



Speech By  
**Daniel Purdie**


**MEMBER FOR NINDERRY**

---

Record of Proceedings, 11 August 2020

## **CORRECTIVE SERVICES (COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE) REGULATION**

### **Disallowance of Statutory Instrument**

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (5.30 pm): I move—

That clause 7 of the Corrective Services (COVID-19 Emergency Response) Regulation 2020, subordinate legislation No. 84 of 2020, tabled in the House on 16 June 2020, be disallowed.

This motion is being moved by the LNP in response to the Palaszczuk Labor government watering down the supervision of dangerous sex offenders living at large in our community. It baffles me that the Palaszczuk Labor government are at it once again, doing what they do best: favouring criminals over community safety. The Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003, known as the DP(SO) Act, would ordinarily provide strict supervision measures that apply to violent and child offenders, but the Labor Party government have taken it upon themselves to weaken these measures.

Unlike Labor, the LNP would never put the rights of dangerous and violent sex offenders ahead of community safety, but once again the LNP is forced to stand up in this House and defend the defenceless, innocent children who too often become the prey of evil: vile child sex offenders who are subject to the DP(SO) Act. The DP(SO) Act plays an important role in managing sex offenders living in our community. The overriding objective of the DP(SO) Act is to provide for the continued detention in custody or supervised release of a particular class of prisoner to ensure adequate protection of the community. This particular class of prisoner is one who has served a period of imprisonment for a serious sexual offence. The serious sexual offence must be one that involves violence or one that is against the child.

Currently, under section 16 of the DP(SO) Act it is a mandatory requirement for all supervised offenders to receive visits from Queensland Corrective Services officers and report to a QCS officer at a stated place. This often means that offenders receive visits from QCS officers at their place of residence. On 23 April this year regulation commenced which has the effect of weakening the supervision of the most dangerous sex offenders living in this state. Under section 7(3) of the regulation, a QCS officer may instead supervise the prisoner remotely by using communication technology—

**Mr Ryan** interjected.

**Mr PURDIE:** I acknowledge the minister is outraged that some violent sex offenders in the community might catch COVID, but I will get to that.

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

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Pugh): Before I hear the point of order I will wait for silence. I cannot hear the minister's point of order.

**Mr RYAN:** I take offence at what the member said and ask that it be withdrawn.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The minister takes offence. Will you withdraw?

**Mr PURDIE:** I withdraw. Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at being called a fool by the police minister.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, the member has taken offence. Do you withdraw?

**Mr RYAN:** If the member has taken offence, I withdraw.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, it needs to be—

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I do not need your assistance. Minister, your withdrawal needs to be unreserved.

**Mr RYAN:** I withdraw whatever the member found offensive.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** 'I withdraw' is all you need to say, Minister.

**Mr RYAN:** I withdraw.

**Mr PURDIE:** Currently, there are a number of DPSO offenders living in the community on supervision orders who, as a condition of their order, would ordinarily receive visits from QCS. These include Jeremy William Voois, who raped two teenaged girls and committed another violent sexual act whilst in custody. Another offender given the pseudonym KBM offended against a number of young girls aged between three and 13 years. One of his most disturbing offences involved committing various sexual offences upon an eight-year-old girl during a four-hour period after giving her drugs. Most recently Terance Guy Carter, an untreated dangerous child sex offender who has committed a range of vile sexual offences against children, was recently let out into the community on a supervision order. He has a long history spanning three decades of indecently dealing with young boys.

All of these offenders were subject to strict supervision measures, but thanks to the Labor Party government they now will not be. These offenders are lucky to have been granted the privilege to roam the streets despite their heinous offending. They should be watched like a hawk, but instead they will be monitored remotely by a QCS officer. This will be the new norm up to 31 December. Strict supervision requirements were put in place for a reason, and they form part of a legislative instrument that should not be stripped away by regulation quietly snuck in without scrutiny by this Labor government.

I want to reiterate that these sex offenders are the worst of the worst living in our community. They are manipulative and callous. The latest figures available to the LNP reveal that in 2017, 50 prisoners were released on supervision orders and in that same year 30 breached the conditions of their order. In 2018, 55 were released on supervision orders and in the same year 20 breached conditions of their supervision orders. In the first half of 2019 there were 26 released, with 18 breaching their conditions. The stats highlight just how rife breaches amongst dangerous child sex offenders are.

One of Queensland's most notorious sex offenders, Robert John Fardon, breached his supervision order and went on to reoffend while on a supervision order. On 4 May 2007 he attended a school while on a pre-arranged visit to address year 11 students. On 11 July 2007 he aided a neighbour, who was also subject to a supervision order, to disobey a curfew restriction. On 21 July 2007 he travelled without authority to Townsville and engaged in a prolonged violent sexual assault on a woman. On 3 April 2008 he went unsupervised to the residence of an intellectually disabled person.

Another DPSO offender, Shane Edward Harvey, also breached his supervision order in 2008 by having a male child two years of age at his residence. A repeat child sex offender, Gregory Kynuna, whose supervision order is littered with breaches as described by Justice David Boddice, recently breached his supervision order again by failing to comply with a curfew, consuming drugs and alcohol and disobeying the lawful instructions of QCS officers. His criminal history involved sexual offences dating back to 1987, including a series of sexual offences committed against a 16-year-old boy.

I cannot reiterate enough that DPSO offenders cannot be trusted, and the most stringent of measures must be in place to protect the safety of our community. These sex offenders are the worst of the worst in society, and the government should act with caution. It is a dangerous game to play by those opposite to weaken the monitoring of DPSO child sex offenders who do not respect the law and who have encroached on the basic rights of children.

The explanatory notes to the regulations state that the amendments were designed to reduce physical contact between persons and to ensure the health and safety of officers and offenders, but I question whether the government have properly justified their response, considering it is disproportionate to the potential harm these offenders may cause children. Breaches involving absconding from their approved residence, breach of curfew and allowing children to unlawfully reside at their residence are more likely to occur without strict supervision and physical inspections.

I question why it is not safe for QCS officers to check on a few dangerous child sex offenders, but it is safe for 25,000 people to gather in a stadium or more than 10,000 people to participate in a marathon. Why is it not safe for QCS officers to check on our most violent sex offenders while at the very same time we are asking our uniformed and plain-clothes Queensland police officers to personally attend the homes of confirmed COVID carriers to ensure they are abiding by their isolation orders.

Surely, it would be safe and practical for QCS officers to practise social distancing and engage in other forms of protective measures, like our police, ambos and other frontline staff have been asked to do. Once again, Labor are rewarding prisoners with their honesty system. The move is unfathomable and I question why the Palaszczuk Labor government are expanding child sex offenders' rights, which only acts to diminish the rights of the community. It makes no sense. It is another deplorable decision by this incompetent government.

The weakening of supervision of dangerous sex offenders is not new to the Palaszczuk Labor government. In fact in 2019, when Labor moved amendments to the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act, the Attorney-General in her media release said—

Queenslanders can rest assured that our State has the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the country because of the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004 and the Dangerous Prisoners (Sexual Offenders) Act 2003.

If Queensland does have the toughest post-conviction monitoring system in the country, then I query why not one post-DPSO offender is GPS tracked.

In addition to the list of blunders by Labor when it comes to monitoring sex offenders, who can forget just last month when a child sex offender who posed as a policeman to lure young boys into a school bathroom where he sexually assaulted them was caught living across the road from a Brisbane primary school? He even told Channel 9 news, 'I'm pretty much known as a very dangerous and violent person.' Again, in May when Labor were caught out trying to let prisoners out on parole early as part of their initial COVID-19 Emergency Response Bill, it was a get-out-of-jail-free card under the guise of COVID-19.

This is yet another example of how Labor's priorities are all wrong when it comes to putting the safety of the community ahead of the rights of prisoners. The so-called tough monitoring of sex offenders by this Labor government is nothing but a sham. Unlike Labor, the LNP is committed to introducing a number of policies that will protect vulnerable Queenslanders. The LNP has committed to introducing a public sex offender register to allow parents to check the background of anyone—

**Mr BAILEY:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are talking about the disallowance of a regulation, which is a specific regulation. The member is now talking about election policies.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Pugh): I will take some guidance from the table. I ask the member to keep within the motion.

**Mr PURDIE:** In talking about the strict monitoring of sex offenders in our community, the LNP has committed to introducing a public sex offender register to allow parents to check the background of anyone who has regular unsupervised access—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Ninderry, I ask you to come back to the motion.

**Mr PURDIE:** Unlike Labor, the LNP intended to crack down on sexual predators. Expanding rights to prisoners will be nonnegotiable under an LNP government. The weakening of the monitoring of dangerous and violent sex offenders is just another embarrassing blunder by this Labor police minister and an embarrassing Palaszczuk Labor government.