ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 4 June 2026

Subject Page

PRIVILEGE **1707**
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House **1707**
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House **1707**
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House **1707**
Comments by Member for Waterford, Withdrawal and Apology **1708**
Comments by Member for Aspley, Withdrawal and Apology **1708**
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **1708**
E-Petition, Authentication **1708**
SPEAKER'S RULING **1709**
Rule of Anticipation **1709**
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **1709**
Visitors to Public Gallery **1709**
PETITION **1709**
TABLED PAPER **1710**
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS **1710**
Child Safety System **1710**
Veterans, Allied Health **1710**
Child Safety Commission of Inquiry **1710**
Child Safety System **1711**
Police Service, Financial Review **1712**
Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Cabinet in Confidence: QPS, Independent Financial Review' 1712
Victims of Crime **1712**
CFMEU Inquiry **1713**
Tabled paper: Document, dated May 2023, titled 'Construction Compliance and Field Services Cultural Discovery Project: Report prepared for the Office of Industrial Relations'. 1713

PT WEIR
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

AL TAGUADA
ACTING CHIEF REPORTER

Tabled paper: Document, undated titled 'Queensland Council of Unions'..... 1714
Housing Supply..... 1714
Rural Fire Service..... 1715
Energy Prices..... 1715
MOTION..... 1716
Referral to Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee..... 1716
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE..... 1716
Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting..... 1717
Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting..... 1717
Tabled paper: Email, dated 2 March 2026, regarding non-offence DV occurrences—The Courier-Mail. 1717
Victims of Crime..... 1719
Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting..... 1719
Tabled paper: Email, dated 2 March 2026, regarding non-offence DV occurrences—The Courier-Mail 1719
Tabled paper: Media release, dated 2 March 2026, by the Queensland Police Service titled 'Non-offence DV occurrences, The Courier Mail enquiry' 1719
Victims of Crime..... 1720
Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting..... 1721
Tabled paper: Email, dated 17 March 2026, with the subject line 'Non-offence DV occurrences, The Courier Mail enquiry statement for advice' 1721
Victims of Crime..... 1722
Police Service, Data Reporting..... 1722
Tabled paper: Document, undated titled 'Community Sentiment, Summary of Analysis' 1722
Cost-of-Living Relief..... 1723
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 June 2026 from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership, Hon. David Janetzki, to Executive Director and CEO, Insurance Council of Australia, Mr Andrew Hall, regarding insurance affordability..... 1724
Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting..... 1724
Child Safety System..... 1725
Gas Industry..... 1725
Victims of Crime..... 1726
Wolston Park Hospital..... 1727
Queensland Day..... 1728
HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL..... 1728
Introduction..... 1728
Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. 1728
Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes..... 1728
Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights..... 1728
First Reading..... 1731
Referral to Health, Environment and Innovation Committee..... 1731
TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MANAGING E-MOBILITY USE AND PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL..... 1731
Second Reading..... 1731
Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence from the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, and Surfers Paradise constituents concerned about e-bike and motorised scooter safety on the Gold Coast..... 1733
Tabled paper: Bundle of papers regarding previous speeches and questions on notice by the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, concerning e-bike and motorised scooter safety. 1733
Tabled paper: Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* online, dated 19 July 2024, titled 'Woman who died in horror Surfers Paradise escooter crash a 30-year-old foreign national living in area'. 1733
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS..... 1747
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance..... 1747
Stafford By-Election..... 1747
Tabled paper: Bundle of documents, undated, relating to the member for Stafford, Mr Luke Richmond MP, and the Stafford by-election 1747
Greenslopes Electorate..... 1748
Moreton Bay TAFE Centre of Excellence, Funding..... 1749
Thriving Kids..... 1749
Disaster Funding..... 1750
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance; Wolston Park Hospital..... 1750
Whitsunday Electorate, Tourism; Proserpine Fire and Rescue Station..... 1751
Multiculturalism..... 1752
Building Industry..... 1752
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance..... 1753
Tabled paper: Extract, dated 21 March 2025, from *Bundaberg Today*..... 1753
Mirani Electorate, Water Security..... 1754
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance..... 1754
Breach of Bail..... 1755
Housing Affordability..... 1756
Z Special Unit Memorial..... 1757
Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting veterans' memorial..... 1757

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance **1757**
Member for Murrumba; Queensland Day **1758**
Housing **1758**
Redcliffe Business Awards **1759**
LOCAL GOVERNMENT, SMALL BUSINESS AND CUSTOMER SERVICE COMMITTEE **1759**
Report, Motion to Take Note **1759**
Division: Question put—That the question be now put. 1761
Resolved in the affirmative 1761
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY **1762**
Report, Motion to Take Note **1762**
SPEAKER'S RULINGS **1769**
Tabled Papers, Out of Order **1769**
Member for Jordan, Conduct in Chamber **1769**
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY **1769**
Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates and Referral of Auditor-General's Report **1769**
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT **1769**
TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MANAGING E-MOBILITY USE AND PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL **1770**
Second Reading **1770**
Tabled paper: Extract, dated 2 June 2026, from Strava, featuring a post by the member for Miller, Hon. Mark Bailey MP 1776
Tabled paper: Document, contribution on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill by the member for Rockhampton, Mrs Donna Kirkland MP 1807
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. 1807
Resolved in the affirmative 1807
Consideration in Detail **1808**
Clause 1— 1808
Division: Question put—That the member for Aspley's amendment No. 1 be agreed to. 1810
Resolved in the negative. 1810
Non-government amendment (Mr Mellish) negatived. 1810
Division: Question put—That clause 1, as read, stand part of the bill. 1810
Resolved in the affirmative 1810
Clause 1, as read, agreed to. 1810
Clause 2— 1811
Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Brent Mickelberg's amendments 1811
Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Brent Mickelberg's amendments 1811
Division: Question put—That the minister's amendment No. 1 be agreed to. 1812
Resolved in the affirmative 1812
Amendment agreed to. 1812
Division: Question put—That leave be granted. 1812
Resolved in the affirmative 1812
Division: Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 2 to 122, as circulated, be agreed to. 1812
Resolved in the affirmative 1812
Amendments agreed to. 1812
Division: Question put—That clauses 2 to 67 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill. 1826
Resolved in the affirmative 1826
Clauses 2 to 67 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to. 1826
Third Reading **1826**
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be read a third time. 1826
Resolved in the affirmative 1827
Long Title **1827**
Division: Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to. 1827
Resolved in the affirmative 1827
ADJOURNMENT **1827**
Small Business Awards **1827**
Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Nikki Boyd MP Small Business Awards 2026 Nominees' 1827
Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Conference at the Komo' 1827
Tabled paper: Bundle of documents, undated, regarding tickets for the Redcliffe Business Awards. 1827
Tabled paper: Extract from Facebook, undated, featuring a post from Jolaine Connolly regarding Redcliffe Business Awards 1827
BMA Mackay Marina Run **1828**
Centenary Highway **1828**
Hinchinbrook Electorate **1829**
Sports House **1830**
Small Business Month **1830**
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance **1831**

Tabled paper: Document, undated, regarding the member for Burnett, Mr Stephen Bennett MP. 1831
Aerospace Industry **1832**
Law and Order; North Queensland, Youth Crime **1832**
Tabled paper: Article from the *Townsville Bulletin*, dated 1 June 2026, titled 'Just fix it'. 1833
EGW Wood Bridge, Upgrade **1833**
ATTENDANCE **1834**

THURSDAY, 4 JUNE 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.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.31 am): Yesterday in question time the Leader of the Opposition tabled a bundle of documents and in asking his first question said, '... the Crisafulli LNP government has placed the athletes village too close to the station.' He further said that 'new platforms will have to be demolished and rebuilt'. The Leader of the Opposition then asked his second question where he said, '... was the Games Leadership Group briefed that the new Exhibition station platforms would need to be demolished and rebuilt?' Not only are those statements untrue, upon reading the source document tabled by the Leader of the Opposition it is clear what he said is not the case and the words he used are not even contained in the documents he tabled.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will hear the statement in silence. The next interjector will be warned.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I believe the Leader of the Opposition has deliberately misled the House and I will be writing to you about this matter requesting he be referred to the Ethics Committee.

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.32 am): Mr Speaker, I have a second matter of privilege. Yesterday in question time the member for McConnel in asking her question said, '... the Games Leadership Group was advised that out of Fortitude Valley and Exhibition train stations only one could be open during the games,' and asked whether the minister had been briefed about the impact of closing the Fortitude Valley station during the games.

It is clear the member for McConnel was relying on the previously sourced documents tabled by the Leader of the Opposition in asking her question. The problem for the member for McConnel is that the minutes are not referring to the Fortitude Valley station being closed during the games but refer to discussions about a prospective additional station at Victoria Park, stating that Exhibition station and said prospective station could not operate at the same time, not referencing Fortitude Valley station.

Not only are the statements made by the member for McConnel untrue, upon reading the source document tabled by the Leader of the Opposition it becomes clear that the words she used are not even contained in the tabled document. I believe the member for McConnel has deliberately misled the House and I will be writing to you about this matter requesting she be referred to the Ethics Committee.

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.33 am): Mr Speaker, I have a third matter of privilege.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BLEIJIE: Yesterday in question time the member for Waterford in asking her question said, '... has the Games Leadership Group been briefed on whether the cost of demolishing and rebuilding Exhibition station platforms'. It is clear, again, that the member for Waterford was relying on the previously sourced documents tabled by the Leader of the Opposition in asking her question. The problem for the member for Waterford is that, not only are those statements untrue, upon reading the source document tabled by the Leader of the Opposition it is clear that what the member for Waterford said is not the case and the words that she used in her question are not even contained in the document. Mr Speaker, as has been the case with the seriousness of all of these matters, I believe the member for Waterford has deliberately misled the House and I will be writing to you about this matter requesting she also be referred to the Ethics Committee.

Mr Chiesa interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, I think this is the first time you have made the warning list, but you are warned.

Comments by Member for Waterford, Withdrawal and Apology

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (9.35 am): In respect of my MPI statement on 21 April, I referred to 93 beds being cut at the Prince Charles Hospital. Immediately after that statement I clarified that I was referring to a delay in beds being built at the hospital compared to Labor's plan.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am trying to hear the statement.

Ms FENTIMAN: It has come to my attention that I may have inadvertently misled the House and, as such, I withdraw my statement and apologise to the House.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It was impossible to hear the member's statement given the level of noise.

Mr SPEAKER: There is a reason for that, Leader of the House.

Opposition members interjected.

Dr ROWAN: It is an apology for misleading the House!

Mr SPEAKER: There is a reason you could not hear it. I could not hear it. Nobody could hear it. It was because of the interjections. For clarity, member for Waterford could you re-read your statement, please?

Ms FENTIMAN: In respect of my MPI statement on 21 April, I referred to 93 beds being cut at the Prince Charles Hospital. Immediately after that statement I clarified that I was referring to a delay in beds being built at the hospital compared to Labor's plan. It has come to my attention that I may have inadvertently misled the House and, as such, I withdraw my statement and apologise to the House.

Comments by Member for Aspley, Withdrawal and Apology

Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (9.37 am): On 21 April, in responding to an interjection, I referred to 93 beds being cut at the Prince Charles Hospital. In making that statement I omitted that I was referring to the plan to build them by 2028. That omission may have inadvertently misled the House. I withdraw my statement and apologise to the House.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

E-Petition, Authentication

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have ruled that e-petition No. 4438-26 'Proposed Trump International Hotel and Tower' be removed on the basis that at least one fact in the e-petition could not be authenticated by the principal petitioner and is potentially misleading to petitioners.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Rule of Anticipation

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, yesterday I gave a ruling about standing order 231. Today I have circulated expanded reasons and authority for my ruling. I seek leave to incorporate my ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT—RULE OF ANTICIPATION AND BLOCKING MOTIONS

Honourable Members

Yesterday the Attorney-General tabled a significant Commission of Inquiry report into the Child Safety system.

Following this, the Leader of Opposition gave notice of motion for debate that afternoon. That motion, amongst other things, noted the report and other matters about the inquiry and recommendations and then went on to seek the dismissal of the Minister.

Later in question time, a question was asked relating to the inquiry.

The Manager of Opposition Business objected to the question on the basis that the question asked by the member sought to elicit an answer which could do nothing other than anticipate a matter that is on the Notice Paper for debate, the private member's motion.

I ruled that given the significance of the report that was tabled earlier and given that essentially the motion is more about a vote of confidence, or lack of, in the minister, I was going to allow the question.

The Manager of the Opposition Business then asked for clarity of the ruling and whether I was ruling the question in order.

I again mentioned the significance of the report and that I was exercising my power to not let the motion be a blocking motion on debate on such a significant issue.

I believe it is important to provide further detail and authority as to my ruling.

I note that motions for the private members' motion are not actually on the Notice Paper. Notice is given in the morning and debate occurs that afternoon. It is significant to note that whilst the Opposition or Cross Bench may know the topic of debate, no other members are aware when they are preparing their questions.

Many of the rules followed by the Legislative Assembly, often inherited from the UK Parliament, have been developed or evolved to guide the effective and efficient use of Assembly's time whilst still ensuring fairness to members and affording due process to important parliamentary functions.

Speaker Pitt in 2019 said, and I quote *"The 'rule of anticipation' ensures issues are dealt with within the most effective proceeding, whilst allowing the Speaker discretion to prevent misuse of the rule by notices of motion that seek to 'block' debate."* (Pitt (S) 8/08/2019, tabled out of session)

According to Speaker Simpson in 2012, *"The anticipation rule is not meant to close all debate. There is some discretion in regard to the application of the anticipation rule. If the rule was unfettered, the simple expediency of giving a notice of motion a subject matter would preclude less or equal proceedings such as questions."* Simpson (S) 19/06/2012 PD p717

Speakers are much more rigorous in preventing questions that invite anticipation of the arguments and principles upon which an order of the day, such as legislation is based. (Turner (S) 11/09/1996 QPD 2718; Hollis (S) 26/11/2002 QPD 4713)

In my view allowing a notice of motion such as that given yesterday to block questions on a new topic of significant public interest would have been unfair and interfered with members' rights. The total circumstances will always affect the discretion applied under SO 231.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to Public Gallery

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from: Southern Cross Catholic College at Woody Point in the electorate of Redcliffe, Narangba Valley State School in the electorate of Kurwongbah and Calamvale Community College in the electorate of Algester.

PETITION

The Clerk presented the following paper petition, lodged by the honourable member indicated—

Morayfield Railway Station, Staffing

Hon. Ryan, from 70 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Queensland Government to direct Queensland Rail (a Queensland Government entity) to restore the station staffing hours at Morayfield Train Station [855].

Petition received.

TABLED PAPER

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington)—

856 Electoral Commission of Queensland—Report on the conduct of Preselection Ballots, 2024 State General Election, May 2026

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Child Safety System

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.39 am): Our government places the utmost importance on keeping children safe. Yesterday we released the final report of the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry. It confirms what too many vulnerable children, families, carers and frontline workers have known for years: Queensland's child safety system is broken.

The findings are sobering and damning and the recommendations demand action. The report makes it clear that systemic failures were allowed to develop over many years during a decade of decline under those opposite. It describes a child safety system that has become increasingly overwhelmed, increasingly complex and increasingly unable to deliver the safe and stable outcomes that Queensland children deserve. Thousands of children remain in out-of-home care. Too many have been placed in residential care settings that were intended to be temporary but have instead become long-term arrangements. Not a single child has been adopted from state care since 2019.

The commission has delivered 52 recommendations. We have established a dedicated cabinet subcommittee to oversee our response to the report, and their first meeting will be today. Every Queenslander should be concerned by these findings. Every Queenslander should also know that our government is committed to fixing this broken system. We owe it to every child who has been failed, we owe it to every foster and kinship carer who has stepped forward to provide support and we owe it to every frontline worker striving to make a difference. Above all, we owe it to the next generation of Queensland children.

Veterans, Allied Health

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.41 am): I am proud to serve as Minister for Veterans. Queensland is home to the largest population of veterans in the country. Our government is working hard to deliver our state's first Veterans and Veterans' Families Strategy to ensure we strengthen outcomes for veterans and their families.

As part of the last federal budget the Australian government has flagged changes to allied health coverage for veterans. From next year the Commonwealth government will introduce a new annual allied health spending cap for veterans. This is a change from the previous model, which covered a set number of visits. In talking to veterans, they are worried they will hit the cap well before the year is up and they do not know if they will be able to get further support. They are confused and anxious about the change.

Our service men and women make the ultimate sacrifice for our country and we owe it to them to honour that service. The federal government must revise this approach and act in the best interests of all veterans.

Child Safety Commission of Inquiry

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.42 am): Yesterday I tabled in the House the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry report titled *From pressure to purpose: reforming child protection in Queensland*. This comprehensive report is a defining moment for Queensland's most vulnerable children because it exposes how, under the former Labor government, their plight was inflamed by ignorance and inaction, leaving their needs unmet, their cries for help unheard and their hope increasingly crushed. How bad did it get?

Through the commission's work, what the former Labor government tried to bury has come to the surface. The former Labor government looked up, they looked down, they looked around—they looked anywhere but into the eyes of vulnerable children. By abandoning their duty as a corporate parent, children who deserved care were misplaced and adrift. Residential care is the last resort for these children.

Would the former Labor government and its five former child safety ministers—its faces of failure opposite—care to explain how a last resort becomes a crowded house or indeed a hotel room? Under Labor, the number of children and young people in residential care skyrocketed by 229 per cent. As the Premier has noted, under Labor, adoption—a headline priority under the Child Protection Act—effectively dropped out of sight. These are catastrophic failures of the former Labor government and their five failed child safety ministers. They point to a redoubling of pain and loss for gravely at-risk children.

The Crisafulli government will not sustain that which is intolerable. That is why we instituted the commission of inquiry. That is why, as we carefully consider the report's 52 recommendations, we are already getting on with the job—starting today with the first meeting of the new cabinet subcommittee—to oversee the development and implementation of a whole-of-government and wholehearted response. The Crisafulli government will not turn away. We will look into the eyes of our children with compassion, care and a focus on their best interests. We will fix the child safety system that was broken under the former Labor government. We will help Queensland's most vulnerable children find a way home.

Child Safety System

Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (9.45 am): After a decade in government presiding over the worst child safety crisis in Queensland's history, Labor's response to the commission of inquiry report was not one of humility, accountability or an apology to the thousands of vulnerable children who were failed under their watch. Let me break down this independent report for the House.

I want to be clear that this is not the Crisafulli government's assessment of the child safety system; it is the assessment of an independent commissioner. Critical incident reports found that approximately 67 per cent of the reported incidents of sexual abuse of children in care involved children placed in residential care. As the Attorney outlined, this is meant to be the place of last resort. The number of children and young people in residential care surged by 229 per cent from March 2015 to March 2025. The commissioner observed that the presence of 550 children under 10 was an acute indicator of system failure. The number of children in residential care had been skyrocketing under those opposite and was set to peak at 3,000—more than all other states combined. The annual cost also rose from $300,000 per child in 2019-20 to approximately $500,000 per child in 2024-25. The former Labor government repeatedly failed to make timely and sustained investments in family-based care and early intervention, contributing directly to the explosion of residential care placements. We are yet to know the answer as to why.

The report's findings clearly set out in frank terms the condition of the child safety system we inherited and the consequences for the children, families, carers and workers who relied upon it. It found that deep structural and cultural problems had developed—and no wonder, under a revolving door of five failed ministers. It found warning signs that were missed, recommendations that were not fully acted upon and a culture that too often accepted poor outcomes as inevitable. Most importantly, it found that vulnerable children were paying the price for a runaway system that had lost sight of its purpose and no minister wanted to be held accountable.

What is truly remarkable is that those opposite are questioning our government's commitment to reform when we have been taking action from day one. Long before this report was finalised the Crisafulli government adopted the Safer Children, Safer Communities plan. We have located hundreds of missing children, launched a professional foster care pilot, provided additional support for foster and kinship carers, committed to Queensland's first SecureCare facility and increased frontline staffing by 20 per cent. We did not wait for this final report to start acting.

This report should be viewed through the eyes of the children whose lives have been shaped by the decisions made by this House and the lack of decisions made by former ministers. They deserve a system that keeps them safe, supports them to thrive and gives them opportunities to succeed. My message to those opposite is that, instead of attacking those on this side of the House who are tasked with fixing the crisis, they should spend time reflecting and justifying their lack of decisions.

Police Service, Financial Review

Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (9.49 am): The Crisafulli government is delivering for Queensland. We are delivering what we said we would: respect for your money. It is something those opposite could not and would not do. Before coming to government we highlighted the dire financial woes of the Queensland Police Service, but we now have a greater understanding of the scale and depth of the issue, which was allowed to fester during Labor's decade of decline. We now know that the Stones Corner catastrophe, which is still under investigation by the CCC, was just the tip of the iceberg. On coming to government we recognised there were systemic issues, which is why we commissioned the QPS independent financial review, which I now table in parliament.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Cabinet in Confidence: QPS, Independent Financial Review' [857].

This review aims to refocus the organisation on frontline policing, and the principles are clear: no redundancies, deliver frontline policing services as a priority and community safety is paramount. This work has been underway since January and the report was taken to cabinet, but as a government that prides itself on transparency we are tabling it today. It is not pretty but, frankly, it is not unexpected. Labor failed our police and they failed Queenslanders.

Some matters identified during this review have been referred by the QPS to the Crime and Corruption Commission. The QPS independent financial review has exposed a decade of financial mismanagement and governance failures within the Queensland Police Service under the former Labor government. It found that without intervention the structural deficit would have blown out to an estimated $400 million. Overspending, weak financial controls and unfunded unsworn staff were among key Labor failures. The former Labor government turned a blind eye to the warning signs and reports. We now know that back in 2022 the Queensland Treasury Corporation conducted a QPS phase 1 financial sustainability review which found that, with no intervention, the operating deficit could be as high as $315 million by 2031. As the report states, the findings and recommendations of this review were ignored. This report was never publicly released; it was hidden by the former Labor government. I am calling on the opposition leader to release this secret report.

Instead of stepping in, the former Labor government told the QPS to put it on the credit card. There was no respect for taxpayers' money; there was no accountability. The former failed Labor police minister either did not care or was inept. This review is a turning point for the QPS. It builds on the work done as part of the commissioner's 100-day review. The report makes 21 key recommendations, which are focused on financial management, governance and procurement capabilities. The Crisafulli government and the QPS will now work through these recommendations and undertake the necessary reforms. I want to reassure all QPS members, both sworn and unsworn, that there will be no redundancies, all contracts will be honoured and there will be no changes to operational shift allowances.

The Crisafulli government is committed to making Queensland safer. We need a police service that is well resourced and focused on the front line. We want every QPS officer to be proud of the organisation. The Crisafulli government backs our police. Labor failed them.

Victims of Crime

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.52 am): The review tabled by the police minister makes for sobering reading. It paints a clear picture: Labor lost focus on supporting frontline police and instead mismanaged and redirected funds. Funding that was intended for frontline policing did not reach our frontline police officers. This is shameful—and it was at a time when communities were dealing with Labor's youth crime crisis and were calling for more police and stronger laws. Queenslanders rightly expect that when governments commit funding for frontline police that funding will deliver more officers on the beat, more investigators solving crime, more police protecting our communities. The QPS independent review makes clear that this expectation was not met under the previous Labor government.

This is in stark contrast to the Crisafulli government's approach. We promised Queenslanders we would restore safety where you live, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are rebuilding the front line, giving police the resources and tools they need to keep Queenslanders safe. We are delivering tougher laws to restore consequences for actions, and we are ensuring Queensland's worst criminals can remain behind bars for up to 10 more years. Under Labor, not only were our frontline police officers failed but also Queensland's parole system was severely mismanaged by their failed

corrective services ministers—ministers who oversaw a critical backlog of parole applications, presided over a Parole Board president being referred to the Crime and Corruption Commission and watched dangerous prisoners walk free into our communities.

Despite three Parole Board reviews, Labor fixed nothing. They left the Parole Board operating at half capacity. They put the rights of criminals ahead of the safety of victims and our community. That is not justice; that is a system in collapse, and Queenslanders paid the price. This Crisafulli government is putting victims first, putting community safety first and giving the front line the laws and resources they need to do their jobs.

The recommendations we have accepted out of the independent Parole Board review will make fundamental changes to how parole decisions are made in Queensland, and they put victims first. The Crisafulli government has transparently released the independent review of the Parole Board, just like we promised—unlike Labor, who kept their reviews secret from Queenslanders when they were in government. Even when the member for Murrumba was asked in opposition to provide those reviews to the independent reviewer, he refused. Labor kept their reviews secret; we are a government that believes in transparency and we have released those reviews so Queenslanders can read them.

The Crisafulli government is expanding restricted prisoner laws to apply to all prisoners serving a life sentence, meaning Queensland's worst of the worst offenders, the most violent and dangerous offenders—murderers, rapists, paedophiles—can remain behind bars for up to 10 more years. Under the Crisafulli government, victims will be better informed, better heard and better protected throughout the parole process. For the first time, community safety will be enshrined as the paramount consideration in Parole Board decision-making. These are extremely significant, nation-leading reforms that mean Queensland will have some of the toughest parole laws in the country which will keep the most violent and dangerous offenders behind bars for longer so we have fewer victims of crime. We prioritise the rights of victims, unlike the previous Queensland Labor government that prioritised the rights of criminals. The Crisafulli government is putting victims first, and we are seeing fewer victims of crime as a result.

CFMEU Inquiry

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.56 am): The Crisafulli government is taking a stand against the CFMEU. That is why we set up the commission of inquiry dealing with the bullying, the sexist remarks, the misogyny, the violence and the physical and verbal assaults on construction sites. For too long, too many people had to stand by and were not protected during the former Labor government's decade of decline. That is why we have extended the royal commission to go down every burrow it can to finally create a workplace and construction industry where people feel safe and are well paid—where they are able to go to work and go home to their families safely without the fear, intimidation and bullying from the CFMEU.

We have heard shocking allegations during the CFMEU inquiry. There have been allegations that it was covered up by former Labor ministers, particularly those ministers who served in industrial relations portfolios, of which there were two during the decade of decline. It gets worse. I can reveal to the House today that a report about the culture of the Office of Industrial Relations was commissioned in 2022 during the former Labor government. That report reveals findings of improper union influence, findings of misconduct and reports of violence and intimidation within the Construction, Compliance and Field Services of the Office of Industrial Relations. The report was completed in May 2023, a year and a half before the election. The report states—

> Aggression, intimidation, and some reports of physical and verbal violence from external stakeholders towards CCFS staff were commonly reported … Some inspectors reported significant trauma and anxiety symptoms of having been exposed to multiple instances of workplace Occupational Violence and Aggression.

Mr Speaker, 17.9 per cent of concerns raised were union related—the third largest complaint about our inspectors in the Office of Industrial Relations.

This report reinforces what we already knew about the culture of OIR under the former government. As one workplace health and safety director has reported to the commission of inquiry, since the Crisafulli government was elected the changes that have been made have already started to create a positive culture in the Office of Industrial Relations because we put our public servants before the CFMEU. I have a copy of the report and I am going to table it. The report was finished in May 2023 and I table it.

Tabled paper: Document, dated May 2023, titled 'Construction Compliance and Field Services Cultural Discovery Project: Report prepared for the Office of Industrial Relations' [858].

The question is: where has the report been and why did the former minister for industrial relations, the member for McConnel, not table the report? How is it that a new government can get a report that was commissioned by a former Labor government yet they not release the report that was commissioned under their watch? I can also reveal—you are going to want to hear this, colleagues—that between 2019—

Mr SPEAKER: I will just stop you. Member for Inala, it is extremely discourteous to stand there with your back to the chamber during ministerial statements.

Mr BLEIJIE: As a former premier used to say in this House every day, how rude!

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I say to the Premier that they are not talking about anything. They are just miming to each other. They are strategising for the big question time.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lytton, please resume your seat, thank you.

Mr BLEIJIE: I can also reveal that between 2019 and 2024 the former Labor government funnelled nearly $1.2 million to their mates in the Queensland Council of Unions to hold the annual Labour Day march. That averaged $237,000 per year and that should have been spent on workplace health and safety. That should have been spent on protecting workplace health and safety inspectors, who were being abused by the CFMEU. Instead, they spent $1.2 million so Labor members could march with their comrades. It gets even worse. In 2020, when there was no march because of COVID lockdowns, the Labor government still gave the QCU $122,375 to fund a 'personal research project' for working from home, paid for by the taxpayers. That year when they cancelled the march because of COVID, the former Labor government through the former industrial relations minister still gave the QCU $109,918 for a march that never took place.

I can advise the House that I have today written to the commission of inquiry into the CFMEU referencing all these matters and materials, including a copy of a Queensland Council of Unions document from 2004 which lists the QCU staff general secretary, Grace Grace, and finance administrative officer, Helen Burgess. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Document, undated titled 'Queensland Council of Unions' [859].

Housing Supply

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (10.03 am): The only way to turn around the housing crisis we inherited from Labor is to deliver supply, supply, supply. If we want more affordable homes, we need to unlock the supply of more homes across Queensland. That is only going to happen if sites are unlocked and if housing is easier, faster and more cost-effective to build.

On top of the Deputy Premier's landmark Residential Activation Fund, which has unlocked 98,000 lots so far and with many more to come, the Crisafulli government has secured a partnership with the federal government to deliver the enabling infrastructure needed to unlock a further 51,000 homes across our state. At least 20,000 of these new homes will be reserved for first home buyers to help them get into the market. This $2.4 billion agreement includes a $399 million investment from the Crisafulli government to deliver the roads, sewerage and other infrastructure which has been holding back housing supply for far too long. This will fast-track housing delivery in three priority development areas—two declared just last year by the Deputy Premier: Mount Peter in Cairns, Southern Thornlands in the Redlands and Waraba in the City of Moreton Bay.

Every extra home delivered helps ease the housing crisis we inherited. Each new development creates more opportunities for Queenslanders to own their own home. However, increasing supply will only happen if we take action to address the cost of delivering homes. For too long under Labor, with their failure to rein in the CFMEU, Queensland's construction sector was crippled by declining productivity and increasing costs, which put up barriers to getting projects out of the ground. We know that Queensland could have delivered around 77,000 additional homes since 2018 if construction productivity had kept pace—that is 77,000, member for Burnett. Instead, Queenslanders were left with higher costs, fewer homes and a housing system under unprecedented pressure.

For too long the former Labor government focused on announcements and interventions that made housing more expensive and harder to deliver. Labor's answer was mandates and targets on paper—hypothetical homes. A 20 per cent affordable housing mandate delivers exactly zero affordable

homes if those homes cannot be affordably built. Here is some maths that even the member for Gaven will be able to understand: zero per cent of zero equals zero. Queenslanders do not need homes existing in glossy brochures put up—

Mr Bleijie: Let her get her calculator out.

Mr O'CONNOR: Let her get her calculator out; I take that interjection. The member for Gaven needs to get her calculator out to figure that one out, which probably explains the housing crisis we are experiencing. It is because Queenslanders do not need homes existing in glossy brochures held up at press conferences by the member for Gaven. They need homes being actually delivered. That is why our government has taken a practical approach, working with developers to unlock supply, investing in infrastructure and increasing opportunities for home ownership. In fact, across our existing PDAs we are already exceeding our commitment in this deal with the federal government to reserve 30 per cent of homes for first home buyers. Our landmark deal with Canberra proves what can be achieved when a government focuses on delivery, not ideology.

We have already seen this week just how passionate the Deputy Premier is about the State of Origin. In fact, I do not think there is a member in this chamber more passionate about rugby league than the Deputy Premier. Unlike some contests, there can be no dispute about the result here. Queensland secured our housing deal before the Labor government in New South Wales did. In fact, the Deputy Premier secured this deal before Canberra's comrades in Victoria locked their agreement in.

Mr Bleijie: I'm not that close to the federal Labor Party.

Mr O'CONNOR: The Deputy Premier still got the results; I will give him credit for that. Housing approvals, commencements and completions are all up in double-digit numbers because we are getting on with the job, and we are just getting started.

In a further update on housing delivery, we will be building a Rockhampton youth foyer. I want to commend the members for Rockhampton and Keppel for their advocacy to get this important facility delivered in their community. That is the seventh of eight that we are committed to have underway in just our first term after Labor delivered just two foyers in their three terms in office. Foyers are so much more than just a roof over someone's head. They give young Queenslanders who are earning or learning the foundation they need to thrive and get on a pathway to a more stable, independent future. We said that we would secure Queensland's housing foundations, and that is exactly what we are delivering.

Rural Fire Service

Hon. A LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (10.09 am): Rural fire volunteers across Queensland are working with landowners to ensure properties are ready ahead of the fire season. These same volunteers continue to be available 24/7, ready to drop everything and help those same communities during incidents and times of crisis. They do amazing work and Labor's decade of decline hit them very hard. Under the members opposite, volunteer firey numbers fell by more than 7,800. Labor gave volunteers noncompliant vehicles and it stripped volunteers of autonomy. It did its best to disempower those who protect our regional communities.

The Crisafulli government is proud to be backing our volunteer firefighters. We have had many successes already. We are on track to deliver 106 rural fire vehicles this financial year. That is 500 per cent more than Labor's last full year in government. That is a new medium attack for Terry, Red and the crew at Guanaba which I handed over two weeks ago with the member for Theodore. It is new vehicles in the member for Maryborough's patch. It is new vehicles for the volunteers in the member for Mirani's electorate. It is a long-awaited new vehicle for the amazing volunteers in Doomadgee, and we even have vehicles going to Gladstone. We are also cleaning up Labor's rural fire shed backlog. The long-awaited Whetstone shed has been delivered in the member for Southern Downs's electorate and other rural fire stations like Biddaddaba and Mount Alford in the Scenic Rim are coming online very soon in the member for Scenic Rim's electorate. This is all on top of other work we are doing to revitalise the Rural Fire Service and the volunteers in that service. Although there is more work to do, we will keep backing those volunteers who back Queenslanders with the tools that they need to do their job.

Energy Prices

Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (10.11 am): Power prices in South-East Queensland are coming down and we are demanding the same be true for regional households and businesses. Tomorrow the Queensland

Competition Authority will hand down its final report into regulated power prices for regional Queensland for next financial year. It should follow that the QCA's determination reflects the default market offer—the DMO—released last month by the Australian Energy Regulator. South-East Queensland households on the flat rate standing offer will see prices fall by 7.2 per cent, while those on standing offer time-of-use tariff will see decreases of up to 10.7 per cent. Small businesses in the south-east will see reductions in power prices between 10.4 per cent and 14 per cent. These are the largest reductions in more than a decade and it is the biggest reduction of any DMO jurisdiction in the nation.

The QCA residential power price rose 29 per cent in the first year after the former Labor government's Energy and Jobs Plan—29 per cent in the first year after its plan. In contrast, in the first year after we released our Energy Roadmap, the final DMO—7.2 per cent to 10 per cent and 10.4 per cent to 14 per cent—shows that the Energy Roadmap is working to deliver affordable, reliable and sustainable power, just as we said it would, and we look forward to the QCA determination tomorrow.

By improving Queensland's existing assets while building what is needed for the future, the Energy Roadmap is putting downward pressure on power prices, optimising taxpayer investment and boosting private sector investment into renewables. That is backed by our government's $1.6 billion Electricity Maintenance Guarantee to properly maintain our energy generators after they were neglected by Labor in the decade of decline. The road map's pragmatic approach—with coal for longer, more gas and private sector investment into renewables—means that under the Crisafulli government's plan Queensland households are forecast to pay $1,035 less in avoided costs per household through to 2035 than what they would have paid under Labor. We have made the government's expectations clear to energy retailers operating in the south-east that the savings shown in the DMO must be reflected in Queenslanders' power bills from 1 July. It is a standard the government will hold itself to if the QCA reduces the regulated price for regional Queenslanders, and that is why today I can announce that I have already directed Ergon to pass on any savings in full to regional households from the QCA determination.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr JANETZKI: After a decade of decline under Labor, Queenslanders have been feeling the pressure of rising power costs. It is only right that, if the cost of energy falls, bills must fall too.

MOTION

Referral to Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.14 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 6 November 2026 on:

1. The operation and effectiveness of the councillor conduct framework in Queensland.
2. The committee should consider:
   (a) the effectiveness and efficiency of the Office of the Independent Assessor in dealing with complaints about the conduct of councillors;
   (b) the effectiveness and efficiency of the Councillor Conduct Tribunal in determining complaints about the conduct of councillors, with a particular focus on tribunal timeframes and resourcing;
   (c) alternative structural models for the Office of the Independent Assessor to deliver better consistency across government and stronger bespoke integrity support for councillors, including targeted training and integrity advice;
   (d) rights of review by parties with respect to decisions of the Councillor Conduct Tribunal, including the costs and timeframes associated with review options; and
   (e) any amendments to the Local Government Act 2009 or changes to the functions of the Office of the Independent Assessor or the Councillor Conduct Tribunal that the committee considers desirable for the effective operation of the councillor conduct framework.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.16 am.

Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting

Mr MILES (10.16 am): My question is to the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Was the minister or her department consulted on the reported Queensland Police Service review into the 2025 change to recording practices for victims of domestic and family violence?

Mr Bleijie: Labor's changes.

Ms CAMM: I take that interjection straight up from the Deputy Premier—the Labor changes to legislation that have been on the record many times in this House. I think the question that all of us on this side of the House in particular and, I am sure, domestic violence stakeholders, whom I engage with regularly, particularly on the back of Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, want to ask is this: who in the Labor opposition undertook consultation when it made the changes to the legislation? Was it the former police minister? As we heard earlier today from the current police minister, there have been some damning findings in terms of the oversight of the QPS under the former minister. Did he undertake consultation? Was it the many and varied different domestic violence prevention ministers who sat on the cabinet front bench in the former Labor government? What I will say, though, is that on this side of the House we do consult with stakeholders and we value their contributions.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms CAMM: I hear those opposite laughing about the need to consult with domestic violence stakeholders and the need to consult with those who are at the front line of supporting victims, and it is not funny. We know those opposite have no regard for putting victims first over perpetrators.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was not about matters in the past; it was about whether or not the minister was consulted on the QPS review.

Mr SPEAKER: Okay, so your point of order is relevance. Minister, that was the question.

Ms CAMM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the Manager of Opposition Business for further clarification referencing a review into legislation that the former Labor government changed. It is my experience that, when discussing with stakeholders, to my knowledge the former Labor government did not undertake consultation with those whom it needed to such as domestic and family violence service providers.

The other thing is: they would never have consulted with a domestic violence peak body because they had not planned to stand one up for several years—unlike the Crisafulli government, which has brought forward that work years in advance. The police minister and I have already brought reforms into this House with the rollout of PPDs and we will continue to strengthen reforms to protect victims. I know that members opposite do not like the fact that we have brought forward funding to stand up a peak body for domestic and family violence—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was not whether her department consulted others; it was whether her department was consulted about this review by QPS.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have 21 seconds to respond.

Ms CAMM: The question that those opposite do not want to give an answer to today is in respect of the four failed ministers who sit on the opposition front bench. They will not come out and answer questions on their failings of children, their failings in the child safety system. We call on those four former ministers to stand up today—

(Time expired)

Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Police. When asked about domestic and family violence recording practices in the House in March, the minister stated they were 'as they always have been'. I table emails released under RTI from Queensland police in response to a media inquiry stating 'while recording practices have changed'. Does the minister stand by his statement?

Tabled paper: Email, dated 2 March 2026, regarding non-offence DV occurrences—The Courier-Mail [860].

Mr SPEAKER: The minister wants to have a look at the document. Hold on for a second.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Pease interjected.

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

Opposition members: He can't read it.

Mr PURDIE: Yes, it is hard to read six-font in this short amount of time. The answer to those questions is clear: we made no changes. These questions should be directed to the former police minister—not me—because I did not change the legislation. These were amendments to—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is bordering on disorderly in relation to the member for Bulimba.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I call the police minister.

Mr PURDIE: I might be overdue for specs, but I did not know you could print in that small a font! The first line says 'that was introduced under the Queensland Community Safety Bill 2024'.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Bulimba is warned.

Mr PURDIE: We heard yesterday—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I would think you would like to hear the minister's response. I would.

Mr PURDIE: During the whole of question time yesterday we heard questions being directed to a minister about what was not in his portfolio. I am being asked questions about what the former minister for police passed in legislation. Seriously, how am I expected to answer questions for legislation that was tabled in 2024 under another minister? It was another government!

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker—

Mr PURDIE: I would like to hear how these standing orders apply to me.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order pertaining to relevance. The question was not about the former minister; it was about this minister's statement.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the point of order raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, the Minister for Police is clearly referring to the document and the information that is contained within that which references the legislation in 2024 under the former Labor government, so they are asking about their own record.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I will take some advice. As I heard it, the minister was referring specifically to the document in his hand that was tabled, so he is being relevant to the document that was part of the question. Minister, you have one minute and 28 seconds left.

Mr PURDIE: Another line I was trying to read talks about domestic violence investigation. It says—

These responsibilities remain unchanged and, in these situations, police maintain their role in investigating, taking necessary enforcement or protective measures, and fulfilling all related reporting requirements.

We now know that yesterday in questions they were relying on documents that were not necessarily in line with the question being asked. I would appreciate next time—if they are going to do this again—at least put it in a font that a human can read.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The members for Jordan, Aspley and Bundaberg are warned. All three of you are warned. You have ignored my requests for order, so I will start warning en bloc. The minister is directly referring to the document in his hand.

Mr PURDIE: I am starting to get a headache from trying to read this! Last time I answered multiple questions on this. I said pretty much in jest that I needed some butcher's paper and some crayon to explain it, but I actually think I might have to seek your leave this time to do it, Mr Speaker. We have answered these questions. This legislation was tabled and passed by a former government under a former minister. All day yesterday we heard a minister being asked questions that they were trying to make out were relevant. I was not the minister at the time the legislative amendments were made. I was not even in government; I was sitting in opposition. This is a change of legislation in 2024 that I am now being asked about. From some of the few lines I have been able to pick up in this document, it supports everything I have been saying.

Victims of Crime

Mr LISTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. Reports today have revealed that insurance claims for stolen cars in Queensland have seen the biggest reduction in a decade. What steps is the Crisafulli LNP government taking to make Queensland safer, and is the Premier aware of any approaches that saw the number of victims of crime rise during a decade of decline?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for Southern Downs for the question. I note his advocacy, particularly in the town of Goondiwindi, where he is having a magnificent go and fighting very hard for fewer victims of crime, which is the thing that drives us. The results the honourable member talks about are promising, but it is a glimmer of hope. It is a point to us to keep going, to keep focused on making sure there are fewer victims of crime. As a result of these figures, Queensland is no longer No. 1 as the car theft capital of the country, but we must keep going. The most pleasing part of the result is that the number of insurance claims for stolen vehicles in Queensland has fallen by 12 per cent. That is the biggest drop ever recorded, but we must keep going. It is off such a high base. Why? Now it is time for a history lesson for those opposite.

In 2016 those opposite walked into this place and watered down laws. On the back of that we have had a 101 per cent increase in stolen cars. There has been a 101 increase in vehicle claims, which is why the reduction of 12 per cent is just a start. We are no longer No. 1, because Victoria has assumed that position. We are building towards becoming the events capital of the country. It is only fair we give one title back to Victoria—they can be the car theft capital of this country. We have a long way to go in Queensland to get where we need to be.

Mr Healy interjected.

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

Mr CRISAFULLI: We might no longer be the car theft capital of the country, but we have a long way to go and we must keep going. Every change we make will be about stronger laws. Every investment will be about more early intervention, more rehabilitation, more police on the street. The next change to laws that will be coming into this House, if the members for North Queensland, Far North Queensland and Central Queensland have anything to do with it, will be bail reform. I say to those opposite: do not vote against it again. Tougher laws need to come in to drive it down. There will always be crime, but our focus must be fewer victims. We need more police to address that. That is our commitment.

Finally, I make this point to the insurers of this nation: pass on the savings. If numbers are falling Queenslanders should benefit. Do not pocket the savings. This report shows that insurance claims have risen by 2.5 per cent across the country, but they are down 12 per cent in Queensland so pass on the savings. Every insurer should cut a break for Queenslanders, pass the savings on and we will keep going with stronger laws in this state.

(Time expired)

Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting

Mr BUTCHER: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I table a draft media response by QPS released under RTI. I also table the final media response issued by QPS.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 2 March 2026, regarding non-offence DV occurrences—The Courier-Mail [861].

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 2 March 2026, by the Queensland Police Service titled 'Non-offence DV occurrences, The Courier Mail enquiry' [862].

Why did the final response to the media not acknowledge the impact the reporting change was having on victim numbers despite it being in the draft response?

Mr PURDIE: Mr Speaker, is that document being tabled?

Mr SPEAKER: Wait to get the document.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Education, I was on my feet. You well know the rules. You are warned under the standing orders. Minister, do you have the document?

Mr PURDIE: What I have just been shown is a QPS draft media statement which obviously does not come across my desk. We need to be very clear: of all the days for those opposite to come—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr J Kelly interjected.

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

Mr PURDIE: Of all the days for those opposite to come in here and try to muddy the waters on the work the police are doing to drive down victim numbers—and they did not believe the numbers when they were going up and up; they thought it was a media beat-up—now they are starting to go down they do not believe it. If they do not believe the Queensland Police crime statistics page, the Premier just spoke about the Insurance Council report today that was reported in the paper. How are they going to spin that—that we are now cooking the books with the Insurance Council? It was the biggest drop.

Mr Nicholls: What about the days of $100 million deficits?

Mr PURDIE: Exactly, as I tabled in parliament today. We know why the former police minister missed out on his spot on the opposition front bench and the allegations that are before the CCC, but the report I tabled today is a sad indictment on those opposite and their failed priorities. They failed to support the front line of our Queensland police. They failed across the board. In relation to these questions about domestic violence, as those opposite know Brett Pointing has now been elevated to Police Commissioner. He is now directly responsible for the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Command. As we have seen across all legislation when it comes to fighting crime and protecting victims in Queensland, the legislation of those opposite failed Queenslanders—whether it was around youth justice, whether it was watered down VLAD—across the board.

In direct response to their question, I have been briefed this morning about what they are talking about. The new commissioner, as the new direct boss of that command, has asked a question about their legislation—knowing that all their other legislation failed to protect victims—to ensure that the legislation was properly protecting victims of crime, particularly vulnerable victims of domestic and family violence, adults or children. We saw all the hype yesterday, where they were misrepresenting tabled documents, and we have all these questions we have answered before. It was their legislation that they tabled in 2024. I commend the new commissioner for having a closer look at that because across the board, whether it was drug laws, whether it was the Summary Offences Act, whether it was VLAD laws, whether it was with multiple amendments watering down the Youth Justice Act, they failed to protect victims. I commend the commissioner, as the person directly responsible for that DV command now, for asking the question of the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Command to ensure that their amendments in 2024 do not fail victims like all their other law enforcement amendments have over 10 years of decline under Labor.

Victims of Crime

Mr G KELLY: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Reports today have revealed that insurance claims for stolen cars in Queensland have seen the biggest reduction in a decade. How is the Crisafulli LNP government empowering our police to keep Queenslanders safe and can the minister outline any approaches that failed to do so during a decade of decline?

Mr PURDIE: What a great question! What a fantastic question! I am going to take this opportunity to give myself a bit of a shout-out because this morning, for the first time ever, I got a call from breakfast radio in Melbourne wanting to talk to me about what we are doing to give them the title of now being the stolen car capital of Australia, which they have taken off us. I said to Tom on morning radio in Melbourne that as much as Queensland loves taking titles off Victoria, like we did at the G just last September, this is a title we are happy to hand over to the comrades of those opposite in Victoria. He legitimately said to me, 'What have you done differently to what we are doing?'

The bells started ringing—I had been speaking for so long about all the things we are doing—and I had to cut it short. I made it quite clear to him that we are reprioritising our focus on the front line. We are giving police the laws back that the Labor government—like they have in Victoria—took off them. We saw a crime crisis explode in Queensland off the back of it. Over 10 years under those opposite the number of stolen vehicle claims in Queensland rose 100 per cent. What we saw in this report released today is that it is the biggest drop in a decade, 12 per cent, and now Victoria has taken the mantle of the stolen car capital of Australia, which they have taken off us. I was proud to be on the radio this morning telling everyone in Victoria the great work that we are doing holding perpetrators to account and refocusing our attention on the front line.

That brings me back to the report I tabled this morning, which really is dire reading. We knew with the Stones Corner issue that that potentially was the tip of iceberg and unfortunately we now know it was. It was the canary in the coalmine. The financial position of the QPS under those opposite was worse than anyone could have imagined—and they knew about it. The report references a 2022 report they commissioned. I am calling on the Leader of the Opposition to release their response to the report. What did they do about it to ensure the police were focusing all their attention on frontline policing? We are doing that. We are ensuring our police have all the resources they need to focus on driving crime down. We are supporting the front line so they can protect vulnerable women and children who might be a victim of domestic and family violence, victims of youth crime and those getting their houses broken into, their cars stolen or even their business robbed. I am proud to be part of a Crisafulli government that is rebuilding our front line after a decade of decline under those opposite. We now know that they not only watered down the laws but also failed to ensure the police were properly resourced and focused on frontline policing.

Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. The minister said that recording practices were 'as they always have been'. I table right-to-information documents from police that show the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Command instigated a review into QPS reporting, investigative practices and processes involving children. The minister said there were no changes. Why was this review instigated?

Tabled paper: Email, dated 17 March 2026, with the subject line 'Non-offence DV occurrences, The Courier Mail enquiry statement for advice' [863].

Mr PURDIE: I am pretty sure they will have put that in a font that no human can read so I will not waste anyone's time. I cannot be clearer. I do not know who is doing the strategy over there but we have already spent a day on this. The member for Waterford, who has asked this question, needs to go out and front the media, with their other failed former child safety ministers—

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, you are warned.

Mr PURDIE:—and either protect their reputations or apologise to the people of Queensland for the failures in that system. This member sat on her hands when calls to police for domestic and family violence in her electorate rose by about 400 per cent. She sat on her hands and did absolutely nothing.

As I have said before, we made no changes. The Community Safety Bill 2024 was passed by those opposite. I have had that legislation in front of me and I have read it. It is on the record. There is no denying it. I think the report in the *Courier-Mail* today even acknowledged that. These were their amendments, passed in 2024. Even the document they passed made it clear that, when it comes to making sure that every child, every vulnerable victim of domestic and family violence and victim of crime—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It occurs to me that the minister is debating the subject to which the question pertains and is not being relevant to the question about why the review was instigated in the first place.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is clearly being responsive to all elements of the question as asked. He is not debating the question. He should be allowed to continue because he is being responsive to the question and there is no debating the question whatsoever.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have the call.

Mr PURDIE: I had a quick look at the most recent document.

Mr SPEAKER: Respond to that. Members, the reason it is difficult to rule is that I cannot hear for the noise. Keep the noise level down.

Mr PURDIE: What I have just seen confirms what I said in answer to a previous question. After getting media inquiries, the commissioner, through the assistant commissioner, made a request to the department to assess the impacts of their legislative amendments to make sure no-one was falling through the cracks. Across the board, we have seen 10 years of failed legislation that did not keep victims of crime safe in Queensland. I mentioned before the Youth Justice Act. I do not have enough time to keep listing them. To his credit, off the back of their amendments and on the back of a media inquiry, the commissioner asked the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Command, which now works directly for him, to review the legislation and make sure no-one is falling through the cracks. I commend him for doing that.

For those opposite, I am happy to go through the statistics. Calls for domestic violence incidents rose by 218 per cent under them—over 200,000—and they did nothing about it. For a decade, the former president of the Queensland Police Union was on the record saying police were drowning in calls to service domestic and family violence incidents. We did not have the laws and resources, the policies and procedures to respond to the next victim sooner. They were failing victims of domestic and family violence because they did not have the proper resources and laws they needed to protect them. That is absolutely on the record. I have more to say and I am looking forward to answering the next question.

Victims of Crime

Mr STEVENS: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. Reports today have revealed that insurance claims for stolen cars in Queensland have seen the biggest reduction in a decade. What impact is the Crisafulli LNP government's decision to hold perpetrators to account having on victims of crime, and is the minister aware of examples where victims were not prioritised during a decade of decline?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Mermaid Beach for his question. He had a front-row seat to Labor's youth crime crisis when homes in his electorate were broken into, cars were pinched and people were terrorised by youth criminals under the previous Labor government. The member for Mermaid Beach is right: the report released by the Insurance Council of Australia is significant because it shows the largest drop in a decade of 12 per cent—a significant drop—in the number of stolen car insurance claims.

The member for Mermaid Beach asks about the laws the Crisafulli government has put in place to account for some of those drops. Our first act was Adult Crime, Adult Time. We have introduced three more tranches of that. That is legislation that those opposite voted against. Labor voted against the third tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time. Motor theft claims have fallen by 12 per cent. There were 6,900 claims in 2024 and 6,100 claims in 2025. That is significant because it means fewer victims of crime, fewer houses being broken into and fewer cars being pinched. Again, that is the largest percentage decrease this state has seen in a decade. The Insurance Council chief executive said—

> Queensland's motor theft claims count was once climbing faster than any other state.

Under Labor, the count was climbing faster than in any other state. The Insurance Council chief executive said—

> Queensland has reversed its car crime trend, proving it can be reduced.

That shows the impact of our strong laws. That shows the impact of more police on the beat. It is proof that we are delivering on our promise to restore safety where you live. We are making inroads when it comes to reducing the number of victims of crime in this state.

However, we will not take our foot off the pedal. We will continue to strengthen our laws because we know that Labor spent a decade weakening them. They spent a decade weakening the Youth Justice Act and failing to give police the resources they need. Under Labor's weak laws and with fewer police, youth crime continued to grow year on year. In fact, under Labor the number of stolen cars jumped 101 per cent and the number of break and enters was up 44 per cent. Under the Crisafulli government, the number of victims of crime is down 7.2 per cent and serious repeat offender numbers are down 17 per cent. That is the impact of a government that cares about victims and stronger laws.

Police Service, Data Reporting

Ms FARMER: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. I table a leaked police community sentiment analysis from 2026 that found there was 'widespread distrust' of statistics and 'claims that victim numbers were artificially reduced'. Will the minister now agree to Labor's calls to have all police statistics independently audited by the Queensland Audit Office?

Tabled paper: Document, undated titled 'Community Sentiment, Summary of Analysis' [864].

Mr PURDIE: I welcome the question from the member for Bulimba, who, as youth justice minister, proudly watered down the Youth Justice Act. We now know that she was not the architect—the architect was the member for Waterford—but she was the site supervisor. It is in *Hansard*. The minister for youth justice at the time proudly watered down the laws. Who can forget that 2019 ABC *Four Corners* report into 90 young people in maximum security in the Brisbane City watch house?

Now the member is asking us about public perceptions of crime. When they were in government and when that member was a minister, she proudly, on multiple occasions, watered down the laws. We will tie this into the stats because I am happy to point to them. If they want to get out their iPads, they can type in 'www.queenslandpolice.qld.gov.au/maps-and-statistics'. They obviously did not know how to do that in government. Anyone can have a look. Anyone playing along at home, get out your iPads and have a look.

When that member was a minister and proudly watered down the laws, crime started going up, and as crime started going up and people were concerned about it—there was a public perception that people were not only not feeling safe but also legitimately unsafe under that youth justice minister—they denied it. They denied it! As crime was going up, by double digits, year on year on year—193 per cent—they did not know how to look up the numbers; they blamed it on a media beat-up.

When the Leader of the Opposition was premier he said, 'Oh, the media are fixated on CCTV and crime.' We could go across the board with all of those opposite. Hopefully they wrote down that internet address where they can have a look for themselves. When that member proudly watered down the laws—and it is in *Hansard* on multiple occasions where she was proud to be part of a 'progressive government'—they were prioritising rehabilitation in communities over going tough on crime. It had dire consequences for Queensland.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba!

Mr PURDIE: And now that member is asking me about public perceptions of safety and crime. For 10 years our police and communities across Queensland were calling out and were warning, particularly that member when she was the minister, that her watered-down laws were having dire consequences, so for her now to come in here and ask us about public perception of safety is galling.

Mr SPEAKER: Just before I call the member for Redcliffe, member for Bulimba, you were on a warning. You can leave the chamber for a period of one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Bulimba withdrew from the chamber at 10.50 am.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Jordan was also on a warning and was constantly interjecting on the minister in relation to that. I draw that to your attention as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Jordan, were you interjecting?

Ms MULLEN: No, Mr Speaker, I was not interjecting.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will be reviewing the tape.

Cost-of-Living Relief

Ms DOOLEY: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. Ahead of this month's budget, can the Treasurer update the House on how the Crisafulli LNP government is helping Queenslanders with cost-of-living pressures, and is the Treasurer aware of alternate policies that would cause householders to pay more?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. Our first budget was dedicated to delivering targeted, timely, responsible and recurrent cost-of-living support for Queenslanders who need it most. I will contrast that with those opposite. Let's look at it. Play On! vouchers were left unfunded by those opposite; we funded them permanently. With regard to the car registration discount, they did not fund it beyond the electoral bribe that it was. Those opposite were cutting 50-cent fares. In our first budget we permanently funded them. They were ending them; we permanently funded them. We also invested in the—

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Ferny Grove, that was uncalled for. You are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: At a time when they cruelly froze the vulnerable household energy rebate, they were putting precisely zero in the forwards for energy rebates, spending more on advertising on the budget papers than actually caring for our most vulnerable. That was their record. That is the contrast.

In opposition, we spoke regularly about structural cost-of-living support and the necessity to invest into long-term structural reforms that were necessary to put downward pressure on cost of living. We are seeing that. In the first year after they released their Energy and Jobs Plan, regional power prices went up 29 per cent. In contrast, the DMO has gone down between 7.2 per cent and 10.7 per

cent in our first year since the Energy Roadmap, and the QCA's regional determination is being made tomorrow. I have already directed Ergon Energy to ensure that any savings there are passed on to regional Queensland. That is a 40 per cent turnaround from the plan under those opposite to ours. That is structural cost-of-living relief.

Today we see the comments from the Insurance Council of Australia. We always said that if you put downward pressure on crime, you would see a reduction in insurance premiums, and today the Insurance Council of Australia has made it clear that Queensland's motor theft claims count, which was once climbing faster than any other state, is reducing. Queensland has reversed its car crime trend, proving it can be reduced. It has been reduced because of the leadership from us on this side of the House—the Premier, the Attorney-General, the police minister and the youth justice minister.

Today I can advise the House that I have written to the Insurance Council of Australia asking that the risk assessment processes be considered to ensure that Queensland policyholders, who are now seeing the reduction in car theft across the state—that is work to be done—have any benefit passed on to them by insurers. We will always fight for structural cost-of-living support. I table the letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 4 June 2026 from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership, Hon. David Janetzki, to Executive Director and CEO, Insurance Council of Australia, Mr Andrew Hall, regarding insurance affordability [865].

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Stafford.

Mr Vorster: The Greens member for Stafford.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Burleigh, you know the protocol around questions: they are to be heard in silence. You are warned.

Domestic and Family Violence, Data Reporting

Mr RICHMOND: My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister publicly release the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Command review into QPS reporting, investigative practices and processes involving children?

Mr PURDIE: I welcome the question from the member for Stafford, his first question, but I suppose our first question is: is he going to apologise to the people of Stafford and the House for perpetuating a lie? It did not say 'a delay' on the corflutes when we were out there, and I think the member for Waterford is now on the record—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on the unparliamentary language.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, that is unparliamentary. I ask you to withdraw that statement.

Mr PURDIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker, I withdraw. The premise of the question does still remain because it did not say 'delay' on any of the corflutes that I saw, so maybe he can address that another time in parliament.

I have already answered the question multiple times this morning. The body of work which is being done is what the police have replied to in the RTI. The commissioner has asked the unit to ensure their legislation in 2024 is not potentially failing any victims of domestic and family violence. That is the extent of the body of work. I have no doubt the commissioner has good intentions for doing that. We want to ensure—and as I said back months ago when I was asked these questions—the Queensland Police Service will continue to prioritise the protection of vulnerable women and children, particularly those who are suffering from domestic and family violence. For every child, every aggrieved person, every victim who is assaulted or against whom a crime is committed, every complaint that is made will be thoroughly investigated by police, actioned and recorded.

I go back to the answer I gave to the first question. These were legislative amendments passed in 2024 under those opposite.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Inala, you are warned.

Mr PURDIE: I do not know how many times I can answer the question. The commissioner has asked that department to make sure no-one is falling through the cracks. I cannot be any clearer. In stark contrast, under those opposite domestic violence incidents rose by 218 per cent in Queensland. Every three minutes our police were responding to a call from a victim of domestic and family violence. That figure rose year on year under those opposite and they did nothing. When Steve Gollschewski was appointed commissioner, in a rare display of passion and desperation he publicly said that he had

spoken to the government and begged them for the laws and resources police need to keep people safe. We are doing that. We will continue to do it. We will make sure the police have the resources to respond to vulnerable victims of domestic violence and get to the next victim sooner.

Child Safety System

Mr DALTON: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. Can the Attorney explain how the Crisafulli LNP government is taking action to reform our child safety and justice systems, and is the Attorney aware of any alternative approaches?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for Mackay, who has been a tireless advocate for many years, even before coming into this House, for the protection and safety of children in his communities of Ireland and now Mackay. The hardworking and dedicated police officers across this state are now being resourced properly, thanks to the Crisafulli government. We now have more police on the beat, and I acknowledge their hard work.

It is interesting because I have been asked about alternatives as well. I can tell the House what we have done today. The Minister for Child Safety, Minister Simpson and I will be getting to work, as I have alluded to. We have the cabinet subcommittee. We have a massive challenge ahead of us: to fix Labor's broken child safety system. After 10 years and five failed ministers we have one broken child safety system. We are up for that massive challenge. Labor had five failed former ministers. I know why the member for Jordan is so hot and sweaty today and disrespecting the Speaker. I will tell the House why: the pressure that is mounting under the collar of the member—

Ms MULLEN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the member's comment and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence, Minister.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. I know why the member for Jordan is so upset in the House today. The pressure that is mounting—

Ms MULLEN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the member's comments and ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence, Minister.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. I can tell the House why the member for Jordan is under so much pressure today. The members for Jordan, Waterford, Bulimba and Nudgee need to go outside this House and front the media.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, just to be clear that you heard me, you are warned.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The members for Nudgee, Waterford, Bulimba and Jordan need to go outside of this House and explain to the people of Queensland why they left our most vulnerable children in the state that they did. It is left to the Crisafulli government to fix their mess.

Ms Camm interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection; they should apologise to the children of Queensland, the children who were let down by the failed former child safety ministers—the last one being the member for Jordan. It is no wonder the member for Jordan is so upset in this House today.

Ms MULLEN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence at the member's comments and ask that they be withdrawn.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. I can say this: the children and parents who have contacted us through this commission of inquiry are offended. They take offence. They take offence at the way they were treated by successive Labor governments under Palaszczuk and then Miles. The member for Waterford was a minister. The member for Jordan refuses to go outside of this House and answer questions, but today is the day. Queenslanders deserve answers from the five failed ministers of the former government.

(Time expired)

Gas Industry

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development. Queensland industry is forced to pay around $16 a petajoule for gas on the global market while competitors pay $6, thanks to their respective

government's policy. Queensland's production is less than six per cent of the world market and there are negligible new production announcements. Does the minister continue to maintain the former Labor government's position of there being no price-capped domestic gas reservation policy in Queensland?

Mr LAST: I thank the member for Traeger for that question. Gas is certainly a good news story in Queensland. We have plenty of gas. When they talk about the east coast gas crisis, I like to say it is a southern state gas crisis. We have plenty of gas in this state, and we are more than willing to pipe that gas into the southern states to meet their needs.

The recent policy position of the federal government on a 20 per cent gas reservation means that Queensland will be severely disadvantaged. Out of all of the states in Australia, Queensland is the one that is doing the heavy lifting when it comes to gas supply in this country. That announcement by the federal Labor government will have a significant impact on our gas supplies going forward and the confidence of gas companies to invest in this state. Yesterday we met with a gas company that wants to do business in this state. Off the back of that announcement by the federal government it is now reconsidering whether to do that because its profitability would be in jeopardy. Instead of being a good news story that will continue going forward, that announcement has put a cloud over the industry in Queensland.

I have two words for the member for Traeger: Taroom Trough. The member for Traeger talks about there being a lack of drilling and a lack of investment. There is massive interest in that particular basin. If I had—

Mr O'Connor: Where's the sample?

Mr LAST: The sample is still under my pillow.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think most of the noise is coming from behind you, Minister.

Mr LAST: They are a bit excited about this oil, Mr Speaker, and I do not blame them. That is a good news story for this state. It comes down to sovereign capability. We want to control our own destiny in Queensland. We want to produce, store and refine.

We have made an announcement in the storage space. The Premier and I talked about increased storage capacity in Queensland. We are doing an audit of all of our ports along the coastline because we want to expand that 30 days out to 60 days. We want to expand that out to 60 days. We are going to continue.

We have opened up 21 new tenements. We are going through the latest round, and we received bids on all of those tenements, including those tenements which are restricted to domestic gas supply. To their credit, those gas companies are bidding on those tenements because they know that they have to look after Queensland first, and that is exactly what they are doing. They are looking after Queensland first because they know that they have a government that is supporting them and standing shoulder to shoulder with them.

Victims of Crime

Mrs POOLE: 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 showing leadership and taking action against unlawful behaviours across Queensland, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Mundingburra for her question. She has served on the front line herself in combating Labor's youth crime crisis in her own area in North Queensland. She was elected on a platform of doing everything we can to undo a decade of decline under the Labor Party, and that means getting rid of the watered-down youth justice laws.

As has been detailed today, Queensland is not the car theft capital of Australia; that title has gone to a southern state—Victoria. So many Victorians are moving to Queensland not only for the bright sunshine but also for the great government that will protect them. Victim numbers are dropping, but, as the Premier said, there is more to do.

If we look at the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry that the honourable Attorney and Minister Camm have undertaken, four failed child safety ministers sit over there still in shadow cabinet. They have many questions to answer. They need to front the media today about the accusations that were made about their government under their tenure when they were ministers in the Labor government. They failed kids. They failed Queenslanders. Now they owe them an explanation. So, too, does the

member for McConnel, if we are talking about commissions of inquiry. The document I released today—the secret document that was published in the department about the OIR in 2013—why didn't she table it? Why hasn't she spoken about the cultural issues when she was industrial relations minister? Yet she sits in the shadow cabinet of the opposition leader.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: still as the industrial relations shadow minister. How can she sit there as the shadow minister for industrial relations with what we have seen come out of the commission of inquiry? More to the point, it is about the leadership of the opposition leader. I say this: the failed experiment of the member for Murrumba being the opposition leader is over. He has failed spectacularly. Don't take my word for it. Ask a couple of Labor colleagues who gave the *Courier-Mail* quotes. One Labor MP said, 'We can't keep going with that (30 per cent vote), that's bad. Certain people have to come to that realisation.' Usually it is the leader who has to come to that realisation. Another Labor MP said, 'It is a dire situation under Miles leadership.'

Let me talk about the leadership of the opposition leader. We have a member in here who was clearly elected on a mistruth. The member for Stafford put out mistruths and misleading statements that the LNP were cutting 93 beds from the Prince Charles Hospital. It has been proven today, with two senior shadow ministers forced to withdraw the comments they made in this House, that he was elected on a mistruth, perpetuated by the Leader of the Opposition. He was happy to go out there and spread the lies. I withdraw. He was happy to go out there and spread the mistruths. He now needs to apologise to the people of Stafford for that mistruth.

(Time expired)

Wolston Park Hospital

Mr McCALLUM: My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister publicly apologise on behalf of the state to the victims who suffered abuse at the Wolston Park mental hospital?

Mr NICHOLLS: I will certainly respond to the member for Bundamba's question. I think the real question is: will the opposition apologise for the mistruths they told in the Stafford by-election more than 180 times that saw—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, you have the call.

Mr NICHOLLS: Will they apologise for the mistruths, for the shameful fear campaign—and we know they are experts at a fear campaign. They are 19 months in and not one new policy, not one new idea. All they have is complaints and fear. All they can do is talk about it. When I read the story in the *Courier-Mail* about Labor members saying how terrible opposition was and how awful it was for them—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Pine Rivers is warned.

Mr NICHOLLS:—I wondered who it was. I did not think it was the member for Bundamba, but it could have been.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is a very serious question. I am advised that the survivors of Wolston Park are in the gallery. None of the response has been relevant whatsoever. I ask you to draw the minister back to giving a serious answer to a serious question.

Mr SPEAKER: The point of order on relevance is relevant. Minister, you have one minute and 39 seconds remaining.

Mr NICHOLLS: Indeed, Mr Speaker. We released a report into the events at Wacol a considerable time ago. In fact, if memory serves me, it was released at the end of last year. There were recommendations made in that report. That report was undertaken very thoroughly. It was, as I said at the time, a disturbing report. It reported on the incidents that occurred in relation to those who were placed in the care of the state in that institution. Not unlike the report of the commission of inquiry that has been released in the last 48 hours, it shows what happens when governments get it wrong. That occurs. It would not surprise me if in due course we have to have a similar inquiry into what happened under the child protection system that those opposite managed over the last 10 years which saw those numbers go through the roof. That commission of inquiry made a number of recommendations. Those recommendations have been accepted. It was commissioned and accepted. The government's response to that commission of inquiry has been fully published.

I do certainly want to acknowledge the trauma, the upset and the harm that was the case in all of those matters that were investigated. The second part of that report, which detailed those harrowing stories of personal incidents, was challenging for everyone.

(Time expired)

Queensland Day

Miss DOOLAN: My question is to the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation. How is Queensland Day helping to promote our state's pristine environment, diverse tourism opportunities and major events, and is the minister aware of any approaches that neglected Queensland's environment and tourism sector during a decade of decline?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute.

Mr POWELL: I certainly can. I thank the member for Pumicestone for the question. Queensland Day is one of those great opportunities when we get to stop and reflect on what makes this the greatest state in the greatest nation.

We found out yesterday that, when it comes to all of the best, we have the best beaches around our state. Mooloolaba Beach was voted Queensland's favourite beach, followed by Noosa Main Beach and then Whitehaven Beach in the Whitsundays. Queenslanders also voted for their favourite camping and four-wheel drive destinations with Gordon Country, Hold It Flats and Double Island Point amongst the best the state has to offer. When it comes to attractions, Queenslanders chose the Savannahlander, Australia Zoo and the Toowoomba Carnival of Flowers.

In the time left, all I can say is that this Saturday is Queensland Day. It is Mega Round. Get out to the NRL, get out to the AFL, get out to the netball and get out to the racing and celebrate everything it is to be a Queenslander.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (11.17 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, the Mental Health Act 2016, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Act 2024, the Public Health Act 2005, the Public Health Regulation 2018, the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 [866].

Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes [867].

Tabled paper: Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights [868].

The Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 makes a number of important and practical amendments across Queensland's health portfolio. As is often the case with health legislation, the bill deals with a range of matters. The bill supports the delivery of essential, new health infrastructure. It protects the independence of community pharmacies, it strengthens safety for frontline clinicians and staff working in our mental health services, it improves public health reporting and school immunisation follow-up, and it supports the continued enforcement of Queensland's nation-leading tobacco and vaping laws.

After a decade of the former government's mismanagement, budget blowouts and delays, as highlighted in the independent report into the former Labor government's failed and underfunded capacity expansion program, the Crisafulli government is getting on with the job of delivering the health infrastructure Queenslanders need under our funded Hospital Rescue Plan. Through our Hospital Rescue Plan we are delivering the largest ever investment in hospital infrastructure in Queensland's history. We are building new hospitals, expanding existing hospitals and delivering health infrastructure right across metropolitan, regional and rural and remote Queensland.

Delivering major infrastructure projects starts well before construction begins. Long before the first shovel hits the ground and before anyone pulls on high-vis, the land needed to support these projects must be secured. The reality is that land acquisition can be a lengthy and complex process. At present, Queensland Health relies on a centralised model under which land acquisitions are managed on its behalf by another department. While this arrangement works well across government, the size and scale of our investment in new hospital infrastructure requires dedicated powers and a process run by Queensland Health. Where projects are complex, where communities are growing rapidly and where timing matters, Queensland Health needs the ability to drive these acquisition activities itself.

The bill therefore amends the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011 to enable the chief executive of Queensland Health to acquire land for health infrastructure purposes. Importantly, these amendments recognise the broad range of purposes needed to support modern health infrastructure because modern health care increasingly relies on integrated health precincts rather than ad hoc, isolated and standalone hospital buildings—the specialist cancer treatment facilities, cutting-edge diagnostic imaging machines, rehabilitation and recovery services, teaching and research facilities, and logistical and ancillary services that keep our hospitals, the people who work in them and the consumers and patients who visit them, running. These are all needed to deliver contemporary models of care.

These amendments will allow Queensland Health to take the lead in securing the land needed to support these projects and better align acquisitions with planning and delivery. It will allow closer engagement with the very hospital and health services running our hospitals. The hospital and health services and their local boards know their communities and will help ensure local needs and circumstances are considered throughout the process. Most importantly, it will help enable critical health infrastructure projects to keep progressing without unnecessary delay.

These are important and necessary reforms; however, land acquisition, particularly compulsory acquisition, is not something this government will ever approach lightly. For affected landowners and their families these processes can have very significant impacts. Queenslanders rightly expect strong protections and a fair process. The bill embraces the safeguards established under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967, ensuring landowners have well-established protections including: the full opportunity to object to proposed acquisitions; the right to have any concerns considered; and the entitlement to fair and just compensation where acquisitions proceed. Supporting a growing state means planning and delivering the hospitals and health infrastructure communities need. These amendments will help ensure Queensland Health is better placed to secure the land needed to support that work.

Delivering hospitals and health services is one part of a strong health system; protecting the institutions Queenslanders rely upon is another, so I am now turning to the amendments to the Pharmacy Business Ownership Act 2024. The Crisafulli government supports the community pharmacy model here in Queensland which has demonstrated its effectiveness in delivering accessibility to primary care for millions of Queenslanders.

The Pharmacy Business Ownership Act, drafted and passed by the then Labor government, prohibits pharmacy businesses from being located in, or directly accessible from, supermarkets; however, these restrictions do not apply in the online environment. This legislative gap means that pharmacy businesses can partner and affiliate with supermarkets online—a practice that threatens to weaken the community pharmacy model and risks jeopardising the independence of our community pharmacies.

This bill amends the licensing framework under the Pharmacy Business Ownership Act. The effect of the amendments is to clearly and categorically prohibit promotional arrangements between supermarkets and pharmacy businesses in the online environment. This prohibition will give effect in the digital world to what already exists and is broadly accepted in the physical world. This will be enforced by the Queensland Pharmacy Business Ownership Council, which will be required to refuse a licence to own a pharmacy business if a prohibited promotional arrangement is in effect. These provisions are designed to operate broadly, prohibiting any arrangement under which the same electronic or digital channel is being used to promote both a supermarket business and a pharmacy business.

The prohibition is not limited to formal or written agreements. It also applies to other agreements, understandings or coordinated conduct which may be inferred from all the circumstances. Whether through websites, digital platforms, social media or other electronic communications, the bill ensures the policy intent of Queensland's pharmacy ownership framework cannot be sidestepped simply because interactions increasingly occur online.

The Pharmacy Guild of Australia supports these changes and describes them as 'a significant measure that will strengthen protections for pharmacy business ownership and uphold the viability of the community pharmacy model in Queensland'. These changes fix up a legislative loophole and reaffirm the Crisafulli government's commitment to an independent pharmacy sector.

The bill also makes a range of amendments to the Mental Health Act 2016. In line with this government's commitment to better support and protect our frontline health workforce, the bill introduces a legislative requirement for the Chief Psychiatrist to issue a binding policy in relation to the safety and security of our hardworking frontline staff. The mandatory policy, which will be binding on all hospital and health services, will help to provide clear guidance and protocols on how to appropriately identify and address any security concerns when patients are transferred to authorised mental health services from custodial settings.

Separately, the bill ensures staff and members of the Mental Health Review Tribunal can disclose confidential information when necessary to prevent serious risk of harm, consistent with hospital and health services. The bill also clarifies that a person who is directed by the Chief Psychiatrist on their own initiative to attend an examination to inform a psychiatrist report may be lawfully detained for an initial period of 24 hours, up to a maximum of 72 hours, in order for the examination to occur. The bill includes several safeguards to ensure this power is exercised appropriately.

The bill makes a range of other operational and technical amendments to improve the administration and effectiveness of the Mental Health Act. Alongside these reforms, the bill also makes several practical improvements designed to strengthen the operation of our broader public health framework.

The bill makes two main amendments to the Public Health Act 2005 to build on the notifiable conditions framework and improve Queensland's free and voluntary School Immunisation Program. Currently, if a condition is made notifiable all types of pathology tests for that condition must be reported by a pathology laboratory, even if these test types do not provide helpful information. To reduce the burden on notifiers, the bill amends the Public Health Act to provide the ability to limit notifications only to test types that provide clinically meaningful information.

The bill also supports another important public health objective: increasing voluntary participation in Queensland's free School Immunisation Program. These amendments ensure hospital and health services that deliver these programs can obtain information from their contracted service providers to support follow-up activities such as keeping track of unreturned consent forms and sending reminders to parents. I stress again that this is part of our voluntary program. While this change is administrative in nature, the potential to increase the uptake of free immunisation is important to keep our young people safe.

Finally, over the last 18 months the Crisafulli government has implemented nation-leading reforms to tackle the tobacco and vape black market. We have introduced record fines, we have closed down more than 270 illegal stores and we have seized record amounts of illegal products—millions of illicit products totalling well over $100 million in street value. However, we are unfortunately becoming a victim of our own success. With these unprecedented seizures come storage pressures. Following last year's amendments, any vapes seized by our enforcement officers are forfeited to the state and can be destroyed swiftly, reducing the burden on our public health units to store these dangerous products. By contrast, illicit tobacco and products like nicotine pouches must be stored for a minimum of eight weeks due to the mandated show cause and appeal periods under the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998.

This bill makes a clear and decisive change. These products will now—just like vapes—be immediately forfeited to the state. This allows for their swift destruction, easing pressure on storage facilities and supporting ongoing robust enforcement. I will not be surprised if other jurisdictions soon follow our lead on this, as they have done before, like New South Wales, Victoria and many other states.

From supporting the delivery of critical health infrastructure to protecting community pharmacy, strengthening frontline safety for our hardworking staff and improving important public health functions, this bill responds to practical issues across our health system. Together, these reforms will help ensure Queensland's legislative framework continues to support the services, staff and communities that rely upon it.

First Reading

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (11.29 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Health, Environment and Innovation Committee

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

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MANAGING E-MOBILITY USE AND PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 3 June (see p. 1700), on motion of Mr Mickelberg—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr KEMPTON (Cook—LNP) (11.30 am), continuing: Children aged between 12 and 17 years will still be able to ride e-mobility devices under the direct supervision of a parent or guardian. Medical exemption frameworks will apply for individuals unable to hold drivers' licences for legitimate medical reasons, and exemptions may also be prescribed for recreational settings such as rail trails and mountain bikes. The amendments also recognise compliance with European standard EN15194 and establish an assurance scheme with Transport and Main Roads oversight to certify compliant e-bikes across Queensland. This provides certainty for consumers, clarity for retailers and, importantly, confidence for enforcement agencies.

The bill also strengthens pedestrian safety by introducing a 12-kilometre-per-hour speed limit on footpaths when riders are passing pedestrians on shared paths. People should be able to enjoy shared pathways safely, whether they are walking, pushing a pram, exercising, mobility impaired or riding lawfully. The bill further establishes blood alcohol concentration limits for e-mobility and bicycle riders and allows police to conduct random breath tests on roads, paths and public places. The legislation also rightly places accountability on retailers and suppliers by introducing offences for selling illegal devices or selling devices to children under the age of 16. The bill also provides real enforcement mechanisms.

I am proud to be part of a committee and a government that leads the way in providing certainty in the use of e-mobility devices. Unlike Mulga Bill's shiny new machine and despite Labor's despicable scare campaign, this bill will not end up in Dead Man's Creek but will rather lead the way in protecting younger lives and making our communities safer. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (11.32 am): Today I rise to speak on a matter that goes to the heart of public safety, government responsibility and the daily lives of Queenslanders—the escalating e-mobility crisis that has unfolded under the watch of the Crisafulli LNP government. Before I get into the body of the debate, I note that the amendments introduced are substantial and it would have been good policy for there to be consultation and scrutiny on these amendments. Let me be clear from the outset. This is not a theoretical issue and it is not a distant policy debate; this is a crisis that is unfolding right now on our streets, in our hospitals and in our communities. It is a crisis measured not just in statistics but in broken bones, lifelong injuries and lives tragically cut short. In 2025 alone, more than 2,000 Queenslanders presented to emergency departments with e-mobility injuries. That is a 23 per cent increase on the previous year and a staggering 45 per cent increase on 2023. Even those figures, we are told, capture only a fraction—just 25 to 30 per cent—of the true scale of harm occurring across our state. I understand that 14 people have lost their lives. Among them were children—an eight-year-old and a 15-year-old, young Queenslanders whose futures were taken in an instant. These are not numbers; these are families shattered, communities grieving and lives that will never be the same.

What has been the response of the Crisafulli government? Delay: delay in the face of rising injuries, delay in the face of mounting deaths, delay in the face of urgent warnings from doctors, police, local leaders and grieving families. Instead of acting decisively, the government chose to stretch a parliamentary inquiry over 333 days, almost an entire year. When the Labor opposition proposed a shorter 92-day inquiry so that safety measures could be introduced before Christmas, the government voted it down. There were 51 members who stood on the wrong side of that decision. When we called for immediate interim safety measures before the December shutdown, that too was rejected—another opportunity ignored, another chance to prevent harm dismissed. This is not leadership; this is negligence.

Stakeholders warned the government from the very beginning that the timeframe was incompatible with the urgency of the crisis. Police urged the government to fast-track its response. Medical experts warned of increasingly severe injuries, with head trauma, complex fractures and lifelong consequences. Road safety advocates said we had reached a tipping point. Still the government chose to wait. This is proof that, under the Crisafulli LNP government, Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own fractures. Even grieving parents begged for action. Jason Gagg, who lost his 17-year-old son, said it plainly: 'It's absolutely ridiculous to wait.' He said that the government needed to act now. However, the Crisafulli government did not act. Every day of delay has had consequences—real consequences, preventable consequences.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Members on my right.

Mr RUSSO: Let us be clear about how we got here. This crisis did not emerge in a vacuum; it is tied directly to regulatory failures—failures that have allowed high-powered, noncompliant devices to flood the market.

Government members interjected.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member has not taken one interjection during his contribution. You have warned that side of the House several times.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Waterford, I think I know where you are going with this. I appreciate you raising it, but I do not need your assistance with the chamber. Members on my right, your interjections are not being taken. I caution you to cease.

Mr RUSSO: Let us be clear about how we got here. This crisis did not emerge in a vacuum; it is tied directly to regulatory failures—failures that have allowed high-powered, noncompliant devices to flood the market. Once, Australia had a clear standard for e-bikes—low-powered, pedal-assist devices designed to integrate safety into shared spaces—but in 2021 those import standards were weakened. Queenslanders can now legally buy devices that are illegal to use. That fundamental gap between purchase and legality has created confusion, undermined enforcement and increased risk in our communities. Police have told us they cannot fix this alone. Enforcement is resource intensive, difficult and often ineffective, with riders avoiding engagement. Officers cannot easily identify illegal devices. Even impounding them presents safety risks. Yet, instead of addressing these upstream failures, the Crisafulli government has allowed the problem to worsen. This is not just about enforcement; it is about responsibility. It is about setting clear rules, ensuring safe products are sold, investing in infrastructure and educating the public.

While the government has failed to act, Queenslanders have been left confused. Parents do not know what devices are safe to buy, young riders do not understand the rules, communities are frustrated and confidence in the system is eroding. At the same time we must recognise the important truth: e-mobility itself is not the problem. Thousands of Queenslanders use safe legal devices responsibly every day. These devices reduce congestion, provide affordable transport and support active travel for many people, especially young people and low-income households. They are not a luxury; they are a necessity. As the cost of living rises—fuel, registration, insurance, parking—e-mobility offers a practical alternative. It helps people get to work, to school and to public transport. It makes our transport system more accessible and more affordable.

The government's failure to act has put both safety and affordability at risk. Instead of providing clarity, they have created uncertainty. Instead of protecting Queenslanders, they have exposed them to harm. Instead of supporting a growing mode of transport, they have undermined confidence in it. Solutions have been put forward—practical, evidence-based solutions: stronger import standards; point-of-sale enforcement; retrofitting existing devices for compliance; investment in separate infrastructure to keep riders, pedestrians and motorists safe; education campaigns to ensure everyone

understands the standard and the rules; technological solutions like geofencing and speed limiting; and better data collection to inform policy. These are not radical ideas; these are commonsense measures supported by industry, experts and community. They require one thing above all else—leadership—and that is what is missing.

The Crisafulli LNP government has had multiple opportunities to show urgency, to show responsibility, to show that it understands the gravity of this crisis, and each time it has chosen delay. Each time it has turned its back on Queensland.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, your interjections are not being taken.

Mr RUSSO: The Labor opposition stands with families who have suffered loss. We stand with those who have been injured. We stand with the communities calling for action and we say clearly that enough is enough. We say that the government must act and it must act now. It must respond urgently to the committee's recommendations and it must close the gap between what can be sold and what can be used. It must invest in safe infrastructure. It must educate the public. It must support police without shifting the burden onto them or onto local councils. It must do all of this while protecting transport affordability for those who rely on devices every day, because this is not just a safety issue; it is a fairness issue. It is about ensuring Queenslanders can get around safely, affordably and with confidence. Every delay has a cost—a cost measured in injuries and in lives, a cost measured in trust placed in the government.

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (11.42 am): I rise to support the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. I say to those on this side of the House: do not listen to the hypocrisy of those on the other side of the House. When we talk about delay, it was those opposite who delayed for the last decade, and the proof positive is these letters that I am going to table that I have been writing to those opposite since 2016.

I say to new MPs who hear the member for Toohey suggesting it is some sort of obfuscation on our part that has led to the delays here that I have letters that I wrote to the then minister for police, the member for Morayfield; the then minister for transport and main roads, the member for Miller; the acting minister who was the member for Murrumba, the now opposition leader; and the then member for Cooper, Kate Jones. I have a heap of them from February 2017, from 18 April 2016—right through 2017 and 2018. I wrote to a number of them, and I table those letters.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence from the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, and Surfers Paradise constituents concerned about e-bike and motorised scooter safety on the Gold Coast [869].

I wrote those on behalf of more than 270 constituents in my electorate of Surfers Paradise where young families, locals and tourists increasingly have to dodge high-powered e-scooters and noncompliant e-bikes because riders are travelling at unsafe speeds on footpaths that were never designed for that kind of use. I note that the member for Currumbin has had that issue arise in her electorate, as has the member for Burleigh. In fact, the Gold Coast is unique in Queensland in terms of having such a wide boulevard where tourists come. Increasingly, operators were bringing in these illegal bikes and there was no enforcement by police. Those four former ministers kept writing sop letters to me over the last decade.

I have also given a number of adjournment speeches about this very issue in the electorate—on 2 March 2017 and another on 26 February 2019 titled 'Motorised Scooters'. Then I spoke on 31 August 2022 on the Transport Legislation (Road Safety and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I asked a question on notice about how many speeding fines had been given; that was on 24 October 2023. On 20 August 2024 I again asked about fines for users of personal mobility devices. I table those.

Tabled paper: Bundle of papers regarding previous speeches and questions on notice by the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, concerning e-bike and motorised scooter safety [870].

What we hear from those opposite is them having a bob each way. They say, 'We don't want to do too much because people rely on these.' We know there are students in the gallery now who may well like to have the use of e-scooters. However, there are more than a dozen Queenslanders who have died, and the blood is on the hands of those opposite for not acting on this issue. In my own electorate, at the Broadbeach Surf Life Saving Club just last year a young man at three o'clock in the morning hit a concrete bollard, struck his head and died. We heard of a woman who died in a horror Surfers Paradise e-scooter crash. She was a 30-year-old foreign national living in the area. That was on 19 July 2024. I table some documents.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* online, dated 19 July 2024, titled 'Woman who died in horror Surfers Paradise escooter crash a 30-year-old foreign national living in area' [871].

This is all because those opposite refused to act. There were changes made by the then minister, the member for Miller. He would constantly say that they were making changes like making people use a bell, making people wear a helmet, making people not go more than 12 kilometres an hour. However, there was no enforcement and Queenslanders lost their lives. Our emergency wards and hospitals were overrun and those opposite did nothing. Those opposite coming in here and suggesting that somehow we have taken too long on this, when we have been in government for 19 months, is a damnation on those opposite. It is a condemnation of their lack of action. It is a major safety issue. Imagine being these families who have lost family members because of the lack of action of those opposite.

My electorate is tired. In places like Main Beach all the way through to Kurrawa, you take your life in your hands when you go on The Esplanade—that happens all the way through to the top of The Spit—because of reckless riders of illegal scooters and motorbikes. They need to be caught. They need to be stopped. I implore those children in the gallery—they will be able to ride with their parents but they are not going to be able to ride by themselves because we cannot rely on people to do the right thing. That is why I support this legislation. We have done something. Those opposite did nothing. I commend the bill to the House.

Dr O'SHEA (South Brisbane—ALP) (11.47 am): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill has attracted significant interest from the Queensland community. Almost 5,000 submissions were received during the committee process from stakeholder organisations, advocacy groups and members of the public. I thank the community for their thoughtful contributions as well as the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee and the committee secretariat for their work during the inquiry.

This bill arises from the earlier parliamentary inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland and attempts to address a range of public safety concerns raised by government agencies, stakeholder groups and community members in relation to these devices. Key changes in the bill include: setting a minimum rider age of 16 years and requiring riders to hold at least a valid learner driver licence; requiring shared e-mobility providers like e-scooter hire companies to ensure riders meet age and licensing requirements; revising e-mobility device definitions and safety standards, including compulsory compliance labelling and a maximum design speed of 25 kilometres per hour; and expanding law enforcement powers and offences to deter risky and illegal behaviour, including the ability to seize illegal or noncompliant e-mobility devices.

It has now been over one year since the government launched the committee inquiry which preceded this bill. In this time we have seen growing frustration about a lack of action to address safety concerns and avoid rising rates of e-mobility related injuries. In my own electorate of South Brisbane, my constituents regularly raise safety issues with me about these devices. They relate stories of rider accidents, collisions with pedestrians, near misses, of children and adults riding devices without helmets and footpaths strewn with abandoned e-scooters. Only recently a constituent told me their neighbour had become stranded in their motorised wheelchair due to a tangle of abandoned scooters on the footpath and was forced to wait for passers-by to come along and clear them so they could continue along the path. Our health professionals have also called for action to be taken. In its submission, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union stated that—

> ... the number of e-mobility related emergency department presentations is significantly rising, and figures may underestimate the true number of incidents. Evidence highlights that many incidents involve risky rider behaviour including riding with more than one person, not wearing helmets, exceeding the maximum speed limit and alcohol use ... The QNMU supports measures which deter riders from engaging in illegal and risky behaviour that contribute to preventable injuries.

The Australian Medical Association Queensland also highlighted the need to address these preventable injuries, stating—

> Injuries and deaths from the use of e-mobility devices, especially of children, have caused immense grief for families, communities and the doctors who treat them. Worse still is the fact that each one is preventable. Our overloaded emergency departments, public hospitals and private practices do not want to treat any more patients harmed from their use.

These statements are borne out by the data. Queensland Health reported to the parliamentary inquiry that there were more than 6,300 e-mobility related emergency department presentations in the year to March 2025, with over 200 cases of major trauma. Tragically, this growing number of injuries has led to fatalities, with 12 deaths from e-mobility device incidents in Queensland last year, including several children.

Numerous submissions to the committee also advocated for policy decisions to take into account the positive impacts of active transport, including e-mobility devices, in our communities. The majority of riders use their devices safely and responsibly as a daily means of transport, exercise or social connection. This is particularly true for communities like my own in South Brisbane, where proximity to the city and high-density living is encouraging more people to give up traditional car ownership in favour of more flexible and cost-effective forms of transport.

During the committee process stakeholder groups and members of the public pointed out that the proposed licensing requirements in the bill for e-mobility devices would significantly disadvantage seniors who have surrendered their driver's licences and people with a disability who are medically ineligible to hold a licence. This risked a de facto ban on a group of Queenslanders for whom e-mobility devices can be an important means of having personal autonomy. As Queensland Advocacy for Inclusion noted in its submission—

> For many people with disability, e-mobility is not a luxury, it provides independence to access their community, enjoy the outdoors and participate in life in a way that their disability would otherwise prevent. People with disability who ride their e-mobility bike or device can do so at their own pace, alongside family and friends.

I know this from personal experience. My brother-in-law lost his leg to cancer and his electric recumbent tricycle allowed him to get out on bike paths in the fresh air, be mobile, exercise and socialise with his brothers and friends, so I understand how vitally important these devices are for enabling people living with disability to participate in our community.

The need for balance on this issue is clear to ensure pedestrian and rider safety while supporting active transport. Unfortunately, stakeholders identified a variety of issues with this bill with significant unintended consequences which the government had failed to consider and I commend the committee for acknowledging that the bill required amending. Many of the issues raised by stakeholders may be due to the lack of proper consultation on this bill, with Bicycle Queensland stating—

> ... I think there has been a problem here that the government has confused the actions of the inquiry and the appearances before the inquiry and the submissions to the original inquiry with consultation with the bike community on the specifics of this bill.

As well as limited consultation and licensing requirements, stakeholders raised a number of other concerns with the bill, including the proposed 10-kilometre-per-hour speed limit on footpaths and shared paths, problems with enforcement of the suggested new laws and issues related to device compliance.

Amendments to the bill were introduced by the minister into this House yesterday afternoon. The explanatory notes accompanying them state that the amendments are being introduced to address potential unintended consequences arising from the original amendments contained in the bill. I am pleased that the minister has listened to the concerns stakeholders had with the bill. However, the 122 amendments that the minister introduced yesterday are complex, convoluted, confusing and lacking in detail, particularly the licensing exemptions, compliance labelling and path speed limits. They are also likely to result in additional cost and red tape, especially for young families, seniors and Queenslanders living with a disability. Currently there is no plan to have these new amendments examined by the committee process which means these rushed new laws may result in further serious unintended consequences. I would ask the government to return this amended amendment bill to the committee to hold a proper consultation process with stakeholders on these new changes to get them right this time and avoid the need for yet more bills and amendments on these important new laws.

Hon. FS SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (11.57 am): In October last year an eight-year-old boy and a 15-year-old boy, both riding e-scooters in opposite directions along a bike path in Mountain Creek near the Sunshine Motorway, crashed head on. Despite both boys wearing helmets, the eight-year-old, Zeke Hondow, died. It was later revealed that the older boy was allegedly riding a high-powered e-motorcycle. I note this case remains before the Childrens Court. In February of this year shocking footage showed a person on an e-scooter riding on the Sunshine Motorway near the Mooloolaba exit without a helmet in peak-hour traffic. The motorist who captured the footage said that they were in an 80-kilometre-per-hour zone of the Sunshine Motorway at the time when the e-scooter rider swerved into traffic in front of others and forced everyone to slow down.

We can all cite examples, and unfortunately too many tragic examples have occurred. Between 2022 and 2025, more than 6,000 e-scooter related injuries were recorded in Queensland hospitals, and this is based upon emergency department data. Even more tragically, there were a number of deaths in addition to this. This did not just happen in the last two years; this has been happening over the last 10 years. The legislation that was previously brought in under the Labor Party and the lack of

compliance saw this huge increase—a spike—in these injuries, as were recorded based on those 2025 figures, coupled with the fact that the former Labor government even subsidised illegal e-mobility devices, and that is just unfathomable.

This has now resulted in the inquiry that we promised at the election. It has been undertaken by a parliamentary committee with a number of recommendations, legislation introduced to the House and further consultation through the parliamentary committee. This bill and the amendments to the bill are based on that feedback.

Let me address the Labor Party, who did nothing for 10 years. They allowed a serious issue to develop with e-bikes, with injuries resulting from illegal activities on our roads. In other instances, activities were simply not policed under the compliance regime of Labor. They now have the audacity to say that we are not acting quickly enough. We then hear a contradiction from Labor members saying, 'No, we want to slow it down even more.' On the one hand they want it to be quicker; on the other hand they are saying, 'Let's slow it down more'—rather than enacting stronger legislation. There has been consultation and the feedback has been taken on board—for an issue that was allowed to get out of hand under Labor.

E-bikes and e-mobility scooters have a place when they are appropriately used, but there have been illegal mobility devices and illegal activity. The legislation before the House clearly targets that, along with the need for compliance—to enact what Labor simply did not do before. Police will have the powers to seize and destroy devices from 1 July. Police will also have powers to conduct random breath tests of riders from 1 July. E-bikes and e-scooters which exceed 25 kilometres per hour unassisted will be banned, and 12-kilometre-per-hour speed limits will apply near pedestrians from 1 July. There will be higher penalties for speeding, failure to wear a helmet, careless riding, illegally carrying a passenger and riding personal mobility devices on prohibited roads from 1 July. We are also bringing in licensing requirements for riders, with exemptions for medical conditions and disabilities. We heard that those with a disability who have the physical capacity to handle devices which aid them need exemptions. That is why there will be a medical exemption regime. There will also be the ability for 12- to 17-year-olds to ride under parental supervision from 31 August, and there will be parental accountability for children under 16 riding illegally from 1 July.

It is time for action. The action is in this legislation. We want to get on with it. We made a commitment to do that. We have heard flip-flopping from the other side in terms or whether or not they support it. On the one hand they say it should be quicker but on the other hand, as we just heard, they want it slowed down. The action is here in this document. We are behind it. We will get on with it to ensure that, where it has been allowed to be abused, there is now a process to get ahead of it and to start to rein it in—to bring about safety on our roads and safety on our footpaths such that people legally and appropriately using these devices can continue to do so but those who were in fear of their lives and limbs will have a system in place that finally starts to address this. I support the bill and the amendments before the House. I thank the committee members who endeavoured to hear the voices of Queenslanders and the transport minister for taking it on board. Let's get on with it. Let's make our roads and pathways safer.

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (12.03 pm): As we have seen, Queensland has experienced exponential e-mobility growth. We now have 230,000 legal e-bikes and 70,000 legal e-scooters. This is a result of high fuel and living costs, limited public transport, promotion of and need for sustainable active transportation and recreation alternatives to reduce congestion, address parking shortages and improve health for Queenslanders of diverse ages, abilities and locations. I have advocated the benefits over the years; however, I have repeatedly—I think since 2022—called on successive governments to address illegal e-motorbikes and the dangerous behaviours which have become a daily occurrence in not only my own community but also many communities across Queensland. Everyone who shares our roads and pathways needs greater safety, and these illegal e-motorbikes and modified devices have been a huge issue—not those who are riding the legal ones. We sought restrictions on modifications and the types of devices being imported and sold. We sought funding for an e-tag identification system, school-based education programs, which have been very successful in New South Wales, and more resourcing for police to enforce existing laws.

Not enough was done, nor quickly enough, and in Queensland last year 12 lives were tragically lost and more than 6,300 people went to hospital as a result of accidents. During that time in my own electorate, our Noosa Coolum police did a sterling job through Operation Zappo Stoppie and were awarded for their outstanding work on e-bike safety and enforcement. They were honoured for

addressing the illegal and dangerous use of devices. In addition, they work with our high schools and students and alongside fabulous organisations like the Tewantin-Noosa Lions Club, TMR and QAS to host community safety days and to educate parents. I want to thank them very much.

In May last year the government announced an inquiry. The committee tabled its report 10 months later and made 28 recommendations—a number were welcomed; others were not—which we took on behalf of our community to the minister. They regarded needed protections for those using legal e-bikes safely; options for those unable to get a driver's licence; changes to the 10-kilometre-per-hour pathway speed limit; clarity on the device clarification system; and a commitment to extra QPS resources. The legislation introduced in March did not sufficiently address these. The result was, overall, nearly 5,000 public submissions, with Bicycle Queensland saying 95 per cent of those submissions were telling government they had gotten a lot wrong.

Where did we end up? In addition to the inquiry recommendations, the bill permits legal devices to be ridden on roads with speed limits up to 60 kilometres per hour, giving greater choice for riders—

Mr McDonald: That is for scooters.

Ms BOLTON: For scooters; I take that interjection. Thank you, member. The bill also restricts the sale of e-mobility devices to those over 16; mandates certification and labelling for compliant e-bikes—although this still needs some work; and introduces offences for the dangerous practice of rented devices being dumped rather than safely parked. There is also an expansion of existing laws around hooning, evading police and drink riding to include e-mobility devices. This is all good. However, there were still some issues, with the committee, stakeholders and, finally, the government, through amendments, acknowledging overreach and unintended consequences. These included: licensing requirements and age restrictions that would negatively impact many for whom legal devices provide independence and transport alternatives; families and young people under 16 who ride to school, work and sport; others with medical conditions or disabilities; older Queenslanders; and those with mobility or financial barriers who cannot obtain or afford a licence and/or a motor vehicle.

To address this, there were 122 amendments—although that is being contested—circulated just before we started debate on the bill, but these have not gone through any appropriate scrutiny process. Some are improvements which I have been able to glean quite quickly, such as an exemption framework for those with medical conditions or disability; however, others fall short, such as the exemption for 12- to 17-year-olds to continue to ride with parental supervision. On the surface, this is partially welcomed, but what about younger siblings or others getting to school? Most submissions oppose licensing requirements entirely. This includes Sunshine Coast bicycle user groups, bike hire businesses and Endeavour Foundation, with Bicycle Queensland stating there is no supporting evidence.

The 10-kilometre-per-hour speed limit proposed for footpaths and shared paths was also highly controversial, with submitters explaining that bikes become unstable at that speed and the limit would be impossible to safely adhere to as well as being against the department's own guidelines, with local departments decrying the lack of research. This has changed in the amendments to 12 kilometres an hour around pedestrians—a compromise. However, as we have heard during this debate, there still seems to be a lot of confusion around some of this.

The bill also required that devices meet the EN15194 standard, which would have rendered tens of thousands of legal e-bikes instantly unusable. The equivalent safety standards will now apply from when the devices were manufactured. I think there was a sigh of relief from many families. However, again, the angst this caused could have been avoided if proper consultation had been undertaken during drafting.

Clarity is still needed on many aspects. This includes for tourist operators in my electorate of Noosa who operate family-friendly trail rides. They continue to face uncertainty, as do all with proposed carve-outs, exemptions and guidelines that still need to be developed. Given the amendment by the member for Aspley to send this bill back to the committee failed, the review of this legislation in 12 months must include stakeholder feedback and be made public so that what needs to be remedied is identified.

The reality is this e-mobility legislation, while having some positive changes, has missed the mark for many everyday Queenslanders who are doing the right thing. Hopefully we will see a reduction in illegal devices and dangerous behaviours that have caused deaths and injuries and have terrorised our communities. However, without increased resourcing for the QPS and increased funding for active

transport networks, trauma will still be experienced and the battle between decades of effort to transition away from cars to reduce parking rage and congestion and ensuring safer pathways and biking will continue.

I want to thank the chair, committee and secretariat for the enormity of work undertaken and I thank those who joined public hearings and community forums en masse. To Noosa residents who continue to share their experiences to guide our advocacy and those who safely and actively use, with respect, our roads, parks, trails, pathways and footpaths, thank you. For those doing the wrong thing, think about the wellbeing of others if you will not do it for yourself because you are the problem, not the majority who ride legally, safely and respectfully and who are now paying the price for your behaviours.

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (12.12 pm): The use of e-mobility devices, such as e-bikes, e-scooters and other types of personal mobility devices, offers many benefits to Queenslanders, including reduced carbon emissions, decreased traffic congestion, greater accessibility for short distance travel and easier travel options for the many tourists who visit our great state. The use and access to these PMDs, used properly, are of great benefit to Queensland. However, with the increased use of these devices, particularly amongst children, we have also seen an increase in dangerous incidents involving PMDs causing community concern over injuries and fatalities, pedestrian safety and noncompliant e-mobility devices. There were 6,089 e-mobility device related injuries that presented at emergency departments across 36 Queensland hospitals from 2022 to 2025—mostly under the Labor government. There were 2,000 injuries from PMD incidents in 2025 alone—almost double that of the reported 1,083 injuries in 2022. More than a quarter of these injuries were sustained by riders under the age of 16. Tragically, in 2025 there were 12 fatalities relating to e-mobility devices, three of those involving noncompliant e-bikes. The youngest of these fatalities was only 13 years old.

One morning on my walk along the Kurrawa beachfront I saw flowers all over a telegraph pole and young people standing around it. As the member for Surfers Paradise mentioned, at three o'clock in the morning out the front of the Broadbeach Surf Life Saving Club a young 13-year-old hit the gutter at 90 kilometres an hour and speared into a power pole. It is absolutely terrible. Local communities have also expressed great concern about the increase in the number of e-mobility riders under 16 being unaware of the road rules and lacking experience and understanding of how to properly navigate our road system. On one occasion I was doing 60 kilometres an hour on Ashmore Road and I was passed by a kid on a scooter, with no helmet, doing 70 or 80 kilometres per hour. There is also research to suggest that the still developing cognitive abilities of riders this young greatly increases the likelihood of crashes.

In the past few years we have seen an increase in the number of noncompliant e-mobility devices that do not meet Australian standards of quality and safety entering Queensland. One of the largest community and government concerns is the increasing number of fires caused by lithium batteries in these devices. There were 200 fires caused by e-mobility batteries reported in 2025 alone. Something must be done and something is being done here today. I congratulate the Minister for Transport for a wonderful effort, a very considered effort, in putting this legislation into the House. I also congratulate the chair of the committee and the committee that did a lot of work in bringing this legislation to fruition.

As a government we have to address these serious community problems. Recently a young group of e-bike riders were terrorising older ladies at the Burleigh Golf Club and throwing things at them. Two police cars went down to catch them and they took off on their e-bikes and could not be caught. The same crew of budding criminals were seen wrecking the Bond University clubhouse at Pizzey Park and abusing and threatening the people who work in that area. Something had to be done.

This bill aims to address this problem by introducing a minimum age limit of 16 for e-mobility riders, with an amendment in relation to parental supervision so they can ride to school. Other than that, all riders have to hold a valid driver's licence. I welcome this measure as our young people are one of the demographics most at threat of injury relating to e-mobility devices and there have been great concerns within the community that many e-mobility riders simply do not know or choose to disregard all road rules. This measure will ensure that all e-mobility riders are familiar with Queensland road rules before using the devices in public areas. With all e-riders knowing the rules I am pleased that this bill will make it easier for our police department to enforce them.

This bill will make Queensland roads safer by granting police fit-for-purpose powers, allowing them to seize and dispose of prohibited bikes, with significant penalties for riders using prohibited devices. This is an essential part of making e-mobility devices safer, as noncompliant devices coming into Queensland often use substandard battery materials and this led to those 200 battery fires in

Queensland in 2025. I understand the need for other speakers to put their views on this very important legislation. I support this bill before the House. I am sure it will deliver a better outcome right across the board for those people using these PMDs throughout Mermaid Beach.

Mr RICHMOND (Stafford—ALP) (12.17 pm): It is a privilege to rise for the first time in this parliament and speak on this bill. Ensuring that we have safe and accessible e-mobility options is particularly important to the people of Stafford. We are an electorate that intersects with many critical bikeways and shared paths: the Kedron Brook Bikeway, the Downfall Creek Bikeway, the Enoggera Creek Bikeway, as well as interconnections such as Kedron Brook Road. Throughout the course of the campaign I had the great privilege and honour of knocking on the doors of friends, former colleagues, neighbours and strangers, and one of the things that came through very strongly to me was the need for action around e-mobility devices. Doorknocking along the streets of Kedron I could hear the illegal e-bikes revving in the background as I spoke to locals about their concerns. When my wife and I go walking along the Kedron Brook we see young kids hooning around. I want to acknowledge the context in which this bill is being debated: where people have tragically lost their lives as a consequence of accidents.

We are seeing increased congestion along Gympie, Stafford, Webster and Appleby roads. People are being forced to drive to work because they do not have alternative options. We are dealing with the strain that our growing population is causing. Therefore, something does need to be done. That is very clear. A few things came through to me from doorknocking. Firstly, the people of Stafford want the 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital delivered. They want a government that is less talk and more action. They want action on illegal e-bikes. They think that this bill is a dog's breakfast and they are right.

I recall, in particular, one conversation that I had during the by-election campaign with a woman who lives in Wilston. She told me about her husband, an older gentleman who was trying his best to stay active in the community and regularly rode his bike. However, as he got on in age, he was less stable and less confident. As often happens, he fell off his bike and was pretty injured. He had to call an ambulance, which took him to the Prince Charles Hospital. He waited hours for treatment. While his wife could not fault the staff, it was clear that they did not have the resources they needed to treat him. Eventually he did receive treatment and he recovered, of course. That is why this bill is important. In order to stay active, in order to continue feeling confident and maintaining social connection, the gentleman started using an e-bike. When I spoke to his wife, she expressed two things: one, for the 93 beds to be delivered at the Prince Charles Hospital; and two, that he needed to ensure—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, I ask you to stay within the long title of the bill and not stray into other things to do with hospitals.

Mr RICHMOND: He needed to ensure that he had access to an e-mobility device and this bill imperils that. This is a government that could not deliver the bed that he needed when he needed it and now is trying to—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I have cautioned you in relation to the matter. Please remain relevant or I will take the action available to me under the standing orders if you continue to stray.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I argue that the member is being relevant to the bill. Going to the point of order, he is talking about a constituent who raised a matter with him and the context in which the constituent raised that matter. He is being entirely relevant.

Mr Hunt: And things that you had to apologise to the parliament for lying about.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member interjecting has used unparliamentary language. I find it personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, will you withdraw?

Mr HUNT: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, there will be no quarrelling across the chamber. We will get on with this in silence, thank you.

Mr RICHMOND: The problem with this bill and this government is that they are defined by arrogance and hubris. Rather than admitting fault and sending this bill back to a committee for genuine consultation with stakeholders, they have decided to dump a raft of amendments at the eleventh hour. The problem with the amendments is that they are effectively asking Queenslanders to take a leap of faith and trust the Minister for Transport to do the right thing. The reality is that there is a trail of evidence

that says that that just cannot be the case; that Queenslanders cannot have faith that this minister will do the right thing. That is evidenced by the bill and the stakeholder feedback. I acknowledge the North Brisbane Bicycle Users Group, which have been extremely active in making their voice heard, and the raft of other stakeholders who have made their voices heard as this legislation is not fit for purpose.

I simply conclude my remarks by saying this: Stafford locals want the LNP to build the 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I rise to a point of order, with the greatest respect to your position, Mr Deputy Speaker. I understand the member is new in this House but the person sitting beside him is not. She is actually the Deputy Opposition Whip.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The speaker is blatantly disregarding your previous—not one but about three—rulings with regard to staying within the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take your seat, please, member, while I get some advice.

Mr Hunt: Perpetuating the lie.

Ms FENTIMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Nicklin has made the same interjection using unparliamentary language and I ask him to withdraw. I bring it to your attention that you have already asked this member to withdraw for using unparliamentary language and he has done the same thing straight away.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: We will have silence. I did not hear the unparliamentary language but I do not want to argue.

Mr HUNT: I am happy to withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stafford, can you complete your contribution but stay within the long title of the bill.

Mr RICHMOND: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I said, I was concluding my remarks. They want this government to stop with the talk and start with the action. They want them to fix this bill, but this bill will not be fixed by a raft of eleventh-hour amendments dropped on this House with little detail and—

Mrs Poole: Are you voting in favour of it? How are you going to vote? Tell us how you're going to vote.

Mr RICHMOND: We will vote in accordance with what our communities have told us, but we believe that this House should send it back to a committee.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr RICHMOND: So rude! This bill should be sent back to a committee because it will be coming back to the House to fix the failures that are manifest within it.

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (12.26 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill has relevance across a number of my responsibilities as the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation as well as in my acting role as the Minister for Sport and Racing and Acting Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. It is also important to me as the member for Glass House where I represent both local operators who use e-mobility devices and residents who want to know that our streets, footpaths and shared spaces are safe.

At the outset, I acknowledge the feedback received through the committee process. The State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee received significant community input and the government has listened. That feedback has helped shape amendments to this bill, which the Crisafulli government has approached in a calm, methodical and evidence-based way, informed by what we have heard from Queenslanders and guided by practical reform. Queenslanders have made it clear that they want change. They want practical action. They want dangerous illegal and high-powered devices off our streets. They want safer footpaths and safer shared spaces for children, for pedestrians, for families, for older Queenslanders and for people with a disability. They have continued to make that message clear. Enough is enough.

As I said, the Crisafulli government is delivering that change through a calm, methodical and evidence-based approach. We are not banning responsible use. We are not targeting people who do the right thing. We are dealing with the unsafe and illegal behaviour that has been allowed to go on for too long. This bill is about setting clear rules and giving police the powers they need to restore accountability and reinstate community confidence in how e-mobility devices are used in Queensland.

In my capacity as Minister for Tourism, I spend a substantial amount of time listening to tourism operators so I want to acknowledge the constructive concerns raised by the tourism industry, including the Queensland Tourism Industry Council. Those concerns are not about defending dangerous behaviour. They are not about giving anyone a free pass to ride illegal, modified or high-powered devices through public spaces. They are about ensuring that responsible tourism operators who may be running guided, supervised, low-speed and well managed experiences are not treated the same as reckless or unlawful riders. It is an important distinction because Queensland is, as members would know, the home of the holiday. We want families to come here. We want international visitors to visit. We want people to experience our regions, our trails, our bikeways, our coastlines and our tourism destinations in a way that is safe, accessible and enjoyable.

The Crisafulli government has listened. One concern raised by industry was that the original framework could have prevented children from participating in family tourism experiences. The amendments respond to that. Children aged 12 to 17 who cannot or do not yet hold a licence will be able to continue riding under the direct supervision of a parent or guardian. That is a commonsense amendment to address concerns raised by industry. It means we are not shutting children out of appropriately supervised experiences. We are ensuring those experiences happen safely.

Another concern raised was that the bill needed to distinguish between low-risk tourism activity and high-risk public use. Again, the amendments respond to that. The bill allows for exemptions in specific declared areas, including rail trails and mountain bike trails. In many parts of Queensland, these tracks are not just transport routes, they are visitor experiences. They support regional communities, they support small businesses and they support accommodation providers, cafes, hire operators, tour guides and local jobs.

The bill also includes a head of power so exemptions can be prescribed by regulation. That gives the framework flexibility. It means the government can continue to respond to safety data, stakeholder feedback and the way e-mobility is being used on the ground.

I also acknowledge the concern raised about international visitors. Many visitors who come to Queensland want simple, safe and accessible ways to experience our destinations. That is particularly important as we look toward 2032. The entirety of Queensland is expecting a high volume of international visitors during the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and this bill ensures we have the e-mobility laws that will keep our visitors and locals safe during the games. This bill protects spaces where Queenslanders are most active in their day-to-day lives, not to mention the spotlight that the Paralympic Games will shine on accessibility. People with disabilities deserve safe shared spaces, free from high-powered, unregistered devices that are being used dangerously. There is no doubt that e-mobility and active transport will have a role to play in Queensland's visitor economy, both now and during 2032, but that role has to be safe and has to be well managed. It has to give confidence to pedestrians, families, operators and visitors alike. Queensland's competitive advantage will be built on safe, well-managed, visitor-ready experiences.

The amendments to shared path speed limits also strike a more practical balance. A 12-kilometre-per-hour limit will apply on footpaths and when passing pedestrians on shared paths, but on higher quality shared paths, bikeways and rail trails with lower pedestrian volumes, riders will not be constrained in the same way. That is common sense. It protects pedestrians without shutting down responsible use.

Tourism operators are not the problem this bill is trying to fix. A guided tourism operator providing safety briefings, supervision, controlled speeds and duty of care is not the same as someone riding an illegal, modified or high-powered device through a public space. This bill backs responsible operators, it backs responsible riders and it gives police the tools they need to deal with those who do the wrong thing. That is the balance Queenslanders expect and that is the balance this bill delivers.

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12.32 pm): I said in the parliament last night it was difficult to find the winner of the most incompetent and failing minister award in the LNP government. It was difficult, but now the transport minister is added to that list. This LNP government is a repeat offender when it comes to poorly drafted pieces of legislation, but this bill before the House takes the cake, or should I say it takes the pie because there was the Premier yesterday, stuffing his face full of pie, grinning like a madman—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, do you intend to tender that document?

Mr DICK: I am about to table it for posterity. For the benefit of all Queenslanders to come, I seek to table that photo. The Premier should not have been eating that pie; he should have been eating humble pie because of the absolute debacle that this bill represents.

Frankly, this bill represents everything that is wrong with the Premier and his leadership. Everything this government has done in relation to e-mobility devices has been all about the photo-op. It has been all about the announcement. It has been all about winning the media cycle and not acting in the best interests of the people of Queensland. We all saw the Premier desperate to get on *A Current Affair* the night the bill was tabled. It was going to be nation leading, just like their anti-free speech laws were going to be nation leading. He said those would 'stand the test of time'. They could not even stand the test of the LNP party room, and now we have another legislative debacle, this time led by the Minister for Transport.

The Premier always prioritises politics over people. He prioritises politics over good policy outcomes for this state, and this bill represents all of that. This latest draft of a dodgy bill is a bill that confounds, confuses and contains so many flaws that it is destined to return to the parliament again and again for repairs. It is another bill full of bad law, something we see time and again from this incompetent LNP government. Legislation that was supposed to fix a problem has the potential to make the problem worse. Not only that, the legislation in its current form will actually create a whole new set of problems that did not previously exist. Think about all those unintended consequences.

Rarely has a bill come before this House that will so comprehensively achieve the opposite of what it was meant to address. This legislation was supposed to make the community safer. Again, another slogan by the LNP government that means nothing. Instead, this legislation has the potential to cause great harm to many people in the community, including those who are the most vulnerable. It is a pretty remarkable outcome—a remarkably bad outcome. I am not sure you could make this legislation any worse if you tried, it is that bad. The litany of errors, missteps and misjudgements contained in the legislation and the perverse outcomes it will produce beggars belief. However, I will do my best to summarise the bleak catalogue of legislative blunders.

Let me say this: the Queensland Labor opposition supports safe and responsible e-mobility use and recognises the role that those devices play as an important alternative form of transport for thousands of our fellow Queenslanders. In line with that position, we want laws that properly address safety issues raised in the inquiry, including the rising sale and use of illegal devices. The problem is that this bill fails to do that effectively. Now it is back in the shop for another repair. They could not even get the amendments right. That is how bad this entire legislative process has been—a bad bill followed by bad amendments and a botched attempt to repair the whole thing.

The amendments are very substantial and, of course, have been dropped on the parliament at five minutes to midnight. Yet again, the LNP government, led by Premier Crisafulli, is denying the parliament and the people of Queensland adequate time and opportunity to properly scrutinise the amendments.

The reality is that we have here legislation that fails to address the fundamental issues of illegal devices in our community. In addition, as I have already alluded to, the bill risks severe unintended consequences that could negatively impact riders and pedestrians. The reality is that what is being proposed is not based on the evidence that was provided to the committee. Again, the LNP government is deaf to the concerns of Queenslanders.

What we see time and time again with this government is that it wilfully ignores the voice of experts. Remember when the Premier said, when he was in opposition, that he would always listen to the experts? He did not listen to the experts when it came to this bill; that is for sure and certain. The government is on the wrong road, heading in the wrong direction. This bill is not supported by the evidence, not supported by stakeholders, not supported by industry advocates and is overwhelmingly not supported by Queenslanders. That does not leave too many people who support this bill, other than the Premier and his botched attempt to win the media cycle every day. Over 3,000 submissions were made to the inquiry into the bill with the overwhelming majority raising issues with some or all aspects of the bill, and again the government was deaf to the concern of Queenslanders.

I acknowledge the Labor members of the committee who worked so hard on this bill. The member for Cooper is in the House. I want to acknowledge the shadow minister for transport as well and the member for Kurwongbah, too. One common criticism that really stood out and the one thing that they called out time and again was the lack of consultation with Queenslanders, and that is a big reason this bill is such a mess.

If the Crisafulli government had properly consulted stakeholders, many of the mistakes contained in the bill could have been avoided. This is just like their anti-free speech bill. We want to see reforms that keep people safe while encouraging more cars to stay off our already congested roads. Active transport should be encouraged in Queensland. Instead, the Premier and his government have introduced bad legislation that, as Bicycle Queensland said in their submission, risks being the death of safe legal e-biking in this state. All of this has come about as the LNP government has cut the active transport budget, including the active transport corridor on the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, is this relevant to the bill?

Mr DICK: It is absolutely relevant, Deputy Speaker, to this government's contempt and disregard for active transport in Queensland. I can tell the House that the cut has not gone down well in Woodridge or in Logan.

There is so much wrong with this bill. Take the speed limit as an example. We know that the Minister for Transport cannot obey the law when it comes to speed limits in Queensland. He cannot even obey the laws of physics. The proposed 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit, as originally proposed, was not backed by any evidence or science, in fact. For example, the department's own advice states that bicycles become unstable and unsafe at speeds below 12 kilometres an hour.

Mr Power: Dangerous.

Mr DICK: They become dangerous; I take the interjection from the member for Logan. He is also fighting for active transport in the City of Logan. The Brisbane West Bicycle User Group told the committee a 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on shared paths and footpaths is at best impractical and at worst unsafe.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please. Member for Logan, did you interject?

Mr DICK: No, he was speaking to me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take your seat, please. Member for Logan, did you interject?

Mr Power: Sorry, did you notice me interjecting?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am asking you if you interjected.

Mr Power: If I was interjecting—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a simple question: did you interject?

Mr Power: The member for—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You were on a warning. I ask you to leave the House for one hour. Thank you.

Whereupon the honourable member for Logan withdrew from the chamber at 12.41 pm.

Mr DICK: A 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on shared paths and footpaths is at best impractical and at worst unsafe. On empty footpaths and shared paths it is nonsensical. That is what the Brisbane West Bicycle User Group said about this proposal. The Brisbane West Bicycle User Group completely summed up this minister, this government and this bill in one word: nonsensical.

Queenslanders have a right to ask why they have to put up with this from the LNP government time and again. This is a government that is more interested in its political interests than in the interests of Queenslanders. It is a government that is more interested in winning the media cycle and in prioritising politics over people. Don't we see it all falling apart now?

This bill has the potential to cause great harm to the community. This bill is about as useful as an e-bike with a flat battery and two flat tyres. That is how useful this bill is. It should be to the eternal shame of the Premier because this is how he runs his government. This is how he treats Queenslanders. This is how he treats this parliament—with complete and utter contempt. This bill has been a failure from beginning to end. It should be regarded by Queenslanders as an abject condemnation of this government and its approach to legislation.

(Time expired)

Mr HUNT (Nicklin—LNP) (12.43 pm): After that contribution, member for Stafford, it appears you will be voting against the legislation. I thought I would be helpful there. The confusion is over, member for Stafford: you will be voting against it.

There is an old saying that laws are written for moments when common sense is not enough. That is very true when it comes to e-bikes, e-scooters and personal mobility devices. Most Queenslanders want to do the right thing. Many use these devices safely and responsibly, but as a police officer in recent years I saw too many young people treating the powerful devices like toys—weaving through traffic, ignoring road rules, showing off to their mates and taking risks they did not fully understand. These devices, however, are not toys when they are travelling at speed on roads, footpaths and shared paths.

The consequences can be devastating. There are consequences for the child who misjudges traffic. There are consequences for the pedestrian who is struck on a footpath. There are consequences for the driver who has no time to react. There are consequences for the family that gets the police visit that no parent ever wants. There are consequences for the first responders who have to attend these incidents. This bill is about those consequences, not about attacking technology.

These devices can be useful. They can be affordable, convenient and practical. They can help people get around, reduce congestion and provide another transport option. Freedom to use technology must come with responsibility. When the misuse of that technology leads to deaths, serious injuries and unsafe streets a responsible government must act, and that is what the Crisafulli government has done.

This government did not rush in recklessly. We did not act on a headline. We took a calm, methodical and evidence-based approach. We held an inquiry, listened to stakeholders, considered the evidence, brought forward a bill, took that bill to hearings and made amendments where amendments were needed. That shows this is a government that is prepared to listen, prepared to act and prepared to get the balance right. I acknowledge the work of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, ably chaired by the member for Lockyer. The committee process has been thorough and considered.

The need for action is clear. Between 2022 and 2025 more than 6,000 e-scooter related injuries were recorded across 36 Queensland hospitals. I remember one incident I attended as a police officer. I was called to a matter involving a young person riding an e-scooter alone to school. That young person collided with a car that was reversing out of a driveway. Thankfully, they escaped with cuts and bruises, but they were inches away from catastrophic injuries.

As a school-based police officer, I also saw young people breaking the law every day by riding to school on e-bikes and e-scooters. They often rode unsupervised without having a proper knowledge of the road rules or the maturity to properly assess risk. In reality, there was very little police could do from an enforcement point of view. All we could do was educate people, speak to schools and try to encourage policies to improve safety. Education matters, and it always will. Education without enforceable laws is not enough when the behaviour is dangerous and the risk is real. These new laws will change that.

This bill gives police new powers to seize and dispose of noncompliant e-mobility devices. Police will now have practical powers to take dangerous high-powered and illegal devices off the street. Importantly, this bill also allows for enforcement action against parents where a child under 16 rides an e-bike, personal mobility device or prohibited bike unlawfully. Parents may be fined where they allow children to ride illegally. This is a significant step that overcomes the problem of police being unable to enforce existing laws. Parents will rightly be held accountable for the safety of the children in their care. Some may say that is tough; I say it is necessary. These laws make it clear that parents have a role in keeping their children safe and ensuring they do not endanger others.

I want to touch briefly on the impact on first responders. A first responder met me in my office after attending an e-bike fatality on the Sunshine Coast. They pleaded with me through tears to help change the laws. We often talk about road trauma in terms of stats, fines and regulations, but for first responders incidents involving children are not statistics—the impact is profound. This bill is sensible and considered lawmaking and strikes the right balance to ensure safety, particularly of our children. I am disappointed to hear the Labor Party is not backing it.

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (12.48 pm): This bill is botched. It was botched in its drafting. It was botched in its consultation. It is botched in its enforcement framework. In fact, this bill is an absolute dog's breakfast. As the minister said: he is cooked, and he knows it. It is actually worse. Watching this minister debate this bill is like watching a dog eat its own vomit.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, keep it within the confines of parliamentary language if you would, please.

Mr de BRENNI: This minister dumped 122 amendments on this House with three minutes notice—a completely weak attempt to rectify his own mistakes. We wanted the constituents of Queensland to be able to have a say on these amendments—and that is only fair—but the Crisafulli LNP government has well and truly stitched Queenslanders up with this bill and these amendments. There has been zero opportunity for them to be properly consulted on the amendments.

This bill is infected by the same ill-discipline and disunity that is now sweeping right across the Crisafulli LNP government. It is proof that under the Premier this state is being dragged backwards—backwards to an era where conservative governments literally ran roughshod over Queenslanders. The way this bill has been handled has all of the hallmarks of the Newman-Crisafulli government of a previous era. It has their dirty fingerprints all over it. Queenslanders know when governments stop governing with transparency, when they stop governing for Queensland, dysfunction infects their laws. This is dysfunctional law and dysfunctional lawmaking. That is exactly what has happened.

The Queensland Labor opposition supports safe and responsible e-mobility use in Queensland. They are an alternative form of transport for so many Queenslanders. We recognise the important role these devices play, but this bad LNP government does not. Five thousand Queenslanders made submissions and their feedback was mostly saying exactly that.

We support properly targeted laws that address legitimate issues raised during the inquiry, but this bill fails to do that. As drafted, the legislation fails to address the core issues: illegal devices that risk severe unintended consequences. The legislation is simply not supported by the evidence that was presented to the committee. We know that many of the problems now being blamed on riders and retailers stem from changes made in 2021: the Scott Morrison Liberal government's dramatic weakening of import settings, not just his pathetic ukulele strumming while the nation literally burned but his dramatic weakening of import settings.

The Liberal leader deliberately allowed a flood of noncompliant high-powered devices to enter the Australian market. It was that change that dramatically increased the availability of illegal devices across the nation. That is the cause of this problem, and this LNP government is not prepared to acknowledge it. This government should be properly targeting those illegal imports and unsafe high-powered devices. Instead, it has turned to targeting ordinary everyday Queenslanders trying to do the right thing.

More than 5,000 submissions were made to this inquiry. Industry groups, disability advocates especially, riders and community organisations have overwhelmingly given the same warning. The legislation is unworkable. Police have said as late as this morning that they will not be able to enforce it. We heard from the Police Union as late as today that they will not be able to enforce it.

Many stakeholders provided feedback on the proposed changes directly to me. I want to refer to correspondence from Popi, who wrote, 'My bike was brought through the NDIS to help me live a normal life.' Why won't the LNP government acknowledge Queenslanders with a disability? Benita wrote, 'Disabled individuals are already disadvantaged enough ...' This government wants to disadvantage Queenslanders like Benita even more. Cameron wrote, 'The proposal would also add significant administrative and enforcement workload for the police while doing nothing to address the real problem of illegal high-powered e-motorcycles.' I want to refer to one of the local cycling clubs. They stated—

> The solution, as currently drafted, would punish the wrong people while leaving the actual problem inadequately addressed. Our members and our mountain biking community do not deserve this.

That is what they said. In today's newspaper, Susan said, 'It looks like Premier David Crisafulli has been run over by his own "crackdown" on e-bike riders.'

As with so many things under the Crisafulli government, consultation was treated as a photo opportunity. Once again this government has rushed towards a political solution to a political problem, and it is all of their political party's making.

What Bicycle Queensland told the committee was scathing. They said the government had confused the inquiry process with genuine consultation on the specifics of the bill. It is little wonder that members of this bad LNP government sat in this House last night and continued to deride bicycle user groups, even when they sat right there in the gallery. The government should have actually listened before drafting the legislation. Then perhaps this bill would now not resemble so much of a dog's breakfast. Even government committee members appeared to know this bill was botched because, after introducing the legislation, they reluctantly admitted it needed a raft of changes. They botched it.

We have carve-outs, exemptions and confusing future reviews simply to prevent harm to Queenslanders doing the right thing. Here is the extraordinary part: the government admitted the bill needed significant amendments, but now they have ensured that those amendments will not even receive proper parliamentary scrutiny.

These amendments should have been sent back to the committee. That way they would have had the proper consideration and proper consultation with stakeholders they deserve. Queenslanders with a disability, bicycle user groups—none of them have had the opportunity to have their say. Instead, this government has deliberately curtailed consideration of this bill. Then they gagged the public from having a say once again on their own amendments. The amendments will not return to a committee. Queenslanders will not have a chance to have their say. They will not undergo the detailed examination stakeholders have been demanding from day one. They will not receive the scrutiny that legislation of this scale deserves. Not a single Queenslander has had any meaningful opportunity even to see these amendments, let alone properly consider their consequences.

The Queenslanders who made submissions to the inquiry were not consulted on these amendments. Industry were not consulted on these amendments. Disability advocates were not consulted on these amendments. Queenslanders affected by these laws were not consulted on these amendments. Yet the government now expects this parliament to simply wave their changes through. This government wants Queenslanders to eat their vomit too, and that is not good enough. That is not good process. That is not transparent government and it is certainly not evidence of a disciplined cabinet—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I did warn you about the use of that language before. Will you withdraw it?

Mr de BRENNI: I withdraw. This is not good process. This is not a transparent government and it is certainly not evidence of a disciplined cabinet confident in its own legislation and lawmaking. It is the behaviour of a government trying to rush flawed laws through the parliament once again, and they do it before Queenslanders fully understand the consequences.

On this side of the House, we will continue speaking about the failure of this consultation process because Queenslanders deserve better than legislation drafted first, amended later and scrutinised never. This is what happens when legislation becomes infected by cabinet ill-discipline—a government septic with disunity.

We all know Queensland's road toll remains far too high. We should be encouraging safer active transport and reducing congestion on our roads. Many older Queenslanders voluntarily surrender their licences for medical reasons. They rely on e-bikes and e-scooters to remain active and independent, yet this legislation risks stripping away that mobility.

The Public Advocate also made something clear: these devices are critical for inclusion and participation for Queenslanders living with disability, but this government has just made life harder for those Queenslanders. They did it unsupported by evidence, unsupported by stakeholders and not even supported by departmental guidance. Yet the government pushed ahead anyway because it is more focused on appearing tough than on getting policy right.

The Crisafulli government is not even prepared to provide police with the resources they need for enforcement. Photo-ops, no follow-up—Queenslanders are now being asked to wear the consequences of a bad and ill-disciplined government. The Crisafulli LNP government is a botched government spewing botched legislation.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (12.58 pm): It is a bit rich having to listen to the contribution from the member for Springwood, a former minister of this chamber who sat around the cabinet table when they put forward a $2 million subsidy for e-bikes. These e-bikes have been terrorising the northern Gold Coast and the Gold Coast, and they sat around and did nothing—nothing. They destroyed parks. They terrorised little old ladies walking their dogs. Even on the M1 motorway I have been overtaken on multiple occasions by e-bikes—e-bikes potentially funded by this subsidy that they put forward. They are placing the lives of young people in danger. By sitting on their hands in this chamber today, they are turning back the clock and hoping it all goes away. We are not going to let it all go away. We are going to do something about it. We cannot allow this to continue—the carnage on our roads and individuals going to hospital because those opposite refused to do what they were supposed to do, and that is protect the lives of Queenslanders. No more.

Debate, on motion of Mr Boothman, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): This week Queenslanders have seen irrefutable proof that the Crisafulli LNP government is paralysed by failure, paralysed by ministers simply not up to the job. This week we have the proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is going backwards. Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures, and what a bunch of failures they are.

Rarely has this parliament witnessed a performance the likes of which we saw yesterday from the Acting Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. The word 'embarrassing' does not really capture it. The only part that worked was when the minister finally sat down and did not get up again. The trouble was, we all had to endure nearly an hour of bumbling, stumbling, bungling buffoonery. Making it all the more tragic was the minister's other-worldly belief that he was actually putting on a good show. I would say to the member for Glass House that he should heed the advice of Clint Eastwood: 'A man's got to know his limitations.'

Then we had the ongoing misadventures of the Minister for Child Safety, a minister whose record of failure is unrivalled in its consistency, a minister whose incompetence resulted in the government curtailing the commission of inquiry for fear her bungling would bring unwanted scrutiny. Even though those opposite cut the inquiry short, it still revealed the government's abject failure to protect vulnerable children, with alarming statistics showing that under this LNP government proper investigations into serious cases are being delayed.

Then we had the member for Kawana. For a self-professed working-class man, he nevertheless fancies himself as something of a wordsmith. I suggest that the Deputy Premier heed Clint Eastwood's words as well, because the only performance that approached that of the member for Glass House for cringe-worthiness this week was the member for Kawana's foray into the realm of poetry. Member for Kawana: less poetry, more policy for Queensland. That might be a good start. That is the problem, because this government is led by a Premier that is all show and no go; a Premier who is all photo-op and no follow-up; a Premier whose hollow words are broken words because they lead to broken promises for Queenslanders—a government that looks after itself, its donors and its LNP mates at the expense of everyday Queenslanders.

Stafford By-Election

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.03 pm): This morning we witnessed something extraordinary in this parliament: two senior Labor MPs were forced to apologise for misleading the House about the Prince Charles Hospital expansion. As I said this morning, it was another desperate scare campaign by a desperate opposition being peddled by a desperate opposition leader and a desperate candidate. Labor and the member for Stafford built their entire by-election campaign—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Richmond interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Stafford, I know there was some provocation there but I was on my feet. You are warned.

Mr NICHOLLS:—on an entire mistruth. I table just a handful of the over 180 times Labor made false claims about the Prince Charles Hospital.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents, undated, relating to the member for Stafford, Mr Luke Richmond MP, and the Stafford by-election [872].

It includes posts from two of Labor's failed former health ministers, the member for Murrumba and the member for Waterford. It includes posts from the newly elected member for Stafford, the faceless architect of Labor's health crisis elected during a false campaign—a member elected with a lukewarm result because he was a loose-with-the-truth candidate. That is exactly what happened. What they now need to do is front the cameras, apologise and explain why they told those mistruths to the people of Stafford.

The Crisafulli government is committed to delivering the 93 beds that were never going to be delivered by Labor under their failed capacity expansion program. It failed by $500 million, failed by two years, failed because clinicians were not consulted, failed because it had no central sterilising

department, failed because there were no beds for paediatrics and failed because there was no space for operating theatres. That is the record of failure of the member for Stafford and those opposite with their failed capacity expansion program.

The facts are that the Stafford electorate was misled and the parliament was misled, and they had to stand up in this place this morning and admit it. This is a serious matter. While many saw through the scare campaign, there will be those who expected the truth from those opposite. They know not to expect it from the member for Miller and they know not to expect it from the member for Murrumba, but they thought they might have got it from the new member for Stafford.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the comments of the minister and ask him to withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. They know there are many on that side they cannot expect the truth from, but they thought a new candidate might be able to deliver the truth. They have been sadly disappointed.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind members to not seek the call until time has expired.

Greenslopes Electorate

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.07 pm): Greenslopes, like the rest of Queensland, is being dragged backwards by a Crisafulli LNP government that is paralysed by its own failure, a government that is leaking to the media about ministers who have passed their use-by dates. The ministers for finance, education, child safety and local government have all been identified by those LNP leakers, and I am sure the environment minister is going to join the list soon too. Mind you, it is hard to get column space in the *Courier-Mail* these days, with the members for Oodgeroo, Gregory and Moggill all doing their own leaking to tout their ambitions.

While this government plays games, wherever I look in my community things are going backwards. On Monday I cut the ribbon on the new tuckshop at Mount Gravatt State High School, a project funded by SSS funding combined with funds from the school and the P&C. Right after I cut the ribbon I remembered that the LNP had cut SSS funding, so no more projects like this are going to be built in my electorate.

When I asked a question on notice about planned schools infrastructure, I got back a pathetic list that contained only projects that Labor were delivering and maybe just a few lights and things they are fixing. Families from Greenslopes State School tell me they need new fencing to keep their kids safe. This school is right on busy Logan Road and the fences need to increase in height to keep the kids safe. Sadly, so far all the department has said is that they only build fences to keep people out, not to keep kids safe. Whites Hill State College, Mount Gravatt State High School, Cavendish Road State High School, Nursery Road State Special School and Holland Park State School all got new fences under Labor.

Zigzag, an organisation that supports young women, trans and gender-diverse people who experience sexual or domestic violence, has been using Sustaining Tenancies funding to support 70 young people each year to re-establish their lives to live independently. From what I hear in the community, they cannot even get an answer from the minister about whether their funding is going to be continued. He is too busy cutting ribbons on Labor projects to do his job. I want an answer in this year's budget.

The embattled transport minister—who has created chaos on our trains and produced the most error-ridden legislation in the history of this parliament—cannot tell my community when or if the Birdwood Road velobridge will be built. This crucial piece of infrastructure will make cyclists safer, but the minister is too busy making videos of himself speeding to do his job.

Let's not forget about the former minister for sport. We know he is not very busy filling out enrolment forms, so I thought he would have some time to do his job. He has found time to spend tens of thousands of dollars on billboards in my electorate advertising projects for the Coorparoo AFL and the Holland Park Hawks footy clubs. I have been contacted by a lot of people from those clubs who are very angry about those billboards. Do you know why? It is because, while he is spending tens of thousands of dollars advertising himself and his government, he did not give the clubs enough money to do the jobs. The only thing that is going to be delivered in my electorate for these sporting clubs is billboards telling them that they are going to be delivering something for the sporting clubs. There will be nothing delivered for these people. This budget, like this government, is going to take the people of Queensland backwards.

Moreton Bay TAFE Centre of Excellence, Funding

Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (2.10 pm): I rise to speak to the curious case of so-called federal government funding to deliver the Moreton Bay TAFE Centre of Excellence. This is a project that those following along at home would know is a commitment of the Crisafulli LNP government, so I was fascinated when this issue was raised in the federal Senate estimates yesterday. What did we learn? That the Albanese Labor government is happy to stand on Queensland land beside a Queensland project that is funded by Queensland taxpayers and pretend it is their win. The federal minister posted from the future Moreton Bay TAFE site at Petrie mill, accompanied by Ali France, the member for Dickson, claiming that federal Labor is 'giving Queensland tradies a $73.8 million boost'. This $73.8 million is a joint commitment from Queensland and the Commonwealth, putting in $36.9 million each to fund a virtual construction technology project that will operate at numerous TAFE campuses throughout Queensland.

Despite this, we see a cute little Facebook tile—with a big Labor Party logo slapped on it—that has the federal minister trying to make out that he and Ali France are spending $73.8 million to deliver the new Queensland funded Moreton Bay TAFE Centre of Excellence. There is no mention that the Commonwealth did not assist with acquiring the land and no mention that the Commonwealth is not paying for the construction of the new campus. Wouldn't you think Ali France has already got into enough trouble with vacant blocks of land before posing in front of another? Moreton Bay is getting a new TAFE campus because the Crisafulli LNP government committed $60 million in our budget.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Order, members!

Ms BATES: We funded it. We are delivering it.

Opposition members interjected.

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

Ms BATES: Sadly, the Albanese government are not content with just taking credit for things they have not delivered. They have now cut the federal apprentice incentive by $1,000 for small businesses and removed it altogether for larger employers. This makes it harder for businesses to take on an apprentice, harder for young Queenslanders to get ahead and harder for our economy to grow. Now federal Labor's proposed fee-free TAFE agreement threatens to cut Queensland's TAFE funding by around $208 million. That puts up to 11,000 fee-free TAFE places at risk. We need workers in construction, we need workers in care, and we need workers to deliver the roads, schools, hospitals and venues that Queensland needs.

What is Labor's answer? Funding cuts, cost shifting, leaving Queensland to carry the load. This is the same old Labor story. Labor cuts the pipeline. Labor creates the skills shortage. Labor then pretends it is someone else's fault. I can assure the House that the Crisafulli LNP government will stand up to Labor's proposed TAFE cuts and fight for a better deal for Queensland. We will call out Labor's deception. The LNP will fight for the future of TAFE in Queensland, even when Labor abandoned it.

Thriving Kids

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (2.13 pm): The failures keep stacking up for this Crisafulli LNP government. Today I speak about the Queensland government's failure to secure certainty for some of our state's most vulnerable children and families through the Thriving Kids partnership. Queenslanders expect governments to work together when it comes to supporting children with disability and developmental needs. They expect ministers to put outcomes ahead of politics. Unfortunately, that is not what we have seen from this LNP government and this under pressure minister.

Earlier this year, the Premier stood alongside the Commonwealth and every other state and territory after he signed the National Agreement on Foundational Supports pledging to the establishment, implementation and delivery of a nationally consistent system of foundational supports designed to improve access to inclusive and sustainable supports for people with disability who are not eligible for the NDIS. That agreement was supposed to provide a framework for cooperation, certainty and a shared commitment to delivering services for Queensland.

The Premier signed the deal. He committed Queensland to working constructively with the federal government. Yet when it came time to negotiate the Thriving Kids arrangements, the disability minister has failed to get the job done. In fact, she is the only state or territory minister who has not been able to fulfil her responsibilities regarding this bilateral agreement. The minister has had every opportunity to negotiate in good faith and deliver certainty for Queensland families. Instead,

Queensland has been left without an agreement, while families and providers continue to face confusion about what comes next. This government cannot claim to support children with disability while failing to secure the arrangements needed to support them. It cannot celebrate signing agreements in front of cameras and then fail to deliver on the practical work required behind closed doors.

The contrast could not be clearer. The Premier was prepared to sign the bilateral agreement. The Commonwealth was prepared to come to the table. Yet the minister has been unable to convert that commitment into an outcome that gives Queensland families confidence about the future. Queenslanders deserve better than excuses. They deserve a government capable of negotiating effectively, capable of working constructively with Canberra and capable of putting children and families first.

The minister for disabilities must explain why, after the Premier signed the bilateral agreement earlier this year, Queensland has still failed to secure a Thriving Kids deal. More importantly, the minister must get back to the negotiating table, negotiate in good faith and deliver the certainty that Queensland children, families and service providers deserve. This is yet further proof that, under the Crisafulli LNP government, Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures. The minister for disabilities in this state needs to step up and do her job, and the Premier needs to hold her to account. When governments fail to work together, it is vulnerable children who pay the price, and that is simply unacceptable.

Disaster Funding

Hon. A LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (2.16 pm): As members would be well aware, especially those members on this side of the House, Queensland is the most disaster-prone state in the nation. In the 2025-26 disaster season alone, we saw a monsoonal flood and multiple cyclones affect more than 1.1 million square kilometres of our state. This required all levels of government to work closely to ensure that communities saw no daylight between response and recovery. During the course of the disaster season, 75 councils and one town authority were activated for joint Commonwealth-state Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements. Here we see the importance of DRFA to Queenslanders and to all local governments.

Funding under DRFA has meant that those communities impacted by disaster were given the funds that they need to recover swiftly. This included funds to support mental health, immediate clean-up, small business grants, fodder support and much more. It has supported communities across the state through tough times and is vital for those communities which are impacted by repeated events, as we see so often in Queensland.

DRFA also strengthens our state against future disasters, especially through our Queensland Resilience and Risk Reduction Program, QRRRP, which strengthens our state against future disasters. This $450 million five-year program is backing high-priority disaster resilience and mitigation projects in our communities. This includes the Duchess to Mount Isa road sealing upgrades, reinstatement and resilience upgrades for the Kuranda Water Treatment Plant, and the Bulloo catchment, Lower Thomson River and Cooper Creek catchment flood risk management program. There are many more projects that have been funded through that program.

Under our government we have also secured an $80 million annual Betterment Fund which is greatly welcomed by local government and a great investment for our state. This funding is investing in improvements to the Flinders Highway, the Eungella Range and Cambridge Crossing in Richmond shire. They are all Betterment projects, and we are rolling out more of those projects across the state.

With all this key work happening, it is crucial that any review of DRFA and associated funding arrangements involves proper and meaningful consultation with Queenslanders. These are important arrangements for every community, every local government and all Queenslanders who are impacted by disaster. Any failure by the Commonwealth to effectively and honestly consult will leave Queenslanders high and dry and jeopardise years of good work and goodwill between all levels of government in safeguarding communities in Queensland, which is the most disaster-prone state in our nation.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance; Wolston Park Hospital

Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (2.19 pm): The Crisafulli government is completely paralysed by its own failures. We have a gaggle of incompetent and underperforming ministers. We have all seen the reports, and the knives are out—they are being sharpened. We have a minister who is stood down

and under investigation by the Federal Police. We have the members for Whitsunday and Warrego underperforming. We have the member for Glass House—the reviews are in and they were not kind. The headline read 'Bumbling minister eaten alive during question time'. That has got to hurt. We have retirements coming up. We have the member for Surfers Paradise—AKA 'defined benefit paradise'—the member for Maroochydore and the member for Mudgeeraba: they will all go out and relax and spend some time together.

The Premier knows he needs a reshuffle, and we have been seeing plenty of auditions this week from the ambitious assistant ministers, although I suspect their ambitions far outweigh their abilities. We have the members for Oodgeroo, Gregory and Moggill. They are definitely not talking about assistant ministers from Callide, Barron River, Rockhampton and Burleigh. Nobody is talking about that. The member for Clayfield said that he wants to keep his portfolio of health because he is enjoying it. He might be, but Queenslanders are not. Queenslanders are hurting under this health minister.

If I could be very serious for a moment, I want to recognise the profound harm caused within the walls of Wolston Park hospital, where patients were subjected to abuse, neglect, chemical restraints and trauma. This included children who were placed in an adult psychiatric facility and were failed by the very system that was meant to protect them. Many families and loved ones still carry the resultant pain.

What happened at Wolston Park should never have happened. It was wrong. The years of silence and inadequate acknowledgement only deepened that wrong. Patients deserved safety, dignity and care and they were failed. As a community leader, I—and everyone on this side of the House—am truly sorry for the pain and the trauma. It was shameful this morning that when the health minister had an opportunity to formally apologise he refused to do so.

While no apology can ever undo the past, I say to the Wolston Park petitioners, patients and victims who are in the gallery right now, as well as the former patients and their families: your stories will not be forgotten and your courage in speaking out has brought what was left for too long in the dark into the light. We say thank you.

(Time expired)

Whitsunday Electorate, Tourism; Proserpine Fire and Rescue Station

Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.22 pm): It is a great pleasure to say that the Crisafulli government, under the Deputy Premier, has declared the Whitsunday Skyway project a prescribed project. What does that mean? It means that our government election commitment of $5 million, along with the prescribed project status and the support of the tourism minister, is going to see a streamlined approvals process for the ecotourism attraction Whitsunday Skyway. In addition, it aligns with the Crisafulli government's Destination 2045 strategy, and I want to thank the tourism minister for his continued support and the certainty of funding that Tourism Whitsundays has received, for the first time ever, under the Crisafulli government.

This was a project under the former Labor government that was placed in a space where it would practically never have seen the light of day. Now aligned with the sod turning at Victoria Park, what we have seen is an incredible stake in the ground, if you like, for the Olympic Games. Not only have we seen the sod turn at Victoria Park, but with the investment and the streamlined process of Whitsunday Skyway we have also seen work progress on the flood mitigation activities at Goorganga Plains. We have also seen the declaration of Shute Harbour boat ramp as part of Olympic and Paralympic infrastructure. We have also seen a commitment with lots happening from the sailing sector and partnerships being formed with Tourism Whitsundays and our local sailing club. I want to commend their leadership, along with that of our regional council and our tourism body.

In addition, on the weekend I had the incredible opportunity to represent Minister Leahy at the celebration of 75 years of the Proserpine Fire and Rescue Station and the open day they held where they unveiled an honour board celebrating the 158 auxiliary firefighters who have represented our community of Proserpine. I want to provide a bit of certainty to the minister that in our region our fire service is in good hands. The qualifications of our auxiliary firefighters are exemplary. I want to pay tribute to Captain Brian Little for his continued leadership and stability: they have one of the lowest rates of turnover of auxiliary firefighters in the state. It is an absolute privilege to be able to speak on behalf of my community. I want to thank them for their leadership and for their continued commitment to the safety of our community.

Multiculturalism

Mr MARTIN (Stretton—ALP) (2.25 pm): Right now in Queensland migrants are under attack. They have been blamed for every problem by a relentless One Nation party determined to paint them as outsiders. They use language that suggests migrants do not pull their weight, do not follow the rules and are somehow disloyal to Australia. It is complete rubbish. At a time when those opposite should be standing up to One Nation and calling out its lies and fearmongering, what do we see? We see paralysis from a front bench full of bench warmers. We have a Premier and a government paralysed by their own failures.

The Premier said he would stand up for multicultural communities, but let's have a look at what he has done. Firstly, let's have a look at the Stafford by-election. Mysteriously, One Nation did not run a candidate. Then their supporters group endorsed the LNP. It certainly smells like a dodgy deal to me. This week in parliament we have seen those opposite come in here and crow about their result in Stafford. Well done, guys! You got the One Nation vote in Stafford. You got the anti-migrant vote in Stafford. That is a strategic masterstroke. Well done!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Order! Direct your comments through the chair, member for Stretton.

Mr MARTIN: You should be very proud of yourselves. Look at them over there, beaming with pride.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Direct your comments through the chair, member for Stretton.

Mr MARTIN: I can tell members on that side that kowtowing to One Nation is no long-term strategy. Do members opposite think those votes are going to help them in Mirani, Hinchinbrook, Gregory or Wide Bay? If they do not grow a backbone now, if they do not stand up to One Nation now, they will be coming second at the next election. The federal LNP are no better. They have gone from being the 'natural party of government' to total irrelevance, and still there is silence from this government. There is Angus Taylor rolling out more anti-migration brainrot—painting migrants as the enemy, offering proposals to strip permanent residents of basic safety net entitlements, casting suspicion on people depending on where they were born and not the content of their character.

Migrants are under attack, yet who has been tasked with defending our multicultural communities? Oh no, it is the member for Maroochydore. She is not exactly a bundle of energy—someone who makes the member for Glass House look exciting at a dinner party. I have asked the minister a number of questions on notice about multicultural communities and the most common response is to handball the issue to another minister. When I asked her about Pauline Hanson's disgraceful comments regarding Muslims, her response was to send me a YouTube link to something the Premier said. Wow! Well done! It is astonishing that the Minister for Multiculturalism cannot offer a few words on a significant attack against multicultural communities. To the minister I say this: multicultural Queenslanders cannot afford a do-nothing minister. The stakes are too high. The job requires leadership and a willingness to stand up for our communities when they come under attack. Queenslanders deserve better.

Building Industry

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (2.28 pm): Queensland needs more homes and to do that we need a building industry that is productive, efficient and attractive to work and invest in. After a decade of decline, the Crisafulli government is making Queensland the building capital of the nation. Transforming how Queenslanders interact with the Queensland Building and Construction Commission is a key part of that work. The QBCC regulates a $69 billion industry, licenses more than 128,000 tradespeople and businesses, and administers the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. For too long, industry has told us that dealing with the regulator was too hard, too slow and too focused on process rather than outcomes. Under our government, that is changing.

Last year we appointed a new QBCC board and commissioner with a clear mandate to modernise the organisation, improve customer service and make it easier to do business with the QBCC. The militant, misogynistic CFMEU no longer has a place on the board of Queensland's building regulator, and as long as we are in government it never will. I want to commend Commissioner Angelo Lambrinos for his focus on accountability, transparency and practical outcomes over the last 12 months. I have joined him and our Building Policy team at industry forums across our state in Cairns, Townsville,

Rocky, Toowoomba, Brisbane, the Redlands and on the central and northern Gold Coast. We have listened directly to builders, subbies, certifiers and industry reps about what is working, what is not and where government can remove unnecessary barriers.

One message has been consistent: industry wants a regulator that is a proactive partner—one that is responsive, consistent, practical and easier to deal with. That feedback is helping shape our Building Reg Reno reforms and our ongoing transformation of the QBCC. We have already removed mandatory annual financial reporting requirements for 50,000 licensees—97 per cent of local builders, contractors and tradies who keep our state building. Less paperwork means more time on the tools. More than 94,000 licensees have adopted digital licences and 40 per cent of licence applications are now submitted electronically. The QBCC is on track to reduce compliance investigation queues by 40 per cent this financial year and the number of complaints being resolved on someone's first call to the QBCC has increased from seven per cent to more than 30 per cent. That is an outstanding number and it is only part of our work to reform our building regulator in Queensland to ensure tradies can spend more time on the tools and deliver the homes and infrastructure that Queenslanders deserve.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.31 pm): We have a cabinet under pressure and an LNP backbench ready to pounce, and wasn't it wonderful to read about the aspiring ministers over the weekend? The member for Redlands, the assistant minister for housing, did not know the difference between social and affordable housing, but it turns out that the minister did not know either, so it is not a prerequisite to be the housing minister. The member for Moggill, who is used to writing prescriptions—

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Thank you, member.

Mr SMITH: I withdraw. The member for Moggill is used to writing prescriptions. Today he wanted to help write the questions to the member for Glass House. If only he prescribed some of the members over there a Valium it would help all of our ears! What about the member for Oodgeroo? I will not say a bad word against the member for Oodgeroo because I have 50 bucks on her to be the next minister, but she is watching those ministers cling on like a koala in a tree in Ormiston, that is for sure. I do note that the member for Pumicestone liked that one. She had a laugh at that one.

What about the members of the LNP who are not being spoken about? The member for Scenic Rim is too busy recruiting anti-abortion candidates. What about the member for Callide? I have not seen his name in the *Courier-Mail*. I have not seen his name being spoken about. He is desperate to get to the cabinet table. The only problem is that they do not let you use crayons at the cabinet table. What about the member for Everton? It has been very quiet. I have not heard about the member for Everton coming back—too busy stockpiling 12 months worth of cigarettes in case he needs to trade for a toaster.

The member for Coomera could get in there. He could start a photography subcommittee in the cabinet. We know that he loves his photography. The member for Cook is an experienced, well-respected safe pair of hands. He would be great in the cabinet—and he would not need a driver, just a helicopter pilot. That is all he would need. Imagine this: if the member for Hinchinbrook got on a ministerial wage, that loan for SET Solutions would come back into his pocket. It would be wonderful! What about the member for Toowoomba North? With regard to the member for Toowoomba North, the assistant minister to the Premier and cabinet, I table this—too many front-page slip-ups.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 21 March 2025, from *Bundaberg Today* [873].

Can members imagine: if the member for Toowoomba North did get into the cabinet, what a party! The whole street would come to the party! With regard to the member for Lockyer, we know that the member for Lockyer was disappointed that he missed out on being a minister or even an assistant minister but, as we learnt this week, the member for Lockyer will just have to pedal harder.

With regard to my neighbour the member for Burnett, there are so many reasons he is not being spoken about. Maybe it is because every time a minister comes to town they have to fix his mistakes, like when he said that the new Bundaberg Hospital would only have 120 beds, or what about the time that he continued to fumble and fumble and got the QRC to write his committee response for him? I have to refer to my talking points. I seek to table my talking points.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, order!

Mr SMITH: All of Benno's bungles, I table that.

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

Mr SMITH: Benno's bungles—no wonder he is not going into the ministry!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, one moment. I have a point of order. I was calling you but you were not paying attention to the chair, member for Bundaberg. What is your point of order, Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: My point of order in relation to the member for Bundaberg in relation to that prop that was used is that it was deliberately and flagrantly disregarding the standing orders and I would submit to you that that needs to be considered.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. Member for Lytton, you are warned. Thank you. I was taking a point of order. You are warned, member for Lytton. You are also warned, member for Bundaberg, and you are very close to being ejected for being disorderly.

Mirani Electorate, Water Security

Mr G KELLY (Mirani—LNP) (2.35 pm): Would members believe that in 2026 there are communities in my electorate that still do not have access to basic drought water infrastructure—something most Queenslanders turn on every day without a second thought—yet at the same time we have a pipeline carrying millions of litres of water through Central Queensland every single day? For years Queenslanders were told that the Fitzroy to Gladstone pipeline was a nation-building project that would transform our region. Now that the dust has settled, local communities are asking a very simple question: what was the local benefit? Let me be clear: nobody begrudges Gladstone industry having water security. Industry supports jobs, exports and economic growth across Queensland. People in places like Ridgelands, Alton Downs and across Central Queensland cannot understand how the former Labor government could spend close to a billion dollars on a pipeline and completely fail to plan the communities it runs through.

At my recent Ridgelands town hall meeting the No. 1 issue raised was this pipeline. Hardworking dryland farmers and graziers looked me in the eye and asked, 'What did our communities get out of this?' I ask the same question, because, while millions of litres of water move through backyards every day, many of those small communities still have no local standpipe and still have to travel to Gracemere for access to potable water during drought conditions. How does this happen after nearly a billion dollars was spent? The answer is simple: the communities hosting this infrastructure were never made a priority. Instead, the former Labor government was focused only on big announcements, glossy press releases and grand promises about the future. It was about Labor chasing headlines and chasing a green dream.

The former Labor government gambled taxpayers' money on Andrew Forrest's hydrogen fantasy in Gladstone—a project dressed up as a transformational economic policy. The member for Gladstone was happy to drain the lifeblood out of the Fitzroy system to prop up a billionaire's pipeline dream while the communities hosting this infrastructure were never talked about and were always left behind, and now what are we left with? Scaled-back promises, stalled projects and regional communities asking why they were ignored while Labor looked after its corporate mates. The member for Gladstone was rolling out the red carpet for Twiggy Forrest while the rest of Central Queensland was left footing the bill.

Where were the former Labor member for Rockhampton and the former Labor member for Keppel? Where were they? There is nothing to see here. They were all there for the good perks. As far as I am concerned, when it comes to the electorate of Mirani and the people who live in it, they were never looked at when it came to this project. I live in that community and I get it and I will stand with them until the day I pass on, because it was an upsetting situation. As far as I am concerned, we were forgotten and someone has to own it, and that is those opposite.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Ms ASIF (Sandgate—ALP) (2.38 pm): Queenslanders do not ask for much. They want health care funded properly, they do not want to be waiting in the back of an ambulance for hours when they need vital health services, and they want their domestic and family violence services funded properly

so that when they need those frontline services they are available. They have an expectation that when ministers are asked questions they will be answered. They want their trains to show up on time—they do not want to be waiting on platforms with no staff there—and they want a government that shows up. Unfortunately, all the government is good for is showing up for photo-ops and not actually making decisions that make a difference in the lives of people.

In terms of how I see it, none of those requests are radical. They are some things that are expected from the government, but there is nothing to be seen from that side. While Queenslanders continue to do it tough—while they pay more for bills, wait longer in emergency departments and sit on unstaffed platforms waiting for their kids while hoping to see a better future for them—the LNP government is not paying attention. Unfortunately, it is too consumed by itself and its integrity crisis. There are ministers who do not know their briefs and ministers who are bumbling through question time—58 minutes and not a single answer—and those opposite somehow think that that is a badge of honour.

That is an embarrassment. It is an embarrassment because Queenslanders deserve answers on how their funding is being spent. They deserve answers about what is going on. We have ministers who are being referred to the Australian Federal Police over electoral fraud; ministers who are being referred to the CCC; ministers with an integrity crisis left, right and centre; and ministers who come into this place and think it is a theatrical performance. People out there expect better from their governments. Hopefully we can hold them to a standard. We will continue to come into this place and ask the government questions, even though they do not think that is something the opposition should be doing. How dare the opposition ask the government questions and expect answers! That is only the job of the opposition. We have a Minister for Police who today could not answer a single question about vital frontline services like domestic and family violence.

The government has spent months managing its own crisis without actually going out there and making decisions that will make people's lives easier. There are people who are struggling to pay bills. They need assistance from their government. We know that the budget is coming up. I will be watching the budget to make sure people in my community are able to get some assistance. We have done a budget submission to the Treasurer, like we did last year—unfortunately, we did not see much there. People have come forward passionately requesting from the government to see cost-of-living relief, to see funding for transport infrastructure, to see that the trains actually show up on time so they can to get to work and school. They want to see investment in their schools.

We will be watching the budget and I sure hope the Treasurer has read the budget submission this time. I hope there is funding not only for my electorate but for all electorates that we represent, because funding is supposed to go to everyone in Queensland, not just to the seats the government holds. We know that this government are so paralysed that they cannot make decisions Queenslanders need. We need the Premier to have a look at his ministers and end the chaos.

Breach of Bail

Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (2.41 pm): I rise today to recognise and sincerely thank the many residents, community groups, victim advocates and families across Thuringowa who have taken the time to engage with me on the critical issue of breach of bail. Over recent weeks and months I have received great feedback and engaged in many conversations via email, phone calls, letters and face-to-face from people deeply concerned about our bail laws and the consequences when they are repeatedly breached. Their voices have been clear, respectful and powerful. I want every person who reached out to know that their contribution has been heard and deeply appreciated. It is my job to listen to them. As their local member of parliament I see it as both my duty and my privilege to bring the real experiences and concerns of our Thuringowa community into this parliament. I am truly rewarded by the unique community we have in Thuringowa, where residents have many opportunities to engage with me and feel comfortable speaking with me whenever they see me. Their engagement is essential.

My campaign for breach of bail is not just asking people to put their name to a petition; it is asking for real stories and allowing people to express their anger and desire for change. Their anger has come about after a decade of decline under Labor, who created the mess by weakening justice laws and allowing repeat offenders back on the streets. I have heard from victims whose car was stolen by a young offender who had already breached bail twice that month—they no longer feel safe parking in their own driveway—and an elderly neighbour who was assaulted during a home invasion by someone who had walked free on bail just days earlier, despite a long history of offending.

These are real people in our community living with fear and frustration because the system is failing them, and it has been for a long time. They do not want to be statistics. They want to be heard and they want changes. This feedback is already shaping outcomes. Their powerful stories have strengthened the case for meaningful bail reform, tougher consequences for serious and repeat breaches, better protection for victims and a justice system that puts community safety and victims first. Because of their engagement they are driving the debate on law reform and will continue to influence the work I do here.

To every person in Thuringowa who took the time to write, call or speak with me: thank you. Your willingness to share your experiences makes our democracy safer and stronger. I will continue to champion your concerns and push for practical reforms that restore confidence in our bail system. Our victims' voices matter. It is making a difference and will continue to do so. Their stories give me the confidence to come into this parliament, look across the floor at a weak Labor opposition and let them understand that this is what the victims of our community want.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms MARR: Thank you, Thuringowa. Keep up the good work.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Order! Member for Pine Rivers!

Ms MARR: That is okay, Mr Deputy Speaker. The truth hurts.

Ms Boyd interjected.

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

Housing Affordability

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (2.44 pm): It is great to follow the member for Thuringowa and remind her that she is in government. That was an extraordinary contribution where she petitioned her own government. It is clearly an admission that words that rhyme do not fix crime. They botched it, and now she is in here petitioning her own government to fix it.

If you ever wondered why Queensland has a housing unaffordability crisis, you need look no further than the Deputy Premier, who tops the *Courier-Mail's* Queensland Power List—a man who at every opportunity has used his power to axe affordable housing projects and mandates, who is proudly selling off public land to luxury developers and who heads the housing taskforce. What was the first bill that they passed in this House? It was not community safety—which is maybe why the member for Thuringowa has problems. It was giving the Deputy Premier power to kill affordable housing projects that Labor had given the green light to. They came in here in the dead of night and tried to ram through a bill that did not go to committee and had no scrutiny and that allowed the Deputy Premier to kill affordable housing projects. That is exactly what he has done, and there are more in the pipeline. The first one that he killed—

Mr Whiting interjected.

Mr Vorster interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Bancroft and member for Burleigh, you are warned for quarrelling.

Ms SCANLON: The first affordable housing project that he killed was on the Sunshine Coast. It was not some dodgy developer trying to chase a profit; it was an organisation involved in the Nightingale project in Victoria which delivers affordable homes for frontline workers. Apparently that project had too many homes, was too tall and was in the member's area, so of course he could not support that project. That is not an isolated decision. There are many other affordable housing projects that have been axed or we suspect will be axed.

Make no mistake about who is actually running the housing portfolio in this state. It is certainly not the actual housing minister—a man who is so paralysed, so captured, that he came to an event just before and told everyone about the thousands of women and children who are sleeping in their cars who do not have affordable housing and yet came into this House this morning and defended removing affordable housing conditions on developers. I do not know how you can do that if you care about affordable housing.

I suspect that the reason all of these measures are being wound back is that, conveniently, at the same time, developer donations have been lifted. We have learned from media reports that there has been a $50,000 donation—a bid—to sit down with the Deputy Premier. At a time when they say it is not viable to deliver affordable homes, it is viable to give the Liberal National Party money. It is just not viable for nurses.

Z Special Unit Memorial

Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (2.47 pm): I rise to honour the courage and sacrifice of the men who served in the Z Special Unit during World War II. That is why I am advocating for a permanent memorial. A clandestine commando school was established on the western side of K'gari Fraser Island in about 1943 to provide specialist military training for covert intelligence missions in South-East Asia. The remote western beaches, dense bushland, isolation and difficult terrain provided the ideal location for commando training. Soldiers trained in stealth, jungle warfare, long-distance paddling, survival skills and unarmed combat. They also trained in explosives by placing limpet mines on the side of the *SS Maheno* shipwreck.

The Z Special Unit conducted operations in Timor and Borneo but is best known for operations Jaywick and Rimau. In Operation Jaywick, soldiers travelled from Exmouth, Western Australia to Singapore in a fishing vessel named the *MV Krait*. The crew members disguised themselves as Malay fishermen to blend into enemy territory. The crew wore sarongs and frequently applied a foul-smelling dark brown dye to their skin while on the voyage.

They completed Operation Jaywick by using limpet mines to sink about 40,000 tonnes of Japanese shipping in the Singapore harbour. In 1944, some men volunteered for Operation Rimau, which is Malay for tiger. The mission was intended to replicate the success of Operation Jaywick and was aimed again at attacking Japanese shipping in Singapore. Operation Rimau's mission was to commandeer a local fishing boat to gain access to Keppel Harbour in Singapore. They would use special one-man motorised submersible canoes known as sleeping beauties and, undetected, plant limpet mines on the enemy ships. Sadly, all the soldiers involved in that operation were either killed in battle or captured and subsequently killed. The Z Special Unit was the forerunner to our modern-day SAS—Special Air Service—whose motto is 'who dares wins'.

Some weeks ago I made the short trek with Wide Bay ABC journalists to the site of the former commando school. We located an improvised Z Special Unit memorial at that site, no doubt prepared in good faith yet seriously degraded and in need of a substantial transformation. I table a copy of pictures of the degraded Z Special Unit memorial.

Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting veterans' memorial [874].

In closing, I will continue to strongly advocate for a permanent K'gari Fraser Island memorial to recognise and commemorate the supreme sacrifices made by the courageous men of the Z Special Unit. I look forward, in due course, to attending the former commando unit site with our Premier and Minister for Veterans, David Crisafulli. Lest we forget.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.50 pm): We have known for some time that the ministers in this Crisafulli LNP government are all talk and no action, but this week we have learnt that they are all talk and no answers. No less than three ministers were given almost a whole question time to answer questions about their portfolios and not a single one could. They flapped about, they attacked us, they bumbled, but there were no answers at all. In the lead is the member for Glass House, who has to have added himself to the list of ministers being circled by backbenchers. Not only was he not across his brief, he could not even get a brief. Did the member for Everton not leave any folders in the office when he packed up? Could not one of the other ministers have handed him one or write a note or something? Where were all the ministerial staff? He babbled on oblivious to how silly he looked.

Then we had the Minister for Police caught out with an RTI from his own department confirming that changes they made had resulted in more than 900 victims of domestic and family violence not being reported. We also discovered that the police were so concerned about this they had commissioned a secret review. We should not be surprised that they are concerned because they also have secret polling which shows that Queenslanders do not have confidence in the police data being used by this government.

It was topped off by the child safety minister, so focused on her own integrity issues she cannot manage her department, let alone do the important work of implementing the royal commission's findings. All she had was political pointscoring and attacks. Today she said she was not concerned at all that more than half of children were not being seen within the safe times. We had three ministers unable to answer questions, questions that they should know the answer to. Then we had the health minister who could not apologise to victim-survivors but instead used his time for more political attacks.

We know that those opposite have the members for Mudgeeraba, Maroochydore and Surfers Paradise on their list. They have the members for Everton and Whitsunday on their list. Glass House is now on the list. More than a quarter of their cabinet are under a cloud because they cannot perform their jobs.

Ms Pugh interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Member for Mount Ommaney, you are warned under the standing orders.

Member for Murrumba; Queensland Day

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (2.53 pm): It is always a pleasure to follow the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Murrumba. The Leader of the Opposition is on life support. We only have to look at the results in the Stafford by-election: a huge swing and a vote of no confidence in the Leader of the Opposition. We know that the member for Woodridge, the member for Waterford and the member for Gaven have been circling around the Leader of the Opposition. He has been on life support for a long period of time. If we think back to the 2024 state election, even on election night the Leader of the Opposition would not accept the election result. The people of Queensland made a judgement at the state election in 2024 in relation to the former Labor government's record, whether it was on crime, whether it was on health, whether it was on cost of living or whether it was on housing. The people of Stafford sent the Labor opposition, and the Leader of the Opposition, a clear message and that is why he has members of his own front bench circling around him. His leadership is terminal.

He failed when he was not only the deputy premier but also in various ministerial portfolios. Like other members who sit opposite, we know what is happening in relation to the CFMEU inquiry and all the matters being uncovered. They are serious matters that are being uncovered. Our health minister is having to mop up all the failures when it comes to service delivery right across Queensland and deliver the infrastructure that those opposite failed to deliver. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is cleaning up the mess of former Labor governments here in Queensland—both the Palaszczuk and Miles Labor governments.

I am a really positive person. Queensland Day is coming up. I know all Queenslanders will celebrate that event and what it means to be a Queenslander. It is a unique opportunity to celebrate our identity, our shared history and the values that unite us all. As Queenslanders we are resilient, we are optimistic, we have a great community spirit and we have a willingness to lend a helping hand. It is terrific to nominate a number of businesses in the electorate of Moggill for awards as part of that process. Many people have got behind that. I am looking forward to celebrating Queensland Day. There will be a fantastic range of activities that will happen in communities right across Queensland.

Before I conclude, I want to acknowledge the Hon. Steve Minnikin, the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business. He recently visited the electorate of Moggill. They were certainly very appreciative to have him visit there. He hosted a round table. I want to thank him for his time in coming to the electorate of Moggill.

Housing

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (2.56 pm): Our hopes that a new government would actually do something for those stuck in housing emergency or instability have been dashed. For nearly two years I have sought reassurances that something—anything—would be done about our dire housing situation, including that funding for emergency accommodation would be available. The result is another weekend like many before, with organisations turning away residents in need because they have no funding. I spoke to desperate, angry and traumatised care workers, government workers and hospitality workers—one begging on Facebook for somewhere safe for women to park their cars to sleep in as our Salvos car park has been full for months. There have been posts from residents outraged that people are sleeping in puddles.

As I have raised many times, we have a former campground with ablution blocks sitting unused that is suitable, with minor works, for demountables, tiny homes and caravans. For years I have had to listen to excuses as to why it cannot be used: it is being master planned—the end result is nothing; it is too far from town—it is five minutes from town; the driveway during floods can get difficult—well, put a couple of pipes in; and, the real humdinger, government prefers to put its money into long-term, sustainable housing, which can be translated into 'government is happy for you to sleep in your car for the next 20 years as, even if you are eligible for subsidisation, to meet the demand of those who are will take decades.'

We have a site that for $200,000 could provide a safe, temporary solution for up to 25 residents. We have community housing providers that are happy to manage it, and I am happy to live onsite if that is what it takes. We cannot have our women begging on Facebook. This has gone beyond a crisis; it is now a disaster. Queensland's income threshold is 20 years old and lower than other states. The government's response to the housing disaster delivers nothing for these workers, instead it sells land to developers without an affordable requirement in the belief that increased supply equals affordability. It does not. Whatever is built will still be out of the reach of these women.

I have pleaded many times in this chamber for action. Now I lay it squarely at the feet of this government: you cannot blame anyone else—not the federal government and not the previous government. You are now responsible. You have not provided solutions or another site yet you own one, so do something with it. You say you care about community safety yet you are allowing this—women begging for somewhere to park their car—to happen on your watch. It is not okay and it does not pass the pub test.

Redcliffe Business Awards

Ms DOOLEY (Redcliffe—LNP) (2.59 pm): Today I rise to celebrate the outstanding success of our 2026 Redcliffe Business Awards, which were held last week in partnership with the Redcliffe Peninsula Chamber of Commerce to recognise the incredible contribution that small businesses make to our local community. The awards night, held at the Komo, was a wonderful celebration of entrepreneurship, innovation, resilience and community spirit across the Redcliffe Peninsula. With 164 nominations across 10 categories and more than 2,000 votes cast in the People's Choice Award, the event showcased the strength and vibrancy of our local business community. It was such an honour to welcome the Premier of Queensland as our special guest, demonstrating the vital importance the Crisafulli government places on supporting small businesses across our state.

Congratulations go to all of this year's Redcliffe nominees, finalists and award winners. For the record, they include the Health and Wellbeing Award, won by Chris and Thea Novic of the Redcliffe tennis and pickleball centre. Congratulations to Captain Kerry and team from Brisbane Whale Watching on winning the Tourism and Accommodation Award. The Community Impact Award was won by Tribe Social Belonging—go, Tribe. The Best Home Business Award went to Julie Blunden from Feta Juli-Etta. The Best Hospitality Business Award was won by Neli Coffee, where Janelle and Eddie are celebrating 18 years of serving coffees on the peninsula. The Trades and Services Award was won by Express Recycling. The Young Entrepreneur Award was won by Chloe Alley from Youngpreneur Markets by Chloe. The Retail Business of the Year Award was won by the iconic Morgans Seafood. The prestigious Redcliffe Business of the Year Award was won by Orange Sherbet, a brand created on the peninsula by Katie Naprasnik at age 16. She now has six stores across South-East Queensland. The coveted People's Choice Award was won by hair salon power couple Cara and Bash at Mrs Collective and Mr Collective.

Those businesses represent the very best of Redcliffe. They create jobs, support local families, create employment, provide services, contribute to community organisations and help drive economic growth across our region. Thank you once again to the Redcliffe Peninsula Chamber of Commerce, our sponsors, judges and my staff who helped make this event such a success. Special thanks go to Bendigo Community Bank Margate for being our gold sponsor; our silver sponsors Jacaranda Kitchens and Redcliffe Treehouse; and category sponsors Tribe Social Belonging, Bindi-Lee Painting, Envy Aesthetics, LST Support Services, My Care Enterprises and 99.7 Bridge FM. Bring on 2027—it will be bigger and better.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT, SMALL BUSINESS AND CUSTOMER SERVICE COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note

Resumed from 14 May (see p. 1470), on motion of Mr Lister—

That the House take note of the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee Report No. 4, 58th Parliament—*Inquiry into volunteering in Queensland*, tabled on 18 September 2025.

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.03 pm): Each and every day, the genuine kindness and generosity of Queensland volunteers is on display for all to see through P&Cs, Meals on Wheels, Lions and Rotary clubs, just to name a few. Importantly, our emergency

services volunteers put themselves at risk every day to protect their communities, including the SES, Marine Rescue, Surf Life Saving and Rural Fire Service volunteers. They take time away from their lives to make a difference in someone else's, with conviction and selflessness.

Queensland Labor has and will always recognise the importance of volunteers and volunteering to our communities. The challenges that volunteerism faces are not unique to Queensland. That is why Labor invested so heavily in our volunteer emergency services and it is why my government developed and released the Queensland Volunteering Strategy 2024-2032. Labor's strategy was as a result of consultation with over 110 sector representatives. It delivered tangible actions that would have delivered real-world outcomes for volunteers.

The inquiry report that we are debating today could have built on Labor's strategy. In fact, it should come as no surprise that seven of the committee's eight key recommendations are simply a regurgitation of our strategy. The Crisafulli government's inquiry into volunteering in Queensland is nothing more than a political box-ticking exercise. It is there in black and white—all talk, no action—with recommendations of things 'to be explored', 'investigated', 'reviewed' or 'considered'. The government's acceptance of the recommendations is 'in principle' or 'subject to further investigation'. It is noncommittal language that raises more questions than it answers.

Sadly, this approach is reflected on the ground. It should come as no surprise that in recent weeks we have learned that Crime Stoppers have all but cut the role of volunteers from their organisation. I was proud to lead a government that delivered $400,000 in ongoing annual funding to Crime Stoppers. This delivered certainty and security to that institution. For all we know, this funding is likely on the chopping block under the LNP if they have not already cut, because under the watch of the LNP government things have clearly deteriorated. Crime Stoppers have made the decision to cut around 300 volunteers from 20 area management committees representing local communities across the state. After they were delivered this shocking news, volunteers were advised—

To better balance the allocation of our core funding with delivery of the expectations in our tied and grant funding, our focus must move ...

If additional funding is what is needed then this government should act in the upcoming budget. If not, it is another example of all talk, no action.

You have to ask the questions: where is the Minister for Volunteering and what does the Minister for Police have to say about this? I expect they are too busy focusing on their imminent cabinet reshuffle to advocate for those hardworking volunteers. At least the member for Cook has bravely spoken out about these savage cuts. Perhaps we can add the member for Cook to the list of backbenchers who are auditioning for a seat at the cabinet table.

All talk, no action: sadly, that is representative of this Premier's approach to governing. Like so many other things, the Crisafulli LNP government's inquiry into volunteering report squanders the opportunity for genuine change. The committee has spent months asking questions of volunteers and organisations that Labor had already asked in the development of our strategy. Now Queensland volunteers will have their own questions to ask the Crisafulli LNP government. The time for talk is done. Where is the action?

I end by giving a shout-out to two of the many amazing volunteer groups in my electorate. The Pine Rivers VIEW club is led by Billie, Debbie and my good friend Helen Young. They are an amazing group that has been advocating for the voices, interests and education of women through social activities, skills workshops and networking events for 30 years. Like all Lions clubs, the Kallangur Lions club makes an invaluable contribution to communities across the state and the members of the Kallangur Lions are no exception. Recently, Terry and Glenn both celebrated 50 years with the club and, on behalf of the people of Murrumba and the Moreton Bay community, I thank them.

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (3.08 pm): I start by paying tribute to the many thousands of Queenslanders who are out and about volunteering in our communities every day. Those individuals dedicate their time and often their own resources in the service of others. Many do not receive the level of acknowledgement that they rightfully deserve. Each of those volunteers makes a tangible difference to the success of our great Queensland community.

In regional areas such as mine, the electorate of Nanango, volunteers are the fundamental difference between something great happening or just not. Volunteers keep our regional communities connected, moving and thriving, especially in times of hardship. I need to mention the volunteers at the

Goomeri Pumpkin Festival on the weekend. The festival is huge and has never been run without volunteers. Our local sporting clubs rely almost entirely on volunteers: coaches, referees, committee members and canteen helpers. Without volunteers, junior sport simply would not exist. Our rural firies are true regional local heroes. They respond in times of great need and danger because they care deeply about our communities. Through disasters, fires and trauma, our regions depend on them.

Rotary and Lions are our long-time quiet achievers, raising funds and supporting the vulnerable. In fact, Rotary has been in Queensland for over a century and Lions for more than 70 years. Additionally, there are groups, like South Burnett Relay for Life, that have raised more than $2 million towards cancer research. This is a monumental achievement and could not have been done without volunteers like Rowena Dionysius, who is just incredible. She and her busy team of volunteers do that each and every year. Volunteers like Eric Ford and all of the blokes from the Kingaroy Men's Shed put on Dinner Under the Stars every year and then those volunteers donate the proceeds from Dinner Under the Stars to LifeFlight. I want to congratulate them.

As Minister for Justice and Attorney-General, I wish to acknowledge the diligence and professionalism of our JPs and our commissioners of declarations—JPs like Barry Krosch in Kingaroy and Denise in Kilcoy. In fact, you and I, Mr Deputy Speaker, as the member for Lockyer, had a wonderful morning tea with local volunteer JPs and Cdecs. I believe the member for Lockyer promised to double their pay to absolutely doubling nothing, of course! It is wonderful!

We know volunteering is not always easy. It often involves late nights and very full weekends. In a modern society, people are busier than ever. Volunteers dedicate their time to helping others. Under the former government, during the past decade of decline, we saw volunteer rates go through the floor. That is why I am very proud to stand alongside my cabinet colleague the Minister for Volunteers—the first time ever there has been a dedicated minister for volunteers—

Ms Leahy: They didn't have one. They didn't care about them.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: No, the former Labor government definitely did not have one. We committed to the parliamentary inquiry which heard from volunteers across the state. In fact, 570 written submissions were received and 15 public hearings were held. I congratulate the minister, the committee, the secretariat and all those who contributed to this report.

Our engagement with volunteers does not stop here. The minister will continue to advocate on behalf of and hear from volunteers throughout her Ministerial Advisory Panel for Volunteering. I thank her for this ongoing engagement. We must better support our volunteers. They mean too much to our communities, and Queenslanders rely upon them.

As the Leader of the Opposition just said in his contribution to this debate in the House, time for talking is done. With that, after five weeks of debate and substantial consideration of this report, I move—

That the question be now put.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): I have taken some advice. This matter has been debated for over five sittings now, so there has been substantial debate. The motion is that the question be now put.

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

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 34:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Report, Motion to Take Note

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (3.18 pm): I move—

That the House take note of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly report No. 40, 58th Parliament, *Report on the 2025 budget estimates process*, tabled on 23 September 2025.

Unlike the report that we have just concluded debate on, I suspect this one will not go for five sitting weeks. The report on the budget estimates process is an annual report prepared by the secretariat of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, endorsed by the committee members. In doing so, I thank the secretariat as always for their efforts in compiling this statistical information. It is something that probably only the members of parliament in this chamber take any serious notice of, but it is important in terms of ensuring ongoing fairness around the estimates process. At the outset, I need to acknowledge that that was my first estimates as a minister again for nearly a decade. It was an opportunity—

Mr Bailey: It will be your last, the way you are going.

Mr POWELL: The member for Miller still has not gotten over it, has he? He cannot handle opposition. It's hurting! It is interesting, I did want to focus on the committee at which the member for Miller appeared. It also happened to be the committee at which I appeared. If people turn to page 3 of the report, they will note a table there that explains how long each hearing went for, the length of government questioning, the length of non-government questioning and then numbers around the total number of questions.

I will use the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee as an example. It sat for a total of 512 minutes, 189 of which were involved in taking government questions and 272 of which involved taking non-government questions. If you break that down, it works out to be 37 per cent of the time was used for government questioning and 63 per cent for non-government questioning. The great thing is if you do that comparison right across all committees, you will find that the figure is very similar—36 per cent for government questioning and 64 per cent for non-government questioning. That indicates to me that our decision to have the committees chaired by the Speaker or the Deputy Speaker resulted in a level of engagement from those opposite.

It is interesting to unpack the total number of questions asked. In the case of the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee, a total of 225 questions were asked, of which only 57 were asked by government members. That leaves a total of 168 questions that were asked by non-government members. In terms of time, clearly there was a lot more time for questions from non-government members than from government members.

On reflection, all of them were directed to directors-general or officials. The member for Miller was a classic example of this. If I recall correctly, I do not think he asked one question of the actual Minister for Health. Indeed, in my portfolio I think I was asked one question by the shadow minister for tourism and one question by the shadow minister for the environment. Of the 168 questions put by the non-government members of the estimates committee, only 20 of them were directed to the ministers. A total of 148 questions were directed to the director-general or to others. Clearly, those opposite did not want to take it up to the ministers; they preferred to approach the directors-general.

The great thing about this report is that we can look at the analyses across more than a decade and see the changes. Obviously they know that the ministers are across their portfolios, but they were too afraid to ask us. It will be interesting to see if that trend continues over the upcoming iterations of estimates hearings.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr POWELL: I could not catch that; you will have to speak louder. This is a useful report in the sense that it does demonstrate over time how government and non-government members utilise the estimates hearings. I commend the report to all members and anyone else who finds this kind of statistical analysis interesting. I commend the report to the House.

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (3.23 pm): When it comes to the estimates process, the Premier promised reform. He promised a stronger estimates process—more scrutiny, fewer Dorothy Dixers and less filibustering—but what Queenslanders got was the exact opposite. Let's be clear: the estimates process highlighted another big broken promise from Premier Crisafulli. Let's deal in facts, not spin.

The Committee of the Legislative Assembly's report into the 2025 budget estimates process confirms there were 4,282 minutes of hearings across the seven portfolio committees—just over 71 hours. Scrutiny is not measured in hours alone; it is measured in who controls the time, who asks the questions, who does the constant interrupting and, of course, who benefits. I remind the House that it was Labor that established a 70-30 rule, which guaranteed non-government members received the majority of time for questioning. That is the purpose of the estimates process. That safeguard ensured scrutiny dominated the estimates process.

In 2025, under Premier Crisafulli and this dysfunctional LNP government, that safeguard was scrapped. That was a broken promise to Queenslanders. The opportunity to hold the government to account on its cuts and delays was creamed deliberately. Then we saw procedural interruption after procedural interruption and scripted government questions being the order of the day. Across every single portfolio, the structural guarantee of major scrutiny was removed. That is not reform; that is regression.

The most extraordinary feature of the 2025 estimates process was the scale of deliberate procedural obstruction. There were 830 points of order raised during the estimates process, and 61 per cent of them were raised by government members. That is not incidental; that is tactical. Every point of order stops questioning. Every interruption consumes time that was for Queenslanders to hear answers from this government. Every procedural argument undermined scrutiny of the executive. That was their intention. We saw it in question time this week. Day after day, this government runs from scrutiny because it is riven with integrity scandals.

Queenslanders are entitled to ask a simple question: what was the LNP's objective for those estimates hearings? Was it simply obstruction? The report says it was. It was all about obstruction and hiding from scrutiny. In a unicameral parliament—the only one in the Commonwealth—a government must exercise restraint, something this government knows nothing about. These estimates hearings showed Queenslanders this is an LNP government that is sick with its own power. The Premier promised fewer government questions. Instead, government members used expanded time allocations for weak, scripted questions. The government promised less filibustering. Instead, ministers read out lengthy, meaningless and non-responsive answers.

Estimates is not theatre or some partisan performance; it is one of the only structured mechanisms in this parliament that we have to interrogate the management of billions of dollars of public funds. Hiding from scrutiny is not having respect for Queenslanders' money.

In 2025 the LNP government scrapped the 70-30 rule, and of the 830 points of order 61 per cent were from government members. Queenslanders have a right to expect the estimates process will hold ministers to account—even though the Premier of this state fails day after day to hold his ministers to account—not protect them from questioning, as this Premier does in this place.

Queenslanders expect balance, and they deserve balance. They expect transparency, and they deserve it from this government. They expect discipline in procedure, and they expect promises of reform to mean something. Instead, they saw a process where scrutiny was diluted by design by a government that is septic with disunity and lacks credibility. Queenslanders deserve a government that treats them better than the way this government treats this parliament and the democracy of this state.

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (3.28 pm): Last year, as the Premier promised, we had a wonderful new addition to the estimates system. The running of the estimates program by the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker was an enormous success in openness and fairness to both the government members and the opposition and crossbench members. The only blight on the estimates hearings of 2025 was the embarrassing questions from the opposition leader to the Speaker which he then had to apologise for because they were out of order. That was the most disgusting part of estimates 2025. I do not forget these matters.

I have been on the estimates train for 19 years. Unfortunately, quite a bit of that time, particularly the last few years, was spent on the Economics and Governance Committee where for the estimates process the chairman, the member for Logan, ran the biggest hazing exercise and protection racket for

ministers that has ever been seen—repeating questions, interrupting and basically spoiling all of the opposition's time for asking questions of ministers. He did a great job; I get that, but he was allowed to do a great job under that previous system.

Now the Speaker is involved. As we know, the Speaker is straight down the line in this parliament, is fair and gives every opportunity for opposition members to ask appropriate questions on the budget itself rather than asking other nefarious questions they like to put forward. Government members also have the opportunity to find out what is happening in their electorates and what is happening with their programs. The time for questions has been well and truly in favour of the opposition and the crossbench. That was an important part of the estimates process in 2025. To be honest, after the Parliamentary Services part of the estimates process was cleared—after that embarrassing exercise by the opposition leader—then I believe, from what I saw, the estimates program for the other portfolio committees was well managed, appropriate and respectful, as they should be.

Despite opposition members crying about the Dorothy Dixers asked by government members, it is a wonderful opportunity in many cases for government members to find out exactly what programs there are because the budget documents are not that easy to follow—they are hidden in different places; not hidden, but hard to find for non-accounting folk. It is a great opportunity for government members to find out what is happening in their neck of the woods.

I hope that this year's estimates program follows last year's estimates program. I know it is a long process for both the Speaker and the Deputy Speaker. They have a commitment to ensure the safe delivery of the estimates process. The estimates process is an incredibly important part of our government operation in terms of the government needs to be open, accountable and answerable for its decision-making. From my point of view, my experience is mostly with treasurers. That was hard to do previously. However, now we have changed the system—and we have the Deputy Speaker doing a great job sitting in for as long as he can to assist the Speaker—we will hopefully have an appropriate estimates program in 2026 based on the model of 2025, which gave more than fair opportunities for the opposition to ask their questions. I do hope they restrict their questions to financial matters in relation to the 2026-27 budget because we need an intelligent opposition, not what we have seen so far.

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.33 pm): I am happy to rise in the House today to speak on this committee report, *Report on the 2025 budget estimates process*. I do not know what planet the member for Glass House or the member for Mermaid Beach reside on, but it is not planet Queensland; it must be planet LNP. I could not believe the member for Mermaid Beach when he said the estimates committee hearing was an enormous success.

Government members interjected.

Mr DICK: They do not like it, do they? They do not like it when the truth is called out about their behaviour. That is when they yell out and interject the most. Maybe the member for Mermaid Beach did tell the truth when he said it was an enormous success. It was an enormous success in an attempt to silence the opposition from properly scrutinising the LNP government for LNP government action.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Logan. It was an attempt to suppress the opposition in doing its job. Imagine the member for Glass House coming in and saying, 'Well, questions are asked of directors-general and not of ministers.' After that performance in question time yesterday, why would you ask the member for Glass House any questions at all! We had an hour of bumbling and fumbling by a minister who was completely out of his depth, desperate to grasp the acting portfolio of the Olympics minister, but his arrogance and his foolishness meant he was unable to answer questions in question time.

We did ask directors-general questions in those estimates hearings. Maybe members of the government were not listening when I was asking Director-General Sosso, the Director-General of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, some questions. Through that process we managed to demonstrate to Queensland that Mr Sosso is not a genuinely committed public servant but a political operative of the LNP. Mr Sosso did tell the truth about the absolutely rorted and corrupt process for the appointment of the CEO of Economic Development Queensland—that LNP mate Julian Simmonds. He was absolutely honest about the dishonesty of the government, which had said there was going to be a merit selection process for that appointment and when questioned at estimates, of course, made it clear that that was just another dishonest scam perpetrated on Queenslanders by the LNP.

What did that estimates committee process demonstrate? It demonstrated once again that this is a government that is all announcement and no action—all show and no go. Where does that come from? It comes from the Premier. All of that talk about a new era of openness and accountability in government through the estimates committee process was demonstrated to be a complete sham and just window-dressing by the Premier—just words that he says so well to convince Queenslanders of one thing when Queenslanders now know that the truth is something else.

He said there was going to be more scrutiny and less filibusters. We got the opposite in the estimates hearing, didn't we? We got 830 points of order. To take the words of the member for Springwood, who benefits from the interruption? Who does the interrupting and who benefits? Of course, 61 per cent of procedural interruptions were government interruptions. Those who sought to interrupt sought to benefit from that process. There were 830 points of order raised during the estimates period—61 per cent were raised by the government and 39 per cent by non-government members. The Leader of the House alone was responsible for 26 per cent of all of the points of order, but he was advertising to the Premier that he would say and do anything to get into the cabinet. Hasn't he been on show this week demonstrating to the world that he is ready to go back into Education, to go back into the portfolio that was ripped from his hands by the Premier? He is ready to say and do anything to achieve that, and didn't we see that through the estimates committee process last year!

We have seen a process where time was consumed by interruptions, scrutiny diluted by design and control consolidated in the hands of the executive. It reminds Queenslanders how the LNP operate for themselves and not for our state.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (3.38 pm): I rise to speak to report No. 40 of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, *Report on the 2025 budget estimates process.* We have just heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Woodridge, reference 'planet Queensland', but we know that the member for Woodridge has never been on Team Queensland. To see this we only have to look at his performance when it came to being treasurer and minister for health.

It is really important to put some facts on the table in relation to the reforms implemented by the Crisafulli LNP state government that were put in place to deliver for Queenslanders. This report documents more than a procedural exercise. It details the delivery of a clear election commitment by the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government to reform, strengthen and restore integrity to Queensland's budget estimates process.

As the Leader of the House, when I brought forward the motion ahead of last year's hearings to reform the estimates process I said that estimates represents one of the most important democratic responsibilities of the Queensland parliament. It is where the annual appropriation bills are subjected to detailed scrutiny, where ministers are held to account and where transparency and respect for public expenditure is not merely encouraged but required. For too long Queenslanders had observed a process that, under the former Labor government, fell far short of that foundational purpose.

The now Premier, David Crisafulli MP, made a clear commitment that an incoming Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government would restore estimates to its rightful place as a cornerstone of accountability. The reforms we enacted gave practical effect to that commitment. For the first time, the Speaker and Deputy Speaker presided over all of the estimates hearings, and I have to give credit to the member for Condamine and the member for Scenic Rim in discharging their responsibilities. That reform brought consistency, authority and impartiality to proceedings across every portfolio committee. It ensured that rulings were made firmly and fairly and that the standing orders were applied uniformly.

Our government also expanded the time available for scrutiny. An additional day was added to the schedule, together with an additional four hours of hearings. That was a deliberate decision to increase the capacity of members to examine the budget in detail. The scale of the exercise is reflected clearly in this report. Across the seven portfolio committees there were 4,200 minutes of hearings and over 71 hours of examination. A total of 1,624 questions were directed to ministers and senior departmental officers. This is a comprehensive and substantial level of scrutiny by any measure.

I know that those opposite have sought to characterise the number of points of order during the 2025 estimates hearings as evidence of some defect in the process. In fact, the opposite is true. A disciplined process, chaired by the Speaker and Deputy Speaker, necessarily involves the consistent enforcement of the standing orders. Where questions were hypothetical, argumentative, outside the portfolio under examination or otherwise noncompliant with the rules, points of order were properly taken and ruled upon. That is not dysfunction; it is order. The government cannot help the fact that the Labor opposition fails to do their homework and come up with questions that are in order—that are not hypothetical, that are not argumentative and that are not outside the portfolio under examination.

Estimates is not a media appearance. It is a formal parliamentary proceeding governed by clear rules. Members are expected to understand those rules and draft their questions accordingly. The Labor opposition failed to do that. Where there was a high incidence of points of order, it more accurately reflected poorly framed questions and a failure by some to adhere to the standards required rather than any weakness in the framework itself. The data demonstrates that scrutiny was not curtailed. Over 71 hours of hearings and more than 1,600 questions confirm that opposition members had extensive opportunities to pursue matters within portfolio responsibilities. What was enforced was relevance, discipline and a respect for the authority of the chair.

The reforms to standing orders, including confirmation that the Speaker or Deputy Speaker preside at all hearings, and the reinforcement of powers to maintain order were central to lifting the standard of proceedings. They ensured that estimates focused on expenditure, performance and effectiveness, not theatrics. As Leader of the House, my responsibility was to ensure these reforms operated as intended. That required close coordination with the Speaker, committee chairs and the Parliamentary Service. It required sustained engagement across long hours of hearings.

The estimates reforms processes were excellent. We are not living in some twilight zone like we did under the former Labor government. They were good reforms. I commend this report to the House.

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (3.43 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Committee of the Legislative Assembly's report on the 2025 estimates program for last year. We heard from the member for Moggill, the Leader of the House, about which team you are on. There is another performance he is on: 'Team Reshuffle'. We saw that last year during estimates he was laying the groundwork for Team Reshuffle. He must have got the message 'don't call us; we'll call you' because it is now almost 12 months on but he is still keeping up the performance. The member for Moggill spoke—

An honourable member interjected.

Mr RYAN: Thank you. In respect of the member for Moggill's quite generous self-comments about his contribution through interjections at last year's estimates, I have to say that I have never seen a protection racket like that. It was almost like when you go down into the vaults of the parliament and open up that lead-lined door, unbolt the lock, and there is the member for Moggill running the protection racket.

In relation to the member for Moggill's contribution around his view about whether the estimates 2025 process lived up to the promises of the Premier and the government, the member for Moggill was very clear in what he did not say rather than what he did say. He talked about the length of the hearing, but the length of the hearing was dominated by 26 per cent of the interjections from him. When you do the breakdown—this is very important and it is in black and white in the committee report—the length of government questions was 1,550 minutes compared to 2024, which was 906 minutes. The government, in its so-called quest for accountability and transparency, gave itself more than 600 minutes worth of extra questions. That is 10 hours—a whole day—of extra questions the government gave itself, yet they say, 'We're more transparent. We're more accountable.'

Let's have a look at the other side of the equation. In 2025 the government gave non-government members 2,285 minutes compared to the year before, which was 2,780 minutes. They gave non-government members 500 fewer minutes—eight hours. They talk about more transparency but they fail at the first hurdle. Not only have they given themselves an extra 10 hours of Dixers and nonsense questions from government members; they have actually removed eight hours of scrutiny from non-government members. It is a falsehood to say that the 2025 estimates was more transparent because on the numbers it is not. It is false because they gave themselves 10 hours more and it is false because they gave non-government members eight hours less.

In terms of the breakdown of the questions, in 2025 non-government members got three-quarters of the questions; the year before it was five-sixths, so again the breakdown shows less transparency in 2025 compared to 2024. In fact, the former Labor government has the record when it comes to more questions for non-government members and more time for non-government members as well. I have to come back to the point about the constant interruptions and interference from the member for Moggill. Not only does that discount the time available to non-government members; it also removes transparency and accountability.

I hope from this report that the member for Moggill and those opposite reflect on their commitment around transparency and accountability through the estimates process. I would hope that if they are true to their word—because they were not true to their word with respect to the 2025 estimates—they

will allow more time this year for non-government questions, a greater proportion of the questions will go to non-government members and there will be fewer interjections and points of order from the member for Moggill.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (3.48 pm): The 2025 budget estimates process was an opportunity for the Crisafulli LNP government to deliver on its promises to reform, do better and provide a fresh start. Instead, the bar was set so low it was on the floor. Instead of delivering for Queensland, the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering for itself. When it comes to accountability, this process laid bare the truth of a government that has failed to live up to its own words. What is clear from this estimates process is that the Crisafulli LNP government continues to choose secrecy over transparency and political gains over genuine accountability.

The Queensland Redistribution Commission is the body that determines the electoral boundaries of this state—a body born from the Fitzgerald inquiry to ensure fairness and guard against political interference.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I seek some guidance in relation to whether the contribution from the member for Toohey is in accordance with the report and the matters contained within it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Member for Toohey, this debate is about the estimates. Can you demonstrate that your speech is in accordance with that?

Mr RUSSO: I can. I am referring to the statement of reservation that is attached to the report. Some of this was outlined in that report.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You can resume while we have a quick look at that.

Mr RUSSO: The Redistribution Commission must not only be independent but be seen to be independent, otherwise it will undermine public confidence in our democracy. What did we see on transparency? Also, when the opposition asked for the Childrens Court data, we were told to wait for the annual reports—we were redirected; we were stonewalled—yet the same data has been selectively referenced when it suits the government's narrative. That is not openness; that is convenience.

The people of Queensland expect a government that acts for them and not for themselves. They want a government that embraces the values of openness, fairness and integrity. After all, they were sold that at the 2024 election. Instead of being an opportunity for genuine interrogation of the 2025 budget—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention again to the specifics of the committee report. Could you seek assurances that the matters the member for Toohey is referring to are contained within the committee report? From my read of the content of the committee report, I do not believe that is contained within the specifics.

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are talking about the budget estimates process. Although it has many dry figures in it, members are going to bring to their—

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I have silence while I am hearing the point of order, please.

Mr POWER: Although it is about the budget estimates process—which has a lot of dry figures in it compared to other years—members are naturally going to take the committees—

Mr Minnikin: What is your point of order?

Mr POWER: The point of order is that it is relevant. Thank you for that interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have silence during the point of order.

Mr POWER: Normally you would be warned if you were making an inappropriate interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair.

Government members interjected.

Dr ROWAN: I have a further point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can we have silence for a moment while I am taking some advice. Member for Moggill, what is your point of order?

Dr ROWAN: My point of order, in responding to the acting manager of opposition business, is that this debate specifically relates to the CLA report on the 2025 estimates process. I do not believe the matters that are being referred to by the member for Toohey are contained within the matters that were canvassed with respect to that committee at the 2025 estimates.

Mr POWER: I have a point of order in response.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Last one, member for Logan.

Mr POWER: We have traversed the fact that 26 per cent of the points of order were interruptions from the Leader of the House.

Government members interjected.

Mr POWER: Hold on. That is not in this report but it is vital to the process and the answers that were given in them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Toohey, this debate is on the CLA report on the estimates process. You need to stick to that, otherwise you will be sat down. Please resume.

Mr RUSSO: What we saw during the estimates period was a diversion from what the Crisafulli government had promised would occur during the estimates period. The disguise of changing the way the estimates was run clearly pointed to the control of the whole system, whereby non-government members were unable to get the answers they needed.

As we all know, the estimates process is designed so there can be transparency and so that non-government members can get the opportunity to examine the different portfolios and understand where the government is spending the money of the Queensland people. One of the mantras of this government was that they would respect the money of the Queensland people. Yet when it came to the estimates process we were unable on many occasions to, firstly, ascertain where exactly the money was being spent and, secondly, get access to data that would have enabled us to understand the needs of the Queensland people and the different departments. That is the idea of estimates. Estimates is an opportunity for non-government members to examine ministers and directors-general to ascertain what is actually happening for the people of Queensland. That was denied to non-government members.

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (3.56 pm): We have already seen here that the estimates process in a unicameral parliament should be when there is a deep examination of the finances of this state.

Government members interjected.

Mr POWER: I am not taking interjections, although I know they are designed to silence me, just like this entire process. There will be points of order in this debate, because that is a strategy used by this government, especially by the member for Moggill, in order to silence us.

We know that promises were made. The member for Moggill was told, 'If you do the right thing, you can be a minister.' Indeed, his title and job would be the 'Minister for the Suppression of Estimates'. That promise was made to the member for Moggill but it has not been delivered—maybe it will be this time, in a couple of days, but we do not know. This might be the last estimates. We do know that the Premier has broken his promise to the member for Moggill. More seriously, he has broken his promises to the Queensland people that there would be true and genuine reform of the process. At our last estimates, we set up a system where 70 per cent of the time was given to those in opposition.

Mr Head interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Member for Callide, I have already called you to order.

Mr POWER: That was immediately thrown away. When we were in government, only 30 per cent of the time was for ministers to talk through the budget from the government's perspective and 70 per cent was for those in opposition. These LNP ministers are not up to answering 70 per cent of the questions. In terms of the speakers on this report, the member for Glass House spoke first and we know that he cannot handle five questions in question time. He does not know the basics of the agenda of a committee; he thinks the Olympics are irrelevant to the estimates process. It is gross that they have no understanding of the estimates process and think that dedicated questioning about expenditure is not part of it. That is their intent; they want to see that.

The Premier made a promise that there would be a stronger estimates process. In fact, there was a weaker estimates process dominated by points of order by the member for Moggill that were designed to slow down the process. The Premier promised there would be more scrutiny, but we have already heard there is now much more time given to the government. I think the statistics that the whip gave showed there was over 600 extra minutes of government questioning. He said there would be fewer Dorothy Dixers. I do not have the figures, but I think there were almost twice as many Dorothy

Dixers asked by the government. I want to tell the people that Dorothy Dixers are questions written by the minister and that he knows the answer to. He broke that promise. He promised there would be less filibustering. As soon as a question was put to a minister there was, as was designed, endless filibustering, which was another broken promise.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, I hate to interrupt you, but the time for this debate has expired.

Debate, on motion of Mr Power, adjourned.

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Tabled Papers, Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I refer to a document purported to be tabled by the member for Woodridge when making a contribution to the second reading debate of the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. Members of this House have an almost unfettered right to table documents, at least in the first instance. However, previous Speakers have ruled out of order attempts to table documents that are not immediately and obviously relevant to the question before the House. As per previous Speakers' rulings, tabled documents need to be relevant to the matter. I rule the document presented by the member for Woodridge as not relevant to the matter before the House and ask the clerks at the table to return the document to the member.

In addition, during private members' statements this afternoon the member for Bundaberg purported to table a document containing unparliamentary language. Accordingly, I have asked the clerks at the table to return that document to the member.

Member for Jordan, Conduct in Chamber

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, in question time this morning the Leader of the House made a point of order alleging that the member for Jordan had interjected during a response to a question without notice by the police minister when she was on a warning. At the time I asked the member for Jordan if she had interjected and she indicated that she had not. I undertook to review the tapes. I have had both the audio and video footage of that part of question time reviewed. I can advise the House that, while there were a number of voices interjecting at the time, there is no conclusive evidence from the review of the audio and video to clearly indicate that the member for Jordan was interjecting.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates and Referral of Auditor-General's Report

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (4.02 pm): I rise to advise the House of the determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 136, that the Primary Industries and Resources Committee report on the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 7 August 2026 and that the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee report on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill by 7 August 2026.

The committee has also resolved, pursuant to standing order 194B, that the Auditor-General's report No. 14 of 2025-26 titled *Managing funding from the mental health levy* be referred to the Governance, Energy and Finance Committee.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (4.03 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 23 June 2026.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (MANAGING E-MOBILITY USE AND PROTECTING OUR COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1746, on motion of Mr Mickelberg—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (4.03 pm), continuing: Before the lunch break I was highlighting the lack of action by the previous Labor government but also the frustration of residents who have had to deal with what was happening in our communities. A good example was from a couple of years ago when we moved a cenotaph from one part of Upper Coomera to another and into a beautiful park. We had only just laid the grass around that cenotaph, which is over 100 years old, and those individuals on e-bikes were there ripping up that grass. That showed their complete lack of regard for those people who gave their life for Australia. That frustrated so many residents in Upper Coomera and the Theodore electorate. We could not sit idly by any longer. That is why the Crisafulli government got on with the job and started implementing nation-leading laws to get tough on these e-mobility devices.

We also understand there are a lot of good people out there who use these devices for good reasons and they should not be punished. That is why we have come to a common ground to ensure both that those people can use these devices and that young hoodlums cannot continue their actions of the last few years.

As I said before the break, the previous Labor government members sat on their hands and did nothing. Thinking about all those individuals—the 6,000 individuals who were hospitalised or suffered injuries—we could not sit idly by. I have residents who have family members who have been seriously injured by these devices. We need to get tough on this. If we do not, it will cause an enormous number of problems when it comes to our hospital system and it will get worse and worse; it will escalate.

The Crisafulli government have drawn a line in the sand and said that enough is enough. That is why we have brought in legislation—as I said, it is nation-leading legislation—to deal with the problem once and for all, to protect the innocent people who want to use our footpaths: elderly people, families and students walking to school. They will feel a lot safer knowing there are laws in place to protect their rights to use our footpaths.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation. I thank the minister for listening to Queensland and also moving these amendments to give those people the right to have their voices heard.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (4.07 pm): I rise to address the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This year I will have been a member of this parliament for 14 years. I have to say that, of all the bills that have been debated over that time, the development of this bill, despite the best efforts of our shadow minister and opposition committee members, the members for Cooper and Kurwongbah, would have to be the most shambolic, the most haphazard, the most chaotic, the most mismanaged, the most disorganised and the most irresponsible I have ever seen. In fact, any university lecturer teaching politics 101 who wants an example of how not to develop legislation, what happens when you do not listen to what people say about draft legislation or how to draft legislation and guarantee it will not work should use this bill as their case study, because it is a complete joke. It was already a complete joke before the minister tabled the 122 amendments that we have to vote on today.

Almost 5,000 submissions were made in the committee process, with the vast majority objecting, and now we see this. The whole process around this bill is a complete and utter travesty because those amendments—which none of us on this side had seen, stakeholders had not seen and I am not even sure if the department, who are the experts, had seen before they were tabled—had not been through any kind of committee process. After those opposite first mucked up the bill before we saw the amendments, the government could have been sure these amendments were going to work if they had gone through the committee process. You would think they would be extra cautious knowing that what they had proposed was going to cause so much consternation.

These amendments have been written by either the chair of the committee, the member for Lockyer, or the transport minister—we do not know which one—but each one of them is blaming the other for the debacle. Neither of them is an expert in the area that I know of and they are certainly not

listening to what anyone is saying about it. They are going to force a new regime on Queenslanders that has had no scrutiny and that already has alarm bells ringing all over the state. It is all very well for LNP members to be attacking Labor on what we are saying about timing or whatever it is that they are attacking us on—I cannot stand listening to it all—but the laws that we put up have to be right. Not only has there been no opportunity for anyone who knows anything to scrutinise the amendments; there is 20 minutes for consideration in detail for a bill that will have such far-reaching implications.

I have been listening to government members talking about this bill and clearly they are just reading from the script they have been given, as they do. I cannot believe that if they were listening to their constituents at all they would be saying the things that they are saying to support the bill and the amendments. I cannot believe that in the electorates of those members opposite they have not had the enormous feedback from their constituents that I have had on this issue and that all opposition members have received. In fact, in all the time I have been in parliament, I would rate this issue in the top five in terms of the frequency of contact from constituents and the level of concern with regard to emails, phone calls, walk-ins and responses to my petition. People queued for hours at the special mobile office that our local councillor and I held to get people's views specifically on this issue and I cannot believe it is not the same in every other electorate.

I have heard from mums and dads, older people, people with disabilities, people commuting to work, teenagers commuting to school, people committed to active transport and people who solely use e-mobility devices because the cost of living allows them no other option. That is quite aside from the stakeholders whose lives rely on them being experts and advocates in this area. I especially want to commend Belinda Ward from East BUG, all of the BUGs and all of the stakeholders who have gone to so much effort and are so concerned about getting this right. My constituents are asking me, 'Who could possibly have even written these laws? Who could they possibly have spoken to to lead them to such ill-informed laws? Do they even know the difference between e-scooters and e-bikes, illegal motorbikes and compliant pedal-based bikes?' How could those opposite support this bill when surely there is such concern from their constituents?

We are all agreed that there is real concern—and it has been building—about people riding e-scooters irresponsibly. There is huge concern about unsafe practices especially, the sale and operation of illegal devices, the number of injuries and presentations to emergency and tragic deaths. I have had those concerns raised with me in my community, and that is why I want a bill that works. There are real threats to Queenslanders not only being safe but also feeling safe—that is, that people can go out in their community and feel safe walking along the footpath or driving along the road. My community has absolutely been saying that to me, and any new laws need to address that. We all want that. The government must address it. There is no dispute about that. However, it is our responsibility to construct our laws properly. They need to be scrutinised not only for effectiveness but also for unintended consequences. From what I hear, there are so many unintended consequences to this bill, not the least of which is making the job of our police harder. Stakeholders who do know a thing or two about this have been deafening in their refusal to stand with the minister to trumpet these new laws.

Government members interjected.

Ms FARMER: As you will note, Mr Deputy Speaker Whiting, I am not taking any interjections. I fear, as the member for Kurwongbah said so eloquently yesterday, we will be back in this House again very soon to fix the numerous problems. I hope we are, because I know the people in my community are going to be really worried and really heavily impacted. That is why we are urging the government to just do the right thing. I have done it myself as a minister: when there was legislation before this House in my portfolio and I heard from stakeholders loud and clear that they were not happy, I withdrew that legislation so it could be sorted properly. There is no shame in that. Those opposite could do that now: send this bill back to the committee, including the 122 amendments, so that we can ensure we protect those people whom we are all concerned about whilst not impacting so many other ordinary, everyday Queenslanders in the way they go about their daily life. This government is dragging Queensland backwards because of its failures. Admit you got it wrong, admit you are not the experts in everything and do this right for Queenslanders.

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (4.15 pm): Listening to the member for Bulimba, anyone would think that those opposite were not in government when e-bikes exploded across our communities and their dangerous use caused not only injuries but also deaths in our communities. The former Labor government failed to give police the powers to deal with e-bikes. More than that, it failed to tackle the growing problem and introduced a botched subsidy scheme wasting $2 million of taxpayer money that actually funded

illegal e-bikes in our communities. As a result, we have witnessed the consequences of Labor's mismanagement and failure to deal with e-bikes in our communities, particularly on the southern Gold Coast.

I have received hundreds of emails and phone calls and spoken to countless residents at mobile offices who have shared stories of serious collisions and near misses: a mother who told me about her child being struck from behind on a footpath in Currumbin; a grandfather describing how his four-year-old grandson was hit and dragged 20 metres along a footpath in Tugun. Our community will never, ever forget the tragic loss of Hudson Gagg in Tallebudgera last year. Every single one of these incidents represents a family whose life was changed forever. As a result of the inaction of the former Labor government failing to deal with the surge of e-bikes across our communities and the dangerous and illegal use of those, the Crisafulli government has introduced this bill to restore safety where people live. It is our response to what our communities have lived through during a decade of decline under Labor—what parents, children and families across the southern Gold Coast from Coolangatta to Tallebudgera have experienced on our footpaths, our streets and in our neighbourhoods.

This bill is a response to a community that has had enough. The No. 1 issue raised in my office over the years has been the dangerous and illegal use of high-powered e-bikes that the former Labor government allowed to run rampant on our streets. Tragically, we have seen lives lost on the southern Gold Coast. That is why the Crisafulli government is taking decisive action to restore safety on our roads and footpaths.

I listened to the member for Bulimba. Half of the backbenchers opposite have asked for this to be stalled and the other half have said that we rushed it, so which one is it? They cannot have it both ways. We do not want to see any more kids die as a result of Labor's inaction to deal with e-bikes. That is why we have taken this decisive action. Parents should not be afraid to walk their children to school or along the Oceanway, yet many in my community have been forced to dodge high-powered e-bikes travelling at dangerous speeds on footpaths, while children as young as 12 weave through traffic performing dangerous stunts on devices capable of excessive speeds.

The Crisafulli government is giving police the powers to seize, crush and destroy illegal e-bikes in our communities. We are introducing tougher penalties for dangerous and reckless behaviour, with fines of more than $600, and riders will have to be 16 years or older with a valid driver's licence but, importantly, we have listened to Queenslanders and included an exemption for young people who are riding with their parent or guardian. We are also cracking down on retailers and suppliers that sell dangerous high-powered e-bikes, especially those that are selling to kids under the age of 16.

Finally, this bill introduces a speed limit of 12 kilometres per hour when passing pedestrians on shared footpaths. This bill strikes the right balance between protecting pedestrians and allowing riders to travel safely. These reforms are the direct result of listening to Queenslanders—something that those opposite are yet to learn the art of. My colleague the member for Burleigh and I brought the inquiry directly to Palm Beach Currumbin State High School so local young people could have their say. Those students raised many of the same concerns we have heard from Queenslanders right across the state. They spoke about the need for age restrictions, speed limits and tougher penalties for dangerous riding and illegal devices.

These reforms have been informed not only by experts and industry but also by the voices of the very young people whom we are committed to protecting. Queenslanders have been calling for stronger laws. They have been calling for action on e-bikes. They have been calling for tough decisions to keep our community safe, and that is what this bill represents. After years of inaction by the previous Labor government, the Crisafulli government is delivering change. No parent should have to live in fear of their child being hit by an illegal e-bike. No community should be forced to wait for another tragedy before action is taken. This bill delivers action. I commend it to the House.

Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (4.19 pm): At a time when Queensland's road toll is extremely high, we need to see reforms that will keep people safe as well as get more cars off our already congested roads. Active transport should be encouraged in Queensland but, instead, what we see with this bill is that the Crisafulli LNP government has introduced bad, fatally flawed legislation that, as Bicycle Queensland submitted, risks being 'the death of safe legal e-biking in this state'.

Ms Dooley: You are worried about that more than the deaths—deaths of 14 people on e-scooters.

Mr McCALLUM: They do not like to hear it. They do not like to hear the advice of experts. They do not like to draft bills that are based on the advice of experts. They do not take the time to consult and they do not like to hear the truth of their failures when it is put to them in this House. They will have to hear it. Out of the almost 5,000 submissions that were made to the committee's inquiry on this bill, around 95 per cent of them—an overwhelming majority—raised issues with either some or all of the bill. Bicycle Queensland submitted that this bill was 'the death of safe legal e-biking in this state'.

This bill is an absolute shambles that has been brought forward to this parliament by a shambolic minister who is in the shambolic cabinet of a shambolic government. This is cooked, and the minister knows it. Now he is desperately rushing to try to fix the mistakes but they cannot even get that right. Rather than just simply admitting that they got it wrong, the minister has come into the House and dumped at the eleventh hour 122 amendments—39 pages worth.

The government should have taken the time to get this right. Why didn't they do this properly in the first place and take the time to get it right and solve a real problem facing Queenslanders? Instead, they chose to rush to address a political problem. They rushed so that the Premier could jump on national media to get on the news cycle. This is a government that is driven by a desire for photo-ops, a desire for media, but there is absolutely no follow-through. That is why we are debating a bill that has been absolutely pilloried by industry and stakeholders.

The minister has had to come in here and dump an absolute bucketload of amendments to try to fix a bad bill. The government have refused to send the amendments that the minister has tabled—these 39 pages and 122 changes—back to the committee for examination. Once again they are avoiding consultation and subverting proper debate of legislation in this House. These amendments are extremely substantial amendments to an already substantial bill—even though it is a bad bill—which makes huge, sweeping changes to e-mobility use in Queensland. The government chose to vote against our motion to refer these amendments back to the committee, I suspect, because they do not want a repeat of the bill process. They always want to silence community stakeholders. They know that stakeholders will have even more questions and concerns about these amendments. Instead of following proper, due process, this government is subverting the passage of the amendments through this House and the government is running away from proper scrutiny so it can tick this box and move on.

I believe that the minister intentionally waited to circulate these amendments until the eleventh hour. The minister put out a press release the day before the amendments were tabled in the House. The minister stood up and did a press conference the day before. If ever you needed proof that this is a government that is obsessed with the media cycle, that is it. Not only did the Premier when announcing these sweeping changes jump up on national media; the minister, when he had to call a press conference to say how he was going to fix this absolutely broken bill, decided to do the media before he tabled the amendments in this House. It is absolutely extraordinary. We have total chaos and total incompetence when it comes to this cabinet. When you have bills like this that are completely and utterly flawed, it is no wonder the Premier is being forced to a point where he is going to have to have a cabinet reshuffle.

If the Crisafulli government did not have the decency to give the opposition an opportunity to read the amendments before this debate, they could have at least had the decency to give Queenslanders the opportunity to have their say on the amendments before they introduced them in the House. That is why we moved a motion to send the 122 substantial amendments back to committee, but the LNP did not want a bar of it. They do not want to hear from the community about the 39 pages of amendments that they have. They want to crunch it through this House tonight—complex amendments to complex legislation that was dropped in this House with next to no notice. Of course, the guillotine motion which will drop later tonight will allow 20 minutes for consideration in detail. The 122 amendments and all of the unamended sections of the bill will be considered in 20 minutes. That is an indictment on every single government member.

Many stakeholders raised the issue of a lack of consultation. We have seen community stakeholders say—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Member for Bonney and member for Currumbin, I have already called you to order this afternoon.

Mr McCALLUM: Thank you for your protection, Deputy Speaker. They do not like it. Stakeholders have said they felt that the government's consultation treated them as merely an afterthought. The government should send these amendments to the bill back to the committee. The government should do proper consultation on the amendments. The government should take the time to do their work properly, to do this reform properly. Follow due process, allow proper scrutiny and listen to the experts. Do not bring into this House fatally flawed legislation that will not fix the problems that it purports to.

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (4.30 pm): The choice we have in this debate is on full display. We have a government that is here to deliver, against an opposition that wants to deliberate. We have an opposition that wants a third committee process on this issue compared to a government that wants to drive change. Those opposite cannot even get their story straight: are we rushing, are we delaying, are we delaying our rush, are we rushing our delay? The points we have heard from the Labor Party have been all over the shop.

I am very proud to rise in support of this bill, as are all members of the Crisafulli government, because more than anything this debate is about one thing, and that is safety. We are driving these reforms because over the last decade too many Queenslanders, particularly young Queenslanders, have lost their lives and too many families have had their lives changed forever as a result of serious incidents involving e-bikes and e-scooters.

I take offence at not being regarded as an important part of the Gold Coast because I do not have surf beaches like the member for Currumbin. This is actually a very big issue along the beautiful Broadwater, which is a legitimate part of the Gold Coast. I want to thank the locals who over many years have consistently raised with me issues with these illegal devices—dangerous riders and a lack of consequences for those who do the wrong thing. I want to thank the parents who have told me that they are worried about young people riding high-powered devices at high speeds. I want to thank the older residents who have told me they feel unsafe on shared pathways and footpaths because they simply do not know what is coming or how fast.

I want to thank the hundred or so people who completed my survey. One person did not agree with what we were putting forward, but the rest were in favour, which is fantastic. I want to give a shout-out to some of them today. I want to highlight Alannah from Arundel who said—

As an emergency nurse, I see not only kids who have fallen/crashed due to e-bike use without wearing a helmet, but I've also seen the people walking along the street or on the sidewalk that have been injured due to people on e-bikes.

We've all seen the deaths due to e-bike/e-scooter usage!

I want to thank Angela in Labrador who said she absolutely supported these reforms and that they are long overdue. She said—

Riders literally terrorize pedestrians and motorists before and after school doubling up on rides and speeding on one wheel in streets not just footpaths.

Margaret in Labrador said—

It is particularly dangerous for me walking along the foreshore footpaths at Marine Parade in Labrador as I am hard of hearing and often don't hear scooters and bikes coming from behind.

Susan in Biggera Waters said the same thing. She talked about the Lands End to Charis section of our Broadwater path and said—

It is so dangerous with people walking with their children and dogs. Even by yourself you have to be watching when they come up behind. They treat it like a racetrack.

My constituents also told me that they do not want responsible riders to be punished. They understand that e-mobility devices can be a practical and affordable way to get to work, to school or to see the beautiful parts of our Gold Coast. What they want to see is common sense. They want to see stronger penalties for dangerous behaviour. These powers will give police the power to seize and destroy illegal devices that have no place on our roads, footpaths and shared pathways. They introduce long overdue new standards so Queenslanders can tell what is legal and what is not. They ensure those operating these devices understand the responsibilities that come with using them. This is ultimately about restoring confidence for families, pedestrians, motorists and responsible riders who have watched dangerous and deadly behaviour become far too common.

This has come about because Queenslanders have rightly demanded action. They have also demanded that we get the balance right. That is exactly what this government has done. We—in particular the Minister for Transport—have listened to parents, to schools, to councils, to disability

advocates, to industry groups and to locals. These reforms target dangerous behaviour and illegal devices, they strengthen penalties for those who put others at risk, they give police the powers they have been calling for, they establish clearer standards around what can and cannot be used on our roads and pathways and they provide certainty for responsible riders. Again, this is not about punishing people who are doing the right thing; it is about protecting Queenslanders from those who are not.

These are practical changes that we are putting forward in amendments that are being made to ensure that these reforms are workable, to ensure that they are proportionate and to ensure that, above all, they are focused on safety. The result is legislation that will protect public safety while recognising that most Queenslanders who use these devices are doing the right thing. This is about ensuring that parents feel safe taking their children for a walk along our beautiful Broadwater, it is about ensuring that older Queenslanders can use a shared pathway without fear of being knocked over by a high-powered illegal device and it is about ensuring that responsible riders can continue to enjoy the benefits of e-mobility in a safer environment. The Crisafulli government promised to deliver nation-leading e-mobility reforms. This is change that is long overdue. This bill delivers on that commitment and I commend it to the House.

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (4.36 pm): The tortured history of this incompetent bill from a bumbling minister, of absurd restrictions proposed and withdrawn, then 122 last-minute amendments dropped as late as possible, means this colossal mess of a bill would make a dog's breakfast look like a three-Michelin-star dish. The Minister for Transport and Main Roads, not renowned for his understanding of active transport—I have never seen him out and about on the ground looking at this issue—has put himself squarely in the picture for demotion or sacking by the Premier at the inevitable cabinet reshuffle based on his woeful and incompetent performance with the bill and after so many other botch-ups in the portfolio.

The member for Buderim—probably his only title in this House in the near future—cannot say he did not have time to set it right. He had a year and a half to wrap his head around it and 18 months later there he is on ABC Radio confused, inept and providing wrong information in the very week the bill is to be debated. The Minister for Transport is now clearly on the demotion list along with the members for Everton, Whitsunday, Glass House, Mudgeeraba, Clayfield and Surfers Paradise. I note the big smile on the face of the member for Chatsworth. He is no longer No. 19.

Labor cannot support the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill in its current form. Labor supports safe and responsible e-mobility use. We support action on illegal devices, dangerous riding, riding without helmets, riding while intoxicated and riders putting pedestrians at risk. We support strong police powers where they are targeted at the people selling, modifying and riding dangerous illegal devices. The problem is that this bill is still a complete dog's breakfast—and the member for Buderim cooked it.

Premier Crisafulli, as clueless on this as his minister, waved it through. The LNP party room, equally clueless, backed it in. Now the minister trudges into the chamber with 122 last-minute amendments to patch up the mess he took 18 months to create. That tells us the bill was defective from the start. There are 67 clauses and 1 schedule in this bill and 122 amendments, but there are only 20 minutes for consideration in detail. This is a minister who is scared to respond in consideration in detail. He is not up to it. That is why there are only 20 minutes for those amendments.

That is the low standard of supposed scrutiny under Premier Crisafulli and this minister. These late amendments are substantial. They rewrite key parts of the scheme. They affect who can ride, where they can ride, under what supervision, at what speed and on what device. The minister deliberately held them back. There was nothing to stop him circulating them earlier, as any decent minister would have. If the Crisafulli LNP government did not have the decency to give the opposition proper time to read them before the debate he could at least have had the decency to give Queenslanders proper time to read them before they were dropped in the House.

Government members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: The arrogance of this government—as evidenced by the interjections from those opposite—is obvious. It is an abuse of parliamentary process, it is contempt for the committee and it is contempt for stakeholders, as well as for members of this House. More importantly, it is contempt for ordinary Queenslanders who will be impacted by this archaic bill. They are treating this parliament like their plaything. It is a case of 'here we Joh again'. The real problem in Queensland is the sale and misuse of devices that are already illegal, overpowered and dangerous. The crackdown should have been aimed squarely at importers, sellers, modifiers and speeding riders using illegal devices that

should never be on roads, shared footpaths or bikeways to begin with. Instead, the member for Buderim produced a confused scheme that hammers and penalises lawful riders with new rules while the cowboys on illegal devices—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order, members.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, there are so many interjections from those wanting the cabinet vacancies that are coming up. It is pretty clear what is going on in this chamber. They are all yelling over themselves, trying to impress. Good on you! Keep going hard.

The member for Buderim was fined by police after uploading his own speeding videos to social media. He has zero credibility on road safety because he is not capable of it when he drives on roads. You only need to follow his own social media platforms to know that because he was the one who posted those videos on his social media platforms—with the Attorney-General in the passenger seat. How can you trust this guy on anything to do with road safety? The road toll is surging, including 14 active transport deaths last year, which is the worst total of lives lost in 16 years in this state, and this year is tracking much worse, on this incompetent minister's watch. This bill will not help. Now he is botching e-mobility. He botched the detail and avoided scrutiny and then expects Queenslanders to deal with the fallout.

I refer to the licence requirement. A driver's licence shows whether someone has met the requirements to drive a car. It simply does not show whether someone can safely ride an e-bike, use a shared path properly or avoid putting pedestrians at risk. A blanket licence rule will punish older Queenslanders who have surrendered a driver's licence but still use an e-bike or e-trike to get to the shops, appointments, medical appointments and the like. It also punishes people who may not be able to have a licence for a variety of legitimate reasons and is therefore discriminatory.

People with a disability raised the same concerns. For some Queenslanders, e-mobility means independence. It means inclusion in our community. It means getting to work, to study and to health care and getting around your own neighbourhood. Now, at the last minute, the government has finally announced a medical exemption framework after enormous public pressure. That proves the original drafting was botched by this minister. Where was the minister? He was AWOL—hands not on the handlebars and not paying attention.

The member for Buderim should have dealt with disability access from the very beginning. It was obvious to any thinking minister. The minister should have consulted properly, listened and responded to the obvious questions at any time in the past 18 months, before the bill got anywhere near the floor of the parliament. Who qualifies? What medical evidence is required? Who decides? How long will it take? What happens to people who already own modified or disability-specific devices paid for through the NDIS? The minister is still hiding on those questions and has not answered them properly.

The original bill banned children under 16 from riding these devices. Now the minister says that children aged 12 to 17 can ride under parental supervision. If a 12-year-old can now ride without a licence but under supervision and people who cannot get a licence for medical reasons are exempted from the requirement, we have to ask: what is left of the licence requirement?

The same confusion applies to speed limits. The original bill imposed an absurd 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths and shared paths, and that has to be noted. This was unsupported by any evidence and inconsistent with practical riding conditions, as any bike rider in this state would understand. I table a summary from my Strava app of a run I did on shared pathways two days ago, when my running speed average was 11.85 kilometres an hour. That is nearly two kilometres above the original 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit and virtually equal to the safe speed at which they are now supposed to pass runners using the shared paths. That shows how absurd this bill is. Is this minister serious that the maximum speed of e-scooters and e-bikes around pedestrians and runners will only be at a running pace? On what planet does this minister live?

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 2 June 2026, from Strava, featuring a post by the member for Miller, Hon. Mark Bailey MP [875].

What is the definition of 'high pedestrian area' and who decides that? Will it be signposted? Who will pay for that: the council or the state government? How do the police enforce a rule that the minister himself could not explain on ABC Radio? What hope do the police have? At his Bicentennial Bikeway media conference, the minister told the media that shared path speed limits would be 25 kilometres an hour and, embarrassingly, his own spokesperson had to correct him. That happened during the week that his own bill is being debated. The minister could not get through a press conference without misrepresenting his own legislation. If he cannot explain the speed limits, how does he expect Queenslanders using active transport to follow them?

As a runner, I do not expect e-scooters or e-bikes on the Bicentennial Bikeway to have to ride alongside me for fear of an expensive fine. I might add, it is obvious that Minister Mickelberg does not understand the difference between an e-bike and an e-motorbike. The bill allows e-mobility devices on roads with speed limits up to 60 kilometres an hour. The government is slowing and complicating shared path use while allowing more devices onto roads with cars, trucks and other vehicles.

Minister Mickelberg now wants to take credit for new problems he has created through his own incompetence. He wants credit for amendments that only exist because the first draft was a botch-up, as this one is. He wants the parliament to wade through a patch-up job after being given almost no time to scrutinise it. We will not be doing that. This is proof that under the Crisafulli government Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures. It is being dragged backwards by a Premier who promised confidence but is delivering chaos. This bill is a cluster you-know-what. The amendments do not clean it up. They prove it was unfit to be—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, that is unparliamentary. Can you withdraw that?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. We will be back on this bill because it is a botch-up—

(Time expired)

Mr CRANDON (Coomera—LNP) (4.45 pm): This week the Crisafulli government will deliver nation-leading e-mobility laws that will take effect from 1 July. We said we would make the tough decisions to deliver nation-leading reforms and get dangerous e-scooters and e-bikes off Queensland streets, and that is exactly what the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026 does.

The use of both legal and noncompliant e-mobility devices has been causing significant community concern right around Queensland and most certainly in my electorate. This relates to a range of issues including an unacceptable rise in injuries and fatalities, particularly involving children and pedestrians, meaning people feel unsafe on footpaths. These tough new laws are to keep pedestrians and the community safe, with new powers granted to police to seize high-powered and illegal devices as well as hold parents accountable. I will be talking about that shortly.

The Crisafulli government took a calm, methodical and evidence-based approach to deliver these practical, enforceable reforms to make Queensland safer after the former Labor government allowed the illegal use of e-mobility devices to spiral out of control. Existing regulations have not kept up with the rapid growth in e-mobility use, contributing to rising incidents linked to unsafe and illegal behaviour. Between 2022 and 2025, more than 6,000 e-scooter related injuries were recorded in 36 Queensland hospitals, based on emergency department data. Some of those injuries will be permanent for those people. They will carry those injuries throughout their lives. We will give police the powers they need to take dangerous high-powered and illegal devices off the streets while backing in Queenslanders who choose to do the right thing. That is the important point here. The Crisafulli government has welcomed the recommendations of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee following its detailed review of the bill. We have listened to the concerns of the community and have put forward a number of amendments.

I will give a real-life example of the failure of those opposite. Last year I was at a coffee-with-a-cop session at Coomera town centre with officers from both stations that service the northern Gold Coast—Pimpama and Coomera stations. Michael, from Signature Restaurant and Bar, hosted us. It is a great location just outside Coles that serves great coffee. Thank you, Michael. During a quiet period, I asked the officers about issues they were facing. The No. 1 issue they raised was e-bikes and their lack of power, including the rigmarole they had to go through to take e-bikes off the roads under Labor. Would you believe that under those laws they had to call a tow truck to collect an e-bike?

Before I go into Labor's record, let me just talk about Rachel Nolan. We all remember Rachel Nolan?

Government members: Queensland Rail not for sale!

Mr CRANDON: Yes, Queensland Rail not for sale. She was a Labor transport minister and now chair of Bicycle Queensland. Where are they getting all their information from? Where are they getting all of their misinformation from? Rachel Nolan! She did not even know they were going to sell half of Queensland Rail when she was the minister. 'Queensland Rail not for sale!' Now she is feeding them all of this rot.

Let me come back to the main point: the police could not act on the activities of these kids that we are talking about. They were aided and abetted by Labor. The former Labor government left Queensland police ill equipped to enforce regulations, introduced a botched subsidy scheme, wasted $2 million in taxpayer money and turned a blind eye to the rise of illegal, high-powered devices.

The scheme funded e-mobility devices that were targeted at children who were not legally allowed to ride them. In Queensland the minimum age to ride an e-scooter under current laws is 12 years old, when supervised. The scheme funded e-scooters which had a top speed of 70 kilometres an hour and e-bikes which could have speed restrictions removed at the touch of an on-screen button.

In December 2023 the member for Aspley, the then minister for transport and main roads, committed to consider amendments to the law to give police the powers to conduct random breath tests. It never happened. This demonstrates that Labor did not give police the powers that they need to do their jobs during their decade of decline. Through this bill, we will give the police the powers they need to keep Queenslanders safe. This legislation reverses that 10 years of failure, provides police with seizure and disposal powers for noncompliant e-mobility devices and other illegal motorbikes and creates new rider offences for these devices. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr HEALY (Cairns—ALP) (4.51 pm): A great contribution. It was very interesting. Queensland is witnessing—

Mr Crandon: Thank you, Michael.

Mr HEALY: My pleasure. Queensland is witnessing one of the most profound shifts in personal transport behaviour in decades. Amid rising fuel prices, escalating household costs, worsening traffic congestion and increasing pressure on public transport networks, more Queenslanders than ever are turning to e-bikes, e-scooters and micromobility devices as affordable, practical and, more importantly, sustainable transport alternatives. Yet, astonishingly, at the very moment the state should be embracing this transition and investing in its future, the Crisafulli LNP government has delivered legislation so fundamentally flawed, so poorly consulted on and so disconnected from modern transport realities that it risks becoming one of the most regressive transport policy failures Queensland has seen in many years.

This bill is not evidence-based reform. It is not smart regulation. It is a rushed, reactionary and deeply car-centric response from a government that simply does not understand the role micromobility now plays in the everyday functioning of Queensland communities and broader economies around the world in First World developed countries.

Queenslanders were promised action targeting dangerous and illegal devices, and we all expected that. Instead, what we have received is legislation that punishes responsible riders, undermines active transport, threatens tourism and small businesses, creates unworkable enforcement burdens and risks forcing thousands of people back into cars and onto already congested roads. This is not transport planning; this is policy failure.

The proposed blanket 10-kilometre-per-hour speed limit on shared pathways and footpaths has been widely condemned by experts, local governments, cycling groups and medical professionals alike. Even the Department of Transport's own guidelines acknowledge that bicycles and e-bikes become unstable at excessively low speeds. Yet, the government has persisted with what the Gold Coast City council accurately described as a speed limit 'pulled out of the air'. This is what happens when governments legislate for headlines instead of outcomes.

The Crisafulli government appears incapable of distinguishing between illegal, high-powered electric bikes masquerading as bicycles and thousands upon thousands of compliant e-bikes. The law-abiding users simply want an affordable and efficient way to commute, work, exercise, socialise or participate in community life. The consequences of getting this wrong are significant.

Queensland's active transport network is not a niche recreational system. It is now a vital component of the state's transport ecosystem. E-bikes and e-scooters reduce pressure on roads, reduce parking demand, reduce emissions, ease congestion and improve connectivity to public transport networks. They help workers get to jobs, students get to education and older Queenslanders maintain independence and mobility. For many families facing cost-of-living pressures, e-bikes have become an essential part of life. At a time when Queenslanders are struggling with rising fuel costs and economic uncertainty, this legislation effectively attacks one of the few genuinely affordable transport alternatives available to ordinary people.

The irony is staggering. Around the world, governments are investing billions into active transport infrastructure and micromobility integration because they recognise these systems are essential to the future of urban mobility. Cities across Europe, Asia and North America are embracing e-mobility as a critical tool for reducing congestion, lowering emissions and improving livability. Meanwhile, Queensland's LNP government is trying to regulate it into dysfunction. This legislation sends a clear

message: this is a government still trapped in the outdated transport thinking of the past; a government whose world view remains dominated by cars, roads and punitive regulation rather than integrated, modern mobility solutions.

It also demonstrates a breathtaking failure to understand the economic role e-mobility now plays across Queensland. Food delivery services, tourism operators, bike hire businesses, accommodation providers, cafes and retailers all rely heavily on e-mobility infrastructure and usage. Uber Eats alone warned the parliamentary committee that reducing e-bike participation would create operational challenges for almost 10,000 Queensland businesses that rely on delivery networks. At the same time, tourism operators from Noosa to the Whitsundays warned these laws could devastate guided tourism experiences, particularly for international visitors and families. A Whitsunday operator described the legislation as potentially crippling to their business's viability. Bike hire operators warned they may no longer survive. Regional tourism economies warned of reduced visitor accessibility. Local governments warned of unaffordable signage and compliance burdens. Disability advocates warned vulnerable Queenslanders would be excluded from transport options essential to their independence and social inclusion. Medical professionals warned the legislation could actually increase injuries and fatalities by forcing riders onto higher speed roads. Still the government pressed ahead.

This extraordinary level of stakeholder opposition should have forced the government back to the drawing board immediately. Instead, the Crisafulli government chose arrogance over consultation. Bicycle Queensland stated openly that the organisation's phone 'had been remarkably silent' throughout the drafting process. That is an astonishing indictment. To introduce sweeping reforms affecting hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders without properly consulting the peak cycling body, disability groups, councils, tourism operators and businesses is not merely poor governance; it is negligent governance.

The proposed licensing requirements are another example of how deeply disconnected this legislation is from reality. The idea that requiring a driver's licence—and this is the government that says, 'We are here to cut the red tape'—is somehow an effective safety mechanism for low-speed e-bike use has been comprehensively dismantled by stakeholders. Licensing is a poor proxy for safety or competence. It unfairly targets elderly Queenslanders who have voluntarily surrendered licences, people with disabilities, international migrants and lower income workers who rely on e-bikes for employment and mobility. Many delivery workers, migrants and temporary residents depend on e-bikes because they provide low-cost access to employment without the financial burden of car ownership.

This legislation threatens to strip that opportunity away. Incredibly, the government is pursuing these restrictions while Queensland prepares for the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games—an event for which active transport and integrated mobility systems are central pillars of planning philosophy. The International Olympic Committee actively encourages sustainable transport alternatives such as walkability and micromobility integrations during games delivery.

Cities around the world showcase bike networks and e-mobility as symbols of innovation, accessibility and environmental leadership, yet Queensland's response under the Crisafulli government appears to be restricting, bureaucratising and discouraging those very transport modes. There is absolutely no doubt that this is proof the Crisafulli LNP government in Queensland is dragging us backwards. It is not moving us in the right direction. We are going backwards because this government is paralysed by its own failures.

Ms DOOLEY (Redcliffe—LNP) (5.00 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This important piece of legislation responds to a growing challenge in communities right across Queensland, including my electorate of Redcliffe. The Crisafulli government is delivering nation-leading reforms to make Queensland safer after the former Labor government bankrolled the rollout of illegal devices on Queensland's streets.

Redcliffe is a community that embraces an active lifestyle. We have families enjoying our beautiful foreshore, seniors walking along Suttons Beach, children riding to school, tourists exploring our peninsula and residents using shared pathways every single day. Our extensive network of foreshore footpaths and shared pathways is one of our greatest community assets. Increasingly, like every member in this House, I have heard concerns from residents about dangerous riding behaviour, illegal high-powered devices, youth offender e-scooter gangs and pedestrians feeling unsafe in places that should be safe for everyone.

The reality is that e-mobility devices have become a significant part of modern transport. When used responsibly they provide a convenient, affordable and environmentally friendly way to travel; however, as their popularity has increased so too have the risks associated with unsafe and unlawful

use. The evidence is alarming. According to emergency department data, between 2022 and 2025 more than 6,000 e-scooter related injuries and, tragically, 14 deaths were recorded in 36 Queensland hospitals. That is 14 families and communities who have devastatingly been affected forever.

I find it offensive that the opposition do not support a bill that can help save lives and limit permanent disability. The committee heard from emergency doctors and peak bodies, like the AMA. They are calling for urgent e-scooter reforms after a sharp surge in severe injuries, death and permanent disability. They are the ones who are pushing for a minimum riding age of 16, mandatory certified helmets and speed caps to curb traumatic incidents across the state.

My daughter works in a very busy emergency department and reports that people with e-scooter injuries come through their doors daily. She says that something needs to be done urgently. This is why the bill matters. At the heart of this legislation is saving lives. It is about ensuring our footpaths remain safe for elderly residents walking to the shops or walking their dog. Most importantly, it is about preventing tragedy.

One of the strongest aspects of this bill is that it gives police the powers they need to take action against dangerous and illegal devices. From 1 July police will be able to seize and destroy illegal devices, including high-powered e-motorbikes, when they are left in public places. Police will also have the ability to conduct random breath testing on riders of e-bikes, e-scooters, personal mobility devices and bicycles. The introduction of random breath testing sends a clear message that safety standards apply to everyone using Queensland's roads. Importantly, this bill also introduces stronger accountability measures. Parents who knowingly allow their children under 16 to ride illegally will face penalties. It is about accountability.

For Redcliffe residents, one of the most welcome changes will be strengthened protections for pedestrians. Many local residents have raised their concerns about excessive speeds on footpaths. Our waterways—including Suttons Beach, Settlement Cove from Clontarf to Scarborough and the Redcliffe Jetty precinct—and our beautiful beachfront pathways are busy with families, tourists and older residents and they need to be kept safe.

This legislation has been informed by extensive consultation. The State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee received 5,000 submissions. Those opposite who claim we have not consulted clearly have not read the report. The government has listened and consulted. This bill recognises that innovation and public safety go hand in hand. The people of Redcliffe deserve safe footpaths and shared pathways. They deserve to have confidence that dangerous and illegal devices will be removed from public places. They deserve to have a police equipped with the powers necessary to enforce the laws and protect our community. For the families who walk our foreshore, for the children who ride our pathways, for the seniors who enjoy our community spaces and for every Redcliffe resident who deserves to feel safe in public, I commend the bill to the House.

Ms ASIF (Sandgate—ALP) (5.06 pm): The Labor opposition has been calling on the LNP government to take meaningful action to improve e-mobility safety in Queensland. We have been doing that for months. Unfortunately, what we have is nothing but a botched bill with 122 amendments on the table.

Road safety is everyone's responsibility, but it relies on strong and targeted laws that balance the diverse needs of our community. Unfortunately, this bill does not provide that. The inquiry into e-mobility use and safety in Queensland was launched in response to a widespread concern about the unsafe use of e-mobility vehicles. This bill is a rushed and, quite honestly, half-baked attempt to regulate e-mobility. It still fails to address the fundamental issues of illegal devices in the community and risks severe unintended consequences for riders and pedestrians.

These amendments need to be sent back to the committee. There is a significant number of amendments on the table—122 of them. There were almost 5,000 submissions made to the committee and, overwhelmingly, the issues they raised have not been addressed. In a press conference the minister said he was cooked. He has truly cooked this bill.

During the process, countless people in my community reached out to me to raise their concerns. They copied in the minister, and I hope he has taken the time to read some of those emails. In case he has not, I am happy to go through each of those emails. Paul said, 'I commute regularly from Sandgate to the city and always see illegal fast scooters. This bill does nothing to fix that.' Liam said, 'Instead of wasting government resources on this absurd, ineffective and ill-thought-out legislation, we should focus on enforcing current laws and cracking down on retailers supplying high-speed, high-powered devices.'

Linda said, 'I am a 63-year-old woman who lives in Brighton, who doesn't hold a driver's licence and has never driven a car. I own a legally compliant e-bike. In the part of the suburb I live in I see one bus an hour outside of peak hour and I am a 30-minute walk away from the nearest train station. My e-bike enables me to safely cycle into Sandgate, Redcliffe and the peninsula to access local services. I am disappointed to see the state government's proposal of this bill. It seriously limits my transport options.'

Kevin said, 'I am 74 years old and ride a bike. A 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit would force me to give up my bike entirely.' Craig and Holly said, 'Safe legal e-mobility has been a godsend for people living with disability, vision impairment, are aged or those with medical conditions. This will really tackle their independence.' Adam said, 'This bill will be catastrophic for safe, independent travel for people who rely on cycling for everyday transport.' Daniel said, 'The proposal would add significant administrative and enforcement workload for the police while doing nothing to address the real problem of illegal high-powered devices.'

There are so many. I could keep going. I will name a few more just to make the point that the minister has clearly not listened to any of our constituents in any of our communities, because I cannot be the only one getting hundreds of emails about this. I am sure every member in this chamber is receiving them.

Nick said, 'The committee acknowledged major issues but proposed no detail as to how exemptions might be applied.' Keith and Franca said, 'We are retired and frequently ride our legal e-bikes on local bike tracks. Our bikes are legally governed to a safe speed—forcing us onto the roads makes us both feel very unsafe.' Paul said, 'This legislation will negatively affect my family, particularly due to strict restrictions it imposes on students.' I can keep going. There are pages and pages of them.

These proposed laws would make legal, efficient and affordable transport options incredibly difficult for many people in our communities who are unable to drive or access reliable public transport. The government is well aware of the high costs and uncertainty which comes with driving. While Queenslanders continue to face cost-of-living pressures and the high cost of fuel, the LNP continue to hike the cost of vehicle registration and deflect responsibility for their failure on to other people. They are also cutting train services, delaying trains and blaming it on industrial action. They have reduced services to weekend hours at some stations so people cannot get to work, all the while taking away modes of transport that they have available to them.

We need the government to choose to make public transport accessible and to ensure people have the ability to use all forms of transport that they can. They have reduced staff hours at train stations across the state, impacting access for disabled and elderly patrons, and it is significantly impacting the safety of vulnerable users such as students who attend school.

Getting around in Queensland is already a daily struggle for so many people. We have a minister who cannot run an effective rail network. Sandgate residents are waiting longer and longer for trains, services are being cut and stations are left unstaffed. Our public transport system is failing Queenslanders. People have been turning to e-bikes and e-scooters, and now they are being told that they are not able to use them anymore to get to school, to get to work or to get to medical appointments. Now more than ever it is crucial that Queenslanders have access to more affordable alternative transport options, especially if they cannot rely on the system that is available to them.

The majority of users operate their vehicles safely and responsibly. Students and workers use e-scooters to travel safely to and from public transport. There are elderly people and people with a disability who use e-bikes to travel independently around their communities. This bill would unjustly impact many of those groups who have done nothing wrong, rather than focusing on the illegal, modified e-motorbikes, which are causing the real harm on our streets. This bill does nothing to address them. It lacks specific provisions to penalise illegal modifications, relying only on the implementation of specific European design standards for all devices.

In areas like my electorate of Sandgate, public transport is extremely limited outside of peak hours—something I have written to the minister about many times. Many people rely on these devices to travel within the community and to and from public transport hubs. Without e-mobility devices, what are people supposed to do and how are they supposed to get to those train stations?

Brisbane's outer suburbs are notoriously under-serviced by public transport and rideshare options are expensive and unreliable, particularly late at night. For many elderly people or people with a disability e-bikes have provided much needed independence to get to the shops and to social events. E-scooters have provided school students a way home that does not require them to walk on main

roads or to get to and from bus stops. However, the proposal to implement licensing requirements removes that option. Many groups who currently rely on PMDs and EPACs do so because they cannot drive. For many seniors, this is a cost-effective option and something that needs to be considered in this bill.

Requiring a driver's licence for vehicles that are not powerful enough to drive on roads and cannot exceed 25 kilometres an hour is nothing short of ridiculous. Although government committee members recommend that an exemption from licensing requirements can be created for people with a disability, it is actually unclear how that will work.

As many community members and stakeholders have raised, it is an absurd bill which does not tackle the real problems. Now, the minister at the last minute has proposed 122 amendments, giving us 20 minutes in consideration in detail to speak to those amendments. It is absolutely ridiculous. The government is putting through a bill which is supposed to tackle a big issue in Queensland. All it is doing is making it difficult for people who are doing the right thing to be able to commute across Brisbane.

This bill is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards, dragged backwards by a government that is paralysed by its own failures. This bill fails to address the core reasons behind unsafe use, and unfairly targets responsible and vulnerable commuters. It is a rushed and careless attempt at a bill to regulate e-mobility in Queensland.

Hon. AJ STOKER (Oodgeroo—LNP) (5.14 pm): This bill is a carefully crafted response to a serious problem facing our community: the harm and disruption caused by the misuse of e-bikes and e-scooters. We have all seen it: multiple people riding a single bike or scooter; kids riding without helmets and finding themselves with serious brain injuries; kids roaring through our streets and on our footpaths on devices that are illegally modified, loud, fast and dangerous; and collisions with our elderly as they use footpaths or slower mobility devices, injuring them and making them fearful to move about our streets.

Though today they complain about these changes somehow being simultaneously too fast and too slow—you cannot have it both ways, Mr Deputy Speaker—they have failed to act over a period of years. Federal Labor imposed no standards around the devices that could be imported, and for a decade state Labor stuck their head in the sand failing to establish a fair framework for their safe use and the enforcement of standards, even subsidising illegal devices with taxpayers' money.

The LNP is willing to do what those opposite were not. We have extensively consulted with communities, both those frustrated with these devices and their biggest fans, and found a way forward to make our community safe while ensuring that those who want to be responsible users can continue to do so. It is fair. It is evidence based.

A constituent of mine, Ian, lamented the high injury rate he has observed in our emergency departments in his work as a paramedic. Kerri raised her frustration with me about kids riding in the middle of the road oblivious to cars, pedestrians and their own safety. I have lost count of how many times I have had reports of riders riding without helmets. I have seen it too many times myself. An elderly couple told me they were nearly hit while out on their afternoon walk. Another local was run down as a pedestrian on a footpath. The rider checked to see he was not dead before taking off, leaving him alone to manage how to get home and treated with a badly injured ankle. Sue shared her experience of going to Apex Park with her granddaughter where she observed that the paths and tracks were being so dominated by e-scooters to the point that those on a bike without a motor, particularly young children, did not feel as though they could safely use it anymore.

These are not isolated complaints. They reflect a real concern in our community that pedestrians, families and older residents are being pushed out of spaces they should be able to safely enjoy. This is not about punishing responsible riders. There are people who use these devices safely and sensibly, but high-powered, illegal and reckless use has gone too far. Pedestrians should not have to feel unsafe on a footpath and kids should not be riding devices that are too powerful and too fast and being used without any supervision or real understanding of the road rules.

The bill introduces stronger penalties for dangerous behaviour including speeding, failing to wear a helmet, careless riding and illegally carrying passengers. It brings in RBT to stop drink riding. From 31 August, riders will in general need to be 16 at least and hold a valid driver's licence—at least a learner's. There are of course sensible exemptions that reflect the care that has been taken in the consultation process. There is an exemption to allow children 12 to 17 to ride when they are doing so under parental supervision, reflecting feedback I received from local families. There are also important exemptions to the requirements for certain medical conditions and people with disabilities who need a

traditional mobility scooter. It is so shameful that those opposite are running a scare campaign to frighten elderly people and people with disabilities into thinking that they will not be able to use devices they rely on.

I received really constructive feedback from locals about the speed limits that are appropriate too. The bill sets a general speed limit of 25 kilometres an hour but it requires slowing to 12 kilometres an hour when passing pedestrians on a shared path. They are strong enforcement arrangements that I know my community will be really pleased to see. Parents are held accountable if their child under 16 rides illegally. Retailers and suppliers are held accountable if they sell illegal devices or sell devices to underage riders. Those who ride modified and souped-up devices will have them confiscated and crushed—so, local hoons, consider yourselves warned.

Let me conclude on a positive note by commending the proactive approach to these devices that has been taken by the leadership and P&C of Cleveland District State High School. They have been working to improve compliance with the law by students using these devices for some time, and I am optimistic these changes will make their task much easier. A huge thank you to the school for their proactive and responsible approach to this issue. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (5.19 pm): I rise to speak against the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. I will say at the outset that this is perhaps one of the most absurd and poorly cobbled together bills I have seen during my time in this place. Frankly, I do not know how the minister managed to introduce it with a straight face. Honestly, opening the second reading debate on World Bicycle Day is an impressively tone-deaf manoeuvre. Where do we even start? How about with age limits.

First the government said it would completely ban legal e-bikes for under-16s. People rightly said that was ridiculous. Then they said they would tweak the bill, but what have they done? Now 12- to 17-year-olds in Queensland can ride an e-bike only when supervised by a very specific few people; that is, their parent, legal guardian or grandparent—no aunties, no uncles, no teachers or older siblings. It gets worse, though. You can supervise your 12-year-old riding a pedal-assist bicycle, but you'd better hope they have one already because it will not be legal to buy them anymore. The government has left a complete ban on selling e-bikes to under-16s in the bill, even with their amendment, so they are clearly hoping that e-bikes will be handed down from generation to generation like family heirlooms.

It is quite unbelievable how many holes like this there are and how sloppy this bill is. In Crisafulli's Queensland, 12- to 17-year-olds can ride a pushbike whenever they like but not a legal pedal-assist e-bike. An unlicensed 17-year-old can ride an e-bike with their dad right up until their 18th birthday but then it is immediately illegal. In Queensland, a 15-year-old can now fly an aircraft solo but they cannot ride an e-bike by themselves. They can leave school and work full-time but they cannot ride their legal pedal-assist e-bike to that same job unsupervised. They could be sentenced to life imprisonment and they can get a gun licence and go target shooting or hunting, but according to this government they are not cognitively capable of riding a pedal-assist bicycle unsupervised. It is absurd.

It is also completely unfair to disabled kids. Kids under 12 who have disabilities that prevent them from riding a pushbike will not be able to ride an e-bike even under supervision. Many disabled kids have been funded by NDIS for adaptive bikes. They will now be banned from simply riding a bike like any of their peers. It is cruel, it is heartless and it is discriminatory.

Turning to licensing, how about this for sloppy and absurd? For over-16s the bill requires a driver's licence to ride an e-bike unsupervised. The amendments mean that an unlicensed adult can legally supervise their child riding an e-bike but they cannot ride one themselves. There are only two other jurisdictions in the world that mandate a driver's licence for riding a bike—especially a standard pedal-assist e-bike—and one of those is North Korea. The LNP in Queensland is now taking its policy cues from Kim Jong Un. Nice work, Minister.

Let's be clear that we are not talking about e-motorbikes, the ones that are in fact already illegal. We are talking about bicycles that have a pedal-assist system that cuts out at 25 kilometres an hour. Instead of just ditching this stupid licensing rule, the LNP has tried to carve out complicated bureaucratic exemptions, but the bill has zero detail on the exemption process. It will be left to the government to regulate. We have no assurance that they will consult with disability organisations or other stakeholders—the very same organisations and stakeholders they have flagrantly ignored during the inquiry.

The government cannot even keep its story straight about why an e-bike rider would need a driver's licence. First it was to ensure they were medically fit to drive. Then it was to make sure they know the road rules, even though the learner's licence test does not really have anything to do with

road rules for bicycles. At one point it was so that police could enforce the age limit. Now they have relaxed the age limit and there are medical and disability exemptions, but there is still this absurd licence requirement. There is no word on what international tourists who do not have a licence should do. I am sure that is going to go down splendidly at the Olympics in 2032.

I move on to the proposed speed limits for e-bikes, which we have seen tweaked further and made almost incomprehensible by the amendments. I challenge anyone to understand and comprehend these on a first reading. There will be no additional speed limits on shared paths except for 12 kilometres an hour when passing a pedestrian and a blanket 12-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths, even where there are no pedestrians in sight, but there is no uniform definition of 'shared path' or 'footpath' in Queensland; nor is there any definition of what 'passing a pedestrian' means. Please make it make sense, Minister.

Even if we had clear definitions, think about this scenario for a second. You are on your e-bike and you are right up behind someone jogging at 12 kilometres an hour on a shared path. There is now no way that you can legally overtake them. The government is literally legislating a mandate for e-bike riders to just loiter behind joggers who are moving at 12 kilometres an hour. Now, that is cool and normal. That is not creepy at all. Of course there are busy areas where anyone on a wheeled device should be slowing down or dismounting around pedestrians. Councils have been managing this for years. If we need to manage speed limits in busy areas we can do it the same way we have always done: with location-specific speed limits that apply to all wheeled devices.

Busy inner-city footpaths are not the only place this speed limit will apply. There are huge chunks of Brisbane, and indeed the whole of Queensland, for those regional members, where there is no infrastructure for bike riders at all. When the only choice is the footpath or a dangerous road, it becomes completely impractical for them to cycle at all. Are you trying to ride with your kids to school? Well, I hope you like cycling on Ipswich Road. Watch out for the trucks, kids! Remember that these speed limits do not apply to pushbikes either, so it is completely okay for someone on a pushbike to ride at 20 kilometres an hour on a footpath, but a parent on a cargo bike has to ride on the road.

May I remind this government that in 2025 there was only one death on a legal pedal-assist e-bike. That is an enormous loss for everyone who loved that person, and I acknowledge that. How did they die? They were hit and killed by a car while cycling on the road. Of the 14 pedestrian deaths in Queensland already in 2026, every single one was caused by a motor vehicle. A pedestrian has never been killed by a legal pedal-assist e-bike in Queensland.

A crackdown on legal pedal-assist e-bikes makes zero sense because they simply are not the problem. The issue is that illegal e-bikes have become widely available. This bill does not change that. It remains completely legal to sell unregistered high-speed electric motorbikes. You just have to say the magic words 'private property use only' and you can be on your way with your new toy. Instead of banning retailers from selling those bikes, this bill gives police new powers to seize them after they have been sold.

If it were not for the fact that hundreds—possibly thousands—more of these devices are being sold every day, that might get us somewhere. It is like asking the police to empty a bathtub with a teaspoon while the tap is still running. As if that is not going to be an impossible enough task, the government is also asking police to go out and do breath tests and licence checks on grandmothers riding their electric tricycle to the shops. It is hard to think of a more absurd and greater waste of police resources than this.

I have not had time to mention the many other bad parts of this bill that have flown under the radar—like the fact that this bill bans people from riding any kind of bike, including a pushbike, if they have any cannabis in their system. We know that THC is a legally prescribed medicine that can show up in people's systems days after impairment has subsided—

Mrs Frecklington: Then don't take drugs.

Mr BERKMAN: It is medicine! If the Attorney-General had any concept of reality she would know that these days it is medicine. This bill is just not a targeted, measured response. It is a kneejerk reaction that not only fails to ameliorate safety concerns; it will have widespread adverse effects on the uptake of active transport. This is a transition that is desperately needed to reduce emissions, improve overall public health and reduce congestion on our roads. You cannot upgrade roads as a solution to traffic; it will always get worse. There was never any evidence that legal pedal-assist e-bikes were causing any safety issues. Legal electric bicycles are just bicycles and they do not need any extra restrictions.

The minister needs to admit that the wheels have fallen off this entire process. He needs to ditch the bill and go back to the drawing board. He is—

(Time expired)

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (5.29 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset, I acknowledge that this legislation has generated significant community discussion and debate. It is a complex policy area and one where there are genuinely diverse views held by Queenslanders. In my own electorate of Moggill, many residents are regular cyclists and active transport users. Organisations such as the Brisbane West Bicycle User Group have engaged throughout this process and have provided considered and extensive feedback on aspects of the bill. I acknowledge their advocacy, their contribution to this debate and their work in encouraging active transport across our community.

I also acknowledge the substantial engagement that has occurred through the parliamentary committee process. The State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee received almost 5,000 submissions and heard from a broad range of stakeholders.

Mr Berkman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member for Maiwar.

Dr ROWAN: The level of engagement demonstrates both the importance of this issue and the strong community interest in ensuring any reforms are practical, proportionate and effective. The committee ultimately recommended that the bill be passed—

Mr Berkman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, I caution you.

Dr ROWAN:—while identifying a range of matters for consideration and enhancement. As legislators, and on this subject, we must carefully balance a range of competing interests. That is the point that the member for Maiwar will never understand when he comes into this place: that there are competing interests and we have to get a balanced approach.

Mr Berkman interjected.

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

Dr ROWAN: We must support active transport, encourage healthy lifestyles and provide opportunities for Queenslanders to choose alternatives to private vehicle travel. At the same time—and this is what the member for Maiwar will not understand—we have a responsibility to ensure our roads, pathways and shared spaces are safe for everyone who uses them.

I have been a strong supporter of active transport. Across the western suburbs of Brisbane, many residents choose to walk, cycle or use other forms of active transport for recreation, commuting and exercise. These activities contribute positively to individual health outcomes, reduce congestion and enhance community connectivity. However, it is equally clear that the rapid growth in e-mobility devices has created new challenges that existing laws have struggled to address.

As with communities across Queensland, local residents have shared with me their growing concerns about high-powered illegal devices, unsafe rider behaviour, pedestrian safety and increasing injury rates. Between 2022 and 2025 alone, more than 6,000 e-scooter injuries were recorded in Queensland hospitals. Those figures cannot simply be ignored. This legislation seeks to respond to those challenges through a considered package of reforms that place community safety at the forefront. As a former president of the Australian Medical Association Queensland, I place significant importance on the submission of the AMAQ with reference to morbidity and mortality and resultant impacts on our health and hospital system. I have also noted the comments of the president-elect of the AMAQ, Associate Professor Erica Gannon.

This legislation provides Queensland Police Service officers with stronger powers to seize dangerous and illegal devices. It introduces a targeted offence framework for high-risk behaviour. It establishes alcohol limits and random breath testing provisions. It strengthens penalties for unsafe conduct and introduces greater accountability for retailers supplying illegal devices. Most importantly, it seeks to improve safety outcomes for pedestrians, riders and the broader community.

Importantly, the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government has demonstrated a willingness to listen throughout this process. Following consideration of community feedback, amendments have been made, including to recognise compliance pathways for e-bikes, establish

assurance mechanisms and provide exemption frameworks where appropriate. These amendments reflect a government that has listened to concerns while remaining focused on the primary objective of improving safety outcomes. These reforms represent a genuine attempt to strike the right balance. They support those Queenslanders who choose to do the right thing, while targeting illegal and dangerous behaviour that places others at risk.

Whilst discussing these transport matters, I also want to highlight an important initiative currently underway in the western suburbs of Brisbane. I am pleased that the delivery of my election commitment for an integrated road and public transport plan for the electorate of Moggill and the western suburbs of Brisbane continues to progress strongly. I thank the Minister for Transport and Main Roads for the work he has progressed to date. Community engagement has been outstanding, with substantial feedback received. I have been particularly encouraged by the strong attendance at community consultation sessions and the thoughtful feedback that local residents have provided, particularly with respect to public and active transport options and associated infrastructure.

In concluding my contribution, I want to say that this legislation strikes the right balance, and that is something the member for Maiwar is constantly unable to achieve when he comes into this place. He does not understand that there are competing interests when it comes to these important public policy matters. In fact, the Labor opposition—who often side with the member for Maiwar or the member for Maiwar sides with the Labor opposition; they are hand in glove—also do not understand that there are competing interests which need to be balanced out. This is an important public policy matter and this legislation strikes the right balance. I commend the minister for his work, and I commend the parliamentary committee for its scrutiny and due diligence. With those words, I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (5.35 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the bill before the House regarding managing e-mobility use. Let me be clear: on this side of the House we support safe and responsible e-mobility use in Queensland. My electorate of McConnel is a dense, inner-city area with crowded shared paths. We want cyclists and pedestrians to be safe on paths; we all want that. The majority of my constituents do ride safely. My neighbours ride safely to work every day on e-mobility devices. In fact, I saw my neighbour leave this morning on his e-mobility device. He was heading to work with his helmet on and he was perfectly safe as he was observing the law and going about his business. That is why it is so important that we get this right, and in that respect I particularly mention the clear lack of listening to the consultation and the 122 amendments to this bill.

In my electorate office, I get more complaints about bicycles on shared paths than I do about e-mobility devices. There have been more accidents in my electorate from people riding their bicycles on the Riverwalk and shared paths. People are constantly fearful of those people who are riding bicycles. E-mobility devices are an extension of that and we want to see them being ridden safely. The member for Moggill stated that this was a balanced approach, but I do not agree with that. This has become a mess, with more questions needing to be answered and more clarification needed before this becomes law.

The real problem we need to address is the use of already illegal devices, but this bill still does little to address this concern, particularly amongst my constituents. I must admit that I had a bit of a smile on my face when I heard the member for Oodgeroo get up and talk about Labor once again not addressing this issue. When the federal LNP government through Barnaby Joyce removed input restrictions on illegal devices in 2021, the member for Oodgeroo was in the federal parliament and voted for it. It is interesting that she did not mention that at all. She said this was all Labor's fault but she was in federal parliament when these restrictions were removed and she failed to tell the House that was the case.

Although I welcome the increased powers to assist in removing dangerous devices and dangerous riders off our roads, new powers are useless if they cannot be clearly enforced or if the resources are not provided to the police to fulfil their job. I am struggling to find any stakeholders who support this bill, let alone the 122 amendments. We are not even having the necessary scrutiny of the amendments. That is why we supported the shadow minister's motion to refer the amendments back to the committee. What is wrong with letting the sunshine in?

For those who say that the AMA is supporting this, let me quote the AMA. Professor Erica Gannon labelled the winding back regarding under-16s not being able to ride e-mobility pedal-assist bikes 'a betrayal of children's safety'. She said—

This decision puts us right back where we started, with children being injured and killed.

There are hardly any stakeholders out of the 5,000 submissions that were given over a period who can actually stand up and say they are supporting not only this bill but all of the amendments. The government and the minister have done an embarrassing backflip and are now letting kids back on e-bikes by watering down the requirements and allowing children under 17 to ride devices with parental supervision. They are walking back a blanket ban for all children under 16 and allowing those aged 12 to 17 to ride supervised. One of the questions my constituent raised, which is a great question, is: why 12? Where did 12 come from? Why not 10? Why not 11? Why 12? Why not eight? If there is a legal e-mobility device and it is ridden on a perfectly legal road with absolutely all of the safety requirements, and a family has a 12-year-old and a 10-year-old who both got e-bikes at Christmas time, the parents can ride with their 12-year-old but they now cannot ride with their 10-year-old. I have to ask a simple question because I cannot answer it for my constituent: why 12? Where did that come from? Is there actually a debate to be had about what that age should be?

The bill talks about parental supervision and it is defined in the legislation. However, what about if it is an adult riding with their 12-year-old sister? Under this legislation, it is defined as someone else. An adult cannot even take their young sister to the shops because that will not be classified as adult supervision, even though they are an adult. Why is that the case? What about if I am an aunty and I am babysitting my 12-year-old, 13-year-old and 14-year-old nieces or nephews and we want to go down to the shops? I cannot supervise my nieces or nephews and take them to the shops. Why is that the case? That is what the regulation is saying. It needs to be scrutinised. These provisions are ridiculous. No wonder my constituents, who are intelligent and want to be able to ride safely, are asking: what is this all about?

Then we get to the penalties. If children are found riding alone, parents will face hefty fines, from $518 to $620. Then there is a backflip on medical condition exemptions, which in a way I can understand. However, the government is adding red tape for those with a disability. I have to ask the minister: what is the definition of 'supervision'? If I sit on the bench in New Farm Park or if I sit on the bench in Victoria Park—sorry, I cannot do that anymore; that has all been closed off—or if I sit on the bench at South Bank and my 12-year-old is safely riding up and down the riverfront, is that supervision? What is the definition of 'supervision'? If I watch my child ride to school and I can see the school from my front porch, is that supervision? No-one knows. Nobody knows because it is not defined. This shows the ridiculousness of these amendments.

Members opposite cannot sit there and tell me that these amendments are not ridiculous. They need to be scrutinised. These are legitimate family issues that are being raised and they should be able to be debated. A 20-year-old should be able to ride with their 12-year-old brother or sister to the shops—supervised—but they cannot do it under this bill. I ask the minister to please explain why this cannot happen. Explain why that makes sense, because it does not make sense to anybody that you explain that to.

Mr McDonald: Because we don't want 20-year-old criminals.

Ms GRACE: I am not taking any interjections. I know that the chair of that committee and the deputy chair tried their best to fix up this mess that was cooked up by the minister, but there are legitimate questions here, particularly for people with a disability. In terms of licensing exemptions, having to go and get a medical, having to get their device—my brother-in-law suffers from MS. He has an e-mobility device. He will never get a licence. Now you are putting—

Mr McDonald: That's good; he's got an exemption.

Ms GRACE: 'Good', I hear; I take that interjection. My brother-in-law has a right to use the roads safely like everybody else. If the chair of that committee says 'good', I take great offence at that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, just address the chair, please.

Ms GRACE: I take great offence at that, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member—

Ms GRACE: I take great offence at that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member! I am asking you to address the chair, if you would. Thank you.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am addressing the chair. I am looking at you while I am speaking. I am taking what you have said and I am looking at you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I do not want to argue with you. I would ask you to address the chair. Would you get on with your speech, please.

Ms GRACE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I will address my comments to you directly. Thank you for your guidance.

My brother-in-law has a right to do that. There are other issues here with the speed limit. First it was 10 kilometres an hour, making it wobbly; now it is 12. Is that the speed limit? Have you assessed it? The minister could not even answer questions about the Bicentennial Bikeway. Is it 12 kilometres an hour? Is it 25? When do you pass? When do you not pass? This legislation has so many flaws. This is a government that cannot get anything right. This is a government that is all talk and no outcomes. This is a government that cannot answer any questions. No matter how many questions we ask those ministers opposite, we never get an answer. Minister, questions need to be answered.

(Time expired)

Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (5.45 pm): I rise in support of the Crisafulli LNP government's Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill addresses concerns raised across my electorate for years. It is about families near Mudgeeraba State School, about residents enjoying their space and about people who simply want to move around the community safely. That should not be controversial, and on this side of the House it is not. However, for too long Queenslanders have watched dangerous behaviour become normalised.

I have heard those opposite claim the government is not listening. Under the former Labor government concerns about high-powered e-bikes and e-scooters fell on deaf ears. Parents raised concerns, pedestrians raised concerns and responsible riders raised concerns, but they were ignored. The Crisafulli LNP government is acting. That is the difference.

Many people contacting me are not opposed to e-bikes; in fact, many support them. One constituent told me they recently borrowed e-bikes and enjoyed a weekend family ride together. They followed the rules and taught their children about road safety and that constituent supports these reforms. They support tougher penalties for people riding under the influence of drugs or alcohol, they support actions against dangerous modifications and they support retailers being held accountable for selling unsafe devices. They also made an important point: responsible riders should not be punished because others are doing the wrong thing. I agree. This bill is not aimed at responsible Queenslanders; it is aimed at dangerous behaviour.

Another constituent of mine contacted me about dangerous behaviour they see at the Reedy Creek Cycleway far too often. They told me about kids riding directly towards them at dangerous speeds on high-powered e-bikes. They warned that when riders travel towards one another at speed an accident could be tragic. These pathways were designed for walkers, runners, families and cyclists. They were never designed to be testing grounds for modified vehicles.

Another constituent highlighted e-bikes racing along Gemvale Road, and I have seen it with my own eyes: along Somerset Drive, Bonogin Road and on the M1, ripping up Firth Park and Franklin Flats. I have seen riders weaving through traffic and footpaths treated like racetracks. We have had fatalities and near fatalities in my electorate of Mudgeeraba. Constituents all ask me a simple question: how long do we wait before someone is seriously hurt?

Not everyone who appeared before the inquiry agreed with every aspect of these reforms. Bicycle Queensland raised concerns about some of the proposed restrictions and have been quoted by those opposite. I should note for the House, though, that Bicycle Queensland is chaired by a former Labor transport minister, Rachel Nolan. Do honourable members remember her? 'Queensland Rail is not for sale', and it was the next day. This debate has never been about responsible people using legal e-bikes. It has always—

Mr Krause: Who sold the assets?

Ms BATES: Yes, who sold the assets? I will take that interjection from the member for Scenic Rim. It has always been about dangerous behaviour, illegal devices and community safety. Even with those concerns being raised, the debate has moved well beyond whether there is a problem. The question before this House is whether we act. Communities like Mudgeeraba have already answered that question. They want action. That is why this bill matters.

Queenslanders understand there is a clear difference between a compliant e-bike being ridden responsibly and a modified, high-powered machine being ridden recklessly. This bill recognises the reality we face. It gives police stronger powers to seize prohibited bikes being used unlawfully in public places, it creates consequences for people who sell controlled devices to children under 16, it strengthens enforcement and it gives police better tools to deal with dangerous and illegal devices before someone is seriously injured, and that is common sense, because it puts responsibility where it belongs—not just on riders but on the sellers and people modifying these devices. Police should not

have to stand by and watch dangerous behaviour while waiting for tragedy to strike. Parents should not have to wonder why children are able to get their hands on machines they cannot safely control, pedestrians should not have to jump out of the way on the footpath, and communities should not have to accept risk because the former Labor government failed to keep up.

Some say these measures are too tough. I disagree. What is tough is explaining to a parent why repeated warnings were ignored. What is tough is explaining to a pedestrian why their safety came second. What is tough is explaining to a family why action only comes after somebody was hurt. The people I represent are practical people. They understand rights come with responsibilities. They know if you use public roads, pathways and community spaces you need to do it safely. For responsible riders, this bill changes very little. For those who ride dangerously, make unlawful modifications, ignore the rules or put others at risk, this bill sends a clear message: the free ride is over. The former Labor government failed to act. The Crisafulli LNP government is listening, and we are acting and delivering for Queenslanders, just like we promised. I commend this bill to the House.

Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (5.51 pm): As yesterday was World Bicycle Day, this bill is not supported by Queenslanders—the public nor stakeholders. It does not address the underlying issue of illegal devices in our community. Instead, the LNP government is unjustly punishing law-abiding citizens and putting Queenslanders at risk. It is not supported by evidence, stakeholders or industry advocates and it is not wanted by Queensland. The 122 amendments tabled yesterday are very substantial. They do need further consultation and scrutiny, and that is why Labor has asked for them to go back to the committee.

There are many areas of considerable concern for thousands of constituents across Queensland, including those in my electorate of Mansfield, who have called for the rejection of this bill. In fact, I have to say that constituents in my electorate find this bill absolutely laughable. They are absolutely disgusted that they are having these amendments and this bill imposed upon them. The No. 1 issue they have raised with me is how their children are going to get to school, and these children are good children. This is the No. 1 issue where both parents work in my community. Members of our community are well educated, they value education and they trust their children—as they should; they are great kids—but those kids are not going to be able to get to school because of this bill and these ridiculous laws.

One of the ridiculous issues covered in amendment Nos 107 to 116 speaks about the bewildering speed limits. The minister's original bill attempted to introduce a wide-sweeping, 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit for all e-mobility devices. This ignored the department's own guidelines and was completely nonsensical given that it is a speed limit that makes devices unstable. After finally listening to his own department, the minister has now raised it to 12 kilometres per hour in high-pedestrian areas. At first a ridiculous speed limit, now it leaves more questions than answers. What enforcement mechanisms will be in place to determine unlawful speeding? Who will determine unlawful speeding? Will the council be burdened with even more signs, or will riders be forced to guess every time they hop on their e-bikes, because not every e-bike has a speedometer? E-mobility users are themselves being taken for a ride by this minister. Not even he understands these rushed amendments, with his spokesperson having to clarify after his bungled media conference.

I have spoken to many constituents. There were 5,000 submitters to the bill. I have had hundreds and hundreds of emails, both from my constituents and constituents living in LNP seats. They are absolutely aghast at the contents of this bill, let alone the amendments. They have all raised issues with the speed limits and how they will be enforced on existing transport infrastructure. Dedicated bike lanes, shared paths and footpaths often see e-mobility devices the fastest form of transport. Forcing users to navigate the minister's hazy speed limits essentially imposes blanket limits for almost all transport infrastructure. If the minister cannot even articulate what his laws outline, then how are riders expected to make sense of these laws? Shared paths and footpaths are at the core of active transport in Queensland and it is being eroded by the Crisafulli government.

South-East Queensland has busy roads, dangerous roads and roads with high traffic, and yet active transport on bike paths is being eroded by this Crisafulli government. At the same time as making pathways and shared paths a bureaucratic nightmare for users, the LNP government is allowing e-mobility devices to be used on roads with speed limits of up to 60 kilometres per hour. First it makes paths virtually unusable and then it opens the roads? This is blatantly unsafe and illogical. Making it more impractical for users to use safe pathways dedicated for active transport will mean that more users will ride on high-risk roads travelling at 60 kilometres per hour. E-mobility users are at risk of being hit by a car on these roads, but of course that is not a consideration this government will make, because this change risks the lives of both riders and motorists.

Another area of concern is the licensing requirements imposed by the Crisafulli government that will limit older Queenslanders' ability to travel, exercise and maintain social interaction. Many older Australians do not hold licences, voluntarily surrendering them. These Queenslanders will be stripped of the ability to use e-mobility devices. The government states that its 122 amendments will fix this issue and include a medical exemption framework, but it has not provided any details whatsoever on this process. Imposing more frameworks on people who suffer a disability is absolutely illogical and, quite frankly, offensive. The red tape and bureaucracy on the first draft of the bill was bad enough. Now those opposite have added even more and forced it upon those most disadvantaged.

Queenslanders safely using e-bikes and e-scooters for exercise and enjoyment—something that is vital for the health of older Australians—are hampered and neglected by this bill. What happens if older Queenslanders who may have no need for a licence anymore or may have forgone their driver's licence in favour of a more affordable, safer e-device want to go for a ride? They cannot because under the LNP government it is a crime to safely ride a bike. With regard to another demographic of our most vulnerable, the Crisafulli government has disregarded those with disabilities who rely on these devices for daily life. E-mobility devices are a core to social inclusion and health. The current bill limits the ability for those with disabilities to travel and engage with the community, which is blatantly neglectful. Exemptions outlined by government committee members are unclear and risk suffocating the most disabled in layers of bureaucracy.

In another blow, definitions of prohibited bikes mean that many NDIS funded support devices will be made illegal. The restrictive definitions make illegal three-wheeled custom devices. People who are medically required to have these for transport will be made criminals by the LNP government, and that is the theme of this bill: an LNP government whose priority is making safe, law-abiding citizens criminals. Rather than admitting that they got it wrong, government committee members have recommended carve-outs and exemptions that make it harder for enforcement. These are both complex and bureaucratic and do not protect communities while limiting usefulness for vulnerable groups. The government could have chosen to solve a real problem facing Queenslanders. Instead, it rushed a solution to address a political problem.

There were over 5,000 submissions to the committee, with a majority raising the serious concerns of Queenslanders. Still, the LNP government refuses to engage with the community and stakeholders. If they had done the due diligence required, this bill would not damage so many Queenslanders and might actually provide a solution to the underlying issues. Active transport should be encouraged in Queensland, but the Crisafulli government have introduced a bill that will lead to the death of e-mobility use across the state. They have rushed this bill and refused to address its problems. If the government had consulted with stakeholders, Queenslanders would not be fearful of this bill stripping rights and creating a more dangerous environment for riders, road users and pedestrians.

Under this LNP Crisafulli government Queensland is being dragged—backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures. The Labor opposition wants to see laws that protect Queensland and address the issues raised by thousands of constituents. We want to see the rising use of illegal devices curbed and ensure e-mobility remains a practical, safe method of active transport. Unlike the LNP, we believe in listening to the experts and listening to our community. I urge those opposite to stand up and agree with Queensland Labor that this bill should be amended further to ensure it reflects the needs of all Queenslanders.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (6.00 pm): I rise today in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. Oh my goodness, if you listened to those on the other side of the House you would think there is no problem—nothing to see—and that everybody who is riding an e-bike or an e-mobility device is doing the right thing, obeying the law and being responsible. The whole reason we are here having this debate is that for 10 years those in the previous Labor government sat on their hands and did absolutely nothing. What did we see over that time? We have seen thousands of scooter related injuries recorded across Queensland hospitals—in fact, 577 just at the Gold Coast University Hospital last year.

We are still seeing young people out riding these bikes around. It is not like they are just innocently riding down the Broadwater Parklands and inconveniencing a few families or elderly people going for a Sunday walk or a Monday morning walk. There are young people out there riding these souped-up, high-powered illegal bikes around our streets and down our main roads, zigzagging through traffic with no registration, no plates and no helmets. As a father of four boys I know what boys get up to, but it worries me every time I see these young kids out there riding recklessly and without a helmet.

Then I hear people saying that young people will not be able to have an electric bike or a pedal-assist bike—well, boohoo. I managed to raise four young men in an era when there were no mobility devices or electric bikes. It was good exercise for them as they were growing up. It was good for their muscles and it was good for their stamina. It builds character, and guess what? Not one of my sons has had any obesity issues, in spite of having a dad who has been a little bit chubby from time to time! Our kids need to be getting on bikes and exercising—not getting on some device where they just pull the trigger back and sort of sit back and pedal gently and lightly along. This is one of the issues we are facing as a society. More than ever we should be encouraging young people to ride a bike, to get out and exercise and enjoy the sunshine, but to do it respectfully and with a helmet.

I enjoyed the member for Surfers Paradise's speech on this matter this morning. He raised the obvious—the absolute hypocrisy of those on the Labor side of the House with their indignation and their concerns around the lack of consultation. What a lot of drivel. I think they are just dealing with some sort of emotional crisis over being in opposition. They have forgotten that they had 10 years to do something about this issue. It is a classic case of selective amnesia. It is interesting that the latest Queensland Audit Office report on mental health says that there has been underspending and no accountability on mental health issues. Maybe some of that money should be directed to the Labor side of the House to help them with their selective amnesia, some of their mental breakdown and the guilt and remorse they are feeling for not dealing with these issues in the past.

Many years ago as a councillor it was my great honour to be involved in the redevelopment of the Broadwater Parklands. One of the issues we were debating probably 20 years ago was the need to build wider footpaths, because the council standard—the member for Mermaid Beach would remember this—used to be 900 millimetres. Clearly, with the changing world we were in, in a place like the Gold Coast, where there is so much outdoor recreation and there were so many new mobility devices that a lot of elderly, disabled and disadvantaged people were riding around, we needed wider paths.

Mr Stevens: Hedges Avenue.

Mr MOLHOEK: I am not taking that interjection, member for Mermaid Beach! We changed the rules back then to build wider footpaths because we wanted people to be safe. We wanted people to be able to get out and enjoy the great outdoors, to enjoy our beautiful waterfront. Today that experience had changed for so many, because there are so many folk now who are having to dodge these e-mobility devices and people riding recklessly in areas that should be respected and treated with regard. People should understand that if there are elderly people walking through a park then you should slow down and you should exercise caution. I know that when my boys were younger and we would go for a bike ride I made them get off the path altogether and ride around on the grass—or I even taught them how to ride on the road—because it was important that they learned good road safety practices and that they were responsible.

I understand some of the concerns that have been raised. As someone now who has a mild disability I understand the issues that have been raised about disability, but that is what these amendments in the bill go to. It is recognising the fact that we need to make special provisions for people with a disability who are dependent on these devices. I commend the chair of the committee, the member for Lockyer, for the work he has done. I also commend the minister. The member for Lockyer has run a great process through the committee. He has done the work. They have had hundreds of submissions. They have made recommendations, and guess what? Unlike those on the Labor side of the House, our minister has listened and he has responded to those recommendations. Sure, we will not get every piece of legislation perfect the first time round, but we cannot afford to sit on our hands for another 10 years and talk about this issue, like Labor have, and just hope the problem will go away while we go through another round of debate and discussion. We need to move forward and we need to take this matter very seriously.

In closing, this is an important issue for Queenslanders. It is also a very important issue in my patch because, aside from the presentations at the Gold Coast University Hospital, it is an issue that I regularly receive emails on. In fact, in the last month or so I have had more than 60 emails from people raising concerns about their own personal safety.

Ms BOURNE (Ipswich West—ALP) (6.08 pm): I rise today to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset I want to say that this bill and its handling has been truly abysmal. The minister put forward a bill so fraught with issues that now he is forced to rush it through with last-minute sweeping and substantial amendments to an already significant bill. This minister and this government have no respect for our

parliament. This bill and its now 122 amendments must be given due process and put to the committee for consideration and scrutiny and to stakeholders for consultation. This needs to happen because the subject matter is so serious. The tragic deaths and serious injuries we have seen connected to e-mobility incidents have deeply concerned communities across Queensland. Fourteen Queenslanders lost their lives in e-mobility related incidents in 2025 alone.

Good governments do not respond to complex and serious issues with rushed legislation—rushed legislation that has not been properly consulted on, is not supported by the evidence before the committee and risks creating even more problems than it solves. That is ultimately why the Queensland Labor opposition cannot support this bill in its current form.

Labor supports safe and responsible e-mobility use because we recognise the important role that e-bikes and e-scooters play. For many people in communities like mine in Ipswich West, these devices are not a novelty, they are affordable and practical ways of getting to work, going to school, accessing public transport and staying connected with family, community and critical services. Throughout this process my office was inundated with emails, calls and messages from constituents who were deeply worried that this legislation would drastically impact their ability to travel affordably. One constituent wrote to me saying—

> Without my e-scooter, I wouldn't be able to do my shopping, and I wouldn't be able to see my family and friends. I have a disability, I don't drive, and I need my scooter to get from A to B.

Communities like mine in Ipswich West understand exactly what it means to commute long distances, sit in congestion and watch transport costs eat into the household budget. This government should be supporting affordable transport options and encouraging active transport use, particularly during a fuel affordability crisis. Instead they are taking us backwards. The government says this bill is about safety. However, the overwhelming evidence presented to the committee was that this legislation fails to properly address the core issue identified by experts, stakeholders and Queenslanders themselves. That issue is illegal devices. The evidence repeatedly showed that Queenslanders support stronger enforcement against dangerous and illegal e-mobility devices. They support cracking down on reckless behaviour. They support stronger penalties and greater enforcement powers. Labor supports many of those measures as well. We support stronger controls around the sale of devices, requirements that devices comply with speed limitations and stronger police powers to enforce helmet laws and drink-riding offences. We also support increased penalties for dangerous behaviour and measures to improve accountability for hire operators, but what we cannot support is legislation that unfairly punishes responsible riders while failing to properly address already illegal devices causing many of the serious incidents.

Nearly 5,000 submissions were made to the committee inquiry and an overwhelming number raised concerns with some or all aspects of this legislation. When so many stakeholders are telling the government they have got it wrong, a responsible government should listen and work collaboratively to fix the legislation. One of the clearest examples of this bill getting the balance wrong is the proposed speed limit changes. After the minister's original bill attempted to introduce a speed limit of 10 kilometres per hour, which went against TMR's guidelines for speed management on shared paths, the minister is now saying that a speed limit of 12 kilometres per hour will only apply near pedestrians in high pedestrian areas. I ask the minister how amendments Nos 107 to 116 actually look in practice? What will constitute a high pedestrian area?

I am also unsure if this is actually the case because at a recent press conference the minister said it would be 25 kilometres per hour on shared paths. If the minister is unsure about his own laws then how are Queenslanders expected to understand. Brisbane West Bicycle User Group told the committee that maintaining a speed below the natural momentum of a bicycle requires extensive engagement of the body's core muscles to keep balance and control. The bill also allows e-mobility devices to be ridden on roads with speed limits up to 60 kilometres per hour. This will see people pushed away from safer shared paths and onto busy roads alongside cars, trucks and heavy vehicles. For the already congested roads that my community drive on to and from Brisbane, this will only put more users, as well as drivers, at risk.

Another deeply concerning aspect of this bill is the proposed licensing regime. The proposed licensing requirements risk unfairly excluding vulnerable Queenslanders from participating in community life. Many older Queenslanders who have voluntarily surrendered their licence for medical reasons now rely on e-bikes and e-scooters for exercise, independence and social cohesion. Many Queenslanders living with a disability rely on specialised e-mobility devices to participate in everyday life and many of those Queenslanders do not hold a driver's licence. The Public Advocate gave

compelling evidence to the committee about the importance of these devices for social inclusion and independent living and now this minister has put forward further rushed amendments, such as amendment No. 76, which will require people with a disability to apply for an exemption to licensing requirements and obtain a separate label for their disability specific device. Stakeholders have already raised concerns with the special circumstances permit process under the first draft of the bill saying that it risked adding layers of red tape and bureaucracy for disadvantaged people.

Labor approached this bill constructively. We were prepared to work with the government and support sensible reforms that genuinely improve safety outcomes for Queenslanders, but after hearing the evidence presented to the committee it became clear that the problems with this bill are not minor drafting issues. The problems are fundamental, and this LNP government has recognised that considering the amendments rushed into this parliament last night which are devoid of any due process. Queenslanders deserve legislation that actually targets dangerous illegal devices and improves enforcement that protects pedestrians while still supporting affordable and active transport. Queenslanders deserve legislation that does not unfairly punish older people, people living with a disability or law-abiding riders simply trying to get to work, school or the shops. This bill should be withdrawn and redrafted following genuine consultation with stakeholders, experts and the broader community. What is in front of us today is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government that is paralysed by its own failures. The Queensland Labor opposition cannot support this bill in its current form.

Miss DOOLAN (Pumicestone—LNP) (6.16 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. This is an important bill that delivers on a commitment made by the Crisafulli government to restore safety, accountability and common sense to Queensland's roads, footpaths and shared pathways. Over recent years, e-scooters and e-bikes have become a common sight across Queensland. For many people they are a convenient and affordable way to travel. They have an important role to play in our transport network and can help reduce congestion and provide greater mobility for many Queenslanders. As these devices have become more popular so too have community concerns. Parents have raised concerns about children riding high-powered devices capable of speeds far beyond what was ever intended for footpaths and shared paths. Seniors have told us they feel unsafe walking in their own communities. Local residents have spoken about riders travelling at excessive speeds through crowded public spaces. Emergency departments have seen a significant increase in injuries linked to e-mobility devices. I have had so many close calls including almost being run over by an e-scooter in the city. The reality is that these laws simply have not kept pace with the rapid growth of this technology.

Queenslanders expect their government to act when public safety is at risk. They expect us to make difficult decisions when necessary and that is exactly what this bill does. The bill takes a practical, evidence-based approach to improving safety while continuing to support responsible riders. It recognises that the vast majority of Queenslanders who use e-scooters and e-bikes actually do the right thing—they wear the helmets, they follow the rules and they use their devices responsibly. However, it also recognises that a small minority are putting themselves and others at risk through dangerous and unlawful behaviour. One of the most significant reforms in this bill is the introduction of new police powers to seize and dispose of noncompliant devices and illegal, high-powered e-bikes being used unlawfully in public places. Queenslanders have seen illegal e-bikes travelling at high speeds through parks, on footpaths and in suburban streets. These devices are not toys. They are powerful machines capable of causing serious injuries or worse. This bill sends a very clear message: if you choose to use an illegal device and put the community at risk there will be consequences.

The bill also introduces a stronger offence framework for dangerous riding behaviour. Riders who speed, fail to wear a helmet, carry passengers illegally, ride carelessly or operate devices on prohibited roads will face significant penalties. Queenslanders understand that rights come with responsibilities. If you choose to ride an e-scooter or an e-bike, you should do so safely and responsibly.

A particularly important aspect of the bill is the focus on protecting children. The bill introduces new requirements around age and licensing, ensuring riders have a basic understanding of road rules and safe operation. At the same time, sensible exemptions have been included following community consultation. Children aged 12 to 17 will still be able to ride under the direct supervision of a parent or guardian while exemptions will also be available for people with certain medical conditions and for designated recreational settings. This is a balanced approach. It protects young people while recognising that families and communities have diverse needs.

The bill introduces new provisions allowing enforcement action against parents where children under 16 are permitted to ride unlawfully. Parents play a critical role in ensuring that children understand and follow the rules. Accountability matters. If we are serious about improving safety outcomes then responsibility must sit not only with the riders but also with those who permit unsafe behaviour.

Another important reform is the introduction of random breath testing powers for riders of e-bikes, e-scooters, personal mobility devices and bicycles. Queenslanders understand the dangers of drink driving. The same principle applies when operating any device capable of travelling at speed in public areas. Whether you are behind the wheel of a car or riding an e-scooter through a crowded public space, impaired judgement can have serious consequences. This measure brings Queensland's laws into line with the community's expectations and provides police with an important tool to improve public safety.

The bill strengthens pedestrian protections for many Queenslanders, particularly seniors, parents with young children and people living with disability. Footpaths should be places where they feel safe. The introduction of a 12-kilometre-per-hour speed limit on footpaths and when passing pedestrians on shared paths strikes an appropriate balance between rider, convenience and pedestrian safety. No-one should feel intimidated simply walking through their local community.

Importantly, this legislation has not been developed in isolation. The government listened carefully to community feedback and the recommendations of the parliamentary committee. Nearly 5,000 submissions were received during the consultation process. Those submissions raised concerns ranging from device standards to licensing requirements and enforcement powers. The amendments brought forward demonstrate that this government has listened.

We have recognised current and future European compliance standards for e-bikes. We have created alternative compliance pathways for safe devices. We have developed an insurance framework to provide greater certainty for riders and retailers. We have ensured exemptions remain available where appropriate. This is how good legislation should be developed. It should be informed by evidence, it should be informed by consultation and, ultimately, it should reflect the community's expectations. Queenslanders deserve to feel safe when walking on their local footpaths, they deserve confidence that dangerous and illegal devices will not be tolerated and they deserve a government that is willing to take action when community safety is at stake.

I thank Bribie local Leo from the Bribie Island Bicycle User Group for his advocacy and, in particular, for giving us feedback on these laws. I also thank Jacob Savige for his letter and thoughts around the bill. The future of Pumicestone is in good hands with forward-thinking young people like Jake. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs NIGHTINGALE (Inala—ALP) (6.22 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. I am a little confused about the title because the word 'managing' is in it. I cannot see how this is going to be managed given the content of the bill and the 122 amendments. Before going further, I acknowledge the Queenslanders who have lost their lives in e-mobility incidents. I want to make sure that this government and this parliament recognise the importance of getting this bill right. It has meaning and it matters.

The real consequences of this bill will be felt in my electorate of Inala and across the Centenary corridor, including in suburbs such as Richlands, Ellen Grove, Forest Lake and Inala. The area is growing rapidly but infrastructure has not kept pace. People are spending longer in traffic, public transport is under pressure and cost-of-living pressures remain front of mind. In that environment, e-mobility is not a luxury; it is a practical solution. It is how people get to work, to study and to daily commitments while keeping costs down.

Recently, a constituent contacted me about the impact that this legislation could have on her. She lives in Richlands and works at UQ in Saint Lucia. Like thousands of people in the western suburbs, she experiences the reality of Centenary Motorway congestion every single day. Rather than sitting in traffic, she has invested in a compliant e-bike and now rides approximately 20 kays to work. The journey takes around an hour, saves her money, gives her certainty and gets a vehicle off our roads—an idea that you would think would appeal to this government. However, under aspects of this legislation her commute could be significantly more difficult. The time it takes could double. She could see herself restricted to speeds as low as 12 kilometres an hour along sections of the Centenary bikeway. She had serious concerns even before these 122 amendments that make things even murkier.

My constituents are right to be concerned. Longer travel times may ultimately push riders back onto the roads and discourage people from using active transport altogether. These concerns deserve answers and this bill does not provide them. So many questions have been left unanswered, such as

exactly what constitutes a high pedestrian area? They cannot tell us that. No-one on the other side of the House can answer these questions tonight—nor can we and nor do the amendments. It is the responsibility of government to ensure they do the hard work before bills and amendments are brought to this House. They should not be throwing up 122 amendments and expecting that somehow that will fix the problem of poor consultation in the first place.

One of the most telling aspects of this debate relates to the amendments because, after months of defending its original approach, the government now has returned with all of these carve-outs. Whether or not they want to admit it, this is an acknowledgement that they stuffed it up. They botched it. If the original framework was working so well, why are so many amendments necessary? The answer is obvious: they botched it. However, rather than accepting accountability, which we know this government is so bad at, they are just trying to do a patch job. The detail is missing. The process is missing. We know that because these 122 important amendments have not gone back for consultation. Stakeholders have warned about this and disability advocates have warned about this, yet here we are again. This bill does not achieve what it was meant to achieve. We asked for it to go back for further consideration, but that was knocked back. Why? It is because the government do not want to be held accountable when they stuff things up, which is what they continue to do.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, I let it go the first time but 'stuffed it up' is unparliamentary. Please withdraw.

Mrs NIGHTINGALE: My apologies, Deputy Speaker. I withdraw.

When the government continues to fail and fail, semantics will not cut it, although that is exactly what this government is doing. Sometimes there are no clearer ways to say something than through what a clear definition provides you. We are hearing a lot of talk about consultation and we are hearing a lot of talk about how they have done the hard work but, frankly, the government should spend more time informing itself rather than embarrassing itself. It seems that they have some clear problems here and I think I have narrowed down one of those problems. They have misunderstood the meaning of the word 'consultation' and mixed it up with the word 'notification'. It is very clear what has happened here and I will help them out. I am someone who likes to come up with solutions and not just identify the problems. The educator in me sees an educative opportunity here so I will help them out.

The Oxford dictionary defines 'consult' as seeking information or advice from someone, especially an expert. The government sought that advice—tick. Experts provided it—tick. However, here is where they have got it wrong: consultation is not measured by the number of submissions received; it is measured by whether those submissions are considered. It is a two-way street. The government's own guidelines require feedback to be analysed and considered in decision-making. How can that happen when we have only just been handed 122 amendments? They will not be considered by stakeholders. They will certainly not be considered by experts. There is certainly no consultation taking place. Those 122 amendments will not be given due consideration. They are going against guidelines on community engagement and consultation. They are doing it proudly, as if there is nothing to see here—as if there is nothing to see by adding in the final moments 122 amendments that will clearly impact lives in considerable and meaningful ways.

This government owes Queenslanders and it owes our communities proper consultation, proper process and due diligence. That due diligence is not being provided by this government. They are not providing it because they know that they are incapable of responding to expert advice. We have seen that over and over again from this government, which chooses to consistently ignore it, again confusing the ideas that align with the word 'consultation' and mixing it up with notification. Queenslanders do not need to be notified of laws; they need to be consulted on the creation of the laws. Experts need to be consulted.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

Mrs NIGHTINGALE: During the break, I looked to the messages of our government's leaders for wisdom. Sadly, I did not find it, and that is perhaps because the Minister for Transport has been preoccupied playing with He-Man's sword of power rather than putting the work into this bill. Before one tries to be master of the universe, one should first master the basics, like not passing off a draft that still needs 122 corrections as the finished product. Governing a state is not about declaring power; it is about exercising judgement, something lacking from this Crisafulli LNP government. This Crisafulli LNP government is a government that is dragging Queensland backwards, a government paralysed by its own failures and a government now scrambling to fix a policy they should have got right in the first place.

In Eternia, problems are solved by shouting, 'By the power of Grayskull!' But here in Queensland, problems are supposed to be solved by consultation, scrutiny and legislation that gets it right. Queenslanders are now left dealing with 122 amendments because this bill was not properly tested, it was not properly scrutinised and it was not properly consulted on.

The teacher in me is really on fire tonight, so here in parliament hear this lesson from today's debate: we do not need masters of the universe; we need grown-ups who take the job of being a minister of this government seriously and who take the responsibility of governing for Queenslanders seriously. I suggest that all members who sit opposite take their responsibilities seriously and consider the implications of this bill before it is too late.

Mrs YOUNG (Redlands—LNP) (7.32 pm): I rise to support the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026. Restoring safety where you live was one of the key commitments the Crisafulli government took to the people of Queensland at the last election. When Queenslanders step outside their front door, they should feel confident that the public spaces they use every day are safe. That is what 'restoring safety where you live' means and that is what this legislation helps to deliver.

This bill is about ensuring Queensland's laws keep pace with the rapid growth of e-mobility devices and address the genuine safety concerns being raised by communities across our state. The issue is not the responsible use of compliant devices. E-bikes and e-scooters can provide an affordable, convenient and sustainable transport option. The issue is the growing prevalence of illegal and modified devices being ridden at excessive speeds, often by people with little regard for the safety of others.

Throughout consultation on this bill, Redlands residents shared with me a number of concerning stories about the misuse of high-powered e-bikes and the risks they are creating in our community. One constituent described an incident involving a 14-year-old boy riding an e-bike reportedly capable of speeds well beyond what is legally permitted. Riding in wet conditions, the young rider lost control and suffered significant injuries. He sustained serious facial injuries requiring extensive stitches and broke both his arms after being struck by a vehicle. While the injuries themselves were confronting, what concerned the constituent most was what happened afterwards. Despite the seriousness of the incident, there appeared to be little appreciation of the risks involved and every intention to continue riding the same high-powered bike.

That story highlights a broader challenge that we face. The overwhelming majority of Queenslanders do the right thing. However, there remains the minority who believe the rules simply do not apply to them. When dangerous behaviour becomes normalised, particularly among young riders, education alone is not enough. There also must be consequences. This bill gives Queensland police stronger powers to seize and dispose of illegal devices, introduces tougher penalties for dangerous behaviour, allows for random breath testing and establishes clearer rules around the use of e-mobility devices.

Importantly, this bill also benefited from extensive consultation. Many of the thousands of Queenslanders who participated in the process supported stronger action against illegal and dangerous devices while also raising legitimate concerns about ensuring the laws remain practical and enforceable. One of those voices came from the cycling and mountain bike community. Redlands is home to many passionate recreational cyclists. A submission from one of Queensland's largest cycling clubs supported stronger action against illegal devices while raising concerns about ensuring there remained a clear distinction between compliant pedal-assist e-bikes and high-powered illegal e-motorbikes, as well as the impact on recreational trail riding. I am pleased the Crisafulli government listened.

The amendments before the House recognise previous and future versions of the EN15194 compliance standard, establish an assurance scheme for existing compliant e-bikes and provide exemptions in recreational settings such as mountain bike trails and rail trails. They also refine the shared path speed provisions so that the 12-kilometre-per-hour limit applies when riders are passing pedestrians. These changes demonstrate exactly how good policy should be made.

We listened, we considered the evidence and where sensible improvements could be made, we made them. What has not changed is the central objective of this legislation: keeping Queenslanders safe and giving police the powers they need to remove dangerous and illegal devices from our communities. Queenslanders have every right to expect that when they walk along a footpath, take their grandchildren to a playground or enjoy one of our many shared public spaces they can do so safely. The Crisafulli government was elected with a commitment to restore safety where you live. This bill delivers on that commitment.

I would like to acknowledge the work undertaken to examine this legislation, the thousands of Queenslanders who shared their views and the stakeholders who engaged constructively throughout this process. Their contributions have helped ensure this bill strikes the right balance between supporting responsible riders and protecting our communities.

Ms MULLEN (Jordan—ALP) (7.37 pm): I have to say that I am not sure that I have seen legislation introduced into this parliament that could upset and outrage so many cohorts in our communities. Bicycle riders—outraged. Parents with children who legally ride e-bikes—outraged. The tourism industry—outraged. The disability sector and older residents—outraged. Well done to all involved on that side of the House! They could not have made a bigger dog's breakfast of these laws if they tried, and by all accounts they tried.

The Minister for Transport and Main Roads is clearly blaming the committee chair, the poor member for Lockyer. The poor member for Lockyer does not know what is going on anymore as he gets given different instructions depending on the time of day or who is outraged the most. Let's start at the very beginning.

On 4 March 2026, the committee tabled report No. 21 of the 58th Parliament, *Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland*. According to the chair of the committee, this report sets out a series of what he called nation-leading recommendations to reform the regulatory framework for e-mobility use, improve community safety and better protect Queenslanders. Public safety is what we were all hoping to see—the safety of riders, pedestrians and other road users. Importantly, as the report outlined, tragically 12 people lost their lives in e-mobility related incidents in 2025, several of them children.

The report also included data showing that more than 6,300 people presented to Queensland Health emergency departments. What became very clear is that the government committee members, who effectively determined the report recommendations, along with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, who subsequently introduced legislation in late March 2026, did not test any of their proposals with real people. This is when the whole thing went off the rails, and the minister could not even blame the RTBU for this.

When the inquiry recommendations were released, the minister should have listened and realised that significant concerns were being raised. Instead, he arrogantly introduced legislation confirming the very same problematic recommendations. What became very clear very quickly is that the bill was not supported by the evidence, it was not supported by the stakeholders, it was definitely not supported by industry advocates and it was overwhelmingly not supported by Queenslanders. There were some provisions regarding enforcement powers and offences that seemed reasonable, but these were overshadowed by the government's position in three key areas: the definitions of compliant and prohibited devices and implementation challenges, including the impact on customised devices for people with disability; the licensing and age requirements, including the impact of requirements on people with disability, older people and people with medical conditions; and the application of a uniform 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths.

These were the very issues that my own constituents and community members raised with me, and I am going to share a few of their comments with the House. Why? Despite the fact that the minister thinks he can move amendments and make the issues disappear, he needs to hear what people thought of his government's proposed laws. In relation to licensing and age requirements, Ben wrote—

> As a parent, this proposal would have a direct impact on my family. I recently purchased an e-scooter for my 13-year-old son after we had previously hired Lime scooters and spent time travelling around Brisbane together. These outings have become something we genuinely value as a family.
>
> My son is autistic, and we have found that these shared trips often involving train travel and exploring different parts of South-East Queensland have been incredibly beneficial for him.

Nerissa said—

> People with low vision who are no longer able to drive a vehicle will be unfairly impacted as a result of the proposed requirement to hold a learners permit to ride an e-device.

In relation to the 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths and shared paths, Peter wrote—

> Years ago I had to give up cycling due to health issues ... when electric bicycles became a thing I was once again able to take up cycling. It's an activity I love.
>
> I ride the full length of the Brisbane Valley Rail Trail every year with my son, I ride to work every day, About once a month I ride from my home ... into Southbank with my 2 children ...
>
> Most of these rides are on shared pathways. The proposed laws limit the speed ... it is a dangerous ride ... on a gravel track, even on a concrete pathway.

We have received over 5,000 submissions, most of them raising concerns with the government's bill. This is where it becomes even more ridiculous. The LNP's own government controlled committee had to make nine recommendations—I will repeat that, nine recommendations—regarding the bill. That is extraordinary and so rarely seen—a government committee had to tell its own government that their proposed laws and policies need significant work. They should have done it properly in the first place. That would have helped.

Unfortunately, these recommendations, which involve a raft of carve-outs and exemptions, are complex and highly bureaucratic and risk the very thing that everyone wants to see: better enforcement. The chair of the committee tried to spin this in his foreword to the report by saying—

> In introducing the Bill, the Minister acknowledged that difficult decisions must be made but reform is necessary to support the safe integration of e-devices across Queensland's transport network and help deliver a safer Queensland where people can use e-mobility devices with confidence ...

Now we see that the minister has quickly backtracked from these 'difficult decisions' and decided reform is problematic when it becomes a political headache. What an absolute joke this is. Once again, they have come into this House with rushed and last-minute amendments—

Mr Mander interjected.

Ms MULLEN: Do you know what I suggest, member? I suggest you live in your electorate. That is what I suggest.

Once again, they have come into this House with rushed and last-minute amendments. This has become a feature of this inept LNP government. There are 67 clauses, one schedule and 122 amendments to this bill. Again, they are substantial amendments that make massive changes to e-mobility use in Queensland. Whilst they think this will fix their political problem, it is raising more questions than providing answers.

When it comes to their amendments to include a medical exemption framework for people with medical conditions and disabilities, what will this framework look like? Is it just going to add additional layers of red tape and bureaucracy? If they make this too onerous there is a massive risk that people will be discouraged from riding, especially those with a disability, impacting their independence and mental and physical health.

We also know that the 10-kilometre-an-hour speed limit was not backed by evidence. The department's own guidelines—just read the guidelines, for goodness sake—for speed management on shared paths state that bicycles become unsafe and unstable at speeds below 12 kilometres an hour. The minister is now saying that the speed limit of 12 kilometres an hour will only apply near pedestrians in 'high pedestrian areas'. This raises the question, as many of my colleagues have stated: how will it be enforced? Our police are struggling right now to enforce the current laws.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order! There will be no quarrelling across the chamber.

Ms MULLEN: Will the police have more resources for this? As we heard today, they probably will not because they are not going to be replaced anymore. What is a high pedestrian area? Who will make that determination? Will it be the state or local councils? Will there be clear signage so everyone knows where the 'high pedestrian area' is? In their submission, the Logan City Council said it will cost them $9.6 million over 10 years to put those signs in. Who is paying for that? This is another aspect of this botched legislation that raises more questions.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Ms Hatcher interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The members for Inala and Caloundra will cease their quarrelling. That is the last warning I will give you before I warn you formally.

Ms MULLEN: Finally, I say to the government: please, for the love of God, do some meaningful consultation with the people of Queensland before bringing these half-baked proposals into the Queensland parliament. As parliamentarians, we are imploring the government to stop throwing last-minute, badly written amendments into the chamber—amendments that are hidden until the very last minute to disguise their failures as legislators. They are not allowing any opportunities to interrogate them through the consideration-in-detail process. This is another example of bad legislation by a bad government. It is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards. We are being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures, and this bill is one mighty failure.

Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (7.46 pm): I rise to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. We have heard those opposite talk tonight and throughout this debate about everything they feel was wrong with the bill when it went through the original processes, and they are failing to accept that everything they raised has been fixed—everything. They have not come up with one alternative—not one. Do you know why? They are going to vote for it. They are going to vote for it because they know it is the best solution. They are going to vote for it.

Mrs Poole interjected.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection; they wish they had thought of it in the first place when they were in power. The process that has seen us get here tonight is textbook strategy with regard to introducing a law into the Queensland parliament. You initially respond to the public—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): The member for Everton is speaking loud enough that he probably does not need protection, but it is getting too rowdy. It is disorderly, and I will start warning members under the standing orders if it continues. I have a few people in mind already.

Mr MANDER: This is a textbook display of how to introduce laws into the Queensland parliament. We have a public inquiry after people have gone to their members of parliament and highlighted an issue. Every person in this room would have received representations from people who were sick of what was happening. We had an unsafe environment which had to be addressed. We had young kids riding what are basically motorbikes on footpaths. We had over 6,000 people injured and 14 deaths. As a result, this responsible government held a parliamentary inquiry. Those people opposite said it was not happening quickly enough: 'Hurry up. Let's not worry about the consultation.'

We went through the process in a methodical way. The members for Lockyer, Cook and Mulgrave, along with the other members of the committee, went through the information and came up with recommendations. It was a great first start. Then the minister had a chance to respond to that and introduce a bill to the House. We looked at that bill and it went to a parliamentary committee. The parliamentary committee had further consultations. What more consultation could we do? There is no more than that. What we as a good government did was listen, and every point they raised has been addressed.

Now we have commonsense carve-outs that strike the right balance between safety and ensuring that law-abiding citizens can enjoy e-scooters. I love e-scooters. I have been a great advocate for them. I use them in the city all the time. In fact, a couple of months ago when I had a driver we got to the edge of the city and the traffic was so bad I said, 'Let me out here, mate. I'm getting a scooter all the way in.' It was great. I love it. With the helmet and the wind going through your hair, it feels fantastic—really free. I am a great advocate for it.

I believe this process that we have gone through to come to this bill tonight is, as I said, textbook. I have had a couple of student leaders come here recently. I love giving them examples of how legislation works. This is an example that I used this week, and it is the example I am going to use going forward of how the parliament should work through proper consultation. Now we have come up with balanced legislation which will ensure, as I said, the police have the necessary powers, which they have not had in the past because when those opposite were in government they ignored the issue. Once again, it is left to the LNP government to solve the issue. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (7.50 pm): It is very interesting to follow the member for Everton when he says this is 'textbook' legislation. I do not know what the name of that textbook is. Maybe it is 'Introducing legislation by dummies' rather than 'for dummies'.

I rise to speak on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. At the outset let me make it clear that the Queensland Labor opposition supports safe and responsible e-mobility use in Queensland and recognises the important role it plays as an alternative form of transport for thousands of Queenslanders. At a time when Queensland's road toll remains far too high, we should be pursuing reforms that improve safety while encouraging more Queenslanders to leave their cars at home and use active and alternative forms of transport. Instead, what we have before us, unfortunately, is an absolute dog's breakfast of a bill. The minister has messed this up, and he knows it. Now he is desperately trying to fix his own mistakes but he cannot even get that right.

What makes this situation even worse is that we are no longer debating the bill that was originally introduced into this parliament. We are debating a bill that is now subject to 122 amendments—122 amendments to a bill containing 67 clauses and a schedule. If that is 'textbook', I really want to know what the member for Everton is referring to. What kind of textbook is that?

These are extremely substantial amendments to an already substantial bill that makes sweeping changes to e-mobility use across Queensland. Yet the government voted against Labor's motion to refer these amendments back to the committee. Why? It is because they do not want a repeat of the original committee process. They know stakeholders will have more questions, they know stakeholders will have more concerns, and they know that proper scrutiny would expose just how flawed this legislation remains. Instead, the government is running away from scrutiny and proper process so they can tick a box and move on.

It would appear that the minister intentionally waited to circulate these amendments. Nothing stopped him from doing so earlier. If the Crisafulli LNP government did not have the decency to give the opposition a reasonable opportunity to review the amendments before debate, they could at least have had the decency to give Queenslanders that opportunity. Members of the government may have had the opportunity to see these amendments before they were circulated. The opposition did not. Queenslanders did not. Stakeholders did not. These are complex amendments to complex legislation that have been dropped into the parliament with virtually no notice. Now we are expected to work through 122 amendments during a consideration in detail process that allows only limited time for scrutiny.

This government is treating parliament like its plaything and bulldozing through communities rather than listening to them. Despite all these amendments, the bill still does very little to address the real problem. The real problem is the use of already illegal devices. The real problem is dangerous riders operating outside existing laws. Labor welcomes the increased police powers designed to remove dangerous devices and dangerous riders from our roads and pathways, but, if the Crisafulli LNP government refuses to properly resource Queensland police then those powers are impacted. Police powers without police resources are little more than a media release.

The government had an opportunity to solve a genuine problem facing Queenslanders. Instead, it chose a rushed solution to a political problem. That is why almost 5,000 submissions were made to the committee inquiry, with an overwhelming majority raising concerns about some or all aspects of the bill. That should have been a warning sign. Instead, the government pressed ahead, and nowhere are the consequences of this failure more serious than for Queenslanders living with disability.

For many Queenslanders this debate is about transport. For many Queenslanders living with disability, it is about independence. It is about mobility. It is about participation. It is about whether they can contribute to be active members of their own communities. For many Queenslanders living with disability, e-mobility devices are not recreational devices; they are assistive technologies. They are mobility aids. They are the difference between participating in community life and being isolated from it. The Public Advocate told the committee, 'The issue at stake here is, broadly defined, for people with disability, social inclusion.'

This bill is not simply regulating transport. For many Queenslanders living with disability, it is regulating independence. These devices allow people to travel independently. They allow people to exercise. They allow people to access services and employment. They improve physical health, support mental wellbeing and reduce social isolation. Yet this bill risks creating new barriers for people who already face enough barriers every day. The licensing provisions are a perfect example. Many Queenslanders living with disability do not hold a driver's licence. Many never have. Others have surrendered their licence because of medical conditions. Many older Queenslanders have voluntarily surrendered their licences but continue to rely on e-bikes and other devices to maintain their independence, physical activity and social connection.

The government now says it will create a medical exemption framework. What does that mean? Who qualifies? What evidence is required? How long will it take? How onerous will the process be? The minister has questions to answer. I call on him to answer those in his reply. Stakeholders already warned that the original permit arrangements risked creating unnecessary red tape for disadvantaged Queenslanders. Now the government's solution appears to be even more bureaucracy. If an exemption process is complicated and onerous, particularly for people living with disability, many may simply stop using these devices altogether. That means less independence, less mobility, less participation and potentially poorer physical and mental health outcomes.

If this legislation requires exemptions simply to avoid disadvantaging people with disability then that is evidence the legislation is fundamentally flawed. Queenslanders living with disability should not have to seek special permission from government simply to maintain the independence they currently enjoy. The concerns do not stop there. Disability stakeholders consistently raised concerns that modified tricycles, adaptive cycles and customised mobility devices could be captured by the bill's restricted definitions. Many of these devices cost thousands of dollars. Many are customised to individual needs. Many have been funded through NDIS. Yet the minister still cannot explain whether those Queenslanders will be able to continue using those devices lawfully. Will they require assessments? Will they require approvals? Will they require exemptions?

Queenslanders living with disability deserve certainty, not confusion, not more bureaucracy and not a government making it up as it goes along. This is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards—backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures; backwards on accessibility; backwards on inclusion; backwards on active transport; backwards on evidence-based policymaking; and, most importantly, backwards for Queenslanders living with disability who simply want the same opportunities as every other Queenslander to participate fully in community life.

Just tonight I met with advocates from the disability sector who continue to feel very concerned about this legislation. They are very concerned for many young people in particular but also for people who are engaging in the workforce in a very supported fashion—that they may not be able to do that as a result of this legislation. These are real people living real lives. This legislation has not catered for any of that. It has created further confusion and further anxiety for people who are already experiencing disadvantage.

We saw the confusion that exists in relation to speed limits. The original bill proposed a 10-kilometre-per-hour speed limit. That was not supported by the evidence. We saw many stakeholders speak up about that. Now we see that a 12-kilometre-per-hour limit will apply around pedestrians and high pedestrian areas, but what is a high pedestrian area? Who determines that? How will riders know? Who pays for the signage?

Again, the minister needs to provide answers. Even the minister's own public comments about the operation of speed limits required clarification. If the minister himself cannot explain his own laws, how can Queenslanders reasonably be expected to understand them? The bill also risks pushing riders away from shared paths and onto roads with speed limits of up to 60 kilometres per hour. That makes no sense.

In fact, this whole legislation right from the start has had so many issues with it. It is so flawed. A lot of things do not make sense and it has spread a lot of confusion out there. It has put a lot of people off, many of whom have spoken out about this legislation. Queenslanders obviously deserve better, people living with disability deserve better and this parliament deserves better. We have a minister attempting to rewrite his own legislation on the run while refusing to allow proper scrutiny of any of the 122 amendments. It is unheard of. They should have been properly scrutinised and consulted upon. Queenslanders deserve legislation that improves safety, supports active transport, protects people with disability and targets illegal devices. Unfortunately, this bill still fails that test. This minister has a lot of questions to answer tonight not just in this parliament but to the people of Queensland.

Mr HUTTON (Keppel—LNP) (8.00 pm): This evening we have heard fake outrage and we have heard fake anger. As a result of their lack of vision and their lack of plan, we will go through yet another fear campaign confusing Queenslanders. There was one thing that was very true in the contribution we just heard: yes, there is confusion because half of the parliament—actually, less than half of the parliament, remembering there is an LNP majority here—is purposely going out there trying to confuse Queenslanders. In the absence of vision, in the absence of a plan, they will run scare campaign after scare campaign and make it harder for Queenslanders.

When I have met with my community, I have heard time and time again how their safety is paramount. My community's desire is to have safety in their homes as well as safety on their streets. When we walk down the main street of town we should feel a sense of safety. When we use our rail trails we should have a sense of safety. When we travel along the esplanades or the foreshores or when we are on the high streets of Rockhampton we should have a sense of safety. Yet under the former government we have seen the former premier, the Leader of the Opposition, offering to buy people e-bikes and e-scooters even if they were not regulation standard. We had a scenario where people had no rules, and that lack of regulation has led to Queenslanders being less safe.

Our Crisafulli government heard the cries of Queenslanders. We did not go into this half-heartedly. We went town by town and communicated through an inquiry process. In fact, the Labor opposition said they wanted to finish it faster because they wanted to get it resolved. But we kept going and made sure that communities across Queensland got to have their say and that they had an opportunity to talk about the issues they were facing. In my community I heard things including people being knocked to the ground, reckless driving, no consideration for other pedestrians, no safety precautions such as helmets being worn and high speeds on footpaths.

From that first step we listened to Queenslanders. We investigated the issue. The committee went on visits to schools and had a chance to engage with groups. Then in response to the committee the government drafted a bill. That committee has produced a report, and with the best of intentions the committee provided a series of recommendations to the government. How novel that a committee should have the opportunity to provide some feedback. They said, 'We have heard some feedback. We have seen what you have, and we suggest that these things could be done to make it even better.' They provided that to the Minister for Transport and he has listened to the committee, he has listened to the Queensland parliament and he has listened to Queenslanders and produced a bill that is going to make sure my community's streets are safer.

Safety on our streets is so important to my community. Our main street has doctors surgeries and chemists. When someone on their worst day is feeling vulnerable, a bit cloudy, and has gone to the chemist to get some medication, when they walk back out onto the street the risk of them being knocked over and hurt is high at the moment. People do not feel safe. They want government to make sure they are putting rules in place to make them safer. This Crisafulli government has heard that.

We conducted a survey and invited our entire community to provide feedback. Of the people who filled out the Keppel e-bike and e-scooter survey, 95 per cent said they had been adversely affected by e-bikes or e-scooters in our community. Of that 95 per cent, 90 per cent said, 'We believe there needs to be better laws, there needs to be better rules, there needs to be better regulation to make us safe.' It is not just about ticking a few boxes; it is about their stories. What are the things they have heard? One constituent told me—

> I have witnessed the unsafe operation of e-scooters on many occasions along pedestrian footpaths. These users are getting younger and they don't use a helmet. From where our shop is we see e-scooters continuously zipping up and down the street at unsafe speeds. My concern is that eventually someone will be cleaned up out the front of my shop, and unfortunately with the number of seniors who frequent businesses along the main street there is going to be a serious accident. Only yesterday I saw three young people on one scooter with no helmets. I live with these. Reckless youths, ignorant people, means that they become hazardous.

We know that e-scooters can be great for communities, but they need to be used responsibly and they need to have good regulations and good rules. That is why I support the bill and commend it to the House.

Ms PUGH (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (8.06 pm): I rise to speak on the bill before the guillotine falls. It has been a long time since I have had such a large volume of individual correspondence on a piece of legislation. While I anticipated lobbying from my wonderful bicycle user groups like the Western Suburbs BUG, I was blown away by the large number of regular pedal-assist bike users who took the time to reach out, and I thank them for doing so.

In my speech I am going to briefly outline my concerns, which are significant despite the many changes to this bill over the last few weeks. I want to be crystal clear about the difference between pedal-assist e-bikes, which are simply bikes, and the e-motorbikes that are wreaking havoc across our communities. In the words of Chris from Western Suburbs BUG, 'E-bikes are bikes!' Along with my community, I am confused even now that pedal-assist bikes have been caught up in the legislation alongside these dangerous illegal devices.

I will spend most of my time sharing the views of the members of my community who wrote to me. There are some clear threads in the feedback they provided. Firstly, all submitters wanted action on the dangerous e-motorbikes that are already illegal. Secondly, the idea that people would need a licence to ride a bike is completely unnecessary red tape. Finally, the speed limits—the minister still cannot really articulate clearly how they will work—are outrageous in the eyes of many in my community.

Hearing from the government that this bill is about being tough on crime has been really concerning, because the people I have heard from are the furthest thing from criminals. They are mums who ride their pedal-assist bikes to work instead of driving, elderly people who have given up their licences and dads who have been able to help the family transition to one car because of their pedal-

assist e-bike, not to mention the families who have kids who use them to ride to school and work and people who do not have a licence and do not want one. All that my constituents want is to ride their pedal-assist bikes in peace, because e-bikes are bikes. Ash at Jindalee, who lives with autism, writes—

> I live with autism and riding a regular bicycle is too hard for me, especially with the hills here. I get out of breath and that makes me overwhelmed and unable to concentrate and stay regulated at school. An e-bike is like walking. It lets me get to school efficiently, I get exercise, but I am not overwhelmed. But I'm only 13 ... With this law, I simply—

will not be able to ride their bike to school. I could not have said it better myself. I used to ride to school as a child. There was always one particularly punishing hill I could never quite get up. With a little assistance from a pedal-assist bike I would not have been such a hot mess when I got to school each day.

Under these laws, as I understand it, I would need to wait until I was 16 to ride my pedal-assist bike to school. I would need to get a learner's to ride my bike to school so my parents could get to work on time. I cannot fathom the idea that mum or dad would need to ride with me to school if I were under 16. I think it is clear that the LNP members of the committee do not understand how this will impact families who will now have to either drive their kids to school or ride with them to school. I am sure that will make people very popular.

I received an email from a constituent who requested that I not use her name but she wanted me to share her story. She wrote—

> I live locally and in 2019 I did a fundraising trip to mount Everest base camp with other locals to raise money for charity ... Unfortunately I came back with an hypoxic brain injury which amongst other things has affected my ability to exercise the way I used to. I can no longer use an upright bike and so at great cost purchased a legal recumbent e-trike ... I use this e trike daily to ride to the shops to buy groceries, to exercise with my friends, and to retain my functionality.

This constituent cannot qualify for a driver's licence. She continued—

> Please consider how this new bill will affect people with disabilities. It has taken me a long time to feel like a valued member of community again, and being able to participate in bike rides ...

It is still not clear how people like this constituent will be impacted as we wait for the exemption information to be released. As I said, she is not eligible for a driver's licence because she has a brain injury. How does she obtain this exemption? What kind of paperwork will she need to do? Why does she need to jump through all of these hoops just to qualify to do an activity she can do legally right now?

Alex wrote to me to provide feedback on the proposed bill. He said that he had firsthand experience as a healthcare worker and an e-bike commuter. He supported the effort to improve public safety—and all of the submissions spoke strongly against those illegal e-motorbikes—but, as Alex said, the issues that are apparent in the community relate to the devices which are already illegal. He encouraged the committee to take a more balanced approach that prioritises identification of noncompliant and high-risk devices, particularly at the point of importation and sale. The approach of the Queensland Police Service attempting to police these proposed changes will clearly not work. Alex said that he feared that if these changes are introduced as proposed they will end up discouraging legitimate, low-impact transport options that contribute positively to reducing congestion and are more sustainable.

Finally, the licensing requirements continue to change day by day as the minister realises what a disaster this is going to be. As I understand it, a 17-year-old with fresh P-plates will be able to drive a large high-powered vehicle like a Ford Ranger to school alone but his classmate without a licence would need their mum or dad to supervise them to ride to school on a pedal-assist e-bike. I cannot make sense of that. Sure, that child's parents can drag their child to the nearest TMR and they can get their licence and that sort of thing, but the point is why should they have to? All they want to do is ride their bike.

My daughter Allegra is 16 and she works one day a week at an early childhood centre as an educator. To get to work, we have to cross the dreaded Jindalee bridge. We are seriously considering getting her an e-bike because she does not want her learner's yet. Under these laws, to ride a pedal-assist bike she would need to get her learner's—just so she can ride a bike because she does not want to get her learner's. How does that make sense?

Ms Hatcher: She can ride a pushbike.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order! The House will come to order.

Ms PUGH: Thank you very much. Obviously, these people have never crossed the Jindalee bridge before, because it is a hill. As some of my constituents have touched on, government amendment No. 76—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PUGH: Honestly, it would be funny if it was not so scary how little regard they have for the rights and liberties of people in my community who just want the ability to ride their bike.

Government amendment No. 76 amends the bill to allow for regulations to prescribe carve-outs to the government's licensing regime, including for: children aged 12 and over to ride under adult supervision, which still does not deal with the problem of how children would get to school—let's hope they live near a bus stop because a lot of kids do not; a person granted an exemption from licensing due to medical conditions, like the constituent I referred to who has that hypoxic brain injury; and the place in which the exemption applies—for example, rail trails.

The question remains: why should people need to get any kind of documentation just to ride a bike? What will be in the regulation? Where is the detail on how these exemptions will work? Essentially, this bill and these amendments will require people with a disability to apply for an exemption to licensing requirements and apply for a separate label for their disability specific device under the government's other amendments. Many of these devices have been purchased at great personal expense and they provide those people with dignity, independence and the mobility that they had lost. The government could be taking that away from them. There is no need for this. Stakeholders have already raised concerns with the special circumstances permit—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Ommaney, would you please resume your seat. Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I call the minister to reply to the second reading debate.

Hon. BA MICKELBERG (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (8.15 pm), in reply: The Crisafulli government said that we would make the tough decisions to deliver nation-leading reforms and get dangerous e-scooters and e-bikes off Queensland streets, and that is exactly what this bill does. But how did we get here? How did we get to a situation where roaming teenage gangs on illegal e-devices terrorise our streets and neighbourhoods?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order! We do not have long to go and I will not have that. We will have an orderly debate for the remainder of the evening.

Mr MICKELBERG: How did we get to a point where elderly Queenslanders are too scared to walk on local pathways because they fear being knocked over? How did we get to a point where last year 12 people were killed and hundreds presented at hospitals from injuries resulting from e-mobility devices?

We need only look at the contribution from the member for Aspley, the former minister for transport and main roads, for an answer. He summed up Labor's position completely, which seems to be that it was all too hard so the only option for those opposite was to do nothing. We heard from those opposite that it was too hard to develop a system that ensures people have the necessary skills to use these devices, while maintaining access for those with medical conditions, so instead those opposite want to do nothing. We heard that it is too hard to ensure only safe and legal devices are being used, so they want to do nothing. Labor thinks it is too resource intensive for the police to undertake operations to get illegal and unsafe devices off our streets, so they want to do nothing.

Queensland tried Labor's way for 10 years. I would challenge the member for Aspley to look in the eyes of a family member of a person who has died because of these devices and tell them that we need to do nothing.

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

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

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. I am the minister, but I am also a local MP and I want to acknowledge the strong local advocacy to improve e-mobility safety by members of my Buderim community, such as Peter and Donna Burt. They are two people in my community who have been injured and directly impacted by an incident involving an e-mobility device. I will agree with the member for Aspley on one thing—that it is a difficult and complex issue to address—but where we differ is that on this side we are not afraid to take the necessary action to keep Queenslanders safe. That is why we are here and that is exactly what the bill aims to deliver.

This bill gives police the powers they need to take dangerous, high-powered and illegal devices off the streets while backing in Queenslanders who choose to do the right thing. Police will be empowered to seize and destroy dangerous, illegal devices, and path speed limits will be introduced alongside penalties for careless riding around pedestrians. This bill restores safety where you live by establishing new measures to improve footpath and shared path safety, including for pedestrians.

I am pleased to inform the member for Nudgee that Joshua from Nundah will not have to ride his e-mobility device at 10 kilometres an hour due to the amendments to the bill. A 12-kilometre-an-hour speed limit on footpaths and only when passing pedestrians on shared paths will keep pedestrians safe on footpaths and recognise and preserve the functionality of shared path infrastructure. At the most basic level, we are giving police the powers to conduct random breath testing on road related areas of public places—something that should have been done long ago, something those opposite thought about but something those opposite failed to do.

E-mobility device riders will need to be at least 16 years old, hold a valid driver's licence and be medically fit to ride, ensuring they have road rule knowledge and are capable of safe riding, with appropriate exemptions in place. This bill introduces tough but fair penalties for dangerous behaviours that contribute to injuries and fatalities, it holds parents accountable for ensuring children under 16 do not ride compliant or noncompliant devices in public spaces and it prohibits retailers from selling devices to children under 16. These reforms aim to create safer streets and footpaths, reduce injuries and stop deaths, and ensure e-mobility remains a responsible and sustainable transport option for Queenslanders. The ages and licensing we are introducing through this bill will ensure that people are as fit to ride as possible and have a thorough understanding of the road rules. A minimum age of 16 years and a requirement to hold a valid licence are key reforms under this bill. These measures ensure riders have the maturity and the road rule knowledge necessary to operate these devices safely.

The member for Aspley said that this bill risks excluding a considerable share of international tourists, who would be unlikely to meet the bill's licensing requirements, making Queensland less accessible and less visitor-friendly when compared to other destinations. If the member was across the detail of this bill he would be aware that the bill clearly recognises international and interstate equivalent licences. This means that tourists will still be able to hire and use e-mobility devices and international workers will still be able to ride for work. The licensing and age requirements are backed up by the safety issues raised by the community and the health data, which clearly indicates that children are at a much higher risk of injury. Following extensive community consultation, the committee recommended exemptions be provided for individuals who cannot obtain a driver's licence due to a disability or a medical condition but who can still safely operate an e-mobility device.

The community has highlighted their concerns about the impact of these requirements on people with disabilities and older Queenslanders as well as the need to balance safety with accessibility. It is also clear that age and licensing requirements will have unintended impacts on certain safe e-mobility use cases, such as riding in dedicated areas like rail trails and mountain bike facilities. While I maintain that it is of utmost importance that people be as fit to ride as possible and have a thorough understanding of the road rules, the government understands that e-mobility devices remain a critical form of transport for already disadvantaged people. To address these issues, amendments allow for exemptions for individuals with disabilities who can safely operate e-mobility devices. We will work with key stakeholders, including disability advocates, to design these processes to ensure they are streamlined and not onerous but ensure people are safe to ride.

To support safe e-mobility use by families and within the tourism industry, children aged 12 to 17 will also be allowed to ride under supervision by a parent and certain areas will be declared where age and licensing requirements will not apply. These changes will keep Queensland moving while ensuring this does not take precedence over the safety of our community.

Illegal high-speed devices have caused significant tragedy and distress amongst the Queensland community. Under our government, the Crisafulli government, this will not be tolerated. The member for Surfers Paradise in his passionate contribution highlighted how he has been calling for action over the last decade to get these illegal high-speed and dangerous devices off local streets. He is not the only LNP member on the Gold Coast to raise these issues. We heard a number of them during this debate talk about the impacts these devices have been having on people in their electorates.

We did hear from some members opposite, such as the member for Lytton, who begrudgingly agreed that we need to address these dangerous and illegal devices. What I did not hear at all during the debate from those opposite was an apology—an apology for not doing anything about these devices

while they were in power. I did not hear an apology for the taxpayer-funded rebates paid which resulted in more illegal devices on our streets. I would like again to take the members through the strong response in the bill to crack down on high-powered illegal devices.

We have created a new category of prohibited bikes covering unregistered and illegal motorbikes, with a new offence for riding such bikes on roads and in public places and a new seizure framework. The bill strengthens police powers and allows officers to seize and destroy or, as the member for Lockyer so eloquently put it, to catch and crush illegal e-mobility devices including high-powered e-bikes and e-scooters that exceed speed or power limits. We will provide police with the resources they need to take this action. That is the difference between the Crisafulli government and those opposite: we will give the police the powers they need to do their job. Those opposite failed to support them and that is because, fundamentally, they are on the side of perpetrators instead of victims.

Tougher penalties will apply to riders of noncompliant devices to discourage reoffending and ensure dangerous devices are removed from roads and footpaths for good. The committee and the community at large supported these measures and submissions strongly supported cracking down on illegal devices, which are seen as a significant safety risk—something those opposite conveniently ignore. These measures will give the police nation-leading powers—

Mr Mellish interjected.

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

Mr MICKELBERG:—to manage the problem of illegal noncompliant devices that are menacing our streets and paths. Once these laws commence, those who flout the laws are on notice: if you choose to ride an illegal device in public, it will be seized and we will be crushing it.

The member for Aspley said he visited an e-bike retailer's website and found that many of their bikes now meet the EN15194 standard. Good! That is what we want. We want retailers to stop selling illegal devices. We want customers looking for the EN15194 standard to know that they are buying something legal and safe. I say to the member for Aspley: if this bill is already delivering positive change despite it not even being passed yet, why will Labor not support it?

I have already pointed out that Labor's preference when it comes to the e-mobility issue is to do nothing. One way they can achieve their objective to do nothing without being seen to do nothing is to send the legislation back to committee for months more deliberation with claims that there has not been enough consultation. It is time for a history lesson. Last year it was the Crisafulli government who set up the parliamentary inquiry into this issue. We understood that this was a complex area and gave the committee the ability to hear from a range of stakeholders over a number of months. We did this despite the efforts of the Labor Party to guillotine the inquiry and to cut it short before all issues had been explored and all stakeholders listened to. Then when the committee made their recommendations, we listened and acted.

When introducing the legislation that came from the committee's recommendations, we could have just presented it to this chamber for consideration. However, due to the complexity of this legislation, it was appropriate that it was referred back to the committee for review. Again Queenslanders were asked to make comment and again Queenslanders provided feedback on the proposal, and this has resulted in changes that will be discussed in consideration in detail. Across both committee processes, more than 6,000 submissions were received and reviewed, and dozens of public hearings have occurred. I cannot accept suggestions that the process lacked consultation or that it has not been deliberative or considered.

The member for Springwood raised a number of amendments in this bill. That member might like to cast his mind back to the Building Industry Fairness (Security of Payment) Bill in 2017, which was introduced under the former Palaszczuk government. It had 143 amendments moved in consideration in detail, but it did not stop there. They got the first lot of amendments wrong and they actually had to include additional amendments during consideration in detail to fix their own mistakes. For those opposite to argue for more delays after they said they want a quicker process says a whole lot more about their politics than their policy positions. They really are a confused bunch on that side. They want it quicker but they want it delayed. They do not know whether they are Mellish or Bellish. Those opposite do not know whether they are coming or going.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: He is taking offence to it because he does not know his own name.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Aspley?

Mr MELLISH: My point of order is with regard to using correct titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will handle the House, member for Aspley. Minister, it would assist the House if you did use correct titles.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. During debate, those opposite sought to spread fear in relation to the impacts on vulnerable Queenslanders, in particular those with a disability and the elderly, and it needs to be called out. The member for Cooper said that we are criminalising e-mobility use for the elderly and those with disability when that is simply untrue, but we do have a responsibility to ensure all users of our roads and footpaths are not a danger to themselves or to others, many of whom are the most vulnerable in our communities. If you want to drive a car, you get a driver's licence. The process to get this licence involves practical tests to ensure you have an understanding of the road rules and that you possess the skills to control the car. If you want to drive a truck or a bus, you must demonstrate greater skills, and you may need to provide additional evidence of medical fitness. I do not think anyone in this place would argue that this is some form of discrimination. It is a framework that addresses the different risks associated with different vehicles.

The fact is that e-mobility devices present a different risk profile than a bicycle due to their additional weight and speed. Therefore, we must ensure users of those devices have the capability to ride safely. Just like a person with a truck licence has the skills to drive a car, a person with a driver's licence will have the skills necessary to ride an e-mobility device. We also recognise that there will be a group of people who, for various reasons, cannot get a driver's licence but may have the ability to ride an e-mobility device safely, and that is why a framework is being introduced to provide exemptions and alternative compliance pathways. This will ensure that we can still provide the independence and convenience people want while ensuring all road users are safe. The community can rest assured that safe, legal forms of transport will always remain available under the Crisafulli government.

Before I close, the member for Rockhampton is present here this evening but is unable to make a contribution due to illness. On behalf of the member for Rockhampton, I want to table the points that the member would have liked to have raised as a part of the debate. I note that the Speaker has reviewed this and approved it.

Tabled paper: Document, contribution on the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill by the member for Rockhampton, Mrs Donna Kirkland MP [876].

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister; noted.

Mr MICKELBERG: This bill delivers strong, decisive action to address the safety challenges posed by e-mobility devices while preserving their benefits as a sustainable and affordable transport option. The Labor opposition's position is simple: 'It's all too hard, so let's do nothing.' That is its position. We saw it for 10 years during its decade of decline, and riders of illegal devices knew it. They flouted the laws because the then Labor government thought it was all too hard. Our government is taking the necessary action to crack down on this behaviour and to keep Queenslanders safe. The amendments that I will move in consideration in detail reflect the government's commitment to listening to Queenslanders and responding to their concerns. Together, these reforms will make our roads and footpaths safer for everyone—from pedestrians and cyclists to e-mobility riders and motorists. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1—

Mr MELLISH (8.37 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 1 (Short title)

Page 8, lines 4 to 6, *'Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Act 2026*'—

omit, *insert*—

Transport and Other Legislation (Reducing Mobility Options and Increasing Road Congestion) Amendment Act 2026

This bill is an absolute dog's breakfast. The reality is this bill will do little to reduce the use of already illegal devices in our communities, yet the minister and the government claim otherwise. There are 122 amendments and 20 minutes for consideration in detail. That is 6.1 seconds per amendment for this House to consider those amendments and I suspect that the minister will not have the courage to answer more than a few questions tonight, even if we get time. How weak an act is that? If we ever needed clearer proof point that this government is not interested in scrutiny and accountability, there it is.

When passed, the title of this bill will be the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Act 2026. It purports to be managing e-mobility use. All this bill is managing to do is reduce options available to Queenslanders. All this bill is managing to do is make it harder for people with a disability to access important physical and mental recreation activities by forcing them to jump through hoops for licensing exemptions for their personal modified devices. After this bill is passed it should be renamed the 'Transport and Other Legislation (Reducing Mobility Options and Increasing Road Congestion) Amendment Act', because that is what it will do. This bill makes it harder for people to access mobility options by forcing them to jump through hoops and understand regulations for which we still have had no detail relating to licensing, labelling and myriad other matters.

Queenslanders will simply give up. People will give up what was once a safe, affordable and legal use of e-mobility as an affordable transport option. Instead, those Queenslanders will be pushed back onto our roads. That is more cars on Gympie Road, more cars on the Centenary Motorway, more cars on the Bruce Highway. That is more Queenslanders stuck in traffic because this cooked minister did not have the decency to admit they got it wrong.

Stakeholders know this bill is a mess. Bicycle Queensland have made it clear it risks being 'the death of safe legal e-mobility in this state'. Queenslanders know this government will never admit their mistakes—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Stop the clock, please. There is way too much chatter.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The shadow minister has referred to the minister as 'cooked'. I believe that is unparliamentary and should be withdrawn.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much noise. I would not have a clue what he called him. I will listen closely now.

Mr MELLISH: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Let us have some silence in the chamber so we can hear what is being said.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Queenslanders know this government will never admit their mistakes. Even worse, they know this Crisafulli LNP government will not even bother properly fixing their mistakes. I genuinely feel sorry for the department for having to implement this mess.

Ms BUSH: This amendment is to call this bill what it is. After 11 months, thousands of submissions and hundreds of hours on public hearings, what we have is a botched bill from a minister who has demonstrated this week that he does not want to hear from cyclists in Queensland—122 amendments, 62 clauses, one schedule and more carve-outs than Swiss cheese, and all we have done is complicate things even further. If we cannot fix that then let's at least fix the long title of the bill, because this bill will do nothing to stop the devices that are already illegal and on Queensland's roads. All it will do is make it unsafe and incredibly impractical for legal e-bicycle users to continue riding safely. The direct result of this bill is going to be—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Cooper, this amendment is to change the short title of the bill—

Ms BUSH: Correct, that is right. I am speaking directly to that amendment.

Mr SPEAKER: I will be listening very closely.

Ms BUSH: Thank you, yes. I am speaking to that short title. What this bill will do is actually drive up congestion and reduce active transport in Queensland. That is the amendment I am speaking to. Despite what the government would have us believe this week, cyclists are some of our most vulnerable road users and we are making it less safe for them to be on the road. Brisbane is now the 10th most congested city in the world and we are going to be driving up congestion, hence the change to the short title of the bill. This bill is draconian and this government is dragging Queenslanders backwards.

The government would have us believe that they have sorted it this week with their amendments, but they have not. Do not take my word for it. Let us look at what everyday Queenslanders have been saying in the last 24 hours about this bill they have apparently got right. On the Premier's social media: 'Enough of politicians and media confusing the argument. Leave legal ebikes alone!' To the Deputy Premier: 'Imagine passing a law where you don't know the difference between an e pushbike and an e motorbike. One Nation to sort this rubbish out.' To the member for Lockyer: 'Your committee stuffed up … A total embarrassment.', 'Complete nanny state', and '… how about you go after the criminals'.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Cooper's contribution is not being completely confined to the amendment moved by the member for Aspley. She is straying from that in relation to a broader contribution.

Ms BUSH: If I can address the point of order as well, my understanding of change to the short title of the bill is that I am empowered to speak to the clauses in the bill and to the amendments that are proposed under the standing orders. That is what I am speaking to.

Mr SPEAKER: Just hold on a second while I take a bit of advice. Member for Cooper, it is not an opportunity to speak to all of the clauses in the bill; that is not the case. You are speaking to the change to the short title of the bill. This is not an opportunity to debate the entire bill.

Ms BUSH: Okay, I will come to the short title of the bill. We are attempting to change the short title of the bill to rename the bill for what it is. Clearly, what the bill is intending to do has not been addressed. If you look at the social media of all of the members who oppose it, it is clearly not addressing what the government set out to address. It is driving up congestion and driving down active transport in Queensland. Take a look—knock yourself out—because the evidence is there. The shadow transport minister's motion is one of transparency. Let's call the bill what it is: the 'reducing active transport options and increasing congestion bill', because that is the effect this bill is going to have.

Mr SPEAKER: I will give the minister an opportunity to respond.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Has anybody got an issue with my ruling? There is an opportunity now to say it. I call the minister.

Hon. BA MICKELBERG (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (8.45 pm): If ever we needed an example of how superficial and devoid of substance the opposition is, here we have it: debating the short title of the bill. Bear in mind that those opposite came into this House and said there was not enough time to consider the amendments. They had two days to debate it, mind you. It has been to committee. There have been 6,000 submissions. Those opposite said, 'We don't have enough time.' Of the time available, what did they think was the most important thing? They thought they would change the name. They thought they would come in here with some sort of trite, pathetic, political game to rename this legislation from the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, that yelling across the chamber has earned you a warning. You are warned.

Mr MICKELBERG: As I was saying, they thought they would come in here, with the time they have available, and rename this legislation from the Transport and Other Legislation—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I take that interjection from the housing minister. They thought they would come in here and rename it from the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Act 2026 to the 'Transport and Other Legislation (Reducing Mobility Options and Increasing Road Congestion Amendment Act 2026'. I would have welcomed an opportunity to debate the substance of this legislation and the amendments—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: All this yelling is just running down the clock. It is up to you. Only the minister has the call.

Mr MICKELBERG: I would have welcomed the opportunity to come in here and debate the substance of the bill. I would have welcomed an opportunity to hear—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

Mr MICKELBERG: I would have welcomed an opportunity to come in here and hear His Majesty's opposition describe what their alternative policy position is, because all we have heard through the debate is that they want to delay this further, that they want to send it back to committee. Do you know why they play these games? They play these games because they do not have a position.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Bulimba is warned.

Mr MICKELBERG: They do not have a position. The member for Lytton knows that they do not have a position and the member for Logan knows that they do not have a position. They know that they have to play these pathetic political games because they do not want to be held to account for their record of not fixing this problem during 10 years of the former Labor government and their record of throwing $2 million of taxpayers' money at subsidising illegal e-bikes and e-scooters. That is their record. We heard the member for Aspley's contribution. He did everything he could to demonstrate that they did not want to have a position on this. Those opposite are bereft of policy and bereft of ideas so they resort to these petty political games. Queenslanders deserve better.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney, the Minister for Housing. He even used a pseudonym on the statement of reservation because he did not want to put his real name to it. We know those opposite cannot agree on anything. They cannot even agree on debating the substance of this legislation. Queenslanders passed judgement on this Labor Party in October 2024. They passed judgment after a decade of decline. Those opposite have learnt nothing. It is writ large tonight debating the name of a bill rather than debating the substance of the bill. It is pathetic. Queenslanders deserve better.

Division: Question put—That the member for Aspley's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

AYES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Mellish) negatived.

Division: Question put—That clause 1, as read, stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 53:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 34:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mr MICKELBERG (8.57 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 8, lines 8 to 14—

omit, *insert*—

(1) This Act, other than the provisions mentioned in subsections (2) and (3), commences on 1 July 2026.

(2) The following provisions commence on 31 August 2026—

(a) section 15(4);

(b) section 18(3A) and (4);

(c) section 34, to the extent it inserts section 78B;

(d) section 34A;

(e) section 45, to the extent it inserts section 247;

(f) section 56.

(3) The following provisions commence on 1 March 2027—

(a) section 18(3B);

(b) section 34, to the extent it inserts section 78C.

I table explanatory notes to my amendment and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Brent Mickelberg's amendments [877].

Tabled paper: Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Brent Mickelberg's amendments [878].

In speaking to these amendments, in relation to amendment No. 1, I propose amendments to implement a phased commencement of the bill supported by comprehensive education campaigns. This amendment will support the implementation of components of the bill which require further time to be consulted on, tested and refined. Commencing on 1 July 2026—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I take the interjection from over there. Hopefully it was the member for Lytton. I think she is on a warning and I think she did interject. Maybe she does not want to vote on this. Commencing on 1 July 2026 we will deliver the most comprehensive e-mobility framework in the nation. We have balanced the needs and safety of our vulnerable road users with the transport and access needs of riders. The reforms will introduce strong new police powers, including seizure and destruction of illegal devices and the ability to randomly breath test e-mobility and e-bike riders, new responsibilities for parents and retailers to keep children safe, new device compliance requirements and new and increased penalties to match the severity of high-risk behaviours.

Licensing and age requirements will commence on 31 August 2026. This will allow time for further consultation with stakeholder groups, including medical professionals, to refine key elements of these new provisions. This will ensure that riders are fit to ride, that they have road rule knowledge and are capable of safe riding with appropriate exemptions in place. We will then progress a regulation to provide these pathways, supported by targeted education to ensure those impacted by these rules know what they need to do. This will ensure we will have a robust process in place when these reforms commence. These amendments ensure the bill is nation-leading and balances community safety concerns with the role of e-mobility.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I take the interjection from the member for Lytton again. Hello, member for Lytton. She obviously does not want to vote on the bill. It balances the concerns of the community, recognising the role of e-mobility in transport in our communities.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lytton! Member for Mansfield! Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill, including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate. The current question before the House is that the minister's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Division: Question put—That the minister's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the minister's amendments Nos 50, 93, 101, 102, 103 and 116 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Division: Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 2 to 122, as circulated, be agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 34:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments as circulated—

2 Clause 7 (Amendment of s 52 (Prevention of offences—general))

Page 10, lines 24 to 27, from 'e-mobility device' to 'the device will'—

omit, *insert*—

electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device may take possession of the cycle or device to prevent the child continuing to ride it when the officer leaves the area, on the basis that the cycle or device will

3 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 11, lines 1 to 5—

omit, *insert*—

Chapter 4A Seizure and destruction powers for prohibited bikes

4 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 11, line 7, 'ch 4A'—

omit, *insert*—

chapter

5 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 11, after line 19—

insert—

internal review decision means a decision made, or taken to have been made, under section 123M on an application for internal review of an original decision.

6 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 12, line 4, after '123H(3)'—

insert—

or (3A)

7 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 12, line 19, 'of seizure'—

omit, *insert*—

the vehicle was seized

8 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 12, after line 23—

insert—

123AB Ways notice may be given

If a provision in this chapter requires the commissioner or a police officer to give notice to a person, the notice may be given in any of the following ways—

(a) by delivering it to the person personally;

(b) by leaving it at, or by sending it by post or similar facility to, the address of the place of residence or business of the person last known to the commissioner;

(c) by sending it by electronic communication to the unique electronic address nominated by the person to a police officer.

9 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 14, after line 10—

insert—

(3) This section does not limit section 60.

10 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 14, after line 23—

insert—

123EA Particular powers and steps for dealing with personal property—unattended seizure

(1) If a police officer seizes an unattended vehicle under this part the officer may remove and take possession of any item of personal property found on or with the vehicle.

(2) The commissioner must take reasonable steps to—

(a) identify the owner of the item; and

(b) facilitate the return of the item to the owner.

(3) If the identity of the owner of the item is known, the commissioner must give the owner a notice stating that the item is in police possession and may be collected from a stated location.

(4) If the identity of the owner of the item is unknown after reasonable steps have been taken to identify the owner, the item must be dealt with under chapter 21, part 3.

11 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 14, line 28, 'personally served with'—

omit, *insert*—

given

12 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, lines 3 and 4, 'serve a seizure notice on'—

omit, *insert*—

give a seizure notice to

13 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, line 9, 'service'—

omit, *insert*—

giving

14 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, line 14, 'by'—

omit, *insert*—

under

15 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, line 17, 'means'—

omit, *insert*—

, for a vehicle seized under this part, means

16 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, line 19, 'of the seizure'—

omit, *insert*—

the vehicle was seized

17 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, line 24—

omit.

18 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 15, after line 32—

insert—

123FA Grounds for release of seized vehicle

In relation to a vehicle seized under part 2 that is the subject of a release application under this part, each of the following is a ***ground for release*** of the vehicle—

(a) the vehicle is registered and may lawfully be used in a public place;

(b) the vehicle is otherwise not a prohibited bike;

(c) the applicant was not responsible for, and did not authorise, the suspected riding of the vehicle on a road, on a road-related area or in a public place;

(d) the vehicle was not ridden on a road, on a road-related area or in a public place.

19 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, line 12, 'information'—

omit, *insert*—

evidence

20 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, lines 15 and 16—

omit, *insert*—

(ii) at least 1 ground for release is made out.

21 Clause 8 (insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, lines 17 to 21—

omit, *insert*—

Examples of evidence to establish that a ground for release is made out—

- CCTV footage showing that a vehicle was brought to a public place in a lawful way and was not ridden in a public place
- documentation showing a vehicle is not a prohibited bike

22 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, after line 27—

insert—

(5) For subsection (3)(c)(ii), a statement or statutory declaration by the applicant about a particular matter is not of itself sufficient evidence to establish the matter.

23 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, lines 29 to 32—

omit, *insert*—

(1) The commissioner must, within 28 days after receiving a release application, decide to—

(a) grant the application and release the vehicle; or

(b) grant the application and retain the vehicle until the commissioner is satisfied it is no longer required for investigative or evidentiary purposes; or

(c) refuse the application.

24 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 16, line 33, 'release the vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

decide to grant the application

25 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, lines 1 to 12—

omit, *insert*—

satisfied—

(a) the applicant is an owner of the vehicle; and

(b) at least 1 ground for release is made out.

26 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, line 13, 'release the vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

grant the application

27 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, lines 15 to 22—

omit, *insert*—

notice of the decision (a ***release notice***) stating that the release application is granted and either—

(a) the vehicle will be released when the commissioner is satisfied it is no longer required for investigative or evidentiary purposes; or

(b) the applicant may collect the vehicle from a stated place during stated hours and, if the applicant does not collect the vehicle within 30 days after the date of the release notice, the vehicle may be forfeited to the State and may be disposed of.

28 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, after line 22—

insert—

(3A) If the commissioner gives a release notice under subsection (3)(a), the commissioner must, when the commissioner is satisfied the vehicle is no longer required for investigative or evidentiary purposes, give the applicant a further notice (also a ***release notice***) stating the matters mentioned in subsection (3)(b).

29 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, line 23, 'to release the vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

the application

30 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 17, lines 32 and 33—

omit, *insert*—

to establish a ground for release of the vehicle; and

31 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 18, line 8, 'applying'—

omit, *insert*—

making an application for internal review

32 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 18, lines 20 to 23—

omit.

33 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 20, line 23, 'chief executive'—

omit, *insert*—

commissioner

34 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 22, lines 29 and 30, from 'each' to 'section,'—

omit, *insert*—

a vehicle forfeited under this section

35 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 23, lines 12 and 13, 'served, either by post or personally, on'—

omit, *insert*—

given to

36 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 23, lines 20 and 21, 'served, either by post or personally, on'—

omit, *insert*—

given to

37 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 23, lines 27 and 28, 'served, either by post or personally, on'—

omit, *insert*—

given to

38 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 24, line 4, 'served, either by post or personally, on'—

omit, *insert*—

given to

39 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 24, lines 26 and 27—

omit, *insert*—

vehicle after it is no longer required for investigative or evidentiary purposes, including, for example, the costs of storing the vehicle

40 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 25, line 21, 'and'—

omit, *insert*—

the vehicle after it was no longer required for investigative or evidentiary purposes and in

41 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 25, line 29, 'the costs'—

omit, *insert*—

the outstanding costs

42 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 27, line 18, 'forfeited vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

vehicle forfeited to the State

43 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 27, after line 20—

insert—

Note—

See also the Road Use Management Act, section 123KA for evidentiary certificates relating to approved testing devices.

44 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 27, after line 33—

insert—

(4A) Subsection (4B) applies if—

(a) a person makes a release application for a seized vehicle on the ground mentioned in section 123FA(c); and

(b) the vehicle is released under section 123H; and

(c) a proceeding for an offence involving the vehicle is started against the applicant or another person, or the applicant or another person is served with an infringement notice for an infringement notice offence involving the vehicle.

(4B) The release of the vehicle under section 123H is not evidence in the proceeding mentioned in subsection (4A)(c) that the vehicle was, or was not, a prohibited bike at the time of the alleged offence.

45 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 28, lines 5 to 8—

omit.

46 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 28, line 30, 'ch 4A'—

omit, *insert*—

chapter

47 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 29, line 13, 'subsection (1),'—

omit, *insert*—

subsection (1)

48 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 4A)

Page 29, after line 14—

insert—

123X Delegation—commissioner

(1) The commissioner may delegate any of the commissioner's powers under this chapter to a senior police officer.

(2) In this section—

senior police officer means—

(a) an officer in charge of a police station or police establishment; or

(b) a police officer of at least the rank of sergeant.

49 Clause 10 (Amendment of s 747 (Definitions for chapter))

Page 29, lines 20 to 25—

omit, *insert*—

(1) Section 747—

insert—

drive, in relation to an electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device, includes ride.

(2) Section 747, definition *stop*, 'motor'—

omit.

50 After clause 10

Page 29, after line 25—

insert—

10A Amendment of s 748 (Giving a direction for ch 22)

(1) Section 748(1), 'another motor'—

omit, *insert*—

another

(2) Section 748(1)(a) and (c) and (2)(a) and (b), 'the motor vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

the vehicle

(3) Section 748(1)(b) and (c), 'other motor'—

omit, *insert*—

other

(4) Section 748(2), 'a motor'—

omit, *insert*—

a

(5) Section 748—

insert—

(3) In this section—

vehicle means a motor vehicle, electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device.

10B Amendment of s 749 (What is a *warning light* for ch 22)

Section 749, after 'another motor vehicle'—

omit, *insert*—

or an electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device

51 Clause 11 (Amendment of s 754 (Evasion offence))

Page 30, lines 1 and 2, from 'or' to 'personal'—

omit, *insert*—

, an electrically power-assisted cycle or personal

52 Clause 11 (Amendment of s 754 (Evasion offence))

Page 30, lines 18 to 21—

omit.

53 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))

Page 31, line 4, 'for a'—

omit, *insert*—

for an original

54 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))

Page 31, lines 6 and 7—

omit, *insert*—

electrically power-assisted cycle see the Road Use Management Act, schedule 4.

55 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))

Page 31, lines 12 and 13, 'section 123A'—

omit, *insert*—

section 123P(3)

56 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))

Page 31, lines 14 and 15, from 'for' to '123A'—
omit, *insert*—
for an original decision, for chapter 4A, see section 123H(4)

57 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))
Page 31, line 16, from 'for' to '123A'—
omit, *insert*—
of an original decision, for chapter 4A, see section 123K(1)

58 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))
Page 31, lines 17 and 18, 'part 4, see section 123I'—
omit, *insert*—
see section 123A

59 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))
Page 31, lines 22 and 23—
omit, *insert*—
personal mobility device see the Road Use Management Act, schedule 4.

60 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))
Page 31, line 31, 'section 123A'—
omit, *insert*—
section 123H(3)

61 Clause 13 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))
Page 32, line 4, 'section 123A'—
omit, *insert*—
section 123F(7)

62 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 5 (Act has limited application to children))
Page 32, line 25, after 'against'—
insert—
any of

63 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 5 (Act has limited application to children))
Page 33, line 2—
omit.

64 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 5 (Act has limited application to children))
Page 33, line 11, after 'against'—
insert—
either of

65 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 5 (Act has limited application to children))
Page 33, after line 21—
insert—
(4) Section 5(5), definition *prescribed transport offence*, paragraph (b), as inserted by this Act—
insert—
(ii) section 78B;

66 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))
Page 35, after line 4, entries for sections 78B(1) and 78C(1)—
omit.

67 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))
Page 35, after line 4—
insert—

s 122T(1)	3
s 122T(2)	3

68 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))
Page 35, before line 5—
insert—
(3A) Schedule 1, entry for *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*—
insert—

s78B(1)	3

69 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))
Page 35, before line 5—
insert—

(3B) Schedule 1, entry for *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*—

insert—

s78C(1)	14

70 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))

Page 36, after line 7, entry for section 253A—

omit.

71 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))

Page 37, after line 5—

insert—

(8A) Schedule 1, entry for *Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Road Rules) Regulation 2009*—

insert—

s 250A(2)	3

72 Clause 18 (Amendment of sch 1 (Infringement notice offences and fines for nominated laws))

Page 37, after line 10—

insert—

(9A) Schedule 1, entry for *Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Road Rules) Regulation 2009*—

insert—

s 253A	1

73 Clause 21 (Amendment of s 19B (Meaning of *racing*, *burn out or other hooning offence*))

Page 40, lines 21 and 22, 'this definition, a relevant offence'—

omit, *insert*—

paragraph (b) of this definition, an offence

74 Clause 25 (Insertion of new pt 2, div 4C)

Page 44, line 27, after 'not'—

insert—

a child

75 Clause 32 (Insertion of new s 34A)

Page 51, line 14, 'on'—

omit.

76 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 54, after line 15—

insert—

(1A) A regulation may prescribe the following—

(a) the circumstances in which a child who is at least 12 years is exempt from complying with subsection (1) while the child is under adult supervision;

(b) the circumstances in which a person who does not hold a valid Queensland driver licence or non-Queensland driver licence is exempt from complying with subsection (1) because the person is able to safely operate the electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device;

(c) a place at which a person who rides an electrically power-assisted cycle or personal mobility device is exempt from complying with subsection (1);

Example—

an area containing mountain bike trails or designed for the riding of vehicles other than motor vehicles

(d) another circumstance in which a person is exempt from complying with subsection (1).

(1B) A regulation made under subsection (1A) may prescribe the requirements, including any conditions, that must be complied with for the exemption to apply.

(1C) Subsection (1) does not apply to a person if—

(a) an exemption prescribed under subsection (1A) applies to the person; and

(b) the person complies with the requirements, including any conditions, prescribed for the exemption under subsection (1B).

(1D) This section does not limit section 171(3)(i).

77 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 54, after line 16—

insert—

adult supervision, in relation to a child, means supervision by—

(a) the child's parent or grandparent; or

(b) the child's legal guardian; or

(c) another person prescribed by regulation who is responsible for the child.

78 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 54, line 27, 'over 16 years'—

omit, *insert*—

16 or over

79 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 55, lines 1 to 4—

omit, *insert*—

(a) is at least 16 years and holds either—

(i) a valid Queensland driver licence; or

(ii) a valid non-Queensland driver licence; or

(b) if the user does not meet a requirement mentioned in paragraph (a)—is, under section 78B(1C), exempt from the requirement in relation to section 78B(1).

80 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 55, lines 13 to 16—

omit, *insert*—

(a) that a user has made a declaration that the user meets the requirements mentioned in subsection (1)(a) or (b); and

81 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 55, after line 26—

insert—

valid, in relation to a Queensland driver licence or non-Queensland driver licence, see section 78B(2).

82 Clause 34 (Insertion of new ss 78B-78D)

Page 55, line 27 to page 57, line 33—

omit, *insert*—

78D Liability of parent—offence committed by child against parent liability provision

(1) If a child under 16 years commits an offence against a parent liability provision, a parent of the child is taken to have also committed an offence against the provision and is liable to the same penalty.

(2) However, it is a defence for the parent to prove that—

(a) the parent did not know, and could not reasonably have been expected to know, of the child's conduct constituting the offence against the parent liability provision; or

(b) the parent took all reasonable steps to ensure the child did not engage in the conduct constituting the offence against the parent liability provision.

(3) In deciding whether things done or omitted to be done by the parent constitute reasonable steps for subsection (2)(b), a court must have regard to whether the parent was in a position to influence the child's conduct in relation to the offence.

(4) The parent may be proceeded against for, and convicted of, an offence against the parent liability provision whether or not the child has been proceeded against for, or convicted of, the child's offence against the parent liability provision.

(5) In a proceeding for an offence against a parent of a child under 16 years for an offence against a parent liability provision, in relation to proof of whether a person is the parent of the child, a belief of a police officer, on reasonable grounds, that a person is the parent of the child is, unless the contrary is proved, sufficient evidence of the fact that the person is the child's parent.

(6) For subsection (5), a belief mentioned in that subsection may be formed by the police officer after reasonable enquiries are made of the child and parent when the police officer finds the child riding a prohibited bike on a road, on a road-related area or in a public place or soon after that time.

(7) This section does not affect—

(a) the liability of a child for an offence against a parent liability provision; or

(b) the liability, under the Criminal Code, chapter 2, of any person, whether or not the person is a parent of a child, for the child's offence against a parent liability provision.

(8) In this section—

approved carer, of a child, means—

(a) an approved foster carer under the *Child Protection Act 1999*, schedule 3 in whose care the child is placed under section 82 of that Act; or

(b) an approved kinship carer of the child under the *Child Protection Act 1999*, schedule 3; or

(c) a provisionally approved carer of the child under the *Child Protection Act 1999*, schedule 3.

chief executive (child safety) means the chief executive of the department in which the *Child Protection Act 1999* is administered.

parent, of a child—

(a) means an adult who is the child's mother, father or someone else, other than the chief executive (child safety), having or exercising parental responsibility for the child; but

(b) does not include—

(i) a person standing in the place of a parent of the child on a temporary basis; or

(ii) an approved carer of the child.

parent liability provision means section 84B.

83 After clause 34

Page 57, after line 33—

insert—

34A Amendment of s 78D (Liability of parent—offence committed by child against parent liability provision)

(1) Section 78D(6), as inserted by this Act, 'a prohibited bike'—

omit, *insert*—

an electrically power-assisted cycle, personal mobility device or prohibited bike

(2) Section 78D(8), definition *parent liability provision*, as inserted by this Act—

omit, *insert*—

parent liability provision means—

(a) section 78B; or

(b) section 84B.

84 Clause 35 (Amendment of s 79 (Vehicle offences involving liquor or other drugs))

Page 58, lines 30 and 31, from 'on' to 'place'—

omit.

85 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 80 (Breath and saliva tests, and analysis and laboratory tests))

Page 62, line 21, before 'person'—

insert—

affected

86 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 80 (Breath and saliva tests, and analysis and laboratory tests))

Page 66, line 7, before 'person'—

insert—

affected

87 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 80 (Breath and saliva tests, and analysis and laboratory tests))

Page 66, line 12, 'for the'—

omit, *insert*—

from riding a bicycle or personal mobility device for a

88 Clause 38 (Insertion of new ss 84B and 84C)

Page 68, lines 3 to 6—

omit, *insert*—

related offence provision—

(a) the person may be charged with an offence against either subsection (1) or the related offence provision; and

89 Clause 38 (Insertion of new ss 84B and 84C)

Page 68, after line 14—

insert—

related offence provision means any of the following—

(a) the *Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994*, section 20;

(b) the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) Regulation 2021*, section 10;

(c) the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Standards and Safety) Regulation 2021*, section 8.

90 Clause 38 (Insertion of new ss 84B and 84C)

Page 68, lines 22 to 32 and page 69, lines 1 to 5—

omit, *insert*—

(2) A person must not ride a vehicle on a road, on a road-related area or in a public place if the vehicle has a compliance label attached to it but the vehicle is not an electrically power-assisted cycle.

Maximum penalty—30 penalty units.

(3) It is a defence to a charge under subsection (1) or (2) for the person to prove that—

(a) the person purchased the vehicle from a retailer in the ordinary course of business and—

(i) the compliance label was already attached to the vehicle when purchased from the retailer; or

(ii) the person attached the compliance label to the vehicle in accordance with instructions provided by the retailer or the manufacturer of the vehicle; or

(b) the person attached the compliance label to the vehicle—

(i) as a retailer or an employee of a retailer; and

(ii) based on information provided by the manufacturer of the vehicle.

(4) In this section—

compliance label, in relation to a vehicle, means a permanent label or marking indicating that the vehicle—

(a) if the vehicle has been verified as a legacy EPAC—is a legacy EPAC; or

(b) if the vehicle has been verified as a special purpose EPAC—is a special purpose EPAC; or

(c) otherwise—complies with the EPAC standard.

91 Clause 39 (Amendment of ch 5, pt 7, hdg)

Page 69, lines 13 to 15—

omit, *insert*—

Chapter 5, part 7, heading, 'devices'—

omit, *insert*—

and testing devices

92 Clause 40 (Insertion of new ch 5, pt 7, div 3)

Page 70, line 24, '*government*'—

omit, *insert*—

Government

93 After clause 40

Page 70, after line 26—

insert—

40A Insertion of new ch 5, pt 7B

Chapter 5—

insert—

Part 7B Legacy EPAC and special purpose EPAC verification

122Q Definitions for part

In this part—

legacy EPAC means a vehicle that—

(a) has 2 or more wheels; and

(b) is built to be propelled by human power; and

(c) has 1 or more auxiliary electric motors; and

(d) was manufactured before 1 July 2026; and

(e) complies with the characteristics or limitations prescribed by regulation.

special purpose EPAC means a vehicle that—

(a) has 2 or more wheels; and

(b) is built to be propelled by human power; and

(c) has 1 or more auxiliary electric motors; and

(d) is designed or modified to enable a person with a disability or medical condition to ride the vehicle; and

(e) complies with the characteristics or limitations prescribed by regulation.

122R Verification includes assessment and testing

A reference in this part to verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC includes—

(a) assessing whether the vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC; and

(b) testing the vehicle for the purpose of assessing whether it is, or verifying that it is, a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC.

122S EPAC verification rules

(1) The chief executive may make rules (***EPAC verification rules***) about verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC.

(2) Without limiting subsection (1), the EPAC verification rules may include rules about the following—

(a) the method or standard of testing to be used in verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

(b) the presumptions that may be relied on in verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

(c) the modifications made to a vehicle that may be ignored or accommodated in verifying that the vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

Example of a modification—

modification of a vehicle to make it suitable for use with a prosthetic limb

(d) who may verify that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

(e) matters relating to the label to be attached to a vehicle indicating that the vehicle is verified to be a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC, including, for example, who may attach the label and how it must be attached;

(f) the records to be made or kept in relation to verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

(g) the circumstances in which the verification of a vehicle ends.

(3) For the purpose of subsection (2)(b), the EPAC verification rules may include a list of makes and models of vehicles that the chief executive is satisfied are, or are not, legacy EPACs or special purpose EPACs as defined under this Act.

(4) The chief executive must publish the EPAC verification rules on the department's website.

122T Failure to comply with EPAC verification rules

(1) A person must comply with the EPAC verification rules in verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC.

Maximum penalty—30 penalty units.

(2) A person must not purport to verify that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC unless that person is a person who may do so under the EPAC verification rules.

Maximum penalty—30 penalty units.

122U Prescribing particular matters for legacy EPACs and special purpose EPACs

(1) A regulation may prescribe the following—

(a) the maximum fees payable for verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC;

(b) the limitations or conditions applying to the use of legacy EPACs or special purpose EPACs.

(2) A regulation may provide for offences relating to—

(a) charging more than the maximum fee prescribed for verifying that a vehicle is a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC; or

(b) use of a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC in contravention of a limitation or condition applying to the EPAC under a regulation.

94 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 74, line 5, 'part 27'—

omit, *insert*—

ch 7, pt 27

95 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 74, line 6—

omit, *insert*—

Chapter 7—

96 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 74, lines 18 to 28—

omit, *insert*—

(1) During the transitional period, a reference in an Act or regulation to a personal mobility device is taken to include a vehicle that—

(a) was manufactured before 1 July 2026; and

(b) would have been a personal mobility device as defined under this Act immediately before the e-mobility reforms.

(2) During the transitional period, a reference in an Act or regulation to an electrically power-assisted cycle is taken to include a vehicle that—

(a) was manufactured before 1 July 2026; and

(b) would have been a power-assisted bicycle as defined under this Act immediately before the e-mobility reforms.

(3) In this section—

e-mobility reforms means the amendments of this Act by the *Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Act 2026*.

transitional period means the period starting on 1 July 2026 and ending on the day prescribed by regulation.

97 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 74, after line 28—

insert—

245A EPAC standard may apply retrospectively

To the extent this Act applies to an EPAC standard in relation to a vehicle, the Act applies to—

(a) the relevant version of the EPAC standard regardless of whether that version has been replaced, superseded or otherwise ceased to be in force; and

(b) any vehicle manufactured before or after the commencement.

Example—

An electrically power-assisted cycle manufactured in 2016 may comply with a version of the EPAC standard in force when the vehicle was manufactured despite that version of the standard no longer being in force.

98 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 75, line 23, 'of this section'—

omit.

99 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 75, line 26, 'of this section'—

omit.

100 Clause 45 (Insertion of new part 27)

Page 75, after line 26—

insert—

247 Requirement to hold valid licence under s 78B

(1) This section applies for the period starting on the commencement and ending on 29 November 2026.

(2) A person does not contravene section 78B(1)(b) if the person has a reasonable excuse.

101 Clause 47 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 76, lines 13 to 18—

omit, *insert*—

(d) is 1 of the following types of vehicles—

(i) a vehicle that—

(A) complies with the EPAC standard in force when the vehicle was manufactured; and

(B) has attached to it, in a permanent way, a label that indicates compliance with the EPAC standard;

(ii) a vehicle to which a special circumstances permit applies;

(iii) a vehicle that is verified as a legacy EPAC or special purpose EPAC as provided for under the EPAC verification rules.

102 Clause 47 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 76, after line 21—

insert—

EPAC verification rules see section 122S(1).

legacy EPAC see section 122Q.

103 Clause 47 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 76, after line 32—

insert—

special purpose EPAC see section 122Q.

104 Clause 49 (Amendment of s 128 (Application for, and issue of, permit))

Page 78, line 7, after 'or'—

insert—

lack of

105 Clause 49 (Amendment of s 128 (Application for, and issue of, permit))

Page 78, line 17, 'example'—

omit, *insert*—

examples

106 After clause 50

Page 78, after line 31—

insert—

50A Insertion of new pt 8, div 4

Part 8—

insert—

Division 4 Transitional provision for Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Act 2026

177 End of transitional period for formerly compliant power-assisted bicycles and personal mobility devices

For the Act, section 245(3), definition *transitional period*, the day prescribed for the end of the transitional period is 28 February 2027.

107 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, line 3, '10km/h'—

omit, *insert*—

12km/h

108 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, after line 11—

insert—

Note—

For riders on shared paths, see also section 250A.

109 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, lines 12 and 13, 'or shared path'—

omit, *insert*—

, other than a separated footpath,

110 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, line 15, '10km/h'—

omit, *insert*—

12km/h

111 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, line 24, 'section of this part'—

omit, *insert*—

provision of this regulation

112 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 82, line 31, '10km/h'—

omit, *insert*—

12km/h

113 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 83, after line 3—

insert—

Note—

For riders on shared paths, see also section 250A.

114 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 83, lines 4 and 5, 'or shared path'—

omit, *insert*—

, other than a separated footpath,

115 Clause 54 (Replacement of s 24B (Speed limit for personal mobility devices))

Page 83, line 7, '10km/h'—

omit, *insert*—

12km/h

116 After clause 56

Page 83, after line 30—

insert—

56A Insertion of new s 250A

After section 250—

insert—

250A Riding an electrically power-assisted cycle or a personal mobility device past a pedestrian on a shared path

(1) This section applies to the rider of an electrically power-assisted cycle or a personal mobility device riding on a shared path.

(2) The rider must not ride past a pedestrian on the shared path at a speed over 12km/h.

Maximum penalty—40 penalty units.

117 After clause 62

Page 86, after line 15—

insert—

62A Amendment of s 291 (Making unnecessary noise or smoke)

Section 291(1), note, after '69A(1)(a)(iv)'—

insert—

and the *Summary Offences Act 2005*, section 19B(b)(v)

118 Clause 63 (Replacement of s 353B (Power-assisted bicycles—Act, sch 4, definition *power-assisted bicycle*))

Page 86, lines 24 to 27—

omit, *insert*—

titled 'EN 15194 Cycles – Electrically power assisted cycles – EPAC Bicycles', published by the European Committee for Standardization, as in force from time to time.

119 Clause 66 (Amendment of sch 5 (Dictionary))

Page 87, line 8, before 'see'—

insert—

, for part 3,

120 Clause 66 (Amendment of sch 5 (Dictionary))

Page 87, line 9, before 'see'—

insert—

, for part 3,

121 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 88, line 4, 'part 1,'—

omit.

122 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 88, lines 8 to 12—

omit, *insert*—

2 Schedule 62, section 3, definition *e-bicycle*, note

omit.

Division: Question put—That clauses 2 to 67 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 2 to 67 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be read a third time.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Division: Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.15 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Small Business Awards

Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (9.16 pm): What a display: 122 amendments moved through the House and another gag motion by this bad LNP government.

Pine Rivers loves to back our small businesses during Small Business Month and all year round. They are the centre of our community, often our first employers, the identity and character of our neighbourhoods and the gathering points that strengthen our ties with one another. Our communities are so much stronger because of our small businesses. I would like to update the House with the wonderful small business award recipients of my 2026 small business awards. I add their names, in deep appreciation, to the public record.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Nikki Boyd MP Small Business Awards 2026 Nominees' [879].

Conversely, I am deeply troubled to see the negative impact and the cost that the member for Redcliffe's business awards were, held last week. Never before have I seen an MP run an event to celebrate and award their businesses while charging hardworking businesses for the pleasure to attend. The Redcliffe Business Awards cost attendees $135 per person. You heard that right—$135 per ticket, per person, to attend the event. But here's the thing: to hold an event at the Komo, it costs less. A two-course alternate drop costs $72 per head and a drinks package is $60, bringing the total to only $132. I table the program.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Conference at the Komo' [880].

However, guests reported having to purchase coffee, which would have been included in a drinks package, out of pocket with a charge of $6 a pop. The question exists over whether the drink package expense even existed. On these calculations, the member for Redcliffe appears to have charged attendees more than the event cost for each one of them to attend. When guests asked why the cost was on them rather than covered by their MP who has dedicated funds to do this, the response was, 'It's a waste of money if you don't turn up.'

On top of what seems to be profiteering off the event, the member for Redcliffe had further costs covered with a gold sponsor of Community Bank Margate/Bendigo Bank and silver sponsors Jacaranda Kitchens and Teneriffe Tree House. I table these documents.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents, undated, regarding tickets for the Redcliffe Business Awards [881].

How much money did these groups contribute? Is it disclosed to them what their funds paid for? What disclosure is the member for Redcliffe making publicly around this apparent for-profit event? Six category sponsors, I am sure, would also have questions around how their money was appropriated through the event. I note the Premier was in attendance for the event. Did he pay for his ticket? I table the response from the small business community.

Tabled paper: Extract from Facebook, undated, featuring a post from Jolaine Connolly regarding Redcliffe Business Awards [882].

It is obvious this is a for-profit exercise—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Time has expired. I call the member for Mackay.

Ms BOYD:—that has left businesses of Redcliffe picking up the tab.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, when I call time, you will take your seat, please.

Ms BOYD: I am terribly apologetic, Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is a matter of courtesy.

Ms BOYD:—I could not hear you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

BMA Mackay Marina Run

Mr DALTON (Mackay—LNP) (9.19 pm): I rise today to highlight one of North Queensland's premier community sporting events: the 18th BMA Mackay Marina Run, which will take place this weekend in my electorate. This year's event is particularly special as it coincides with Queensland Day celebrations—a time when we can reflect on what makes our great state the best place in the nation to live, work and raise a family. Few things capture the Queensland spirit better than communities coming together through sport, volunteering and the great outdoors.

What began as a local initiative has grown into a nationally recognised event that now attracts thousands of participants from across Queensland and Australia. More than 7,500 people are expected to be involved this weekend, with around 20 per cent travelling from outside of the Mackay region. Those visitors will generate approximately 1,700 visitor nights and contribute almost half a million dollars to the local Queensland economy. That means there will be more people staying in local accommodation, dining in local cafes and restaurants, supporting local businesses and experiencing everything our region has to offer.

The Mackay Marina Run is more than just a race; it is an opportunity to showcase Mackay to visitors from across the country. Participants will run alongside our spectacular coastline, taking in the views of the Mackay Marina, the breakwater and the beautiful waters that make our region so unique.

As we celebrate Queensland Day, it is also a reminder of the important role sport plays in bringing communities together. Whether it is junior sport, community events or major participation events like the marina run, sport helps build stronger, healthier and more connected communities. The Crisafulli government is proud to support events like the BMA Mackay Marina Run through Tourism and Events Queensland because we understand the value they bring to regional Queensland. These events support local jobs, grow tourism and help deliver our Destination 2045 vision by showcasing Queensland's regions to visitors from across Australia and beyond.

I would like to acknowledge the outstanding work of the event organisers, volunteers, sponsors and community partners. Events of this scale simply do not happen without the dedication of hundreds of people behind the scenes. To everyone taking part this weekend, I wish you all the very best. Enjoy the atmosphere, the challenge and everything Mackay has to offer. As Queenslanders celebrate Queensland Day this weekend, I can think of few better places to be than at the Mackay Marina Run.

Centenary Highway

Mrs NIGHTINGALE (Inala—ALP) (9.22 pm): I rise tonight to speak about something my office hears about every single week: the Centenary Highway and the complete lack of a plan from this government. For people in Inala, Richlands, Ellen Grove, Forest Lake, Doolandella, Oxley and Wacol, the Centenary Highway is not optional; it is essential. It is how people get to work, how they get their kids to school and how they get to medical appointments, and right now it is failing them.

This corridor has been under pressure for years. That is exactly why when Labor were in government we got on with the job, investing more than $320 million into the Centenary corridor and, critically, doing the planning work needed to deliver a long-term solution because responsible governments plan ahead. What we are seeing now is the opposite.

In communities like Inala, growth is not coming; it is already here. We can see it in the new developments, the increasing density and the traffic that is getting worse by the week. What the community cannot see, though, is a plan from this government to deal with it. The planning work for the

Darra-Toowong and Darra-Yamanto sections was about real and practical upgrades, more capacity, safer interchanges and a corridor that can actually function for a growing city. Since those opposite came to government we have had nothing. There have been no updates, no timelines and no commitment.

The question from my community and the question I have for the minister is simple: what is the plan for the Centenary, because right now it looks like there isn't one? There is not even a working plan to keep up with the road we have. Along the Centenary Motorway, just in my electorate alone, from Sumners Road through Richlands to the Logan Motorway, there stretches more than five kilometres of infrastructure that sits in darkness—infrastructure that is the responsibility of government left to flicker and fail. It is five kilometres of darkness that perfectly mirrors this government's approach: keep the community in the dark, just as they have done with their complete lack of a plan to extend the Centenary Motorway.

We have been told by the Department of Transport and Main Roads that works must be prioritised across the state. The Centenary Motorway is a priority. When this government fails to plan, it is working people who pay the price. They are stuck sitting in traffic longer, getting home later and losing time with their families.

Public transport in the electorate of Inala is also left wanting. That means that people often do not have a genuine alternative to using the Centenary Highway. Do not think you can rely on public transport out my way, especially not the trains at the moment. The people who are moving into the electorate because it is one of the few close to being affordable electorates around rely on this government to get their act together and fix the Centenary Motorway and show people their plan.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Members on my left, I asked you to keep your conversation down. Member for Logan, I remind you that you are on a warning.

Hinchinbrook Electorate

Mr CHIESA (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (9.26 pm): As Queenslanders prepare to celebrate Queensland Day this Saturday, it is a fitting time to reflect on what makes our state so special. For me the answer is simple: it is our people. One of the great privileges of representing the people of Hinchinbrook is seeing firsthand the individuals, organisations and volunteers who quietly make our communities stronger every day.

Over the past few weeks I have attended events that, while very different, all reflected the values that define Queensland: service, resilience, generosity and a commitment to future generations. I recently had the privilege of emceeing both the annual Red Shield Appeal business breakfast in Townsville and the Herbert River Canegrowers centenary celebrations. One brought together hundreds of people to support the Salvos; the other celebrated 100 years of an industry that helped build the economy and identity of the Herbert River district.

At first glance these events may seem very different, yet both were celebrations of service—one recognised those supporting our most vulnerable members of our community today, while the other honoured generations of farming families whose hard work has sustained North Queensland for a century. Both were reminders that strong communities are built on people who give back, look after one another and leave something better for those who follow.

I have also enjoyed visiting schools across the electorate including St Peter's Catholic School in Halifax; Gilroy Santa Maria College, where they wanted to talk about the Premier; North Shore State School; and Ingham State High School. Meeting students and hearing their ideas is always one of the most rewarding parts of this role. Their confidence, curiosity and enthusiasm for the future should all give us optimism. These young Queenslanders are already thinking about the future of their communities, their careers and the contribution they can make to their own patch.

A particular highlight was opening the renovated tuckshop at Ingham State High School. My mother served as a tuckshop convenor there for 21 years and still going, following her sister—my Aunty Chris—who served for 20 years before her. They have kept generations well fed and ready to learn. It was a reminder that strong communities are often built by people who simply keep turning up year after year.

On Saturday evening I attended the Ingham Catholic Debutante Ball. It is wonderful to see so many young people celebrating an important milestone surrounded by proud parents, families and friends. Events like these remind us of the strength of our community traditions and the important role families and community organisations play in helping young people grow into confident young adults and future leaders.

As Queensland Day approaches, I also look forward to attending tomorrow night the Townsville Hospital and Health Service Staff Excellence Awards, recognising healthcare professionals who dedicate their lives to caring for others. It is important that we acknowledge and celebrate those whose commitment improves the lives of people right across North Queensland.

From volunteers and healthcare workers to canegrowers, teachers, parents and students, I have been reminded why Hinchinbrook is such a wonderful place to call home. When we celebrate Queensland Day this weekend, we will celebrate the history of our state, but it is people like these who are writing its future.

Sports House

Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (9.29 pm): I am standing tonight to speak about a wonderful initiative in my electorate, Sports House, and my concerns about its future. Sports House is located right outside Suncorp Stadium, in a prime location in Milton. It is home to 20 community sporting organisations like Volleyball Queensland, Equestrian Queensland and Bowls Queensland. These are the peak bodies for community sport that represent thousands of athletes and players right throughout Queensland. It is unique. It is co-located, which means that peak bodies can collaborate, and it is affordable.

As we head towards the Olympics we are going to need more, not less, of this type of infrastructure. Unfortunately, whistleblowers have told me that the LNP government is shopping that site around to their developer mates to turn it into a commercial precinct. This site is publicly owned. It is funded by taxpayers for Queenslanders and it is there to benefit Queenslanders. To think they are shopping this around, discreetly trying to flog it off to their developer mates and not keeping it for the people of Queensland, is an absolute disgrace.

We know that the government is not interested in community sport. We know that they are now the department of sport and that they have dumped the term 'recreation' from their social media account. We know they have already cut the funding to recreational groups like Queensland Walks, whose funding was not renewed. Imagine cutting the funding for an organisation which is the peak body advocating for accessible, safe and walkable neighbourhoods! What kind of ideological political party does that? We obviously know, based on this week's debate, that they are currently contemplating cutting the funding for Bicycle Queensland—it is also located at Sports House—based on everything they have said, post 30 June. We will certainly be monitoring the situation to see what happens with that funding.

What they forget is that every future Firebird, Lion, Matilda or Olympian begins at a local club. If you neglect grassroots sports, you undermine the entire sporting system. If they are shopping around Sports House as a potential commercial site, they are probably doing it to account for the cost blowouts that we know they are going to incur as part of Victoria Park stadium.

I have written to the former minister, who refused to commit to retaining this vital property in Milton. The shadow minister and I met with tenants of Sports House, and we want to know what their future is. Will the new minister commit to retaining Sports House? If sports organisations are being required to relocate, what are the dates and how are they going to be supported in that transition? Are they going to be consulted? It is unbelievable that they are advancing these conversations without giving community sports the decency of being open and honest.

While I am speaking about the minister, it would be lovely if this current minister could land a sports strategy. It is now 10 months overdue. The former sports minister, who was obviously focused on his integrity crisis, did not land the one thing he had to do. He did not deliver on his self-imposed deadline. To not deliver a sports strategy in 10 months is unforgiveable—

(Time expired)

Small Business Month

Mrs POOLE (Mundingburra—LNP) (9.32 pm): With your indulgence, first I would like to wish a couple of people happy birthday: my mother, who today would have been 84, was a proud Queenslander; and my husband. Fancy having the same birthday as your mother-in-law! I will not tell you how old he is, but happy birthday, Darren.

Queensland Small Business Month is a great opportunity to shine a spotlight on the amazing small and family businesses that keep our community ticking. With over half a million small and family businesses in our Queensland community, it was time to showcase and celebrate our small businesses. That is exactly what I had the opportunity to do in the Mundingburra electorate.

Thank you to the Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister Steve Minnikin, for showing his support to all of our small and family businesses in Queensland and in the Mundingburra electorate. There were grants available for chambers of commerce, industry groups and regional councils to host Queensland Small Business Month events that were focused on upskilling and connection building. The new Regional Business Gateways program has provided up to $600,000 per initiative to build capability, strengthen local industries and drive regional economic development.

We coupled Small Business Month with Queensland Day awards, celebrating the best of the best of our local communities. I had the opportunity to taste-test many burgers in the Mundingburra electorate in the running for best burger: Cafe Bambini, Angelina's Fine Food, Grill'd Healthy Burgers, the Spirited Goat, Fulham Road Fish Bar, Snack Shack, yo,Hash Burger and Burger Urge. I think next I will be checking out gyms after tasting all of those burgers!

Congratulations to Brock and his team of 35 at Mal's Pies and Pastries on Abbott St in Oonoonba for placing second in best bakery in Queensland. We are so very proud of your achievements. To us, you are the best bakery in Queensland—from your bread to your peach blossoms to your Cowboys pie, which you aptly changed to the Reuben Cotter pie for game 1 of the State of Origin. We'll get them next year.

Today many outstanding Queenslanders were recognised in the Queensland Day Awards. Barbara Page was recognised for 29 years of volunteer service to the Townsville City Netball Association. A posthumous Queensland Great Award was presented to the family of Jane Illin for Team Pink Feet, which she grew from a humble team of 20 in 2013 to approximately 900 members worldwide. She focused on raising funds to aid in the development of new trial drugs to assist people dying with cancer. All award recipients shared an unassuming, selfless and humble spirit. We are truly grateful to have them in our communities. Whatever you are doing this Queensland Day—and go the Cowboys—enjoy being a Queenslander.

(Time expired)

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

Mr WHITING (Bancroft—ALP) (9.35 pm): As the last opposition speaker this week, I get to ask the question: what have we learnt this week? The most relevant thing we have learnt is what the LNP members have learnt—that is, that their ministers cannot deliver what they have promised. They cannot deliver a games at Victoria Park on time. It is beyond them. Their biggest fear—that they will embarrass Queenslanders on the world stage—looks to be coming true. They do not know how to get people to and from the stadium. They do not know how to build the aquatic centre or the stadium or how much it will cost. After 500 days, all they have got is a dirty ceremonial shovel in the corner of the Deputy Premier's office.

Their minister cannot deliver a child protection system that protects our most vulnerable Queenslanders. It is beyond them. Under their minister, they cannot meet the statutory timeframes for child protection. The 24-hour priority response has gone from 96 per cent to 44 per cent under this minister. The 72-hour priority response has gone from 38 per cent to 13 per cent under this minister.

Their ministers cannot deliver the hospital projects that they have halted. There are just not enough workers to get them done by the next election or even the Olympics. At the rate they are doing things, they will have to choose what to deliver: hospitals or Olympics. Here is an example of that. The day they announced their new Olympic stadium and aquatic centre was the day the piling contractor pulled out the last of their piling rigs from the Redcliffe Hospital site. Olympics, 1; hospitals, nil. Under the LNP, construction of a new clinical services building at Redcliffe was halted. I believe we will not see that completed until the Olympics arrive in 2032. Olympics, 2; hospitals, nil.

I want to re-table this corrected document that the member for Bundaberg tabled before with those necessary amendments.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, regarding the member for Burnett, Mr Stephen Bennett MP [883].

It is very clear that the minister cannot even deliver a regulatory system for the simple new technology of electric scooters. There were 122 amendments over 39 pages—which is bigger than most of their bills this term—and those amendments were riddled with errors. They have the distinction of providing solutions that are actually making the problem worse. Worst of all for them, their leader cannot deliver them out of this mess. He has not backed up any of his ministers this week; he has gone missing. The Deputy Premier cannot deliver solutions either. He is all sneer and veneer and he will never back his colleagues.

(Time expired)

Aerospace Industry

Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.38 pm): I want to tell the House about one of my constituents, a young man named Alex. Alex used to be at St Mary's College. While he was there, he won the Boeing Aeroskills Scholarship at the 2025 Aerospace Industry Education Awards. This year he came back to St Mary's. I was privileged to represent the Hon. Ros Bates, the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, at Launchpad 2027. At this event, schoolkids from 10 different schools came to St Mary's to look at different opportunities that might exist in the aerospace footprint in and around Toowoomba.

People often do not think about Toowoomba as a place where aerospace careers could be forged. Alex works on Singaporean Chinooks at the Swartz Barracks for Boeing. At Wellcamp, Boeing are also building a massive factory where they are going to construct the MQ-28, the Ghost Bat, which is an autonomous fighter jet, the first offensive weapon that will be constructed in Australia since the Second World War in terms of aircraft. There will be plenty of jobs there both in constructing the Ghost Bat and in the advanced electronics that go into that.

On the day when the students came to Launchpad 2027 they had an opportunity to wear some VR headsets, walk into a big factory and go through a process of dismantling a big jet engine, to give them an idea of the sorts of careers that might be available. It was a real, live opportunity for them to see what Boeing actually does and where they might be able to go.

There were also some other organisations there: Aviation Australia, Manufacturing Skills Queensland and Boeing Defence. They all came together and the students had a really interesting experience. I was really pleased that the minister had put this on so we can try to keep some of our young talent in our region in careers with multinational organisations that will pay them well and give them a real opportunity. In Toowoomba we are getting a real name now for avionics and aviation careers and opportunities. Having Boeing both maintaining aircraft in our area and then designing and constructing aircraft in our area will be a great opportunity.

All I would say is: let's look out for whose career can next be kicked off. There were plenty of students excited about that at Launchpad 2027 in Toowoomba. This is what the Crisafulli government is doing to make sure we have full employment in the regions.

(Time expired)

Law and Order; North Queensland, Youth Crime

Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (9.41 pm): Today we heard about a horrific home invasion in New South Wales where an elderly couple were brutally attacked with a knife and seriously injured. Fortunately, the elderly man was able to shoot the intruder before any further harm was done. We pray for the couple and hope common sense prevails so that a man defending himself and his wife in their own home is not treated as a criminal. Law-abiding citizens want certainty that they can defend themselves and their family without having to second-guess what level of force may later be deemed reasonable. Hesitation can mean the difference between life and death. Let's be fair dinkum about this.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I want to clarify in relation to the contribution of the member for Hill that this does not offend any sub judice rules with respect to the case he is referencing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): I was about to beat you to the button. Member for Hill, could you assure us that you will not be breaching the sub judice rule—

Mr KNUTH: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I have not finished. In relation to the contribution you are making, can you assure us that you will not be breaching any of the rules of sub judice?

Mr KNUTH: That is correct, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have not mentioned castle law.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not what I am asking you.

Mr KNUTH: It has nothing to do with it. It is about a shooting in New South Wales and a person had to defend himself. I am speaking about what happened in New South Wales.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I do not want to argue with you. What I want from you is an assurance that your contribution will not breach the rules of sub judice. I want that assurance.

Mr KNUTH: You have that assurance. I also want to talk about one of the most absurd political situations I have seen during my time in parliament. North Queensland government MPs have launched a public petition demanding tougher youth bail laws from their own government. The member for

Hinchinbrook built his by-election campaign around being tough on youth crime and repeatedly promised 'breach bail, go to jail' laws. Voters were told that electing him would give Hinchinbrook a seat at the government's table and the ability to deliver those laws.

If the member truly has a seat at the table, why is he now circulating a petition asking his own government to do what should have already been done? Even the *Townsville Bulletin* highlighted the stupidity of the situation this week under the headline 'Just fix it'. The article points out that the government MPs were effectively begging their own government for tougher laws. The public expects that when you hold the levers of power you introduce legislation; you do not launch a petition against yourself. I table this article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Townsville Bulletin*, dated 1 June 2026, titled 'Just fix it' [884].

North Queenslanders have had enough of stolen cars, home break-ins and repeat offenders continually breaching bail. If northern government MPs have a seat at the table, why are they acting like lobbyists in the waiting room begging their own government to deliver what they promised in the first place?

EGW Wood Bridge, Upgrade

Mr FIELD (Capalaba—LNP) (9.44 pm): I am proud to update the House on a project of real importance to local residents in the Capalaba electorate. That project is the duplication of the EGW Wood Bridge, known to many people locally as the Tingalpa Creek bridge. Recently I announced that the Crisafulli government is investing $500,000 to advance the business case for the upgrade of this important connection between the Redland and Brisbane City Council areas. For far too long this bridge has been a bottleneck for local commuters, tradies, families, small business owners and everyone who relies on that crossing to get between the Redlands and Brisbane.

The EGW Wood Bridge was officially opened in 1970 and named after Ernest Gaden Western Wood, known as Dick Wood, who was a long-serving chairman of the Redland Shire Council and briefly the member for Logan. At the time the opening was officiated by then lord mayor Clem Jones. More than 50 years later, that bridge remains the northernmost road connection out of the Redlands and a crucial route for people travelling through Capalaba, Birkdale, Thorneside, Wynnum and the surrounding bayside communities. This road is a daily pressure point in the lives of thousands of residents who simply want to get to work, get home to their families, pick up their kids, attend appointments, run their businesses and move around their community without unnecessary delay.

Since that bridge was opened, the population in our community has grown enormously as more people have moved to the area to enjoy the best lifestyle in the state. Unfortunately, the transport infrastructure in the Capalaba electorate has not kept pace with that growth. The former Labor government put this project in the too-hard basket while locals were crying out for action. The benefit of upgrading this bridge is plain to see, and it is time we got on with the job.

When I put my hand up to run for parliament, I knew this bridge was a source of congestion and that it had been neglected for too long. One of my key election commitments was to tackle the issue, and now I am doing just that. This is exactly the sort of practical local infrastructure issue that people raise with me constantly. They are not asking for the world; they are asking for basic transport connections in our community to be treated seriously. Locals are telling me that they are very pleased to see that progress is finally underway. They know that advancing the business case is an important step toward a genuine improvement of the congestion issues that my constituents are dealing with every day. They also understand that serious infrastructure projects require proper planning, proper assessment and a clear pathway toward delivery. I have heard feedback from some residents expressing frustration that work is only just now being done on this bridge, and I share that frustration. This should have been dealt with years ago. The former Labor government had plenty of time to recognise the problem and act on it but, like so many other pressing issues across the state, it sat on its hands and did nothing.

The business case is due to be completed around mid-2027, and I will continue to provide strong advocacy every step of the way to ensure this important bridge comes to fruition. We all know the bridge needs upgrading, and the business case is the crucial first step in getting that work properly assessed, planned and ready to proceed. Capalaba, the Redlands and the wider bayside communities deserve a government that listens, acts and delivers on the local infrastructure that matters to their daily lives. That is what I promised to do and that is exactly what the Crisafulli government is delivering.

(Time expired)

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.47 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, 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, 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, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richmond, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young