



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, 21 April 2026

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO A BILL	921
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 27 March 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 27 March 2026.....	
	921
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	921
Sullivan, Mr JA, MP.....	921
ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD	921
By-Election, Issue of Writ.....	921
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 17 April 2026, from the Director-General, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Damien Walker, to the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie, enclosing a copy of the writ for a by-election to be held on 16 May 2026 for the electorate of Stafford.....	
	921
REPORT	922
Office of the Information Commissioner.....	922
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Information Commissioner Report 2: 2025-26—Camera surveillance through the privacy lens: Local government use of camera surveillance in public spaces and privacy impact assessments, April 2026.....	
	922
SPEAKER'S RULING	922
Same Question Rule.....	922
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	922
Member for Caloundra.....	922
Parliament House, Artwork.....	922
Parliament House, Purple House.....	923
Visitors to Public Gallery.....	923
PETITIONS	923
TABLED PAPERS	924
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	928
Fuel Security.....	928

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 21 April 2026

Sullivan, Mr JA, MP	929
Fuel Security.....	929
Karreman Quarries, Death; Taroom Trough	930
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act.....	931
Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act.....	931
Trade, Fuel Security	932
Freight Industry, Fuel Security	933
Small and Family Business, Fuel Security.....	933
Tourism Industry, Fuel Security	934
ABSENCE OF MINISTER.....	935
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS	935
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	935
Comments by Member for Macalister, Apology	935
STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE	935
Alleged Unauthorised Disclosure of Committee Proceedings, Referral to Ethics Committee	935
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	935
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	935
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	936
Fuel Security.....	937
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	938
Manufacturing and Resources Industries.....	939
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from social media, dated 27 November 2025, featuring a post by 'Lean Qld—Labor Environment Action Network' regarding environment laws	939
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, attending a LEAN function.	940
Members of Parliament, Accommodation.....	940
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	940
Resources Industries	940
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, attending a LEAN function.	941
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	941
Resources Industries	942
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	942
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	942
Fuel Security.....	943
CopperString	943
Health Services.....	944
Crisafulli LNP Government, Ministers.....	944
Youth Crime.....	945
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	946
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	946
Youth Crime	946
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	946
MOTIONS	947
Amendments to Sessional Orders	947
Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order	951
Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order	955
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.	955
Resolved in the affirmative.....	955
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	956
Resolved in the affirmative.....	956
Business Program.....	956
Suspension of Standing Orders	959
EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL.....	959
Second Reading	959
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	965
Cost of Living; Transport Affordability	965
Stafford By-Election.....	966
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.....	967
Stafford By-Election	968
Cost of Living	970
Stafford By-Election	970
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance.....	971
Stafford By-Election	972
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance.....	973
Crime, North Brisbane	974
Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme.....	975
EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL.....	976
Second Reading	976
Division: Question put—That the question be now put.	988
Resolved in the affirmative.....	988
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	988

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 21 April 2026

Resolved in the negative	988
Non-government amendment (Ms Farmer) negated	988
PLANNING (STATE FACILITATED DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT REGULATION	997
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	997
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated April 2025, from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, regarding the SFD program.....	1001
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	1012
Resolved in the negative	1012
EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL.....	1013
Second Reading	1013
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 21 April 2026, by AMA Queensland, titled 'Drug diversion changes a blow to mental and preventative health in Queensland'	1013
ADJOURNMENT	1028
Small and Family Business, Fuel Security	1028
Balanda, Mr RJ	1028
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, undated, titled 'MPs dig deep in bid to stop quarry'	1029
Parkinson's Disease	1029
Karreman Quarries; Thomson, Mr Q; Australian Dragon Boat Championships	1030
Peptides	1030
Shepley, Mr PG.....	1031
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance	1031
Broadbeach Cats Australian Football Club	1032
Noosa Electorate, Volunteers.....	1032
Mundingburra Electorate, Anzac Day	1033
ATTENDANCE	1034

TUESDAY, 21 APRIL 2026

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 A BILL



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to a bill. 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 Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of His Majesty The King on the date shown:

27 March 2026

A bill for an Act to amend the Electrical Safety Act 2002, the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013, the James Cook University Act 1997, the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes 27 March 2026

This Bill is 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

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 27 March 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 27 March 2026 [\[541\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Sullivan, Mr JA, MP



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, as you would be aware, the member for Stafford, Jimmy Sullivan, sadly passed away on the evening of Thursday, 9 April 2026. As a mark of respect, on the evening of Friday, 10 April the external display lights of Parliament House were left dark. On behalf of all honourable members, I offer condolences to Jimmy's family.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD

By-Election, Issue of Writ




Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to inform the House that Her Excellency the Governor has issued a writ for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Stafford. The dates in connection with the issue of the writs are as follows: issue of writ, 17 April 2026; cut-off date for electoral rolls, 21 April 2026; nomination day, 24 April 2026; polling day, 16 May 2026; and return of writ, 9 July 2026. I table the relevant correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 17 April 2026, from the Director-General, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Damien Walker, to the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie, enclosing a copy of the writ for a by-election to be held on 16 May 2026 for the electorate of Stafford [\[542\]](#).

REPORT


Office of the Information Commissioner

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Information Commissioner *Report 2: 2025-26—Camera surveillance through the privacy lens: local government use of camera surveillance in public spaces and privacy impact assessments*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 2: 2025-26—Camera surveillance through the privacy lens: Local government use of camera surveillance in public spaces and privacy impact assessments, April 2026 [\[543\]](#).

SPEAKER'S RULING

Same Question Rule

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have considered the application of the same question rule to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. In summary, the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 17, 56 and 57 of the bill contrary to standing order 87. A motion to suspend standing order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered. I seek leave to incorporate my full ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—APPLICATION OF SAME QUESTION RULE TO EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL 2026

I have considered the application of the same question rule to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026.

The Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026 was introduced on 3 March 2026. It seeks to amend provisions of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 that have already been considered by the House in this session of Parliament in the context of amendments contained in the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Making Jack's Law Permanent) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025, which was passed by the House on 11 June 2025 and received assent on 16 June 2025; the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024, which was passed by the House on 12 December 2024 and received assent on 13 December 2024; the Making Queensland Safer (Adult Crime, Adult Time) Amendment Act 2025, which was passed by the House on 21 May 2025 and received assent on 23 May 2025; and the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Act 2026, which was passed by the House on 5 March 2026 and received assent on 11 March 2026.


Standing Order 87 provides the general rule of Westminster parliamentary practice that, once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative, the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session. Similarly, Standing Order 150 provides for the application of the same question rule in relation to amendments, new clauses or schedules of a Bill. As previous Speakers have noted, the matters do not have to be identical but merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form (Speaker Reynolds, Record of Proceedings, 9 September 2008, p. 2559).

Clauses 17, 56 and 57 of the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026 propose amendments to provisions of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 that are substantially the same as amendments previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament due to the passing of the Police Powers and Responsibilities (Making Jack's Law Permanent) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025, the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024, the Making Queensland Safer (Adult Crime, Adult Time) Amendment Act 2025 and the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Act 2026. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.


Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 17, 56 and 57 of the Bill contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Member for Caloundra

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise that the member for Caloundra, Ms Kendall Morton MP, has legally changed her surname to Hatcher following her wedding over the Easter break. On behalf of the House, I congratulate the member on her nuptials. We believe that this is the first time in the history of the Queensland parliament that a sitting member has changed their name due to marriage. Relevant parliamentary records have been updated to reflect the change.


Parliament House, Artwork

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, this sitting week we are showcasing two more works from the Regional Council Artwork Collection, assembled in 1979. The first work, titled *The Bridge*, is by artist John Clark. Born in Scotland in 1945, Clark worked as a teacher for 12 years and holds an


Associate Diploma in Fine Art from the Queensland College of Art at Seven Hills. The painting is rendered in an impressionist style and depicts the Hornibrook Highway connecting Brisbane and Redcliffe. This artwork was donated by the Redcliffe City Council.

The second artwork, *River Mouth*, is by Anneke Silver. Silver lived and practised in North Queensland from 1962, after training in Amsterdam and Brisbane. She has won several art prizes and her work is held in a range of collections including universities, local government and private collections. Her work often explores landscapes from an aerial perspective, with a map-like quality, and examines the relationship between the figure and the landscape. The artwork was donated by the Townsville City Council. Next sitting week we will feature two more artworks, continuing to highlight regional communities represented in this chamber.

Parliament House, Purple House

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, tonight Parliament House will be lit in purple to mark the 100th birthday of the late Queen Elizabeth II. This splash of purple also coincides with the marking of World Parkinson's Month.

Visitors to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Kenmore State High School in the electorate of Moggill, North Lakes State School in the electorate of Bancroft and Mount Samson State School in the electorate of Pine Rivers.

PETITIONS

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

Hervey Bay Electorate, Hervey Bay Hospital

Mr Lee, from 2,287 petitioners, requesting the House to act decisively in objecting to the removal of the Hervey Bay Hospital from the Hervey Bay State electorate district [\[522\]](#) [\[523\]](#).

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

Fuel Security

1,479 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to consider the long-term fuel security of the state [\[524\]](#).

Youth Justice

1,803 petitioners, requesting the House to review youth justice bail and sentencing laws to ensure they are effective in addressing repeat serious youth offending and maintaining community safety [\[525\]](#).

Companion Animals

798 petitioners, requesting the House to protect our pet companion animals so important to families in our community [\[526\]](#).

Public Sector Workforce, Identification

588 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that all government employees supply an identification number or form of identification in their dealings with the public [\[527\]](#).

Proserpine, Main Street Upgrade

155 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake works to upgrade Main Street, Proserpine [\[528\]](#).

Proserpine, Land Availability

123 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to make new residential and commercial land available in and around Proserpine [\[529\]](#).

Oakey, Speed Limits

99 petitioners, requesting the House to reduce the speed limit on a section of 4AK Road, Oakey from 80 km/h to 60 km/h [\[530\]](#).

Crocodile Management

1,715 petitioners, requesting the House to align with the Northern Territory with respect to managing our wild crocodile population [\[531\]](#).

Community Treatment Orders

1,468 petitioners, requesting the House to amend community treatment order provisions to require integrated treatment and intensive rehabilitation programs for mental illness and substance abuse disorders [\[532\]](#).

Insurance, Fees and Charges

2,330 petitioners, requesting the House to abolish Stamp Duty or GST from any and all insurance policies [\[533\]](#).

Firearms, Policy

2,582 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure firearms policy and legislation is proportionate and evidence-based [\[534\]](#).

Nuclear Energy

2,969 petitioners, requesting the House to lift the ban on nuclear [\[535\]](#).

Anzac Day, Public Holiday

1,959 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce a Monday public holiday when ANZAC Day falls on a Saturday [\[536\]](#).

Traffic and Parking Fines

1,091 petitioners, requesting the House to stop the issue of all on the spot traffic and parking fines [\[537\]](#).

Queensland Criminal Cases Review Commission, Establishment

1,440 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a Queensland Criminal Cases Review Commission and Fair Compensation for wrongful convictions [\[538\]](#).

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—

27 March 2026—

- [419](#) Response from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Hon. Purdie), to an E-Petition (4283-25), sponsored by the member for Mansfield, Ms McMillan, from 389 petitioners, requesting the House to install advanced anti-hooping surveillance cameras in Mansfield
- [420](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 22, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 19 November 2025 and 9 December 2025
- [421](#) Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 15, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 19 November 2025 and 10 February 2026
- [422](#) National Energy Retail Law (Retailer of Last Resort) Amendment Act 2025 (SA) which received Royal Assent on 27 November 2025
- [423](#) National Energy Retail Law (South Australia) Act 2011: National Energy Retail (Retailer of Last Resort) Amendment Regulations 2025
- [424](#) National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014: National Energy Retail Amendment (Real-time data for consumers) Rule 2025, No. 6
- [425](#) Queensland College of Teachers—Annual Report 2025
- [426](#) University of Queensland—Annual Report 2025
- [427](#) University of Southern Queensland—Annual Report 2025
- [428](#) University of the Sunshine Coast—Annual Report 2025
- [429](#) CQ University—Annual Report 2025
- [430](#) James Cook University—Annual Report 2025
- [431](#) Griffith University—Annual Report 2025
- [432](#) Queensland University of Technology—Annual Report 2025
- [433](#) Townsville Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [434](#) Toowoomba Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [435](#) Rockhampton Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [436](#) Rockhampton Girls Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [437](#) Ipswich Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [438](#) Ipswich Girls Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [439](#) Brisbane Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [440](#) Brisbane Girls Grammar School—Annual Report 2025
- [441](#) Queensland Theatre Company—Annual Report 2025
- [442](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on official visit to East Asia, South Korea and Japan by the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development, Hon. Dale Last, 21-27 February 2026

[443](#) Education and Care Services Ombudsman and National Education and Care Services Freedom of Information and Privacy Commissioners—Annual Report 2024-2025

30 March 2026—

[444](#) Auditor-General Report 11: 2025-26—State entities 2025: Erratum

[445](#) Ethics Committee: Report No. 243, 58th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 26 June 2025 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by the member for Bancroft

31 March 2026—

[446](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 15, 58th Parliament—Subordinate Legislation tabled between 19 November 2025 and 9 December 2025

[447](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 16, 58th Parliament—Inquiry into Sugarcane Bioenergy Opportunities in Queensland

[448](#) Queensland Family and Child Commission—Annual Report 2024-2025: Erratum

[449](#) Report titled '2023 Review of the Meriba Omasker Kaziw Kazipa (Torres Strait Islander Traditional Child Rearing Practice) Act 2020', December 2023

[450](#) Report titled '2023 Review of the Meriba Omasker Kaziw Kazipa (Torres Strait Islander Traditional Child Rearing Practice) Act 2020', December 2023, government response

2 April 2026—

[451](#) Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 24, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 December 2025 and 10 February 2026

[452](#) Response from the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Perrett), to an E-Petition (4333-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,694 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 to protect dogs from heat and unsafe ute transport

[453](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 23, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled on 10 February 2026

[454](#) Response from the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training (Hon. Bates), to an E-Petition (4354-25), sponsored by the member for Coomera, Mr Crandon, from 287 petitioners, requesting the House to fast-track stage 2 of the Coomera TAFE Marine Centre of Excellence

[455](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on trade mission to the United States of America by the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, Hon. Tim Mander, 23 February—3 March 2026

[456](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to a paper petition (4448-26), presented by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(3), and an E-Petition (4356-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 416 and 830 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to address primary healthcare in Clermont and the recruitment practices of Mackay Hospital and Health Services for the Clermont Hospital

[457](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4411-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 365 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate trans rights and healthcare to trans youth and trans kids

[458](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4388-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 683 petitioners, requesting the House to do all in its power to establish a permanent renal dialysis unit at Stanthorpe Hospital and to equip Stanthorpe Hospital with at least three dialysis chairs to accommodate the current and projected local patient demand

[459](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4290-25), sponsored by the member for Kurwongbah, Mr King, from 2,450 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the Narangba rail crossing and end traffic congestion

[460](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to a paper petition (4444-26), presented by the member for Maryborough, Mr Barounis, and an E-Petition (4315-25), sponsored by the member for Maryborough, Mr Barounis, from 104 and 376 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to install crossing traffic lights on Alice Street, Maryborough, in the vicinity of Sunbury State School

[461](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to a paper petition (4443-26), presented by the member for Maryborough, Mr Barounis, and an E-Petition (4330-25), sponsored by the member for Maryborough, Mr Barounis, from 100 and 540 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to install a pedestrian crossing to improve safety at Maryborough Special School

[462](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to a paper petition (4445-26), presented by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(3), and an E-Petition (4335-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 451 and 1,640 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to provide an effective inclusive Translink bus service on Macleay Island

[463](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4408-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,509 petitioners, requesting the House to remove tolls from Brisbane tunnels and bridges

[464](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4291-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 5,478 petitioners, requesting the House to reject all future development proposals for wind, solar and hydrogen power and support new or refurbish existing coal fired power stations for a reliable affordable stable power supply

- [465](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4295-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,009 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures regarding the Moreton Bay Regional Council's planning scheme administration
- [466](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4324-25), sponsored by the member for South Brisbane, Dr O'Shea, from 1,938 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake community consultation and to incorporate this feedback into any decision regarding the redevelopment and future use of the Visy site on Montague Road, South Brisbane
- [467](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4338-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 4,419 petitioners, requesting the House to suspend the proposed Mt Challenger and Crystal Brook/Kelsey Creek Wind Farm Project in its current form and assess alternative, more suitable sites
- [468](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4424-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 190 petitioners, requesting the House to stop giving the authority to land developers to build more homes
- [469](#) Board of Examiners—Annual Report 2024-25
- [470](#) Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2024-25
- [471](#) Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2024-25
- 7 April 2026—
- [472](#) Commissioner for Resources Safety & Health—Annual Report 2024-25
- 8 April 2026—
- [473](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 23, 58th Parliament—Consideration of Auditor-General Report 9: 2024-25—Major projects 2024
- 14 April 2026—
- [474](#) Queensland Ombudsman—Preventing harm to children with disability in Queensland—Report 3: Queensland Health, April 2026
- [475](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on Singapore and India Trade Mission by the Minister for Environment and Tourism and the Minister for Science and Innovation, Hon. Andrew Powell, 8-14 March 2026
- 16 April 2026—
- [476](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4380-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 695 petitioners, requesting the House to reject any development proposals for industrial sites in the Baffle Creek catchment and head waters
- [477](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4452-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 8,300 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the proposed expansion at Ormiston College does not proceed until the impacts on koalas have been properly assessed
- [478](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to a petition (4467-26), presented by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(3), from 1,770 petitioners, requesting the House to suspend the proposed Mt Challenger and Crystal Brook/Kelsey Creek Wind Farm Project in its current form and assess alternative, more suitable sites
- 17 April 2026—
- [479](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 24, 58th Parliament—Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill 2026
- [480](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 17, 58th Parliament—Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026
- [481](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 29, 58th Parliament—Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026
- [482](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report 30, 58th—Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026
- 20 April 2026—
- [483](#) National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2019-2020
- [484](#) National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2020-2021
- [485](#) National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2021-2022
- [486](#) National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2022-2023
- [487](#) National Environment Protection Council—Annual Report 2023-2024
- [488](#) Electoral Commission Queensland—2025 Hinchinbrook State By-Election Report
- [489](#) Queensland Law Reform Commission—Review of particular criminal defences: Just, clear and modern: Reformed criminal defences for Queensland—Final Report, December 2025: Volume 1

- [490](#) Queensland Law Reform Commission—Review of particular criminal defences: Just, clear and modern: Reformed criminal defences for Queensland—Final Report, December 2025: Volume 2
- [491](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4302-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,950 petitioners, requesting the House to stop state funding for the Olympic stadium/precinct at Barrambin/Victoria Park
- [492](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4410-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), requesting the House to amend the requirements for all existing and newly constructed basketball courts so they must be located no less than 200 metres from residential homes and introduce a playing curfew between 1700 and 0900

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994, National Injury Insurance Scheme (Queensland) Act 2016:

- [493](#) Motor Accident Insurance (Administration Fee and Levies) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 26
- [494](#) Motor Accident Insurance (Administration Fee and Levies) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 26, explanatory notes
- [495](#) Motor Accident Insurance (Administration Fee and Levies) and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 26, human rights certificate

Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999:

- [496](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 27
- [497](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 27, explanatory notes
- [498](#) Mining Safety and Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 27, human rights certificate

Justices Act 1886:

- [499](#) Justices Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 28
- [500](#) Justices Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 28, explanatory notes
- [501](#) Justices Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 28, human rights certificate

Trusts Act 2025:

- [502](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 29
- [503](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 29, explanatory notes

Trusts Act 2025:

- [504](#) Trusts Regulation 2026, No. 30
- [505](#) Trusts Regulation 2026, No. 30, explanatory notes
- [506](#) Trusts Regulation 2026, No. 30, human rights certificate

Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000:

- [507](#) Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2026, No. 31
- [508](#) Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2026, No. 31, explanatory notes
- [509](#) Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2026, No. 31, human rights certificate

Biosecurity Act 2014:

- [510](#) Biosecurity (Tomato/Potato Psyllid Carrier) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 32
- [511](#) Biosecurity (Tomato/Potato Psyllid Carrier) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 32, explanatory notes
- [512](#) Biosecurity (Tomato/Potato Psyllid Carrier) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 32, human rights certificate

Fisheries Act 1994:

- [513](#) Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 33
- [514](#) Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 33, explanatory notes
- [515](#) Fisheries Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 33, human rights certificate

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

- [516](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) (Refund of Setting Down Fee and Hearing Fee) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 34
- [517](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) (Refund of Setting Down Fee and Hearing Fee) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 34, explanatory notes
- [518](#) Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) (Refund of Setting Down Fee and Hearing Fee) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 34, human rights certificate

Biosecurity Act 2014:

- [519](#) Biosecurity (Prohibited and Restricted Matter) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 35
- [520](#) Biosecurity (Prohibited and Restricted Matter) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 35, explanatory notes
- [521](#) Biosecurity (Prohibited and Restricted Matter) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 35, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Education and the Arts (Hon. Langbroek)—

- [539](#) Response from the Minister for Education and the Arts (Hon. Langbroek), to an E-Petition (4340-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 524 petitioners, requesting the House to finish the Musgrave Park Cultural Centre

MEMBER'S PAPER


The following member's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Barron River (Ms James)—

- [540](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on official visit to Vietnam by the Assistant Minister for Tourism, Early Learning, Creative Industries and Far North Queensland and member for Barron River, Ms Bree James, 2-6 February 2026

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Fuel Security

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.39 am): Queensland families and businesses across our state continue to be concerned about the affordability of and access to fuel. Our government has been focused on developing short-, medium- and long-term solutions to ensure supply and increase our capacity to refine and store fuel right here in Queensland. We are in constant communication with suppliers and retailers to ensure a flow of information. Tomorrow I will be convening another meeting of Queensland's Fuel Supply Taskforce, where industry leaders work with Commissioner Bob Gee to feed in their concerns regarding this nationwide crisis. We are also continuing to call on Canberra to support state and territory calls to develop a national dashboard. It is not just useful to see what pressures are within Australia; we deserve to see in real time what shipments are on their way so that people can plan. It is a simple ask: tell us how many ships we have contracted to arrive in May, in June and in July and how that compares to previous years. It makes sense. It enables people to plan.

We are also encouraging the Commonwealth to roll out packages to assist small and family business and their staff across those industries that are hurting so badly during this crisis. For our part, we stand ready to play a role. We made 50-cent fares permanent to encourage more Queenslanders onto public transport, we have removed state taxes so the government does not profit from the heartache of rising fuel prices, and our budget will continue to roll out a culture of respect for your money. We are also expediting planning processes for projects that will promote supply and storage. We are in discussions with several proponents to build a fuel refinery right here in Queensland. A nation of our size should not be reliant on just a handful of refineries. Multiple sites are being investigated in the Gladstone region, and industry knows we are open for business.


Importantly, last year, well before this fuel crisis began, our government opened tenders for new oil and gas exploration in the Taroom Trough. We are a resource-rich state, and this project has the potential to create Australia's first new oilfield in 50 years. In February, also before this crisis, we approved three preferred tenderers and we are already seeing results. This area has the potential to become a major supplier of domestic fuel—something that Australia desperately needs.

This crisis has shown us that, as a nation, we are too dependent on imported fuel products. We are at the end of a global supply chain, and that puts our fuel security at risk. We need to be drilling, refining and storing our own fuel right here in Queensland. Never again should we be left without the ability to generate fuel and store fuel right here in Australia. To fast-track the project, we are progressing the new Taroom Trough Development Plan. We will accelerate the delivery of strategic roads and trunk infrastructure to get oil and gas projects in the region off the ground as soon as we can. It is a golden opportunity for our state and for our nation, but we need the federal government to get on board to help us.


New legislation passed by the federal government last year—late last year—will prevent projects like the Taroom Trough from receiving streamlined approvals. I do not believe that projects of national significance should have extra barriers put in front of them. We need projects like the Taroom Trough

so that we have our own fuel to fill the family car, transport food and goods, visit our tourism hotspots, harvest crops, mine our resources and make products. We must make sure we have sovereign capability to look after our fuel security. It is critical to locking in national fuel security for our future. Our government will do everything possible to ensure we do not miss the generational opportunity right here in Queensland.

Sullivan, Mr JA, MP

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.43 am): Queenslanders will have been shocked to hear of the passing of the member for Stafford, Jimmy Sullivan, in recent weeks. There will be time for formal condolences in due course and we must take that opportunity, but on behalf of the government I place on record that our thoughts are with his family following their loss.

Fuel Security

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.43 am): Queenslanders are bearing the brunt of the Albanese Labor government's failure to shore up Australia's domestic fuel supply—a failure that has meant our nation is reliant on overseas supply chains that depend on free and fair trade in a region beset by war and instability. All Australians saw, in the most grotesque fashion, the federal energy minister, Chris Bowen, claim that there was not a problem with the fuel issue, that there was 'nothing to see here', and now Australians are paying the price because of his arrogance. The federal government tried to pretend there was not an issue and have been caught playing catch-up once again.

As the Premier has said on a number of occasions, this Queensland government was the first to call out the federal government for their lack of preparedness, and for that we were called names by the flailing and failing federal energy minister, Chris Bowen, under pressure. Meanwhile, all we hear from the Queensland Labor opposition is excuses for their federal Labor mates, with no plan for Queenslanders. Labor put their political self-interest ahead of the interests of Queenslanders time and time again.

The Crisafulli government is unlocking Australia's first oilfield in more than a century at the Taroom Trough, with the Coordinator-General in my department preparing a development plan to streamline all the necessary approvals to ensure Queenslanders get the benefits of this natural asset. I am pleased to advise the House that I have written to the federal environment minister, Senator Murray Watt, on behalf of the Crisafulli government to urge him to take practical action now to see this government's vision of energy independence realised. It is time for Labor and the Greens to get out of the way of these major fuel projects and put ideology to the side for the benefit of Australians facing the current fuel crisis.

This government believes in restoring our sovereign capabilities. That is why I have directed my department to take a whole-of-basin approach to ensure the long-term supply of fuel from the Taroom Trough, catalysed by a fast-tracked approach when it comes to the delivery of essential trunk infrastructure such as roads. We do not want to see Australia's domestic fuel security held up by the federal EPBC legislation as a result of left-wing ideology and a dodgy deal done by federal Labor with the Greens in the national parliament at the end of last year.

My department, through the Coordinator-General, will not hesitate to pull every lever possible to ensure the future of our domestic resources sector. It is not just fuel supply or oil reserves we believe in; we believe in regional Queensland and all resources across this resource-rich state. That is why I am pleased to advise the House that this government has declared two major resource projects will be fast-tracked now to signal that Queensland is open for business. To that end, I can announce today that the Coordinator-General has declared the \$1.24 billion Corvus Metallurgical Coal Project, located 17 kilometres north of Emerald, a coordinated project paving the way for a streamlined environmental approvals process and the creation of up to 800 jobs. Once operational, this coalmine is expected to produce up to 10.5 million tonnes of raw coal annually for 25 years from 2027, delivering a major boost to Queensland's economy and regional development.

I am also pleased to announce today that the \$400 million Big Vein South Gold Project, which is located 120 kilometres north of Richmond in the state's north, has been declared a prescribed project. This project, which will, from 2028, produce 1.95 million tonnes of ore annually, is set to create more than 1,300 jobs, demonstrating a major vote of confidence in Queensland's resources sector and the Crisafulli government's approach to the resources in this state.

The Crisafulli government will continue to back regional and rural Queensland, which delivers so much of our state's economic prosperity, and we will not stop until our federal counterparts get out of the way to make these opportunities a reality for all of Queensland.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. During the Deputy Premier's ministerial statement, he used unparliamentary language and I submit to you that he should be asked to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

Mr SPEAKER: I missed that.

Mr Bleijie interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Order! I missed that. I will have a look at it a later date. Member for Kawana, are you aware that you used unparliamentary language?

Mr BLEIJIE: No, I did not.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Some of the words being considered unparliamentary depend on the context in which they are used. As I said, I missed that. I will have a look at it later.

Karreman Quarries, Death; Taroom Trough

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (9.49 am): Before I start, I would like to express my sincere condolences to the family, friends and colleagues of the forklift operator who was fatally injured in a workplace incident at the Redlands quarry late yesterday. Safety in the resources and quarrying industries is my priority, and this tragedy will be felt throughout the industry and that local community. My thoughts are with all of those who are affected.

What I want to talk about today will come as no surprise: the Taroom Trough. By all indications, it holds a potential sea of underground oil and, as I speak, our resource companies are on the ground proving up the reserves across an area of 4,554 square kilometres. The Crisafulli government is delivering a better lifestyle through a stronger economy by unlocking Queensland's first prospective oilfield in 50 years.

Two weeks ago the Premier and I, along with Minister Leahy and the member for Callide, visited the Taroom Trough to see firsthand the potential of what South-West Queensland's new energy frontier looks like. Hosted by Shell QGC and joined by Omega Oil and Gas and Elixir Energy, we toured Shell's site where a new appraisal well has been drilled. We saw with our own eyes a producing oil well, from which Shell is already extracting liquids that are being transported to IOR's Eromanga Refinery. This is real. There it is: the first oil from the Taroom Trough. It is good oil—

Mr Nicholls: The good oil.

Mr LAST: The good oil; I take that interjection.


Mr O'Connor: Don't table it.

Mr LAST: I am not tabling it; it is too precious. This well is already producing a few hundred barrels of high-quality crude oil per day. The oil is transported to the Eromanga Refinery, where it is turned into diesel. It is being used in underground mining and sold to nearby service stations. That is oil drilled in Queensland, refined in Queensland and used in Queensland. We want to see a lot more of it. The Crisafulli government is delivering a plan for the Taroom Trough.

The ongoing events in the Middle East continue to remind us why we need to have our own long-term fuel security and sovereign manufacturing capability. We want to be able to drill, refine and store fuel right here in Queensland. Unlike those opposite, who had 10 years to get these projects going, we are not going to let this opportunity pass us by. We will work with Shell, Omega and Elixir to move from exploration to full-scale production, and we are doing this with a clear plan. This is government working in lock step with industry. On this side of the House we support the resources sector, we back the gas industry and the coal industry and we will roll out the red carpet for those who want to do business here. We just get things done.

Unlocking the Taroom Trough is critical to Australia's long-term fuel security. Unlike the southern states that cannot shake their left-wing ideology and their anti-resources policies, we are willing to stand up and play our part to keep the lights on, to make sure our farmers have the diesel to plant and harvest and to keep the trucks running across Australia. The Crisafulli government is providing certainty to industry. We are backing our producers. We have a plan to capitalise on the resources that are under our feet for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.53 am): The Crisafulli government is committed to unlocking productivity in Queensland. Whether it is in the construction industry or the resources and agriculture sectors, we are boosting productivity after a decade of decline under the former government. We want Canberra to back Queensland jobs, grow our economy and accelerate delivery of major projects.


Last week I directed the Queensland Productivity Commission to conduct an independent public inquiry into the impact of the federal government's 2025 changes to the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999. The changes in November to the EPBC Act have raised concerns with stakeholders about increased regulatory burden, compliance costs, uncertainty and delays. The 12-month inquiry will give all Queenslanders, including stakeholders, an opportunity to provide their feedback and experiences via a public consultation process. The evidence gathered and subsequent recommendations will help us identify opportunities to unlock productivity to drive Queensland's economic growth—opportunities like the Taroom Trough, which is Australia's first new prospective oilfield in 50 years.

We are working to bolster the nation's long-term fuel security with streamlined approvals to support the development of the Taroom Trough as a prospective major oil supplier for domestic fuel. We have called on the federal government to recognise the Taroom Trough as a project of national interest and streamline EPBC approvals under the national interest fast-track assessment pathway, which is already in place for other major projects. It is in the national interest, and we need the federal government to come to the table.

This inquiry will examine how we can balance environmental outcomes while driving economic growth without tying up businesses and project proponents in bureaucracy and regulation. Importantly, the inquiry will address jurisdictional challenges and will examine the extent to which ongoing Commonwealth-state bilateral agreements, accreditation frameworks and related arrangements provide opportunities to reduce duplication in existing planning, land management and environmental frameworks.

For a decade, the former Labor government treated our resources and agricultural industries with contempt, constantly moving the goalposts. The Crisafulli government is delivering certainty and efficiency for the state's resources, agriculture and housing sectors, and we are calling on the federal government to play its part in streamlining approvals. We cannot afford to have political ideology as a barrier to boosting sovereign capability and delivering energy security for our state and our nation. That is why it is important that the Productivity Commission undertake this work, hearing from stakeholders and gathering evidence to ensure Queensland's efforts to improve productivity are not thwarted by federal government regulation.

Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (9.55 am): The Prime Minister went to the last election promising that EPBC reform would lift productivity, streamline approvals and make it easier to get projects moving. That was the pitch. After Labor's deal with the Greens, what we are seeing on the ground is something very different. We are seeing reform in parts, not the full picture. We are seeing new layers of unnecessary protection being added. There is not enough focus on removing duplication. There is not enough recognition of the strong environmental approval system that already exists in the states.

Queensland already has an environmental regulator. It is called the Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation. It is my department's role to enforce environmental protection laws and safeguard our environment. The regulator provides community, industry and local government with certainty through decisions that assess environmental impacts. Those decisions are based on the best available information, guided by science, informed by risk and aligned with strong policy and legislation. Where there are breaches of environmental obligations, we take timely enforcement action to reduce the risk of environmental harm and protect the community.


The question is simple: if Queensland already has a leading regulator, why should proponents be asked to do something twice? Why are they navigating two systems which assess many of the same issues? How does that improve productivity? This is where the gap is becoming clear. If reform is about productivity then duplication has to go. If reform is about certainty then the pathway needs to be clear. If reform is about getting projects moving then the system needs to work in practice, not just on paper.

If we want to look at a test case, we need look no further than the Taroom Trough. It is a region that has enormous potential for regional Queensland. It is a region that can support jobs, investment and energy security, all while protecting the environment. Projects in that basin will already be subject to Queensland's environmental approvals. They will go through rigorous environmental assessments, and then they will face a second Commonwealth process which will look at many of the same matters on different timelines with different requirements.

That duplication adds time. It adds cost. It adds uncertainty. It slows decisions that should be straightforward. It makes it harder to get projects, particularly projects of this kind of national interest, off the ground. For Queenslanders, that matters. It means delays to investment. It means slower job creation in regional Queensland. It means it will be harder to get on with building the infrastructure and energy projects our state needs.

We support strong environmental protections. We support sensible reform, but reform should make the system better, not more complicated. At the end of the day, Queenslanders were promised a system that would protect the environment and lift productivity, a system that would cut green tape and a system that would help get projects moving. Right now that is not what we are seeing, and it is Queenslanders who feel the impact when projects are delayed, investment is held back and opportunity is slowed.

Trade, Fuel Security

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.59 am): We are navigating a period of great global uncertainty, and trade conditions are constantly being reshaped by instability, supply chain disruption and shifting investment patterns. It is no secret that Queenslanders are being impacted by the ongoing conflict in the Middle East. A key issue, as we know, is fuel, and our exporters are not immune.

We keep hearing from those opposite that our government should be doing more. I am not surprised those opposite are confused about which level of government is responsible for what. Labor certainly did not understand how to run a government during their decade of decline and they never took any responsibility. We on this side of the chamber know that it is not a state-based problem; it is a nationwide problem and therefore requires a national response.

A nationally coordinated approach is required to see fuel flow where it is needed, and that is why we continue to push for a national dashboard—so Queenslanders have certainty and access to information about fuel. The role of a state government is to act in the interests of the people they represent within its responsibilities, and we do not begrudge other states for doing the same. While the fuel crisis is a national issue, I and members of our government continue to meet with our international partners to ensure they know that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is a stable, reliable and certain destination—and they know it, unlike when those opposite were in power.


For many Queensland exporters, this current situation is translating into rising costs, constrained freight options, longer delivery times and increased volatility in offshore demand. However, Queensland exporters are better placed than many to respond, thanks to the work of the Crisafulli LNP government. Our export sector is reporting strong resilience, with many exporters continuing to export despite the challenges, and strategies to pivot to other markets are taking place.

Under the Crisafulli LNP government, Trade and Investment Queensland has activated a global trade disruption response plan to provide practical, timely support to exporters, particularly small and family owned businesses. Services are being delivered through our new Queensland Exporter Academy, a central hub of information for our businesses to deliver up-to-date market insights, business advisory services, freight and logistics guidance, and information on financial assistance.

The Crisafulli LNP government knows how critical it is to support businesses when times are tough, which is why we are so committed to helping our exporters through this period of turbulence. It is also why the Crisafulli LNP government is determined to get back to a time when we can drill, refine and store our own fuel again. Our government is unlocking Australia's first oilfield in 50 years at the Taroom Trough to deliver future fuel security. We have a solution and we are calling on the federal government to assess the Taroom Trough under the national interest fast-track assessment pathway, removing delays in bringing mass oil production to market.

This is the 'Queensland of opportunity'—and we are open for business. We are unlocking new investment and development opportunities to secure the future economic prosperity and resilience of Queensland households, businesses and exporters.

Freight Industry, Fuel Security

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.03 am): As Australia's most decentralised state, Queensland's freight movements rely heavily on trucks. Right now our freight operators are struggling with the high cost of fuel. I note the recent Fair Work Commission order for businesses to review the rates that they pay for road freight. While I acknowledge this action is necessary to support freight operators, it is also likely to impact what Australians pay at the check-out at a time when families are already struggling.


I call on all retailers, particularly the big supermarkets, to do the right thing and resist passing on those costs to consumers. Now is not the time for the big supermarkets to protect their profits at the expense of their customers. It is not just consumers who are doing it tough; Queensland's primary producers are also affected. Queensland farmers are some of the most efficient in the world, but when it is more expensive to put diesel in a tractor, a combine or a cane harvester, or even to put avgas in a mustering chopper, the rising cost of fuel is pushing up the cost of agricultural production, which will bite at the farm gate and will eat into the bottom line. That is why the Crisafulli government is continuing to do what we can to improve productivity in the freight sector, to help turn the tide on increasing freight costs while ensuring goods are continuing to get to market.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the member for Gregory for his work as part of the Ministerial Freight Council and specifically the work he is doing on heavy vehicle access issues. Together with key industry players, the Ministerial Freight Council is seeking to identify and to address the network restrictions that are holding back our freight operators.

I want to take a moment to acknowledge the important contributions of people like Gary Mahon of the Queensland Trucking Association and Jared Seiler of the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association, with whom I remain in regular contact. I had a chance to address the LRTAQ national conference a couple of weeks ago—alongside the member for Burnett; the member for Hinchinbrook; and the Assistant Minister for Western Queensland, the member for Gregory—speaking directly to operators on the challenges like fuel to let them know that our government is focused on improving freight productivity and on backing them in.

I acknowledge it is not an easy task. Labor's decade of decline has resulted in chronic underinvestment right across Queensland's road network. Many poor bridges and structures are load limited and they cannot be fixed overnight. Make no mistake: where an opportunity exists, we will find it and we will fix it. This is a government that will fight for Queensland's freight operators. I call on the federal government to ensure that they deliver a strong and timely response to this fuel crisis to protect the future of Queensland's trucking industry.

Small and Family Business, Fuel Security

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (10.06 am): Queensland small and family businesses are facing uncertainty due to the federal Labor government failing to plan and secure our fuel supply. These challenges are being felt across the sector, from retail shop owners to tradespeople and tourism operators, and many other industries in every corner of our great state.

Fuel supply is a national responsibility which means that small and family businesses are crying out for federal leadership and consistency. Business needs timely information in order to make informed decisions. Data from Business Chamber Queensland's Fuel Disruption Survey highlights the scale of the issue, with more than 95 per cent of over 1,600 Queensland businesses surveyed reporting direct impacts. Businesses are being forced to take action. Almost half—47 per cent—are reducing production or service levels; almost one-third—31 per cent—are forced to pass costs onto customers; and one in five—18 per cent—are reducing operating hours.

The Crisafulli government is delivering support for small and family businesses and, as soon as international tensions rose, we acted. We called out fuel security and appointed senior official Bob Gee as the key contact to ensure effective communication between jurisdictions and industry. The Premier has requested consistently a national fuel dashboard, and other states have followed.

We are continuing to engage closely with small and family businesses and industry leaders. Just last week Queensland Small Business Commissioner, Ms Nicolle Kelly, and I, along with Mr Gee, met with small businesses, chambers of commerce and small business leaders from across the state to hear directly—firsthand feedback—from them about the ongoing impact of federal Labor's fuel crisis. Small business owners, chambers and industry leaders also put forward the firsthand experiences that they and their staff were continually feeling. They are hurting. That is why now more than ever

Queenslanders should get out and support small and family businesses in their local communities. What better time to do it than in Queensland Small Business Month 2026, kicking off in a little over a week on 1 May. It is another way the Crisafulli government is delivering for Queensland's small and family businesses during this difficult time.


This Small Business Month we will be hosting small business expos in Cairns, on the Gold Coast and in Brisbane to help small and family businesses build resilience, embrace innovation and seize opportunities. The expos are part of our plan to end Labor's decade of decline when they failed to deliver the support that small and family businesses actually needed.

Small and family businesses can now register to attend Queensland Small Business Month expos. Attendees will have direct access to mentoring, financial counselling and cybersecurity advice—practical, grassroots assistance that will help business protect themselves, plan ahead and make informed decisions. These expos will also help businesses position themselves for future opportunities and those linked to the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, ensuring that Queensland small and family businesses are not merely spectators but active participants in the economic benefits ahead.

Registrations are now open at business.qld.gov.au, and I encourage all small and family businesses to attend. For the first time this year, 45 collaboration partners will play a pivotal role in making a real difference to Queensland's 508,000 small and family businesses, delivering tailored events and initiatives across Queensland throughout May. We have also provided event delivery grants to chambers of commerce, industry associations and local councils across 28 regions to support tailored events that help small businesses grow opportunities.

I and many members on this side of the House look forward to attending these events and others across the state and listening directly to business owners. We understand that small and family businesses are indeed the backbone of our state's economy. The Crisafulli government urges all Queenslanders to get out and shop locally and support their small and family business community.

Tourism Industry, Fuel Security

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (10.10 am): Fuel uncertainty is a real national challenge for the tourism industry and Queensland is feeling it first and hardest. We have been clear: the industry needs certainty. That starts with a national fuel dashboard, because without it operators and travellers are being left to make big decisions in the dark.


I have been out speaking directly with operators right across Queensland. I met with nearly 30 tourism leaders from all over Queensland at a forum here in Brisbane. I have been in Cairns and Rockhampton meeting with local businesses and tourism leaders on the ground. Next week I will be in Longreach to continue those conversations in the heart of regional and outback Queensland. Wherever I go, the message is the same: uncertainty around fuel is making it incredibly hard—harder for operators to price and harder to give travellers the confidence to book. We are seeing the real-world consequences of this play out in our regions. The federal government's fuel messaging has created confusion in the market, and that is having an impact on markets like outback tourism. We have had mayors from across regional Queensland write directly to the Prime Minister raising concerns about cancellations and reduced forward bookings as a result. This is exactly why a national fuel dashboard matters.

Outback Queensland depends on interstate travellers—people from Victoria and New South Wales—hitching up the caravan and heading north, but right now they are being hit with mixed messages: 'stay close to home' one day, 'travel' the next. That confusion does not build confidence; it drives hesitation. When travellers hesitate, bookings drop. That is the real cost of national dithering and it is being felt most in regional Queensland. Our regions rely on people getting in the car, towing their caravan, hitching up the boat and hitting the road. That is how people experience our state. That is how regional economies grow.

Fuel is not a side issue for our tourism operators; it is central to how they do business. It affects their margins, it affects their workforce and it affects whether visitors make the trip in the first place. For many small operators, particularly in regional areas, even modest shifts in fuel costs or supply can have a real impact on day-to-day decisions. That is why I have written to federal tourism minister Don Farrell calling for clarity on what the Albanese government is doing to support the industry through this period. This sits squarely with Canberra. Fuel security, supply and transparency are national responsibilities, and right now industry is asking for something pretty straightforward: a clear line of sight. A national fuel dashboard would give operators and travellers access to consistent, reliable information, helping them plan ahead and manage risks with greater confidence.


We will keep working closely with industry, we will keep listening to what they are telling us on the ground, and we will keep backing Queensland tourism as part of our plan to grow the visitor economy. When it comes to fuel certainty, the ball is in the federal government's court. Queenslanders are not asking for miracles; they are asking for practical action and they are asking for transparency. They deserve to see a plan that gives them the confidence to keep investing, keep employing and keep welcoming visitors to our great state.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER


 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.13 am): Mr Speaker, I advise that the Minister for Primary Industries will be absent for today's sitting. I advise that the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development will answer questions for the minister in question time.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games


 **Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (10.13 am): Mr Speaker, I rise to address the recent commentary about my electoral enrolment. It is public knowledge that I had a marriage separation over a year ago, and many who have experienced similar circumstances would understand the uncertainty that can follow. During this period I am fortunate that I had friends to whom I could turn for support. I updated the Electoral Commission of Queensland with my correct details when my circumstances changed. I am currently enrolled at my permanent address and I have complied with the requirements of the Electoral Commission of Queensland at all times. To put this matter to rest, I have written to the Electoral Commissioner of Queensland to affirm that I have followed the appropriate processes.

Comments by Member for Macalister, Apology

 **Ms McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (10.14 am): Mr Speaker, on 26 March I made a contribution which at the time I genuinely understood did not breach standing order 233. I have been advised that it may have, and as such I apologise to the House unreservedly for this inadvertent procedural error.

STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE


Alleged Unauthorised Disclosure of Committee Proceedings, Referral to Ethics Committee

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (10.15 am): In accordance with standing order 268(1), I rise as chair of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee to report that a matter involving the unauthorised disclosure of private committee proceedings has arisen. The committee has resolved to recommend that the matter be referred to the Ethics Committee for examination. The matter involves the disclosure of recommendations contained in the committee's report No. 21, 58th Parliament: *Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland* to a journalist prior to the report being tabled. On behalf of the committee, I advise the House of the referral so that standing order 271 can be invoked.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.16 am.

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

 **Mr MILES** (10.16 am): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that all of his ministers have been compliant with the Electoral Act at all times?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I know what this matter relates to. The honourable member has just said that he has sought clarification from the Electoral Commission of Queensland, and I hope that might allow the opposition to take some comfort. I do note what the Leader of the Opposition is alluding to in his question; I understand that. The member has put the matter to bed.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will read that again. The minister has sought clarification from the ECQ. I do note that the member has not asked the minister any questions about his portfolio, so I am very happy to give the honourable member an update on what the member has been doing. He has been fixing the mess left by those opposite. He has been investing in grassroots sports right across this state with the biggest investment we have seen. There would not be a member in this House who has not seen, put forward or been the beneficiary of that vision in that space. I know that in my own community of Broadwater the Runaway Bay Cricket Club has been one of those beneficiaries.

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

Mr SPEAKER: It is a fair point of order, Premier. You have answered the question. If you have nothing more to say on that specific question, we will go to the next question.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Mr Speaker, I am seeking to furnish the honourable member with some further information about the member.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you have answered the question. I do not know if you have anything more to add. The minister can speak to his own portfolio when he has an opportunity.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Fine, Mr Speaker. If I can just point out to—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am moving on. The honourable member asked about the importance of disclosures when it comes to the Electoral Commission. I understand that, which is why the first action I took as Premier was to get rid of Mike Kaiser as the director-general. There is a reason, and that is because compliance with electoral acts is very important. If someone is a self-confessed electoral rorter—

Mr Miles interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you get a bit of leeway because of your position, but you are well aware of the standing orders of this House.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The Leader of the Opposition is well aware of the standing orders but he is very desperate at the moment—very desperate. He is clinging on by his fingertips.

Mr SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, please.

Mr CRISAFULLI: He knows why. He has one month to go. The Leader of the Opposition knows it, this chamber knows it and all of his team know it. As a result there is the sloppiness, the laziness and the overreach. We are seeing it time and time again. I say to the Leader of the Opposition: if he wants to contrast his attitude to electoral reform with mine, let me go. The head of the Public Service right now is an independent, apolitical public servant. The Leader of the Opposition put a self-confessed electoral rorter in that role.

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Sport. I refer to the minister's statement this morning. Can he confirm that he has complied with his obligations under federal electoral laws?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to standing order 113. The question is not about administration or portfolio responsibility with respect to the minister's obligations. I ask you to consider that matter, particularly given that the Leader of the Opposition seems to be politicising a personal matter.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I wish to submit a contrary view to the Leader of the House. The standing orders clearly indicate that questions can be asked of ministers in relation to public affairs, and the public sector code of ethics, which applies to ministers, indicates that they have a duty to uphold the system of government and the laws of the state, Commonwealth and local government. Therefore, the question is in order.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take some advice. We are probably stretching the boundaries here a little bit. Minister, you spoke about your position before. I will allow you to answer the question.

Mr MANDER: Thanks, Mr Speaker, and thank you for the question. I am happy to confirm again what I have said time and time again on this issue. I have updated the Electoral Commission of Queensland with correct details when circumstances have changed. I am currently enrolled at my

permanent address and I have complied with ECQ requirements on every occasion. Mr Speaker, why are they so focused on my personal details? That is the question. Why are they so focused on that? What are they trying to divert attention away from? It can be only one thing: that is, the division within their ranks when it comes to legislation that will come before this House.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lytton.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier!

Mr MANDER: The question that has to be asked is: why are they so focused on my personal circumstances?

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

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

Mr MANDER: When we talk in this House about the important matters the people of Queensland are concerned about, we talk about the crime rates that we are trying to address after 10 years of decline where there was a 193 per cent increase in crime. Is it any wonder they are trying to distract—

Ms Pease interjected.

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

Mr MANDER—away from the issues that Queenslanders are really concerned about.

As the Premier said earlier, I am focused on ensuring that we deliver a games in 2032 that Queenslanders will be proud of and rescuing us from the mess that we inherited and the chaotic decision-making that took place for over 1,000 days. Thank goodness that, after announcing our Delivery Plan 12 months ago, public sentiment has changed and Queenslanders are behind our Delivery Plan, and that is what we are focusing on.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was about compliance with federal electoral laws.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I accept your ruling in relation to allowing the question. However, there was reference to portfolio responsibilities, and the minister is being responsive in relation to portfolio responsibilities, which was part of the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: That is correct. I did allow the minister to answer the question and it was a bit of a stretch. Minister, I will allow you to continue your response. You have 27 seconds left. There is no point of order.

Mr MANDER: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This side of the House is focusing on the matters that Queenslanders are concerned about. The fuel crisis that we have in this country at the moment is the issue that people are most concerned about. They are the issues we are interested in. We are trying to address the rising crime rates, and we are having success with that. That is another issue that we are focused on.

Mr Mellish interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Those issues are not within this minister's portfolio either. My point of order is on relevance. The question was about compliance with federal electoral laws.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, are you finished?

Mr MANDER: Yes.

Fuel Security

Mr WATTS: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering nation-leading fuel security measures, and is the Premier aware of any approaches where Queensland's fuel security was decimated during a decade of decline?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to thank the honourable member for the question.

Mr Mellish interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, you are warned.

Mr CRISAFULLI: He is a member who represents a region that relies so much on fuel—whether it is for agriculture, tourism or the many small and family businesses. I want to thank him for his advocacy. The member used the word ‘nation-leading’ and I am going to touch on that in relation to two occasions. There were two instances of nation-leading behaviour from this side of the House. One, we were the first state government to call out this fuel crisis, and I want to thank the honourable members who took up the call. When we did, we were mocked in the federal parliament of this nation, but it turned out to be the right call and I want to thank the Treasurer and the Deputy Premier for the way they advocated. It was the right decision.

The second thing that has been nation-leading is that we are the first government in this nation for half a century to say, ‘We must secure our own destiny.’ We were the first government that was prepared to say before the fuel crisis that it is not good enough that we no longer refine in this state and in this nation, and it is not good enough that we no longer drill and control our own sovereignty and store our own fuel. We did that before the crisis.

I point to when the Minister for Natural Resources stood up in this place and first announced that we were going to tender and then announced the successful tenderers. I want to contrast that with the feedback and the push back he received at the time when he was talking about fuel security. We are leaning into it and I am asking the opposition to lean into it. I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition will not lean into it because this is a matter of national sovereignty and security.

I ask the Leader of the Opposition: what is stopping him from advocating for this plan? Why are Labor and the Greens here in Queensland and in Canberra trying to put roadblocks on a once-in-a-generation opportunity to secure our fuel sovereignty in this country? Is it because, as the member for Burnett says, it is not in their DNA? Do they owe their existence to a group? Right now there is an opportunity for the people of this state to stand up and say, ‘We believe in this plan,’ and we do have a plan for the short term, medium term and long term. I want the Leader of the Opposition and those opposite to stand up and say, ‘We back it. We want to drill for our own fuel. We want to see it refined in this country. We want to be storing it,’ and I do not know why the Leader of the Opposition will not do it. Someone has to explain in this House why the Leader of the Opposition will not back a plan to secure our fuel sovereignty in this state.

(Time expired)

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Attorney-General. The *Australian* reported that the Minister for Sport declared his relationship with the Minister for Child Safety on 14 July 2025 and is reported to have enrolled at an Arana Hills residence ‘some time later’. Will the Attorney-General refer this matter for investigation to both the Electoral Commission of Queensland and the Australian Electoral Commission?

Mr Crisafulli: Couldn’t pivot.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the honourable member from the other side for the question. I will take the Premier’s interjection: she cannot pivot. I say to all of those opposite: not only did the honourable sport minister stand in this House and give the entire House a personal explanation—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, I just called for order. You are warned under the standing orders.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—about the fact—

Mr Bleijie: And yesterday in the media.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection: also in the media yesterday. They would always be hiding but I will say that the minister has stood in this chamber not once but twice and said that he has written to the Electoral Commissioner. It is probably a bit tough for the former attorney-general to remember, but it is actually the Queensland Electoral Commission that then guides the information for the Australian Electoral Commission. I know it is a bit tough to understand that link. As a former attorney-general you would think she would know that. You would think maybe the shadow attorney-general would help her out and say, ‘Come on.’

Let's look at their history. This is a former Labor government whose culture and integrity the premier of the day had to commission a report into, because it was completely in the gutter. It was interesting because, whilst I have been sitting in the chamber listening to the honourable sport minister give his explanation in this House, those opposite—

A government member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I knew they would not be able to pivot. We have learned from experience; they are pretty steady. Coaldrake's report into those opposite is interesting. They are sitting there smiling away because they know of the culture of fear and intimidation that was led by ministers opposite, led by their ministerial staffers. I think they even talked about the fact that maybe staplers were thrown—

Honourable members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I cannot find it in all these texts, but this report said—

All of these matters are compounded by a culture too tolerant of bullying, unwilling to give life to—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I do not see the relevance in this answer to a question about a referral to the AEC.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the Manager of Opposition Business's point of order, the Attorney-General is being responsive and she has referenced elements to do with the Electoral Commission of Queensland. She is providing a detailed response and she is talking about the kind of culture under the former government.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you have heard the question. You have 12 seconds to respond.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is obvious that those opposite do not even know how the ECQ and the AEC work. Maybe the shadow attorney-general would like to help out the former attorney-general. You would think she would know better.

(Time expired)

Manufacturing and Resources Industries

Mr DILLON: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government securing our sovereign manufacturing capabilities, particularly in our vital resources sector, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches that left Queensland exposed and vulnerable during a decade of decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Gregory for the question. I want to thank him because if anyone knows resources it is the member for Gregory. His electorate is booming because of the Crisafulli government's coordinated projects and prescribed projects, just like I mentioned in my ministerial statement. On this side of the House, the LNP government backs resource-rich industries in regional and rural Queensland. Labor are doing a lot of talking at the moment but they had 10 years to do it and never did. What was their plan on the Taroom Trough? They did not have one and now they are whingeing and whining. Where have we heard it before? The Labor Party opposition are whingeing and whining; that is all they do. I say they should get a program and get a plan in place.

Earlier when I was asked the question about alternatives and what has been the issue, the honourable the Premier interjected and said, 'People just need to lean in on this stuff.' We have people leaning in on it. The LNP government is leaning in on it. The resources industry is leaning in on it. Shell is leaning in on it. We are leaning in on the oil substance and the honourable resources minister—look at this: Queensland-made. The only thing more slippery than that is the opposition leader.

Mr O'Connor: And nowhere near as valuable.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: nowhere near as valuable. When the Premier was saying 'lean in on', I was thinking, 'I have heard this before. Where have I heard it?' I am reminded of LEAN—that is, Labor Environment Action Network. They put out a post on 27 November 2025 when the federal government got rid of fossil fuels from the EPBC Act and made it virtually impossible to get this sort of thing approved. That post was congratulating and championing those who closed the loopholes to remove fossil fuels from the fast-track approval process. There it is in black and white, the Labor Environment Action Network congratulating the federal Labor government. I table that.

Tabled paper: Extract from social media, dated 27 November 2025, featuring a post by 'Lean Qld—Labor Environment Action Network' regarding environment laws [\[544\]](#).

Earlier the Premier said, 'Why are people not leaning in?' I ask: why is the opposition leader not leaning in and supporting us on the Taroom Trough? He says that he is. I have here a photo of the opposition leader with LEAN, congratulating LEAN. I table that photo.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, attending a LEAN function [\[545\]](#).

That shows the opposition leader at a function congratulating the federal government on changing EPBC legislation. It is not in his blood; it is not in his DNA. He does not support the Taroom Trough. That is the reality. They do not back regional Queensland and they do not back Queensland.

(Time expired)

Members of Parliament, Accommodation

Ms FARMER: My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been made aware of any of his ministers living permanently in the parliament?

Mr SPEAKER: Just hold on for a moment.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, I am getting advice.

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member, it is I who is responsible for the parliamentary precinct, not the Premier, so I will rule that question out of order.

Resources Industries

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government fast-tracking approvals for critical resource projects to secure Queensland's sovereign capabilities, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any approaches that got in the way of these approvals during a decade of decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Scenic Rim for the question because, like him, we are backing regional Queensland because of the tireless advocacy from our regional members and members in South-East Queensland who back Queensland and back Queenslanders. No matter in which electorate our members are representing the LNP across the state, we back the plan and we back the Taroom Trough because we need to build our sovereign capability. That is why we are supporting not only what the Minister for Natural Resources is doing but also the Sovereign Industry Development Fund. We are looking across the state at biomed, biofuel and defence. That is the priority of the Crisafulli government.

There has been a remarkable turn of events in the last year and a half in terms of what the Crisafulli government has done with coordinated projects and fast-tracking approval processes. However, there is one thing getting in the way—well, there are two. There are two things getting in the way of fast-tracked approvals for these projects: the first is the federal Albanese Labor government and its EPBC legislation and the second is the Leader of the Opposition and the state Labor team. It is not in their DNA to support these projects. Those opposite have done a lot of press conferences recently about the Taroom Trough project, but why would they not pick up the phone to their Labor comrade mates in Canberra and say, 'Make it happen, Murray,' because the federal government can make it happen but will not because the Leader of the Opposition is in the far left of the Labor Party? It is not in his DNA to support these types of projects.

As I alluded to earlier, LEAN, the Labor Environment Action Network, has another post from 30 November 2025 when it was congratulating the federal government for putting fossil fuels as an anti-development opportunity in Queensland in the EPBC legislation. It congratulated legislating a renewable energy framework and targets and it mentioned opposition leader Miles in its press release helping get Queensland LEAN off the ground. The photo I tabled earlier was a very recent photo from 2025, but then I read this comment where it was congratulating the opposition leader, Steven Miles, for helping the Labor Environment Action Network get off the ground. I thought to myself, 'When did this happen?', because that was the most recent photo in November 2025. Well, here it is: LEAN, the Labor Environment Action Network, with a very young looking Steven Miles, the now opposition leader. Look at him in the leather coat!

Mr SPEAKER: No props.

Mr BLEIJIE: I table it.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the Leader of the Opposition, Hon. Steven Miles MP, attending a LEAN function [546].

Mr Nicholls: Was he lifting weights?

Mr BLEIJIE: No, he has a cast on. He was not lifting weights in that picture, but he is certainly lifting Labor's anti-policy for Queensland. That is the reality. Those opposite are not going to get behind it. They are not going to pick up the phone to Murray because the Labor leader does not believe in it.

(Time expired)

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Mr DICK: My question is to the Minister for Sport. The minister's charter letter states that it is critical to remember that every decision a minister makes and all actions taken must be in the interests of the Queensland public. Can the minister assure Queenslanders that he has complied with all of his legal obligations at all times?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have a copy of the charter letter in front of me and I cannot see that specific section in terms of the reference, but my point of order also relates to seeking an opinion in relation to the question as asked and I just ask whether you could consider that matter in relation to how it is actually framed.

Mr SPEAKER: Just one second.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question speaks for itself. It is asking for a direct answer to a direct question on whether he has complied with his legal obligations as a minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Okay. I am taking advice.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Once again I am going to allow the question, but I am going to allow a bit of latitude to answer it because that was, once again, a pretty broad question.

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for the question. It was a while ago, but I think the question was about the decisions that I make and whether I have always complied with the appropriate regulations. I think it was something along those lines.

Mr Dick: The law.

Mr MANDER: Thank you. I take that interjection. Let's start talking about some of the decisions that I have made since I have been minister. One of the first decisions I made in consultation and cooperation with the Premier and the Deputy Premier was the 2032 Delivery Plan that was announced over 13 months ago with regard to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. That was a process that took quite some time after the 100-day review, and I can assure the opposition spokesperson that, in making those decisions, I complied with every law of this state and ensured that we were acting in the best interests of Queenslanders, and Queenslanders have now responded that way with a ringing endorsement of our plan.

When I made decisions about Games On! funding, a \$250 million program, to ensure that our community sporting organisations had the infrastructure that they deserve so that we can have a pipeline of young people to provide elite athletes for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, the decisions I made about that were all compliant with state government regulations and laws. When it came to the QAS, the Queensland Academy of Sport, and the decision to fast-track the transition of the QAS from departmental control to a statutory authority, a lot of work went into that to ensure that it was done 12 months quicker than the previous government was going to do it—and it was going to do it reluctantly—and I can confidently say that I complied with every law of the state and ensured that we did that appropriately. I remember a recent decision to do with upgrades to Browne Park in Rockhampton where we had to put in more funding because the previous government forgot a couple of very important things with regard to that funding such as ensuring there were broadcast standard lights, ensuring there was a great scoreboard and ensuring that there was grass on the field. I can assure the House that every decision made about Browne Park was made in accordance with state laws and regulations.

(Time expired)

Resources Industries

Mr G KELLY: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development. How is the Crisafulli LNP government unlocking Australia's first oilfield in over half a century, and is the minister aware of any policies that failed to unlock Queensland natural resources during a decade of decline?

Mr LAST: I thank the member for the question. He is a member who understands all too well what this fuel crisis is doing to those who live on the land in regional and rural Queensland and how tough they are doing it at the moment. To see this we need look no further than to the RFDS simulator that sits outside this place today. I was talking to the staff this morning. There has been \$3 million extra in fuel costs already since the start of this crisis.

I want to highlight that this is a government that is planning for the future of this state. This is a government that saw the need to develop our own sovereign capability when it comes to fuel reserves and resources in Queensland. In May last year I issued nine tenements and in March this year I issued another 12, because we saw a need to develop this capability in this state. I did so under the mantra of 'I'll sign, you drill'. That is what they are doing out there in the Taroom Trough. The Premier and I and the member for Callide were out there a couple of weeks ago looking at those wells that are producing oil as we speak—

Ms Grace interjected.

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

Mr LAST:—oil which is being refined in Queensland for the use of Queenslanders, and we will continue to do that.

Mr O'Connor: But what does it look like?

Mr LAST: I take that interjection; isn't it beautiful? Good enough to kiss!

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I do not want to see that prop again.

Ms Grace interjected.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for McConnel interjected. I understand that she is already on a warning.

Mr SPEAKER: I was watching the Leader of the House. I will be watching.

Mr LAST: When you go to the Taroom Trough and you see that drilling rig in action and that oil being produced out there—the next step, of course, is to develop—

Ms Grace interjected.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. I understand that the member for McConnel is interjecting again and I ask you to consider that matter. She is already on a warning.

Mr SPEAKER: I will run the House. Minister, do you have anything more to add?

Mr LAST: I certainly do have some more to say on this topic. We are going to develop that refinery here in Queensland because we want to produce fuel that meets the needs of all Queenslanders. We want to produce fuel that can be used and purchased from the Torres Strait to Currumbin. I will bet that in the next month the voters in the electorate of Stafford will appreciate what we are doing when it comes to easing cost-of-living pressures in this state. We are about alleviating cost-of-living pressures and delivering for the state of Queensland. I will continue to sign the applications that come into my office because we are a pro-resource state and we are a pro-resource government.

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Mr FURNER: My question is to the Minister for Sport. For how many days did the minister sleep at the Arana Hills residence which he declared as his primary place of residence for at least three months?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I am ruling the question out of order.

Fuel Security

Mr LISTER: My question is to the Treasurer, the Minister for Energy and the Minister for Home Ownership. How is the Crisafulli LNP government working with suppliers and industry to enhance the reliability of fuel supply, and is the Treasurer aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for Southern Downs for the question, because it was he who spoke most passionately earliest about concerns with fuel supply in his communities across the Southern Downs, from Stanthorpe, Texas and Inglewood to Allora. Those early complaints are what drove us to write to the ACCC about predatory pricing activities and behaviours and to write to Chris Bowen warning that Queensland was on the precipice of a major challenge. We were mocked about that but we were proven correct. The member for Southern Downs led that early charge, and I thank him for his advocacy for the important communities he represents in Southern Downs.

The honourable member asked me about engagement and the role we are playing with industry stakeholders and suppliers. I acknowledge the efforts of Bob Gee and our taskforce in feeding important information to Anthea Harris and the national taskforce. Bob is doing important work. The Premier referred to a meeting last week where we met not just with agriculture and resources but, importantly, with freight and logistics to make sure they are aware of the concerns. We take their feedback and they hear from Mr Gee, who is doing an outstanding job coordinating that effort. That is on top of all of the feedback we are giving to the federal government—whether it be through NOSEC, ECMC meetings or the National Cabinet. The information we are garnering from fuel suppliers forms part of our information base. All of that is important work that we are delivering.

The honourable member also asked me about the alternatives. The Premier has talked about it. We know that there should be a national dashboard in this country because we are flying blind. Industry is flying blind. Consumers are flying blind. Chris Bowen, through a national dashboard, must give information in terms of what is contracted, what is here and what is on the high seas. That is important information that we must have. That is important information that will feed growing confidence, and that is why we continue to advocate for a national dashboard.

What are the alternatives from those opposite? We have heard time and again this morning that they are not supporting the Taroom Trough. They will not be picking up the phone to their federal masters and advocating for Queensland's interests as we have been doing. They should be picking up the phone not just to Chris Bowen about the national dashboard; they should pick up the phone to the relevant federal minister, Murray Watt. He used to represent a northern Brisbane seat. Murray Watt knows that they are holding up supply. The people of Stafford know that those opposite are holding up long-term fuel security for Queensland. The people of Stafford understand, and those opposite should understand it too.

(Time expired)

CopperString

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. The QIC are privatising CopperString and refusing to confirm that the western link will be built. Has the Premier categorically instructed the Treasurer and QIC to build CopperString all the way to Mount Isa regardless of QIC's recommendations, in line with multiple public statements by the Premier to that effect?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the honourable member for the question. I will answer it with two words: you bet. The honourable member asked a good question and it deserves a good response. That project is absolutely needed in this state. That project was advocated for by the member for a long time, but those opposite never had their heart in it—they never did. They never funded it properly. They never set up the proper planning vehicles for it. They never understood how to deliver it. This minister has done, in a short period, what those opposite would never have been able to—a record investment of \$2.4 billion.

The honourable member asked a good question about the western link. That western link is absolutely essential. If you are to bring on the critical minerals that I am so passionate about and see as an opportunity for this state into the future, that line needs to run all the way. The first link going to the eastern section makes sense. We have to connect it to the NEM. If you do not connect it to the NEM, you do not have the ability sooner to connect and drive those projects to come on.

Long-term, CopperString must go all the way to the west. It has to for the following reasons. Firstly, the people in this state need to know that we have a plan to invest in renewable energy in the kinds of areas where the community is crying out for it. The honourable member represents a community that is crying out for this investment. We set a planning framework. We called time on the

days of rolling out renewables and high-value agriculture in people's backyards where they did not want them. We established a blueprint to ensure that investment can be delivered in exactly the areas the honourable member talks about.

I make the observation that there was a reason this government invested in ensuring the long-term viability of that smelter was secure: it opened up the opportunity for investment. That was the first thing. The second thing is that it ensured the viability of a fertiliser plant in this state—and we did that long before the crisis. Long before the crisis we were looking at the long-term viability of fuel in this state. Long before the crisis we were investing in securing fertiliser capacity for this state.

This is a government not driven—like those opposite—on survival, on undermining, on backstabbing; this is a government that delivers on economic opportunities, long-term viability and sovereign capability. That is what we invested in. The annals of history will record those opposite sending things offshore, failing to invest in renewable energy where it was needed and not backing projects like CopperString. I am going to give the honourable member the clearest and most definitive answer I can: yes, it absolutely must. I do want to thank the honourable member for asking what is a very good question.

Health Services

Ms DOOLEY: My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering more health services closer to home and is the minister aware of any approaches that could never have delivered the beds Queenslanders needed during a decade of decline?

Mr NICHOLLS: I want to thank the member for Redcliffe, a former nurse—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit to you that the question as put by the member for Redcliffe contained an inference and therefore I submit to you that the question should be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. There were no inferences as I heard the question.

Mr NICHOLLS: As I said, the member for Redcliffe, a good, hardworking local member, who as a candidate was a good local candidate who brought the experience of being a nurse caring for her community—whose family worked at the Redcliffe Hospital—into this place, and advocated and did what those opposite never, ever could do and that is help deliver a plan that will shape the future of health care on the north side of Brisbane. Queenslanders were abandoned by Labor when it came to delivering healthcare services on the north side, whether at the Royal Brisbane Hospital, whether at the Redcliffe Hospital or whether at the Prince Charles Hospital. All of them were abandoned for a decade under Labor. I have the folder to prove it—'Labor's big book of failures'—always at hand. What does it say about what Labor was talking about when it came to the north side? Also, as members know, I have the Hospital Rescue Plan, put together to save Queensland Health's hospital services from Labor's decade of decline.

In metro north, as I said, where did Labor fail? They failed at the Prince Charles Hospital. They failed to deliver a program. Their plan was found to be full of holes. There was a dearth of investment in infrastructure on the north side. Who was complicit in this failure to invest on the north side? He was miles away. He was working for 'Miles Away'. That was Luke Richmond, Labor's candidate for the seat of Stafford—a former acting chief of staff to a former health minister; a failed adviser to another failed former health minister, now Leader of the Opposition; and an adviser to other health ministers. Three health ministers, three failures, the same person—Luke Richmond, Labor's candidate for Stafford. He was there. He was elevated to the position of assistant state secretary of the Labor Party—taking a woman's position. Given their quota they had to create another position for her.

Where did they fail? There was a \$488 million blowout in the cost of the Prince Charles upgrade—delayed by over two years. They failed to take into account paediatric services. You could turn up there, but just do not take your kids along. That would not have worked because they would not have those services.

(Time expired)

Crisafulli LNP Government, Ministers

Ms MULLEN: My question is to the Premier. When the member for Everton and the member for Whitsundays disclosed their relationship to the cabinet in July 2025, did the Premier seek assurances that both ministers had updated their enrolment details within 21 days as required under the Electoral Act?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to matters of cabinet. The member opposite would be well aware of the conventions in relation to those matters that take place before cabinet. I would ask you to consider that matter.

Mr SPEAKER: The member would be aware of cabinet confidentiality. I will give the Premier latitude in answering the question.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Honourable members, like all members when they serve as ministers of the Crown, always comply, as those opposite would have done in a similar situation. The difference is that when I was in that role I would never have lowered myself to ask a question like that. That is the difference. If you want proof of that, we never asked the question despite the fact that a similar relationship existed—not once; never. I make that observation.

Ms Boyd interjected.

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

Mr CRISAFULLI: Those opposite, and indeed all honourable members, can compare and contrast the way I conduct myself on these matters with that of the Leader of the Opposition. That is what I will say.

I will make another point because I was not afforded the opportunity to answer the member for Bulimba's question. I do not know what the arrangements are for honourable members on the other side. I do not know, member for Bulimba, but I will make one observation: there has been a renovation in the Parliamentary Annexe, and it was conducted under those opposite, and one of the great things about that is the locks were removed from the cupboards.

Youth Crime

Ms JAMES: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering more police resources in the fight against youth crime, particularly in the Far North, and is the minister aware of any alternatives that saw crime explode across Queensland during a decade of decline?

Mr PURDIE: I welcome the question from the honourable member for Barron River—a great question; a question that is no doubt top of mind for a lot of her constituents. It is in stark contrast to the questions we have heard from those opposite today. Crime is a big issue. It is a big issue in Far North Queensland, North Queensland and right across Queensland. We know what created that issue. It is no longer in dispute what created the youth crime crisis across Queensland. It is great to see North Queensland members of parliament in the government advocating fiercely for their communities. That is in stark contrast to what we saw from those opposite. It was awfully frustrating in opposition, sitting over there, when the member for Cairns and other former Labor members for North Queensland sat on their hands and did nothing. They did absolutely nothing.

When robberies were increasing in Cairns by 200 per cent over 10 years and DV breaches were going up 400 per cent, the member for Cairns and those opposite sat on their hands and did absolutely nothing. I welcome the member's question and the advocacy of all of our members, which is in stark contrast to what they did. I should correct the record and be more accurate. When the member for Cairns and those opposite were in government, they did do one thing as crime was spiralling out of control in Cairns. The member for Cairns, on his social media, asked his constituents to watch question time today and I am hoping that they do. In August 2019, one thing the member for Cairns did was support a Labor Party bill, tabled by the member for Bulimba when she was the youth justice minister, to water down youth bail laws in Queensland. In August 2019, the member for Cairns and the Labor members voted on a bill—and I am quoting from a parliamentary document—the policy objective of which was 'to remove legislative barriers to enable more young people to be granted bail'. That is what those opposite did. I should correct the record: I said that they did nothing but they voted in support of watering down youth bail laws in Queensland as crime was spiralling out of control.

I welcome the fierce advocacy of our members in North Queensland, where we will continue to deliver more police. For the first time in the history of Queensland, we now have over 13,000 police on the streets of Queensland. In our first term of government we committed to delivering more than 1,600 new recruits and we have done that in the first 18 months. We have increased the net number of police in Queensland by over 700. In their last term of government they promised 2,000 more police and they delivered fewer than 500. Not only do we have more police; we also have tougher laws and resources. With more police we can deliver, as we have seen in Far North Queensland, the new Tablelands Property Crime Unit that is arresting offenders. We will continue to hold people to account and put them before courts and give the police all the resources they need to drive down crime.

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Ms BUSH: My question is to the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Where was the minister living during the 2025 federal election: Arana Hills or in the Parliamentary Annexe?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: That is another question that has absolutely nothing to do with the minister's portfolio and I rule it out of order.

Youth Crime

Mr CHIESA: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering the strong laws required to ensure safety where Queenslanders live, and is the minister aware of any policies that failed to hold criminals accountable during a decade of decline?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for the question. He has been a fierce advocate for his community in the past five months that he been in this chamber. He is a fierce advocate for stronger laws, particularly on bail. Since he was elected he has been banging down my door fighting for these strong laws, and I thank him for that. The message from the Hinchinbrook electorate has been really clear: they were failed under the previous Labor government and they want a government that will continue to strengthen our laws.

We are a government that is listening. Just yesterday, the Attorney-General, the police minister and I sat down with LNP members from Far North and North Queensland to listen to their concerns in relation to what their communities are facing. They raised with us that Labor's youth crime crisis has seen crime spiral out of control in their communities. They raised with us that Labor's youth crime crisis had seen a revolving door of repeat youth offenders being released on bail and continuing to cause terror in their communities. I thank those North Queensland and Far North Queensland members for continuing to be fierce advocates for their communities, for raising the concerns of their communities, for listening to their communities and for coming into this House and calling on this government to deliver stronger laws. We are listening and we will deliver stronger laws—unlike those opposite, who came into this House, time and time again, and weakened our youth crime laws. They came into this House and made breach of bail not an offence. They came into this House and weakened our bail laws, which saw the youth crime crisis that members are talking about spiral out of control.

In fact, under those opposite victim numbers rose 193 per cent. Under the Crisafulli government, victim numbers have fallen 7.2 per cent. Under those opposite, serious repeat offender numbers rose 64 per cent in just five years. Under the Crisafulli government, we have seen a drop in serious repeat offender numbers of 17 per cent. Those are small inroads because we are coming off such a high bar. We are the first to acknowledge that, and we will keep coming into this House to deliver stronger laws for Queenslanders.

I thank those local members for fighting for stronger bail laws, including breach-of-bail laws, and for fighting for laws that protect their communities, because for a decade we had a Labor government that weakened our laws. For a decade we had a Labor government that came into this House and continually weakened the Youth Justice Act and that saw the youth crime crisis spiral out of control. To the LNP members from the far north and the north who are fighting to make stronger breach-of-bail laws I say thank you. I say: go back to your communities, continue to listen and bring those voices into this House, because this is a government that will continue to strengthen our laws, not weaken them as happened under Labor for a decade.

(Time expired)

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Mr de BRENNI: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. As the minister responsible for administering the Financial Accountability Act 2009, will the Treasurer make inquiries to the accountable officer to ensure the sport minister has appropriately claimed allowances and declared fringe benefits tax appropriately?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the question asked by the Manager of Opposition Business. My point of order relates to matters that are under the jurisdiction of the Clerk and the parliamentary precinct, and you have provided some guidance and advice earlier today in

relation to previous questions. I also reference, in relation to a number of questions asked today, former Speaker Pitt's ruling that questions must be directed to matters for which a minister is presently responsible and not used to place allegations on the record. I submit to you that there have been a number of questions today in a strategy that you have had to rule in relation to and provide guidance on. I also reference those matters that are under the guidance of the Clerk and yourself as the Office of the Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, they are valid points regarding Speaker Pitt's ruling in particular. That is basically what I have been doing today. It is immaterial at the moment because the period for question time has expired.

MOTIONS

Amendments to Sessional Orders



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

The following amendments to Sessional Orders to take effect immediately—

1. Insert new Sessional Order 3A—

'Business Program Motion

- 3A.**
- (1) At any time in Government Business, the Leader of the House may move a motion without notice, that provides for the allocation of time for any business.
 - (2) The motion may include, that:
 - (a) bills be declared cognate in accordance with Standing Order 172;
 - (b) bills or other business on the Notice Paper be reordered; or
 - (c) time for government motions and time limits for speeches.
 - (3) The motion may include a requirement that at the expiration of allotted time or a time specified in (1), all remaining processes and questions necessary to pass the Bill, a stage of the Bill or any other business be put, without further debate, which is taken to include any of the following:
 - (a) when the member in charge of the Bill is to be called on to reply to the second reading debate;
 - (b) the second reading question;
 - (c) clauses and schedules en bloc;
 - (d) any amendments to be moved by the Minister or Member in charge of the Bill; and
 - (e) the third reading and long title.
 - (4) Completion of all questions necessary to pass the Bill, a stage of the Bill or any other business in accordance with (1) and (2) shall take precedence over all other business, with the Order of Business adjusting to recommence after necessary questions are completed.
 - (5) Any agreed Business Program may be amended by a motion without notice, moved by the Leader of the House.'

2. Inserting into the Schedule in Sessional Order 12, before 'Debate of Committee Reports' the following—

'Business Program Motion Sessional Order 3A

- Total time 15 minutes
- Each Member 5 minutes'

In addressing this, at the outset, it is important to understand the history and the context of the business program motion and its function in the Queensland parliament. On 23 August 2018, the then leader of the House, the former Labor member for Redcliffe, formally introduced to the Queensland parliament amendments to sessional orders enabling the creation of a Business Committee and a business program motion. The so-called Business Committee process under the former Labor government was, in reality, nothing more than a charade. It was all smoke and mirrors. It was presented as a mechanism for bipartisan consultation, but in practice it delivered no such thing. Decisions were made by the Labor government, and the committee served only to create the appearance of consultation without the substance.

After the Business Committee was held on a Monday, the Labor government would then present the business program motion to the House on the Tuesday of a sitting week where it was debated. The debate was routinely and falsely characterised by Labor as being a result of consultation with the then opposition and crossbench, but, as we know, it was nothing more than an opportunity for Labor to rubberstamp its own agenda.

This farcical process was for years continued by Labor, including through the 57th Parliament until 2024 when the former leader of the House and now Manager of Opposition Business removed all avenues for debate. The former Labor state government still kept the charade of a business committee. However, when it came to the business program motion to be introduced, no member was allowed to debate the motion.

As Labor did in government and now in opposition, Labor continues to demonstrate in the 58th Parliament that they are incapable of treating this House, its processes and the orderly conduct of proceedings with the due respect that Queenslanders deserve. What should be routine procedural matters, including the allocation of set times for ministers in charge of bills to reply, have too often been politicised and turned into opportunities for disruptions, delay and political theatrics by Labor, and that is not what the people of Queensland expect of their parliament. It is for this reason that this government is reverting to the use of a business program motion to be introduced each sitting week to provide clarity, structure and certainty to the management of government business.

Unlike the last reforms to the business program motion brought in by the then leader of the House, the member for Springwood, this government is ensuring time is allocated for debate of the business program motion itself, and that is a critical point. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is restoring transparency and accountability ensuring members of this House have the opportunity to consider and debate the proposed program of business, and that is a fundamental difference in the approach.

These amendments do not include the creation of a business committee. Rather than engaging in such insulting and farcical processes, the Crisafulli LNP state government is interested in delivering a system that is clear, transparent and effective. This is not an unprecedented reform. In fact, it is a mechanism that was embraced, implemented and defended by those opposite when they were in government. To that end, it is worth reflecting on the words of those opposite when they themselves introduced and supported the use of a business program motion.

When first introducing this mechanism, the former leader of the House, the former member for Redcliffe, was very clear about the principles that underpinned it. The former Labor member for Redcliffe acknowledged that this House operates within a framework, and that has always been the case. The former Labor member for Redcliffe made the point that there has never been an absolute or unfettered right for every member to speak on every matter for as long as they wish. The former Labor member for Redcliffe also went on to explain that time limits exist, structures exist and standing and sessional orders exist precisely to ensure that the business of the House is conducted in an orderly, efficient and meaningful way. They are not our words; they are the words of the former Labor government. It did not stop there.


When the first business program motion was introduced, the now leader of the Labor opposition spoke glowingly of its benefits. The Leader of the Opposition noted that a business program motion would ensure that the House maximises the time it spends on matters of importance, delivers certainty to members and allows stakeholders and members of the public to understand when legislation would be debated. In 2024, the now Manager of Opposition Business described the business program motion as 'a powerful tool to ensure we are using this chamber to its full effect'. He went on to say that it provides 'real clarity' to members and ensures 'a clear picture of what this House will debate'. Again, these are not the words of this government; they are the words spoken by Labor in support of a business program.

I am sure that we will soon hear the Labor opposition seek to criticise and undermine this approach. I may be pleasantly surprised and they may support it; however, it is difficult to see that it is anything other than duplicity and petty politics if they do not support this. That duplicity has been on full display. We have previously heard claims from those opposite in this parliament that their ability to contribute to the Queensland parliament has somehow been curtailed, yet during the most recent sitting week in the cognate appropriation debate so far, of the 34 contributions made to the debate that week, only 11 were from Labor members. The assertion that members are being silenced simply does not stand up to scrutiny. It is contradicted by Labor's own participation or, more accurately, as we have seen in this parliament, Labor's lack of participation.

In concluding my contribution, these amendments provide a clear mechanism for allocating time to business. They allow for the orderly progression of legislation and they ensure, where necessary, that the House can come to a decision in a timely way. At the same time, they preserve the opportunity for debate. These changes are entirely consistent with the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's commitment to be considered and orderly with respect to the operation of the Queensland parliament.

The implementation of a business program motion is about ensuring that debate is meaningful, that time is used effectively and that the parliament can deliver on its core responsibility to Queenslanders. It is also about restoring a level of discipline and respect to the way that this chamber conducts its business. Given the previous contributions by now members of the Labor opposition when they were in government, I look forward to those opposite supporting this motion not only to the benefit of the orderly conduct of business in this House but also to the benefit of all Queenslanders. It is for those reasons that I commend the motion to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Before I call the Manager of Opposition Business, I will remind the following members that they are on warnings: the members for Inala, Lytton, Aspley, Greenslopes, Pine Rivers and McConnel.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (11.26 am): I rise to respond to the motion moved by the Leader of the House seeking to amend standing orders. The first point I seek to put on the record is that it is highly unusual for members to come into this place and seek to amend the operational procedures of this House without consulting other members of this House.

The second point I place on the record is the immeasurable hypocrisy of this LNP government. This motion seeks to establish a procedure, as the Leader of the House has outlined, that existed previously, but they have come into this place today to establish that without any consultation, and the framework that they are seeking to establish also allows them to pursue their objectives without any consultation. That is the hallmark of this LNP government—complete disregard for the voices of representatives in this House, complete disregard for parliamentary procedure and abject failure to uphold standards and conventions of this House.

We have seen week in and week out this government do the same things that they spent their time in opposition complaining about. It is all well within their remit to do that, but it is not lost on any member of this House, and should not be lost on Queenslanders, that no Queensland can trust anything that this LNP Premier or government says. Time and time again, the LNP complained about motions designed to manage the orderly functioning of this House. Now, week in and week out and with this motion before this place today, without notice and without consultation, they are doing exactly that. It is this unmitigated hypocrisy that is the problem with this government—when they say one thing before an election and do another immediately after.

It underscores everything that Queenslanders need to know about this Premier and this LNP government. They will say and do anything to help themselves, but they never help Queenslanders. In relation to the Leader of the House's motion, I move—

That all words after 'name' be omitted and the following inserted:

'and the name of the Manager of Opposition Business be agreed to, effective immediately, except for amendment 19 which is effective from 28 November 2024.'

19. After Standing Order 63—

Insert—

'63A. Motions cannot be moved to limit the rights of Members to raise matters

- (1) Motions cannot be moved that will prevent Members of Parliament from raising a topic, moving a motion about a topic or introducing legislation or an amendment about a topic.

20. Standing Order 114. Questions on notice—

Insert—

- (7) If a Minister or member does not comply with (5) and three business days has lapsed, then the Clerk must immediately refer the Minister or member to the Ethics Committee.

21. Standing Order 266. Examples of contempt—

Insert—

- (27) not responding in a compliant manner to a Question on Notice within the timeframes outlined in the Standing Orders.

22. Standing Order 196. Appointment, discharge and substitution of members—

Insert—

- (1A) The Premier or Leader of the House must within one sitting day must move a motion without notice to give effect to any request from the Leader of the Opposition for non-Government Member committee membership.

I table the amendment. At its core, this amendment is about one thing: protecting the ability of members of this House to do their jobs, not the government's job and not the executive's job. It is the job of every elected representative in this chamber to raise issues, to scrutinise power and to speak for the people who elected us. If this parliament cannot do that freely then it cannot function as a parliament at all.

The first part of my amendment is simple but fundamental. It makes it clear that no motion can be used to prevent a member from raising a topic, moving a motion or introducing legislation into this House. That is not radical; it is foundational. The Queensland parliament itself makes it clear that standing orders exist to facilitate debate, not shut it down. Speakers' rulings over many years have reinforced this principle: while the House may regulate its business, it should not extinguish the rights of members to participate in it. This amendment draws a clear line: you can manage debate and you can structure proceedings but you cannot silence members. Once the majority can decide what cannot be spoken about, this chamber ceases to be a place of scrutiny and becomes a place of control. That is not democracy.

The second and third parts of my amendment go to questions on notice. The parliament's own guidance is clear: questions on notice are a key accountability mechanism. They allow members to obtain detailed information that cannot be provided in the cut and thrust of question time. They are not optional. It is not optional under the standing orders whether or not ministers answer them. They are not a courtesy to other members of the House; they are the obligation of ministers. Standing orders already set those timeframes.

What happens when those timeframes are ignored? Too often, very little happens. That is the problem this amendment seeks to address. This amendment introduces a consequence. If a minister fails to comply and three business days pass beyond the deadline, the matter is automatically referred to the Ethics Committee. That is not at the discretion of the government; it is automatic. To reinforce that obligation, failure to comply becomes explicitly recognised as a potential contempt of this parliament. This aligns with longstanding parliamentary principle. Contempt is not only about dramatic acts; it is about the conduct that obstructs this House in the performance of its function—the sort of conduct that we see day in and day out from ministers opposite. When ministers refuse to answer questions on notice, they are obstructing scrutiny. They are withholding information from the very body charged with holding them to account: this chamber. This is not a minor administrative issue; it goes to the heart of responsible government.

The final part of my amendment deals with committee membership. Committees are where much of the real work of this parliament occurs. The parliament's own materials make clear that committees are designed to be bipartisan, to examine legislation and to hold the executive to account on behalf of the House. That only works if non-government members are properly represented. This amendment will ensure the Premier or Leader of the House acts within one sitting day of the Leader of the Opposition's request for non-government membership—not eventually, as we saw earlier this year, and not when convenient, as we saw a few months ago, but within one sitting day. Delay is not neutral. Delay can be used to deny scrutiny. Delay can be used to manipulate committees. Delay can be used to avoid accountability. This amendment removes that ambiguity and replaces it with certainty.

None of these amendments seeks to advantage one side of politics over the other. In fact, they do the opposite. They are designed to protect this institution itself. Governments change and majorities shift, but the rules we set in this place should endure. The question before us is simple: do we want a parliament where members can speak freely, where ministers must answer questions and where committees function as intended? I submit that we do.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Pause the clock. What is your point of order?

Dr ROWAN: I have not received a copy of the amendment. Has that been circulated yet? I have given substantial time for—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, have you circulated the amendment?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I tabled the amendment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the House, we will get you a copy as soon as possible. Members, I am seeking advice from the Clerk about the amendment. We will pause for a moment. Leader of the House, I do not think you had another point of order other than seeking a copy of the amendment.

Manager of Opposition Business, notwithstanding that you have had eight minutes and seven seconds to provide a contribution to the amendment that you have moved, I have sought advice from the Clerk in relation to the amendment moved. Notwithstanding the heading of the amendment, which states that amendments to standing and sessional orders have been moved, the amendment relates only to sessional orders, as moved by the Leader of the House. I have consulted with the Clerk on the applicability of standing order 94, which states—

Every amendment must be relevant to the question which it is proposed to amend.

I have sought advice from the Clerk in relation to that. Manager of Opposition Business, I can see that you want to make a point of order on that particular standing order, so I will allow you to make a point of order.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. To assist you in contemplating this matter and perhaps in seeking some additional advice, I submit to you that standing order 3 in fact establishes the sessional orders. The standing orders allow for the establishment of sessional orders, and it is the sessional orders that these amendments are seeking to address.

If the motion of the Leader of the House and the reasons for it—which is about the orderly conduct of this House—are to be accepted, I submit to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the standing orders are the way in which the order of this House is established. The sessional orders are an element of that, yes. The sessional orders are also established under the standing orders. I submit to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your consideration that our amendments are within the scope as outlined by the Leader of the House and for the purpose of the orderly conduct and management of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order. I am going to seek some further advice from the Clerk. Before I do that, I will take a point of order from the Leader of the House.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. These amendments, as outlined in the motion, pertain to the sessional orders. I understand the point of order that has been raised by the Manager of Opposition Business. However, the amendments pertain purely to the sessional orders. I would just bring to your attention that, in relation to the point of order from the Manager of Opposition Business, there is no reverse effect in relation to the standing orders themselves.

Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House, for your point of order on the Manager of Opposition Business's point of order. I am going to seek advice now having heard both points of order. Thank you, members, for your patience as I have sought advice from the Clerk a second time. In relation to the points of order raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, as I said to you previously, the original motion relates only to the amendment of sessional orders. It also relates to a business program motion being established. The amendment moved goes outside of that in terms of dealing with standing orders. It would also deal with a number of other matters that are not related to the business program motion, subject to the motion of the Leader of the House. Accordingly, I rule the amendment out of order.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I have ruled that amendment out of order. I think you will need to resume your seat because you are speaking to the amendment that you moved.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I was speaking to the Leader of the House's motion and my amendment. I submit to you that I have some time available to continue addressing the motion moved by the Leader of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: My apologies, Manager of Opposition Business. You may resume your contribution. You have one minute and 53 seconds.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you. The commentary that I have submitted to the House in relation to the merits or otherwise of the motion of the Leader of the House stands. The merits for what the opposition is seeking to achieve stand. Accordingly, I move—

That all words after 'move the' be omitted and the following inserted:

'Leader of the House's amendments and also the Manager of Opposition Business's amendments to Sessional Orders to take effect immediately'

MANAGER OF OPPOSITION BUSINESS AMENDMENTS TO SESSIONAL ORDERS

15. Motions cannot be moved to limit the rights of Members to raise matters

Motions cannot be moved that will prevent Members of Parliament from raising a topic, moving a motion about a topic or introducing legislation or an amendment about a topic.

16. Questions on notice

If a Minister or member does not comply with providing an answer as requested and three business days has lapsed, then the Clerk must immediately refer the Minister or member to the Ethics Committee.

17. Appointment, discharge and substitution of members—

The Premier or Leader of the House must within one sitting day must move a motion without notice to give effect to any request from the Leader of the Opposition for non-Government Member committee membership.



Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (11.43 am): I have endured the proposed amendment put forward by the Manager of Opposition Business. It reminds me of the total hypocrisy of the Manager of Opposition Business when he was the leader of the House. We go back even further when the former member for Redcliffe, I think it was, was leader of the House and the then manager of opposition business, who is now the Deputy Premier, constantly brought to the attention of the then leader of the House the so-called 'Business Committee' meetings they had where basically anything that the then manager of opposition business brought forward was dismissed out of hand in the arrogant and hubris manner that the government with a majority in the House had at the time.

Apparently, that has all changed now where the Manager of Opposition Business has sought to move amendments to standing orders when the motion seeks to amend sessional orders. I know he is only new at the game, but he should know better that his amendment deals with the standing orders, which is outside of the motion that was moved. He really needed to talk to the motion—whether he opposed it or agreed with it. That has led to a completely ridiculous proposed amendment by the Manager of Opposition Business which flies in the face of what we have here in establishing a new business program motion—and I congratulate the Leader of the House—that gives sense and timing to the business of the House in a proper, well thought out and defined manner. It limits the time for let's call it 'rabbiting on', if you like, by the Manager of Opposition Business, to 15 minutes, with each member having five minutes to put forward their case as to why they do not agree with the efficient operation of government business in the House.

This change to the sessional orders makes it clear that the government of the day will give every opportunity to the opposition to put forward their views on the matter, but it will not be repetitive in allowing every member of the opposition to give their views—repeating themselves one after another with speeches written for them by their staffers, going on and on and wasting parliamentary time. The government has many bills to deal with. This business program motion gives timing and effect to ensure that the opposition will have an opportunity to talk to every motion and it gives timing and effect to ensure that legislation is passed in a timely and reasonable manner. The motion before us here today that the Leader of the House has presented gives every opportunity for the agreed business program to be amended by a motion without notice by the Leader of the House.

Quite clearly, this motion is for the better management of the House. As we see today, we have moved on from question time and we have lost half an hour of debate due to the frivolous amendment to the standing orders put forward by the Manager of Opposition Business when he should know better. This motion that establishes a business program motion should have been adopted in a reasonable amount of time. I get the fact that the Manager of Opposition Business would like to have a little whinge and whine about the government's efficient operation of the parliament, as he is wont to do in many cases as we see in points of order raised regularly by the Manager of Opposition Business.

The idea of being a Manager of Opposition Business is not to disrupt and disturb. It is to bring forward matters that are important to the successful operation of the parliament. This motion to amend sessional orders is a clear attempt to bring forward that type of operation for the House. I see no reason that the amendment put forward by the Manager of Opposition Business would add to the effective operation of the House.



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.48 am): I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Leader of the House and support the amendment moved by the Manager of Opposition Business. Every member of this House should know that the motion moved by the government is about one thing and one thing alone, and that is control. Every conservative government in the history of this state has a tendency to authoritarianism and control of the parliament, control of its members and control of the people of Queensland. Today we see that on full display.

It is positively Orwellian to have to sit here and listen to the contributions made by the Leader of the House on this debate. Can you imagine the Leader of the House lecturing the Labor Party on petty politics when three seats down from him is the master of petty politics and—to quote the words of the member for Moggill—theatrics, the Deputy Premier. I cannot believe the government is lecturing the opposition on appropriate parliamentary behaviour and how this motion and these changes to the sessional orders will bring efficiency, structure and certainty to the parliament. When the LNP talks about efficiency, structure and certainty it means one thing. If you add those three things together, what do you get? Control. That is what this is about. If the government had any decency or respect for the parliament, this institution and its members, it would consult on the processes relevant to the parliament.

In this week of all weeks, after recent events which should have properly impacted every single member of this parliament, maybe we should reflect on how we behave in here. Maybe there is an opportunity through this motion to lift the standard of how we operate as a parliament. The standing and sessional orders that the government seeks to amend today go to how we operate as 93 people coming together for the benefit of the peace, order and good governance of Queensland. Every other parliament in the Commonwealth acts in a mature and adult fashion. That is what they do. Opposition and government come together and agree to the business program, the number of speakers and the big set-piece debates on things that matter, but they work through the other business of the House. We do not see any of that.

The Leader of the House lectured us about how often and how many times we talk on legislation. It is not for the government to control members of the opposition with regard to the legislation we speak on. We determine the legislation we speak on and the circumstances in which we speak on it. That is what we do. The Leader of the House talked about debate on the supplementary appropriation bills as if there is some sort of order of merit for every member of the government to list how many times they spoke versus the opposition. That is not how a parliament should operate. 'They've spoken 23 times'—or, as I say, one speech repeated 23 times, because all they ever do is repeat the same talking points. That is not elevated public debate.

Let's get into the things that matter, using the sessional and standing orders together to change how the parliament behaves so we can reflect the maturity of other parliaments in the Commonwealth. That is what this motion does not do. The most egregious thing about this motion is the lack of consultation—how it has been dropped on this parliament.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr DICK: If you wanted to change things, member for Toowoomba North, you would have taken a different approach in government, but you have not. At the last election you promised that under your leader the parliament would be elevated, standards would rise and performance would be different. You have done the complete opposite. You have tried to put the parliament under the heel of the LNP, and that is the history of every conservative government in the state. Imagine being lectured to by the member for Mermaid Beach on repetitiveness and rabbiting on. That was not an elevated contribution. I do not mind the member for Mermaid Beach. I like taking his tips when it comes to the racetrack, but on this matter I do not think I will take his advice.

We have had zero consultation. What we again see from the parliament is that it is not a place for policy and progress for the benefit of the people; it is used by the LNP as their plaything—a place where the government can do its own bidding. I am sorry that I want to stand in the way of the government and its legislative program. I am sorry that I want to speak on legislation—or not, as the case may be, depending on the substance and importance of the legislation and its relevance to me and my electorate, my shadow portfolio responsibilities or my responsibilities as the deputy leader. I make that decision.

When we have an opportunity to come together, as we are doing today, we should not have this motion dropped on us at five minutes to midnight, expecting us to respond, and then complaining, as the Leader of the House did, when written amendments were not ready to be circulated, again making a mockery of the parliament. This is another example of the government saying one thing and doing something else or doing something completely opposite. It is all big talk about the parliament's performance and no action.

I oppose this motion and the way it has been put on this parliament. Frankly, I think the Leader of the House is better than this, but I think he is suborned and put upon by the leadership of the government: the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

A government member: What about you and the unions?

Mr DICK: I take that interjection. I do not ever resile from being a member of a trade union or supporting trade unions in this state. I will never resile from that. I will never resile from standing up for Queenslanders, because you want to silence workers in this House. Every time you come in, as you did with that interjection—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Direct your comments through the chair, please, member for Woodridge.

Mr DICK:—to traduce, limit or silence unions, we are going to make sure unions and the members they represent are heard in the parliament. We are not going to be silenced. You can denigrate unions as much as you like; we are going to stand up for them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, please, member for Woodridge.

Mr DICK: I oppose this motion and the way it has been brought in with zero consultation. In accordance with the words moved by the Manager of Opposition Business, motions should not be moved that will prevent members of parliament from raising a topic, moving a motion about a topic or introducing legislation or an amendment about a topic. We should not be limited or silenced on that. If a minister or member does not comply with providing an answer as requested and three business days have elapsed then the Clerk must immediately refer the minister or member to the Ethics Committee.

What do we see? We see the ritual abuse of the standing orders when it comes to the executive answering questions. We see the ritual abuse of the standing orders when ministers speak beyond time and disrespect the chair. We see ministers coming in and ritually abusing the standing orders when it comes to ministerial statements. Ministerial statements are dead in this state because of the way they have been abused by the executive, aided and abetted and supported and encouraged and led by Premier Crisafulli and Deputy Premier Bleijie.

We are expected to stand here and debate a motion dropped on us with no consultation and no discussion because the people who want to put the parliament under their heel expect us to bend the knee and respect them. We do not respect them, we do not respect how they treat the parliament and we do not respect how they disrespect the people of Queensland. I oppose the motion and support the amendment moved by the Manager of Opposition Business.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Having heard the contribution of the member for Woodridge, and having also had time now to look at the amendment that has been circulated and moved by the Manager of Opposition Business, I would submit to you that that amendment is out of scope, unrelated to the original motion and pertains to standing orders. As such, I would ask you to consider that matter with respect to ruling it out of order. I also submit to you that the original motion be put once that is ruled out of order, if that is your decision as Deputy Speaker.

Mr de BRENNI: I am inclined to accept that the original amendment I tabled may not have been in scope.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, because that was my ruling.

Mr de BRENNI: You found that in your ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Thank you for accepting the ruling.

Mr de BRENNI: In accordance with your ruling, the amendment that I subsequently moved makes very clear that our amendment is to address the sessional orders specifically and is within the scope of the orderly management of the House, as the Leader of the House outlined in his original motion, and therefore, I submit to you, entirely within the scope of a properly formed amendment to the Leader of the House's motion.

Dr ROWAN: On a further point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker—


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: To the same point of order?

Dr ROWAN: To the same point of order, I would submit to you that there are elements in relation to what has been circulated by the Manager of Opposition Business that go to the function and effect of standing orders, as opposed to the original motion as moved by me as Leader of the House.

Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I am just going to seek some advice. I have sought extensive advice about this from the Clerk right now and also with the Clerk of the Parliament previously. Standing order 94 is the relevant standing order on the question of relevance of amendments to questions. In my previous ruling, I noted that the first amendment attempted to amend standing orders, where the motion moved by the Leader of the House dealt only with sessional orders. I also noted in that ruling that the Leader of the House's motion specifically related to the establishment of a business program motion and the first amendment moved by the Manager of Opposition Business went beyond that as well to deal with standing orders.

In relation to the amendment moved now by the Manager of Opposition Business, having sought advice I am of the view that it goes beyond the amendment moved by the Leader of the House to establish a business program motion. The Leader of the House also raised a point of order that the amendment moved by the Manager of Opposition Business deals with matters that are subject to standing orders. I am not making a ruling in relation to that point of order. However, in relation to the point of order under standing order 94 that the amendment must be relevant to the question which it is proposed to amend, I am of the view that the Manager of Opposition Business's amendment does go beyond the scope of standing order 94 and I will be ruling it out of order.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (12.02 pm): I rise to support the Leader of the House's motion. This is about restoring the orderly progress of legislation in this chamber. I have found it quite interesting to listen to some of the remarks of the members opposite and their so-called frustration about speeches. As somebody who puts speaking lists together for each bill we debate in this chamber, I would like to remind members that there are times when members do drop off speaking lists. That has happened in this session of parliament where members of the opposition have decided not to speak on legislation. It is important that we have an orderly progress of legislation in this chamber for the people of Queensland because the people of Queensland elect us to these very important roles.

As somebody who sits in this chamber almost all day in my role as a whip, I get to listen to a lot of speeches. The speeches from the government side are very thoughtful and well considered. Government members are on topic, they talk about their electorates and they speak about what is going on in their areas and how the legislation will affect their constituencies. Then we hear those opposite, like the member for McConnel. I love her whingeing and whining—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I take offence and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Theodore?

Mr BOOTHMAN: I withdraw. I find it very interesting to hear the negativity from those opposite on any bit of legislation that is put forward in this chamber. They do not have any constructive criticism; they are just all over the shop. Their talking points from their union masters are all over the shop, and they do not have constructive criticism. I move—

That the question be now put.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 36:

ALP, 34—Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahan, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pair: Perrett, Asif.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 36:

ALP, 34—Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, 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—Bolton.

Pair: Perrett, Asif.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Business Program



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (12.12 pm), by leave, without notice: in accordance with sessional order 3A, I move—

1. That the following business will be considered within the times as specified:
 - (a) The Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill:
 - i. minister called to reply to the bill by 12.25 pm on Thursday, 23 April 2026; and
 - ii. all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 12.55 pm on Thursday, 23 April 2026.
 - (b) The Appropriation (Supplementary 2024-25) Bill and Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024-25) Bill [Cognate bills]:
 - i. minister called to reply to the bills by 8.35 pm on Thursday, 23 April 2026; and
 - ii. all remaining stages of the bills to be completed by 9 pm on Thursday, 23 April 2026.
2. If all stages of the bills listed above have not been completed by the times specified, Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to pass 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.

I begin by noting the contributions made by honourable members during the preceding debate which have enabled the House to consider and agree to changes to the sessional orders. This motion before the House is a straightforward one. As I indicated in my previous contribution, this is about the good management of the business of the House. It is about providing structure, certainty and clarity to all members as to how the week ahead will unfold. This is important not only for us in the chamber but also for all Queenslanders who take an interest in the work the parliament undertakes.

Without pre-empting debate on the substance of the legislation before the House, the motion ensures there is sufficient time for fulsome contributions on the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill. This motion provides a clear framework with which members can make considered contributions whilst also ensuring the House is able to reach a conclusion not only on that piece of legislation but also on other legislation in a timely and orderly way. Similarly, the motion facilitates the resumption and continuation of debate on the appropriation bills. These are significant bills which go to the core of the Crisafulli LNP state government's management and service delivery right across Queensland. This provides a structured and predictable timetable for all members of the House for the week ahead.


It is also important to recognise that the business of the House extends beyond the legislative debates. As outlined in the program, there is time for disallowance motions later today which I know the opposition is keen to prosecute. We are also aware of the stated intent of the Labor opposition to introduce a private member's bill during the course of the week. In addition, the House will continue its regular important work when it comes to matters of public interest and private members' statements, which provide members the opportunity to raise issues on behalf of their communities. Taken together, this reflects a full and balanced program of work. It is not simply about government business; it is about ensuring all aspects of the parliamentary week are accommodated in an orderly, methodical and coherent way.

Motions such as this are not new or unique to this parliament. They are a feature of parliaments operating under the great Westminster tradition across the world. As I know the Manager of Opposition Business would appreciate, they provide a framework within which debates can occur whilst also ensuring the House discharges its responsibilities. There may be some in this House who suggest that such motions limit debate. We have heard members from the Labor opposition who always try to characterise these motions as limiting debate, but I and members of the government do not accept that characterisation, particularly given what those opposite did for many years when in government.

As I have said, this motion provides certainty. It ensures that all members know when debates will occur and how long they will run for so they are able to make their contributions accordingly. This chamber will always be a chamber that has great debates when it comes to ideas and the contest of ideas. Robust debate is a fundamental part of our democratic process and that is what Queenslanders expect of us. This is how the parliament should operate. It is going to be operating transparently, with accountability and in accordance with these great Westminster traditions.

As such, I would expect that the Labor opposition will support this motion because this is what they did when they were in government. Our previous motion was passed without their support. I think the hypocrisy was on display there and I am sure we will hear further contributions from those opposite opposing this motion today, given their record in government. It was they who when in government criticised us, but let's get on with it. It is time to debate important business.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (12.17 pm): I rise to address the business program motion put to the House by the Leader of the House. At the outset I feel most of all for the member for Glass House, who for years stood here and complained bitterly about the business program motion.

A government member: He seems pretty happy these days.

Mr de BRENNI: Sorry, the interjection?


Mr SPEAKER: No quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr de BRENNI: Now there is the extraordinary turn of events. I wonder if it occurred to the member for Glass House to point out to the Premier when this amendment to standing and sessional orders was being designed and contemplated in their workshop, in their party room, that for years he consumed valuable debate time standing here saying how offensive the business program motion was to parliamentary democracy. He talked about how it was an affront to parliamentary convention and talked about how it limited members of the then opposition in having their say. What this points out is the unmitigated hypocrisy of those opposite. Nothing was okay for the then government to do in this House, but as soon as those opposite are elected to the government benches everything is fine. That is why Queenslanders cannot trust this Premier: he says one thing and then he does another.

A government member: A fresh start.

Mr de BRENNI: He has his slick slogan, but he is all photo-op and no follow-up. Time and again the LNP complained about motions like this that are designed to manage the orderly conduct of this House. When they say one thing before an election and they say it over and over and they have the member for Glass House, at the instruction of the then leader of the opposition, saying the same thing over and over and then they come into this House and do something entirely inconsistent with what they had been espousing for years and years, I say to the Premier and all of those on the government benches: Queenslanders will work them out. The *Record of Proceedings* of this House will clearly outline their hypocrisy.

I want to place on the record that this motion we are considering now and the motion the House has just considered to establish the process of business program motions without consultation and without any opportunity for input from any other member of the House from the crossbench or any member on this side of the House proves—it is a proof point—that in the history of this parliament this Premier cannot be trusted on anything he says or does. He only takes action that suits his political purposes for scoring political points. He only takes action when it helps himself politically, never when it helps Queenslanders. I conclude my remarks by once again expressing my deep sympathy to the member for Glass House.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (12.21 pm): I have had a lot to do with business committee motions over the years as I was the manager of opposition business for some five or six years—I do not know; it was so long ago—but it was quite a successful period of time in opposition then when I was the manager of opposition business. Having listened to the current Manager of

Opposition Business, I would say that he has convinced me that I was wrong all those years about the business committee motions. Having had time now to reflect on the Westminster convention and democracy, I am with the Labor Party on this in terms of the business committee motion. In terms of the orderly business of the House to be conducted, I did research what I said about the business committee motion and I would say that it is no secret that I was not a fan of that over the years, but having listened to the debate of those opposite in the last year and a half—and the intellectual capacity of those opposite is quite low to form a good debate—I think this is the right move from the Leader of the House and I congratulate him on putting forward the business committee motion.

What the Manager of Opposition Business did not tell us is whether or not those opposite are going to back it. He talks about hypocrisy. If he votes against the re-establishment of the orderly transition of business of the House, then pot kettle black, because this business committee motion is what Labor did year after year, and apparently it was the best thing for democracy for the Labor Party. He also talked about a change of views when government changes and things like that. We promised Queenslanders a fresh start and—are honourable members ready for this—we have considered this in a calm and methodical manner. Having considered this matter in a calm and methodical manner, we believe that the business committee motion affords honourable members the opportune time to have their say.

Dr Rowan: That's what Labor wants.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Leader of the House. It is what those opposite wanted for years and the issue that they have been raising was when the House needed to deal with urgent legislation like the original Adult Crime, Adult Time legislation we had no provision other than an urgency motion. Those opposite were trying to tell the media and Queenslanders that urgency motions were dysfunctional, chaotic or whatever, but they were not. Rather, they were the only way the House could determine its own destiny about getting important legislation passed during the week. We have listened to the Labor Party and thought, 'Okay, if they don't want those urgency motions to get through important legislation like tackling youth crime, then we'll implement the system they had,' because they were pretty supportive of the system they had so we would expect that they are going to be pretty supportive now. Every Tuesday morning the government will move the business committee program motion which will show the business of the House for the week in its entirety—the same motion the Labor Party moved year after year when it sat on this side of the House.

We are simply implementing the system that those opposite have called for. They did not want the declaration of urgent bills, so we can dispense with that now and have the business committee motion. With regard to the commentary from the Manager of Opposition Business, it is like a parallel universe on steroids. He talks about doing one thing in government and then another thing in opposition. That is exactly what he has just done by voting against the establishment of the business committee motion that those opposite established under Yvette D'Ath when in government. I was the then manager of opposition business when the Business Committee was set up and the Business Committee motion was debated every Tuesday, and every Tuesday I would come in here and talk about the issues of the Business Committee. As I said, having reflected on the Business Committee motion over the years and considered it in a calm and methodical way, as we do in this government on all things that we consider—

A government member interjected.


Mr BLEIJIE:—on everything; I take the interjection—then it is my belief now that this is the best thing for the Queensland parliament.

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Even the best of us can change our views when it is in the best interests of the parliament and the people of Queensland, and I believe this is in the best interests of democracy on this particular day.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Logan, I inform you that you have one minute.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (12.27 pm): It is disappointing of course to be guillotined on a debate about guillotining other speakers. I note the road to Damascus which the Deputy Premier has been on. He, the member for Glass House and others had said in this parliament so many times that they would be different and that they would provide a different way of operating this parliament that had more accountability and more time for debate. Instead, we see that those opposite are indeed different: they are much worse. We note because of new sessional order 3A the context in which this debate

happened. This is the first time new sessional order 3A has been used after an already guillotined debate so that we could not fully examine the changes that were dropped on this House. We now see that this is a government that does not want any scrutiny.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The time for debate on this motion has expired.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I wish to advise members that we are being visited in the gallery this morning by members of the Victorian parliament—Mr Brad Battin MP, member for Berwick, and Mr Richard Riordan MP, member for Polwarth. Welcome to the Queensland parliament.

Suspension of Standing Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (12.28 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026 and any amendments circulated by the minister to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 3 March (see p. 374).

Second Reading



Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (12.29 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Crisafulli government has made a commitment to restore safety where you live, to deliver consequences for actions and to put the rights of victims before the rights of offenders. The Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill delivers on that commitment. It is the next step in our plan to make Queensland safer and ensure there are fewer victims of crime in this state.

This bill continues to build on our tough Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, expanding the scope by 12 serious offences and ensuring there are appropriate consequences for serious crimes; it scraps Labor's failed three-strikes, soft-on-drugs policy and restores consequences for actions by introducing a new Illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework; and it recognises the impacts of antisocial behaviours on our communities and promotes community safety by promoting new designated business and community precincts, giving our police the laws and resources they need to restore safety to our shopping centres, community hubs and business districts. The Crisafulli government is restoring safety where you live, ensuring there are consequences for actions and giving police the tools they need to hold offenders to account. That is what Queenslanders voted for, and that is exactly what we are delivering after a decade of decline under Labor.

The Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill was introduced on 3 March 2026 and referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee for consideration. The committee examined the bill and tabled its report on 17 April 2026. The committee made only one recommendation: that the bill be passed. I thank the chair, the member for Nicklin, and the members of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee for their hard work throughout the committee process. I express my sincere appreciation to all of the submitters to the committee, particularly the brave victims who came forward and wrote in or appeared before the committee to share their stories and ensure their voices were heard in this process.

I will turn first to the part of this bill that expands Adult Crime, Adult Time. At the heart of these reforms is the Crisafulli government's top priority: to restore safety where you live and reduce the number of victims of crime in this state. For too long, that was not the focus. For a decade, Labor loudly

and proudly weakened Queensland's youth crime laws. They prioritised the rights of offenders over the rights of victims, closed the Childrens Court to victims and their families and removed consequences for serious offending. They made detention a last resort, stating 'a detention order should be imposed only as a last resort and for the shortest appropriate period'. They abolished the Childrens Court trigger, removing the ability for the Family Responsibilities Commissioner to work with families and intervene early, and they removed breach of bail as an offence, allowing more youth offenders to be released back into the community.

The decisions Labor made had real-world consequences. They meant courts were constrained, consequences for actions were missing from the youth justice system and victims and their families were left unseen and unprotected. That is why, after a decade of decline under Labor, in December 2024 the Crisafulli government introduced the Making Queensland Safer Laws to restore consequences for actions and put victims back at the centre of the justice system. Those laws removed detention as a last resort, ensured courts can now see the full criminal history of offenders and made the impact on victims the primary consideration during sentencing. Victims, their families and the media can now attend Childrens Court proceedings, and victims are now automatically registered to receive updates regarding their offender.

Those laws also introduced the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time, making youth offenders liable to the same mandatory minimum and maximum penalties as adults for 13 serious offences. We have continued to build on these reforms, just like we said we would do. As promised, we established an independent panel to provide advice on the additional offences that should be included as Adult Crime, Adult Time. In 2025 the Crisafulli government expanded Adult Crime, Adult Time to include an additional 20 offences, and now we are strengthening our laws again, just like we said we would do, to continue driving down the number of victims of crime in this state. As promised, the panel's advice was published in a report during the committee process. It sets out the offences that the panel recommended the government consider for inclusion in Adult Crime, Adult Time, the work undertaken by the panel and the basis on which these offences were recommended, including harm, victim impact and community safety.

This is in stark contrast to the record of the Labor Party opposite, who sat on their hands and watched victim numbers go up year on year. After a decade of weak laws, Labor's legacy is a youth crime crisis and a generation of hardcore serious repeat offenders. In fact, under Labor, serious repeat offenders skyrocketed 64 per cent in just five years. Under the Crisafulli government, that trend is already starting to turn around, with a 17 per cent drop in serious repeat offenders. Under Labor's decade of decline, car thefts surged, break-ins climbed, robberies rose and victims increased 193 per cent. Under the Crisafulli government, victim numbers are down 7.2 per cent. Under Labor, proven offences committed by youths increased 98 per cent. Under the Crisafulli government, we have already seen a 27 per cent drop in proven Adult Crime, Adult Time offences.

This bill will add a dozen serious offences to Adult Crime, Adult Time. These offences are among the most serious. They involve planned and coordinated violence, the exploitation of children and vulnerable individuals, and the deliberate incapacitation of victims in order to commit further harm. I have to say, when I read the first line of Labor's statement of reservation—'The Crisafulli LNP Government is back, back, back again'—I would have laughed if it were not so gravely serious. After a decade of Labor weakening our youth crime laws, the Crisafulli government is coming back into this House to strengthen our youth crime laws. Queenslanders now have a government that is happy to come back again to strengthen our laws and restore safety where they live, where previously they had a Labor government that came back into this House to weaken our youth justice laws. Yes, members of the opposition, we are back. We are back—strengthening the youth crime laws that Labor weakened, restoring consequences for actions that Labor removed and putting the rights of victims before the rights of offenders. We will keep coming back into this House, working every single day, until Queenslanders are safe in their homes and there are fewer victims of crime in this state—just like we promised we would do, just like we were elected to do.

The offences contained in this bill can contain significant physical harm and deep trauma and, in many cases, leave victims dealing with lasting consequences for the rest of their lives. As the Office of the Victims' Commissioner stated during the committee hearing, the impact 'is not confined to a single moment of time; it is ongoing' and—

It is their sense of personal safety, it is their sense of psychological safety, and it is their sense of being safe in the community ... For many victims, there is no end to the grief and trauma.

This has been the lived experience of hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders under Labor, including local Redlands man and Army veteran Chris Sanders, who made a submission to the committee. Chris was at his local shopping centre when he was set upon by a group of youth offenders. They kicked and punched his car, and when he got out of the car he was kicked from behind while two youth offenders filmed him. They were yelling out, 'You can't touch us, we are kids,' and 'You're dead, old man.' Chris wrote in his submission—

... I walked towards the shopping centre to go and find security but heard a lady yell out he has a knife he has a knife as I turned around he said your dead old man I suffered a slash to my leg a slash stomach a torn shirt and a stabbed wound which entered through my body pierced and collapsed my left lung and stopped a centimetre from my heart.

These laws are for victims like Chris. As he said, 'If you are old enough to commit an adult crime, then you should do the adult time'.

During the committee process there was a suggestion that some of the serious offences included in this bill should not be included because they do not occur frequently. The Labor opposition in their statement of reservation said that because of their rarity or because their frequency has not significantly increased in the past decade there is no urgent need to include these offences as Adult Crime, Adult Time. The Labor opposition want to wait for these offences to become more prevalent before taking action. They want to wait until more Queenslanders are harmed before acting. They want to wait until the damage is done and another victim is paying the price before supporting our strong youth crime laws. We will not wait until a child is violated. We will not wait until someone is targeted in a planned conspiracy to take their life, because for the victim it does not matter that it did not happen to many people; it happened to them and it altered their life. We are taking action now because we stand on the side of victims. We are doing exactly what Queenslanders voted for: making Queensland safer, ensuring there are consequences for action and fewer victims of crime. As Trudy Reading, Chief Advocacy Officer and Director at the Voice for Victims Foundation, said—

If it is an offence that is really quite serious and it is going to cause significant harm to a victim, I cannot see a reason for excluding it just based on the fact that it does not happen very often.

That is exactly the approach the Crisafulli government is taking because that is what we have heard from victims, communities and those on the front line. As the Member for Capalaba said during the committee process when reflecting that no victims were consulted according to the Queensland Bar Association and Law Society's submissions—

For years and years, victims have been yelling out for stronger laws. We have had rallies, petitions and everything else, but everything seems to be falling on deaf ears.

During the committee's consultation on this bill, Christopher Dee said—

Youth crime has escalated dramatically in Varsity Lakes since 2018 including:

Youths seen and heard congregating in numbers after midnight ...

Attempting to steal cars while driving around in stolen cars; and

Attempting to and breaking into properties by slashing fly screens to open windows, forcing open garage doors and windows.

That is the reality Queenslanders were left with after a decade of decline under Labor. It was also clear throughout the committee's consultation that strong laws must be alongside early intervention and measures ensuring rehabilitation. That is exactly what we have delivered. In fact, we are delivering the largest investment in early intervention, crime prevention and rehabilitation this state has ever seen: \$560 million to stop youth offending before it starts and help turn young lives around with rehabilitation.

We have already rolled out more than 50 new Kickstart early intervention programs right across the state and we have lots more to come. Alongside this there is \$65 million for our Proven Initiatives program to deliver ongoing funding for early intervention programs proven to deliver results to divert youth from crime. Nine Regional Reset programs are up and running, delivering intensive early intervention through short-stay resets. Youth justice and crime prevention schools in Cairns, Townsville, Rockhampton, Ipswich and Logan are on track to start taking referrals later this year, just as we promised, and the crime prevention school on the Gold Coast held its first year 7 class yesterday. We have rolled out our nation-leading, 12-month rehabilitation program, Staying on Track, to help reduce the risk of reoffending. This is all part of our plan to restore safety where you live. The Crisafulli government will keep delivering every single day to make Queensland safer.

While those opposite have put on the record that they think expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time is an 'admission of failure' and that it will somehow 'push victims to the back of the criminal justice system queue', what they are really saying is that they do not support our stronger laws. It is completely

ridiculous. Alongside our record investment in early intervention and rehabilitation, stronger laws are part of the solution. After a decade of Labor weakening our youth crime laws, removing consequences for actions and putting the rights of offenders before the rights of victims, Queenslanders deserve stronger laws that restore safety where they live. We will continue to come into this House to strengthen our laws.

The question is how will Labor vote? Will they stand with victims of crime and vote for stronger laws or will they stand with the criminals and repeat youth offenders by voting against strengthening Adult Crime, Adult Time in Queensland? We all know that Labor's plan is to stop holding youth accountable for their crimes once again. It is in black and white in their state platform policy document for 2025 to increase the age of criminal responsibility to 14 years, which means serious violent offending 10-year-olds, 12-year-olds and 13-year-olds would no longer face any consequences for offences against victims like the 13-year-old girl from Noosa. She was tortured by a 12-year-old and a 13-year-old. In 2023 she was lured to a house, locked inside, assaulted, cut with a knife, threatened and left with serious injuries. The footage was shared across social media and viewed by millions of people on TikTok before it was removed. Under Labor's approach, those two youth offenders would face no consequences for their conduct—offending that was described by the court as egregious and abhorrent.

We will always stand on the side of victims. We will continue to deliver consequences for actions after a decade of Labor putting the rights of offenders first. While we are starting to turn the tide on Labor's youth crime crisis, we know there is a long way to go. We will work every single day to continue driving down victim numbers and restoring safety where you live.

I will now turn to the part of the bill that scraps Labor's failed drug diversion program and replaces it with a new illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework. At the heart of these reforms is a very simple principle: illicit drug offending should not be ignored, excused or normalised because illicit drugs are not harmless. It impacts families, children, businesses and the safety of our neighbourhoods and communities. That is why the Crisafulli government is restoring consequences for illicit drug use.

In April 2023 those opposite came into this House and weakened Queensland's drug laws. They removed consequences for drug offending and replaced them with a system that allowed repeated offending without accountability. Under Labor's three-tiered diversion scheme, on the first occasion an offender was found in possession of illicit drugs police were required to issue a warning. On the second occasion they were required to refer that offender to a drug diversion assessment program. On the third occasion there was another diversion opportunity. Even after that, on the fourth and fifth occasions, offenders could still receive court-ordered diversions. That meant, in practice, a person could be caught with dangerous drugs on up to five occasions before facing any criminal consequence for their offending.

That was Labor's idea of illegal drug laws and it sent exactly the wrong message. It told Queenslanders that drug offending would be tolerated, it told police that they had to issue a number of warnings before they could actually deal with the criminal conduct of a repeat offender and it told offenders that they could get away with repeated illicit drug offending without consequences. But that is not all. Labor also expanded the types of drugs to which this three-tiered, get-out-of-jail program could apply. Labor expanded it to all schedule 1 and schedule 2 drugs, drugs like methamphetamine, cocaine, heroin, fentanyl, ketamine, MDMA and GHB. That approach was never going to make Queensland safer, and the evidence shows that Labor's soft-on-drugs policy did not work. In fact, since the introduction of Labor's soft-on-drugs scheme in May 2024, total drug offences increased by more than 11,000 from the previous year, rising to 76,756 in the period from July 2024 to June 2025. That is a 16.8 per cent increase.

Think about that—Labor's scheme meant you could get away with illicit drug offending up to five times and drug offending increased by 16.8 per cent. Queensland Health data also reveals 1,184 people were admitted to public hospitals during that same period for illicit drug poisoning. The year before Labor weakened these laws there were 310 unintentional drug induced deaths. That is horrific. These facts prove that Labor's soft-on-drugs approach saw an increase in drug offending in our communities. When those opposite say their drug diversion program was good progressive policy, the facts paint a very different picture: more offending and more harm, and a model that was not working. Helen Tagg from Nambour Now told the committee—

Repeated opportunities without meaningful consequence do not help individuals or the broader community.

Pastor Dale Dowler from the Shack Community Centre said—

Over the years with the diversional programs I have seen in place, I have not really seen any of them work effectively ...

Stakeholders are saying whatever is happening now is not working. They want to see change. That is why this bill takes a different approach. Under the Crisafulli government's new framework, diversions are limited to first-time, low-risk offenders. This means that for minor cannabis possession—not more than 50 grams—an eligible first-time offender can be offered a single opportunity to complete a diversion program. One opportunity—that is it. For first-time offenders in possession of small quantities of other dangerous drugs, police will have the discretion to issue a penalty infringement notice. That notice carries a financial consequence of three penalty units. However, if an offender would like help, they have the option to complete a drug assessment program in lieu of paying the fine. This ensures that for those who are willing to get help a health pathway is available to them. If the offender successfully completes that drug assessment program, the fine will be waived. However, importantly, if they offend again, they will be charged and they will be prosecuted because when a government allows repeat illicit drug offending without consequence it does not reduce crime, it facilitates it.

This bill gives our police the tools they need to keep Queensland safe. Illicit drugs are not safe. They can affect health, parenting, work, school, friends and family. Illicit drugs destroy lives, they are a gateway to addiction and they fuel organised crime, driving up crime rates and leading to an increased number of victims. All too often it is not just the user who pays the price; it is the elderly couple whose home is broken into, the woman experiencing drug-fuelled domestic violence, the child growing up in a home shaped by addiction, neglect and instability. The Crisafulli government will not stand by and allow repeat illicit drug offending to be normalised. Unlike those opposite, we will not facilitate it.

I now turn to the part of the bill that takes a strong stance against antisocial behaviour and establishes designated business and community precincts. Those precincts will be declared by regulation, in consultation with local government, where it is necessary to enhance public safety or public amenity, reduce antisocial behaviour occurring and reduce or prevent disruption in the area. When a person behaves in a disorderly, offensive, threatening or violent way, whether that be assaulting someone, threatening damage, stealing from a shop, unlawfully possessing a weapon, using drugs in a public place or engaging in other offensive conduct in a designated precinct, police will have the power to direct that person to leave and not return for up to 24 hours. If they fail to comply with the move-on direction, police will have the power to issue a banning notice excluding them from that precinct for a month, and breaching that banning notice will be a criminal offence.

This is about restoring safety in the places Queenslanders should be able to go without fear: their local shopping centres, business precincts, community hubs and town centres. For too long under Labor, antisocial behaviour was allowed to fester and the people who paid the price were the small business owners trying to open their doors in the morning, the workers walking to their cars after a nightshift, the customers trying to support their local shops and the families simply wanting to enjoy their local community. In places like Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Maryborough, the Crisafulli government brought together business owners, residents, police and local councils to hear firsthand about the impacts of antisocial behaviour on their communities. Those forums were about listening to locals, understanding the problem and working with them on the ground to find real solutions. We listened to those communities, and that is why this bill gives police stronger, clearer powers to disrupt unsafe, antisocial behaviour and restore safety in those precincts.

Throughout the committee process we heard clearly that this is not an abstract issue. We heard from local governments, from chambers of commerce, from community groups and from small and family businesses that are living with the impacts of antisocial behaviour every day. The Shopping Centre Council of Australia representative said—

We ... welcome measures that strengthen community safety by aligning penalties with community expectation and giving police the tools they need to protect businesses, staff and customers.

In shopping centres, the reality on the ground is confronting. The committee was told that recently a security guard was faced with a youth who lifted his shirt to reveal a knife and said, 'I dare you to touch me.' That is not good enough. That is why this bill introduces strong measures for police to be able to take action to ensure we return safety to our business and community precincts.

The committee heard from business owners such as Anna from the Lyra Cafe and Les from Concrete Lines Skate Shop in my own community of Coolangatta. They described the reality for retailers dealing with shoplifting, aggressive and threatening behaviour, drug use, loitering, vandalism

and intimidation, which deters customers and drives up costs. We heard from Nambour residents who spoke about the impact of antisocial behaviour and drug activity outside premises, including a women's gym where it impacts women trying to walk safely to and from their cars.

In Maryborough, Michelle said, 'Our CBD has become known as having an open door for antisocial behaviour.' She said they had documented many incidents of antisocial behaviour and further stated—

Assaults, screaming, yelling at customers and community members walking down the street, attacks by obviously drug-affected persons—children are witnessing this, children who are simply passing through their own town centre.

Kevin Booth, the President of the Townsville Chamber of Commerce, said—

A lot of businesses are having to lock up their shopfronts to ensure random people do not walk in and start doing unsavoury things within their business. They are also having to pay for additional security for themselves or for a group of shops along the street front.

This bill is about restoring safety to business precincts and community hubs and giving police the powers they need to issue banning notices to deal with antisocial behaviour that is wreaking havoc in the communities I have just spoken about. The member for Maryborough has fought fiercely for this, as have the members in North Queensland. I thank them for bringing this bill to their communities and for consulting on it.

At the time of the bill's introduction into the Queensland parliament on 3 March 2026, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2012 was in force and, therefore, was referenced in the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. However, the Governor in Council subsequently approved the Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2026, which has now superseded the 2012 regulation. As such, during consideration in detail we will be moving amendments to update the bill to reflect this technical amendment. Those amendments have been authorised for circulation in the House.

Communities right across Queensland have been calling for stronger laws. They have been calling for Adult Crime, Adult Time. They have been calling for stronger laws that deal with drugs. They have been calling for stronger laws that deal with the antisocial behaviour that has been wreaking havoc in our communities as a result of the previous Labor government's failure to deal with these issues. In fact, time and again they brought legislation into this House that watered down our laws and failed to give police the powers they needed to deal with crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour. This bill is delivering exactly what Queenslanders voted for: Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, taking a strong stance on drugs and dealing with the antisocial behaviour that is affecting our business and community precincts. As a result of this bill we are delivering safety to communities, restoring consequences for actions and reducing the number of victims of crime.

For too long, Queenslanders had been suffering under Labor's youth crime crisis. This bill says that enough is enough. It says enough to adult crimes without adult time, enough to repeat illicit drug offending without accountability and enough to antisocial behaviour permeating our communities, in the very places Queenslanders should feel safe. These are the questions for the Labor opposition: will they back what Queenslanders voted for? Will they back the Adult Crime, Adult Time laws in this bill? Will they back a strong stance on illicit drugs? Will they back laws that give police the powers to deal with antisocial behaviour in our businesses and our communities? Their statement of reservation is pretty clear: they do not support Adult Crime, Adult Time; they do not support a strong illicit drug framework; and they do not support giving police the powers they need to deal with antisocial behaviour.


The Crisafulli government is delivering safety where you live. We will keep coming back into this House to deliver strong laws. While those opposite came into this House time and again and weakened our Youth Justice Act, created a drug framework that meant offenders could get away with illicit drug use up to five times and failed to give police the powers to deal with antisocial behaviour in our communities—they did that in this House time and again over a decade—the Crisafulli government will come into this House and deliver strong laws. Alongside that, we will deliver the early intervention and rehabilitation needed to turn young lives around. Our record investment is starting to see that through \$560 million invested in early intervention and rehabilitation programs. The Crisafulli government is delivering safety where you live. We will keep delivering stronger laws, backing our police and standing on the side of victims until Queenslanders feel safe in their own homes and in their communities and until there are fewer victims of crime in this state. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Ms Farmer, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12.58 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Cost of Living; Transport Affordability

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Premier David Crisafulli made a lot of promises to Queenslanders, but in 18 months under his LNP government we have had more slogans than solutions, more photo-ops than fixes, and in that time life has become harder for hardworking Queensland families. Housing is further out of reach, affordability pressures are unrelenting, crime is up and health care is harder to access than ever before. Those big four crises—the pillars that this government promised to act on—have only become worse under the LNP's watch. They are big challenges, but Queenslanders were promised big solutions. Yet, in the 18 months we have seen very little. Instead of delivering, this LNP government delays, deflects and disappoints.

To add insult to injury, in the middle of a fuel crisis, the LNP kicked the guts out of the South East Queensland transport network. While we were being told—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the Leader of the Opposition. I draw your reference to unparliamentary language.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): I will take some advice on that. Leader of the Opposition, I believe you did use some unparliamentary language. Would you withdraw, please?

Mr MILES: I withdraw. While we were being told to conserve fuel and use public transport where we could, the entire rail network was shut down; not just shut down, the south-east was plunged into weeks of commuter chaos, and the architect of that chaos was none other than the transport minister. This was a rail fail of his own making. On this side of the House, we had raised concerns about proceeding with the mass track closures for weeks prior. We called for a sensible restructure of the maintenance program, to limit the big closures to weekends and public holidays so that those Queenslanders who still go to work during the school holidays had an option to catch public transport. Instead of that sensible solution, we have seen weeks of rail failures, widespread delays and disruption across the network, leaving commuters stranded, frustrated and, in many cases, out of pocket.

What has made the situation even worse is that the rail replacement buses that we were told would be there as a fallback were too often missing, delayed or simply inadequate to meet demand. That is not just poor planning; it is failure to deliver one of the most basic responsibilities of a state government.

Public transport is not a luxury for the Queenslanders who rely on it. It is an essential service and in the middle of a fuel crisis it becomes that much more important. When petrol prices surge, when families are forced to make tough choices at the checkout and at the bowser, people turn to trains and buses to make ends meet. They expect those services to be reliable, affordable and accessible. Queenslanders who have been caught up in this mess are rightly frustrated. They have been left waiting on platforms as services are cancelled with little notice and replacement buses that do not arrive or, when they do, are already packed so full that they keep moving without picking anyone up, leaving commuters scrambling to find alternative ways to get to work, school or uni because those buses never arrived. The implication is that people needing to work so they can pay those bills are getting to work late or missing their shifts altogether. The system they rely on has simply failed. When Queenslanders quite rightly ask for answers they are met with silence, spin and union-blaming, rather than a clear plan to fix the problem.

Labor proved that when you make public transport more affordable you can encourage people off the roads. We introduced 50-cent fares despite the critics and they have been a raging success. Now other states, amidst the fuel crisis, have moved to make their public transport completely free. Just yesterday in Victoria the state government announced an extension of free public transport. That is what leadership in a crisis looks like.

The Crisafulli LNP government is so devoid of that same leadership that their fuel security plan—so-called fuel security plan—will not relieve any pressure right now. In fact, their plan hinges on action by the federal government and the relief will not be felt by Queenslanders for years and years and years, if ever. However, Queensland families are struggling now—today—and we know that this government is set to make somewhere between \$1 billion and \$2 billion in additional royalties off the back of high fuel and resource prices. That windfall could be used to help people now. But we know the LNP will not.

It is not just the fuel crisis where we are seeing this level of failure. It is part of a broader pattern by a government that does not want to take responsibility for the problems this state is facing for fear of being held accountable for the solution. Like in health, we are seeing a system under increasing

strain and, on some days, on life support. This LNP government made the decision to delay critical new infrastructure such as at the Prince Charles Hospital, meaning that the delivery of critical healthcare services is pushed out to the never-never. Around the state patients are waiting longer and longer for the care they need. There are now more than 346,000 Queenslanders waiting to see a specialist, a figure that continues to grow, and people cannot even get the initial appointment they need to enter the elective surgery system. It is a tactic we have seen before to increase the waitlist for the waitlist. That is not a health system improving; it is a health system being left behind.


When it comes to affordable housing, this government has made the extraordinary decision to scrap affordable housing targets that will effectively reduce the pipeline of housing that hardworking Queenslanders can actually afford. At a time when more families are experiencing rental stress and more people are at risk of homelessness, that decision is not just wrong, it is completely indefensible.

Families are struggling. They are stretched completely thin. Rents are higher, grocery bills are up, energy bills are more expensive and fuel and transport costs are up too, yet the one thing they are not getting is support from their state government, from a Premier who is all talk and no action. To this day, David Crisafulli has not delivered a single meaningful universal measure to ease pressure at the bowser or provide any real cost-of-living relief. That is why the failure of public transport is so significant because it removes one of the few practical ways people have to manage rising costs.

When fuel prices go up, reliable public transport should be a real alternative to help families save money and stay connected to work, education and services. When trains are delayed, when services are cancelled and when replacement buses do not turn up, that alternative disappears and Queenslanders are left worse off. This is not just a question of inconvenience; it is a question of competence and priorities.

The Stafford by-election presents voters with an opportunity not to change the government but to send the LNP a message that they deserve better, that they want more solutions and fewer slogans and that they want a premier who shows up and follows up, not a premier who just leaves after the photo-op. Queenslanders deserve a government that understands the pressures they are under and takes practical steps to ease those pressures, including investing in a public transport system that is reliable, affordable and accessible. They deserve a government that responds quickly when things go wrong rather than one that leaves commuters stranded and hopes the problems will go away. The voters of Stafford will have a chance to send this bad government that precise message.

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.11 pm): Ladies and gentlemen, I agree with the opposition leader: the Stafford by-election is an opportunity not to change the government but to change the opposition leader. That is the only thing that is going to happen with the Stafford by-election. We have a desperate and dangerous opposition leader—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): The member for Waterford will cease her interjections.

Mr BLEIJIE: The person yelling at me is the very person who wants the opposition leader to fail in Stafford. If he fails in Stafford, there will be a swing against him, the member for Waterford will come through the middle and the member for Murrumba will be gone. I said he would be gone before Christmas—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Waterford.

Mr BLEIJIE: I said he would be gone before Christmas, then I thought it would be Easter and now he is saying, 'Give me one more chance. The Stafford by-election is an opportunity.' He is so desperate to hold onto his position. While he is desperate to hold onto his position, he is not thinking about Queenslanders. He is not supporting our plan to drill, refine and store fuel in Queensland. He did not talk about that. All he did this morning was continue a salacious campaign, and we know that gutter politics is true to the Labor Party's form. That salacious campaign against members of the House is akin to my saying that the member for Gaven's electorate only got road and bus projects because of the person she was dating. We on this side of the House would never say that. It was a desperate attempt of the opposition leader this morning to resort to gutter politics. That is what he did.

We never talked about the disclosure of conflict of interest management plans because there is a time and place. In his desperation, they have gone too far. They always go over the edge in desperation. You saw it. You saw it when he was asking the questions this morning. There are certain members over there who know that this is not a can of worms you ought to open, mate. If it is, I can assure you this—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, make your remarks through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: I can assure the honourable opposition leader: if he wants this can of worms opened, it will have detrimental impacts on more of his members than government members. I can assure him of that. If he wants to go there, bring it on. We are ready. We are also ready for the Stafford by-election. The candidate the Labor Party have put up, Luke Richmond, is everything—

An opposition member: Here we go.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection—‘Here we go.’ They have put up a candidate who designed the health failures under the former Labor government. They have put up a guy who designed the policy. This is ‘Labor Luke’s’ policy platform of the Labor Party which reintroduces BPIC. They had the biggest ambulance ramping—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Waterford is warned under the standing orders.

A government member: ‘Ramping Richmond’.


Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection—‘Ramping Richmond’ in Stafford. That is Luke. That is Labor’s legacy. The candidate the Labor Party have put up—Luke Richmond—has been a senior shadowy figure in the Labor Party for years. He was the right-hand man for an unholy trinity of failed health ministers—Yvette D’Ath, Shannon Fentiman and Steven Miles. Labor Luke’s platform was for weak youth justice laws. He was the state secretary of the Labor Party when he designed the platform last year, which was voted on by the Labor Party, to weaken the youth justice laws, increase the age of criminal responsibility—it is all contained in here—and reintroduce the CFMEU BPIC tax for the Labor Party. That was all designed by Labor Luke, a candidate for the Stafford by-election. He was—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection—‘Oh, dear me.’ I would say, ‘Oh, dear you,’ to the candidate you put up. If only they had done some due diligence on Labor Luke. They know that Labor Luke’s history of failures will be exposed during this by-election campaign by our candidate, Fiona Hammond. This is a chance to send the opposition leader the message that he ain’t up to it. This is a chance for the people of Stafford to say, ‘We don’t want to go back to the bad old days of 10 years of decline under the Labor Party.’

Believe it or not, the opposition leader was praising the Victorian government in his contribution. Out of any government to praise in Australia that would be at the bottom of the barrel, but that is the only place he knows where to play. The opposition leader only plays in the gutter, only plays in the bottom of the barrel. We have a great record after a year and a half. We are turning the tide on the failures of the Labor Party and that opposition leader.

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): The Minister for Sport is not above the law. Under Commonwealth law, the minister was obligated to tell the Australian Electoral Commission where he was living so he could be properly enrolled to vote, not where his electorate officer lived—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): The Deputy Premier will cease his interjections.

Mr DICK:—not where his mail was being sent and not where he was leaving his gym bag. Under Commonwealth law, the minister had an obligation to properly and lawfully enrol to vote. The Minister for Sport is not above the law.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the Deputy Premier under the standing orders. Member for Waterford, you are making gesticulations and faces at me. Do you have something you wish to raise?

Ms Fentiman: No, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are on a warning. You are on very thin ice. I will not tolerate any disrespect of the chair.

Mr DICK: Under Commonwealth law, the minister was obliged to tell the Australian Electoral Commission where he was living so he could be properly enrolled to vote, not where his electorate officer was living, not where his mail was being sent and not where he was leaving his gym bag. Under Commonwealth law, the minister had an obligation to properly and lawfully enrol to vote. The Minister for Sport is not above the law.

News reporting has revealed the minister has failed to comply with the law. News reports state that the Minister for Sport was living in the Parliamentary Annexe, not a three-bedroom, one-bathroom home in Arana Hills with his electorate officer. Queenslanders deserve answers, but, once again, we get nothing from this secretive Premier and this secretive LNP government.

All we have from the Minister for Sport is a timeline of inconsistencies—a conga line of deflections and evasions. What the Minister for Sport is asking every Queenslander to believe is, on its face, simply unbelievable. The minister disclosed to the Crisafulli LNP government in July last year that he was in a relationship with another minister. The minister registered to vote at an Arana Hills rental property occupied by one of the minister's electorate officers. When did the minister update his change of address with the Electoral Commission? Did he update it in July when he was legally obliged to do so? Does the minister expect Queenslanders to believe that he was sharing the fridge and toaster with his electorate officer from July to March and not living in the Parliamentary Annexe?

According to the 'Feeding the Chooks' column in the *Australian* newspaper, the minister was spending most of his time in taxpayer-funded accommodation at the Parliamentary Annexe. Despite this, it has been reported that the minister was enrolled to vote at Arana Hills. The minister, it appears, has told the Electoral Commission his place of residence was the rental property at Arana Hills. Telling the Electoral Commission something that is not true is a breach of the Queensland Criminal Code, the Commonwealth Criminal Code or both. Breaching the Commonwealth Criminal Code or the state Criminal Code is a breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

It is clear from media reporting that the Minister for Sport was living upstairs in the taxpayer-funded Parliamentary Annexe for some time, not only getting free accommodation but potentially opening up the taxpayers of this state to a fringe benefits tax liability. If media reports are correct, while Queenslanders are struggling to pay their rent and mortgage, the Minister for Sport was getting a taxpayer-funded roof over his head.


Why did the Minister for Sport keep this a secret? Ministers have a higher duty when it comes to integrity, so it is unclear where the minister has been living for the past few months—upstairs in the Parliamentary Annexe or at his electorate officer's home, where it is reported that no neighbours have ever seen him. Surely a high-profile former NRL referee—a man being picked up and dropped off by his taxpayer-funded chauffeur every day—would be recognised.

The Minister for Sport needs to stand in this parliament today and provide more than a 30-second statement and come clean. All of this matters because it raises serious questions about the minister, the Premier, the LNP government and their integrity. The LNP always think they are better than everyday, ordinary working Queenslanders. The LNP do not work for Queenslanders; they think Queenslanders work for them. This goes to show that they think they are also above the law.

Today the Minister for Sport failed to guarantee he has complied with Commonwealth law. He could not bring himself to utter the words 'Australian Electoral Commission'. Three times the Minister for Sport could have put this to bed. Three times the Minister for Sport failed to declare that he followed Commonwealth law. Queenslanders cannot pick and choose when they follow Commonwealth laws. This murky episode of *Home and Away* has far more time to run.

The minister and the Premier must face the press gallery and answer some questions. The sports minister should table in parliament today all of his updates to the electoral roll so Queenslanders know when they occurred.

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.21 pm): Listening to the speeches coming from those over that side just reminded me of the litany of failures of the Shepherdson inquiry, with the rorters over there who were employed by the Leader of the Opposition to run the highest office in the land. What hypocrisy from the people who shielded 'Bollinger

Bob', who lived upstairs here for years without paying anything! If they want to go down that path, we have plenty and we have more recent things. I warn them. I warn them right now—old smiley over there, old lanky over there walking around, wheeling his bike out in the mornings to go for a stroll—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Minister, resume your seat, please.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That outburst was totally unparliamentary.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I give warning now that I will be warning members under the standing orders in rapid succession, starting with the member for Miller. Attorney-General, you will be next.

Mr NICHOLLS: I turn now to the opportunity for the people of Stafford to send a message. That message is pretty clear. The message they can send is in relation to the performance of a lazy opposition, an opposition that has not come up with a policy and an opposition that has failed singularly in the better part of 18 months to advance anything that will advance the interests of the people of Queensland.

Yesterday we saw further evidence of that laziness. Yesterday Labor's candidate for Stafford, Luke Richmond, chose the Prince Charles Hospital as a backdrop for a B-grade social media reel. It is an ironic choice given we know that Luke Richmond was the faceless architect of Labor's health crisis that included selling the Prince Charles Hospital short and leaving the Stafford community in the lurch. Luke Richmond has been the shadowy, faceless right-hand man to an unholy trinity of failed health ministers—Yvette D'Ath, Shannon Fentiman and Steven Miles. He stood behind those ministers every time promises were broken. Luke Richmond is the common thread woven through Labor's litany of failures across the health system—out-of-control ramping; surgical waiting lists that have blown out; maternity ward closures of up to 1,000 days; and, tellingly, the DNA lab debacle. They all took place under Labor's Luke Richmond.

Labor's candidate was even bold enough to talk about saving the Prince Charles Hospital. Let's have a quick look at Labor's record when it comes to the Prince Charles Hospital. The independent report into Labor's failed hospital building program castigated the dearth of investment in health infrastructure. They had 10 years and three ministers and they did not invest. There was the Infrastructure Partnerships Australia comment that the Labor Party's capital expansion program was no more than a mirage of media releases. That is what Luke Richmond stands for.

Luke Richmond and Labor neglected the electorate of Stafford. Labor and Luke Richmond failed to do proper clinical planning for the hospital. What did the report say? It left it short of critical services like short-stay beds for paediatric emergencies—you could turn up, but just do not take your kids; expansion space for operating theatres—you could turn up, but there would be no room to carry out an operation; or a full sterilising centre—you could turn up, but there would be no safe sterilising equipment. That is what the independent report found out. That is what Luke Richmond was offering the people of Stafford.

Adding to this mess was a \$488 million cost blowout—half a billion dollars—and a delay of at least two years thanks to unresolved scope and design issues. I also note that Luke Richmond is silent on his role in Labor's BPICs or CFMEU tax which saw onsite productivity fall by more than 20 per cent—worse even than Labor in Victoria—and he worked in Steven Miles' office!


Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members to my left, order! That is highly disorderly. There is too much chatter and interjections from my left. I know it is spirited debate, but I am going to run a hard line. You are all on notice.

Mr NICHOLLS: That was Luke Richmond's efforts for Labor. Let's look at the performance of the Prince Charles Hospital. Under Labor, with Luke Richmond in the shadows, the elective surgery list across Queensland went from 35,000 to 66,000. Residents of Stafford were not spared. In that period the waitlist went from 1,139 to over 2,180—almost doubling. The ramping record at Prince Charles went from 24 per cent in 2015 to an all-time high of 55 per cent under those opposite. The latest monthly figure under the LNP is 37.1 per cent. Luke Richmond's record does not stand up, but the LNP is delivering for the people of Stafford.

(Time expired)

Cost of Living

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (2.27 pm): After that contribution from the health minister it would seem that he and the LNP are a little bit worried about the campaign that Luke Richmond and Labor will run in Stafford, ensuring every constituent in Stafford knows they cut 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital under their watch. Imagine the patient flow outcomes that would be happening at that hospital now if they had not delayed and built 93 beds that Labor would have delivered for that community! That is what every constituent in Stafford will know.

They will also know that this Premier is all photo-op and no follow-up. Queenslanders need cost-of-living relief right now. They need fuel security right now. They need leadership right now. Of course everyone is talking about affordability and the cost of living. It is the issue at the forefront of everyone's mind, of every family sitting down crunching the numbers and doing the budget, of every Queenslander at the check-out and the bowser.

It is even harder not to mention the complete lack of action we are seeing from this Premier. Other states have acted with urgency. Tasmania has passed emergency fuel laws and reduced the cost of transportation, but this Premier has ignored all of our concerns and then increased the price of car rego. While Western Australia has accelerated renewable energy investment, this Premier has scrapped Labor's targets and cancelled projects. Investment is down and the number of people on energy bill hardship payments are through the roof. New South Wales has a statewide fuel dashboard and a 24/7 emergency operations centre, but the Premier just goes on Karl Stefanovic and blames Albo. Please, Premier, do something. Do anything!

Opposition members: Do better!


Ms FENTIMAN: Do better; I take that interjection. How is it that every other state's premier can act except ours? It is because premiers can act. They do have the ability to help Queensland families right now; it is just that this Premier will not act. When people are struggling, photo-ops just will not cut it. This government should want to be driven by action—not spin, not stunts and not carefully crafted photo-ops in high-vis. Of course the Labor opposition supports projects that create jobs and strengthen supply, like the Taroom Trough, on the condition that it goes back to Queenslanders.

Let me ask: why has the Premier not sent any formal proposal about this to Canberra? Why has the Premier asked for an assessment pathway that does not currently exist? Why is the Premier refusing to say whether Queensland will develop its own fuel stockpile? It is because he loves to point the finger when he cannot lift a hand. Families struggling right now do not care about spin; they care about solutions. They care about immediate action and transparency when it comes to petrol prices. They care about power prices. They care about affordable bills.

Instead of getting relief, they are getting hikes. The former Labor government provided relief. We cut 20 per cent off people's rego. Now we are seeing the LNP not only scrap that discount even though Queenslanders are still struggling; they have increased Queenslanders' rego bills by 24 per cent. Families are getting slugged before they even hit the road. Every trip to work, every school drop-off and every run to the shops costs more and more because the Premier will not do anything.

The Treasurer has said he wants the government to respect taxpayers' money, but Queenslanders are starting to ask when this government will start respecting them. Right now they are paying more to register their car, they are paying more every time they fill up, and they are getting less in return. This is a government that talks about the cost of living, but every decision it has made is making life more expensive for Queenslanders. The government has not delivered a single dollar back into the pockets of hardworking Queenslanders. This Premier is more interested in scripting the story than solving the problem. He is more interested in the photo-op than the follow-up. When will this Premier stop the spin and actually start helping Queensland families?

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (2.32 pm): It gives me great pleasure to follow not just the first but the second audition we have seen in this House today, because we know full well that the failed opposition leader is trying to run a by-election in Stafford with a Labor guy who obviously wrote the Labor bible, and we will get to that.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): The member for Cairns is warned under the standing orders.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is outstanding to follow the member for Waterford, who presided over the worst ever ambulance ramping in Australian history, at 45.5 per cent. That is the record of the member for Waterford. I would suggest that Luke Richmond, the Labor prince, was behind it. What have we seen under this Crisafulli government and the health minister? We have ambulance ramping down, at 37.3 per cent. We know that more needs to be done—it is just like in crime—but we are coming off a base where crime was up 193 per cent under those opposite. Imagine what the people of Stafford think about that. Once again it is the Labor Party prioritising their union and party machine mates over the good, hardworking people of Queensland.

You only have to have a quick look at this Labor candidate's bio on Labor's website. It notes that the Labor candidate was a lawyer with a background in health policy. You betcha he was! His background in health policy ran the highest ambulance ramping in the nation and he presided over the DNA debacle. This was the guy who left victims all across Queensland. They did not care about victims; that is why the Crisafulli government has the first ever victims minister. I give the victims minister a big shout-out for looking after victims, whose numbers were increasing because of those opposite and their decade of decline. I feel for the people of Stafford having someone from the Labor machine compared to the LNP's candidate, Fiona Hammond, who has represented that area for years and years. She is a fresh start for the people of Stafford. Let's have a chat about the Queensland Labor Party's state platform.


Mr Mellish interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Aspley is warned under the standing orders.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I know that we keep talking about the Labor candidate, but we have to talk about the recent document that was endorsed by the Labor Party on 29-30 November 2025. You would wonder who wrote a plan that did not have the words 'youth crime' in it but did have 'raise the age of criminal responsibility'. We know that the member for Waterford and the member for Gaven were all in behind that push, but who actually wrote the Queensland Labor State Platform 2025? That would have to be the Labor Party's candidate for the state seat of Stafford, Luke Richmond. What else does this joker think is a good idea? They want to bring back BPIC. They want to increase the cost of builds across this great state. Instead of trying to fight for getting people off the streets and into those homes, what does this joker want to do? He wants to bring back BPIC. He wants to increase the age of criminal responsibility to ensure that we have even more victims in Queensland.

It is the Crisafulli government under the leadership of David Crisafulli and the state LNP team that is improving things for the people of Stafford. We know that the guy the Labor Party thinks should represent them in this great House is a Labor hack who wrote the Labor Party platform that wants to increase the age of criminal responsibility. He wants to bring back BPIC and he wants to bring back the ambulance ramping that he presided over as a chief of staff for the Labor Party.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (2.37 pm): I hope longbow archery is in the Olympics because those are some of the longest bows I have ever seen drawn. What a joke! The fresh start that Premier Crisafulli promised has clearly gone stale. At a time of global instability that is driving up fuel costs and squeezing every household budget, the LNP government has failed to deliver cost-of-living relief.

Mr Nicholls: You wanted to have a go. That lasted about 20 seconds, didn't it? You were over there campaigning. Did you run out of bottles?

Mr MELLISH: Member for Clayfield, I am very happy to talk about Prince Charles Hospital and the 93 beds you have cut there. We will see if you reverse that during the campaign. When the former Labor government saw Queenslanders doing it tough we did not hesitate; we took decisive action. We introduced 50-cent fares to make public transport more affordable and saw a record uptake in public transport journeys. For those who had no choice but to drive we cut vehicle registration by 20 per cent. Now under the LNP, driving has never been more expensive. Vehicle rego costs are up 24 per cent, with another increase on the way later this year. We introduced energy rebates for every household. I know of some families that did not see an electricity bill for months as a result of our cost-of-living relief. Now under the LNP, the number of hardship payment plan registrations has almost doubled to more than 37,000 in the space of a year. While the LNP stands by, it is Labor that stands up for everyday Queenslanders.

I will give the LNP some credit, though. They have shown a real focus on lowering unemployment, but that is only the unemployment of their former MPs and councillors. This dedication to rehabilitate and rehome LNP rejects could almost be charitable. Peter Dutton is the latest beneficiary.

Premier Crisafulli has been typically vocal about calling on the federal government to come and save us from the fuel crisis. The Premier has been performing for the media—showing off his props, calling for solutions that already exist and ducking the very responsibilities of the job he was elected to do. If you want to know just how self-obsessed this PR Premier is, check out his latest social media videos. Half of them are of the Premier watching videos of the Premier and then looking up misty-eyed at the camera while the music builds and he talk about himself some more.

Today, weren't we given a treat with the new hands routine from the Premier? He has clearly had some body language coaching over recent weeks. The hands were doing a lot of the heavy lifting today, trying to defend the member for Everton. I cannot wait until he does the chicken dance with the member for Mermaid Beach. We should call him the 'Taroom Talker', because that is all he does: he talks. Usually all he does is write letters, but he has not even got around to writing a letter to the federal government, as the minister for the environment outlined yesterday. We have heard that they used to call him 'Two Stroke', because he makes a lot of noise but he cannot move anything of significance.

On fuel, instead of articulating a plan on how to support Queenslanders, the Premier called on the federal government to deliver a website that already exists. Well before the war broke out in Iran, Queensland Labor raised the alarm about the state of the fuel industry. By refusing to back our transport affordability bill—which had practical and meaningful reforms designed to protect motorists from painful spikes in fuel prices—this government have shown their hand.


While the Premier is asleep at the wheel, some hope is being delivered to the transport industry. The Fair Work Commission has stepped up, delivering a lifeline to drivers and transport operators pushed to the brink by rising fuel costs. Thanks to a campaign led by the Transport Workers Union and the Australian Road Transport Industrial Organisation, and backed in by the trucking industry, those at the top of the supply chain will be forced to pay their fair share. Fortnightly fuel reviews and fairer pay for owner drivers will deliver real support for an industry under significant pressure.

However, it was disappointing to hear the minister today not backing in the trucking industry yet again in his ministerial statement. He was having a bet each way. Yet again this transport minister is asleep at the wheel. The Albanese Labor government is showing what real leadership looks like, and it is not what we are seeing from Queensland.

I have heard so many regretful stories from commuters at the moment who, in the face of unpredictable and ever-rising fuel prices, have turned to public transport. Residents in my electorate stood in line at Geebung station for almost an hour, hoping and praying for a rail replacement bus that never arrived. They were late for work and missed appointments because of the inaction of this government. The Fair Work Commission made clear that this extra disruption was caused by the government locking out their own workers. Where was the minister? He hid from public scrutiny for 13 days. He makes a big noise in here but, when it is outside parliament, mate, he's cooked.

All of that is just life under the LNP. We are paying more and getting nothing in return from this government. While the transport system fell into chaos, the transport minister did not step up, he stepped out. For 13 days he hid. The minister spent 13 days hiding from scrutiny from the media and the very people he is supposed to represent. The criticism was damning and it was well deserved. When the minister finally emerged, all Queenslanders got were excuses and finger-pointing. Frankly, after watching this embarrassing display, he was right to hide. Paul Keating once said that leadership is about imagination and courage. This government showed us the dangers of what happens when you have neither. When it comes to transport, mate, they are cooked.

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.42 pm): There you have it. The member for Aspley was holding mobile offices in the electorate of Stafford because he wanted to jump seats and run in the by-election and be the candidate for Stafford. Do you know what he was told by the Leader of the Opposition? 'You can't. I can't afford two by-elections. I'm already half-cooked with this one.' The member for Aspley wanted to jump ship and run in the by-election.

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

Mrs GERBER: They would have been better off with him because their candidate—

Mr MELLISH: Point of order! Mr Deputy Speaker, point of order!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Minister, would you please resume your seat. Sorry, I did not see you, member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: I take personal offence regarding a funeral I am heading to tomorrow, which the member is referring to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I understand. You have raised a point of order. I will rule on that. Minister, the member for Aspley has taken personal offence at what you said. Will you withdraw?

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw. The Labor Party would have been better off with the member for Aspley because it has come to light that the candidate they have put up, Luke Richmond, was one of the right-hand men of the unholy trinity—the member for Waterford and wannabe opposition leader, the current opposition leader and former health minister D’Ath. He was the right-hand man when victims saw the greatest injustice in our justice system: the DNA debacle where victims were failed as a result.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mrs GERBER: Member for McConnel, I take your interjections. He was the chief of staff to the failed minister for health and member for Waterford, who wants to be the opposition leader, as well as to then minister D’Ath, who is another failed health minister, and to the current opposition leader.

That is not all. It has come to light that Labor’s candidate in the Stafford by-election was in fact the assistant state secretary and the author of Labor’s state platform for 2025. That document does not reference youth crime, but do you know what it does reference? It says that Labor will increase the age of criminal responsibility from 10 years to 14 years. That means that a youth who commits a heinous crime at aged 10, 11, 12 or 13 will face no—

Ms Grace: Here we go. You’ve got nothing.

Mrs GERBER: The member for McConnel is saying, ‘Here you go.’ In 2023 a 13-year-old girl was tortured in Noosa by a 12-year-old and a 13-year-old. Under your failed state policy, those criminals would not face any justice. That 13-year-old victim, who was tortured by those youth criminals, would not have justice and there would have been no consequences. The opposition are continuing to defend that position. I listened to the interjections from the member for McConnel. That is their state platform and she is defending it right now.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence and I ask that that be withdrawn.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member for McConnel has taken personal reference. Will you withdraw?

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw. Labor’s candidate for Stafford is the faceless architect of Labor’s health crisis who oversaw the DNA debacle that saw hundreds of victims failed as a result of Labor. It is the worst case of maladministration this state has ever seen, and he was there as the right-hand man to the Labor health minister at the time. He is the architect of Labor’s state platform that wants to remove consequences for action for youth and see the age of criminal responsibility raised to 14.

What is worse is that Labor have chosen this party machine as their candidate for Stafford. They know that when the last by-election was held in Stafford the Labor opposition leader at the time, Palaszczuk, received a 19 per cent swing to her. They know that if this opposition leader does not get a double-digit swing he is cooked, it is done, he is gone. It will be an abject failure of his leadership and his policies. He will be wholly rejected. In the last by-election that was held in that seat, the Labor opposition got a 19 per cent swing to them. If this failed opposition leader does not get double digits, he is cooked, he is gone. There is no way his position as opposition leader is tenable.

The people of Stafford need to know Luke Richmond’s history. They need to know that he was there for the health crisis, he was there for the DNA debacle, he was there when victims were failed and he was a part of writing the platform that will see youth criminals escape consequences for action. The Leader of the Opposition knows it too. He knows it, and he knows that if he does not win with double digits he is goneski.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.47 pm): Before I begin I think it is important that we all recognise that we should thrive in the privilege of democracy and representing democracy in our communities. None of us should get to a position where we want to lament our time in this House. I think it is best if all members of all sides recognise this as we move forward throughout this week especially.

Times are tough for Queenslanders. Times are tough for regional Queenslanders. Every day across this state, mums and dads, pensioners, tradies, professionals, trainees and apprentices are finding it harder to stretch their weekly wage to be as long as the working week. The lack of action on

cost-of-living support and a failure to address the current crisis on the cost of transport is exposing the government for what it is—a government in name only, focused on testing their next slogan and rhyming couplet. Whether it is the transport minister blaming working people for his train line bungles, choosing not to continue electricity and vehicle rego rebates, ignoring the levers available to them under ministerial powers in the state or, as we saw today, giving up on it all and just blaming the federal government, this LNP government have given up on governing for Queenslanders. Instead, they are trying to cover themselves from Queenslanders.

Last sitting week the government had an opportunity to bring about real fuel price relief for Queenslanders by supporting the opposition's private member's bill. Last sitting week the government chose to deny families the support they need as they navigate the school drop-off, the car ride to work, the school pick-up, the daily and weekly shop, the drive to training for their kids' sport—and that is not just one night a week but two nights a week plus the game on the weekend—and any unexpected trips to the doctor or the hospital, school excursions, car servicing, mechanical work and more. Still we see no immediate plan to ease the burden on families across Queensland, especially in regional Queensland.

Having a fuel dashboard does not change the fact that this weekend across the Fraser Coast and the Bundaberg region some families will travel an hour and a half in one direction so their kids can play an hour of footy, netball, hockey or whatever it may be and then they will jump in their car and drive an hour and a half back home. I can guarantee they will not be talking about a national dashboard on the car ride home.

It is not just families. We have heard across vital industries of the pressure on employers to keep their doors open. From farming to freighting, Queensland business is under the pump because there is no relief at the bowser. Fabricators with large contracts to deliver key infrastructure projects across this state are having to take significant financial losses to keep their winning reputation through fixed price contracts they have signed in good faith. Wholesalers who have built their reputation on the family name need this government to act and support them so their reputation with their buyers is not tarnished by having to impose fuel levies on delivery.


The Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I met with these families and businesses only two weeks ago in Bundaberg. Every business we listened to raised fuel relief as a priority for their business and it should be a priority for this state government. Across the Wide Bay our tourism operators are feeling more than just a pinch and are calling for this state government to do what every other state government across this country has done—that is, act within the powers they have to alleviate fuel pressure during this fuel crisis.

Bundaberg is a drive destination for tourism, as are Maryborough and Hervey Bay. The world famous turtle season at Mon Repos runs from November to March. What confidence can this government give businesses across the Bundaberg region that next season will not just bring the turtles but also the families from the Sunshine Coast, Brisbane and the Gold Coast and that they can afford to fuel up their car and drive up and experience that world famous event? What about in Hervey Bay and across the Fraser Coast? What has the member for Hervey Bay done to stand up for his constituents and say that he will guarantee that the whale-watching season will not be impacted and that the cost of operation will be alleviated so that we will see families getting in the car and driving to Hervey Bay? What has the member for Maryborough done to assure his local businesses, especially the cafes, that—

An opposition member: Where people get abused.

Mr SMITH: I am not taking interjections—the heritage city will still have families coming and visiting? This government needs to act. They need to act now.

Crime, North Brisbane

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.52 pm): It is always great to rise and make a contribution after the member for Bundaberg. I want to reflect on some comments made by the member for Waterford in her contribution a few minutes ago. She started her contribution by saying that some people were concerned about the by-election in Stafford. I think the people who need to be concerned about the by-election in Stafford are the people of Stafford and the people of north Brisbane. I am happy to go through a chronology of what crime occurred in north Brisbane under a decade of those opposite, who proudly watered down the law.

We know that across Queensland after they proudly watered down the law on multiple occasions the number of victims increased by 193 per cent. In north Brisbane alone in that time robberies increased by 80 per cent and break and enters increased by 47 per cent. In the short time we have

been in government—and I appreciate there is a lot more work to do and we will continue to do that work—we have started to see a decline in both of those, with robberies now down 13.5 per cent and break and enters down 11.9 per cent. What we cannot afford to do—and what the people of Stafford cannot afford to do—is take a backward step in our ongoing fight to return community safety to Stafford and the broader north Brisbane area.

Another way we are doing that is by having more police. Members would have heard me say this morning that those opposite had a strategy of fewer police and weaker laws and celebrated fewer arrests as success. We have a starkly different approach with more police, and we now have 13,000 police for the first time in Queensland. We have sworn in over 1,600. We promised we would do that in our first term and we did it in the first 18 months. Almost 200 of those new police have gone to north Brisbane.

We cannot afford to take a backward step when it comes to what we are doing to drive down crime in Queensland. That is why it is awfully concerning to learn, as expressed by those who have spoken before me, that the Labor candidate preselected to run for the seat of Stafford was a former top adviser to two former Labor attorneys-general when they were in government for 10 years, the member for Waterford and the former member for Redcliffe. We know that both of them, as is recorded in *Hansard*, were the architects of Labor's youth crime crisis. We cannot afford for someone with that ideology—soft on crime and fewer police—to take a backward step at Stafford. Also we have found out, as has been articulated, that in his current role as the assistant state secretary of the Labor Party he is one of the authors of this document, the 2025 Labor policy platform.


You would think by now they would have learned the lessons after 10 years of watered down laws and crime spiralling out of control not only in Far North Queensland but also in north Brisbane. You would think they would have learned from their mistakes. We have now found out that their candidate for Stafford, Luke Richmond, was one of the authors of this document, which contains a policy position that was in line with a policy position we know was advocated by the former attorney-general the member for Waterford and the former member for Redcliffe when she was the attorney-general to raise the age of criminal responsibility in Queensland. Essentially, that would have meant young people on SROs—as we are seeing now such as in the story we heard from the youth justice minister today of 12- and 13-year-olds committing serious violent offences—would not be held to account at all. Police would be powerless to take any action.

We know that is what those opposite stand for. They were soft on crime. They were proud to be soft on crime and we saw that have dire consequences right across Queensland. That is why I am happy that Fiona Hammond has put her hand up again to run for us in the seat of Stafford. She is a local champion who for 15 years represented the people of north Brisbane in the Brisbane City Council. She is a strong local advocate for safer communities, for infrastructure and for all of the things this government is fighting to improve after a decade of decline under those opposite.

In response to the member for Waterford's contribution, which she started by saying that people are concerned about the by-election in Stafford, I say that the people of Stafford are the ones who need to be concerned because the person the Labor Party put up is a former Labor Party hack who has worked for those opposite and who is proud to be soft on crime. We cannot afford to take a step back.

The Crisafulli government is doing everything we can and Fiona Hammond is on board with this. She will have a seat at the table if elected the member for Stafford; she will have a seat on the government benches. We cannot afford to take a step back and go back to the bad old days of those opposite.

Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (2.57 pm): 'Disgraceful' is how I would describe the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme in Queensland. This is not a new issue or something that has suddenly appeared overnight. I have been raising this issue since I was a candidate back in 2003 and in 2005 when I stood in the House and called out the failures of the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme. Back then, the subsidy was a pittance and today it is a dismal pittance. It has seen different governments but the same neglect.

I have repeatedly raised the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme in the parliament through questions, speeches and advocacy, most recently through a formal question on notice calling for CPI indexation and increased financial support. The Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme is a joke; \$70 a night and 34 cents a kilometre does not even come close to covering the real costs while fuel, travel and accommodation costs have exploded. To highlight how measly the current PTSS is, in 2013 the accommodation subsidy

was \$60; 13 years later it is \$70. I repeat: 13 years later there has been an increase of a lousy \$10. Meanwhile, the real cost of accommodation has blown out massively. Even Queensland Health admits that a \$70 allowance leaves patients significantly out of pocket.

That is not all. The private vehicle subsidy travel rate of 30 cents per kilometre was introduced in 2013. It took 13 years for that to be increased to a pathetic 34 cents per kilometre. That is an increase of four cents per kilometre when during that time the price of fuel has exploded. Last month I called on the government to urgently review and double the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme. The reality is rural and regional Queensland families are being forced to choose between putting food on the table or travelling for life-saving medical treatment. Queenslanders are delaying treatment, going into debt or suffering because they simply cannot afford to travel to access specialist treatment services in Townsville, Cairns or Brisbane. There have been multiple petitions over the years on the PTSS, with the latest petition closing yesterday with over 6,000 signatures demanding action.

The system is not just underfunded; it is complex. With all of the red tape that you have to go through, the subsidy ends up being a pittance. Even charities are now being overwhelmed trying to pick up the slack. Data from the charity Ronald McDonald House reveals that demand is growing so fast that in Townsville in 2025 it had to turn away around 360 families because it simply did not have the capacity. That is families left to fend for themselves being forced to find thousands of dollars for accommodation and travel, sleeping in cars and delaying treatment for their children all because the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme does not come anywhere near close to the real cost of care. While this is happening, the government is pouring billions into luxuries such as the Olympics and Cross River Rail which North Queensland is not benefiting from. Regional Queenslanders deserve the same access to medical treatment as those in Brisbane. It is not a luxury; it is a basic right that saves lives. I again call on the government to immediately double the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme and index it to CPI, simplify the system and stop treating rural and regional Queenslanders like second-class citizens.

EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 964, on motion of Mrs Gerber—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (3.02 pm): I rise to speak to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. Before I start the debate formally, I want to acknowledge the passing of Jimmy Sullivan, who was one of all of us, and pass on my condolences to his family. He will be greatly missed.

I want to thank the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee secretariat for its very good work in bringing this bill through the committee process. It does a great job each day supporting us to scrutinise the legislation. Without it, we would not have been able to hear firsthand the views of Queenslanders. I also thank the many organisations and individuals who took the time to write to the committee and/or to appear before us. As we are all aware, there are three elements to this bill: the expansion of the application of the government's Adult Crime, Adult Time agenda with a further 12 offences; the repeal of Labor's police drug diversion program, a program which had been specifically requested by police; and the establishment of designated business and community precincts. I will speak to each of these separately.

Regarding the expansion of Adult Crime, Adult Time offences to a further 12, bringing to a total of 47 the number of offences covered under this slogan—the government recently said 45 but had forgotten, which it does a bit, the two offences contained within the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026—I note that this is now the third time we have come back to this parliament to expand Adult Crime, Adult Time legislation, in addition to some amendments to other bills tacked on by this government, with Queenslanders hoping that this time the government will get it right. Despite what the Premier—who is all photo-op and no follow-up—says, Queenslanders do not seem to be feeling safe yet. Stakeholders were perplexed about the addition of these 12 offences and were unclear on how they would contribute to community safety. If only they had been able to see the advice of the Expert Legal Panel, which the minister had so frequently referenced and which she had promised us all would be provided to the committee; if only when that advice was provided it was provided in a timely fashion and not posted on the department's

website at the very moment public hearings were beginning; if only once we saw it it was the actual advice and not a report of what the panel did. As the Bar Association of Queensland stated in the public hearing to the committee after having less than an hour to review the report—

What I will note is that it is apparent from reading the report that it is not, in fact, the advice that was provided to government. It is a report which states that advice was provided to cabinet and it appears to be a report which essentially describes a process and then refers to advice having been provided rather than demonstrating what the advice was.

...

... it also needs to be observed that the task that was given to the panel was a very narrow one.

...

... it is not clear whether there was any requirement for these offences to be demonstrated as posing a real risk to the community as committed by children.

No wonder stakeholders could not understand why these particular 12 offences were added, and of course none of the stakeholders had been consulted because the LNP just does not do that. The Youth Advocacy Centre said—

The Statement of Compatibility says that 'the current situation with respect to youth crime in Queensland presents an exceptional crisis situation constituting a threat to public safety.' This is simply untrue, particularly in relation to the following offences, for which we can find no reported cases of children being sentenced in the last 5 years ...

In fact, the data which the opposition requested of the department shows that for five of the 12 offences there have been no juvenile convictions recorded in the last 10 years and of a further five of that 12 that do have a meaningful, though not high, number of young people charged there has been no significant increase in the levels of offending among that cohort. This is from Voice for Victims—

The expansion to include s.311 (aiding suicide) and s.316 (stupefying in order to commit indictable offence) raises important considerations for community understanding and transparency. The Statement of Compatibility does not provide sufficient explanation of the nature or scope of these offences ...

Stakeholder after stakeholder raised similar issues, begging the question of whether adding these new offences will actually make any difference to the number of victims, which is what we all want to see. We all want to see victim numbers go down. We all want the community to not only be safe but to feel safe as well.

I have consulted with many Queenslanders, including my local youth advisory panel, about these laws. Unfortunately the panel was formed only a couple of days before submissions had to be made to the committee and so there was not sufficient time for it to put something together, but I promised instead that if the members of that panel gave me their thoughts I would speak them in parliament. I believe it is incredibly important that we hear from young people about policies and laws we are making for young people, so thank you to Zeta, Ava, Lucie, Liam, Gabrielle, Hannah, Zara, Poppy, Camilla, Noah and Hayden. There is not the time to read out every single comment, but I valued them all. Their views were varied. Looking for the strongest theme throughout, it was clear that, regardless of what they thought about the laws we put in place, these young people believe government needs to be looking at the reasons young people are committing offences in the first place. What a disappointment for them then that, despite the rhetoric from this government about its so-called rolled-gold early intervention, we are already seeing many programs collapsing, being cancelled or delayed, with the government's crime prevention schools being the latest casualty.

I turn now to designated business and community precincts. In addressing these particular clauses, I want to acknowledge the very real concerns that many people hold about disruptive behaviour in their communities. These are valid concerns which the government should be addressing. However, the Labor opposition shares the concerns of many stakeholders about the reality of the LNP government's proposed DBCPs and the government's failure to consult on their impacts.

I will outline the common themes articulated by stakeholders, not in any particular order. No. 1 is that many of the people captured by the precincts proposal will in fact be people suffering extreme disadvantage—those who are homeless, victims of DV, those suffering mental health issues, those facing unsustainable cost-of-living pressures and many people who are incredibly vulnerable for a range of reasons. Lee-Anne Whalley of Althea Projects said—

Many of the people ... are sleeping rough in public spaces. They are living with trauma, mental health challenges, physical health issues and substance dependence. For many of them just day-to-day survival has priority over long-term planning. Our approach recognises that public intoxication and antisocial behaviour are not stand-alone issues. They are often symptoms of homelessness, trauma, poor health and systemic disadvantage. That is why our focus is always on welfare first.

No. 2 is that the proposal does not resolve the underlying issues. Q Shelter said—

... we are very concerned that in the context of a deep and worsening housing crisis—

of course, we know that the LNP has only made this worse by cancelling affordable housing projects and scrapping housing targets—

this bill risks responding to visible disadvantage with enforcement rather than addressing the underlying causes.

No. 3 is that if people are moved from CBDs the government will only be displacing the problem to other areas, and there appears to be no promise from the government to address this in terms of wraparound support. The Nambour Community Centre said—

.. shifting the issue rather than resolving it—without clear pathways to assistance, these measures may shift people around rather than address the underlying issues driving the harmful behaviour. When a person is excluded from a precinct, where do they go and what support is available to them?

Mayor Natoli from Sunshine Coast Council was very clear on this, saying—

We would also ask that resourcing be considered. Council already carries considerable costs in this space, and if displacement puts extra pressure on our own resources—because people are gathering in other public spaces—then those costs will grow for council. We would ask that that be a consideration of this committee as well going forward—those resourcing implications for local government—and that there is a measure of success. Enforcement activity alone is not a measure of success. What we need to see is genuine sustained improvement.

Townsville Shopping Centre representatives made an extremely thorough submission. Their issues are clearly deeply disturbing. This centre appears to be on the outside of the DBCP that Townsville City Council has initially proposed for the city. I asked them in the committee hearing how they felt about knowing people could be displaced to their centre, which is already experiencing significant disruption, and whether they would like to see the government committing to the resources needed to manage this. They, quite rightly, were very concerned, saying, 'We need to address it now.'

No. 4 is that by introducing this concept the government will actually exacerbate the problems. Referring to a recent court decision involving Moreton Bay Regional Council, Basic Rights Queensland said—

We endorse Justice Smith's findings that: 'when people are evicted from a public space this perpetuates a lack of connection and exclusion from broader society and it can add to isolation and stigma and creates fractures in society. If people are moved on without alternative accommodation the outcome is likely further hardship and the psychological toll can be severe.'

No. 5 is that the government already has powers available to it to deal with disruption in public spaces. As Mr Damien Bartholomew from the Queensland Law Society told the committee—

There are already, of course, many powers that exist for police in dealing with public spaces ... it is the view of the society that there are already sufficient powers to be able to regulate community and to be able to protect the community.

I now come to the section of the bill that deals with the repeal of Labor's police drug diversion program. In the 16 months the LNP have been in government we have, unfortunately, become so familiar with their playbook. The instructions to ministers when preparing legislation are, 'Don't consult, ignore the experts, don't bother looking at the evidence, don't overthink it, make it sound good and, of course, if possible, make it rhyme.' We saw them do it with termination of pregnancy. We saw them do it with pill testing. We saw them do it with gender-affirming care. We even saw it with the flu vaccine. Each of these actions was so dangerous. Expert after expert implored the government to look at the evidence, to take the trouble to understand just how damaging their actions would be, but the LNP just did not care. They did not give two hoots, and this is after the Premier pledged to listen to experts.

We thought those things were bad enough, but now we come to this—the repealing of a drug diversion regime that the Labor government put in place because police asked us to do it, because experts asked us to do it. The evidence shows that it works because it saves lives. It implemented an evidence-based health response where health services were invested in to support Queenslanders— not cut, like what occurs under the LNP.

No-one wants to see the damage drugs do. Drug addiction is a personal tragedy and it is a tragedy for the community. That is why it is so important that the way we deal with it is based on evidence—not ideology—because we want to fix it. The evidence clearly says that it is a health response, not a criminal response, that is effective in dealing with minor drug possession—clearly. What does this government want to do? They want the criminal response—the one that does not work, the one that actually puts Queenslanders at risk—because it sounds good. We all know how much this government likes to sound good, even if it is just making stuff up. Again, experts are imploring them not to go ahead with this. In fact, there is a bit more than 'imploring' on many occasions. The AMA said—

AMA Queensland condemns the government's decision to repeal the laws supporting the PDDP as dangerous and contrary to evidence.

We know that the AMA tried on multiple occasions to meet with the government to discuss this, to no avail. They go on to say—

'Taking a strong stance on drugs' simply won't stop drug use or harms, despite the government's rhetoric. People who use alcohol and other drugs need and deserve evidence-based programs that support their mental and physical health and we urge the government to do just that and retain the PDDP.

It is so disappointing that the parliamentary committee, dominated by LNP members, did not hear firsthand from AMA Queensland during the committee process. It is such a shame that we were not able to hear through oral testimony the work of Queensland's peak body for doctors, who provide strong health services for Queenslanders. Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies said—

Compared with criminal justice system responses, universal health-based responses to problematic substance use are more effective and have a strong return on investment. It is estimated that for every dollar invested in alcohol and other drug treatment and harm reduction services, there is a seven-dollar return via improved health status, improved psychological wellbeing, and participation in the community.

Further, referring to QPS data, they said—

Over an 18-month reporting period, the majority of people provided with a Drug Diversion Warning had no further contact with the program ...

The Australian Drug Foundation said—

Research consistently finds diversion is associated with improved quality of life, including improved health ...

The explanatory notes for the bill state that the LNP government consulted with the Mental Health Commissioner and that all stakeholder feedback was carefully considered. The submission from the Mental Health Commissioner—a health expert—stated that the bill is unlikely to achieve its identified objectives and commented in the negative about the bill, including the impacts on First Nations communities. This is another prime example of the LNP not listening to the health experts and being guided by their ideology which usually leads to cuts to services, cuts to opportunities and, in this case, a cut in an opportunity for Queenslanders to get the health services and health response they so desperately need.

I could be here all day. Stakeholder after stakeholder, expert after expert and clinician after clinician clearly stated the case for a health response and implored the government to look at the evidence. With this bill, the LNP government is blatantly ignoring the health of Queenslanders, and do you know what? They actually know they are doing it, or they would not have hidden the work that was being done by the University of Queensland to evaluate the PDDP and the fact that almost 33,000 people were diverted through the program between May 2024 and March 2026. That is the evaluation the government paid over \$330,000 for—the one the progress report was showing really positive early signs for, the one they cancelled so we would not have to see that the PDDP was working. No-one would have even known about that without stakeholders pointing it out and the opposition formally requesting it through the committee process.

Regarding the issue of evidence, I should be fair and say that the LNP did try to throw one bit of evidence into the mix since this bill was introduced, with the Minister for Police quoting a national wastewater report which he says clearly indicates that drug use in Queensland is on the rise since the PDDP was introduced. It seems he made that up. The committee chair asked Rebecca Lang from QNADA, a highly regarded expert in this space, about this. He asked—

Would you accept that this evidence might suggest that as Australian states, including Queensland, have progressively relaxed the criminalisation of drug possession that drug use has increased dramatically in our community?

Ms Lang replied—

No. Wastewater analysis cannot be used to determine how many people use drugs or what the quantity is of a substance being consumed by an individual.

And—

It is really important in our space to triangulate our data sources and never rely on any one data source to make decisions about whether we can see a trend one way or the other.

Rebecca Lang is a true diplomat. The Bar Association had already addressed this issue in its written submission, pointing out that increased traces of drugs in wastewater had, in fact, been starting to occur well before the PDDP was introduced. My point is: if you are going to quote evidence, be credible about it and actually know what you are talking about. It was all a bit embarrassing really. We all want evidence-based and sound laws that will work for all Queenslanders. However, the evidence is clear through the committee that this bill, at the instigation of the Crisafulli LNP government, is cutting the ability for Queenslanders to get the health services and health responses they need. The LNP is

removing the opportunity for health-based intervention for care. It is clear that this bill will lead to worse health outcomes for Queenslanders and will limit the opportunity for Queenslanders to seek genuine rehabilitation. It is time the LNP put its ideology of cutting aside and steps up and support strong health programs, health services and a health response to a complex problem. Put simply, we cannot support a bill that cuts health-based intervention and the ability for a strong health response for Queenslanders. As such, I move—

That the words 'now read a second time' be deleted and the following words inserted—

'withdrawn, redrafted and reintroduced as two separate bills:

1. the first bill dealing with Adult Crime, Adult Time and Designated Business and Community Precincts, to be reintroduced and considered during this week's sitting; and
2. the second bill dealing with the Illicit Drug Enforcement and Diversion Framework, to be reintroduced and referred back to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to undertake a full and proper examination and report back to the House by 5 June 2026.'

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): We are now speaking to the amendment that has been moved by the member for Bulimba and circulated in the House.

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.23 pm): I rise to speak to the amendment moved by the member for Bulimba. There are moments as members of this House when a choice before us is clear and the outcomes stark. This bill is one of those moments. The Crisafulli LNP government would like to make this debate about their supposed signature crime laws—laws that they have had to amend over and over again; indeed, laws that stakeholders have raised serious concerns about.

In relation to the new offences being added in this bill, stakeholders like Voice for Victims have raised the limited impact they will likely have on victim numbers given the low number of previous convictions. Likewise, those opposite might want to make this debate all about the proposed designated business and community precincts and the move-on powers, which stakeholders were concerned will be a tool to criminalise homelessness and to push the most vulnerable from the support services they need but, when one looks at the real consequences of this bill, this debate is really about health and health-based interventions.

Today we are being asked to decide what kind of Queensland we want to be: a Queensland that invests in health care for our citizens or a Queensland that cuts health services; a Queensland that supports people through addiction and mental health challenges or a Queensland that punishes them for it; a Queensland that listens to doctors, nurses and health experts or one that ignores advice in favour of antiquated ideology. I know one thing for sure, and that is that Labor will always choose health care and will always stand against LNP cuts.

Under the guise of taking a strong stance on drugs, the Crisafulli LNP government is quietly winding back the opportunity for health-based interventions for those who need it the most—those who are found with small quantities of drugs for personal use. It winds back drug diversion and rips away a pathway to care for Queenslanders in need. As a former health minister, I cannot stand for cuts to health care. Labor will never stand for cuts to health care. We are not the only ones calling out the Crisafulli LNP government's ideological charade. 'Dangerous and contrary to advice' are the words of the state's leading medical body, the AMAQ. They say that the data showed that the drug diversion program was successfully supporting patients. The Queensland Aboriginal and Islander Health Council said—

The repeal of the Police Drug Diversion Program will limit opportunities for individuals to access early intervention and treatment for alcohol and other drug use.

The Alcohol and Drug Foundation outlined that—

Diversion does not increase drug use and in fact can decrease it.

Even the government's own Mental Health Commissioner said the bill was unlikely to meet its objectives.

Our approach to this bill is not about being soft on drugs. On this side, my Labor team and I believe in strong laws to keep Queenslanders safe. We stand firmly on the side of victims and victim-survivors, but we also believe in something else—something this ideological LNP government is choosing to ignore: we believe in laws that will work, laws that are evidence based and grounded in expert advice and laws that will make communities safe. This bill, in its current form, fails that test. It is a bill based on ideology, not expert advice: the ideology of punishment over prevention, the ideology of slogans over solutions, the ideology of division over compassion. There is only one place that that leads


and that is to worse health outcomes for vulnerable Queenslanders, more pressure on our already overworked front line and more Queenslanders falling through the cracks and pushed into a life in the criminal justice system. Addiction is not a slogan or a political point to score.

Mr HUNT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I have just received the actual amendment. I do not believe that the member is being relevant to the amendment. He is talking in detail about the bill, not the amendment before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): I will seek some advice. Leader of the Opposition, I remind you that we are currently debating the amendment moved by the member for Bulimba. I ask you to be mindful of relevance to the amendment.

Mr MILES: The amendment moved by the member for Bulimba calls for additional consultation on the drug diversion elements. I am speaking to that element of the amendment.

Addiction is not a slogan. It is not a talking point or a political point to score. It is consuming, complex and sometimes silent. When someone is struggling with addiction, they need a helping hand. They need health care, not a night in a watch house, not a criminal record and not a court date. Sometimes they need a helping hand more than once to get their life back on track. Drug diversion offers access to treatment and support. It offers an opportunity to make a change. It is why I feel so strongly about this health problem requiring a health response.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (3.30 pm): I rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Bulimba. Today we are again here because the LNP, under the guise of having to come back for the fourth time on their signature crime slogan, wanted to sneak through a huge change to how we deal with people who are experiencing drug addiction or have a small quantity of drugs for personal use.

The member for Bulimba has moved this amendment, and the Labor opposition supports it, because on this huge change the police themselves, medical professionals and experts have all said that removing this will make things less safe here in Queensland and will potentially remove life-saving health care. That deserves proper consideration from key stakeholders. That deserves time before a committee so that we can properly examine just how devastating removing drug diversion will be. In fact, as we debate this very amendment the AMA have put out a media release. It is headed 'Drug diversion changes a blow to mental and preventive health in Queensland'. The media release states—

The Queensland government's move to repeal the state's drug diversion program is short-sighted and a blow to mental and preventive health.

If passed in parliament this week—

the bill—

will replace Queensland's three-strike program with a framework targeting first-time and low-risk drug offenders.

AMA Queensland President Dr Nick Yim said it fundamentally misunderstood why the tiered system was necessary.

Dr Yim is quoted as saying—

Treating these people as criminals instead of patients will not reduce drug use in our community.

The media release states—

Dr Yim said the cost of ongoing drug use would ultimately cost the health system more.

Today we move this amendment because Labor will always back ensuring that people have access to health care in this state. That is what this is fundamentally about.


The LNP want to deny some of the most vulnerable people in our community access to health services. With all of the evidence that was presented, I want to be clear: we did not have sufficient time to hear from all of the experts on this issue because this part of the bill is their fourth attempt at fixing their crime slogan.

We need to properly interrogate just how devastating this will be for people denied access to health care. In the 18 months drug diversion was in place, evaluation showed that it was actually having an impact. It was addressing people's drug addiction in the right way, which is to provide them with health care so that they never come back before the criminal justice system, so that the police can focus on what they do best and so that our health professionals, such as the doctors who are so strongly in support of keeping the drug diversion program, can do their job. The AMA and other medical professionals have said that this will limit access to life-saving treatment.

When we are elected to this parliament, one of the things that I hope we would all agree on and fight for is providing life-saving treatment to people who need it. I really hope that members opposite go back to their communities and talk to their constituents about why they have voted to deny life-saving treatment to Queenslanders. I remember that when he was in opposition the Premier said that he would absolutely take the advice of our doctors and our experts. However, when our medical experts come before a committee and release statements as we debate these important issues, it would seem that their views are falling on deaf ears.

This is fundamentally about providing the health care that vulnerable people need. Of course, the Labor opposition will always stand up for people accessing health care. The evidence is very clear: this actually improves community safety. It means that police can focus on what they need to be focusing on. It means that our medical professionals can undertake timely intervention so that people do not come back before the criminal justice system. The people who really need health treatment in this context are people who may be experiencing mental health issues, social isolation and poverty. Do those opposite really want to be denying health treatment to people experiencing mental health challenges, social isolation and poverty? That is what their bill, in its current form, does.

I do not think in their speeches on this bill any members opposite would have talked about drug diversion. They wanted it to be tacked on secretly so that it could slip through, but thank God we have such tremendous medical professionals in Queensland and that the AMA and others are standing up and calling them out for denying vulnerable Queenslanders the health treatment they need. This is about whether or not as a parliament we will provide life-saving treatment to people who need it. That is what we are here to do today: provide life-saving treatment to those who need it.

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.36 pm): Let's call this out for what it really is. This is a Labor Party trick because, in their core, they want to vote against Adult Crime, Adult Time. This is tricky university politics from the Labor Party because they do not support Adult Crime, Adult Time. This is a move straight out of their playbook. We know that in their meeting yesterday, as with Adult Crime, Adult Time tranche 1, they tore their caucus apart. I notice that the member for Cooper is not here. With the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time the member for Cooper was not able to support them. There had to be intervention by the member for McConnel because they did not support Adult Crime, Adult Time. We know they voted against Adult Crime, Adult Time for drive-by shootings. We know they do not support it this time.

This motion is playing university politics because, at their core, they do not support strong laws. Do you know how we know it? It is in their state Labor platform. It is in their policy. I see the members over there smirking. They know that their Labor Party policy is to raise the age of criminal responsibility. They want to make sure youth criminals are no longer held accountable for their crimes. Raising the age of criminal responsibility would mean 10-year-olds, 12-year-olds and 13-year-olds who commit heinous crimes that see victims suffering are not held accountable for their actions. Those victims would not get justice. In Noosa, a 13-year-old child was tortured by a 12-year-old and a 13-year-old in what the court said was grievous criminal conduct. Under this Labor Party, the 13-year-old victim would receive no justice because the youth criminals would not be held accountable under their 2025 policy document. This amendment is to cover up—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question before the House is in relation to an amendment to consider the bill in two parts and the elements to which the minister is speaking would be considered this week and nor is the material that she is referring to relevant to the amendment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I hear your point of order. I will seek some advice.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: And I will do that after I hear a point of order from the Leader of the House.

Dr ROWAN: My point of order in relation to the Manager of Opposition Business's point of order is that the minister is addressing both elements in relation to those things that are contained within the amendment as moved by the member for Bulimba, and she is providing some context. I would suggest to you that there is some latitude around that, given she is referencing those elements to do with Adult Crime, Adult Time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your points of order, Manager of Opposition Business and Leader of the House. I have been listening to the minister's contribution and consider she is being relevant. I ask her to continue with her contribution in a relevant way.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reason this amendment is before the House is that those opposite cannot, at their core, support our strong Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. That is the reason we are debating this amendment right now. If their state party policy platform is not proof of that and you want more proof of that, just look at what they did over a decade to our youth crime laws: they made detention a last resort; they removed the breach of bail offence; and they closed the courts to victims and the media. They ensured youth criminals were back on our streets as a result of their weak bail laws. They want us to go back. They want to go back to that time. At their core, they know they do not want to support Adult Crime, Adult Time, so that is the reason we have this amendment. We saw it with their caucus chaos the first time where there was an intervention by the member for McConnell because members of their far-left faction could not support Adult Crime, Adult Time. The Leader of the Opposition knows. He knows! He is a member of the left faction.

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

Mrs GERBER: He cannot support this and that is the reason we are debating this amendment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock for a moment.

Mrs GERBER: They have had 10 years to consult—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you pause, please?

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, I will ask you to stop. I do not need guidance from your benches about the conduct of the chamber. Manager of Opposition Business, do you have a point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker, my point of order is again on relevance. The matters to which the minister is speaking do not pertain to the amendment, nor do they pertain to the bill, in fact.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Manager of Opposition Business. I have been listening to the minister with reference to Adult Crime, Adult Time and the context around that and the amendment, and I consider the minister is being relevant. I ask the minister to continue.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. They talk about consultation. They had 10 years to consult with the Queensland community. Do you know what the Queensland community said? They said they wanted stronger laws. They said they wanted Adult Crime, Adult Time. They said they wanted us to crack down on drugs. They said they wanted us to make our communities and business precincts safe again. That is what this bill does. This bill brings in the strong laws that Queenslanders voted for—Adult Crime, Adult Time. Those opposite cannot support it at their core, which is why we are debating this motion. It also cracks down on the illegal use of drugs and it also ensures that the police have the power and the ability to restore safety to our community and business precincts. We have spoken about the reason this motion is before the House. It is because they cannot support Adult Crime, Adult Time.

Let's talk about the illicit drug enforcement and divergent framework in this bill. You know what it is doing? It is restoring consequences for illicit drug use. We heard from communities the damage that illicit drug use is doing in communities. We have heard from families, businesses and communities that want to see stronger action on illicit drug use.

Under Labor, there were no consequences for that. Under Labor, illicit drug users could do that illegal conduct and get away with it up to five times—up to five times! We are going to restore consequences for illegal drug use. In practice under Labor, it meant a person caught with dangerous drugs on up to five occasions could get off without facing any criminal consequence for their offending. That was Labor's idea of illegal drug laws. It sent exactly the wrong message. It told Queenslanders that drug offending would be tolerated. It told police that they had to issue a number of warnings before they could deal with the criminal conduct of illicit drug use. It told repeat drug offenders that they could get away with their repeat illicit drug offending without any consequences.

But that is not all. Labor also, as part of the framework they are talking about, expanded the types of drugs to which their get-out-of-jail-free card applied. They expanded it to drugs like heroin, fentanyl, ketamine, MDMA, GBH, methamphetamine—a drug that is tearing communities apart. They said illegal drug users can keep using methamphetamine up to five times before there are consequences for their illegal conduct. That approach was never going to make Queensland safe, and the evidence shows that. In fact, in 2024, under Labor, total drug offences increased by more than 11,000 from the previous year. That is a 16.8 per cent increase. Even after Labor's five-times get-out-of-jail-free card, illegal drug use increased by 16.8 per cent. When those opposite say their drug diversion was good, progressive policy, those facts paint a very different picture.

That is not really what this amendment is about. This amendment at its core is about those opposite being unable to support strong laws that hold youth offenders accountable for their actions. It is because those opposite cannot support Adult Crime, Adult Time that applies to youth offenders from the age of 10 to 17. Do you know why they cannot support it? Their state Labor Party policy platform says that they want to raise the age of criminal responsibility to 14.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There has been nothing since I last rose to my feet that has been relevant to the merits of this amendment, which is procedural and about ensuring that various elements of this bill—and I will not go to the specific terms of the bill—are separated and dealt with in different ways. Then the minister has strayed into commentary around a document—

Ms Bates: About Adult Crime, Adult Time?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, cease your interjections while I am hearing a point of order, please.


Mr de BRENNI:—that also has no bearing on the provisions in this bill, and so my—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: On relevance?

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order is on relevance, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Youth Justice, I have been listening to your contribution and, whilst there is some scope for context around Adult Crime, Adult Time and also the other elements of this bill which is proposed to be split, I would ask you to come back, please, to the amendment and the impact of this amendment on those elements.

Mrs GERBER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This amendment is asking to do something that would allow the Labor Party to take a course of action that suits their ideology because they do not support Adult Crime, Adult Time. If we want to look at how drug offences operate, the way this bill is structured means that if first-time offenders are in possession of small quantities of other dangerous drugs, police have the discretion to issue an infringement notice. That notice, whilst it carries financial consequences, also allows that person to obtain drug rehabilitation if they choose. If they choose not to do that, then they have to pay the financial consequences of that. It gives the opportunity for drug rehabilitation, but what it does not do is give it time and time again, like what Labor did. It does not facilitate drug use like what Labor did.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (3.47 pm): Frankly, listening to the member for Currumbin lecture this House about university politics, given her performance in this House, is laughable. The Premier is a very clever politician and this bill has his fingerprints all over it. He wants to sneak through these laws to try and disguise from Queenslanders that they are winding back drug diversion laws that work. It is not just us saying that. We had five former police commissioners back Labor's laws. The police asked us to implement these laws. Health experts asked us to implement these reforms that those opposite want to wind back.

I suspect the reason they have cobbled together all of these reforms is because they do not want these reforms to see the light of day. If they truly believed in every section of these reforms, they would let them be appropriately scrutinised. Clearly they do not have confidence in every element of the bill because otherwise they would allow them to be scrutinised on their merits, and clearly they are afraid of that. There were organisations, like the Australian Medication Association, that wrote in a media release that they were disappointed they were not invited to appear before the committee, despite their asking to appear. That demonstrates that those opposite are trying to hide something.

As has been mentioned by many other speakers, we know that drug diversion laws work, despite what the member for Currumbin is trying to peddle. The majority of people who were given a drug diversion warning never came in contact with the system again.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I hear the interjection from the member for Currumbin. If she truly believed in what she was saying she would send this back to the committee. I suspect that she does not believe it, and that is why she does not want these laws to be scrutinised. She does not want to hear from the five former police commissioners whom she is now ignoring. She does not want to hear from the Public Service. When we asked them questions during the committee briefing, they were very clear to say that this was a policy decision by government, which we all know is code for 'we don't really support this,

but the Crisafulli government is making us appear here to defend their laws that no-one else wants to support'. In fact, the only stakeholder, effectively, that supported these reforms was an organisation that appeared but could not back up what it was saying with evidence. We have nurses, doctors and police all saying that these laws should not be wound back, yet those opposite are deliberately ignoring all of those experts.

We also know that this will have a significant impact on our legal and justice system. In fact, the Productivity Commission report—those opposite like talking about productivity commissions, just not when it does not suit their political narrative—estimates that 258,000 police hours would be saved every single year through drug diversion laws, yet the police minister will come in here and try to defend these laws. I look forward to hearing his contribution, given there have been five former police commissioners who have supported Labor's laws that they are winding back and they are going to place police under more pressure. Hundreds of thousands of hours will be spent going after low-level possession drug use rather than serious crime. Every time police do not respond to a serious crime in this state we will be asking why the government would wind back laws that have meant they now cannot go after those serious crimes.

I heard the member for Currumbin mention some of the data. The data shows—the data we have been able to see so far anyway—that from May 2024 to March this year 32,000 people were diverted under this program and 83 per cent of them had no further contact with the program. Again, if those opposite feel confident with winding back these laws they should release the final report. Do not spend money on it and then just quietly shelve it. If they have confidence in this reform they should show us the evidence, the full evaluation. Again, this government are not interested in facts; all they are interested in is politics.

We come to this debate in good faith. We have engaged in the committee process thoughtfully, as we have on the previous iterations of this reform. This is all about politics for those opposite. They want this to be about us when we want this to be about Queenslanders. We ultimately want to see good health reform. We want to make sure victims of crime are supported. Frankly, I get a bit frustrated with those opposite trying to suggest that they are the only people who are advocating for victims of crime. We have former police officers on this side. My father was a police officer. I did a law degree to ensure Queenslanders were given the justice they deserve. I have also been the victim of crime. The fact that these people come in here and try to say that they have some sort of moral hierarchy over crime and victims is laughable, particularly given the range of reforms they are blocking right now. They will not act on the recommendations of the inquiry into institutional child sexual abuse, yet they come in here and say that they can claim some sort of high moral ground on justice.

There are real consequences from these reforms. We heard some of the medical experts give real case examples of what these reforms would mean. There was a case study of a 24-year-old man, and I will call him John. He was found at a train station with heroin. He was offered diversion. He completed it. Two months later he was found with heroin again. Again, he was offered diversion. This time a peer support worker helped him into opioid treatment, re-enrolled him in a barbering course and connected him to a structured support program, and now he is doing an apprenticeship. This shows that a health-based response works and that criminalising people makes things worse. That is effectively what that submission said. He said that he is now off the drugs he was taking. He said—

I haven't used in over a year ... I have mates who are stuck in that life, in and out of jail. It could easily be me.

He was given a chance. He was given a health-based response, one that those opposite are now taking away.

Mrs Gerber: He'd still get that under this bill.

Ms SCANLON: I hear the interjection from the member for Currumbin. You clearly were not listening to the circumstances, and you clearly have not been listening to any of the health professionals.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Gaven, direct your comments through the chair, please. Member for Currumbin, you do the same too, please.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I know that some latitude has been given in relation to the amendment, but there are many matters now that relate to the substance of the bill as opposed to being confined to the amendment as moved by the member for Bulimba. I understand that some latitude has been provided, but I would ask you to consider that matter, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is difficult to separate the context of the substance of the bill from the procedural motion before us. You have had a fair go, member for Gaven, at explaining the context. If you could bring some of your comments back to the procedural motion before us and link the context to it, that would be appreciated.

Ms SCANLON: It is important that this section of the bill goes back to the committee, as our amendment outlines. Former police commissioner Ian Stewart said—

Expanding drug diversion ... will free up police to concentrate on recidivist criminal offenders, and those who profit from the tragedy of drug addiction ...


He said—

Expanding drug diversion is not about going soft on crime. Just the opposite.

By ignoring that, those opposite are ignoring a very distinguished former police commissioner. Legal Aid said—

The expanded program has avoided approximately \$4.58 million in Magistrates costs ... \$2.27 million in police resources ...

All of these things need to be appropriately considered. They have not been because they have been cobbled together in a bill that deserves more consideration.

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (3.57 pm): I appreciate the opportunity to rise and oppose the amendment moved by those opposite. This is not about ideology. This is not about evidence. This is about politics. That is blatantly what this is about today. We know that they have never supported our Adult Crime, Adult Time legislation. They have never supported our tough-on-crime stance. They refuse to admit that their soft-on-crime approach had a devastating impact on communities across Queensland.

This gives me the opportunity to tell a story. The member for Gaven asked me to articulate my position on this. I was not going to get a chance to tell this story in the debate. Shortly after being promoted to this position, I did a night shift on the first night of schoolies with the Surfers Paradise police and the Beasley family on a wandering operation. It was the first night of schoolies. I have two young girls who, before I know it, will be off to schoolies, and parents always dread that that might be the place where they get introduced to drugs.

There was a bikie in the line to get into a nightclub on the first night of schoolies. He was not hiding the fact that he was a bikie. The tats on his face and neck gave that away. One of the police officers was an experienced detective who had just been promoted to uniform and he recognised the bikie as someone he had targeted for a long time. He had a long history and was well known to police for committing serious crime, organised crime. They pulled him out of the line and wanded him. He was found with a cocktail of drugs in his pockets—MDMA, ecstasy, GHB, meth, coke, you name it. This was a bikie who was well known to police trying to get into a nightclub on the first night of schoolies. Thanks to their mandatory three-strikes policy in relation to a caution and then two mandatory drug diversions, the police had no other option but to give that offender a caution. He laughed in their faces. I was there. I was there on the first night of schoolies when this bikie, with tattoos on his face, was laughing in the face of police. He said to the detective who was now in uniform and had previously arrested him on multiple occasions, 'This would be killing you, wouldn't it?'

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr PURDIE: I am happy to get statements if we need to.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr PURDIE: Yes, they can—all under the prescribed amounts. It is on the website.

Mr McCallum interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Bundamba, withdraw that language.

Mr McCALLUM: I withdraw.

Mr PURDIE: Under their failed policy, that is what police had to put up with. Serious well-known criminals who were eligible for three strikes—even though they were well known to police, even though they were found with drugs in their pockets at schoolies—were laughing in the face of police officers. I have never seen anything more demoralising for a team of police on the first night of schoolies who were out in force with the newly minted police minister. It was at that point that I knew, not only from

my career in child abuse but also from arresting domestic violence perpetrators for murder or being in the drug squad—and you cannot be tough on crime if you are soft on drugs—we needed to progress the commitment we made before the election to ensure we embed consequences for actions and send a deterrent.

It is not about the ideology. I want to respond to the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Waterford, who spoke about the evidence and about the ideology. It just does not work. The member for Currumbin spoke about the stats we have seen. On every indicator drug use is up—drug driving and wastewater reports. The member for Gaven was talking about child abuse and serious crime. The Child Death Review Board reports talk about the overwhelming number of young people dying at the hands of drug-affected parents. Across the board it has dire consequences.

I urge those opposite to turn to their idols—the Democrats. In 2020 Gavin Newsom in California started the harm minimisation approach, funded by George Soros. This is on the record. Gavin Newsom now realises that the damage he did to California is probably going to stop him from becoming the President of America. What about London Breed?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PURDIE: For those opposite, my brother lives in San Francisco. He is a professor of epidemiology.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Inala.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think the minister has had a pretty good go, but I ask you to bring him back to relevance to the amendment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, thank you for your point of order. I will determine whether the minister or anyone else has had a 'good go' or is in compliance with standing orders. I thank you for your point of order on relevance. Minister, like all other speakers, there is a range of context around this. I understand you are providing some of that context. I would ask you to also address the procedural aspect of the amendment.

Mr PURDIE: I do intend to do that, Mr Deputy Speaker, but I was asked specifically by the member for Gaven as to my position and I am responding directly to those opposite. I am telling them to have a look at this. What about the new Mayor of San Francisco, Daniel Lurie, and the new Mayor of San Jose?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members on my left.

Mr PURDIE: This is where harm minimisation strategies started. In 2000 there were 100 overdose deaths in San Francisco. By 2023 there were 800. Overdose deaths increased by 800 per cent. Crime increased, as did mental health, addiction and ultimately overdose deaths.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Inala, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mr PURDIE: We talk about ideology. This is not about ideology. I say to those opposite: the ones who invented harm minimisation strategies now admit they got it wrong. Former mayor of San Francisco London Breed admitted before she was voted out in 2024 that they got it wrong. The new Democrat mayor in California is trying to unravel it. They are bringing back consequences for actions. They are not only bringing back therapeutic options, which we still have available, but sending a clear message. When you remove barriers to drug supply, the price goes down and usage goes up. As I said before, crime—domestic violence, child abuse, addiction and ultimately overdose deaths—goes up by 800 per cent, like it did in San Francisco.

For those opposite, who are using this issue as a distraction as to why they cannot vote for Adult Crime, Adult Time, I hope some of this has put that to rest. You have time. Go do the research. Reach out to your idols—the Democratic Party in the US. It failed. Every state in the America that followed that harm minimisation approach are desperately trying to unravel it. I hope I have put this matter to bed. The evidence across the world shows that harm minimisation strategies, as well intentioned as they were, did not work. Our police on the Gold Coast have been laughed at in their face by hardened criminals. That is why I now move—

That the question be now put.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 36:

ALP, 34—Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, 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—Bolton.

Pair: Perrett, Asif.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 36:

ALP, 34—Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, 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—Bolton.

NOES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pair: Perrett, Asif.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Farmer) negatived.



Mr HUNT (Nicklin—LNP) (4.11 pm): I rise to speak as the chair of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee on the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill. I thank committee members and the hardworking parliamentary secretariat staff for their assistance throughout this inquiry.

For too long Queensland victims have felt like an afterthought. For too long communities watched as repeat offenders cycled through a system that seemed more focused on explaining and excusing crime and bad behaviour than preventing it, with a decade of decline under the former Labor government. This bill is part of correcting that course. The objective of this legislation is to make Queensland safer by strengthening the capability of the justice system to hold offenders to account and by giving police the tools they need to intervene earlier and more effectively.

Importantly, this bill builds on expert advice, community consultation and, critically, the lived experience of victims in our communities. We heard that clearly during our hearings. In Brisbane the Office of the Victims' Commissioner told us that victims consistently feel the system has not got the balance right, that too much attention is placed on the background of offenders and not enough on the harm suffered by victims and their families.

The committee respects expert evidence. The committee heard from legal experts, academics, advocacy groups and frontline services. We considered a large number of submissions and held hearings across Brisbane and regional Queensland. What is clear, and what some members opposite perhaps fail to understand, is that there is not one, single expert view. There are competing perspectives. When we went into communities like Townsville, Maryborough and Nambour we heard about fear. We heard about businesses closing early. We heard about workers needing additional protection just to do their jobs.

One of the key pillars of this bill is the expansion of Adult Crime, Adult Time. This is about recognising that serious crime that does serious harm deserves serious consequences. They include offences like violent assault, serious endangerment and crimes that leave lasting physical and

psychological harm. When it comes to these tough-on-crime laws, the Labor opposition are divided and conflicted. They send in the big guns, replacing committee members with shadow ministers for the hearings—no faith in the member for Toohey, one of the great legal minds of Queensland. They desperately want to find excuses not to support victims and the strong laws that Queensland is calling for.

They will use excuses like they did not have enough time to consider the expert panel report, even though under the standing orders the minister is under no obligation whatsoever to supply the details of any advice they receive. They complain about the number of pages. I ask those opposite how many pages they need before they stand up for victims and acknowledge the harm caused. How many pages would it take to acknowledge the crisis that developed under them over the past decade of decline? Queenslanders did not need a report to tell them something was wrong; they were living it every day. While some search for excuses, this government is delivering action.

I will also address the part of the bill that relates to reforms around drugs and policing. For years we saw a softening approach that, in effect, reduced deterrence. Previous diversion frameworks allowed repeat offenders multiple opportunities to avoid prosecution, which clearly sent the message to the community that drug use did not matter. Importantly, it also sent the message to law enforcement: do not bother policing drugs. This bill recalibrates that approach. It maintains pathways for first-time and low-risk offenders but it restores accountability for repeat behaviour. Another critical element is the introduction of designated business and community precincts. This is about restoring safety in the very places Queenslanders should feel most secure: our town centres, our business districts and our community spaces.


I particularly thank my community of Nambour and the people who stood up to give evidence at our committee hearing there. I thank some of the community members who appeared before us who have fought long and hard for change and the reputation of our great town of Nambour including Greg Rogerson, Peter Clark, Helen Tagg, Brian Bugenhagen, Dale Dowler and Rhonda Billett. They are all community champions. Thank you for your advocacy and support for our town of Nambour.

None of us likes to talk Nambour down, but we also must face the reality of the safety issues highlighted by the community in the council's Nambour safety strategy report in July 2023. This report was ignored by the former Labor government and their previous Labor member for Nicklin, who continually blamed media for how people were feeling. They buried their heads in the sand and did nothing. I am incredibly grateful to the community for giving me the opportunity to be part of a Crisafulli government that listens and acts. With the opening of the new police beat and the introduction of strong laws like this bill, we are seeing the green shoots of change and enhanced reputation of our town. We are already seeing record private investment and confidence returning, and it is great to be part of.

I will return to the broader ideological divide at the heart of this debate. For too long the system has been dominated by voices seeking to explain offending behaviour, often through the lens of vulnerability. Vulnerability exists and must be acknowledge, but it cannot become an excuse. It cannot override the rights of victims. It cannot justify a system where communities feel unsafe in their own streets. The first responsibility of any government is to ensure the safety of its citizens. During our regional hearings one message came through clearly: people expect to feel safe. That is not an unreasonable expectation. It is a basic right that too many Queenslanders feel has been eroded over the last decade of decline.

Despite Labor's excuses in their statement of reservation to the committee report, the committee conducted a thorough and comprehensive inquiry. We heard from a wide range of stakeholders across metropolitan and regional Queensland. We considered expert evidence and community views and we recommended that the bill be passed.

This bill is not about being tough for the sake of it. It is about being fair—fair to victims, fair to communities and fair to the vast majority of Queenslanders who do the right thing every single day. I am proud to be part of a Crisafulli government that is listening—truly listening—to victims. This is a government that recognises that community safety is not negotiable—a government that is prepared to make the difficult decisions to restore balance to our justice system. There is much more to be done, but after a decade of decline we are turning the tide. We are giving police the powers they need, we are holding offenders to account and, most importantly, we are putting victims and our communities back at the centre of our justice system.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (4.19 pm): I rise to speak on the bill. As I mentioned before, my dad was a police officer and I grew up being taught at an early age the importance of consequences for action and what it means for a community when people feel safe and what it costs when they do

not. I went into law because I believe in justice. I have also been the victim of crime, so this is not abstract. I have long believed—genuinely believed, not as a political position but as a matter of conviction—that if we are ever going to be serious about keeping our communities safe then we have to be serious about prevention and early intervention. If we are serious about tackling crime, we have to be willing to tackle its causes.

Nothing excuses acts of violence—nothing—and that has to be said clearly, and I mean it. When I look at the statistic that almost half of the children in our youth justice system have a disability, I cannot help but think of my brother. He needed speech therapy and physical therapy when he was young and he got the help he needed. He was in a loving household with every chance to thrive, but too many kids who need support miss out entirely and they are unfortunately the children who are more likely to end up in our criminal justice system. That is not conjecture. That is what the evidence shows, and that is what frontline services tell us every single day. That is why it is so deeply disappointing that the Crisafulli government are in some instances cutting the early interventions and health supports that we know actually make a difference, rather than investing in them. They are cutting the very programs that give a fighting chance to those kids who need a hand up.

Let me be clear about where the Queensland Labor opposition stands. We believe in strong, robust and evidence-based laws that will work. We stand on the side of victims and victim-survivors in Queensland. We want to see laws put in place that will keep our communities safe, but this bill does not achieve that. This bill is not based on expert advice and it is not based on evidence; it is based entirely on misguided ideology, on division and marginalisation and on making promises they cannot keep. The fact that the government have had to come slinking back into this parliament—changing their signature laws for the third time—is a damning indictment on them. Criminal justice reform is serious. It is not solved by a slogan, because words that rhyme do not stop crime.

On the other reforms in this bill relevant to the Youth Justice Act, the Voice for Victims Foundation—which is a victim advocacy organisation—raised concern in their submission about specific offences. I want to quote them directly because this is a victims group, not Labor, raising these concerns. They said—

The expansion to include s.311 (aiding suicide) and s.316 (stupefying in order to commit indictable offence) raises important considerations for community understanding and transparency. The Statement of Compatibility does not provide sufficient explanation of the nature or scope of these offences ...

That is a victims group. The Youth Advocacy Centre found that for seven of the proposed offences 'we can find no reported cases of children being sentenced in the last five years'. The Bar Association of Queensland stated that the list includes offences that children would 'rarely, if ever, be prosecuted for committing'. They also said—

No data is provided in any of the briefing material to indicate the incidence of these offences or whether children are committing them.

The government promised Queenslanders that the Expert Legal Panel's advice would be released as part of the committee process. The minister said it on the record in this parliament, so what happened? At the exact moment the public briefing was due to start, the government conveniently uploaded a 25-page document to an obscure publications portal. The Bar Association of Queensland had 45 minutes to review it before giving evidence. What did they find? They were unambiguous. They said it was apparent from reading the report that in fact it was not the advice that was provided to the government. It described a process. It referred to advice having been given, but it did not show what that advice actually was.

In fact, Geoffrey Watson SC—who those opposite like to quote a lot—told the *Courier-Mail* that withholding the information until the last minute was 'just appalling'. He said that the absence of real advice within the document told you one of two things: the panel either did not do its job or it was not given the right job to do. This was a taxpayer funded panel that did 12 months of work and had nine meetings, and Queenslanders still have no idea what advice they actually gave. That is a broken promise.

Let me turn to drug diversion laws because these changes are something that the Labor opposition and almost every frontline expert who appeared before the committee cannot support—not the doctors, nurses, drug and alcohol experts, or the five former police commissioners who backed this program when it was introduced. We already had a conversation about this earlier today and the fact that the AMA—one of the peak medical bodies in this state but which did not appear before the committee—said that the government jettisoned the program when the preliminary data indicated it was successful and that this was ideological and not driven by evidence. These are five former police

commissioners—Katarina Carroll, Bob Atkinson, Jim O’Sullivan, Mick Palmer and Ian Stewart—not some politicians overseas who the police minister just tried to reference. These are actual former law enforcement officers whom those opposite clearly want to now deliberately ignore.


As I said, these changes will mean hundreds of thousands of hours of police time going after low-level possession rather than serious crimes. When the LNP say they are tough on crime, we need to ask them why they are pulling police officers off serious cases to process paperwork on minor possession. That is not being tough on crime; that is making the system weaker and the victims of sexual assault, home invasions and serious armed robberies will now wait longer.

What does the data actually show? From March 2024 to March this year, 32,000 people were diverted under this program and more than 80 per cent of them had no further contact with the system. Clearly, that shows this system was working. What was the government’s justification for repealing it? We had a bizarre contribution from the police minister, who continues to reference National Wastewater Drug Monitoring Program reports despite the fact that QNADA said the wastewater analysis cannot tell you how many people are using drugs, it cannot distinguish between heroin and prescribed opioids, it cannot distinguish between medicinal and illicit cannabis, and it cannot tell you what the right response should be. The Bar Association went further, stating there is no cogent evidence within that wastewater report linking the drug diversion program to any increase in illicit drug use. There is no evidence—that is what they said—yet the police minister comes in here and tries to suggest that is what the evidence says.

I want to briefly turn to the antisocial behaviour and designated precinct provisions. Of course our communities expect public places to be safe. Labor does not dispute that; we never have. However, service after service said that they work with people every day who are not getting the support they need. The Nambour Community Centre told us that exclusions do not resolve the underlying issue and that without clear pathways to assistance these measures will shift people around rather than address what is actually driving the problem.

When a person is excluded from a precinct, where do they go and what support is available to them? These are not hypothetical questions. These are questions this bill does not address at all. Q Shelter came and called for a housing summit to elevate the conversation and bring people to the table to address these underlying problems, but the housing minister said the next day, ‘No, we’re not going to do that.’ Despite the fact there are 55,000 people on the social housing register, he is not interested in having a housing summit or talking about the underlying issues and the housing support these individuals might need.

We had the Mental Health Commissioner tell the committee that this bill is unlikely to achieve its identified objectives. That is why Labor moved to split this bill to have drug diversion considered separately. However, the Crisafulli government in their pig-headedness denied us that right today. I came into this place because I believe the right support at the right time actually changes lives. I believe that if we are serious about safer communities, we have to be serious about prevention. I believe health care is worth fighting for. I believe standing up for vulnerable Queenslanders grappling with mental health and addiction is worth fighting for. Because this bill cuts critical health-based interventions, because it takes Queensland backwards, because it breaks promises to Queenslanders—Labor cannot support a bill that cuts health care.

 **Mr FIELD** (Capalaba—LNP) (4.29 pm): My father was also in the police force for over 37 years and I am also a victim of crime. I cannot understand how two people whose fathers were in the police force and who have been victims of crime can have two totally different points of view. That aside, I rise to address the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. The Crisafulli government is once again taking firm action to bolster youth justice laws while those opposite continue tearing themselves apart on whether they will support it and stand with Queenslanders. Too many people across the state know the impact that weak laws can have on their lives, as we saw when youth criminals were running wild during Labor’s decade of decline.

This bill acts on the advice of the Expert Legal Panel and introduces further offences to Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. Adult Crime, Adult Time is a policy which Queenslanders have backed wholeheartedly. We have even seen copycat legislation from Labor state governments elsewhere, which proves that these laws are a step in the right direction.

In keeping with our promise to strengthen and never weaken these laws, the new offences being added include domestic and sexual violence crimes, riot, assault occasioning bodily harm and conspiring to murder. These are serious offences and they need to be treated with the appropriate

consequences in our justice system. We are also introducing a new drug enforcement and diversion framework which will ensure that offenders are held accountable while providing diversionary pathways for eligible individuals. Additionally, this bill will give our hardworking police new powers to maintain public order in busy public areas across the state. These are areas where the effects of antisocial behaviour are amplified and even low-level disruptions can lead to massive detrimental impacts on patrons and businesses alike.

As a member of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee I had the opportunity to examine this bill closely. We heard from a range of stakeholders across the legal profession, local councils, victims organisations and those working directly within the justice system. After that process the committee chair tabled the report, which recommended that the bill be passed. However, we know that many Queenslanders are probably not paying close attention to committee reports. They are watching what is happening in their own communities and forming a view from that. During Labor's decade of decline, that view was not a positive one. We saw repeat offending becoming more visible. We saw offences continue to occur without any consequences being applied. That level of offending was unacceptable, and Queenslanders made their voices heard loud and clear in the October 2024 election.

We also readily acknowledge that there is a long way to go in turning the tide on this crisis and that the levels of offending are still not acceptable to the Crisafulli government or to the people of this state. This bill sits within that broader context. It is not a standalone reform and it is not intended to be. The initial reform set that direction and further tranches of Adult Crime, Adult Time reinforced it. This bill continues that work.

The Crisafulli government has taken a comprehensive approach to the youth crime crisis, delivering a range of measures that address offending early on, applying genuine consequences when offences are committed and implementing effective rehabilitation programs as well. All of these are working to make Queensland safer. Too often in this space a government makes a change, declares the issue addressed and moves on. We have seen victims of crime treated as an afterthought or ignored entirely and the rights of offenders being placed ahead of victims. This is not what happens here. The Crisafulli government made a commitment to stand with victims and we are doing just that. I know what it is like to be ignored as a victim of crime and I will continue to fight for victims every day I am in this place.


As I alluded to earlier, the bill also revisits the former Labor government's soft-touch approach to drug offending. The current diversion regime for possession of small quantities of illicit drugs is ineffective and skirts far too close to giving the impression that drug possession is acceptable. Let me be clear: it is not acceptable and there is no safe way to take drugs. However, there remains an opportunity for minor first encounters with the system to be dealt with in a way that diverts offenders from further offending. This is appropriate and can be effective when done properly, but where behaviour is repeated the response cannot remain static. A sensible new diversion framework will strike a balance between diverting offenders found with small quantities of illicit drugs as a first offence while maintaining that illicit drug possession will not be tolerated and allowing police to enforce consequences as necessary.

Also within the amendments there are changes to strengthen police powers in designated areas where antisocial behaviour is more concentrated with the establishment of new designated business and community precincts. That reflects what officers are dealing with in practice. Laws only operate effectively if they can be applied in real conditions. These provisions support our police by giving them the powers to act quickly in environments where smaller issues can escalate into something which impacts a large proportion of the public. We heard during the committee hearings that antisocial behaviour of a few people can create a no-go zone in central business districts. Often when police issue move-on orders to people causing trouble they return the next day and start all over again. Coppers have had enough. Councils have had enough. Business owners have had enough. Everyone has had enough. Things need to change.

These laws also tie in with the Jack's Law framework, made permanent by the Crisafulli government by providing police officers with powers to conduct wandering searches in designated precincts without the prior approval of a senior officer. This removes a number of impediments to quick and preventive action, which can make a huge difference when tackling disorderly activities. We are also expanding police banning notice powers, which are already in place for individuals whom police may prohibit from entering or remaining in licensed venues, events and safe night precincts. The banning powers will further increase police officers' ability to do their job proactively and address public disturbances.

In my community of Capalaba, the issue of youth crime has been front of mind for many of my constituents. One constituent I have spoken to at length, Chris Sanders, was nearly killed in a random attack just down the road from my office in December 2023. He felt completely ignored by the former Labor government after the incident occurred. I know exactly how he feels. He certainly did not feel that the former local MP took this issue seriously, especially after hearing youth crime being called a 'media beat-up', and I still share that same feeling. This constituent has supported each tranche of the strengthening of the youth justice laws we have passed and he supports this bill, too. It is not a huge ask or even a novel concept for governments to put the rights of victims ahead of offenders, yet that was lacking for a decade under those opposite. Queenslanders have rightly demanded action on this issue for years, and on this side of the House we are absolutely committed to restoring safety where you live. This bill contributes to that shift. It strengthens connection between behaviour and consequences in a way that becomes visible. That visibility is what rebuilds confidence that our justice system actually works for victims of crime. I am confident that this will continue to move us in the right direction.

These laws represent government acting with a clear mission. We are determined to ensure that fewer Queenslanders become victims of crime and that consequences for actions are restored. I came to this place for that very reason and I know that the Crisafulli government will never take a backward step in standing on the side of victims.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.38 pm): I rise to speak to the government bill before the House. Let me be clear at the start: this bill has nothing to do with fighting crime. This bill is really about cutting the opportunity to seek healthcare services in certain circumstances. That is why the opposition moved today to ensure that an essential part of this bill was subject to further parliamentary and public scrutiny and examination, and that was rejected by the government today.

The Crisafulli LNP government likes to portray the notion that it is a friend of police and that it supports our dedicated, hardworking Queensland police officers. This bill goes against the advice of police. This bill goes against the wishes of police. The repeal of the drug diversion program will reduce the capacity of police to pursue the real criminals when it comes to drugs in our state—the producers and suppliers of illicit drugs. The drug diversion program was introduced based in large part on the express request of police to do so—not Gavin Newsom, not Santa Claus, not all of those people the police minister wanted to talk about today—but we listened to the experts. We listened to the experts in the parliamentary process and everyone said this was a critical part of the criminal justice system in Queensland.

When the program was introduced, every current and former Queensland police commissioner spoke in favour of it. No doubt every one of those former police commissioners is now extremely disappointed. A reform those police commissioners—real experts—supported wholeheartedly now faces being dismantled, dismantled not in the face and in the name of science or evidence; the Crisafulli government is axing the drug diversion program based on ideology and its ideological view of the world. This bill is not just a slap in the face of police; it flies in the face of all the expert evidence put before the committee. The evidence to the committee was very clear. This bill is not based on evidence. Instead, it is entirely based on ideology. The LNP wants to cut access pathways to health services and the state opposition and Queensland Labor cannot stand for that. That is the difference. Labor invests in health and the LNP cuts. It is why we moved today to split the bills.

As many have noted and commented, many of the offences included in the expanded legislation will have little or no effect on crime, but the removal of the drug diversion program is of consequence. We cannot support a move that cuts access to health service pathways. I ask the chamber to listen to these words—'dangerous and contrary to advice'. Those words belong to the Australian Medical Association. 'Dangerous and contrary to advice' was the AMAQ's verdict on what this ideologically driven LNP government is doing. The Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies said that the majority of people provided with a drug diversion warning had no further contact with the program—83 per cent in fact—with only 17 per cent also accessing the initial drug diversion assessment program. The AMAQ added—

In fact, the government has jettisoned the program when preliminary data indicated it was successfully reducing police costs and supporting patients and before it had sufficient time to be properly evaluated.

This is a concerning feature of the Crisafulli government's approach to life-saving programs, including pill testing, and we urge it to set aside ideology in favour of science.

What is AMA Queensland saying? This government is jettisoning a program that was successfully reducing police costs, supporting patients and providing life-saving programs. In the face of the peak medical body in Queensland, the LNP government turns its face against that. The Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies said—

Put simply, reducing opportunities for diversion makes policing less effective, by requiring police to spend time and resources on low-level drug possession instead of more serious offending.

Every single serious stakeholder body and every expert said what the Crisafulli LNP government is doing is wrong. Even today there is another cry from AMA Queensland, desperately calling on the LNP government to follow the science and listen to experts. Today it has released another media release calling on the government to do the right thing. Remember that the LNP said before the election, 'We're going to put the doctors and nurses back in charge,' except when it comes to expert advice or their expertise and experience when it comes to drug and alcohol diversion. They can be silent in government—happy to use their name in opposition but silent in government. What did the AMA say? It said—

The Queensland government's move to repeal the state's drug diversion program is short-sighted and a blow to mental and preventive health.

If passed in parliament this week, the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026 will replace Queensland's three-strike program with a framework targeting first-time and low-risk drug offenders.

AMA Queensland President Dr Nick Yim said it fundamentally misunderstood why the tiered system was necessary.

It went on further to say—

AMA Queensland is disappointed not to have been called to appear before the parliamentary committee ...

The government and the committee, dominated by government MPs, could not even be bothered to call the AMAQ to give evidence on a fundamentally important bill, or so it says.

It is not often you get universal agreement, but the Crisafulli LNP government has managed to pull that off. Everyone outside the LNP says that repealing the diversion program is wrong, including all police commissioners. Former police commissioner Bob Atkinson—and you could find no finer nor distinguished Queenslanders than Bob Atkinson—said—

Our response to illegal drug use should have as many options as possible. This doesn't mean that they get off, but that they have chances to make better choices.

He also said—

There have been many young people who have obtained a criminal history only because of the possession of a small quantity of illegal drugs for personal use who would never otherwise have been in the criminal justice system.

He went on to say—

This initiative provides a sensible and beneficial option in that regard.

Former police commissioner Ian Stewart said—

For years, Queenslanders have accepted successful drug diversion programs aimed at alcohol and more recently cannabis.

This expansion of the drug diversion program announced by the Government today—

the former Labor government—

is a step in the right direction to treat rather than criminalise minor drug use.

By expanding the already successful drug diversion programs in our State, the Government has today provided further opportunities for those suffering drug addiction to access health treatments and offer alternative outcomes for minor drug users other than a criminal history.

Expanding drug diversion in Queensland will free up police to concentrate on recidivist criminal offenders—

and that is what the police should be doing—

and those who profit from the tragedy of drug addiction particularly among our youth.

Expanding drug diversion is not about going soft on crime. Just the opposite. It is a way of offering real hope to those caught up in drug use and providing a proven pathway to better personal wellbeing away from the criminal justice spiral.


Increasing penalties for drug trafficking in the State while broadening the ability of police when dealing with minor personal drug use, shows a commitment to going hard on the real criminals involved in the drug trade.

And that is what the Labor government did. He continued—

Enabling our police to have greater choices when dealing with minor drug users is a win/win for society and all involved.

I will take the word of former police commissioners Ian Stewart and Bob Atkinson over the LNP every day.

The Crisafulli LNP government stands alone. The LNP government stands alone, isolated from all of the evidence and expert advice when it comes to the drug diversion program. The Crisafulli LNP government is out of step with the advice and wishes of police and every other major stakeholder. The Crisafulli LNP government resides on an island called 'ignorance'—a place where ideological beliefs masquerade as logic. For all the reasons I have enunciated and more, it is difficult to support a bill that cuts access to vital, potentially life-saving and life-changing health care.

 **Ms MARR** (Thuringowa—LNP) (4.47 pm): I rise in strong support of the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. As the member for Thuringowa, I am proud to stand here today on behalf of the hardworking families, business owners and communities of Townsville who have waited far too long for the Queensland government to put victims first and deliver real consequences for crime. This bill is exactly what Queenslanders voted for—stronger laws, more accountability and safer streets. It strengthens our criminal justice system in three clear and powerful ways: expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time to 12 more serious offences, replacing Labor's failed drug diversion regime with a new framework that holds repeat offenders to account, and giving police the practical tools they need to tackle antisocial behaviour in our designated business and community precincts. Minister Gerber's explanatory notes and second reading speech make the case crystal clear: this bill is part of the Crisafulli government's Making Queensland Safer plan—our direct response to years of community outrage over youth crime.

Under the previous Labor government, victims of crime skyrocketed by 193 per cent. Car thefts, break-ins, robberies and sexual offences all surged. The average daily number of serious repeat youth offenders rose by 64 per cent between 2018 and 2023. What was Labor's response? It was to weaken the laws, make detention a last resort, remove breach of bail as an offence and put offenders' rights ahead of the rights of victims. We are fixing all of that. Our first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time laws in 2024 already covers 13 of the most serious offences. The results speak for themselves: more than 4,000 youth charged with over 19,000 offences under this scheme; a 7.2 per cent drop in victims across the state; a 17 per cent drop in serious repeat youth offenders; and a 27 per cent drop in proven Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. We are telling youth offenders that the world has changed, because community expectations now demand real consequences.

Following advice from the independent Expert Legal Panel, which carefully assessed the level of harm, violence, victim impact and risk to community safety, we are adding 12 more serious offences to the Adult Crime, Adult Time schedule. These include: riot; aggravated indecent treatment of a child; abuse of a person with an impairment of the mind; conspiring to murder; aiding suicide; disabling or stupefying a person to commit an indictable offence; choking in a domestic setting; endangering safety in a vehicle with intent; administering poison with intent to harm; aggravated assault occasioning bodily harm; and unlawful stalking. The regime is also extended to attempts, conspiracies and accessories after the fact. These are not minor infractions; these are violent, calculated and deeply damaging crimes. Under this bill, children who commit adult crimes will face adult penalties. The impact on victims is front and centre in our sentencing, and our communities deserve nothing less.

The bill also takes a strong stance on drugs. Labor's police drug diversion program became a revolving door. Thousands of repeat offenders faced no real consequences, sending the wrong message that illicit drug use was somehow tolerable. The new illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework strikes the right balance: one genuine opportunity for eligible first-time or low-risk individuals to complete a health focused diversion program but clear accountability for everyone else through penalty infringement notices and prosecution pathways. Repeat offenders and those with prior serious drug convictions will face the full force of the law. This recalibrates the system, offering deterrence where it is needed and help where it can work.

It is the antisocial behaviour measures that will hit home hardest in Townsville. The bill introduces targeted police powers in designated business and community precincts. Police will be able to issue move-on directions of up to 24 hours. They will have expanded banning notices and the power to require name and address in connection with these directions. Jack's Law handheld scanning powers are extended without senior officer approval in these precincts. These tools directly address the unacceptable risk that antisocial behaviour poses to patrons, business owners and everyday residents of our community. From the perspective of the local community of Townsville, these changes cannot come soon enough.


On 9 April, the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee public hearing in Townsville heard evidence from local leaders and residents that was powerful and unanimous. Mayor Nick Dametto and the Townsville City Council spoke forcefully about the daily toll on our city. Business leaders from the Townsville Chamber of Commerce and shopping centre managers described how antisocial behaviour and drug fuelled chaos are driving customers away and threatening livelihoods. They told us in no uncertain terms that families no longer feel safe in their own CBD or local centres. The community statement session was particularly moving. One long-term resident and business owner said, 'We've had enough. Our elderly residents are intimidated, our kids can't play safely and our businesses are closing early because of the constant disruption. This bill is what we've been begging for.' Another mother stood and declared, 'I want my children to grow up in a Townsville where they can walk to the shops without fear. Adult crime must mean adult time—no more excuses.'

These are not isolated views; they represent the overwhelming sentiment of the Townsville community. People are exhausted by smashed windows, loitering, aggressive begging and the fear that grips our public spaces. They want safer streets and no more stats. That is why the antisocial behaviour measures in this bill are so critical for Townsville. Move-on powers, expanded banning notices, name and address requirements and extended handheld scanning in designated precincts will give police the practical ability to act swiftly in our CBD, shopping centres, parks and community hubs.

On drugs, the new framework is balanced and firm: one genuine chance for low-level first offenders through health diversion but clear penalties and prosecution for repeat offenders—no more revolving door. Our community wants businesses to thrive without the constant threat of disruption. This bill delivers exactly that: practical frontline tools for police to restore order and public confidence in the places where Townsville families gather every day.

The Crisafulli government is delivering what we promised: more police, stronger laws and a justice system that protects the innocent and deters the guilty. This bill is tough, targeted and long overdue. Gone are the days when weak, spineless Townsville Labor MPs stood in this place, looked our community in the eye and told us there was no crime problem, all while they protected their Brisbane mates and their precious political narrative. They turned their backs on victims, dismissed terrified families and sold out our streets just to keep their inner-city bosses happy. Those days are finished. We are done with excuses, done with the denial and done with the weakness. Today Thuringowa and the greater Townsville region have a strong representation that puts our community first. We will never apologise for demanding safer streets, tougher laws and real action for the people we are proud to serve.

The real question now for the Labor Party is simple and direct: will they vote in favour of this bill and stand with victims and Queensland communities, or will they once again choose to be on the side of the offenders, just as they did for years in government? Queenslanders are watching closely. The people of Townsville and every regional community deserve to know whether Labor have learnt from their failures or whether they will continue to put criminals first. Let us listen to the people of Thuringowa and every regional community across Queensland. Let us pass this legislation and restore safety to our streets. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (4.56 pm): I rise to speak on the bill. The Queensland Labor opposition believes in strong, robust and evidence-based laws that are actually effective. We stand on the side of victims and victim-survivors. We want Queenslanders to be safe and to feel safe at home, in our streets and in our communities, but legislation should be dealt with honestly and in this bill it is not.

This bill is a political stitch-up—let's be very clear. It jams together two entirely separate issues: provisions in relation to very serious and violent crimes on the one hand and the winding back of effective health-based drug provisions on the other. The government knows that the second part would struggle if it had to stand on its own two feet. That is why Labor moved to split this bill. We wanted the drug diversion provisions dealt with separately. We wanted this parliament to properly examine the impact of cutting effective health intervention and care for people found with small amounts of drugs for personal use. The Crisafulli government refused. If the government had any confidence in the case for ending the current and effective drug diversion laws, it would have split this bill. This is another abuse of parliamentary process by a government that does not want the drug diversion provisions examined on their own merits. It does not want Queenslanders to see that, yet again, it is cutting access to health care and not listening to the doctors and nurses as they promised to do before the last election.

Labor cannot support a bill that cuts health care and health-based interventions for the people who need it. The evidence to the committee was very clear: the best practice response to the possession of small amounts of drugs for personal use is a health response. This is not just Labor's

view. The Australian Medical Association Queensland, the peak doctors organisation, condemned the repeal by the Crisafulli government of the laws supporting police drug diversion as dangerous and contrary to evidence. AMAQ said that the government had jettisoned the program when preliminary data indicated it was reducing police costs and supporting patients. An AMAQ press release today quotes Dr Nick Yim as saying—

“A University of Queensland report into the program ... showed of the 17,644 diversions between May 2024 and March 2025, 62% were warnings, 8% were first diversions and 30% were second diversions.

“It’s this second diversion cohort that benefits most from the program, as people who regularly use drugs are often struggling with other social, health or mental health challenges.

“Treating these people as criminals instead of patients will not reduce drug use in our community.”

The media release continues—

Dr Yim said the cost of ongoing drug use would ultimately cost the health system more.

“Timely intervention helps prevent other consequential issues including dementia, cognitive decline, seizures and chronic liver disease.

That is what the doctors say and they should be listened to. The Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drugs Agencies said—

... reducing opportunities for diversion makes policing less effective, by requiring police to spend time and resources on low-level drug possession instead of more serious offending.

The Queensland Mental Health Commission said that the bill is ‘unlikely to achieve its identified objectives’. The Queensland Aboriginal and Islander Health Council warned that repealing the police drug diversion program will reduce opportunities for early intervention, counselling, treatment and rehabilitation.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bailey, adjourned.

PLANNING (STATE FACILITATED DEVELOPMENT) AMENDMENT REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5.00 pm): I move—

That the Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026, subordinate legislation No. 23 of 2026, tabled in the House on 24 March 2026, be disallowed.

The Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026 goes to the heart of one of the biggest challenges facing Queenslanders right now: housing affordability. I want to start by setting out clearly what this regulation changes. Under the planning pathway that was designed by the former Labor government to deliver more affordable homes for everyday Queenslanders, if a developer sought access to the state facilitated development pathway they were required to include at least 15 per cent affordable housing in their project. In return they could access a streamlined state-led approval process. That was the deal: faster approvals in exchange for guaranteed affordable housing for Queenslanders. Under this regulation the affordable housing requirement is axed. Projects can still access the same fast-track pathway, but there is no longer any minimum requirement to deliver affordable housing for Queenslanders.

The Crisafulli LNP government say this regulatory change is necessary because the system is not working. The LNP say uptake has been low. They say the 15 per cent affordable housing requirement is ‘red tape’—a barrier to supply. They say removing it will unlock supply. That is the government’s justification. But, of course, it is difficult to get the government and facts in the same room at the same time, because when you actually look at the facts those claims simply do not stack up.

We know that at least 276 proposals were submitted under the state facilitated development pathway since it was established in July 2024 by the former Labor government. I want to acknowledge the work of the former Labor minister for housing, local government and planning, the member for Gaven, in bringing this very important regulatory framework to life in the last Labor government. It was not a system that failed to attract investment; it was a system that was working. This is the critical point: the only projects that have been declared for the SFD process are the 11 projects declared by the former Labor government in 2024. Not one additional project has been declared by the current Crisafulli

government in over a year—not one. So when the LNP stand up and say uptake is poor, they are not telling the full story. Uptake was not the problem, the LNP government led by Premier Crisafulli and Deputy Premier Bleijie are the problem.

The Queensland Labor opposition understands from a range of stakeholders that communications were sent out by the government to say the process would not be continuing. You cannot shut down a planning pathway, refuse to assess proposals and then claim uptake is poor. When you slam the door shut in the face of proponents how could you possibly expect anyone to walk in? The Crisafulli LNP government's decisions and delays are taking Queensland backwards, not just in affordable housing but across a range of portfolios and policy measures that impact everyday Queenslanders. Because of the Crisafulli LNP government's decisions, two state facilitated development projects declared under Labor have already been revoked by Deputy Premier Jarrod Bleijie, removing 115 homes, including 41 affordable homes, from the Redlands and Noosa. Other state facilitated development projects declared by Labor remain sitting in limbo, with Deputy Premier Bleijie delaying the delivery of around 3,170 homes, including 622 affordable homes, on the Gold Coast, in Noosa and in Brisbane. Fewer homes, fewer affordable homes, more delay; the LNP's decisions are leaving working Queenslanders worse off.

Let us also deal with the claim that the 15 per cent requirement was unworkable, because again the facts tell a very different story. The projects declared under Labor were not just meeting the minimum 15 per cent affordable housing requirement; they were exceeding it. On average, the 11 state facilitated development projects declared by Labor delivered 27 per cent affordable housing, not 15 per cent—almost double. That demonstrates two things: first, the affordable housing requirement was not a barrier; and, second, when you set a minimum standard the market can and will do better if incentivised to do so. That is how you get real, affordable housing outcomes for Queenslanders.

This regulation does not improve affordable housing supply, nor does it improve housing affordability generally. The government's regulation strips it back. It says to developers: you can access a fast-tracked state-led approvals pathway, you can bypass normal processes, you can benefit from streamlined decision-making and you do not have to deliver a single new affordable home—not one. That is the trade-off this government is making: speed for developers at the expense of affordability for Queenslanders. Those opposite want to frame this as a choice: supply or affordability, but that is a false choice. It is nonsense. In fact, it is nonsense on stilts because this state needs both. If we have to hear the Deputy Premier say 'supply, supply, supply' again, but not deliver affordable housing, it shows it is just another hollow slogan by the LNP government. Supply or affordability is a false choice. This state needs both and Labor's model delivered both. It delivered supply and it delivered affordable homes as part of that supply.

A government member: Where?

Mr DICK: Just listen to my speech! I told the member opposite the projects that had been approved. The LNP regulation that we seek to revoke tonight breaks that link. Let us be honest about who benefits from this change. It benefits developers who no longer have to include affordable housing and conveniently now donate to the LNP. I am sure this is just coincidence. The LNP's regulation does not help renters locked out of the market, first home buyers struggling to get in and key workers who cannot afford to live near their jobs. Nothing in this regulation guarantees affordable homes for them. The LNP's regulation also tells you everything you need to know about the priorities of the Crisafulli LNP government. When faced with a choice between securing affordable housing outcomes and removing obligations on developers, cruelly the LNP chose the latter. When it comes to affordable housing only Labor will stand up for and with Queenslanders. Only Labor will hold the LNP government to account for its cuts, its delays and its decisions. We believe if developers get a fast track, Queenslanders should simply get something in return. What Queenslanders should get in return are homes that they can actually afford.

Labor's policy position has always been about supporting our frontline workers. Police officers, teachers and nurses, for example, cannot afford to live near where they work. That is particularly the case in places such as the Sunshine Coast, which is represented by wall-to-wall LNP members of parliament. There are more than 3,400 people on the Social Housing Register in the Sunshine Coast local government area alone. That is an increase of over 700 people in one year under the LNP. On the Sunshine Coast, nearly 15,000 households are experiencing housing stress. Over 10,000 households are in rental stress. Over 4,000 households are experiencing mortgage stress. It is estimated that more than 7,000 households are in need of affordable housing on the Sunshine Coast. Those are households unable to access market priced rental housing. Housing stress is defined as households that are spending more than 30 per cent of gross household income on rent or mortgage

and are in the very low, low or moderate income ranges—the people Labor always stands for and speaks for and fights for. The statistics paint a dire picture of life for too many people on the Sunshine Coast—a situation that the Crisafulli LNP government is making worse, not better. You do not solve a housing crisis by axing the delivery of social and affordable housing.


The housing crisis in Brisbane is similarly concerning. Brisbane house prices more than doubled between March 2020 and December last year. In 2020, the median Brisbane house price was \$495,760 and in 2025 the median Brisbane house price was more than \$1 million. In just a matter of months, at the end of last year Brisbane unit prices surged by almost \$60,000. Brisbane house prices climbed by \$50,000 in just three months. Under the Crisafulli LNP government, Brisbane is caught in the grip of an unprecedented housing unaffordability crisis that is a hammer blow to the hopes of home seekers. What do the LNP do? They move this regulation that attacks and removes affordable housing! The prices we are seeing are out of control and have put the dream of owning a home even further out of reach. That Brisbane house prices have more than doubled in just five years is almost incomprehensible, and the Crisafulli LNP government is simply not doing anything to help. It is not helping; it is a hindrance.

The Crisafulli government needs to act to deliver more affordable houses. Instead, the Crisafulli government is taking deliberate decisions to deliver fewer affordable homes. The prediction from the experts is that the situation is only going to get worse. Under the LNP, Brisbane is in the grip of a growing housing unaffordability crisis. Prices are expected to spike by another 11 per cent this year. KPMG predicts Brisbane housing prices will jump 10.9 per cent in 2026. Brisbane's predicted rise dwarfs Sydney's 5.8 per cent. Brisbane unit prices are expected to rise 7.8 per cent. Another property report also paints a bleak picture for would-be homebuyers. According to the latest Cotality property report, in the March quarter Sydney home prices went backwards by 0.2 per cent but in Brisbane prices rose by more than five per cent. The projection is that by December 2026 Sydney's house prices will have decreased by more than \$2,000 while Brisbane's house prices will have risen by more than \$50,000, the highest rise in the nation.

It is nonsensical and it is simply beyond comprehension that they would remove this important mechanism to deliver more social and affordable housing in the face of the LNP's housing crisis. The experts have looked at the Crisafulli LNP government's housing plan and decided it will just make matters worse because the government is doing nothing real to boost housing supply. You cannot ease a housing unaffordability crisis by axing the delivery of affordable homes. The Crisafulli government has axed the delivery of thousands of affordable homes on the Gold Coast, on the Sunshine Coast and in Brisbane. With Brisbane house prices continuing to spiral out of control, where will our key and essential workers live? Under the LNP, what is the future for an essential worker in Brisbane? The fact that Brisbane's house prices are going to increase by twice the amount of Sydney's is a wake-up call that something is seriously out of whack under the LNP in Queensland.

The Premier and the LNP said that they had the solution to the housing crisis, but clearly they have not. It is just getting worse. Imagine being a young Queenslanders. How on earth do they save for a home deposit? How can they save for a house when everything else costs more under the LNP? Under the LNP, universal power bill relief has disappeared, car registration has spiralled, and house and unit prices and rents keep going up. Under the LNP, notwithstanding all of their promises, the dream of home ownership is fast becoming just that: a dream.

This regulation removes a simple fair deal. It gives more to developers and it takes more away from Queenslanders. At a time when Queenslanders are struggling to afford the basics, that is the wrong decision. That is why this LNP regulation should be disallowed.

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (5.14 pm): The Liberal National Party will be opposing this disallowance motion because what we are debating tonight is simple: does this House support supply, supply, supply? Do we want to make it easier to build more homes for Queenslanders or do we want to go back to the red tape, the delays and the failed mandates that helped create the housing crisis we are experiencing in the first place? Tonight we have a choice between Labor's approach of housing announcements and the Crisafulli government's record of housing delivery.

The Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026 is about one thing, that is, getting more homes built faster. The greatest impact we can have on affordability is to deliver more supply. Again, the Crisafulli government is determined to deliver more supply, supply, supply. This regulation expands the eligibility for the state facilitated development pathway, it cuts unnecessary red tape, it restores local decision-making and it makes it easier for councils and industry to work together to deliver more homes. That is exactly what Queenslanders expect from their government right now—not process and not talk but delivery.

This reform allows flexibility to consider a wider range of residential developments through this pathway. It keeps the option open for proposals to include social and affordable housing, despite what this House has heard from the member for Woodridge tonight. Critically, under the new operational guidance, only projects supported by local government will proceed. It is a stark contrast to the approach of those opposite, including the member for Gaven, who was not the minister for local government; she was the minister against local government. Our changes are about partnerships. They are about local feedback. It means better outcomes on the ground. This is about resetting the planning partnership with councils after a decade in which they were ignored and overridden. We are putting councils back at the table because they know their communities best, they know what infrastructure exists and they know where growth should happen.

Those opposite want to disallow these reforms. We have to ask why. Their record is clear: Labor's decade of decline created the Queensland housing crisis. Housing lot approvals fell by 29 per cent on their watch. They left a more than \$2.2 billion black hole in trunk infrastructure funding. Vacancy rates hit record lows and the social housing waitlist grew by more than 80 per cent. Adding fuel to the fire, 1,960 social homes were sold by Labor between 2015 and 2024. I will break down those numbers. The member for Springwood sold 1,377 social homes. The member for Algester sold 539 social homes. The member for Gaven, who led the false scare campaign against the Crisafulli government accusing us of embarking on a mass sales program, sold 44 social homes. That is more than the Crisafulli government has sold and I have been the minister for around the same time as the member for Gaven was the housing minister. That is Labor's legacy.

When it came to actually building new homes, they failed. They did not complete a single new home from their signature Housing Investment Fund in over three years of running it—not one. Every single newly built Housing Investment Fund home has been delivered under the Crisafulli government—every single one. Instead, from Labor we got talkfests, glossy brochures and mandates that stalled projects and scared off investment. Their approach to the SFD pathway is a perfect example. They imposed rigid requirements and mandatory percentages for certain housing types. What happened? The pathway became unworkable, projects did not proceed and homes were not built. They spent a decade mowing vacant blocks of land while projects could not get off the ground. Labor mowed; we build.

Incredibly, we are hearing misinformation from those opposite about their failed system and what it could have delivered. They talk about thousands of homes being stopped. As the Deputy Premier will make clear, of the 276 expressions of interest that the member for Woodridge touched on in his contribution, more than half were not even eligible under Labor's own policy settings. They were not fully formed applications. They were not deliverable projects. They were not homes. What is true, though, is that the way they let productivity decline has cost us 77,000 homes across Queensland since 2018.

If those opposite were so confident in the system they were running, they had 10 years to deliver those homes, but they did not because their model did not work. If it did work, how many of the more than 63,700 social homes that my department manages were delivered through these mandates, were gifted to us by developers? Not a single one. These mandates do not work.

We have taken a very different approach. We are pulling every lever to boost housing supply. These reforms are part of that. They respond directly to expert advice from the Queensland Productivity Commission. Recommendation 26 called for improvements to state assessment pathways, including the SFD process. We are acting on that advice because we want a system that works in practice, not just on paper. The commission was also clear that the previous requirement for at least 15 per cent of dwellings to meet certain criteria made the pathway difficult to comply with. It increased costs. It made the pathway unattractive. That is why it was underused and that is why we are fixing it. We are removing those barriers. We have made this pathway workable again. Importantly, we have kept the flexibility for projects to include social and affordable housing. We are not enforcing a one-size-fits-all mandate that stops projects from proceeding. We are enabling delivery and choice.

The LGAQ has welcomed these changes, noting that they enable meaningful local government participation. The Property Council has said this reform will help turn reform into homes on the ground sooner. The Urban Development Institute has said this pathway creates the opportunity for industry to get on with the job of delivering housing. That is what we are all about.


We are already seeing results. The Crisafulli government is investing a record \$5.6 billion to deliver new social and community housing, and we have more than 6,300 homes under contract or construction across our state. In just 18 months, we have added 4,137 of those social and affordable

homes to that pipeline. We are on track by the end of our term to deliver four times as many social homes per year as Labor managed on average over their decade of decline. Despite the claims of the member for Woodridge, there have been six state facilitated development approvals which will deliver nearly 1,500 homes, including hundreds of affordable dwellings. Through the ministerial infrastructure designation pathway, we have approved 20 projects which will deliver another 1,200 homes, including social and affordable housing. That is real delivery and it is happening right now. It is not promises, it is not projections; these are real homes.

They are supported by our broader actions across the housing system. Our Land Activation Program is unlocking more sites for housing. Our \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund is supporting the infrastructure that has long been needed to bring forward close to 100,000 extra lots.

Recent ABS building data shows our reforms are working. After a lost decade, the housing pipeline in Queensland is starting to turn around under the Crisafulli government. New data shows a clear lift in the number of approvals, commencements and construction completions—the first meaningful turnaround after years of decline. We have had a 14 per cent increase in dwelling approvals, we have had a 16 per cent increase in dwelling commencements and we have had a 21 per cent increase in dwellings under construction. That is what a real plan looks like, that is what delivery looks like, and it all connects back to our commitment to secure our housing foundations and deliver a million new homes by 2044.

This disallowance motion would take us backwards. It would take us back to a system that was too rigid, too slow—a system that failed to deliver. We need to keep moving forward. We need to keep removing barriers. We need to keep working with local governments and with industry, and we need to keep delivering more homes at a scale our state has never seen before. At the end of the day, this is not about process. It is about people. It is about ensuring more Queenslanders have a place to call home. Only this side of the House has a plan to deliver that. We are getting on with the job. I urge the House to reject this disallowance motion.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.24 pm): I rise tonight to speak on the disallowance motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This decision—this deliberate decision—by the Crisafulli LNP government shows that it is never what they say that matters; it is what they do. What they have done with this regulation is cut affordable housing targets in the middle of a housing affordability crisis—a housing affordability crisis where first home buyers who started saving for a home four years ago are further away from affording to buy today than when they first started; a housing affordability crisis where the vacancy rate on rentals is so low and the rents so high that dual-income families are being priced out; a housing affordability crisis that is fuelled by an LNP government that would rather build luxury units than affordable homes.

When times are tough and families are struggling to keep a roof over their head, the decision to scrap affordable housing tells us everything we need to know about whose side this government is on. This government and this Deputy Premier made a choice: not to strengthen affordable housing, not to accelerate it, but to cut the pipeline.

Let's be clear about what has changed. Under Labor's state facilitated development pathway, there was a simple, fair principle: if a developer wanted access to a fast-tracked, state-led approval process, they had to deliver at least 15 per cent affordable housing. That was the deal—expedited approvals and cutting red tape for developers in exchange for homes Queenslanders could actually afford. That is what governments should be doing—using its powers to help people.

These sorts of developments were popular. Since the pathway was introduced, at least 276 proposals were submitted. Two hundred and seventy-six—that is not a failed policy, despite what the LNP might want to say; that is a short cut that developers were using because it worked. The projects approved under Labor did not just meet the requirement; they exceeded it. On average, they delivered 27 per cent affordable housing, not 15. That is what happens when you set clear expectations and what happens when government leads decisively.

But what has happened since the LNP took office? Those proponents were told the pathway would be 'inactive for the foreseeable future'. I table that correspondence.

Tabled paper. Email, dated April 2025, from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, regarding the SFD program [\[547\]](#).

They were told a pathway to affordable housing would be inactive in the middle of a housing crisis. You cannot just shut down a system, refuse to assess projects and then turn around and claim it is not working.

Two projects have already been revoked, removing 115 homes, including 41 affordable homes. More than 3,000 homes, including 600 affordable homes in the pipeline, are now stuck in limbo, at risk of never being delivered. That is fewer homes for Queenslanders and fewer affordable homes for Queenslanders in need. It only adds to the pressures people are feeling and puts the dream of home ownership further out of reach, and puts more pressure on families already doing it tough.

Let's call this decision for what it is. This is not reform. This is a signal to their developer mates that luxury is the way to go. The reality is we need more homes, but not just homes for the upper echelon of buyers; we need homes people can afford, and Labor's model delivered both. The LNP's plan delivers nothing for working Queenslanders—


Mr Head interjected.

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

Mr MILES: The LNP's plan delivers nothing for working Queenslanders because when you remove affordable housing requirements, you do not magically get affordability. You get higher margins and fewer guarantees for those just wanting to get their foot in the door in the communities they have grown up in and you leave everyday Queenslanders behind. Think about who misses out here: the nurse who cannot afford to live near the hospital, the teacher who has to commute further every year, the young couple who are trying to buy their first home, the family who are stuck in the rental market with no way out. Nothing in this regulation helps them or guarantees them a home that they can afford, but it tells us everything about this government's priorities.

Labor will not sit idly by and accept a cut to the affordable housing pipeline. Labor will not stand by and let this change go through during a housing crisis. If developers get a fast track to approvals, Queenslanders deserve something in return. Queenslanders cannot afford delays, division and deflection from this LNP government. They cannot afford more inaction and they cannot afford decisions that make the crisis worse.

This is a defining moment—a choice between a government that cuts affordable housing and a Labor team that will fight for it. Housing is not just about bricks and mortar and plasterboard; it is about people, security and dignity. It is about making sure every Queenslander has a place to call home. That is why this regulation should be disallowed, and that is why Labor will keep fighting to deliver more homes, more affordable homes and a better future for Queenslanders.

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (5.30 pm): I have a master's degree in property economics, but I have a PhD in common sense. The reality is that this is always about supply, supply, supply. Let's have a look at how we got here. Queensland, as we all know, has experienced sustained population growth for the better part of a decade. According to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, Queensland's resident population increased from an estimated 4.78 million in June 2015 to approximately 5.7 million by September 2025, representing growth of around 910,000 people, or almost 20 per cent. That growth rate consistently exceeded the national average. After 2021 it accelerated, driven primarily by interstate and overseas immigration. Despite being in power for most of that time, those opposite failed to plan and failed to act. As a result of that unprecedented growth we have the problem we have today—supply, supply, supply. Truly, they are geniuses, each and every one of them.

Very simply, housing supply under Labor did not match population growth. Their failed approach to planning presided over a 29 per cent fall in housing lot approvals. As a result, housing affordability deteriorated massively across Queensland under Labor's watch. Labor's negligence on housing produced results which are no shock to anyone. We keep hearing the clarion call 'if only they had another term'. Mercifully, they did not get that extra term back in October 2024. Thank goodness.

Under Labor, planning system delays also affected housing costs by increasing, from a developer's perspective, holding costs, financial risks and uncertainty for projects. The independent Queensland Productivity Commission—which we need to remember is a body that those opposite abolished and that we have restored—has identified that Labor's state facilitated development settings were a drag on new development throughout the state. In fact, it described the requirement that at least 15 per cent of the total dwellings be affordable housing to qualify for the state facilitated development pathway as difficult to comply with in practice and, therefore, underutilised, limiting their effectiveness as a supply lever.

Once again, the LNP have had to come in and clean up the Labor Party's mess. The amended regulation, introduced by the Deputy Premier, addresses these weaknesses while retaining core planning safeguards. The Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026

amended the Planning Regulation 2017 to expand eligibility for the state facilitated development pathway to developments that are predominantly residential and subject to zoning and infrastructure suitability. The regulation preserves flexibility for proposals to include social or affordable housing, which are very noble—we do not deny that—while removing rigid mandates that discourage participation. Furthermore, the reforms to the state facilitated development pathway remove red tape, reduce development costs and boost supply—supply, supply, supply—delivering on recommendation 26 of the Queensland Productivity Commission's 2026 report *Opportunities to improve productivity of the construction industry* to improve state assessment pathways, particularly state facilitated development. We are doing what we said we would do. We have been consistent in that for 17 months now. We are doing what we said we would do.

Crucially, the amended pathway requires written support from the relevant local government before a proposal may be declared a state facilitated development, restoring councils as equal partners in the decision-making process. I will speak more about that shortly. The LGAQ has publicly supported the amended approach, noting that it enables meaningful council participation and aligns with the Equal Partners in Government agreement. On 20 March the CEO of the LGAQ, Ms Alison Smith, said—

We are pleased to see changes to the State Facilitated Development process that now enable meaningful local government participation.

Industry bodies, including the PCA and the Urban Development Institute of Australia, have also welcomed the reforms, as mentioned by the member for Bonney. Queensland Property Council executive director Jess Caire said that quicker and clearer planning decisions meant more housing more quickly and that they 'welcome the government's swift action to turn reform into homes on the ground, sooner, across all product types'.

Let's cut to the chase here. As at March 2026, six developments had been approved through the state facilitated development pathway, delivering 1,492 dwellings, including 364 affordable homes. A further 20 approvals through the ministerial infrastructure designation pathway are delivering 1,280 dwellings, including 860 social and 420 affordable homes. In parallel, 6,342 social and community housing dwellings are under contract or construction following a \$5.6 billion investment over four years.

The state facilitated development reset is one of the many Crisafulli government reforms to help fix Labor's housing crisis and give more Queenslanders a place to call home. This includes—and it needs to be restated—the \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund, which is a nation-leading land activation program which is delivering new regional plans in every corner of Queensland. That is another mess that the Deputy Premier has had to clean up after the decade of decline under those opposite. Truly, truly hopeless.

I turn now to a local case study which highlights how the Labor Party approach planning decisions in contrast to the LNP. The suburb of Wakerley within my electorate of Chatsworth is a classic example of how badly Labor handled this process. In their quest to rush this through when the 2024 election was in sight, they gave approval for a project in my electorate, in the suburb of Wakerley, after hardly any community consultation. There were literally three blank pages on the website. It was truly abysmal.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: I take the interjection from the member for Woodridge, 'Mr Dollar Bill'. This is the genius who did not even know how to capitalise income when it came to defining a discount rate. I hope he is much better when it comes to the law than he was an economist. He certainly was a failed treasurer. No wonder he slunk off back to Woodridge—truly hopeless. He does not have control of his brief—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Woodridge.

Mr MINNIKIN:—but he has the audacity to bring in this disallowance motion on a subject matter in which he has no expertise—truly hopeless.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge, cease your interjections.

Mr MINNIKIN: I will not take any further commentary, tips or advice from the failed treasurer and the gentleman who scurried away from Greenslopes back to Woodridge. He is absolutely hopeless. If you piped down you might learn a trick or two. You may, but in your case, member for Woodridge, that is highly doubtful. The member for Woodridge's arrogance—

Mr Dick interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge, I will not warn you again. Next time, it will be a warning under the standing orders. It would help if you put your comments through the chair, Minister.

Mr MINNIKIN: The ham-fisted approach by those opposite caused my community unparalleled angst. The biggest issue of all is that local government was precluded from the framework which is why they were truly aghast—in my case, it was the Brisbane City Council. They were absolutely flummoxed that they had no input into this at all. The community was absolutely aghast as well, so I called an urgent onsite meeting at New Cleveland Road and Dianthus Street at Wakerley. About 110 people turned up. I turned that into a reverse wedge. It was something that was done in the shadows—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: Something must have worked. I take the interjection. When it came to the primary vote at Gumdale, it was 63 per cent—a primary vote that some of them over there with their margins could only dream of, trust me. I say this again: thank you so much for your genius wedge. It worked out beautifully in Wakerley. That translated only a matter of months later to the primary vote at Gumdale.

Some of us do not need to scurry and run from our seats. Some of us stay the distance, some of us have ticker, some of us have heart and some of us invest in the areas that we have always represented. Some of us do not need to look for an easy ride when things get a little bit too tough and you get your marching orders from your electorates. Some of us on this side have real merit; over there—vacuous. When it comes to this issue, I will land where I started: for those opposite, this is all about supply, supply, supply. Follow the bouncing ball.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (5.40 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the deputy Labor leader. I cannot believe that the member for Chatsworth seriously just said that he increased his primary vote because he effectively opposed affordable housing! You wonder why Queenslanders are cynical about politics—why they do not think the system is built for them. This is why. At the exact time that this government removes affordable housing requirements it has lifted the cap on developer donations. Right when the LNP say, 'Developers won't be required to build homes that working people can actually afford,' they can now give the LNP money. I will let Queenslanders draw their own conclusions from that, but I know what it looks like and I know who will pay the price ultimately—and that is working Queenslanders.

I want to be clear about what this pathway actually did, despite the narrative from those opposite. We were willing to do something significant. We were willing to bypass the normal council processes, override local planning conditions and limit third-party appeal rights and application fees—all to use powers of the state to get projects moving faster. That is not a small thing to hand to a developer. The condition—the only condition, in fact—was that some of those homes needed to be affordable. I do not think that is an unreasonable thing to ask. The affordable housing requirement was not red tape. It was not a barrier. It was the entire justification of using the state power in this way. The government has just stripped it out. I do not know how you seriously justify that to families who are sleeping in their cars tonight.

When I was the planning minister I was not afraid to tell NIMBYs to get out of the way. Those opposite were very critical of me doing that, but I knew it was the right thing to do by this state and by working Queenslanders. What I find interesting is the list of members speaking on this disallowance motion. All of them have opposed affordable housing projects in their communities. We just heard from one of them, the member for Chatsworth, who opposed church land where they wanted to build affordable housing. He came in here and talked about the fact that he had concerns about that project. We have the member for Bonney; the member for Redlands, who is the assistant housing minister, who campaigned against affordable housing in her own electorate; the member for Burleigh; the member for Toowoomba North; and the chief NIMBY himself, the member for Kawana, who at every opportunity—whether it is removing social and affordable housing conditions from PDAs, removing this requirement through the state facilitated development pathway or opposing projects in his backyard—blocks homes that working Queenslanders could actually afford.

The government's justification for this change is that uptake was poor and that the system was not working. What a load of rubbish! There were 276 expressions of interest submitted. That is the potential for 30,000 homes across Queensland—30,000. I see the Deputy Premier shaking his head. This nonsense being sprouted by the LNP that no-one was interested is just rubbish. Those projects have been gathering dust on the Deputy Premier's desk. In fact, I am the only person who actually declared a project. They want to talk about housing supply. The Deputy Premier has had projects sitting on his desk for a year now that he has refused to approve, so those opposite should not come in here and suggest that they are pro supply.

This government wrote to proponents from as early as April last year telling them that the pathway would be 'inactive for the foreseeable future'. They shut the door on that pathway for developers—refused to assess proposals and turned them away. Then they had the audacity to come into this place and say that the uptake was poor. Come on! You cannot seriously close the door and then complain that nobody is walking through it. The Premier and the Deputy Premier are not the solution to Queensland's housing crisis; they are the obstacle.

The government also claims that the 15 per cent requirement was red tape—an unworkable barrier. As previous speakers have mentioned, again the facts tell a very different story. On average, the projects delivered had 20 per cent affordable housing. That was more than the requirement even outlined. When you have nearly double the minimum requirement—when you set a standard, when you create real incentive—I think it demonstrates that the market responded and responded in a positive way, despite what those opposite are now trying to suggest.

The decisions of this government are not abstract; they have real consequences for real people. Two SFD projects declared under Labor have already been revoked by the Deputy Premier. That is removing 115 homes, including 41 affordable homes. They are gone. Right now sitting with the Deputy Premier unassessed, going nowhere, are 3,170 homes on the Gold Coast, in Noosa and in Brisbane, right where rents are skyrocketing. That means fewer homes, fewer affordable homes and more delay in the middle of a housing crisis. There are people in this state who are working full-time who cannot afford a home. There are teachers, nurses, ambos—people who hold this state together—who cannot afford to live here. This government's answer in the middle of a crisis is to hand developers a government fast-track process and ask for nothing in return, not one affordable home. That is a choice and it tells you everything about whose side this government is on.

Those opposite want to present this as a binary option—supply or affordability. Remove the requirement and unlock supply. That is a false choice. The evidence from this very pathway shows that. Labor's model delivered both—supply and affordability and at the same time as part of the same deal. This regulation breaks that link permanently. It hands developers all of the benefits of the government fast-tracked process while stripping away any obligations to ensure that they actually delivered for working people.

I also want to comment on the process. This government did not bring this change to the floor of parliament. They tried to do it sneakily through a regulation because they knew it would not uphold scrutiny. We will not let them get away with that. That is why we are here to disallow this change, because we do not support them ripping out affordable housing conditions in the middle of a crisis. There are working Queenslanders who did everything right—who are paying their taxes and serving their communities. They were supposed to be part of this deal and they have now been shut out.

This is not complicated. A developer accesses a government fast-track. They save time. They save money. They get certainty, backed by the resources of the Queensland state. The least we can ask of them in return is that some of those homes are ones that ordinary Queenslanders can actually afford, but this government has removed that ask at the wrong time for the wrong reasons with the wrong consequences for people of this state.

I want to respond to some of the comments made by the housing minister. It is deeply alarming that we have a housing minister in this state who does not understand the difference between social and affordable housing. He just said that none of the homes in these projects were transferred to the housing department. That would be because they are affordable homes, not social homes. I am unclear who is responsible for affordable housing over there. Evidently no-one is, which is probably why we are in the situation that we are in.

He quoted the Property Council. He quoted all of those development organisations. We worked with them. We also want to support the work that they do, but it was very interesting who he did not quote—the Queensland Council of Social Service and Q Shelter, the very organisations that he, as a housing minister responsible for a blown out social housing waiting list, should actually come in here and represent. He refused to even mention what they said, and that is because they do not support what this government is doing. They are the ones who called for the process that those opposite are stripping away.

He also came in here and talked about all of the social homes the government is delivering. Again I remind those opposite it was confirmed at estimates that pretty much all of the homes under construction right now are because of the former Labor government's investment, not because of the work of those opposite. Instead of turning up to construction sites where he thinks homes have

magically appeared under the LNP's watch and taking credit for Labor projects, he should do his job and deliver more social and supportive social housing. He should tell the Deputy Premier to do his job and stop blocking affordable housing conditions and requirements.

We know that the member for Bonney has absolutely no influence in this government. That has been evidenced every time he comes into this parliament. Whether it is in relation to pill testing, abortion reform, voluntary assisted dying—


Mr Dick: Renewable energy.

Ms SCANLON: I take that interjection—renewable energy, climate change, and the list goes on, he gets rolled every single time. That is the bloke they have in charge of one of the biggest crises in this state. It should shock any young Queenslander that we have a housing minister who just came in here and defended the actions of the Deputy Premier, who is removing affordable housing targets but at the same time allowing developers to donate to the Liberal National Party. I support the deputy leader's motion. This is a fast-track approval process—

Mr Head: What did BPIC cost us on the housing front? Profits to unions and back to the Labor Party.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Callide, you will be warned under the standing orders the next time you interject.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. We will always stand up for working Queenslanders and unions. You stand up for developers.

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (5.50 pm): In Redlands, people do not ask for special treatment; they ask to be heard. Recently on a proposed state facilitated development, SFD, at Broadwater Terrace in Redland Bay they made that very clear. A local couple, Gail and Brett, wrote to me saying—

We understand how bad the housing crisis [has been] and that there is a need to fix this, but I don't think this proposal is geographically suitable for the area ... at least if something is going to be built there, it should be a similar size and aesthetic.

That sums it up. This was never about stopping housing; it was about getting it right. Under the former Labor government's state facilitated development pathway that project bypassed local planning, bypassed council and bypassed the very people who would live alongside it. There was no consultation, no local input and no respect for the planning rules that apply everywhere else. Actually, there was no respect at all by the former minister, who resorts to name-calling the community of Redlands.

Let's not forget how this happened. That approval was signed off by former housing minister Meaghan Scanlon on the eve of caretaker mode in 2024—a decision that was rushed through without consultation, without community input, without proper planning, against council planning and without a way that residents could voice their concerns. Passing this on the eve of caretaker mode left Redlanders voiceless, powerless and without a representative who could listen and act on their concerns. It eroded trust in the former member, trust in the previous government and trust in the process of SFDs.

However, unlike the previous government, I was listening. I cared about what residents had to say and I promised to deliver action and restore proper planning to Redlands. When I brought the community together—more than 120 residents—they raised real, practical concerns. They were not being NIMBYs; they were concerned about building heights, traffic congestion, parking and the character of the neighbourhood they live in. These are real concerns, and Redlanders expect these concerns to be respected and heard. After that, the decision was made to revoke the SFD based on the community's concerns. They expressed relief and appreciation. They once again had a voice, and that voice mattered. I thank the Deputy Premier for listening to the Redlands community and making that decision for them. A resident sent me a text message immediately after we stood with them to simply say, 'Thank you for listening to our community.' That is what this is about. That is why the Crisafulli government reinstated consultation, that is why we restored local government input and that is why that development was ultimately revoked, because planning should not be done to communities; it should be done with them.

Let's be clear about the broader issue before the House. We are in the middle of a housing crisis that was created by those opposite during a decade of decline, and Queenslanders feel it every single day. Rents are rising, vacancy rates are tight and young people are struggling to get into the market. Families are making tough choices just to stay in their communities, and no-one on this side of the House is pretending otherwise. We know that we need more homes, more supply, and we need it fast. The question is not whether we build more homes; the question is how.


That is where those opposite got it wrong. They relied on mandates, rigid targets and policies that looked good in theory but did not work in practice. The 15 per cent social and affordable housing requirement is a perfect example of that. It sounded good and it looked good, but it became a barrier. The Queensland Productivity Commission made that very clear. They found the requirement was difficult to comply with, increased development costs and made the SFD pathway unattractive. When a pathway becomes unattractive it does not get used, and when it does not get used homes do not get built. That is exactly what happened. We saw it at Hamilton Northshore and we saw it at Woolloongabba. There were big announcements and ambitious targets, but nothing was actually built.

At the same time, under Labor housing lot approvals fell by almost 30 per cent. The social housing waitlist grew by 77 per cent and their housing investment fund, despite all of the headlines, did not deliver one new home while they were in government—not one. When those opposite stand up tonight and talk about protecting social and affordable housing, Queenslanders are entitled to ask, 'Where was that delivery when you had the chance?' On this side we are focused on outcomes. That means removing barriers that stop projects from getting off the ground. It means backing the advice of the Queensland Productivity Commission and fixing a pathway that was not successful. It means working with local governments, not overriding them, so projects progress. It means unlocking supply at every level—I will say it: supply, supply, supply—through the state facilitated development pathway, through ministerial infrastructure designations, through the Residential Activation Fund unlocking tens of thousands of homes, through the Land Activation Program already unlocking thousands of homes, and through direct investment in social and community housing. If you are serious about housing you do not just rely on one mechanism; you pull every lever available. That is exactly what our Deputy Premier has been doing. That is exactly what this government is doing.

We have kept the option for social and affordable housing within the SFD pathway. Let me be very clear about that; we have not removed it. We have made it achievable because a flexible system means that more projects proceed, and more projects proceeding means more homes overall, including social and affordable homes. That is the difference, and we are already seeing it: six SFD approvals are delivering nearly 1,500 homes, including affordable dwellings; 20 ministerial infrastructure designations are delivering more than 1,200 homes, most of them social and affordable; and across Queensland more than 6,300 social and community homes are under contract and construction. That is what delivery looks like: real homes for real Queenslanders.

This matters in Redlands. We are seeing growth, we are seeing pressure and we are seeing young families trying to get into the market, seniors trying to downsize and essential workers trying to stay close to their jobs. They need more housing, but they expect it to be done properly to fit the community, have infrastructure that keeps up and that their voice still counts. These reforms deliver a system that is faster and more flexible and brings communities, councils and industry back to the table together. We understand something those opposite seem to forget, because if you ignore communities you lose trust, and when you lose trust you slow everything down.

Good planning is not about cutting corners; it is about getting the balance right, and that is what we are restoring. When those opposite stand up and argue for disallowance, what they are really arguing for is a return to the very settings that created their housing crisis in the first place—a system that stalled approvals, drove up costs and failed to deliver the homes that Queenslanders need. We will not go back to that. In Redlands the message was clear: build the homes and build them right. That is exactly what this government is doing. We are cutting red tape, we are restoring partnership and we are getting on with delivering more places for Queenslanders to call home.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.59 pm): Supply, supply, supply—they are the talking points of the assistant minister for housing. I have written down a list from her speech, and I have a list from the member for Chatsworth and the housing minister as well. Their first point was, 'Where is the delivery?' They should jump on my Facebook page where I have pictures of affordable housing openings in Walkervale, Kalkie, Bundy South and Bundy West. Our government delivered social and affordable housing time and time again.

It is clear that those opposite do not understand the difference between social and affordable housing. We just heard the assistant minister for housing say that this provision is about getting rid of the 15 per cent social housing mandate. No, it is affordable housing. There is a difference. Affordable housing is when those who are not eligible for social housing are having difficulty getting into the property market. Let me assist the assistant housing minister and the housing minister because he also said the same thing: that this was about social housing. He asked, 'Why is it that affordable homes built by private developers are not being gifted to my department to become social housing?' It is because they are two different things, comrade. Comrade O'Connor wants private development to become social housing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Member for Bundaberg, you know better than that. I ask you to withdraw that reference to the minister and in future use correct titles.

Mr SMITH: I withdraw. We really got to the crux of what this is about when the minister, the member for Chatsworth and the member for Redlands said that they opposed these affordable housing developments because of the character of the neighbourhood. That is what this is really about. This is about government members thinking that affordable housing is social housing and they do not like social housing. They do not like the development of social housing and I wonder if they even care for the people in social housing.

I have told the minister on numerous occasions that families in my electorate are living in tents, in cars or on the streets and I have asked time and time again for the minister to intervene to ensure that children are not living on the streets, yet no intervention has come forth. I have had instances where families who signed an agreement to sleep in a tent in a caravan park are told that they have signed a lease and are no longer considered to be homeless. Not all of these families qualify for social housing. Some of them are working and they might be a dual income family but their form of employment is not providing them with the funds they need to be able to purchase their own home or even rent in some cases.

We heard about how we got to this housing crisis, and let me give the reality about what occurred. When COVID-19 hit throughout the globe and the state, it drove up housing prices and rental prices. It also took rental properties off the market to become owner-occupied, especially throughout regional Queensland and Bundaberg. In the Bundaberg region, rental vacancies dropped to below one per cent and further developments were affected because of pressures on the construction market.

Time and time again, families came to me saying that they had been forced out of a rental they had lived in for five or 10 years, and one family had been in the same rental for 20 years. All of a sudden, investors from down south decided they were going to move up to Bundaberg—and well done to them because it is the greatest place to live—but as soon as they purchased that rental property, that property was off the rental market and that family was trying to get into another rental property. When that repeated itself, we had 60 families rocking up to a rental inspection on a Saturday or a Tuesday to see if they could get a property. We saw that families who were on an income, along with disability pensioners and those receiving carer payments, were blocked from accessing social housing and were in this space like a no man's land because of the increased cost of rent or purchasing their own property. They could not get housing when they needed it. That is exactly why we brought in the state facilitated development pathway. It was to ensure that developers did what they should do in terms of building homes for Queenslanders, and there was a 15 per cent mandate on them to ensure there was affordable housing for working Queenslanders.


The LNP want to say they are supporting working Queenslanders through supply, supply, supply, but not every working Queenslanders can be on \$100,000, \$80,000 or \$60,000 a year. Some working Queenslanders are battling every single day to ensure they can get food in the lunch box for their kids at school and food on the table for breakfast and dinner. They need to have the ability to get into the housing market in some form through affordable housing. That is exactly why we have this provision. The LNP are saying that this is red tape, but that suggests that everyday families across Bundaberg and Queensland are only considered as bureaucratic victims by this LNP government. That is who the real victims are; it is the everyday working Queenslanders who battle every single day just to stay afloat during the cost-of-living crisis and the Crisafulli fuel crisis we are currently facing.

There is a suggestion that there was no uptake. At least 276 EOIs were submitted under the state facilitated development pathway, as was outlined by our previous speakers, and we know that the only projects that have been declared for the SFD process were 11 projects that were declared by the former Labor government. We also know that there are currently three proposals that are not being acted upon. One in particular on the Gold Coast looks at 2,750 homes, of which 20 per cent are affordable homes. That is 550 homes that developers are very happy to invest in, but there has been no decision and it is on the table collecting dust. Imagine that: 550 homes that could be for Queenslanders who are on disability pensions or receiving a carer payment or who are just trying to get their kids to school while they work every day from nine to three and be there to pick them up.

How can it be suggested that ensuring 15 per cent is driving investment down, when developers are willing to go five per cent or even more over? That is nonsensical. That is why I hope in this debate in parliament that government members will make their own choice and cross the floor if they so wish—as we know they are free to do. Why don't they listen to what is happening in this debate? I want government members to take a reasoned approach. Do we really want to say that people on disability

pensions or receiving a carer allowance should be phased out of the market because we are only going to allow luxury developments to continue? Are we going to say that the everyday mums and dads—who are working at the pub cleaning dishes for six hours a day and then getting their kids from school and taking them to training, and then going home to get as much food as they can on the table for dinner and breakfast—do not matter enough to ensure that, through a sped up process, at least 15 per cent of a development should go towards affordable housing?

That is what is happening here tonight. The government is making a decision to turn its back on everyday Queenslanders, to turn its back on people who have similar stories to members of the government. There are members in this government who have fought tooth and nail to get to where they are today or their families did, their parents did or their grandparents did. However, they were able to exist in a market where housing was more affordable. We know that global pressures are driving up prices. The pressures through COVID-19 are driving up prices as well as construction prices. Those opposite need to consider their history, their background and how their family ensured they got ahead just in the same way that my family struggled so I could get to where I am today in terms of representing people. Is it really that hard to say that under this one proposal pathway 15 per cent of the development should go towards helping vulnerable Queenslanders who are not seeking social housing but seeking housing?

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (6.10 pm): I take the last point. The member for Bundaberg talks about aspiration and what young people are going to do and how people are going to be able to afford homes. I look at the member for Gaven, who was a good renter under the Labor government for 10 years and could not afford a home until the Crisafulli government was elected and created a pathway for the member for Gaven to become a home owner. I congratulate her because that is what we want: we want aspiration. If people want to rent, that is their choice. If people aspire to be able to afford a home, that is great.

It is really interesting because Labor have just said that in the last year and a half everything has become unaffordable, yet for the member for Gaven it is when she could afford to buy a home in Queensland—not under the Labor Party but under an LNP government. I congratulate the member for Gaven on becoming a home owner under the LNP Crisafulli government's policy. I feel for her that she was not able to do it when she was the housing minister. We are happy to help and support anyone across Queensland, even those who are members of the Labor Party. If they aspire to achieve home ownership, we are here to help. Okay, member for Gaven? We are here to help and I am glad we could—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Deputy Premier, please put your contributions through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: Interestingly, I heard the member for Bundaberg also say that under their great SFD—state facilitated development—process they made 11 declarations. What he did not tell us is that under the SFD process a declaration is not an approval. They did not approve any under the Labor government process. Declaring a state facilitated development application is not an approval. Guess what? Just like this government is cleaning up all of Labor's mess, I have approved six. That former minister the member for Gaven, who implemented it, approved zero; I have approved six, even under Labor's policy.

That is all we could do because the planning framework was not a good framework. They rushed it, they botched it and people wanted change. It was not only the LGAQ and local governments across the state that wanted change; consumers wanted change and local members wanted change. Communities were not consulted. The former government did exactly the same as they did with wind and solar farms on prime agricultural land, where they took away the rights of residents to have a say. That is exactly what they did with the SFD process. There were 11 declarations but they approved zero. They also said—and a couple of them mentioned this—they had 276, but half of them were not eligible for the SFD program. They did not tell us that. The former minister for housing the member for Gaven said, 'We had 276 expressions of interest,' but what she did not say is that half of them were not even eligible. You cannot count the homes in the SFD process for which people put in expressions of interest under the Labor Party when they were not even eligible for the SFD process. They are taking people for a ride and there is a level of revisionism from the Labor Party going on in terms of what the policy was about. It was a spectacular failure.

That is why we paused it until we sorted out the regulation and consulted with consumers and communities and those in the industry, particularly local governments. Mr Deputy Speaker, would you believe that under Labor's failed SFD policies local governments had no say? That is why we did take

a position to the election. It was not only in the Redlands electorate where I stopped that process because community were not consulted, and there was real agitation in the community. It was not that the Labor Party would say people were against those houses, but traffic was not taken into consideration and amenity for people who lived there was not taken into consideration. We did take that into consideration, along with the views of local government. Noosa was a prime example. The Noosa mayor begged me to terminate one of the SFD processes because they could not handle the traffic in that area, but under their SFD process none of that was taken into consideration.

I find it ironic that on one hand the Labor Party are accusing the LNP of changing developer donation laws—they say that we are in bed with developers and their mates, yet under our SFD process it is harder for developers to get housing approvals because they have to get local government acknowledgement and support before we will approve an SFD. If anything, it was easier for developers to get these through under the Labor Party. The irony is that the Labor Party come in here all the time and knock developers, but developers are the ones who build most of the homes in the state. That is exactly right, yet that does not stop the opposition leader and the member for Gaven at the Property Council Christmas party getting on the drink and making out they are best friends with the developers. They say, 'Happy Christmas. Well done. We love what you're doing,' yet they come in here and attack the development industry that is responsible for building the homes they are attacking. At the Christmas celebrations they get on the booze with the Property Council, they are all friends and they love the developers, but now they do not and they try to besmirch the reputation of builders who are trying to build homes across the state.

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says, 'If I have to hear the Deputy Premier say "supply, supply, supply" once more'—I am going to say it a lot and, because I know it agitates him more than the car I drive, I am going to say it—

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The white Lexus. I thought he would have gotten agitated at that.

Mr Dick: I saw you and the Premier at the petrol station in your Lexus. There they were driving up, and then they lecture everyone else about petrol.

Mr BLEIJIE: Here he goes; he does not care about policy. I take the interjection. It is actually giving me an opportunity to deal with this. I would rather the Deputy Leader of the Opposition talk about the issues in housing supply and SFDs, but all we hear those opposite complaining about is what cars people drive. I think I have worked it out. I think the main point is that he has not gotten over the fact they did not win the election and he has to drive himself now. I think it cuts him to the core that he has lost his limo and he has lost his driver. That just shows the priority of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—not housing supply, not dealing with the health crisis, not dealing with the housing crisis, not dealing with the cost-of-living crisis, not dealing with the youth crime crisis. No, he is agitated and obsessed with the ministerial leather—

Mr Mander: And the fleet.

Mr BLEIJIE:—and the car fleet, because we know he has never experienced anything other than ministerial leather. For colleagues who have only recently joined this place I point out that the member for Woodridge was elected in 2009 straight into the ministry, no opposition—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would love to hear the Deputy Premier talk more about me—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I do not want commentary. Member for Woodridge, what is your point of order?

Mr DICK: My point of order is relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would say that the Deputy Premier is responding to specific interjections that you made on the topics, so I am going to give him a bit of latitude on that.

Mr Dick: Not about me in 2009, though. The Lexus maybe.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I am not going to debate the matter with you, member for Woodridge. Deputy Premier, you have the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: I reflected to some of my colleagues when we won the election and Steven Miles, the opposition leader, did not concede election defeat that night. Do honourable members remember that? I said at that time to many of my colleagues that the one person this is going to hurt the most out of the Labor Party will be the member for Woodridge because he has not ever experienced opposition. It is not easy in opposition, is it—driving yourself and all those sorts of things? It is hard work.

Mr Dick: What about the member for Everton? I'm loving it because he has broken the law.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Woodridge is not interjecting about housing; he is interjecting about the ministerial leather. When you agitate, you know what gets under his skin—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge, it would assist the House if you would cease your interjections. Deputy Premier, I would encourage you to return to relevance to the motion before us.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I would love to take interjections from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition on housing and things, but we have just seen what gets under his skin, and unfortunately it is not the housing crisis. He is missing the ministerial leather, which is a real shame because it just shows his priorities are all wrong, as they were in government.

The other thing that I want to reflect on given the Labor Party speeches tonight is how many times those opposite mentioned the housing crisis. They did not really talk about it for 10 years and they did not acknowledge the housing crisis, but all of a sudden after a year and a half and a new government they say, 'There's a housing crisis,' like it has just happened. We were banging on about the housing crisis for years. The Labor Party refused to acknowledge the housing crisis, yet now all of a sudden it is in opposition there is this big housing crisis that just happened to happen with a new government. It is ridiculous! The Labor Party caused the housing crisis. What was its response to the housing crisis? Round table after round table. I remember Palaszczuk announcing round tables: 'We're going to have a round table and then we're going to come out with that SFD and we're going to activate government land under the ground lease model,' which would have created 715 dwellings at a cost of billions of dollars and at a total cost of \$2.4 million per dwelling. That was their policy.

Mr Mander: Labornomics.

Mr BLEIJIE: Labornomics; I take the interjection from the sports minister. Labornomics: that was their policy. They call their policy affordable? Some \$2.4 million for a house and they think that is affordable! I would say this to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: availability equals affordability. I would also say this to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: supply, supply, supply, fast, fast, fast.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am happy to take it but not directly. Through the chair, please.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would caution all members that it is not appropriate to use the opportunity to raise a point of order to prosecute a case. So long as I am in the chair, you will come straight to the point of order and nothing else. Member for Woodridge, what is your point of order?

Mr DICK: If the honourable Deputy Premier would address the House through the chair.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will manage the House. I have been alert to departures from that requirement that we address each other by correct terms. I did not notice that, but if you would do so as you continue that would be great, Deputy Premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Let me repeat what I just said to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: supply, supply, supply, fast, fast, fast, and I cannot believe he takes offence at the word 'supply'. We are unlocking so much land. I am getting people come up to me saying, 'Deputy Premier, stop releasing so much land. What are you doing, Deputy Premier?' I say, 'We need to. We need to get land supply right across the state.' What I am doing with the housing minister and what he is doing with affordable and social housing and what the home ownership minister is doing is that we are unlocking land right across Queensland. I would say to people that we are not slowing down; we are releasing land everywhere in every corner of the state—supply, supply, supply, fast, fast, fast. We are turning sods everywhere. I have so much dust on my shoes from the sods we are turning, whether it be in North Queensland, Western Queensland, Charleville, the southern Gold Coast, Logan, Varsity Lakes—everywhere.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: The hair is just fine, housing minister.

Mr Mander: Bounces back good.

Mr BLEIJIE: They have a good hard hat that does not affect the hair, so don't worry about that.

Mr O'Connor: It's for that shape and size.

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, exactly; I do not take the offensive interjection from the housing minister. Look at our policies in the last year and a half compared to the Labor Party. The Residential Activation Fund is unlocking 98,000 homes across the state. I am not only turning sods but cutting ribbons on

infrastructure now like in the city of Moreton recently when we cut the ribbon on the new wastewater treatment plant. We have done that. That is unlocking hundreds of homes in the city of Moreton region. I want to thank all of our wonderful members in the city of Moreton region for getting on with the job and helping deliver that—the member for Pumicestone and the member for Redcliffe. It is unlocking land supply. That is the Residential Activation Fund and round 2 closes this week on 24 April. Round 2 is worth \$500 million and the applications are coming in everywhere.

The other thing is the Land Activation Program. Those opposite had a ground lease model. The opposition leader stood on a vacant block of land in his own electorate and said that he was going to develop all of these homes, yet not one house was built. As the housing minister said, they mowed every two weeks but did not deliver a home on it, but according to the Labor Party that is delivery—that is, mowing lawns and having kangaroo pasture on the land. That is their policy. Our policy is building homes on that vacant land. I did it in Varsity Lakes the other day. I was there with the member for Burleigh. We stood at Varsity Lakes and we announced hundreds of homes on another vacant block of land that those opposite said they were going to unlock under their policies, which they never did. I stood at Banyo and we unlocked hundreds of homes on that site that those opposite said they were going to unlock and never did. It is ridiculous for the Labor Party to say that it ever contributed positively to the housing crisis in this state. Everything it did—every lever it pulled—exacerbated the housing crisis in this state and it cannot lecture people on the housing crisis.

Those opposite acknowledge there is a housing crisis. We have been acknowledging it for years. That is why we are pulling every lever possible to get on with the job and build homes for everybody. We want people to be aspiring to home ownership across the state. We want choice. This Minister for Housing has approved more social and affordable homes than ever before. I have approved ministerial infrastructure designations on social and affordable housing more in the last 12 months than those opposite ever did. We are getting on with the job and in our change of this regulation nothing prevents community housing providers and social and affordable homes being built in any of these developments, and to say otherwise like those opposite are doing is misleading vulnerable Queenslanders.

There are opportunities. There will be lots of supply—social and affordable—in all of these developments across the state, but we do not have to mandate it. Clearly Labor did and it did not work because people did not build the infrastructure. That is why the only people making money out of Labor Party policies were the small businesses mowing the lawns. The mower men and mower women were the ones benefiting from Labor Party policies and the kangaroos were getting fat because they were eating so much grass on these vacant blocks of land.

I will tell members what we are going to have: we are going to have a different kangaroo. We are going to have a Kanga—the one you sit on to get the dirt out of the way. I refer to the little Kangas you sit on—dig, baby, dig, build, baby, build. They are the Kangas we are going to have on our sites, not kangaroos eating the blooming grass! On that note, I would encourage all honourable members to not support the Labor Party's anti-housing policy. That is what its policy is by this disallowance motion. I would encourage members to not listen to a word those opposite say. Do not believe them, because look what they have done. They have a bad record. In 10 years they did not deliver the housing needed. This side of the House is getting on with the job of building across the state, just what everyone voted for in October 2024—the fresh start. We are getting on and delivering it.

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

AYES, 36:

ALP, 34—Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, 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—Bolton.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pair: Perrett, Asif.

Resolved in the negative.


Sitting suspended from 6.32 pm to 7.30 pm.

EXPANDING ADULT CRIME, ADULT TIME AND TAKING A STRONG STANCE ON DRUGS AND ANTI-SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 997, on motion of Mrs Gerber—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (7.30 pm), continuing: As I was saying before the break, we saw a media release today from the Australian Medical Association Queensland titled 'Drug diversion changes a blow to mental and preventive health in Queensland'. So much for the government listening to doctors and nurses, as they promised before the election. This is another broken promise by the Crisafulli government. I table the media release, which I quoted from earlier.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 21 April 2026, by AMA Queensland, titled 'Drug diversion changes a blow to mental and preventative health in Queensland' [548].

It is a condemnation of this bill in terms of its health outcomes. The doctors are against it, mental health experts are against it, alcohol and other drug services are against it and Aboriginal and Islander health leaders are also against it. Who is this government listening to? Certainly it is not the experts. Before the election, Premier Crisafulli promised to put doctors and nurses back in charge. We all remember that one—we heard it over and over—yet when doctors and nurses say that this bill is dangerous and contrary to evidence they are ignored yet again. That is the pattern with this Crisafulli government. They say one thing but they do another. That is Premier Crisafulli's modus operandi.

The fact is that addiction is an illness. It often occurs alongside trauma and mental illness. It can be related to homelessness, poverty or family breakdown. A person found with a small amount of drugs for personal use needs a path into health care and support, not a pathway into the criminal justice system. Winding back current effective drug diversion provisions has nothing to do with being tough on crime. It is about Premier Crisafulli and the LNP cutting a healthcare intervention and relying on outdated ideology, not evidence or expert advice.

From 3 May 2024 to 24 March this year, 32,659 people were diverted under tiers 1, 2 and 3 of Queensland's drug diversion framework. That means 32,659 chances to steer someone away from deeper contact with the criminal justice system and towards a better path of education, assessment and treatment. Now the Crisafulli government is blocking that pathway with this bill. The Alcohol and Drug Foundation pointed to evidence that diversion does not increase drug use and can decrease it, so when the government cuts diversion it is not being tough or smart; it is being counterproductive. It is restricting access to health care and treatment, it is cutting early intervention and it is tying up more police time on matters of minor drug possession which means worse health outcomes for Queenslanders.

There is one debate to be had about combating serious and violent offending. There is another debate to be had about how Queensland should respond to low-level personal drug possession. The Crisafulli government refused to let the parliament separate those debates because it did not want the drug diversion changes to be considered on their own merits. That is cynical. It is slippery, it is pig-headed and it shows contempt for this parliament. This House should have been allowed to deal with the serious crime provisions on their own terms and then deal with the winding back of drug diversion also on its own terms. The government refused because it knows full well that the drug provisions are the weak underbelly of this bill.

The Premier has form on this. He had a plan to get elected but he had no plan to govern Queensland. We have seen that pattern again and again—secrecy, last-minute amendments and abuse of process. We have seen them hide reports. We have seen them block scrutiny. We saw it when they passed botched bills and, embarrassingly, had to come back over and over to patch them up mere months later, and we are seeing it here again. The same government that talks about being tough is too scared to let the parliament vote separately on these matters. The same government that claims it backs police is ignoring the evidence that diversion saves police time. The same government that claims it is putting health workers back in charge is ignoring the evidence from the health workers themselves.

Queenslanders have every right to expect safety in their communities and Labor supports laws that are strong, practical and evidence-based. This bill does not meet that standard. Ending drug diversion is not based on expert advice and it is not based on evidence; it is based on outdated ideology. We have seen that already from this government—banning pill testing, banning youth gender-affirming

care for new patients in the public system and the Premier and Deputy Premier refusing to back flu vaccination publicly when Queensland needs that leadership. It is the same pattern yet again—the LNP cutting health intervention—

Government members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: We hear interjections from those opposite who clearly do not listen to evidence and do not listen to doctors and health workers. Frontline health workers tell us that ramping is worse than ever, waitlists are blowing out, hospital expansions have been blocked or delayed for years, including at the Prince Charles Hospital in Stafford and the Queensland Cancer Centre at the RBWH—

Mr DILLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on whether the contribution is maintaining relevance.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Miller, I ask you to come back to the bill.

Mr BAILEY: What we see with this bill is that cutting health care is in the LNP's DNA. They do it whenever they get the chance. That is the difference between Labor and the LNP. We invest in health; they cut it. We support best practice early intervention—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You have just given a direction in relation to relevance. The member is not being relevant to the bill, which is around Adult Crime, Adult Time and the drug diversion clauses, not in relation to the health budget. He will have time to discuss that later this year.

Mr BAILEY: To the point of order, I was speaking directly to the bill and that was a frivolous point of order.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller, I ask you to remain relevant to the bill. You may continue.

Mr BAILEY: Certainly, Madam Deputy Speaker. This side supports best practice early intervention, which this bill prevents. The LNP shun it. We on this side think Queenslanders dealing with addiction should get a health response, not a pathetic response from the health minister, who is supporting taking health intervention—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask that the member withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. They would rather ram this bill through the House. There is nothing courageous about that.

Mr NICHOLLS: The member should withdraw. He did not withdraw. You have to say it in a voice that can be heard.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I heard the member withdraw. You can continue now, member for Miller.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you. There is nothing courageous about ramming this bill through. There is nothing principled about that and there is nothing evidence-based about that. It is politics first and outcomes second. We cannot support a bill that cuts health and health-based interventions, we cannot support winding back drug diversion backed by expert evidence and we cannot support the government's latest abuse of parliamentary process here today in refusing to split this bill so that the drug provisions could be examined on their own merits. Listen to the AMA, listen to the doctors and listen to the people in the sector. The evidence is very clear. It is this government and this health minister who are supporting worse health outcomes by supporting this bill.

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

Mr BAILEY: There he goes again.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

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

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

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. The health minister's record against evidence-based policy is very, very clear with this bill and with his record over 16 months.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, member for Miller. Member for Gregory?

Mr DILLON: I rose on a separate point of order to the health minister. My point of order was on the relevance to the bill following the health minister's point of order.

Mr POWER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member was absolutely speaking to the truncation of the bill. It was absolutely relevant. This is frivolous to disrupt the House. Might I add that the member's time should be added back in.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please, while I take some advice. Let us have silence while I take some advice. Thank you. Member for Miller, have you finished your contribution?

Mr BAILEY: Not just yet, no. I did have three seconds.

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I did have a point of order. Again I take personal offence at the comments made by the minister and ask that he withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller?


Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. This barrage of interjections is more abuse of process by people who do not want to know—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BAILEY: Go back to the bar!

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please!

 **Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill. Far North Queensland felt the crime crisis first and we feel it the worst. There is a long way to go to turn things around in our region. Labor's core beliefs are that people under the age of 18 who have broken the law should not be in jail. Labor believes that the age of criminal responsibility should be increased to youth over the age of 14. Labor believes that possessing drugs like meth, cocaine, heroin, ice and MDMA in small personal-use quantities on the streets is okay. Labor believes it is okay to urinate and defecate in public on our streets. Labor believes that youth breaching bail is not a crime.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Barron River, could I ask you to be relevant to the bill before us.

Ms JAMES: I am referring to the antisocial behaviour. Labor believes that youth breaching bail is not a crime and they should get another chance. Labor believes that detention should be an absolute last resort, and even if a youth criminal has committed crime after crime and has a rap sheet that is significantly larger in number than their age they still should not go to detention. Labor believes that youth criminals who do not get bail should be able to apply for bail as many times as they like until they get bail from the court. Labor believes that criminals are the victims and we should give them countless chances to turn their life around.

The compounding effect of weakening laws over the past decade has not just increased crime, it has allowed it to spread. Crime, particularly youth offending, does not exist in isolation; it spreads just like a virus. We saw during COVID how quickly one case became 10, 10 became hundreds and entire communities were impacted. That is exactly what is happening here. A small group of serious repeat offenders are not just committing crime; they are infecting others with it—recruiting, influencing, normalising this behaviour and pulling more young people into the cycle. One offender becomes five, five becomes 15 and before long the problem is no longer contained, it is embedded.

This did not happen by accident. Every decision to weaken laws, to remove consequences, to lower the bar has acted like removing the safeguards that stop that spread. Far North Queensland is now feeling the full force of that policy failure. The member for Cairns and former Labor representatives supported those changes. What we are dealing with today is the consequence of those decisions because every action has a reaction. In Far North Queensland the reaction has been the rapid, visible and deeply damaging spread of youth crime through our communities.

The Crisafulli government will not weaken the laws. This bill delivers on a key election commitment to make Queensland safer. Antisocial behaviour in Far North Queensland is also out of control and the police unfortunately do not have the laws they need to do anything about it because Labor weakened them. Small businesses in the Cairns CBD are suffering and closing because of antisocial behaviour. We have several problem streets—Grafton Street, Mulgrave Road and Sheridan Street. A spate of business owners who are not even in my electorate are coming to my office for help as they have been able to get nowhere with the member for Cairns. There is a never-ending pattern of drinking in public, people urinating and defecating in doorways and aggressive or sexualised antisocial

behaviour that is very confronting. It is impacting businesses to the point where they are shutting down as they just cannot retain customers or staff and there is constant damage to their business and reputation.

This is also happening in my electorate, in particular in Kuranda and other suburbs in the northern beaches. As a tourism town where one in six people are employed by tourism, it is an embarrassment to our great city. That is why this new legislation is so important. This bill recognises the impacts of antisocial behaviour and promotes community safety by creating new designated business and community precincts, giving our police the laws and resources they need to restore safety to our shopping centres, community hubs and business districts. This bill allows the government to declare high-risk areas—for example, the Cairns CBD and major shopping centres—as designated precincts and gives police stronger, clearer powers to restore order.

Key powers for police include 24-hour move-on directions and banning notices for one month or more. There are also provisions for escalation to banning notices for repeat behaviour. These new laws matter for Far North Queensland. They target repeat youth offenders disrupting our CBD and high-traffic community spaces. They help restore confidence for locals, businesses and tourism. It gives police the practical, on-the-ground tools they have been asking for and moves from reactive policing to proactive prevention. The bottom line is that it is about taking back control of our public spaces and supporting police to act decisively to ensure our business precincts are safe, usable and welcoming again.

Drugs are also a major driver of crime and antisocial behaviour in Far North Queensland and that is why it is essential we scrap Labor's failed three-strike, soft-on-drugs approach and restore consequences through a new illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework. We cannot be tough on crime if we are soft on drugs. Too often we hear drug use excused as a response to deeper issues of mental health challenges, trauma, homelessness and instability. It is not a solution, it is a mask. Illegal drug use does not treat anxiety or depression, it buries it. It does not resolve trauma, it postpones it. In many cases it takes people who are already vulnerable and pushes them further away from the help they actually need. Real recovery does not come from numbing pain, it comes from confronting it, treating it and connecting people to proper care and support and for that person to want to do the work to change and heal. That is why these laws matter.

They create the boundary between behaviour and consequence. They are the point where society says this is not acceptable and this is where intervention begins. When Labor weakened those laws, it does not reduce harm, it enables it. It removes the guardrails that interrupt the cycle and we leave vulnerable people drifting further into addiction, offending and disorder without consequence or direction. Clear laws, properly enforced, do not just deter offending, they create the structure that allows intervention to happen before harm becomes entrenched. This is not about being harsh for the sake of it, it is about recognising that without consequence there is no intervention point and without intervention the cycle continues for individuals and for our communities.

Methamphetamine use is at record highs, with users reporting it is easy—even very easy—to obtain, cocaine and cannabis use is increasing, and heroin remains readily available. We are seeing the impact of that clearly in Far North Queensland, with youth criminals high on ice driving up the wrong side of our highway at high speed like they are playing a video game. At the same time, drug offences have risen significantly across Queensland, including possession, trafficking and other serious drug-related crime, following the introduction of weakened diversion settings. The harm is real and measurable. Hospital admissions for illicit drug poisoning are rising. Child protection data shows methamphetamine is present in a significant proportion of cases involving deceased children and young people. National research consistently links drugs—particularly methamphetamine—to both violent and property crime.

We are also seeing young people increasingly drawn into this cycle of addiction and offending. Our responsibility is not to normalise that cycle by saying, 'It's okay to carry a small amount of meth. The police won't charge you. It's not a criminal offence.' This is wrong on so many levels. Using ice one time in many cases means addiction for a very long time. If you are found to be carrying any amount of illegal drugs you should be charged and intervention programs kick in. If you walk out of a shop with something you did not pay for, it is still theft no matter how small. Possessing illegal drugs should be treated the same way. If something is illegal, it is illegal and we should not have a sliding scale of excuses. There is a direct relationship between the availability of a drug and social approval of its use and the incidence and prevalence of drug abuse in the community.


Lastly, I want to talk about the 12 serious offences we are adding to Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. They are not minor offences. They represent the most serious end of criminal behaviour. Far North Queensland has already seen real examples of this harm. We are seeing assault that causes

injuries that last a lifetime. We are seeing group-based violence in public spaces. We are seeing abhorrent sexual offences against women and children. We are seeing cases involving abduction and torture type behaviour. What is also clear is that a small cohort of serious repeat youth offenders are responsible for a disproportionate amount of this harm. These new offences are specifically targeted at the upper end of severity and escalation.

The impact does not stop there. The Deputy Mayor of Cairns Regional Council has agreed for his story to be mentioned because it reflects what many victims are feeling. Recently his family were victims of a break-in during which their car was stolen. During the police response, the offenders were told the property belonged to the deputy mayor. They responded by saying that the house should have been burnt down. That threat has had a lasting impact on the family and they are fearful in their own home. The impact does not stop there because of insurance delays and a three-month wait for their vehicle. Like many victims, they are impacted not just by the crime itself but also by the prolonged disruption and the huge cost that follows.

This is why I support these laws, but I will be advocating for more. Injustice only wins when we let it win. We should not and will not let it win. Across our communities, people do not feel like justice is being served. They see repeat offenders walk free, bail breached within hours and the same cycle playing out again and again. We have strengthened the laws. The courts now have the power to hand down tougher sentences, which is exactly what the community expects. However, here is the problem: too many repeat offenders are getting bail and breaching it within hours. That is unacceptable. If you breach bail then you should go to jail—no second chances, no excuses. Serious repeat offenders being continually released on bail has to end. We have over 60 repeat offenders and our community is sick of it. I give my full support to this bill and will continue to fight for more.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. GJ BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (7.51 pm): I was certainly interested to hear the contribution that the police minister gave in the debate this afternoon. When talking about the police drug diversion laws, he talked about doing a shift at schoolies on the Gold Coast recently. He said that he knew firsthand what they were going through because while he was there they saw a bikie with tattoos on his neck standing in line waiting to go into a club and found that he had pockets full of different sorts of drugs. The minister said that he was let off because of the current drug diversion laws. I find that extremely difficult to believe. I suggest that the minister has made a mistake in his contribution and that he should come back into the chamber, explain himself a bit better and correct the record if he is wrong.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: I take that interjection. The minister said that a bikie who had pockets full of drugs was let off under these current laws. I find that very hard to believe.

Five former Queensland police commissioners backed Labor's policy on drug diversion laws—not one but five. That statement alone puts into perspective the arrogance of this police minister, the Premier and every single LNP member who was previously a police officer in Queensland. The LNP have the audacity to think they know better than five former police commissioners. That is before we consider the pre-eminent experts in the field from across the sector who also supported Labor's health focused approach on drug diversion, including the AMA Queensland, the QNADA, the Alcohol and Drug Foundation and many more. That is what we have come to expect from this ideologically-driven LNP government. They ignore the evidence that is out there, they ignore the science around drug diversion and they ignore the advice of Queensland clinicians who want to make sure we get this right. They ignore the data. They even fudged the figures, as we have seen with much of what they do in Queensland at the moment, because it did not suit their narrative or what they are trying to achieve.

What baffles me is that they would wilfully ignore the genuine advice of those they profess to respect. Here are just a few examples. Former commissioner Bob Atkinson AO, APM said—

Our response to illegal drug use should have as many options as possible—this doesn't mean they get off but that they have chances to make better choices.

Former commissioner Ian Stewart said—

This expansion of the drug diversion program announced by the Government today is a step in the right direction to treat rather than criminalise minor drug use.

Former commissioner the late Jim O'Sullivan said—

I strongly support any measure that might successfully divert young people from the court system and potentially give them a chance in life.

The fifth commissioner said—

If we hope to be successful in dealing with drug related conduct and offences, we need to start focusing far more strongly on the causes rather than just the symptoms, and the more options that are available to governments and police, the better the prospects of success or improvement are likely to be.

I would say that if anyone in this chamber had a young person in their life who had got on the wrong track then they would want that as well. Former commissioner Katarina Carroll said—

We have seen great success with the current program, diverting 158,000 people into a health intervention.

We know this program works—as most people who complete their drug diversion appointment do not come to the attention of police again.

That speaks loudly and clearly on how the current legislation works for drug diversion. I cannot see one reason this current government is moving away from that.

It does prove one thing, though: they profess to respect police but actually it is not real. For this Crisafulli LNP government, it is all about politics. We have heard that loudly and clearly today. It is all about ideology and the narrative of the day. This Premier is about being a very clever politician; he is not about doing the right thing for Queenslanders, particularly young Queenslanders. Let us not lose sight of the unavoidable fact that it was the police who asked the former Queensland Labor government for these laws—alongside those in the sector and probably some of the ex-police people in the House today. They asked for these laws because the evidence showed that a health-based response was the right response for those people. Providing support, rather than a gateway into the criminal justice system, was the right response.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Currumbin, I ask you not to shout across the chamber, please.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. The police also asked for these laws because it would allow them to dedicate valuable resources towards addressing serious offending and supporting victims of serious offending rather than dealing with paperwork and court files for minor drug offences. In fact, the former Labor government was advised that an officer can spend around nine working hours processing a minor drug offence case right through to its conclusion in court. According to data we received in the committee briefing, over 32,000 people went through the program between 3 May 2024 and 24 March this year. That really puts into perspective not only the tens of thousands of hours of valuable police time that would have been better spent helping victims and stopping serious offences, which is also part of the bill that now will not have that, but also the opportunity it represents for every one of those 32,000 people. The opportunity gives somebody a wake-up call and help to pull somebody back from the edge of addiction—an opportunity to deliver a health response and change the course of somebody's life. How important is that for our young people?

Whatever way you look at it, this repeal is the removal of a health focused response and is ideologically and politically driven, as we have heard today. It is the ideology of a clever politician and his police minister who are always chasing a hardline headline rather than sound policy that actually works. The police minister could not wait to repeal these laws so he could boast to the right-wing members of his local LNP branch about how tough he thinks he is, but the truth is he met with the experts in the sector and he totally ignored their advice. Somehow, I doubt he will be showing his branch members the documents on the public record that indicate he did not understand how the laws he was responsible for actually worked. Somehow, I doubt he will be telling them how he would not even allow the UQ evaluation to be completed through fear of seeing the outcome.


Some \$330,000 in taxpayers' money has gone down the drain to avoid an inconvenient truth. What an absolute disgrace that is. Ultimately, the evidence put before the committee could not have been any clearer. The best way to deal with possession of small amounts of drugs for personal use is with a health response, not a slogan and certainly not with cuts to health. That is what this bill is doing. It is the LNP doing what they do best and we have seen it all before—cutting. Worse still, it is cutting a health-based response.

Labor will always stand up for vulnerable Queenslanders. Labor will always support those grappling with mental health issues and addiction. We will always listen to the advice from experts and we will always listen to the evidence.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, if you interject again, I will have to put you on a warning.

Mr BUTCHER: No. 1: Labor will always invest in health. That is why we simply cannot support a bill that cuts health-based interventions. It is wrong and it will not work. This bill will take Queenslanders backwards.

 **Mr BAILLIE** (Townsville—LNP) (8.01 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. Of course, in Townsville my community has felt the impact after a decade of decline and increasing crime under Labor. Our community has been the epicentre, it is said often in this House, and that we are impacted by crime, and our community voted for a fresh start at the last election. In doing so, they voted for a government that would bring in the Making Queensland Safer laws including Adult Crime, Adult Time that would bolster the Police Service, increase the number of boots on the ground and provide our Police Service with the resources and tools they need to do their job to make our community safer, and also invest in early intervention and rehabilitation.

I am pleased to say—and those who have been paying attention, of course, would know—that the Making Queensland Safer Laws are the first laws that we brought in as a government, and that included the first tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time. We have since brought in another tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time, and now this bill includes the third tranche which involves another 12 offences. Some of those offences include: conspiring to murder, aiding suicide, choking, suffocation or strangulation in a domestic setting. These are very serious offences and are included because of the severity and the impact they have on victims. That should not be understated or forgotten.

We do not take these steps lightly on increasing these penalties, but bigger penalties than what there have been are deserved, and I fully stand behind what we are doing here in increasing the penalties and ensuring there are consequences for action. The additional 12 offences in this tranche take it to a total of 45 offences under Adult Crime, Adult Time. That will have a huge impact. It is starting to have an impact now in my electorate—across the board in Queensland, but in Townsville especially. Over the last decade, we have seen an increase in crime activity. It continued to increase year after year. We are just starting to turn the tide on that now. We are seeing the impact of these laws. They are working. It is taking longer for us to see all the results we want, but we will continue to strengthen the laws until we see the victim numbers drop and our community feeling safe in their homes again. But that will take time. I commend the minister and all her team for bringing these offences forward to be included in this legislation.

The bill also includes a strong stance on drugs. We have heard several contributions from members regarding that, particularly on the opposite side—the stance on drugs. I think it is necessary—absolutely necessary. When you take a weak stance on drugs, especially illicit drugs, and say, 'It is okay to carry them. There are no consequences really if you carry these drugs,' what it does in turn is make it acceptable for users to walk around with those drugs in public places where they might be otherwise detected and there might be a penalty associated. When there is no penalty, they are more likely to carry those drugs in a public place, they are more likely to use those drugs in a public place and the community is more likely to see the behaviour of those drug users in a public space which often is violent and very offensive. One of the side effects is you also end up with a lot more needles in public spaces. That is what we are seeing in and around our community.

Talk to anyone who spends time in the CBD or even in the parks—shop owners, Townsville City Council, the cleaning crews—we are seeing drug use continue to expand and we are seeing the needles—the signs that there are drugs being used—continue to be more and more widespread. It is absolutely necessary that we do have a strong stance on drugs and send a clear message that carrying these drugs around, whether it be for personal use or otherwise, is not acceptable. They are called illicit drugs for a reason—because they are illicit. They are not legal to carry and not legal to use.

The third part of this bill addresses antisocial behaviour. I am really proud that that has been included in this bill. It has been something we have been pushing for from Townsville since I have been elected into this position. My community is very outspoken on antisocial behaviour. We are a proud city, we are a proud community, and when people misbehave and act in an antisocial fashion, it really hurts. It hurts our community, it hurts our businesses, and overall we need to do something different. The taking a strong stance on drugs and antisocial behaviour component of the bill undoes some of the legislation that was weakened under Labor. We are seeing rampant antisocial behaviour and it seems to be continuing to expand.

With regard to the stance on antisocial behaviour, it is worth pointing out that this is not the first step we have taken. It is not that we have gone to legislation straightaway. Through the community safety grants, we have invested with council to improve CCTV across the CBD to ensure that we can

detect antisocial behaviour sooner. We have also established an antisocial behaviour response group in Townsville which, to my knowledge, nothing equivalent has been done there. The idea of this response group is to send services in sooner before the behaviour escalates to violence or damaging behaviour that threatens the community or others who are involved.


The antisocial behaviour response group includes departments such as health, housing, communities, justice and corrections. It includes Townsville City Council and police. It includes the Red Cross, Althea Projects, Yumba-Meta and Murri Watch. It includes the non-government organisations that help provide these services. What we are seeing now—the boots on the ground they are calling themselves—is they are improving communication from departments right through to non-government organisations, driving the right behaviours and driving that response early in the day, that is, before the behaviour escalates. The idea is to get these services in and provide these individuals with the services so that they can make better choices. They do not all take that option, they do not all make those choices and what you do see then is that behaviour begins to escalate and it escalates to a point where it is unsafe for the service providers to engage with these individuals. That is where we need the police to get involved and to have the power to disrupt that antisocial behaviour and disperse the individuals who are displaying it.

Mr McDonald: It is a whole-of-community response.

Mr BAILLIE: I take that interjection; it is a whole-of-community response. The member has thrown me with that great interjection. We do want to see that response get to them. If the police do not get involved and do not have those powers, we end up having to call ambulances and then emergency beds are taken up because it has escalated. Unfortunately, it does end in violence a lot of the time.

I would like to commend the committee that examined this bill. I congratulate them and thank them for coming to Townsville. It is important that regional voices are heard on these issues, and we really appreciate it. We lobbied hard as a group of local MPs to ensure our community was heard. Again, I thank the committee for coming to Townsville. We had a wide range of people talking to the committee—the council, the chamber of commerce and several non-government organisations in the service space. The advocacy for the steps we are taking to give police more powers was definitely in the majority and very positive.

In relation to drugs, Yumba-Meta noted that about five years ago they would go into lockdown mode about twice a year, but now it is almost once a month. Some of these people are uncontrollable after whatever they have consumed, be it drugs or alcohol. The staff are trying to help but they fear for their own wellbeing, with good reason. We need to bring this legislation in. We need to provide police with the powers to disrupt this antisocial behaviour and drug use. We need to try something new. We will continue to take steps forward. We are not done yet. We will not stop until we make our community safer and lower the number of victims of crime.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (8.11 pm): We find ourselves here again. After just 14 months the Crisafulli LNP government have returned to this parliament to amend their flagship Adult Crime, Adult Time legislation for the fourth time. This entire debate has been undermined—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Currumbin, you are now on a warning. Order, please. I want to be able to hear the member who is speaking.

Ms FENTIMAN: This entire debate has been undermined by the way the government has handled the bill itself. We moved for this bill to be split so that the youth justice provisions and the drug diversion changes could be considered separately on their own merits, but they have refused. Instead, they have bundled together two entirely different policy areas—one about criminal justice and one about public health—and forced them through as a single package. For this government, careful scrutiny comes second to political theatre.

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the government keep returning to parliament with these laws because they are being driven by perception rather than evidence. The LNP want to be seen as tough on crime, but they have no interest in considering what actually might work to keep the community safe. I say this because we have not seen the evidence or advice on which these laws are being implemented. If the government wish to proceed down this path, the least they could do is be transparent about the basis on which they are acting.

The government committed to releasing the advice of the Expert Legal Panel, and the Minister for Youth Justice now says, 'The information has been released. It's on the website. That's the advice.' What is on the website is not the advice; it is a report that simply says that advice was given, without

disclosing what the advice actually was. There are 258 words on the website explaining that advice exists, but there is not a single word explaining what that advice is. Did I mention that it is on the website? I might have managed to say it as many times as the Minister for Youth Justice during her train wreck of a press conference.

As the Bar Association of Queensland observed—lawyers who would know what legal advice looks like—this document does not appear to be legal advice. It does not reveal the reasoning underpinning the recommendations, nor does it provide the evidentiary foundation for the inclusion of the additional offences. This leaves the parliament in a position where it is being asked to expand significant criminal laws without access to the very advice that is said to support them. If the government maintains that this expansion is justified, then the underlying advice should be released in full so that it can be properly scrutinised. For a Premier who claimed that he needed to restore transparency and openness to government, this is not very transparent or open.

Equally troubling is the decision to repeal the police drug diversion program. This reform was introduced following requests from police, supported by health experts, precisely because it offers a more effective response to low-level drug possession. It was a more effective response in every sense. First and foremost, it is effective in a health sense. The Alcohol and Drug Foundation states that dependence on drugs is a health condition, where a person is unable to control or stop using a substance even though it is causing them harm. I want those opposite to carefully note the words 'health condition'. This is how we should be treating vulnerable persons who have a drug addiction—with a health- and evidence-based approach.

In fact, this program was backed by doctors. The AMA has called it a 'life-saving program'. Removing drug diversion programs removes a pathway for vulnerable individuals to access support and avoid deeper involvement in the criminal justice system. The AMA, the Alcohol and Drug Foundation, QuIVAA, the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies and the Nurses and Midwives' Union have all begged this Premier to keep the expanded police drug diversion program in place until it has been comprehensively evaluated at least. Of course, this Premier knows better than all of the experts on the front line. In fact, the AMA today released a statement saying, again, how disappointed they were not to have been called to appear before the parliamentary committee inquiry, despite lodging a written submission and making an express request to the committee. They said in their statement—

We maintain illegal drug use should be treated as a health issue that needs compassionate and appropriate treatment and support to give people the best chance of recovery and a healthier future.

I hope all of those opposite go back to their communities, their local hospitals and their GPs and explain to the medical experts and doctors, who work hard each and every day, why they know better than them about how to deal with someone with a drug addiction. Queensland police asked the government to implement the drug diversion program. When we introduced this, the then police commissioner said—

We know this program works—as most people who complete their drug diversion appointment do not come to the attention of police again.


The new reforms also align with all other jurisdictions, enabling our frontline officers to have more time focused on targeting drug manufacturers and traffickers domestically and internationally.

If those opposite want to go hard on drugs, police officers themselves said that this drug diversion program will give them more time to focus on those who are trafficking and manufacturing the drugs. If they want to be tough on drugs, they should allow the police to do their work and target the people who are trafficking illegal drugs. It reduces the burden on police, who would otherwise spend considerable time preparing briefs and attending court for minor matters. It reduces pressure on the courts. It allows resources to be directed towards more serious offending. The evidence before the committee indicates that the program diverted more than 32,000 individuals, with a substantial proportion having no further contact with police.

The Minister for Youth Justice came into this House and declared that illicit drug use is not a victimless crime. No-one in this House disputes that drug harm can devastate lives, families and communities. That is precisely why the response should be serious, evidence based and focused on reducing harm. If this minister truly wanted to put victims first, she would look at the evidence on what prevents dependence, what reduces reoffending and what connects people with treatment. That is not done by repealing a key program which is backed by police and doctors. Queenslanders struggling with drug dependence are becoming victim to this government's complete lack of regard for clinicians, lawyers, police, doctors and drug and alcohol workers.

Early analysis from the UQ, commissioned by the Police Service, noted that the drug diversion program aligned with key national and Queensland policy objectives—but I guess it just did not fit with the LNP's narrative, so the evaluation itself has been discontinued. This raises serious concerns about how those opposite are more concerned with ideology than actually making the community safe. It raises serious concern about the role of evidence in policy-making. Those opposite turn a blind eye every time the experts say something that does not fit with their ideology.

Those on this side of the House are not surprised that this is the approach the LNP have taken, because it has become this government's MO. They will just ignore the evidence, ignore the data, ignore the experts, ignore what works, ignore what will keep the community safe and actually deny people who need health care the ability to get that care and avoid the criminal justice system because they no longer need to come back to the attention of police and police can focus their efforts on what they need to be focused on, and that is serious crime—the manufacture and trafficking of illicit drugs. They are disregarding what has proven to work, replacing practical solutions with political slogans and the ideological demands of their backbench.

 **Mr JAMES** (Mulgrave—LNP) (8.20 pm): I rise today to speak in strong support of the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill. This bill delivers on a clear election commitment—making Queensland safer. It is about protecting Queenslanders. It is about fewer victims of crime and it is about restoring consequences for actions after a decade of decline under Labor.

My electorate of Mulgrave have told me loud and clear that they have had enough—enough of being afraid in their own communities, enough of repeat offenders cycling through a system with no meaningful consequences, enough of policies that prioritise the rights of offenders over the rights of victims. This bill responds to that call. Community safety is not ideological; it is fundamental. Queenslanders deserve to feel safe where they live, where they work, where they shop and where they raise their families. They expect that, when a serious crime is committed, the offender is held accountable. That is exactly what this bill does.

This bill strengthens our tough Adult Crime, Adult Time laws by expanding the framework to include 12 additional serious offences. It seeks to prescribe new Adult Crime, Adult Time offences; repeal the current police drug diversion program and introduce the new illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework; and introduce new and expanded police powers within prescribed designated business and community precincts.

These are not minor matters. These are not technical offences. They involve violence, coercion, exploitation, deliberate harm and, in some cases, conduct that leaves victims frightened for their lives. Crimes such as conspiring to murder; disabling a person to commit another indictable offence; choking; suffocation or strangulation in domestic settings; stupefying or administering poison with intent to harm; and serious assaults, including those filmed or published online. These impacts of crimes are devastating, long-lasting and often life altering. If a youth is capable of committing an adult crime of this severity then the courts must have the capacity to impose adult consequences. These laws send a clear and unmistakable message: if you commit an adult crime, you will face adult crime, and the early results show that these laws are working.

Since the introduction of our Making Queensland Safer Laws, more than 4,000 youths have been charged with over 19,000 Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. More importantly, the data shows a 7.2 per cent reduction in victim numbers across Queensland, a 17 per cent reduction in serious repeat offenders and a 27 per cent drop in proven Adult Crime, Adult Time offences. These are not insignificant figures. These are fewer victims. These are fewer lives disrupted by crime. We know we are coming off an extremely high base after Labor's decade of decline. We know there is a lot more work to do, but we are heading in the right direction, and this bill continues that momentum.

This bill presents a clear test for Labor. Will those opposite stand with victims of crime or will they once again stand with criminals and repeat youth offenders? Labor's record speaks for itself. For 10 years Labor weakened Queensland's youth crime laws, they made detention a last resort, they abolished breach of bail, they closed the Childrens Court to victims and their families, and they consistently put the rights of offenders ahead of the rights of victims. The legacy of that approach was catastrophic. Under Labor's decade of decline, victims of crime increased by 193 per cent; stolen vehicles increased by 101 per cent; break-ins increased by 44 per cent; assaults increased by 198 per cent; and robberies increased by 101 per cent, including an 82 per cent increase in armed robberies. Even now, Labor has learnt nothing.


Labor still proposes raising the age of criminal responsibility from 10 to 14 years, meaning youth offenders guilty of serious crimes like murder, robbery and assault would face no criminal responsibility at all. That is not a plan for community safety; that is a plan for continued chaos. On this side of the House, we will only strengthen youth crime laws. We will never weaken them, always putting the victims first.

The second pillar of this bill is the repeal of Labor's failed police drug diversion program and the introduction of a new illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework. Labor's three-strike drug policy removed consequences for repeat offences. Under their model, offenders could be found in possession of illicit drugs on up to five occasions before facing any real penalty. The evidence shows it did not work. Since Labor introduced this watered down program in May 2024, total drug offences increased by more than 11,000 in one year; trafficking offences rose by 9.2 per cent; possession offences rose by 12.9 per cent; and other drug offences increased by 26 per cent.

Drug use fuels crime, it destroys families and it leaves communities picking up the pieces. Our approach is balanced, sensible and firm. Under the new framework, first-time low-risk offenders still have access to diversion—diversion is limited to one opportunity per pathway; repeat offenders face real consequences; and police are empowered to issue penalty infringement notices with the option to complete a diversion program in lieu of payment. This framework sends a clear signal: drug use is not tolerated, but rehabilitation remains available where it can make a genuine difference.

The third pillar of this bill addresses the growing and persistent problem of antisocial behaviour in our town centres, business districts and community hubs. Under Labor, weakened public order laws allowed disorderly, threatening and violent behaviour to flourish, driving families, workers and customers away from public spaces. This bill establishes designated business and community precincts, giving police the tools they need to intervene early and restore order. Within these precincts police will be able to issue move-on directions for up to 22 hours, require individuals to provide their name and address, issue banning notices for repeat disruptive behaviour and use handheld scanners without unnecessary bureaucratic delay.

Importantly, these powers are targeted, proportionate and supported by sensible exemptions—so people can still access essential services, medical care and public transport, and comply with court orders. This is about protecting the peaceful enjoyment of public spaces and supporting local businesses that have been pushed to the brink by ongoing antisocial behaviour. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (8.28 pm): Whether in support of or against this bill, submitters agree that Queensland communities have had enough of crime, with fewer victims a goal that unites all; however, legislation should be evidence based and prioritise short-term relief whilst long-term solutions tackle the contributors to criminal behaviours. This has been raised repeatedly and reiterated in inquiries and reports for years. The government convened expert panel report, which informed these amendments in the previous Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, has been requested for months. It was finally released online, not on the committee site, two weeks after submissions closed and failed to provide the rationale or detail needed. Evidence provided in submissions from frontliners, experts in youth advocacy law and Indigenous services referencing decades of international and national research and the government's own data clearly stipulates this legislation risks increased long-term future crime, victim trauma and more dangerous criminals. This is with increased cost to taxpayers, less safety and laws labelled as political rhetoric over evidence.

The additional Adult Crime, Adult Time offences range from stalking, intimidation and harassment to crimes against children with intellectual disability. These are crimes no-one wants to see. The inclusion of aiding suicide, stupefying in order to commit an indictable offence and several other offences do not meet the stated government metric of those causing serious harm to the community. As their own data confirms, there is little to no evidence of this occurring in the past decade. As evidenced by the recidivism rate of 96 per cent in the first year post detention and 69 per cent in serious repeat offenders, the incarceration of children and youth—or length of—does not stop reoffending. The Australian Childhood Foundation stated—

Everyone deserves to feel safe [but] when a 14 year old commits a violent act, our first question shouldn't be 'How do we punish them like an adult?' it should be 'What's happened in their life that's brought them here and how do we stop it happening again?'

By age 14 these offenders, some 53 per cent of whom are victims themselves, have, as the Youth Advocacy Centre reiterated, experienced domestic and family violence, homelessness and mental health issues. They have also been found to suffer brain damage from fetal alcohol syndrome, rape, torture and a system that failed them for years. QUT researchers confirmed that youth crime overall is at historic lows, trending down for the past 14 years and a testament to what was working.

Detention costs \$1 million per year per young person, or \$3,600 per day. Let's think about this. As taxpayers, we are paying to see nearly all of those incarcerated—and I go back to the 90-odd per cent—reoffend and return to detention at \$1 million a year. Existing youth detention facilities are operating well above safe capacity at 99.6 per cent, the highest nationally. Prisons are overcrowded, with most at between 130 per cent to 170 per cent capacity. Currently, aviation fuel is being used to transport prisoners across the state to reduce overcrowding at watch houses. This is to avoid the government being held to the same account they held the previous government to. This is a vicious circle. How many more billions will need to be spent to build more prisons that will not ultimately see a reduction—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, just one moment, please. There is way too much noise in the House. Could you take your conversations outside, thank you.


Ms BOLTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will say that again. How many more billions will need to be spent to build more prisons that will not ultimately see a reduction in crime into the future? Both sides have reported while in government or opposition—and experts across Queensland, Australia and internationally concur—that this legislation, by the government's own admission, contravenes the human rights of young Queenslanders. What is needed is evidence and community-based responses if victim numbers are to be reduced and continue to reduce. If the expert panel found differently, I urge the government to publicly release those details, as the only way we can reduce crimes and victims is through facts. We have been repeatedly told that we cannot police, legislate or politic our way out of this.

Enforcing personal illicit drug possession costs Queenslanders over \$222 million a year. These amendments seek to increase the cost as a result of potentially more incarcerations by reducing drug diversion opportunities for minor offences from three to one. This is another example of post-election wasted taxpayer dollars. Acronyms have changed, with the new IDEDF—illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework—replacing the existing PDDP, police drug diversion program. Those in support praised the clear consequences; however, two-thirds of submitters were opposed. This included the AMA, which described the previous program as an evidence-based, cost-effective approach. The QPS acknowledged the cost saving of drug diversion versus the criminal justice system.

The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare national drug survey showed 70 per cent community support for non-criminal responses—80 per cent where the use is ecstasy and 93 per cent for cannabis. If, as submitted, drug diversion opportunities reflect community expectations, are better informed by evidence, create pathways to improved health and wellbeing, save money and help police focus on more serious crimes, I ask: why the change?

There are more acronyms and wasted costs to recreate what we already have. Basically, the safe night precinct approach has been remodelled into the new designated business and community precinct to target antisocial behaviour. We need these behaviours stamped out; however, it does not require legislative change. As has been requested for years, we need extra boots on the ground. Government, QPS and submitters jointly noted that effective enforcement will rely on effective police discretion. Safeguards are also needed for those with cognitive or communication challenges who may be inadvertently captured. I implore government to ensure the QPS are provided with what they need, including increased overtime provisions, to ensure they are not diverted from other crime hotspots.

There we have it. Overall, instead of evidence and transparent expert advice and taking into account what many inquiries have found, the government is rebranding existing interventions, ignoring what works, increasing the need to build even more prisons and adding to already choking court systems. Anglicare's submission stated that government must commit to greater transparency of data and amendments that are evidence based, with a continued focus on targeted intervention. This includes the 500 or so youths who were identified during the bipartisan youth justice select committee who commit the majority of these crimes and are declared and on the serious repeat offender index. What is occurring there? The reality is that rehabilitation needs to be mandated before the next crime is committed, not after. That is what being held accountable is all about. Relocating these youth to work and education opportunities away from contributors would immediately reduce victim numbers and prevent future offences. Give them a chance at life and reduce the costs to taxpayers. For \$1 million per child per year, surely we can do much better than trying to fit legislation to justify slogans.

 **Mr BAROUNIS** (Maryborough—LNP) (8.37 pm): I rise today to speak on the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026. This is a significant piece of legislation, and today I wish to focus my contribution on one area in

particular: the ongoing antisocial behaviour we are facing and the positive outcomes the designated business and community precincts will deliver. This is an issue of deep and ongoing concern within my electorate and, most notably, within the CBD of our beautiful, proud heritage city.

For more than a decade the Maryborough CBD has been experiencing a steady and deeply troubling decline. What was once a vibrant, welcoming and thriving town centre—a place where families gathered, where businesses flourished and where visitors felt safe—has over time been eroded by persistent antisocial behaviour. This decline did not happen overnight. It developed gradually under the former Labor government which, in my view, failed to respond with the seriousness and urgency required. Instead, a blind eye was turned to the increasing presence of individuals who chose not to respect the community that supports them.

Maryborough is a compassionate community. It is a community that has always extended a hand to those in need, providing food, support services and shelter. However, what we have seen in return in far too many cases is not respect or cooperation but behaviour that has undermined the safety and wellbeing of the broader community. We have seen businesses subjected to abuse. We have seen shoppers intimidated. We have seen tourists—people who should be bringing life and economic activity into our town—choose instead to stay away.

There comes a point when a community says enough is enough, and that is precisely where the people of Maryborough now stand. The Crisafulli LNP government understands this. It recognises that small business owners—the backbone of our local economy—have been pushed to the brink. These are hardworking people who open their doors each day not knowing whether they will be subjected to abuse, theft or intimidation. They should not have to operate under those conditions. They should not have to feel unsafe in their own workplaces.

On 4 March this year the Premier, the Hon. David Crisafulli, together with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the Hon. Dan Purdie, visited Maryborough. They did not come just to make an announcement; they sat down with local business owners, they heard firsthand the challenges they face and they acknowledged the reality of the situation on the ground. As a result of this visit, Maryborough was announced as a trial location for a designated business and community precinct.

This is a practical, targeted and necessary initiative. It will provide police with the tools they need to respond effectively to antisocial behaviour within our CBD. It will allow them to move on offenders, issue banning notices and take meaningful action to prevent repeat behaviour. Most importantly, it sends a clear message that antisocial behaviour will no longer be tolerated. The Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill 2026 is another step forward. It is another step to bring safety back to our community.

On 31 March this year the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee held a public hearing in Maryborough into this bill. Over 40 local passionate residents, organisation leaders and local councillors spoke and expressed their concerns about Maryborough and their support of this bill. All agreed that once introduced this will be the support that Maryborough has been urgently needing for the past 10 years. I would like to thank the chair of the committee, the members, parliamentary staff and everyone else for coming to our city and listening to our community.


This bill is about restoring balance. It is about ensuring that the rights of law-abiding citizens, business owners, workers, families and visitors are placed back at the centre of our decision-making. It provides a clear legislative framework to establish designated precincts in areas where public safety is compromised, where amenity has been diminished and where intervention is urgently required. Within these precincts, police will have enhanced powers to address disorderly, offensive, threatening and violent behaviour.

I want to acknowledge the work of our police. I speak with them regularly, and what they tell me is both simple and concerning. They want to do their jobs, and they want to protect the community. Under previous legislative settings, they have often felt constrained and unable to act in the way the community expects and deserves. This bill changes that. It restores confidence, not only for police but for the community they serve.

At its core, this issue is about fairness. It is about ensuring that the majority of people—those who do the right thing—are not held hostage by the actions of a disruptive minority. Yes, those engaging in antisocial behaviour represent a small proportion of our population, but their impact has been significant and until now their influence has been disproportionate. This legislation rebalances that equation. It gives power back to the community, it gives certainty back to businesses and it gives authority back to the police.

Our government again has listened to the residents within the Maryborough electorate with regard to ensuring that our youth do not fall into a life of crime and antisocial behaviour later. The Hon. Laura Gerber, Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services, announced in Maryborough recently that two fantastic local projects—the Smithery and Operation Hard Yakka—are set to receive grants to support troubled youths from a life of crime. These programs will help these kids and show them that there are better choices in life available for them.

This is why I stand in full support of this bill. It reflects the voices of my community, it addresses a real and pressing problem and it demonstrates a clear commitment to restoring safety, order and confidence in our public spaces. Our communities deserve to feel safe, our businesses deserve to operate without fear and our police deserve the tools they need to uphold the law effectively. This legislation delivers on those principles. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (8.46 pm): This bill has been dressed up as decisive, as tough and as the answer to crime, drugs and antisocial behaviour. However, if you strip away the slogans and look at the evidence, the expert advice and the real-world consequences, what you are left with is not strength but failure, because real community safety is not built on press releases. It is built on evidence, and this bill ignores evidence completely.

Let's be clear about what this government is doing. This bill repeals the police drug diversion program and replaces it with a so-called illicit drug enforcement and diversion framework. What does that really mean? It means dismantling a system that was working. The system was introduced in 2023 by the former Labor government. It is a three-tiered, evidence-based model grounded in early intervention and prevention. That system recognised a simple truth: you do not solve drug use by dragging people deeper into the criminal justice system.

Under that system, a first offence resulted in a warning and referral to support. A second and third offence required participation in a diversion program. Only at a fourth offence did a person face court. That is not being soft; that is being smart. It balances accountability with intervention. It gives people a chance to change course before their lives spiral. It addresses the problem before it escalates. It allows police to focus on serious crime—the crime that threatens community safety.

Queensland police evidence confirms the scale of the diversion program. From 3 May 2024 to 24 March 2026, more than 32,000 Queenslanders were diverted under the tiered system. That is tens of thousands of people redirected towards support instead of being funnelled straight into the criminal justice system. This was not fringe policy; it had broad support across the community and across the sector and it was backed by five former police commissioners. When the government tear it down, they are not just ignoring the opposition; they are ignoring policing expertise, ignoring medical advice and ignoring the evidence. Why would a government do that? It is because this government are not interested in what works. They are interested in what sounds tough. It is about headlines. That is the politics of this bill—not outcomes, not safety and not evidence, just headlines. That is why Labor moved to split this legislation: so drug diversion could be properly considered separate from the rest of the government's proposals. As we saw, the government in their stubbornness denied the parliament that opportunity. They refused to separate the health response from their political agenda because this government do not want evidence-based reform; they want a slogan.

The Australian Medical Association Queensland could not have been clearer. They have condemned this decision as 'dangerous and contrary to evidence'. Dangerous—that is not political language; that is expert assessment. They did not stop there. They warned that this government is choosing ideology over science. At a time when Queenslanders expect leadership, this government is choosing ideology over evidence. That should concern every member of this House because when ideology replaces evidence bad policy follows and communities pay the price.

Labor proudly stands for better access to health care and health-based early interventions including for Queenslanders found in possession of small amounts of drugs for personal use. That is the difference between Labor and the LNP. We invest in health and those opposite cut. If ignoring expert advice was not enough, this government have gone one step further. They actively shut down the evidence. The committee process revealed that the government had cancelled a University of Queensland evaluation of the police drug diversion program. This was not an optional extra; it was built into the program and it was meant to provide independent, rigorous analysis after two years. It had already been commissioned by the Queensland Police Service and taxpayers had already paid more than \$330,000 for it. What happened? It was cancelled, scrapped, buried. A government confident in its decisions welcomes scrutiny, a government committed to evidence waits for the data, but a government afraid of the truth shuts the evaluation down before it can be reported, and that is exactly what has happened here.

We even know that the early findings were already pointing in the right direction. A 44-page independent progress report tabled during the committee process showed early alignment with the program's intended outcomes. In plain terms, the program was working. If you scrap a program before it is evaluated, cancel the independent review and ignore early positive findings, you are not making evidence-based policy; you are making political decisions and hoping no-one notices. The consequences of those decisions are real, because when you remove diversion you do not remove drug use; you remove pathways to health, you remove early intervention and you remove opportunity. You replace it with punishment and you push people further into the system. That is not tough; that is reckless. The Queensland Network of Alcohol and Other Drug Agencies evidence is clear. The majority of people who receive a drug diversion warning had no further contact with the program. That is what success looks like and that is what early intervention looks like.


We were also told that punitive approaches do not work. They have been tried, they have been tested and they have consistently failed. That is not speculation; this is decades of evidence. Again, this is not a debate about theory; this is established. Diversion works, treatment works, health-based responses work and punishment alone does not, yet this bill drags Queensland backwards into failed policy.

The government claims to stand with police, but in reality the bill does not support the police. It ties police up in low-level drug possession matters, forcing police to spend time on processing minor offences instead of targeting serious crime. At a time when communities are demanding action on serious offending, this government is redirecting resources away from where they are needed most. That is not backing the police; that is burdening them. The government claims it has consulted the Queensland Mental Health Commissioner and carefully considered feedback, but the commission itself warned the bill is unlikely to achieve its objectives. Again, we see the same pattern: consult, ignore, bulldoze ahead and then pretend the experts supported it. Nowhere is this failure more dangerous than for vulnerable Queenslanders, because behind every statistic is a person.

We heard from Tim Robinson, a community volunteer working with people experiencing homelessness and crisis. He sees the reality that this government refuses to acknowledge: that many people caught in this system are dealing with addiction, mental illness, homelessness, trauma and disadvantage. He made a simple but powerful point—

Long-term community safety depends not only on enforcement but also on helping people stabilise their lives.

However, this bill moves in the opposite direction. It risks pushing people further away from support, further away from services and further away from stability.

 **Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (8.56 pm): I wish to make a contribution to the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Bill. I was privileged to be the member for Cook between 2012 and 2015 and am now even more honoured to be the member for Cook, once again, in this Crisafulli government. Mareeba is the largest town in my electorate. It is a predominantly farming and service town with a population of 12,000 people. Mareeba has a diverse multicultural population and is, in fact, one of the multicultural hubs of our great state. Mareeba is also a vital town with a tremendous community spirit, a town I am proud to represent.

Mareeba has had its setbacks over the years with the closure of the tobacco industry in the early 2000s and again with the COVID outbreak in more recent years. However, community spirit, economic resilience and perseverance saw the region not only survive these setbacks but prosper. My town of Mareeba is now confronted by the impacts of youth crime. The escalating youth crime problem arose as a result of a decade of Labor watering down youth crime laws, making detention a last resort and abolishing breach of bail as an offence, with the result that there were no consequences for the criminal actions of young offenders.

During the time from 2015 to 2024 Mareeba and the Cook electorate were represented by Labor members of parliament—members who dropped the ball when it came to law and order and in particular youth crime. Nothing could be more telling on the subject of abandoning a community than the former member for Cook's cynical step of relocating the electorate office out of Mareeba and out of the electorate. Not only did the Labor member for Cook show contempt for the people who elected her; she failed at every turn to stand up for the people of Mareeba when it came to law and order. Under Labor, victims of crime increased by 193 per cent.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I am trying to find how this is relevant to this particular bill.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): What is your point of order? Is it to that point of order, Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: It is to that point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. In relation to that point of order, the member for Cook is providing some contextual background with respect to the current bill and it is important to understand in relation to the current bill that is under debate the historical legacy and context of the former Labor government.

Mr KEMPTON: I am more than happy to move on, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I would like to seek some advice about these points of order. Thank you for your points of order, member for Miller and Leader of the House. I have carefully considered them. I think the member was providing context to the bill before the House. However, member for Cook, it being 9 pm, I would ask that you move that the debate be now adjourned.

Debate, on motion of Mr Kempton, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.00 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Small and Family Business, Fuel Security



Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (9.00 pm): Over the past few weeks I have been busy out on the road in our regions listening. From Gin Gin to Childers, from Hervey Bay to Bundaberg, Maryborough, Caloundra and Mooloolaba, I have sat down with small businesses, chambers of commerce, local governments, mayors, family operators and cafe owners—people who keep regional Queensland going—and, no matter where I went, I heard the same message: the impact of rising fuel costs are crippling small businesses, not abstractly, not theoretically but right now on the ground every single day, and in particular diesel. Diesel is not optional in these businesses. It is not a luxury; it is the lifeblood of their operations. It powers their utes, their trucks, their machinery. When diesel goes up, everything goes up and Queensland's 508,000 businesses are being squeezed from every direction. Take the latest survey data from the Queensland Chamber of Commerce. A clear majority of small businesses say that fuel costs are their top cost pressure. Many report that they are unable to pass these costs on to customers and a growing number of them are cutting back on investments, delaying hiring or simply trying to survive week to week. This is not a healthy economy; this is a sector under stress.

Behind every statistic is a story. Garth, a small business owner from Capalaba, reached out to my office. He had tried to reach out to his own local member but unfortunately did not get anywhere, so he came to me. He runs Human Nature Landscapes, a highly successful business employing people. He has a fleet of five vehicles. He now spends over \$300 plus for each vehicle each week on fuel. That is over \$1,500 a week on fuel. He wants to grow and he wants to invest, but right now he cannot. Rising fuel costs are hitting his bottom line so hard that he has put expansion plans on hold. He is not buying the additional vehicles he needs; he is not taking the next step. He has told us plainly that he is in a holding pattern.

How many more Garths are there out there—ambitious small business owners who want to grow but are being held back by this LNP government, which has no plan? Let us be clear: what is the LNP government doing about this? Where is the targeted, meaningful assistance for fuel-intensive small businesses? Where is the plan? We get announcements, slogans and distractions like the embarrassment of the Taroom Trough—a so-called solution to fuel security talked up, promoted, used as a justification for inaction—yet never even properly progressed. As the federal environment minister made clear in his letter to the Premier—

The Australian Government has not received any documentation that would allow us to consider your proposal.

That is not leadership; that is a photo opportunity.

(Time expired)

Balanda, Mr RJ




Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.03 pm): It is with great sadness that I rise to inform the House of the passing of a long-time Gold Coast local, Mr Robert John Balanda. A respected legal practitioner and a tireless advocate for his community, Rob was a leader in our Gold Coast community for over 50 years. Professionally he was one of the founding partners of MBA Lawyers on the Gold Coast, becoming a partner of the firm in 1979. A respected property lawyer, he was a pioneer of management rights on the Gold Coast. His colleagues have remembered him as a generous teacher and mentor who was always willing to share his time and expertise.

He will also be remembered as one of the original voices behind the Stop the Gold Coast Quarry movement—an effort that reflected his enduring commitment to protecting the future of our region. Alongside Sam Stewart, Lorraine Cook and Tony Davis, he was one of the core group of locals who spearheaded our efforts, marshalling support and ensuring the voices of our Reedy Creek community—and, indeed, our wider Gold Coast community—were heard. The original Stop the Gold Coast Quarry team organised community rallies and a petition, which was tabled in this House, with over 9,000 signatures against the development application. I was proud to stand alongside them all those years ago, and I am reminded that only yesterday it was one year to the day that that fight started back up again. Rob played a pivotal role to opposing the quarry from day one all those years ago and he never gave up the fight, even joining our most recent community rally earlier this year against the latest Boral application. As part of the original Stop the Gold Coast Quarry team, at a time when the outcome was far from certain, his insight and wisdom helped guide a community determined to stand up for itself. He brought not only legal expertise but clarity of thought and a calm resolve. He also brought his family members. Many will remember his granddaughter Isabella, who was featured in a 2012 *Gold Coast Bulletin* article about the fight against the Gold Coast quarry. I table a photo of young Isabella.

Tabled paper: Media article, undated, titled 'MPs dig deep in bid to stop quarry' [549].

With all of that said, Rob's contribution extended far beyond any single cause. He believed deeply in giving back both personally and professionally through his involvement in Australian Management Rights and the REIQ. A mutual friend recently shared that Rob had described giving back to his community as one of the highlights of his life. This is a true reflection of his character and his legacy. Today our community is poorer for his passing but richer for his life. Rob's spirit endures in the community he inspired and the countless people he encouraged. My thoughts are with his family and his friends, particularly his children—Kimberley, who I know very well, Adam, Scott and Brett—at this difficult time. His generosity and legacy of community service will no doubt continue to inspire generations to come. Vale, Robert Balanda.

Parkinson's Disease

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (9.06 pm): April is Parkinson's Awareness Month. Fifty-five thousand people in Queensland live with this disease. It is a progressive neurological disease that involves a decline in the amount of the neurotransmitter dopamine, and this interferes with the capacity of the nervous system to transmit signals around the body. There are many different impacts of Parkinson's disease and it impacts people differently. Balance and mobility issues and speech and swallowing issues are just a few of the ways people are impacted. As the disease progresses, people need increasing levels of care so it has a real impact on families and carers.


My mum cared for my dad for 15 years before being diagnosed herself with Parkinson's just before Dad's passing. Both Mum and Dad continued to enjoy life as much as possible and faced each challenge with great dignity. There are two things that made me very sad during their journey. Dad was a great whistler—better than Roger Whittaker! I remember the sadness in his voice when he told me he could no longer whistle or play the harmonica. Mum was always the life of any party and was probably one of the most socially active and connected people I know. To watch her withdraw from friends and community over the last year of her life was particularly hard for all of my family.

Unfortunately, we do not fully understand what causes Parkinson's so there is no prevention strategies or a cure. There are many treatment options and a lot of research is happening. On World Parkinson's Day—11 April—Dr Alex Lehn and his team from the TRI led a research symposium supported by the staff and volunteers of Parkinson's Queensland. It was attended by over 150 people with Parkinson's, their carers, health professionals and researchers. We learned about work on the gut biome, smart shoes and inflammatory markers, to name just a few things. All of this research is part of a global effort and it costs a lot of money. On 19 April, 300 people joined the Big Walk for Parkinson's Queensland to Bridge the Gap—an inclusive walk starting at the Story Bridge and ending at UQ after crossing every bridge in between.

There was a 16-kilometre, a six-kilometre and a shorter, inclusive walk which all joined up at the UQ athletics oval. It was an absolute pleasure to be once again joined by my brother Vince as we continue to raise money for Parkinson's Queensland. It was made possible by the kind sponsors, including Moreton Eye Group and i4 Architecture, and over 100 volunteers. The walk raised money, awareness and hope, with the last thing being the most important. I want to pay tribute to all the people with Parkinson's who walked, whether they did a few steps or 16 kilometres. Every step is a victory for people with Parkinson's and it is a step in the right direction.

To round out Parkinson's Awareness Month, Parkinson's Queensland was joined by The Park—The Parkinson's Centre for a drop-in session today here in parliament. Thanks to all those MPs who could make it along to meet our ambassadors and staff. We have 37 support groups around the state and all MPs have an open invitation to visit their local group. I want to thank the volunteers, carers and staff of Parkinson's Queensland for supporting the many Queenslanders who live with Parkinson's and their families. Thanks to you, the Parkinson's community walked this journey together.


Karreman Quarries; Thomson, Mr Q; Australian Dragon Boat Championships

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (9.10 pm): Tonight I rise in the House with a very heavy heart due to a couple of losses we have had in my community over the last week. First of all, I would like to send my well wishes and condolences to the family—the family of Karreman Quarries—and friends who tragically lost one of their forklift operators yesterday. Team Redlands, Amanda in Oodgeroo and Russell in Capalaba, would like to extend our thoughts to that company and to the family of that forklift operator. Today on social media the resources minister reflected that his No. 1 priority was safety across our resources and quarry sector.

The second loss in our community over the last week was Quentin Thomson, known as QT to the Sharks community. He spent tireless hours at our AFL club volunteering. His wife, Maree, is one of our announcers at Bay FM. To Matt, Kimberley, Chris, Rhiannon, Arabella, Sofia and Hugo, I know your hearts are extremely heavy at the moment and I want to send my thoughts and my love to your family. QT was a very loyal friend and community member. He would send me a number of text messages and emails advocating for 1 Intrepid Drive, a block that was a chiropractor which burnt down a number of years ago, right next door to his property, that was left overgrown, with garages that the homeless would sleep in, trolleys and fires. Yesterday there was a great sense of joy to see garages pulled down. I would like to think that that was done in Quentin's honour. Maree, he would be looking down on that moment knowing that he had won that good fight he had for his neighbourhood community.

On a lighter note I would like to give a big call-out to Lynda Hall-Watson who competed in the Australian Dragon Boat Championships at Lake Kawana this week. Lynda and her team became the 2026 Australian Senior B champions. Last night her husband, Simon, texted me very proudly to let me know about Lynda's achievements. He said the 4 am starts, day after day, have truly paid off for Lynda and her team. Congratulations, Lynda, and the Redlands dragon boat club. The Redlands community is extremely proud of you. Apparently, New South Wales said, 'Where did these guys come from?' They annihilated them.

Peptides

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (9.13 pm): Tonight I want to raise a substantial public health problem that is growing rapidly across Queensland—that is, the unregulated use of peptides by everyday Queenslanders. Peptides, when properly prescribed and supervised, do have legitimate medical uses, but that is not the issue before us. What concerns me is the flood of unapproved peptides with names like BPC-157 and Retatrutide being sold online and marketed on social media for all kinds of things from weight loss to muscle growth to anti-ageing, injury recovery and so-called wellness with no prescription, no supervision and in most cases no evidence that they do what the sellers claim. The TGA has already issued a public warning about the surge in the importation, supply, compounding and advertising of these products. They have not been assessed for safety, quality or for effectiveness. They are frequently mislabelled. Users face risks, including contamination, infection, allergic reactions and tissue damage.


This is not problem confined to the back rooms of dodgy gyms. Members of the RACGP, who are in the parliament today, have flagged that children as young as 14 are following social media influencers into this market and injecting unapproved substances bought on the internet. In Queensland, our frontline health services are already feeling the impact of this surge. Needle and syringe programs and peer-led outreach workers are reporting a sharp rise in peptide related presentations.

The people walking through those doors are not who you might think. They are often ordinary Queensland mums looking to lose some weight, dads trying to recover from an injury, seniors trying to find relief from chronic pain or young people simply trying to improve their appearance in ways that social media promotes and tells them are easy, safe and within reach when, in fact, often they are not. Instead, many are ending up with substances of unknown origin, purity and risk. These are deeply concerning developments because we already know this government's general instinct on drug policy.

Queensland needs a serious response to this peptide boom: public health education, honest warnings, proper surveillance, greater support for frontline services and a government prepared to deal with reality and deliver health care grounded in evidence and expert medical advice—that would be nice for a change—rather than outdated ideology. The booming peptide market only accelerates in a void of inaction and disinterest by government. People need access to genuine contemporary public information on peptides from reputable sources, not from social influencers and internet marketeers.

Health Minister Nicholls, whom I am glad to see is in the chamber hopefully listening to this speech, needs to get active now and meet with the health sector on the peptide surge. He needs to get briefed by the department, meet with QuIVAA and respond to this social media fuelled public health trend before it is too late. It is shame to see that he is not listening to this speech, despite being right across the chamber from me.

Shepley, Mr PG


 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (9.15 pm): It is with much sadness that I rise tonight to talk about another tragedy for the Shepley family. Only last June I paid tribute to Adrian, a true community champion of the Laidley community, who was taken far too young. Tonight I pay tribute to Peter George Shepley, who was only 41. Pete was a son, a brother, an uncle and fiance to Jodee. For the Laidley Lions he was a coach. For the Gatton Hawks he was a much loved member, a player, a coach and a supporter, known as the 'Can Bar King'. He was a true club man and part of their premiership success. He was recognised last weekend when Jodee stood in for him. I know just how proud Pete would have been to hand over the sponsor's jerseys and have a seat reserved for him in the 'can bar' as the game went on and the sun set.

I think Pete will be remembered most fondly as an uncle. Pete was brother to Paul and Kate, Aaron and Tracey, Darren and Regina, Carmen and Steve, Lee and Sonia, Luke and Stacey, Bridget and Erik, and Jeremy and Amy and an uncle to their very many sons and daughters, Pete's nieces and nephews. Pete was very well known as 'Uncle Pete'. He was great fun and always the life of the party. Pete was a very loving son to his mother, Margaret, who is also a wonderful stalwart of our Laidley community.

Pete's funeral will be held at St Patrick's Catholic Church, John Street, Laidley at 10.30 this Thursday, 23 April, which would have been his birthday. Pete is survived by Jodee, his lovely fiancée. It was only recently that they installed a pizza oven at their home so that people could come over and enjoy good times, such was the love they had for so many others.

Pete was always a club man. From over the back fence I would hear the war cry of the Hawks or 'Go the Hawbies'. A quote from his brother Aaron reminded me of just how much the XXXX heavy will be flowing at the wake this Thursday. Pete would say, 'Pour a slab, drink a slab. I don't make the rules; I just follow 'em.' Rest in peace, Peter George Shepley.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance


 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (9.18 pm): I rise to call out this LNP government for its failure on fuel affordability and on roads. Locals expect this government to actually do their job. Locals want fewer slick slogans and taxpayer funded ads, fewer photo-ops and more follow-up, less blaming of workers and more doing the job that they are paid to do—to build the infrastructure communities need before their roads reach breaking point; to put the buses and the trains where commuters need them; to do something, anything, urgently about fuel affordability; and to keep their promises on cost of living, rather than jacking up car rego by 24 per cent whilst the government rakes in billions in royalties.

Follow-up is not happening under this LNP government. Beenleigh-Redland Bay Road and Mount Cotton Road are under significant strain. Commuters are frustrated, stranded and at risk. We are seeing expanding activity at Barro and Karreman quarries and growth at the Golden Cockerel processing plant. Labor in government, on the other hand, funded intersection and road upgrades. Labor's budgets funded planning and consultation for the next stage and they funded car rego relief. However, under this LNP government, momentum has been lost.

Is this LNP government delaying projects that are so clearly needed in our community? Whilst the Crisafulli LNP government delays, the risk of serious accidents continues to rise, and there is zero relief coming from this LNP government on fuel costs for motorists. We have seen the LNP rail fail, the LNP rego fail, the LNP bus fail, the LNP fuel fail and now we have the LNP roads fail. This is a government focused on nothing more than photo-ops and rhyming slogans.

Budgets demonstrate what matters. With the state budget around the corner, we are saying to this LNP government that our community matters, that our community deserves the safe road infrastructure that keeps up, not a government that walks away from the work that has already been done. Our community makes clear our calls on this LNP government to cease its delays, our calls to restart the work on roads, to deliver the funding in this year's budget for those roads and get off its hands and help with fuel costs for motorists today.

Broadbeach Cats Australian Football Club

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (9.21 pm): On Saturday, 11 April I had the pleasure of attending the opening round of the Broadbeach Cats' first game in the top tier QAFL Women's competition against last year's premiers, the Southport Sharks, at home in the Mermaid Beach electorate. At the kind invitation of passionate president Andrew Covino, I was hosted for the evening by hardworking vice-president Nick Harrison, as well as catching up with other committee members Warren Newbegin and my personal friend, Monica Puntoriero, accountant to the stars—well, me anyway.


It was a grand evening for the Cats ladies, even though the very experienced Southport Sharks, last year's premiers, dealt them a fairly heavy learning experience as they welcomed them to the big time. However, it highlighted to me the fantastic work the AFL followers do in the community to promote and provide for women to enjoy the opportunity to play one of the fastest growing sports throughout the country, so much so that over 250 female football members of the club are putting pressure on the existing facilities which were initially built for a men-only sport. With this in mind, the Broadbeach Cats are looking at financial ways to expand their facilities to cater for the burgeoning number of young female members who are increasingly finding that AFL is a great game to involve themselves in, without the heavy body contact that some other football codes require.

The Gold Coast City council is the landlord of their facility and is primarily responsible for upgrades to their amenities. However, because of the large number of women joining the exponentially growing sport, it would not be untoward for the state government to look at ways to financially assist the club, as was the case with the previous state government commitment to female facilities at the Burleigh Bears Rugby League Club, also in my electorate, to the tune of some \$600,000.

There are 1,450 members playing multiple sports at the Broadbeach venue of which 450 are women. As we head towards the 2032 Olympics, it may be that AFL and AFL Women could be included as demonstration sports, promoting our uniquely Australian football. That would be even more reason to encourage and support clubs like Broadbeach Cats as their hardworking volunteer committees lend their enthusiasm and copious amounts of time to ensuring the best outcomes and opportunities for their players.

I am sure the Minister for Sport and the Olympics shares my enthusiasm for giving these inspiring young women every opportunity to succeed and enjoy every aspect of their chosen sport, and I will continue to seek ways in which appropriate female facilities at the Broadbeach Cats becomes a financial reality. I have even joined the Gold Coast Suns.

Noosa Electorate, Volunteers

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (9.24 pm): Tonight I give my immense gratitude to every resident and organisation in my electorate and across Queensland who selflessly dedicates their time and expertise without pay. They are much adored volunteers, our unpaid workers. As well, I recognise those who have passed who gave for decades without seeking or requiring recognition. I would need many hours to list much loved Noosans who have made our community incredible. They put in real efforts every day saving lives, providing sports for our kids, caring for our elderly, fundraising for services and supports, and the list goes on. Every single resident benefits yet may not realise.


For eight years we have put forward their challenges, including the extensive processes, rising operational costs and assistance needed for meals, phones and fuel. Finally, the inquiry into volunteering in Queensland has estimated that the economic value of volunteering sits at over \$117 billion annually. Unsurprisingly, it found that participation rates are declining significantly and recommended that barriers be reduced and supports be provided. The government has responded with a 10-year plan; however, as we have seen, plans that are not resourced may not become reality or can gather dust.

The inquiry appears to have missed the role that flawed government processes play in the challenges volunteers face, and I want to give the House some examples. The Kinaba Information Centre, which was closed and left to rot many years ago by government, has been brought back to life by volunteers. For 15 years they have sought to have some interpretive signage so that school groups can return and the river users who use the amenities can be educated. That is not too much to ask.

As a result of insurmountable conditions, including restoration and contractor costs, the Cooroy Mountain Spring Festival—an annual charity event since 2014—will end. There may be some damage from this walk; however, we need to ask how the environmental ‘tick box’ is working when for seven years governments of both colours have not reduced the thousands who use the beaches in the Cooloola Recreation Area as a highway during peak times. What is the damage of walking once a year versus thousands of vehicles driving daily? Like the Cooroy Mountain Spring Festival, the Pomona King of the Mountain has faced insurmountable conditions. It was an internationally recognised event, but it has ended.

Do any of these examples pass the pub test? There are many more. We have the rural fires—28,000 volunteers defending 93 per cent of Queensland. Issues taken to government remain unactioned and do not appear in the recommendations to be resolved. I say to the government: before developing a 10-year plan in the lead-up to the Olympics, think about the volunteer organisations that are battling flawed processes now, where the systems themselves make it impossible for the unpaid workers to deliver to our communities.

Mundingburra Electorate, Anzac Day

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (9.27 pm): We gather each year on Anzac Day to pause, reflect and remember those who have served, sacrificed and continue to defend our great nation. It is a time that unites Australians across generations and across communities in gratitude and respect. To our veterans and to our current service men and women, we say thank you. Thank you for your sacrifice, for your courage and for your unwavering commitment to protecting the freedoms that we enjoy today. Those freedoms were not given lightly; they were earned through service, through hardship and through a deep sense of duty to country.

My hometown of Townsville is Australia’s largest garrison city, and we are a proud garrison city where the sense of service runs deep. Our current and former service men and women are woven through the fabric of our community. Each and every person has a link to Defence, through their family, their partner, their colleague or their teammate. It is our common bond and a badge that we wear with honour.

Saturday’s Anzac Day dawn service will be a solemn and profoundly respectful commemoration. In the quiet stillness of the early morning, as the first light breaks, our community will stand together in silence. We will reflect not only on those who have served in conflicts long past but also on those who continue to serve today. Anzac Day is not just about history; it is about legacy. It is about ensuring the stories, the sacrifices and the spirit of those who came before us are never forgotten. It is about passing the understanding on to the next generation so they, too, know the price of the freedoms they inherit.

Remembrance must be matched with action, and that is why our government is committed to standing with those who have served, not just in words but in meaningful support. Through the Crisafulli government’s Veterans and Veterans’ Families Strategy we will be delivering a nation-leading approach that recognises not just our veterans but their families as well.

We know that supporting our veterans starts with supporting our veterans’ families. We are ensuring better access to services, stronger community connections and more support where it is needed most. We are proud to deliver the Honouring our Veterans Grants Program, supporting local organisations and communities to commemorate service, preserve history and continue the legacy of remembrance across Queensland.

As the member for Mundingburra and Assistant Minister for Veterans, I carry with me the voices of a community that deeply values and respects those who have worn the uniform. Just like on Anzac Day, today and every day we honour our veterans, we honour their service, we honour their sacrifice and we commit ourselves to ensuring their legacy lives on. Lest we forget.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Hatcher, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, 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, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young