




Speech By  
**Christopher Whiting**

**MEMBER FOR BANCROFT**

---

Record of Proceedings, 10 June 2025

**POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (MAKING JACK'S LAW  
PERMANENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CORRECTIVE  
SERVICES (PAROLE BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (3.43 pm): I rise to speak to these bills but will mainly focus on the Corrective Services (Parole Board) Amendment Bill. I was on the committee that examined this bill and as I talk I will reflect what was in our statement of reservation. However, I first want to take up one of the points that the member for Thuringowa made, and that is that wandering works. That reminds me to thank the member for Morayfield and my colleagues for bringing in those laws in 2021 and expanding them in 2023. There may have been some resistance to that amongst some members of the community. It was interesting to push this new way forward in terms of conducting wandering, but there is no doubt that our approach worked, and that has been endorsed by the other side. We can see that endorsement around Australia as other Australian jurisdictions look to us and copy what we have done in order to help make their streets safer. I want to put on record my thanks to my colleagues who have supported, introduced and developed those laws and especially the former attorney-general and the former police minister for the work that they have done with this groundbreaking legislation coming through.

As we have heard, we support the bills as presented, but I do want to talk about a couple of things specifically with regard to the Parole Board bill. What we said in our statement of reservation is that in many ways this bill was unnecessary because the legislative change needed could have simply been added into another bill such as a community safety bill or perhaps the other bill we are debating right now. It is unnecessary because what we discovered during the committee hearings was that this policy was already being achieved by the practice that was already happening through the Parole Board and the sector. As we found, the Parole Board continued to review decisions of individual members under the current powers of the Corrective Services Act.

We say it was unnecessary because departmental officers admitted that there is no legislative gap because they can use section 205 of the Corrective Services Act in the meantime. It was confirmed at the public hearings that the Parole Board, as I said, could rely on section 205 which is in line with its current practices. As we said in our statement of reservation—and I want to thank the member for Bundamba for this—

These are clarifying reforms that affirm an existing practice, not reforms resulting from a gap in the current legislation.

What we also discovered in the examination of the bill is that the bill process itself was flawed. One of the things that we have seen is that the statement of compatibility presented with this bill is flawed. In our view, the explanatory notes tabled with this bill do not meet the required standards of the parliament, nor do they provide details about the number of people affected by the validation provision. This was a fundamental omission by the minister and it emerged only after evidence from Corrective Services officers was provided that we discovered this.

In terms of the explanatory notes, this is what the committee was told by officers of the parliament—that the explanatory notes do not provide strong justifications for the legislation's adverse effect on the rights of impacted persons to bring legal action regarding the decisions and that the statement of compatibility asserts that the validation provision preserves the state's revenue by extinguishing potential liability and that it is difficult to assess the strength of this justification without further information about the number of impacted persons and an estimate of the level of damages that may be awarded. The human rights brief talks about people's rights to seek legal redress. There is, however, no guarantee that impacted persons would not bring claims in the future. These things needed to be addressed in the explanatory notes and they were not. Bear in mind that I am not talking about favouring perpetrators or favouring victims; what we are talking about is the legal obligations of the state that they need to fulfil.

Other ways that we discovered that these legislative mechanisms were flawed is that the explanatory notes omitted things. For example, I believe they did not mention the impact of the *Foster v Shaddock* case—a case which went through two courts—and it found that section 205 of the Corrective Services Act empowers the Parole Board to amend, suspend or cancel a parole order. The explanatory notes omitted these important aspects, but they said that these policies could not be achieved through other means. We are starting to see this a lot—that is, the explanatory notes for bills are increasingly inadequate under this LNP government. It is clear to me and I believe that these explanatory notes are being written by the minister's office and they are aimed to achieve political leverage; they are not aimed to deliver clarity for the readers of the explanatory notes.

Those who watched our hearings or read through the transcripts would have been entertained because at times the examination of this bill was a sham and a travesty. Members were not allowed to ask questions. We moved motions that were ignored. We were denied private meetings. We also saw that members were not given the opportunity to examine issues—

**Mr Crandon:** You're misleading the House, member.

**Mr WHITING:**—and the chair—

**Mr Crandon:** Come off it!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order!

**Mr WHITING:** I think that the member has just proved my point exactly. As soon as it gets uncomfortable, this is what we are subjected to.

**Mr Crandon:** We'll see what happens, hey?

**Mr WHITING:** 'We'll see about this': this is the level of intimidation and the level of childishness and vindictiveness that we see from the member for Coomera as he chairs the committee. Get used to this, pal! You have 3½ years of me being your deputy chair, so you better get used to it.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Direct your comments through the chair, member for Bancroft.

**Mr WHITING:** This is how the LNP conducts—

**Mr Crandon:** I'm relishing it!

**Mr WHITING:** I bet you are. I cannot wait to see you try to spring on other rubbish.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That will be enough, thank you. The next person who interjects while the Speaker is on his feet will be on a warning.

**Mr WHITING:** We have just seen it: this is how the LNP conducts the business of government.

I believe that the bill itself was unnecessary. The processes were flawed. The policy was already happening in practice. They could have attached the amendment to another bill. The explanatory notes were deficient. The standards of legislation and legislative practice under the LNP have deteriorated as they struggle with the mechanisms of government.