




Speech By
Lance McCallum

MEMBER FOR BUNDAMBA

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 McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (8.30 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate of these two bills. I begin my contribution by addressing the Corrective Services (Parole Board) Amendment Bill 2025. I was privileged to be on the committee that examined and inquired into this bill. Before I turn to the content of the bill and the committee's examination of it, I place on record my deep appreciation for our hardworking corrective services officers. They are often unsung frontline heroes who work in incredibly complex and challenging circumstances, some of which many of us probably cannot even begin to imagine. They face that on a daily basis. I thank the many hardworking corrective services officers throughout Queensland. I know some of them in our Bundamba community, and the training academy for Corrective Services is located just down the Ipswich Motorway.

At the outset of my contribution, I point out that the reforms that are contained within the Parole Board bill hardwire into law some clarifying provisions and a specific head of power for a practice that is already happening operationally within the Parole Board, not because of a legislative gap in the current legislation. I will come to that in greater detail later in my contribution. This was confirmed by the Parole Board during a public hearing. Unfortunately, some members of the government have chosen to cherry-pick quotes from *Hansard*, and I will refer to that soon.

Whilst this is now a cognate debate, as stand-alone legislation this bill really belied the fact that the government has no substantive legislative agenda. Other speakers have raised this point and it is an important one. The clarifying provisions that are contained in the Parole Board bill could and should have been brought forward for consideration in this House as part of another bill, be it through amendments contained in other justice legislation that the House has already considered or as part of an omnibus bill. Instead, the government chose to bring forward stand-alone legislation. Frankly, it is a revealing indication that the Crisafulli LNP government does not have a substantive legislative agenda. The agenda that they do have is unfortunately driven by partisan politics and not necessarily better laws or policies.

The second point I raise is that this bill is from a rookie minister and it really shows. The Legislative Standards Act sets out the requirements for legislative notes and the information that they should contain. In my view, the explanatory notes that were tabled with this bill fall far short of meeting the required standard as they do not provide the details that are required for this parliament's consideration of a bill. I say that because, under the heading 'Alternative ways of achieving policy objectives', the explanatory notes state—

There are no alternative ways of achieving the policy objectives of the proposed amendments to the CSA.

However, as has been canvassed, there is in fact a general provision in the current act, under section 205, that has been used and tested in the High Court—

Mr Lee interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): One moment, member for Bundamba. Member for Hervey Bay, address your comments through the chair, please.

Mr McCALLUM: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. During his contribution to this bill, the member for Hervey Bay waxed lyrical as he desperately and clumsily tried to cover off on the fact that there is a Court of Appeal decision in *Foster v Shaddock* that explicitly states that there exists a power, under section 205, that can achieve the same outcomes. During the hearings the president of the Parole Board was very fulsome in his evidence. He pointed out—

Mr Lee interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hervey Bay, you will be on a warning if you interject again.

Mr McCALLUM: They do not like the truth, Madam Deputy Speaker, especially when they cannot understand it. We have the general provision in section 205. The president of the Parole Board said that it is operationally better for the Parole Board to have this explicit head of power. As is stated in our statement of reservation, I put to the president—

Would it be fair to say that whilst there would be a potential under 205 in terms of the power that exists, it is not operationally practical when it comes to the real-world implementation of that?

Mr Woodford replied—

I would accept that as a fair comment.

He went on to say a few more things. I then asked—

But there is no legislative gap? This will make it operationally better, but it would be fair to say that there is no legislative gap?

The president replied—

In that way, no. These provisions were put in following reviews of the Parole Board for a specific purpose, so it would be a major policy move to move away from them.

We have had a conga line of government speakers come in here and be very careful with the words that they have used when making their contributions to this bill by saying that there is no procedural gap because none of them want to be referred for misleading the House. They will not say that there is a legislative gap because there is not one. If there were, members such as the member for Hervey Bay would have had the intestinal fortitude to say it, but they did not and that is why he is sitting there with a big grin. It is absolutely ridiculous.

This Parole Board bill is very concerning. This particular minister failed to furnish the expert advice on the recent tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. During the committee hearings there was reference to whether or not section 205 is appropriate for what the Parole Board wants to change in this legislation. I asked the representatives from the Parole Board whether or not they were able to furnish the advice that they were relying on but, unfortunately, they were not in a position to do that, which is completely understandable. I believe that that advice would have been provided to the minister in the ordinary course of business.

It is to the government's eternal shame that that advice has not been made public for the members of this House, the members of the community and, indeed, the members of the corrective services sector when considering these important changes. We have clarifying amendments being brought forward because that is what the government wants, not because there is a gap in current legislation.