provisions around allowable bases for site rent increases, requirements for site agreements, sales agreements, and precontractual information, disclosure and maintenance and capital replacement plan requirements. These would have all automatically started on 6 June, which was not enough time to get these significant changes right. That is a timeline that, as I have outlined, Labor was going to go past anyway.

These are important reforms and they must be done properly. We are taking a genuinely consultative approach, which takes time and effort but leads to better outcomes. We have already locked in reforms to commence in December to limit the site rent increase methods in new site agreements to specific bases, simplify the manufactured homes sale process, ensure home owners have up-to-date site agreements, establish minimum requirements for sale contracts and overhaul precontractual disclosure processes so consumers can make informed choices about their housing decisions.

The final stage of reform—the only remaining provisions, despite the contributions we have heard from the Labor Party tonight—will introduce requirements for park owners to develop maintenance and capital replacement plans, improving accountability and giving home owners a voice on how their communities are maintained. These reforms are not being delayed. The work is being done to deliver

these changes for residents and park owners. If this disallowance motion were to pass it would result in confusion, disruption and uncertainty for park owners and home owners across Queensland. It would be a return to the bad old days of the housing failures we saw time and time again under Labor.

There is complexity in designing the detailed regulatory and administrative arrangements needed to implement the reforms that are being commenced by proclamation under the amendment act, particularly those related to the sales process. We want Queensland to be a state where people can invest with confidence and where older residents can age with dignity, whether they are in a retirement village, a residential park or other types of housing suited to their needs. That is why we are taking a measured, structured approach to implementing these changes. We are ensuring this process is staged and consultative. Importantly, these changes will not be 'set and forget'. We will continue to engage with peak bodies, industry representatives and home owners to ensure these reforms are working as they should. The Labor alternative—a rushed implementation without doing the work—would be irresponsible. It would impact thousands of current and future residents of residential parks.

This Labor motion is not about reform. This is playing politics at the expense of the Queenslanders who live in these communities. It is another example of the member for Gaven talking about all of the things that she did not do when she had the chance. Our government is focused on delivering housing reforms that are fair, consultative and built to last. Labor's approach is nothing but chaos, contradiction and yet another scare campaign. We are getting on with the job of doing the work that Labor never did in its decade of decline. That is why this disallowance motion must be opposed by the House tonight.

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

AYES, 36:

ALP, 34—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Sullivan.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, , 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.

Pair: Hutton, Furner.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.33 pm to 7.30 pm.

PENALTIES AND SENTENCES (SEXUAL OFFENCES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2748, on motion of Mrs Frecklington—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (7.30 pm), continuing: By the time victims get to court and actually face the effects of the recommendations that hopefully we will pass today, they are whittled down. They have gone through the doubt. They have gone through years of not being believed. They have gone through incredible trauma to be among the two per cent of victims of rape and sexual assault who actually end up in court. They are incredibly brave people. That is why, when we were in government, we passed successive rafts of legislation to support them: the coercive control and affirmative consent laws, the child sexual offences reform bill, the sexual violence and other matters amendment bill and, of course, our response to the massive Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce reports.

The former attorney-general instigated the QSAC process. The four amendments that we are talking about today have resulted from that QSAC process. Through the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce process and the QSAC process, many victims came forward to bare their souls, hoping that we would act appropriately, hoping that we would act in good faith and hoping that we would respond to their needs. Many victims came forward. I do not think any of us would truly understand what that actually means unless we have been victims ourselves.

When they came to power, this government had an opportunity to show victims of rape and sexual assault—the victims we are now talking about—that they care, that they actually believe them and that they are going to make this a priority. How do we think those victims felt when, with the first legislation effectively passed in this House through the Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, the Minister for Youth Justice and the Attorney-General did not think that rape and sexual assault were serious enough crimes to be included in that first tranche? How do we think those victims felt when the Attorney-General sat on the QSAC recommendations for six months? How do we think they felt when the government refused to support our amendments around the four recommendations that we are considering today and also refused our offer to support an urgency motion to have them passed and make a difference to victims? I cannot even imagine how victims felt when the government decided to make the Trusts Bill urgent but was not willing to pass these amendments on an urgency motion. The government then put forward the same four recommendations, pretending they were their idea.

Victims can see that all this government has been doing is playing politics with them. We have heard the insincerity when they talk about caring for victims. When this bill passes tonight, it will be 165 days from when it could have happened to when it is actually going to happen. To show good faith to those victims, to actually show them that we support a system that will expedite their case and give them some closure, all we want is for our amendments to be passed now and to take effect now. For all of the rhetoric, for all of the speeches, for all of the chest beating and the moral high ground, I am yet to hear anything from anyone on that side of the House that justifies not letting them take effect now. There is no good reason. They cannot say to any victim, 'We have a good reason for delaying this.' Why can't they accept these amendments now? The only reason that I can think of is that they do not want to look like they are agreeing with us. How petty and pathetic that is. How insulting it is to those victims who have gone through so much to reach this particular point.

Before I finish, for my electorate I want to clearly articulate what these four recommendations are about. On the aggravating factor for offences against children, the change will mean that courts will be able to impose tougher sentences for rape or sexual assault against children, recognising their vulnerability. On the recognition of victim harm, sentencing must explicitly recognise the harm to victim-survivors, strengthening trust in the justice system. The bill reforms the use of good-character evidence because there is no universe where someone can be called a 'good bloke' if they have raped or sexually assaulted someone—no universe. The last recommendation is about victim impact statements. The absence of a statement must never be taken as evidence of little or no harm.

We agree that these are important reforms that must be put in place. We support them. We support them for victims. Please, for the sake of victims and in recognition of the trauma that they have all been through, stop playing politics and let these things happen straightaway.

Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (7.36 pm): I am very pleased to rise and speak about the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. It is great to be part of a government that is doing what we said we would do. This bill reflects the community's expectations. For those opposite who talk about delays, I highlight that we were elected last October, we formed government in November and we started to get down to business in December. Our first budget was delivered in July. We promised Queenslanders that we would deliver Adult Crime, Adult Time before Christmas and we did. We said we would introduce the Making Queensland Safer Laws and we have with one, two and three tranches. We have continued with a full legislative program with the likes of Jack's Law. Now we are debating the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill at the first opportunity that we have had.

I commend the Attorney-General and her team. I recognise the hard work that the team has been doing to get this bill right and to meet the Queensland community's expectations on sentencing. The bill contains some very sound reforms that reinforce to Queenslanders, and particularly the victims of sexual offences, that we understand that there was an imbalance and we are addressing that imbalance by ensuring the rights of victims. At this time, I think it is appropriate to also pay tribute to my colleagues the member for Nicklin and chair of the committee, the member for Capalaba and the member for Thuringowa as well as the secretariat who did a wonderful job on the committee. They had to deal with

a number of very delicate and complex submissions and I believe they got the balance right. I believe that because in its report the committee made only one recommendation. Please accept my personal congratulations.

I do not want to dwell on the member for Nicklin, but his contribution earlier about his experience as a sworn police officer walking with victims and understanding that journey through to understanding the operationalisation of legislation in this House was glowing. I congratulate him on that. I also pay tribute to our police, particularly our frontline police in the Lockyer, Gatton, Laidley, Lowood and Helidon divisions, as well as the Lockyer CIB and the Laidley CPIU, which look after many of our sexual offence cases, for the great work that they do. I know that our frontline police very much appreciate the changes we are making to the laws to ensure they are empowered, and we are giving them the resources that they need. I look forward to continuing to work with our government to see those things put in place. Again, I commend the police minister for his efforts in that regard.

I also commend the way in which our government has been working together. During the last 10 years of decline we did not see an attorney-general, a minister for police, a minister for victims and a minister for the prevention of domestic violence working together to make the changes that matter to Queenslanders. This is another change that Queenslanders will appreciate. It is all about making Queensland safer. It is about putting people over politics and making sure that Queenslanders' rights and community expectations, particularly in this Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, are met. Again, I congratulate the government.

I turn now to a couple of specifics of this bill. I recognise that it is also dealing with recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council report which talked about the lifelong impacts on victims. In my former role as an operational officer I did have the great privilege to support some traumatised victims during the lowest point in their life. They were very vulnerable, and I had the privilege to support them through that journey and actually truly understand—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Just a moment, please, member for Lockyer. There is too much background noise on both sides of the House. Thank you. Go ahead, member for Lockyer.

Mr McDONALD: Being able to walk beside those victims—to use the member for Nicklin's phrase—and support them through that journey was a privilege and something I will never forget. Today I remain friends with a number of those victims—they catch up with me at the markets or in the street—and it is because of the support we gave and the outcomes we achieved in very challenging times.

This bill deals with a number of sensible issues, particularly the good-character reference or the 'good bloke' defence that was allowed to be raised in all manner of sentencing processes and now will be restricted. Again, I think the committee and the bill have this right, so well done on that. This bill also balances the rights of victims and the safety of justice to make sure the court outcomes are well protected. This bill removes the inference the victim has not been harmed by an offender if there is not a victim impact statement. This removes that and, again, I welcome that. It is a very sensible reform.

Those opposite have been talking about delays regarding this matter. I appreciate, though, that they are supporting the bill. There has not been a great delay. It has been a very sensible and considered approach working with victims groups, working with the committee and going through full and proper consultation to get a good outcome.

I also recognise the changes that are being made to the blue card system, which is one of the issues that my community and many across the state talk to us about. I was privileged to be part of the former parliament when we were dealing with the blue card issues. I appreciate that the Attorney-General and her team are doing a review into the blue card system, and I look forward to seeing the outcomes of the next tranche of inquiries. This is a really good start.

I am very proud to be part of a government that is continuing to return the balance after a decade of decline under Labor. In the last 10 months we have seen remarkable changes that show every Queenslander that we are fair dinkum about crime. This is another important aspect to it. I have been travelling across the state and I know many people in my community have been critical of the judiciary in many instances. I have actually referred them to a number of discussions we have had here in parliament where the Attorney-General has quoted some magistrates and judges who have recently dealt with those new laws. This is another suite of changes—and if it is not in legislation the judges cannot consider it. This is another suite of changes in legislation that those magistrates and judges will have to consider when sentencing offenders. It is another lever that we are using.

At the start of the criminal justice process, we have to target hard, make sure that victims are protected at the earliest opportunity and minimise the opportunity for offences to occur—and that is all about educating our community. When we get to the criminal justice system, we have to make sure the police are well supported. When we get to the courts, we have to make sure the courts are well supported. These changes will see the judiciary's balance improved to make sure victims' rights are put ahead of offenders' rights. I certainly welcome each of those outcomes.

I will finish where I started: this bill is such an important part of this government's changes to meet community expectations right across Queensland. I know it is meeting the community expectations in Lockyer, as this is the No. 1 issue that people talk to me about. Queenslanders have not felt safe in their home. It is still early days and there is more work to be done. We do not want to see any victims out there, and this is another set of changes that will allow the judiciary to consider really important matters so we can get better outcomes for Queenslanders and make sure they are safe.

Ms BOURNE (Ipswich West—ALP) (7.47 pm): I rise today to speak on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Let me begin by acknowledging the member for Waterford, who asked the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council in 2023 to review how sexual assault and rape offences are sentenced in our state. I would also like to put on the record my thanks to those victim-survivors who had to relive their experiences during consultation on this bill. The Labor opposition supports the bill, but we will not rubberstamp it without ensuring it delivers for victims sooner.

That review was certainly not a tick-and-flick exercise; it was 18 months of deep consultation with survivors, with frontline support workers, with legal experts, with judges and prosecutors and, most importantly, with Queenslanders who had lived through the trauma of sexual violence. That is how good legislation should be developed, and those of us on this side of the House understand that.

What did this process deliver? It delivered 28 clear and detailed recommendations handed to the current Attorney-General last December. Survivors, advocates and communities did their part. They told their stories, they offered their solutions and they made their voices heard. Labor immediately committed to act. In May, when this bill was introduced, the opposition said, 'We will support it this week. Victims and victim-survivors should not have to wait any longer for protections already supported by both sides,' but the LNP government said, 'Not yet.' Here we are—survivors have waited not months but years for change. This government is dragging its feet. Let us be crystal clear: these reforms matter. They are not optional. They are protections survivors deserve today, not in the distant future, yet this government wants to delay them until November 2025.

Why delay making the sexual assault of a child an aggravating factor in sentencing? Why delay recognising that children, our most vulnerable, deserve the full protection of the law and that courts must be empowered to hand down tougher sentencing? Why delay requiring courts to explicitly recognise the lived harm of survivors? Sentencing that ignores the lifelong impact of sexual violence is sentencing that denies reality. It is sentencing that strips away trust in justice. Why delay ending the so-called 'good person' defence? For too long perpetrators have hidden behind testimonials that they are good people, good employees, good mates at the pub as though that erases what they did behind closed doors. Character evidence must be relevant only to rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending. That is common sense. That is justice.

Why delay reforms to victim impact statements? Survivors have told us time and time again that that they are retraumatised in court—they have had to relive the trauma. Sometimes they cannot or choose not to put their pain into words. Silence does not mean the harm is less. Silence does not mean the trauma disappears. The absence of a victim impact statement must never be taken as evidence that harm is minimal. Yet, across every one of these critical reforms, the government wants to delay its introduction.

In 2023-24 alone, there were 3,898 recorded offences of rape and attempted rape in Queensland. That is around 75 people every single week. That is 75 families every single week. Every week we wait another 75 lives are shattered and our justice system, by delaying these reforms, tells them that they must wait even longer for change. Justice delayed is justice denied. Survivors know it. Communities know it. Those of us on this side of the House know it. The only people who do not seem to understand it are those opposite on the government benches.

The government had a choice. When Labor offered bipartisan support in May, the government could have passed this bill immediately. They could have said that justice cannot wait. Instead, they said, 'Let's push this off. Let's delay the commencement until November 2025.' That is 165 days after

bipartisan support was offered. That is not efficiency. That is not leadership. This parliament must stand for survivors. It must stand for families. It must stand for a justice system that is not stacked against the vulnerable.

Every delay undermines trust. Every delay sends a signal that survivors come second. I say to this House: survivors have waited long enough; communities have waited long enough. The time for excuses is over. This bill matters because it strengthens sentencing. It matters because it strengthens trust. It matters because it says to every Queenslander who has endured sexual violence, 'Your suffering is real, your voice is heard and your parliament will stand with you.'

Justice delayed is justice denied. Every day we wait is another day too many. Let us pass these reforms. Let us pass them now with no delays with the commencement.

Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (7.52 pm): I rise to contribute to the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill amends schedule 1 to the Criminal Code 1899, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Crimes at Sea Act 2001 and the Working With Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000.

This bill is primarily about implementing four of the recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's *The ripple effect* report. The Crisafulli government is taking a measured, consultative and methodical approach to the QSAC recommendations. This is in glaring contrast to Labor's botched, rushed and ultimately ineffective section 11 Making Queensland Safer Laws tranche 2 amendment that would have had catastrophic consequences for deceased victims' families and character evidence as an aggravating factor.

The objectives of this bill are to implement the four QSAC recommendations and introduce a new offence for falsely representing a government agency, realign the Queensland Crimes at Sea Act with relevant provisions of the Commonwealth Crimes At Sea Act and amend the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000. The Penalties and Sentences Act will be amended to: implement a statutory aggravating factor for rape and sexual assault against children aged 16 or 17 years, recommendation 1; expand the sentencing purposes to include recognition of harm caused to a victim of an offence, recommendation 2; qualify the court's treatment of good character as a mitigating factor in sentencing persons convicted of offences of a sexual nature, recommendation 5; and clarify that no inference can be drawn from the absence of details of harm caused to a victim, recommendation 23.

This bill will introduce a new statutory aggravating factor to section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act. This will reinforce that sexual offences committed against children are more serious due to the high level of harm experienced by child victims and the greater culpability of perpetrators in targeting vulnerable child victims.

Clause 12, a new subsection 9BA of the bill, provides that the court must treat the age of the victim as an aggravating factor unless the court considers that it is not reasonable because of the exceptional circumstances of the case. Clause 12 of the bill furthermore introduces a new subsection 9BB which states—

> ... in deciding whether there are exceptional circumstances, the court may have regard to the closeness of age between the offender and the child.

Subsection 9(1) of the Penalties and Sentences Act provides five purposes for which a court may impose a sentence: punishment, rehabilitation, deterrence, denunciation and protection. According to the QSAC report, these sentencing purposes do not recognise and acknowledge the necessity to hold an offender accountable for the harm done to the victim-survivor.

This bill will expressly recognise in subsection 9(1) of the sentencing guidelines harm done by the offender to a victim of the offence. The term 'harm' will have its plain and ordinary meaning and is not confined to a particular type of harm. This amendment implements recommendation 2 of the QSAC report to expand the sentencing purpose to include the recognition of harm done to a victim by the offender.

Recommendation 5 in the QSAC report deals with reforms to the use of good-character evidence. Clause 12 of the bill will insert new subsections that displace the common law requirement to have regard to an offender's good character concerning offences of a sexual nature committed in relation to children under 16 years of age if the good character assisted the offender in committing the offence.

The Attorney-General, Deb Frecklington, in her introductory speech stated—

> The amendments in the bill are considered and give direct effect to the council's recommendation to restrict the use of problematic types of good character evidence while retaining the sentencing court's discretion to consider this evidence in appropriate cases.

Clause 13 of the bill will provide a clarifying amendment to subsection 179K(5) of the Penalties and Sentences Act to implement recommendation 23 in the QSAC report. This amendment will ensure a court does not draw any inference about whether the offence had little or no harm caused to the victim-survivor from the fact that a victim impact statement was not given. It makes it unambiguously clear that the victim is not obligated to provide a victim impact statement. Replacing the wording in subsection 179K(5) will promote the victim's rights and remove any pressure to provide a victim impact statement.

Labor suddenly claim to care about victim-survivors of sexual assault, yet they are responsible for the devastating DNA forensic laboratory and enormous rape kit backlog debacles. Recent *Courier-Mail* articles have highlighted that Labor left a backlog of 18,000 DNA samples, resulting in a three-year delay for victim-survivors to access justice. Meanwhile, the Labor rabble spent the lion's share—$19.5 million—of Forensic Science Queensland funds on building 'swanky offices'. It is literally a slap in the face for sexual assault victims. That is unconscionable. I table copies of the *Courier-Mail* articles.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Sunday Mail* (Qld), dated 10 August 2025, titled 'Slap in the face for the victims' [1252].

Tabled paper: Article from the *Sunday Mail* (Qld), dated 10 August 2025, titled ''Broken' forensic lab adds insult to injury' [1253].

Dr Kirsty Wright, in her *Review of operational matters at Forensic Science Queensland*, concluded—

The negative impact of this decision is still being felt today by victims, the police, and the courts.

This bill also introduces a new offence for falsely representing a government agency. Section 97 of the Criminal Code provides that it is an offence to impersonate a public officer. The offence is punishable by up to three years imprisonment. Clause 10 of this bill will amend the Criminal Code to include false representations in relation to government agencies. It will be an offence if a person makes a false representation that they are a government agency or are acting on behalf or with the authority of a government authority. This section is designed to address the risk to the Queensland public from government impersonation scams and protect the integrity of government communications. A reasonable excuse defence is provided under section 97A(2) that reverses the onus of proof.

Part 2 of the bill provides for amendments to realign the Queensland Crimes at Sea Act 2001 with the Commonwealth Crimes at Sea Act 2000. The Commonwealth Crimes at Sea Act and uniform crimes at sea legislation is enacted in all states and the Northern Territory. These amendments are largely of a technical nature.

Finally, after eight years of Queensland Labor's dithering, the Crisafulli government is decisively implementing the recommendations in the July 2017 Queensland Family and Child Commission's review into the blue card system. The bill will amend section 295 of the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000 to retain the current list of offences for which the chief executive officer must suspend a person's working with children authority where a person is charged. This change is necessitated by the unintentional removal of some offences for which a suspension must be issued, and the bill rectifies this by restoring these offences. I commend the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 to the House.

Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (8.01 pm): I will not take too long this evening on my contribution on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill because I am really conscious of time. I am conscious of the fact that victim-survivors have been waiting too long to see these recommendations from *The ripple effect* implemented. I am also very conscious that, while there could have been immediate action some weeks ago during a parliamentary sitting, we are still here talking about these reforms today. This government says that it puts victims first; however, it is very clear in the way that it has dealt with rape victim-survivors through this process that that is not the case. That statement is, in fact, a hollow and substanceless slogan, because the LNP put politics first and victim-survivors last.

The Attorney-General sat on this report, *The ripple effect*, for six months and only acted once she was forced to, when there was political pressure applied. When pressure was applied, the Attorney-General could have legislated immediately on these matters. Rather than doing so, the Attorney-General decided to play politics and decided to refer it to a prolonged committee process—a committee process that in and of itself demonstrated that a committee process was not required when the single recommendation of the committee report was that the bill be passed. The Attorney-General sat on the report for six months and then we went through the committee process as well. Instead of seeing decisive and swift action from the Attorney-General, we have seen this issue become a political football.

Mr Head interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Callide, can you address your comments through the chair.

Ms BOYD: Madam Deputy Speaker, thank you for your protection. There are 1,600 victim-survivors who will be disadvantaged by the delays that are happening here this evening.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is too much conversation on my right.

Ms BOYD: There are 1,600 victim-survivors who will face court without the protections that are in this bill because not only have there been delays in bringing this legislation before the House but also there have been delays in the immediate resolution of these matters in this place. There will be yet a further delay in their implementation. That is a delay that will be too long for victim-survivors to have to wait.

Rather than taking decisive action and leading on this issue, the government would prefer to throw mud and throw slogans around. The people who will lose the most because of that will be victim-survivors in this state. I cannot even see how the government would benefit from that. It is a massive blow to credibility. How do you look victim-survivors in the face and say, 'You have to wait longer because of the actions that are being taken in this chamber'—actions being taken by the LNP government because they are a political unit that prioritises politics over protections? It is a perverse value set and one that I do not understand.

All we hear being thrown around incessantly from those opposite are historic issues and political slogans. Rape victims do not want to hear that. They actually want to hear how the government of the day will assist them.

Mr Minnikin: Victims want rape kits.

Ms BOYD: They do want rape kits. I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth. They want rape kits when they come to the Kilcoy Hospital or the Caboolture Hospital or the Redcliffe Hospital.

Mr Minnikin: Finally you've cottoned on—finally. Failed public policy. You had your chance—failed.

Ms BOYD: Under your government they are not getting them, member for Chatsworth.

Mr Minnikin: Redistribution will take care of you, if not the CCC.

Ms BOYD: I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth, who just said, 'Redistribution will take care of you.'

Mr Minnikin: 'Or the CCC'—quote it properly.

Ms BOYD: Madam Deputy Speaker, if ever you wanted evidence of a gerrymander, we have just heard it from the Minister for Small Business. The Minister for Small Business has just made those comments in the *Hansard* of this place.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are far too many interjections. The member for Pine Rivers is not taking them. If we can have order on my right, please.

Ms BOYD: An important body of work has been done by the Sentencing Advisory Council. This was work where they methodically listened, analysed and tested. They listened to the voice of victim-survivors. They had the experience of frontline workers put forward. They had the evidence of judges and lawyers. It was work that delivered 28 recommendations. It went on for quite a period of time. There were 20 key findings—not four findings, not four things to legislate on, but 20 key findings and 28 recommendations. If this government were fair dinkum about this then they would be acting on it.

Government members: Ten years!

Ms BOYD: They obviously cannot even add up when they keep chanting '10 years.' This was a body of work that was instigated under the Labor government, but the LNP government now has carriage of it. Rather than focusing on the important work that they have to do to protect Queenslanders, they are sitting in this chamber acting like children.

They are acting like there is some kind of political point-scoring to be made from this. There is not; there are actually Queensland lives at risk. I appreciate just how traumatic these experiences are for the people who have gone through them. They are hoping and praying for outcomes in this space. Instead of having that support, this LNP government is playing political games. It is a real disappointment because what Queenslanders want from a government is a mature government, a government that is going to take on the challenges of the day, a government that will listen to the experts and put politics aside. What they have instead is this LNP government, which is nothing short of a disgrace.

Mr DILLON (Gregory—LNP) (8.10 pm): I have listened tonight and this afternoon with intent to the debate on this bill, the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. My last contribution in this chamber was to speak in support of the domestic and family violence bill. As then, I highlight that this bill continues the Crisafulli government's swift yet methodical approach to arresting the crime slide in Queensland: Labor's crime crisis. Despite the protestations of those opposite, who have one after another lined up to defend their report, it is plainly simple that these reforms have been required due to the failures and inaction of those opposite during their 10 years of neglect.

In contrast to those opposite who have, over 10 years, held numerous inquiries regarding victims yet not enacted real, meaningful change, we have here in this bill reform that will not only categorically change circumstances but also act to defer potential future perpetrators. The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity is to be thanked on behalf of Queenslanders for drafting and introducing this bill with due regard to the thoughts and experiences of victims. Perpetrators of sexual violence in this state should know that the Attorney-General and the Crisafulli government as a whole will not stand for your vile, reprehensible, destructive and disgusting actions against vulnerable people.

I also acknowledge the diligence and excellent work of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, especially its chair, the member for Nicklin, who is capably supported by the members for Capalaba and Thuringowa. They received and considered 197 written submissions along with a public hearing and other briefings by the Department of Justice. Ensuring this committee has considered the submissions and given due regard to the legislative process gives us and Queenslanders everywhere confidence that this bill will stand up to not only legal scrutiny but also public expectations.

At the heart of this bill is recognition that rape is rape and children are children, whether 14 or 17. We live in a society where children have too many unfair expectations placed upon them to grow up so quickly without due regard to the fact that they are still developing both physically and emotionally. Provision within this bill to recognise the statutory aggravating factor for rape and sexual assault of 16- and 17-year-olds is a recognition of this fact and the fact that the perpetrator is a particularly vile and sick individual.

Not allowing convicted perpetrators of sexual violence to seek and receive lighter sentences due to the current and historical allowance of good-character references is another key element to the legislation. How on earth anyone could consider a convicted rapist or perpetrator of sexual violence to be a 'good bloke' or a 'person of good standing' is completely beyond me, and it is especially galling to see this being used for a person of good standing or for their previous contributions to the community. I am pleased to see the Attorney has seen fit to include this recommendation as a key element of the bill.

I also note from the committee's report and the written briefing from the Department of Justice that the new qualifications to a court's treatment of good character must not apply as a mitigating factor if it assisted the perpetrator to commit the offence. I believe this is an important inclusion, both from a punitive perspective but also as a deterrence against people misusing their standing or position of trust to commit these vile acts against minors.

I also wish to highlight in my contribution the significance in the reforms of the clarification that the absence of a victim impact statement cannot allow the court to infer that a victim has not been harmed. This important reform allows the victim choice whether to relive the pain or not. This is once again a demonstration of how Queensland, through the actions of the Crisafulli government, is delivering for Queenslanders, in particular victims of crime, by putting them first and working hard to improve the sentencing process for them.

I could not help but hear in several contributions from those opposite, but especially the members for Toohey and Gladstone, references or quotes to this bill or its provisions being 'long overdue', 'critical protections' and 'do more to centre the voice of victims'. Members opposite are also calling for a faster timetable. I say if this bill is 'long overdue' and contains 'critical protections', then why did it take the LNP under Premier Crisafulli to actually deliver it? There have been 10 years of their failure to act.

Sure, there has been an inquiry or two, but there has been nothing that actually strengthens the provisions to ensure real justice for victims. It is disingenuous to the people of Queensland for Labor to come in here and line up to attack this government for the speed with which it has moved, yet not tell the story of how they deferred or delayed and in general did nothing to enshrine in law real protections for victims and to act in any meaningful way to deter potential future perpetrators.

I also note criticism from opposition members to the inclusion of other amendments in this bill. This is evidence of a government getting on with the job of cleaning up Labor's mess. There are some legislative areas that require a broom and a tidy up and a lot that require complete renovation, to be honest, but the other provisions included are important pieces of reform, and inclusion with this bill is, as I said, evidence of a government getting on with the job of governing.

The amendments to the working with children act are technical in nature and in response to recommendations made by the Queensland Family and Child Commission. They are also largely required as a correction mechanism for Labor's drafting errors—once again the Crisafulli government cleaning up a Labor mess.

This bill also introduces tough penalties for those who seek to confuse or harm Queenslanders by impersonating a government agency. This is to ensure that legitimate government communications are not undermined and will act as a strong deterrent against this, with a penalty of up to three years imprisonment.

This is a good bill. Members from all sides seem to acknowledge that and I fundamentally believe it. It does good things to protect vulnerable victims and punish criminals. I wish that Labor for once could have put aside politics and that this parliament could have spoken with one voice on this topic. But no, they have nitpicked and sought to score points they could have scored for 10 years had they truly wanted to. The LNP has been swift yet methodical to ensure that vulnerable Queenslanders are protected through criminal justice system reforms, cleaning up the DNA debacle, providing extra frontline policing capacity, and generally ensuring our legislative reforms with the rights of victims first and criminals last.

Only the LNP will deliver a safer Queensland, and this legislation is a continuation of this government's strong stance against perpetrators or criminals and our unwavering support for victims. On behalf of the people of Gregory, I strongly recommend support for this bill.

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (8.18 pm): As we have heard, the bill makes some small amendments to the Crimes At Sea Act and administrative requirements under the working with children act, which were welcomed by Luke Twyford, the Queensland Family and Child Commission's Principal Commissioner; however, the main purpose is to implement four recommendations of the Queensland Sentencing and Advisory Council's report titled *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect.* The first three of these are (1) to introduce a statutory aggravating factor for rape and sexual assault against children aged 16 or 17 years; (2) to expand the sentencing purposes to include recognition of harm caused to a victim of an offence; and (3), to clarify that no inference may be drawn from the absence of details of harm caused to a victim.

The fourth, limiting the court's treatment of good character as a mitigating factor in sentencing persons convicted of offences of a sexual nature, is the most substantial and generated the largest response from stakeholders, particularly victims of crime or victim-survivors. I will focus my contribution on this.

Under current law, the Penalties and Sentences Act requires that a court, when sentencing an offender, must have regard to the presence of any aggravating or mitigating factors, which could include evidence of good character. This can take many forms, including a character reference from a family member, friend or employer, with the idea that evidence of good character may assist the court as part of the sentencing decision.

Dr Rachael Burgin, the CEO of the Rape and Sexual Assault Research and Advocacy organisation, said at the public hearings that good-character evidence suggests that committing these offences is more acceptable where an offender can establish unrelated, supposedly redeeming qualities that failed to prevent the offending in the first place. In addition, that supposed good character

has no relevance to the prospect of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending. The Queensland Sexual Assault Network submitted that the use of good-character evidence is highly traumatic and offensive to victim-survivors as it demeans, dismisses and minimises their experience, particularly for rape and sexual assault victims.

In their report, QSAC concluded that problems arise with good-character evidence that contains subjective or a non-professional opinion about a sentenced person's personality traits. This includes their standing in the community and contributions to the community, and they accordingly recommended reforms to the use of good-character evidence.

The amendments in this bill attempt to limit, although not eliminate, the use of good-character evidence in sentencing decisions. First, courts do not have to take into account any good-character evidence presented. Second, if they do, it must be relevant to the offender's prospects of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending. Third, they must also consider the seriousness of the offence and the harm to the victim-survivor. Fourth, if the offence is against a child under 16, the court must not treat an offender's good character as a mitigating factor if it assisted them to commit the offence.

The reality is that there are new restrictions on the use of good-character evidence. However, it still can be used in specific circumstances. Some submitters—such as the QFCC, the Queensland Council of Social Service and Voice for Victims—broadly supported the proposed reforms. However, a larger number suggest that they do not go far enough in addressing concerns and advocate for the removal of all character references for the sentencing of sexual offenders, domestic violence offenders, serious drug offenders and child sex offenders.

The Queensland Law Society did not support the amendments, observing that removing character evidence, except in particular circumstances, would limit the court's access to information that may be vital in formulating a sentence that balances all relevant features and is tailored to the individual circumstances. QCOSS raised concerns that further charges could go too far in limiting access to procedural fairness and the impact further reforms could have on incarceration rates. This includes of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander adults and young people, who are already disproportionately impacted by the criminal and youth justice systems.

Ultimately, we must give priority to victims of crime—whose submissions, while distressing, offer the voice of those directly impacted—and ensure their trauma and perspectives are given priority in the legal process, particularly during sentencing and parole decisions. This bill, even though it is seen as falling short to many, is a step in the right direction and, as QCOSS suggested, we need further work on guidance for judicial officers and in court bench books and so forth. In addition, the government should amend the bill to ensure there is a statutory post-implementation review conducted by an appropriate independent authority once sufficient experience with the amendments has been obtained. If there is no valid reason for why these amendments regarding character evidence should not be brought forward as soon as possible, I am not sure why that would not occur.

I want to thank the committee, the submitters and department attendees at the hearing and public briefing for their examination of this bill. To all victim-survivors, there can be nothing harder than hearing or reading how someone who has impacted your life forever in a most traumatic way is described as a 'good person'. Ultimately, good people, regardless of contributors to offending, know that to harm others is not good and they must take responsibility by giving their own character reference and commitment, including the steps they have taken and will continue to take to make sure they never harm anyone again.

Mr DALTON (Mackay—LNP) (8.24 pm): I rise today in strong support of the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The Crisafulli government is committed to delivering a fair and effective justice system that prioritises victims and restores community safety after a decade of weak Labor laws that failed the people of Queensland. I want to put on record my thanks to the Attorney-General for her work on this vital bill. I also want to thank her staff for the hours of work they put towards getting the bill right. I thank the committee for their work and the hearings they held throughout the state. I also thank the police in Mackay, the CPIU and the CIB, led by Detective Senior Sergeant Chris Eton and Detective Senior Sergeant Feldman, for their work in protecting our community.

In my electorate of Mackay I hear constantly from victims, families and frontline workers that the system under Labor ignored the voices of victims, diminished their experiences and left our community exposed to repeat offenders. This bill is about correcting that failure and giving Mackay and all of Queensland a justice system that reflects community expectations. We recognise the profound harm

experienced by victims of crime. In Mackay I have spoken with men and women and families whose lives have been torn apart by sexual offences. Their message is clear: the law must treat these crimes with the seriousness they deserve.

This bill reflects our unwavering commitment to victims. It introduces key reforms that better protect Queenslanders, guided by the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's comprehensive report into sentencing for sexual assault and rape which was handed to the government late last year and released publicly in February. QSAC made 28 recommendations, and this bill captures four of the most significant through the following legislative changes.

The bill introduces a new statutory aggravating factor. The bill ensures that when offences are committed against children aged 16 or 17 the court must treat this as an aggravating factor. In Mackay, where our schools and sporting clubs are the pride of the community, parents deserve to have confidence that, if their child is targeted, the law will impose the toughest possible penalties.

The bill reforms good-character evidence. For far too long offenders have hidden behind glowing references, claiming that being a 'good bloke' in the community should excuse their crimes. This bill makes Queensland the first jurisdiction to restrict such evidence so it is only relevant where it shows prospects for rehabilitation or reduced risk of reoffending. No longer, for example, will standing in Mackay's business community or volunteering at a local club be a shield against accountability for horrific crimes.

The bill recognises harm to victims. Sentencing will now expressly acknowledge the devastating harm done to victims. In Mackay, where our local support services like Mackay Women's Services and community health providers work tirelessly to help survivors, this recognition is long overdue. It tells victims, 'We see you, we hear you and we recognise the damage that is done.'

In relation to victim impact statements, courts can no longer infer that the absence of a victim impact statement means no harm was caused. Many victims in Mackay have told me that they are too traumatised or fearful to provide a statement. This bill ensures their silence cannot diminish the seriousness of the crime.

Labor tried to claim credit for these reforms, but their rushed, sloppy amendments were flawed. They sought to prevent courts from using good-character evidence to increase sentences where an offender abused community trust. They limited recognition of harm only to 'surviving victims', excluding victims killed after enduring sexual violence. True to form, they tried to ram changes through the House without proper consultation. We will not make these mistakes. Our approach is considered, thorough and shaped by the voices of Queenslanders including victims who came forward during the committee process. To those victims, especially those in Mackay who made submissions or appeared at the hearings, I thank you. Your courage is shaping stronger laws for all Queenslanders.

This bill also strengthens other areas critical to community confidence. With regard to the blue card system, technical amendments will correct Labor's drafting mistakes and ensure the blue card system remains strong. For Mackay's families, this means confidence that those working in schools, sporting clubs and community programs are held to the highest standards. The Crisafulli government puts child safety first. Queenslanders deserve to know that anyone working with kids meets the toughest standards. This bill fixes technical issues in Labor's 2024 amendments to the blue card laws, acting on recommendations from the Queensland Family and Child Commission. These changes close loopholes and keep the current list of offences that trigger an immediate suspension when someone is charged, keeping all Queenslanders safe.

Falsely representing a government agency is another part of the legislation. We are introducing new offences for impersonating government agencies with penalties up to three years imprisonment. In communities like Mackay, where trust in government information is vital during cyclones, floods and emergencies, this reform will protect residents from dangerous misinformation.

With respect to crimes at sea, amendments bring Queensland into line with national legislation. For a coastal city like Mackay, where our port, tourism and fishing industries depend on safety at sea, these changes matter.

This bill is just the start. The Attorney-General has flagged further reviews into sentencing guidelines and the victim impact statement regime. These reviews will ensure reforms remain thorough, considered and, above all, victim focused.

In Mackay, families want a justice system that listens, that protects and that punishes offenders in line with community expectations. They want their sons and daughters safe at sportsgrounds, their sons and daughters safe at school, and their neighbours safe walking around their neighbourhood at

night. This bill delivers that. It restores faith in the justice system, puts victims first and ensures sentences reflect both the gravity of the crime and the enduring harm it causes. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr WHITING (Bancroft—ALP) (8.32 pm): I rise to contribute to the bill before us. I want to start by reflecting on the contribution made by the member for Macalister who spoke a lot about victims. I always listen to what the member for Macalister says. She speaks from a great depth of experience and from the heart every single time. One of the things that struck me in her speech was she said victims do not want words, they want action. She made the point that over the years Labor has listened and we have taken action. I think that was a good point made by her. Certainly I recall, for example, the coercive control act that was legislated in March 2024, which I think is a great contribution towards looking after victims. I also refer to our track record on implementing the *Hear her voice* recommendations. Ninety-five per cent of those recommendations were underway or were completed by May 2024. That meant more women protected and more perpetrators held to account.

It was interesting to hear the member for Macalister talk about the sanctimonious contributions that have been made in this debate. It was ironic that she was then followed by the member for Burleigh who gave a theatrically outraged contribution, but I guess that is what you expect in this place.

The member also made the point—and she makes this point often—that only two per cent of sexual assault cases which go through the legal system are found against the accused. That highlights the many barriers victims need to overcome in order to get justice and what they need out of the system.

What I took from all of that is that we, on both sides of parliament, need to take all actions possible, not just words, to support victims. It is absolutely necessary, and we need the bill passed now.

In listening to this debate, I reflected on the contribution of the member for Waterford where she spoke about the impact of delays in bringing this bill to parliament. Both the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Waterford spoke about how many months this issue has been on the desk of the Attorney-General. This bill has been on the parliament's agenda for five months and only now has it been made urgent, and this was after the Nature Conservation Act was made urgent at the previous sitting. The member for Waterford said—and I think we need to bear this in mind—it has been 165 days since Labor offered bipartisan support to get this bill passed immediately through the parliament. I want to echo the words of the member for Waterford and support her appeal to the government in saying it is imperative that the provisions must commence immediately. I do believe—and I echo what others on this side have said—that every day delayed in getting these provisions through means more victims unable to reap the benefits of these changes. It is very clear that victim-survivors have been waiting too long for these reforms, and it is high time that they came through.

One of the things I also pondered on, listening to the member for Oodgeroo, was that many young offenders are given a slap on the wrist and then released. Earlier this year I spent a morning at one of our local courthouses, watching the cases as they came through. What struck me was the largest cohort of offenders to come through the court that day were people who had breached DV orders. They were potential DV perpetrators. There were a few young offenders appearing, but it was quite sobering to see the number of people facing the court on DV charges. I thought to myself, 'You cannot possibly lock all of these people up. The watch house and the jail will be full within a day.' It emphasised to me the enormity of this problem and the enormous number of victims that must be out there and what they face. A lot of the offenders on charges that day would have gone straight back to their homes at the end of the day.

One last thing I want to say, listening to this debate, is that a lot of words are thrown around. We need to be careful with the words we use. In recent months I have spoken to a high school student who had been the victim of a sexual assault, and she was very specific to me about, as she called it, the use of the R-word. We have heard it used a few times here tonight. She said that the use of the R-word when talking about sexual assault is a trigger for her. We have heard a lot of posturing tonight. We need to stop this debate becoming sanctimonious. We need to be careful about the words we throw around here. To respect victims is to respect their wishes in wanting to get these reforms through quickly and to be respectful in the words we use when talking about their trauma.

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (8.38 pm): I rise to speak on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. It is interesting to follow the member for Bancroft. We enjoyed his reflections on his morning in the courtroom, or a couple of mornings there. I do not know the purpose of the reflection. He spoke about hanging around the courtroom which basically has nothing

to do with this particular bill. It just shows that when you are in opposition you have a bit more time than normal, and I honestly do not know what the purpose of that was, yet they make allegations about us being tardy in bringing things to this parliament.

I congratulate the Attorney-General for bringing this very important matter to parliament when those opposite had time to do this. It is amazing how all these 'problems' have been created in the first 10 months of a new government and complaints have come from the other side about things not happening quickly enough—

Mr Perrett: It is disingenuous.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Gympie; it is disingenuous. That is exactly what it is. They lose all credibility when they speak that way because it has absolutely—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr Perrett: It is disingenuous.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection again from the member for Gympie. I honestly do not understand where they are coming from. This is a government that is acting in 10 months, compared to 10 years of decline and—

Mr Stevens: We are delivering.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. We are delivering and making the fresh start that Queenslanders have been asking for. This bill is a great indication of our unwavering commitment to victims and the people of Queensland as compared to sympathy and empathy for perpetrators, who just do not deserve that. This government has made a very firm commitment, and this is one of the bills that really brings it home.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr MANDER: I thank the Attorney-General and the whip for their encouragement. Are you smiling because you are trying to encourage me?

Mrs Frecklington: I am enjoying the glasses.

Mr MANDER: You have to improvise sometimes and these glasses are very helpful. I thank the member for Whitsunday for lending them to me!

This bill introduces new sentencing provisions that better reflect community expectations and implements recommendations from the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council report into sentencing for sexual assault and rape in Queensland. The sentencing of offenders found guilty of rape and sexual assault must reflect the seriousness of these offences and their lifelong impact on victims.

QSAC made 28 recommendations which led to four specific legislative amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act that are captured in this bill. There were new recommendations around the statutory aggravating factor. The Queensland community understands that sexual offending against children is amongst the most heinous crimes that can be committed. The bill reflects community expectations by making amendments to require courts to consider the age of victims aged 16 and 17 as an aggravating factor when sentencing for sexual assault or rape. It indicates to the court that sentences for these offences should be higher when committed against a child. I could not agree more with that. This is another example of how the Crisafulli government is putting victims first, recognising that sexual offences committed against our vulnerable children are more serious.

The second aspect of the bill talks about good-character evidence. This bill delivers important, overdue reforms to good-character evidence when sentencing for sexual offences. The bill clarifies the court should only consider good character established by problematic types of evidence, including character references and evidence of a person's contributions or good standing in the community, if it is relevant to the offender's prospect of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending. It goes without saying that if you have been sentenced on a sexual offence you obviously do not have good character; nor should you be relying on references that would somehow seek the court's sympathy when you have committed such a heinous crime. Under our laws, a sexual offender will not be able to rely on the evidence that they are a 'good bloke'. They will have to make sure any restricted evidence directly relates to their prospect of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending, which are appropriate factors for a sentencing judge to consider.

The third thing this bill looks at is the recognition of harm to victims. The bill expands the purposes of sentencing to include the recognition of harm done by an offender to a victim. This is incredibly important. We know that this harm can be profound, with potentially lifelong impacts, particularly for children, who are vulnerable and impressionable. Again, this shows that we are putting victims first by making sure that a court can impose a sentence for the purpose of recognising the impact of the offending on them and the harm it causes.

The fourth major aspect of the bill talks about the victim impact statement. The bill clarifies that the court cannot infer from the absence of a victim impact statement or any other details of harm that a victim has not been harmed by an offender. This is an important change which supports all victims in their right to choose whether to provide a victim impact statement to the court by ensuring a sentence will not be reduced merely because they did not provide one where another victim did because of the trauma that is often associated with making these types of statements.

I commend the Attorney-General, the Crisafulli government in general and the team of ministers who are responsible for standing up for victims' rights and reducing the number of victims that we have. This is another bill that goes towards achieving those goals—

Mrs Frecklington: It is all about supporting victims.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the Attorney-General; it is all about supporting victims. This is something that drives her and her colleagues the Minister for Police, the Minister for Youth Justice and the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. All of those ministers are very committed to the task that has been given to them. This is another way of making sure we put victims first, by improving the sentencing process for them. I commend the bill to the House.

Dr O'SHEA (South Brisbane—ALP) (8.46 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The Labor opposition understands and shares the deep concern in our community about the prevalence of sexual offences, the devastating impact they have on victims and the urgent need for a justice system that delivers both deterrence and accountability. In addressing this bill, I would like to first acknowledge the work of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, the submitters who provided contributions and the hard work of the secretariat in supporting the committee in its review of this proposed legislation.

This bill proposes amendments to a range of legislation including the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Criminal Code and the Evidence Act 1977. Primarily, the bill's amendments implement recommendations from a report by the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council, QSAC. This report came about from a review requested two years ago by the then attorney-general, the member for Waterford. QSAC was asked to review the sentencing of sexual assault and rape in Queensland and advise on any changes required. Following 18 months of consultation with victims of crime, advocates, frontline workers and the wider community, QSAC delivered their report in December last year.

The *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* made 28 detailed recommendations for change. This bill addresses four of the recommendations in the QSAC report. Firstly, it amends the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to require the court to treat offences of rape or sexual assault against children aged 16 or 17 years as an aggravating factor in sentencing. This amendment extends the current considerations of the age of the victim for offences against children under the age of 16 years to all children under 18 years. This change recognises the vulnerability of older adolescents and reinforces that sexual offences against children of any age are more serious due to the increased level of harm experienced by child victims. Secondly, this bill amends the act to ensure sentencing explicitly recognises the harm done to a victim. Doing so will improve the visibility of the harm done to victims, acknowledge the need for offenders to be held properly to account and strengthen trust in the justice system.

This bill will also qualify the treatment of good-character evidence in sentencing offenders convicted of sexual offences. In addressing this amendment, the Queensland Sexual Assault Network explained—

The use of good character evidence is highly traumatic and offensive to victim-survivors. It demeans, dismisses and minimises their experience of sexual violence. That has lifelong impacts.

Rape and Sexual Assault Research and Advocacy stated—

Rape and sexual assault are never acceptable. Good character evidence suggests that committing these offences is more acceptable where an offender can establish unrelated, supposedly redeeming qualities that failed to prevent the offending in the first place.

This bill provides that the court may treat an offender's good character as a mitigating factor in sentencing only if it is relevant to the offender's prospects of rehabilitation or risk of reoffending. I note that for sexual offences against children under 16 the bill requires the court not to treat the offender's good character as a mitigating factor if it assisted the offender to commit the offence.

The final recommendation from the QSAC report that this bill addresses is with regard to victim impact statements. The bill will ensure the court does not draw any inference about the harm caused to a victim by an offender if a victim impact statement is not submitted to the court. This is essential as it supports a victim's right to choose whether or not to give a victim impact statement and their right to privacy. Many submitters supported this amendment, including the Victims' Commissioner as well as Bravehearts, who stated that there are a variety of deeply personal, psychological, legal and social reasons for sexual abuse victims to choose not to provide an impact statement.

Importantly, each of these four changes to sentencing of sexual offenders will apply to sentencing proceedings on or after commencement of the bill regardless of when the offence occurred. Figures from the 2023-24 year revealed that there were almost 75 rape or attempted rape offences recorded every week. It is concerning that the provisions in the bill will only commence on 1 November 2025, almost a year since QSAC handed down its report, even though there is bipartisan support for the changes in this bill.

The opposition welcomes the measures contained in this bill which strengthen the law's ability to respond to sexual offences. However, delaying commencement of the provisions contained in this bill until November leaves victim-survivors without these protections for a further two months. As the Attorney-General mentioned in the House this morning, justice delayed is justice denied, and this is a case in point. Setting a commencement date some months in the future rather than on the assent of this bill is not an academic exercise; it has real-world effects. Real people already carrying immense trauma are being told to wait for these urgent reforms.

Queenslanders deserve a justice system that treats sexual offences with the seriousness these dreadful offences deserve, supports victims from the moment they report through to the conclusion of their matter, and implements necessary reform when it is needed. Delaying the commencement of this bill by another two months denies victim-survivors access to a justice system that is more responsive to their experience, a justice system which takes the offences committed against them seriously and reflects this appropriately in sentencing. I would urge the government to bring forward the commencement date for this legislation and deliver the protections victim-survivors deserve as soon as possible.

Miss DOOLAN (Pumicestone—LNP) (8.55 pm): I rise today to speak in strong support of the Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. After 10 years of neglect, the Crisafulli government is committed to delivering fair and efficient justice for victims of crime in this state. At the election, Queenslanders could not have sent a stronger message: no more excuses, no more cop-outs, no more negligence. Today the Crisafulli government yet again delivers on the people's mandate. We will put victims of these terrible sexual offences first once gain.

This bill introduces key reforms recommended by the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council in its report into sentencing for rape and sexual assault delivered late last year. This government has listened, considered and acted on these recommendations. There exist four major legislative principles within the bill: the introduction of a new statutory aggravating factor, the reformation of good-character evidence, the recognition of the harm and trauma of victim-survivors, and the reform of the consideration of a victim impact statement. Offending against children aged 16 or 17 will now be recognised as an aggravating circumstance at sentencing. Queenslanders expect that sexual offending against children is treated as among the most serious of crimes. These reforms ensure courts reflect that expectation and deliver stronger sentences.

Under this Crisafulli government no longer will offenders be able to hide behind good-character references to minimise their own consequences for their actions. Good-character evidence will only be relevant if it relates directly to rehabilitation or the risk of reoffending. Being a 'good bloke' to some should not be an excuse for terrible actions that have sentenced their victims to a life of trauma. Queensland will be the first Australian jurisdiction to restrict good-character evidence. This government is leading the nation in its reforms, putting victims first and acting after 10 years of Labor's neglect.

Third, the bill expands the purpose of sentencing to include recognition of harm to victims. We know this harm can be profound, lifelong and devastating. Victims deserve to know that the justice system recognises the full impact of what has been done to them, and these reforms make them explicit.

Fourth, the bill clarifies that the absence of a victim impact statement does not mean there has been no harm. Every victim has a right to choose whether to provide such a statement and no offender should benefit simply because a victim exercised their right not to do so. This is about respecting victims' choices while still recognising the gravity of the harm caused.

These reforms stand in stark contrast to Labor's rushed and flawed attempts earlier this year. Labor tried to pass changes through urgency motions, cutting the community out of the process. Their amendments were poorly drafted and would have left critical gaps including limiting harm recognition to only surviving victims. That failure would have meant, for example, that offences committed immediately before a victim's death could not have been properly recognised in sentencing.

This government has ensured the framework is right and that victims are at the heart of the reforms. We have listened to communities across Queensland including my electorate of Pumicestone. I want to thank all those who contributed to the committee process, especially victims who bravely shared their experiences. Your voices have shaped this bill. The committee has recommended the bill be passed and I am proud to support that recommendation.

Beyond sentencing, this bill also strengthens protections in other critical areas. We are delivering technical amendments to the working with children legislation, often referred to as the blue card system, correcting Labor's drafting errors to ensure Queenslanders can continue to have confidence that those working with children meet the highest standards of safety. The bill also creates a new offence of falsely representing a government agency, punishable by up to three years imprisonment. In an age when misinformation spreads quickly, this reform sends a clear message that deliberately impersonating government to confuse or harm Queenslanders will not be tolerated.

Finally, the bill amends the Crimes at Sea Act 2001 to bring Queensland into line with the national cooperative scheme. These technical changes ensure we remain consistent with Commonwealth law and other states in exercising jurisdiction over offences committed at sea. This bill represents a balanced and considered approach to some of the most serious issues facing our justice system. It prioritises victims, strengthens sentencing, protects children and upholds public confidence. The Crisafulli government is delivering on its promise of a fairer and safer Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Miss Doolan, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (8.59 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Multiculturalism

Mr MARTIN (Stretton—ALP) (8.59 pm): I rise to address the recent anti-immigration protests in our capital cities, and I will start by proudly declaring that I am a migrant. I stand with 30 per cent of Australians born overseas and nearly half with a parent born abroad. Our strength lies in our unity. As my friend the former member for Stretton said, 'What unites us is what we have built—a vibrant, multicultural community.' Australia is something we have all built together, not something you can 'take back'. Migrants in my electorate—business owners, nurses, teachers, carers—work hard, follow the rules and give back, enriching our diversity. It is there for anyone to see in the Census data—higher than average education, household incomes and less reliance on welfare—so I will not stay silent while far-right extremists sow division and exploit issues like housing affordability and cost of living, blaming migration for every problem we face. Sadly, the LNP has failed to confront these fringe groups and risks letting the tail wag the dog. Too weak to act, it winks at extremism, threatening community cohesion. I urge the Premier to challenge these groups now and stand up to the right wing within his party. Stand up to the likes of Senator Price, whose comments are disgraceful and have alienated hardworking Queenslanders of Indian heritage.

There is always a place for legitimate disagreement and respectful debate about policy settings, including precise levels of immigration, but let us not confuse separate issues. The community, particularly younger Australians, holds legitimate concerns about housing affordability. These need to be addressed, but they should be addressed by unlocking supply. The fact is that Australia managed higher migration rates of 2.3 per cent annually from 1947 to 1960 without housing crises, so today's 1.7 per cent growth is not the issue; it is supply. The New South Wales Labor government has fast-tracked nearly 90,000 new homes this year through innovative reforms while the Crisafulli

government sits idle. Queensland Labor's 50-cent public transport fares and federal policies like 20 per cent off student debt and free TAFE tackle cost-of-living pressure head-on. Meanwhile, the LNP is calling in housing developments to keep golf courses and watering down hate laws.

Governments at all levels need to address genuine economic issues that are feeding resentment and anger, or otherwise they will continue to be exploited by the far right. To deal with the housing crisis we must address the increasing delays in approvals that restrict supply and increase the speed of construction. We must get on with building social and affordable housing—all housing. A multicultural Queensland is who we are and I will not stand by while far-right groups poison our democracy while the LNP does nothing.

Whitsunday Electorate

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) (9.02 pm): This year is significant in milestones for two of my local schools. I was very pleased to attend St Catherine's college, which held a week of commemorative events which was officially launched on 27 July. A highlight of the day was a roll call of past and present students and a cake-cutting ceremony which featured St Catherine's oldest living alumni, Verona Dinnie, aged 92, and current student Mia Penglase-Fortunato, aged five. It was sad in our community of Proserpine that Mrs Dinnie sadly passed away two weeks after the celebration. Her family said that Verona had been greatly looking forward to the 100-year celebrations and had rallied herself from her hospital bed in order to attend. Another memorable moment was the gathering together of some of the school's past students, now in their 90s. Many are dear to my heart including Margaret Faust, Mavis Camm, Diana Crossley, Kay Pini, Verona Dinnie and Father Bill Bussettin. My mother and many of her family members attended St Catherine's college.

I was also pleased to attend Calen District State College, which is a combination of a number of small country schools that came together over the last 100 years, including Ellery State School and Cameron's Pocket State School, which are no longer in existence, and there are many more. What was incredible at that event was the commemorative plaque, which I was very pleased to unveil with the new principal, Ms Tamra Murray, who has joined our community from the Gold Coast. It is fabulous to have her and her husband in our country community of Calen. I was also honoured to be joined by former principal Brian O'Neill, who was my former year 12 English teacher. He has served a quarter of a century—25 years—at Calen State District College and it was a real honour to be alongside him that day. There were many memorable displays and a rich history which culminated in Isabella Dunn, our oldest past student, who is now in her nineties, and Connor Kuhrt, who is the youngest student at age five, coming together to cut the cake.

While I have a moment I would like to acknowledge Deb Friend, who has retired the *Whitsunday News*, a local community paper she has produced and edited for five years after the closure of many of our papers, including the *Whitsunday Times* and the *Proserpine Guardian*. She and her husband, Carl, were a force to be reckoned with when it comes to establishing community news. It was a joint partnership effort. Her contribution in a fair, balanced and accurate way, telling the stories of our community, will be sadly missed and we wish her well in her next chapter.

Youth Foyers

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (9.06 pm): I rise to speak today about a Labor initiative that has transformed the lives of many young people in Queensland: youth foyers. For too long young Queenslanders have faced the challenges of housing insecurity. As a matter of fact, 4,500 young people experience homelessness on any given night in Queensland. On a nationwide scale, 122,000 people experience homelessness each night—18,000 of them are believed to be aged under 12. To make it worse, an overwhelming majority of young people are homeless due to domestic and family violence.

Youth foyers are accommodation for young people committed to engaging in education, training or employment and for young people who need a safe and stable environment to live in as they build their future as adults. Each youth foyer holds up to 40 young individuals and surrounds them with 24/7 experienced youth workers. The idea was built on a strong, simple belief: every young person deserves the tools to build a better life regardless of their social class, background and past challenges they have had to face.

Youth foyers are more than just a roof over one's head. They provide opportunity, stability and hope. For people between the ages of 16 and 25 who are suffering or at risk of homelessness, youth foyers offer a safe environment alongside education, training and pathways to employment. The

statistics speak for themselves: 67 per cent of students leave a youth foyer with a year 12 or certificate III qualification. A year later the percentage is even higher, at 75 per cent. Thirty-one per cent of students have a part-time or permanent job when they leave a youth foyer and, of course, many others are still studying. Forty-three per cent of students move into their own rental place when they leave a youth foyer and a year later 51 per cent have their own housing.

Youth foyers are a Labor initiative introduced by the former Palaszczuk government. While we were in power, Labor delivered three youth foyers. In 2019 the Logan youth foyer was officially opened. The Logan youth foyer is known for its holistic approach.

Redlands Electorate, Police Service

Mrs YOUNG (Redlands—LNP) (9.09 pm): Tonight I want to take a moment to recognise the incredible work that our frontline police officers do right across the Redlands, from Cleveland and Redland Bay, out to Russell and Macleay islands and everywhere in between. Every single day, those men and women work hard to deliver a safer community for our region, whether it is patrolling our neighbourhoods, responding to calls or simply taking the time to connect with locals, they are the ones on the ground making a real difference. Since our government passed Jack's Law, Redlands police have been able to get out to hotspots like our ferry terminals, bus hubs, shopping centres and public spaces to conduct wanding operations. This is about keeping weapons off our streets and sending a very clear message: crime will not be tolerated in Redlands. Already, we are seeing the benefits of these laws.

However, our officers are not about just enforcement. They are also deeply connected in our community. I have seen it firsthand, whether with Constable Trei Watkins from the Russell Island Police Station joining me at the recent school athletics carnival or the officer in charge at the Redland Bay Station, Matt Thompson, attending the progress association meetings on Coochie or Lamb islands. Those moments build trust, strengthen relationships and remind us that strong communities are built in partnership.

I am proud that, in just 12 months, our government has delivered 350 extra police on the beat, including four new officers in Redlands. Two of them, Brittany and Michaella, are new recruits. They both live locally and both went to local high schools. Recently I had the privilege of welcoming them to their new roles and their new station. The results are clear: youth crime is down, victim numbers are down and confidence in policing is being restored so tonight I simply say thank you to every police officer serving in Redlands. Your dedication does not go unnoticed. Our community is safer, stronger and better because of what you do.

Because I have some time left, I wish the Sharks senior men's AFL team the best of luck on Saturday. They are going up against Surfers Paradise in the grand final at the Brighton Homes Arena. JP, they are coming for your guys!

Redcliffe Hospital

Mr WHITING (Bancroft—ALP) (9.11 pm): Tonight I want to talk about what we have learned in relation to how badly the LNP has managed our health system in the past couple of weeks. They are out there telling everyone how wonderful they are. They are running their 'maroon is out, blue is in' campaign. They are patting themselves on the back. However, the local people are not buying it. Moreton Bay locals have pointed out to me that the LNP member for Redcliffe is promoting the so-called LNP Hospital Rescue Plan in relation to the Redcliffe Hospital, using a lovely artist's impression of what it would look like. I have a copy of the DL flyer. People said they have seen this image online and on electronic billboards. But do you know what? They are not using a picture of what they will build; they are using a picture of the project that they cancelled.

Ms Pugh: What?

Mr WHITING: That is right: they are use an artist's impression of the project that they halted. I will table that and I have another flyer with the same picture.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): No props, please, member for Bancroft.

Mr WHITING: I have another flyer using a picture from a 2024 post by Stirling Hinchliffe.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents—extract from social media dated 15 June 2024 and promotional materials regarding the Redcliffe Hospital expansion, showing imagery used by the former and current governments [1254].

They are saying that this is what they will build. What they are not saying is that it is actually a picture of what they refused to build. Locals know this. When they see it they ask, what is the LNP thinking by publicising their so-called Hospital Rescue Plan with a picture of the hospital project that they cut? Are they so removed from reality? Do they think people are so naive?

Local people know that things are not going well with existing services at the hospital. In the last sitting week, I revealed that at the Redcliffe Hospital the median waiting time for planned surgeries has blown out from 145 days to 285 days under the LNP. We have done further analysis on these publicly available figures. At the Redcliffe Hospital we have seen an increase in the median waiting times to see a specialist from 2,742 days to 2,948 days in subsequent financial years. Under the LNP, people are waiting longer to see a specialist at the Redcliffe Hospital. Under the LNP, you will wait longer in an ambulance to get into the Redcliffe Hospital. You will wait longer to see a specialist at the Redcliffe Hospital. You will wait longer to get your planned surgery at the Redcliffe Hospital. The future is not looking bright. They will build only two extra levels on the car park, not the three levels as in the original design. They have halted construction on the new clinical services building and they are going to cut a range of improvements that were part of the expansion project.

Moggill Electorate

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (9.14 pm): It is a pleasure to rise and reference the many terrific events and local achievements across the electorate of Moggill which have occurred in recent weeks. It was a privilege last weekend to join in the celebrations for the 50th anniversary of the Sayers Dance Centre, an institution that has inspired generations of local students. I want to acknowledge principal Nadine Sayers-D'Arro for her dedication and leadership as well as the late Vivianne Sayers, whose vision built a legacy that continues to this day.

Recently, in Brookfield, I joined the Moggill Creek Catchment Croup to celebrate 20 years of their annual platypus survey, the longest running survey of its kind in Australia. The President of the Moggill Creek Catchment Croup, Tracey Read, her members and all volunteers have done outstanding work in protecting and restoring our local environment. I am also delighted that the Crisafulli LNP government is backing their efforts with $75,000 for upgrades to the Gold Creek nursery, and I certainly acknowledge the Minister for the Environment, who is in the House this evening, for that allocated funding.

Last week I had the opportunity to welcome the 2025 Kenmore State High School captains, vice-captains and student leaders to the Queensland parliament, together with their executive principal Paul Robertson. It was a great opportunity to recognise their commitment and leadership over the last 12 months.

It was also a pleasure to recently host the Minister for Education, the Hon. John-Paul Langbroek MP, at Chapel Hill State School. Together with principal Stewart Jones and School Council Chair Carene Hogg, we were able to discuss school infrastructure priorities, including the growing needs of families in our area. It was a positive and engaging visit, and one that reflects the Liberal National Party state government's commitment to working closely with local school communities.

Another recent highlight was attending the King's Birthday Australian honours and awards investiture ceremony at Government House, where I was honoured to represent the Premier, the Hon. David Crisafulli MP. It was particularly special to be present as local Moggill electorate constituent Graham Smith was awarded an OAM for his service to local community organisations, including the Moggill SES and the Bellbowrie Men's Shed. His award is a significant recognition of many years of dedicated service to local community organisations.

Our sporting clubs also continue to thrive, and it has been wonderful to join some of our local clubs, including the Kenmore Bears Junior AFL club and the Moggill Mustangs AFL club, to celebrate their end-of-season presentations. I congratulate all players, coaches, volunteers and parents on another successful year, and I am proud that the Crisafulli LNP state government is delivering funding for upgrades for many of our local supporting clubs in this year's state budget.

I am also delighted that funding of $100,000 for our local Mount Crosby Bowls Club and $150,000 for the Brookfield Show Society is also being progressed and delivered, as promised by the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government, with still more to come over the next few years. These events and investments reflect the strength and spirit of the electorate of Moggill, and I remain committed to working hard each and every day to represent, support and deliver for our local community.

Inala Community Hub

Mrs NIGHTINGALE (Inala—ALP) (9.17 pm): I rise today to acknowledge the great work of the Inala community hub. This hub serves one of Queensland's lowest socio-economic communities. It supports families from refugee and migrant backgrounds, many of whom face language barriers, financial stress and challenges with their children's schooling. Community hubs are a proven, evidence-based model embedded in 100 schools nationwide. Deloitte's 2023 evaluation found that hubs deliver $3.50 in social benefits for every dollar invested. The outcomes speak for themselves: improved school readiness; stronger English language skills; higher parental engagement; and increased employment opportunities. I want to put on record my thanks to the hub and those involved for their hard work and dedication.

I also rise tonight to call out the government's shameful decision to end state funding for the Inala community hub after 2025. In the last year alone the Inala hub engaged 113 families, delivered over 300 activities, made referrals to vital services and partnered with 14 local organisations. It even supported participants into jobs. All of this has been achieved on modest funding, including the $10,000 annual contribution from the Queensland government, which I might add is around the cost of catering for the cabinet committee meetings during the same period.

The Crisafulli government is stripping $10,000 away from families who need it most. This government claims to care about education, but when it comes time to put its money where it matters it turns its back on Inala. Cutting this modest $10,000 contribution is short-sighted and cruel. It abandons the very families who most need support, undermines the teachers and schools trying to engage those families and sends a message to multicultural communities in Inala that they do not matter to this government.

School engagement is one of the strongest protective factors against young people becoming involved in the youth justice system. Community hubs drive that engagement by preparing children for school, connecting parents and helping families settle and succeed. Cutting this funding undermines that protective factor and leaves vulnerable young people behind.

The government claims to care about education and youth crime but its actions tell a different story. It is funding hubs in communities like Logan and Ipswich while abandoning Inala. Ten thousand dollars is a small investment, and I will not stand by without urging the government to reverse its decision and fund Inala's community hub.

Men's Mental Health

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (9.20 pm): I rise to speak about the Men's Table round table on 7 August. It was a discussion about men's mental health in Queensland. I was there to represent the Premier. I joined 17 industry leaders and experts including members of the Men's Table Bradly McLees, Rendle Williams and David McNair and CEO and co-founder David Pointon.

Earlier this year I had the privilege of attending another event on behalf of the Premier, the Men, Mates and Mentors event—a two-part series organised by Gold Coast resident Tim Fisk. This initiative creates a safe and supportive environment where men can share experiences, build connections and access resources to improve their mental health and personal growth. With Tim's vision, outstanding groups such as Complete Men, Dads in Distress, Mens Wellbeing, Men's Table and ManKind Project Queensland are working together to provide meaningful resources that foster connection, resilience and wellbeing among men in our community.

The Mental Health Commission's *Suicide in Queensland* annual report 2024 reported 769 suspected suicides in Queensland and stated that 78 per cent of those deaths were male. That is a staggering 602 suspected male suicides in 2024. The reported figure for 2023 was a staggering 782.

Men's mental health in Australia is a significant concern. I think all of us in the House would agree that we should be thankful for the many programs that are already conducted across the state to support men's mental health. I particularly want to acknowledge the great work of Mates in Construction. It was my privilege to represent the party at a recent lunch with them. They do a great job. I also want to give a shout-out to other organisations like the Hervey Bay Chamber of Commerce, which runs a walk and talk program. The Kingaroy Chamber of Commerce runs the Smiles program supporting mental wellness through information, leadership and education. We all know about men's sheds across Australia which provide tremendous support to men—a place to come together to connect and contribute in a meaningful way. I think most of us would be surprised to know that there are now more men's sheds across Australia than there are McDonald's.

In closing, I especially want to acknowledge Tim Fisk and his team for their stewardship, leadership and passion in creating Mens, Mates and Mentors—an incredibly valuable program to support men in an environment where there is so much more that needs to be done.

Kirk, Mr C

Mr DAMETTO (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (9.23 pm): I rise to acknowledge the passing of American political commentator Charlie Kirk, a man who stood up and spoke out and refused to be cowed by the forces of political correctness. I am not here to canonise the man. He was controversial, but he also was courageous. He said what many of us are thinking but are too afraid to say. He has paid the ultimate price in a very public way. Still, he never backed down. That is something I must take my hat off to.

Charlie Kirk's death reminds us how fragile freedom of speech has become, not just in the United States but also right here in Australia. Increasingly we are seeing free speech politicised, censored and sanitised to suit political agendas, the media, voting opinions and bureaucrats in many departments. That is not how this country was built.

The Aussie way of life, especially in rural and regional areas, has been grounded in truths such as male is male and female is female. If you have any trouble with that question, try coming out to Charters Towers and milking a bull. Whether you are in the cattle yards at Charters Towers or at the front bar at the Hinchinbrook Hotel, many people want to be able to say what they say without worrying about being shunned or even cancelled for their set of beliefs. Unfortunately, the trend we are seeing from those who do not align with conservative views is that they are becoming more agitated and forceful in pushing their viewpoint. They want to decide what is offensive. They want to define the 'truth', and those who dare to disagree are branded extremist.

Charlie Kirk warned of this. He saw how governments and corporations can weaponise free speech and media platforms and use cancel culture to shut down anyone who challenged their narrative. Sadly, that warning has landed on our doorstep. Charlie Kirk's passing is a reminder of what we stand to lose if we stay silent. May his passing do as his life work did: empower a generation to stand up for their political, moral and spiritual views, even if they are unpopular with the mainstream views of the university campus or the TikTok algorithm.

Free speech for many has seemed like a God-given right, but unfortunately time has proved that, if left unattended and undefended, it can be eroded in such a short amount of time. A generation robbed of free speech inherits a future void of free thinking, creativity and acceptance of different viewpoints. Social media must not be taken as a measure of truth. Ideas should be open for debate at all costs. Charlie Kirk, rest in peace, and may those who serve in this House never stop fighting for the right to speak freely in this great state.

Hervey Bay Hospital, MRI Machine

Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (9.26 pm): Leading up to the 2024 state election I was contacted by Helen Schmidt. Helen informed me that she had awoken one morning to discover her husband, Doug, was in a diabetic coma. An ambulance was called and Doug was rushed to the Hervey Bay Hospital. He was transferred to the intensive care unit, where he was placed on a ventilator to assist with his breathing. Doctors needed to obtain an MRI of Doug's brain to determine whether he had any brain damage.

An MRI is a non-invasive imaging technology that produces three-dimensional, detailed anatomical images. Helen was astounded to hear that the Hervey Bay Hospital did not have an MRI machine and that Doug would have to be transferred to a private hospital for an MRI. This and many other Hervey Bay Hospital MRI stories stress the urgent need for an MRI machine at the hospital. That is why I am visibly, vocally and actively supporting Helen's petition for an MRI machine at Hervey Bay Hospital.

It beggars belief that a growing population of our magnitude does not have an MRI machine. According to 2021 Australian Bureau of Statistics data, Fraser Coast, which includes Hervey Bay, has an estimated 31 per cent of our population aged 65 and over, and we have the highest rates of chronic disease, as a proportion of the Fraser Coast population, in Australia. Our Fraser Coast median age is 51 against a Queensland median age of 38.

I want to acknowledge Helen, Emanuel, Paula, Sonya, Vanessa and Phil for their tremendous efforts in promoting the petition to our community. You know when you are on the right side of an argument when over 6,800 Queenslanders stand shoulder to shoulder supporting our fight for an MRI machine at Hervey Bay Hospital.

Labor ostensibly did nothing to advocate for an MRI machine. Instead, Labor misleadingly claimed to have 'delivered' a fully funded $40 million Hervey Bay ED expansion that was delayed for years and subsequently blew out to $94 million. Labor further falsely claimed to have delivered a multistorey Hervey Bay Hospital car park. Other desperate and false claims included a new Hervey Bay Fire and Rescue Station and a River Heads pontoon.

In closing, I will continue to tirelessly and persistently advocate for our Fraser Coast residents to get a Hervey Bay Hospital MRI machine. My community desperately needs the right care at the right place and at the right time, and there are over 6,800 petitioners who agree with me.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.29 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, 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