TO BE IN TIME FOR CORRECTION
PROOFS MUST BE RETURNED
BY **12 noon** TO THE
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS
(PROOF)

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

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 17 November 2026

Subject — Page

ASSENT TO BILL **3661**
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 5 November 2026, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 5 November 2026. 3661
SPEAKER'S RULING **3661**
Same Question Rule **3661**
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **3663**
Absence of Ministers **3663**
REPORT **3663**
Office of the Information Commissioner **3663**
Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 1: 2026-27—Privacy online: Review of Queensland Government privacy information, November 2026. 3663
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT **3663**
Visitors to Public Gallery **3663**
PETITIONS **3663**
TABLED PAPERS **3665**
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS **3668**
Infrastructure **3668**
Industrial Relations **3669**
Tabled paper: Queensland Construction Productivity Code 2026. 3671
Tabled paper: Commission of Inquiry into the CFMEU and Misconduct in the Construction Industry—Building Queensland's Future: Interim Report on a Queensland Construction Code, government response. 3671
Productivity **3671**
Skills and Training **3671**
Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 11 April 2024, titled "Toxic' culture blamed for keeping women out of lucrative construction sector'. 3672

PT WEIR
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

J HURLEY
ACTING CHIEF REPORTER

Procurement ... **3672**
Health System ... **3673**
Trade Mission, Indonesia ... **3673**
Police Resources ... **3674**
Service Queensland ... **3675**
JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE ... **3675**
Membership ... **3675**
ABSENCE OF MINISTERS ... **3676**
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE ... **3676**
Ambulance Service ... **3676**
Ambulance Service ... **3676**
Crisafulli LNP Government, Achievements ... **3677**
Ambulance Service ... **3678**
Industrial Relations ... **3678**
Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 17 November 2026, titled ''No hope': Steven Miles urged to resign as Labor leader by Xmas'. ... 3679
Ambulance Service ... **3679**
Infrastructure ... **3680**
Ambulance Service ... **3680**
Housing Supply ... **3681**
Queensland Hospital Watch ... **3682**
Transport Infrastructure ... **3683**
Ambulance Service ... **3683**
Productivity ... **3684**
Health System, Workforce ... **3685**
Skills and Training ... **3685**
Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 5 March 2024, titled 'Miles defends Health delays'. ... 3686
Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 17 November 2026, titled ''No hope': Steven Miles urged to resign as Labor leader by Xmas'. ... 3686
Health Workforce Plan ... **3686**
Women ... **3687**
MOTIONS ... **3688**
Suspension of Standing Orders ... **3688**
Business Program ... **3688**
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ... 3691
Resolved in the affirmative. ... 3691
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION ... **3691**
Division: Question put—That the member for Aspley be now heard. ... 3691
Resolved in the negative. ... 3691
Division: Question put—That leave be granted. ... 3692
Resolved in the affirmative. ... 3692
MOTION ... **3692**
Suspension of Standing Orders ... **3692**
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION ... **3692**
Division: Question put—That leave be granted. ... 3692
Resolved in the negative. ... 3692
JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL; VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL; CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL ... **3692**
Second Reading (Cognate Debate) ... **3693**
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST ... **3704**
Health System, Performance ... **3704**
Leader of the Opposition ... **3706**
Health System ... **3707**
Labor Party, Performance ... **3708**
Health System ... **3709**
Springfield Central State High School ... **3710**
Health System ... **3711**
Leader of the Opposition ... **3712**
Leader of the Opposition ... **3713**
Health System ... **3714**
Health System ... **3715**
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT ... **3715**
Tourism Industry ... **3715**
LIQUOR AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL ... **3716**
Introduction ... **3716**
Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. ... 3716
Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes. ... 3716
Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights. ... 3716
First Reading ... **3720**
Referral to Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee ... **3720**

JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL; VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL; CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL 3720
Second Reading (Cognate Debate) 3720
TRANSPORT AFFORDABILITY AMENDMENT BILL 3736
Second Reading 3736
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. 3752
Resolved in the negative. 3752
JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL; VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL; CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL 3752
Second Reading (Cognate Debate) 3752
Tabled paper: Document, dated 17 November 2026, by the National Survivors Foundation, titled 'Queensland Parliament – Vicarious Liability Legislation Debate' 3758
Tabled paper: Photographs depicting Diane Carpenter and Val Cooper. 3759
Tabled paper: Extract from social media featuring posts from the member for Ninderry, Hon Dan Purdie MP, in relation to National Survivors Day. 3760
Division: Question put—That Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill be now read a second time. 3768
Resolved in the negative. 3768
Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate) 3768
Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 3768
Clause 1, as read, agreed to. 3768
Clause 2— 3768
Tabled paper: Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon Frecklington's amendments. 3768
Tabled paper: Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility to Hon Frecklington's amendments. 3768
Amendment agreed to. 3768
Clause 2, as amended, agreed to. 3769
Amendments agreed to. 3769
Clauses 3 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to. 3770
Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 3770
Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to. 3770
Third Reading (Cognate Debate) 3770
Long Title (Cognate Debate) 3770
Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 3771
Amendment agreed to. 3771
Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 3771
ADJOURNMENT 3771
Pollock, Mrs I; McEachren, Mrs N 3771
Bonney Electorate, Local Legends Community Awards 3771
Algester Electorate, Transport Infrastructure 3772
Whitsunday Electorate, Community Services 3773
Logan Electorate, Transport Infrastructure 3773
Cairns Aviation Skills Centre 3774
Morayfield Electorate, Road Infrastructure 3774
Redlands Electorate, Training 3775
Remembrance Day 3776
Lockyer Electorate, Schools 3776
ATTENDANCE 3777

TUESDAY, 17 NOVEMBER 2026

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Pat Weir, Condamine) read prayers and took the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I acknowledge the Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islander people of this state and their elders past, present and emerging. I also acknowledge the former members of this parliament who have participated in and nourished the democratic institutions of this state. Finally, I acknowledge the people of this state, whether they have been born here or have chosen to make this state their home and whom we represent to make laws and conduct other business for the peace, welfare and good government of this state.

ASSENT TO BILL

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to a bill. The contents of the letter will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable P. Weir MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bill, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, was assented to in the name of His Majesty The King on the date shown:

Date of assent: 5 November 2026

> A bill for an Act to amend the Bail Act 1980, the Expanding Adult Crime, Adult Time and Taking a Strong Stance on Drugs and Anti-Social Behaviour Amendment Act 2026, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Young Offenders (Interstate Transfer) Act 1987 and the Youth Justice Act 1992 for particular purposes

This Bill is hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

5 November 2026

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 5 November 2026, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to a certain bill on 5 November 2026.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Same Question Rule

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have considered the application of the same question rule to the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, the Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill 2026, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The same question rule is enlivened by clauses 7, 20, 22 and 39 of the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, contrary to standing order 87. The same question rule is enlivened by clauses 74, 77 to 80 and 82 of the Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill, contrary to standing order 87. The same question rule is enlivened by schedule 1, 'Youth Justice Act 1992', amendment 2 of the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, contrary to standing order 87. If the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 is passed by the House prior to this bill, the same question rule

will also be enlivened by schedule 1, 'Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024', amendment 3. The same question rule is enlivened by clauses 13 to 19, 21, 23 to 26, 29 to 32, 51 and 52, 54, 72 and 76 and 77 of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, contrary to standing order 87. If the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 is passed by the House prior to this bill, the same question rule will also be enlivened by clause 88 of the bill. As such, a motion to suspend standing order 87 would be required for these clauses of the bills to be considered. I seek leave to incorporate my full ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—MULTIPLE GOVERNMENT BILLS

I have considered the application of the same question rule to multiple government bills—namely, the Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, the Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill 2026, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026, and the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026.

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

Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

The Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 (the Bill) was introduced on 15 September 2026. It seeks to amend multiple sections of Acts already amended in the same session of parliament. The proposed amendments are effectively reconsidering the substance of earlier amendments to these sections.

Clauses 7, 20, 22 and 39 of the Bill propose amendments to provisions of Acts that are substantially the same as amendments previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament due to the passing of earlier Acts. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.

Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 7, 20, 22 and 39 of the Bill contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill

The Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill 2026 was introduced on 15 September 2026. It seeks to amend provisions of the Youth Justice Act 1992 that have already been considered by the House in this session of Parliament in the context of amendments contained in the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024, which was passed by the House on 12 December 2024 and received assent on 13 December 2024.

Clauses 74, 77-80 and 82 of the Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill 2026 propose amendments to provisions of the Youth Justice Act 1992 that are substantially the same as amendments previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament due to the passing of the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.

Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 74, 77-80 and 82 of the Bill contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill

The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 was introduced on 16 September 2026. It seeks to amend a provision of the Youth Justice Act 1992 that has already been considered by the House in this session of Parliament in the context of amendments contained in the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024, which was passed by the House on 12 December 2024 and received assent on 13 December 2024. It also seeks to amend a provision of the Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 that is being considered by the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, which was introduced on 17 September 2026, and is yet to be passed by the House.

Schedule 1, 'Youth Justice Act 1992', amendment 2 of the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 proposes an amendment to a provision of the Youth Justice Act 1992 that is substantially the same as an amendment previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament due to the passing of the Making Queensland Safer Act 2024. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.

Schedule 1, 'Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024', amendment 3 of the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 proposes an amendment to a provision of the Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 that is substantially the same as an amendment that is currently being considered by the House in the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. If that Bill is passed by the House first, the amendment contained in the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 will enliven the same question rule, contrary to Standing Order 87.

Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by Schedule 1, 'Youth Justice Act 1992', amendment 2 of the Bill, and may be enlivened by Schedule 1, 'Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024', amendment 3 of the Bill contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 was introduced on 17 September 2026. It seeks to amend multiple sections of Acts already amended in the same session of parliament. The proposed amendments are effectively reconsidering the substance of earlier amendments to these sections.

Clauses 13-19, 21, 23-26, 29-32, 51-52, 54, 72 and 76-77 of the Bill propose amendments to provisions of Acts that are substantially the same as amendments previously considered and agreed to by the House in the same session of parliament due to the passing of earlier Acts. This is contrary to Standing Order 87.

Clause 88 of the Bill proposes an amendment to a provision of the Victims' Commissioner and Sexual Violence Review Board Act 2024 that is substantially the same as an amendment that is currently being considered by the House in the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026. If that Bill is passed by the House first, the amendment contained in the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will enliven the same question rule, contrary to Standing Order 87.

Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by clauses 13-19, 21, 23-26, 29-32, 51-52, 54, 72 and 76-77 of the Bill, and may be enlivened by clause 88 of the Bill, contrary to Standing Order 87. A motion to suspend Standing Order 87 would be required for these clauses to be considered.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Ministers

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received advice from the Minister for Primary Industries and member for Gympie that he will be absent from the House for the sitting weeks commencing 17 November 2026 and 1 December 2026. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A. I have also received advice from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads that he will be absent from the House for today's sitting. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

REPORT

Office of the Information Commissioner

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Information Commissioner *Privacy online: review of Queensland government privacy information*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Information Commissioner Report 1: 2026-27—Privacy online: Review of Queensland Government privacy information, November 2026.

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 Redlands College in the electorate of Oodgeroo and Our Lady of the Rosary in Kenmore in the electorate of Moggill.

PETITIONS

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

Leucaena

Mr G Kelly, from 338 petitioners, requesting the House to recognise unmanaged and naturalised Leucaena as a significant emerging environmental and biosecurity issue across Queensland.

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

Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, Homelessness

Hon. Scanlon, from 1,466 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 to create an explicit exemption preventing police from issuing move-on directions to people facing homeless or rough sleeping.

M1, Exit 87

Mr Vorster, from 144 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Department of Transport and Main Roads to replace the stoplight with a giveway sign at exit 87 on the M1 northbound.

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

WorkCover, Workplace Injuries

299 petitioners, requesting the House to retain the current timeframe for seeking a review of a WorkCover decision and protect access to support for genuine workplace injuries, including psychological injuries.

Oxenford Quarry, Expansion

885 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, to urgently consider using sections 103–105 of the Planning Act 2016 to call in and reassess Nucrush's Oxenford Quarry expansion application before the Planning and Environment Court determines the appeal.

Pallara-Brisbane CBD, Bus Services

336 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Queensland Government, through Translink and Brisbane City Council, to urgently introduce direct express or limited-stop bus services between Pallara and Brisbane CBD to reduce commuting times.

New England Highway, Maintenance

354 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Department of Transport and Main Roads to repair the potholes and road surface on the New England Highway between Stanthorpe and Dalveen.

Blue Card System, Carers

159 petitioners, requesting the House to table five years of figures on foster and kinship carer applicants and household members refused a blue card as an "exceptional case" with no disqualifying offence, and review if these refusals are worsening the foster carer shortage.

ATV and UTV, Conditional Registration Framework

295 petitioners, requesting the House to request the responsible Minister to review Queensland's conditional registration framework and establish a Local Access category for ATVs and UTVs for agricultural, commercial and recreational use.

Chermside, Pedestrian Crossing

408 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to immediately provide a safe pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Gympie Road and Hamilton Road in Chermside.

Right to Information, Delays

850 petitioners, requesting the House to do all in its power to stop the endless right to information delays in Queensland .

Local Governments

884 petitioners, requesting the House to remove the power of Councils to recoup outstanding rates by selling property, and make it mandatory to offer hardship support.

Site Location, Impacts

315 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Queensland Government to reject the site location due to congestion constraints, unresolved cultural heritage issues and negative ecological impacts.

ATAR System

481 petitioners, requesting the House to overhaul the ATAR System to prioritise student wellbeing and fair admissions.

The Q, Greyhound Racing

198 petitioners, requesting the House to cease greyhound racing at The Q and convert the site into a public Athletes Park.

ACON, Pride in Diversity Program

1,409 petitioners, requesting the House to do all in its power to ensure that the Queensland Department of Education relinquish its membership of ACON and any Pride in Diversity program.

State Schools, Playgrounds

926 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Queensland Government to develop and implement a statewide policy that opens Queensland State School outdoor grounds and playgrounds for free community use outside school hours, weekends, and school holidays, except where temporary closures are required for safety, maintenance, or other exceptional operational reasons.

Sunscreen

1,944 petitioners, requesting the House to review the Queensland Government's sunscreen procurement policy with a view to ensuring that sunscreen products purchased by Queensland Government departments, State schools, Government workplaces and State-funded infrastructure projects do not contain UV filters 4-MBC, Homosalate or Oxybenzone.

ParentShield

328 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Queensland Government to co-design, provide support and independently evaluate a two-year Parent Support and Navigation Pilot informed by the ParentShield model.

Cranes, Highways

123 petitioners, requesting the House to amend legislation to ban small mobile cranes from major highways.

Recreational Cannabis

1,406 petitioners, requesting the House to investigate legislating the use of recreational cannabis products for adults.

Oonoonba, The Village

292 petitioners, requesting the House to do all in its power to oppose the proposed development of The Village in Oonoonba and ensure full consideration is given to its impacts on neighbouring residents, local infrastructure, and the character of the community.

Blue Card System

286 petitioners, requesting the House to commission an independent public review of the Blue Card negative notice and appeals system, including human rights and child-safety impacts.

Seatbelts, Fines

1,196 petitioners, requesting the House to reduce seatbelt fines in Queensland to match other states.

Cost of Living

1,170 petitioners, requesting the House to urge the Queensland Government to improve government spending transparency and provide better support to Queensland communities during the cost-of-living crisis.

Child Protection

840 petitioners, requesting the House to strengthen legislation and service responses relating to high-risk minors to ensure appropriate protective intervention is available when a child is at significant risk.

TABLED PAPERS

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

30 October 2026—

2183 Queensland's River Improvement Trusts—Consolidated Annual Report 2025-2026

2184 Queensland's Category 2 Water Authorities—Consolidated Annual Report 2025-2026

2185 National Health Practitioner Ombudsman—Annual Report 2025-26

2 November 2026—

2186 Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator—Annual Report 2025-26

2187 Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 44, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2188 Overseas Travel Report: Report on InternationalTrade Mission to the United Kingdom by the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, 28 September-4 October 2026

2189 Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal—Remuneration Determination: Electorate and Communication Allowance Band Adjustment 2026—Determination 39/2026, 2 November 2026

3 November 2026—

2190 Queensland Government: Report titled 'Report to the Legislative Assembly—State Facilitated Development Declarations', October 2026

2191 Legal Services Commission—Annual Report 2025-26

4 November 2026—

2192 Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 23, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

5 November 2026—

2193 Auditor-General Report 2: 2026-27—2026 status of Auditor-General's recommendations

2194 Crime and Corruption Commission: Investigation Sphynx—An investigation into allegations of corrupt conduct surrounding the QPS's decision to enter into the Stones Corner lease, November 2026

2195 State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 38, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 24 June 2026 and 25 August 2026

2196 Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 30, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 25 August 2026 and 15 September 2026

2197 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 48, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Victims' Commissioner

2198 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 49, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 22 July 2026 and 25 August 2026

6 November 2026—

2199 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 50, 58th Parliament—Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026

2200 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 51, 58th Parliament—Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026

2201 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 52, 58th Parliament—Protecting Queenslanders from Dangerous Prisoners and Strengthening Victims' Rights Amendment Bill 2026

2202 Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee: Report No. 14, 58th Parliament—Inquiry into the Operation and Effectiveness of the Councillor Conduct Framework in Queensland

2203 Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 29, 58th Parliament—Mineral Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

2204 Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 24, 58th Parliament—Education Legislation (Registration of Early Childhood Teachers) Amendment Bill 2026

2205 Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 25, 58th Parliament—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

2206 National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014: National Energy Retail Amendment (Streamlining payment difficulty protections) Rule 2026, No. 3

9 November 2026—

2207 Overseas Travel Report: Report on official visit to the United Kingdom and Europe by the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership, Hon. David Janetzki, 30 September-10 October 2026

11 November 2026—

2208 Response from the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth (Hon. O'Connor), to an E-Petition (4585-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 936 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct a public inquiry and remove the Home Warranty Insurance Scheme from the Queensland Building and Construction Commission, establishing it under an independent entity to address conflicts of interest

2209 Commission of Inquiry into the CFMEU and Misconduct in the Construction Industry—Building Queensland's Future: Interim Report on a Queensland Construction Code

12 November 2026—

2210 Response from the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Perrett), to an E-Petition (4573-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 977 petitioners, requesting the House to provide the RSPCA with sufficient powers to act effectively on community complaints or intervene early in cases of suspected cruelty

2211 Response from the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Perrett), to an E-Petition (4574-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 483 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce minimum standards for keeping dogs in apartments, units and small residential properties

2212 Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4601-26), sponsored by the member for Traeger, Mr Katter, from 442 petitioners, requesting the House to require the Minister to publish the full annual taxpayer cost of the Blue Card system and to publicly provide the evidence that proves the system works

2213 Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4479-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 310 petitioners, requesting the House to put forward a referendum for the people of Queensland to consider a range of measures to enhance long term government planning and democratic accountability

2214 Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4611-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 474 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce a new annual levy on all Queensland residential properties not registered as the owner's principal place of residence, with 100% of the revenue used to fund council rate exemptions for Queensland residents living in their own home

2215 Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4636-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 390 petitioners, requesting the House to do all within its power to bring competition to the electricity market in Hervey Bay and Maryborough which would allow residents to choose the best provider and plan for their circumstances

2216 Response from the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers (Hon. Leahy), to an E-Petition (4681-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 456 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Minister for Local Government to examine the circumstances in which inaccurate public statements by Gympie Regional Council have been made and the Council's failure to publicly correct the record

2217 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4471-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 613 petitioners, requesting the House to replace the outdated and unreliable Moggill ferry with a bridge

2218 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4504-26), sponsored by the member for Maiwar, Mr Berkman, from 715 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures for more dog-friendly options on Brisbane public transport

2219 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4605-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 328 petitioners, requesting the House to re-examine the e-mobility device legislation

2220 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4638-26), sponsored by the member for Pine Rivers, Ms Boyd, from 3,487 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce a Recreational Registration for Motorcycles in Queensland

2221 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4643-26), sponsored by the member for Theodore, Mr Boothman, from 322 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the City of Gold Coast to allocate the necessary support to complete the extension of Highland Way, and that the Department of Transport and Main Roads deliver any required works on Tamborine Oxenford Road to safely accommodate the connection of Highland Way

2222 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4644-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 152 petitioners, requesting the House to do all within its power to introduce a bus service specifically catering to Palm Meadows Drive and linking directly to the Merrimac train station, as well as Pacific Fair shopping centre in the east

2223 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4678-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 797 petitioners, requesting the House to amend transport legislation to require seatbelts on dedicated school buses operating on unsealed roads or roads exceeding 60 km/h

2224 Response from the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation (Hon. Powell), to an E-Petition (4677-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 878 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce laws ensuring that fast food outlets become responsible for the litter generated and identifiable by their store branding for a distance of at least 250 metres from their stores

2225 Response from the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth (Hon. O'Connor), to an E-Petition (4545-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 761 petitioners, requesting the House to amend Queensland's residential tenancy law so that, where a lessor has issued a Notice to Leave for the end of a fixed term, the tenant may end the tenancy during the final 90 days of the fixed term, or during the Notice to Leave period, by giving 14 days written notice without penalty

2226 Response from the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Hon. Mander), to an E-Petition (4674-26), sponsored by the member for Mount Ommaney, Ms Pugh, from 7,626 petitioners, requesting the House to remove unnecessary barriers and create a fair pathway for all legitimate Queensland dance schools to participate in the Play On! program

13 November 2026—

2227 Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4493-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 596 petitioners, requesting the House to put forward a referendum or official postal survey to determine the majority view of all Queensland voters on the termination of pregnancy legislation

2228 Response from the Minister for Education and the Arts (Hon. Langbroek), to a paper petition (4741-26), presented by the member for Murrumba, Hon. Miles, and an E-Petition (4705-26), sponsored by the member for Murrumba, Hon. Miles, from 48 and 643 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to request the Minister for Education to suspend the proposed acquisition of land from the Pine Rivers Uniting Church

2229 Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 31, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 24 June 2026 and 25 August 2026

2230 Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4712-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,756 petitioners, requesting the House to reconsider the introduction of the proposed diesel buses and bring in electric buses instead; and consider a greater use of electric trains throughout the state and measures to encourage taxis and rideshare vehicles to transition to electric vehicles

2231 Response from the Premier and Minister for Veterans (Hon. Crisafulli), to an E-Petition (4689-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 689 petitioners, requesting the House to refer the operation of Queensland's system for petitioning the Legislative Assembly to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, or another appropriate parliamentary committee, for review

16 November 2026—

2232 Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 28, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2233 Ethics Committee: Report No. 249, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2234 Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee: Report No. 15, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2235 Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee: Report No. 114, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2236 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 53, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2237 Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to a paper petition (4757-26), presented by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(3), from 511 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Queensland Government to refuse the proposed Ministerial Infrastructure Designation for Village Yard Christian School at 120 Mudgeeraba Road, Mudgeeraba

2238 Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 32, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2239 Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 33, 58th Parliament—Liquid Fuel Supply (Ethanol and Other Biofuels Mandate) Amendment Bill 2026

2240 Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 31, 58th Parliament—Annual Report 2025-26

2241 Auditor-General Report 3: 2026-27—Major projects 2026

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, Medicines and Poisons Act 2019, Public Health Act 2005:

Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 152

Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 152, explanatory notes

Health Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 152, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992:

Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2026, No. 153

Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2026, No. 153, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2026, No. 153, human rights certificate

Public Sector Act 2022:

Public Sector (Civil Liability) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 154

Public Sector (Civil Liability) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 154, explanatory notes

Public Sector (Civil Liability) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 154, human rights certificate

Public Sector Ethics Act 1994:

Public Sector Ethics (Public Service Agency) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 155

Public Sector Ethics (Public Service Agency) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 155, explanatory notes

Public Sector Ethics (Public Service Agency) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 155, human rights certificate

Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000:

Police Powers and Responsibilities (Designated Business and Community Precincts) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 156

Police Powers and Responsibilities (Designated Business and Community Precincts) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 156, explanatory notes

Police Powers and Responsibilities (Designated Business and Community Precincts) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 156, human rights certificate

Economic Development Act 2012:

Economic Development (Caloundra Aerodrome PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 157

Economic Development (Caloundra Aerodrome PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 157, explanatory notes

Economic Development (Caloundra Aerodrome PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 157, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Infrastructure

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.41 am): Our government is delivering generational infrastructure right across the state after our construction industry was in dire straits.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will get back on the straight and narrow.

Mr CRISAFULLI: We are building things again to get Queenslanders home sooner and safer, to deliver the schools, homes and essential infrastructure our growing communities deserve, and to deliver health services when and where they are needed. Under the former Labor government, productivity went backwards. We needed to restore productivity to Queensland worksites to deliver the homes, hospitals, roads and public transport our state needs. It is why our government initiated the landmark commission of inquiry into the CFMEU and misconduct in the construction industry, and it is why we permanently removed Best Practice Industry Conditions, which drove costs up and drove productivity down.

Government members: Shame!

Mr CRISAFULLI: We have clarity on this side of the House. Costs skyrocketed, timelines blew out and the housing market became stifled by a lack of supply and an affordability crisis. Queenslanders are paying the price for those failed policies. After a decade of decline under Labor we are delivering for Queensland's future.

Nowhere is that commitment clearer than on the Bruce Highway. We secured a $9 billion funding agreement with the Commonwealth to make this vital road safer and more reliable. Those opposite said it could not be done. Right now there are 150 projects underway or in the pipeline between Gympie and Cairns, with more to come. Last month construction began on the long-awaited upgrades at Gairloch, north of Ingham. These works will improve safety and flood resilience on a section of the highway North Queenslanders have waited decades to see upgraded. Our Country Roads Connect Program is delivering safer roads, stronger freight connections and more reliable access for regional communities. In the south-east we are progressing the new four-lane Bribie Island Bridge. This is a project Labor talked about for years but never delivered—plus there are major projects on the Gold and Sunshine coasts.

We are also delivering the health infrastructure Queenslanders need. At Hervey Bay Hospital the expansion has been completed, while in Cairns a new 32-bed ward has been opened. Contractors have been announced at Redcliffe and Coomera and at the Prince Charles Hospital we have unveiled a master plan for expanded emergency, cardiac and mental health facilities and a record investment in beds. This is real progress on a real credible plan that will see services expanded and better health care delivered.

We are investing in the next generation, too. Construction is underway on a new special school on the northern Gold Coast. We have opened the expansion of the Cairns State Special School and work has started on the new TAFE centre of excellence in Caloundra. We are building TAFEs again in Queensland, helping to train the skilled workers Queensland needs to build into the future. We know the infrastructure pipeline is only as strong as the workforce delivering it. We promised to be a government that works for all Queenslanders. That is what delivering for Queensland looks like.

Industrial Relations

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.45 am): The Crisafulli government is determined to restore safety on Queensland worksites, while respecting taxpayers' money after a decade of decline where the former Labor government were beholden to the CFMEU, enabling a culture of fear and intimidation across Queensland's construction industry. It is this LNP government that resolved to expose the cronyism, the misogyny, the violence, the threats against children, the favouritism and the institutional decay that occurred under Labor—a party that owes its political existence to the CFMEU. Don't take my word for it, just ask the member for Waterford who thanked the CFMEU and gave a special shout-out to Michael Ravbar for all his help in getting her elected.

The CFMEU commission of inquiry has, since its inception and under the guidance of Stuart Wood AM KC, peeled back the curtain on Labor's disgraceful legacy. In light of the significant evidence coming forward from industry, public servants and even Labor aligned unions, the government last Wednesday released a damning interim report from the commission which lays bare the insidious and corrosive legacy of Labor and the CFMEU. The report confirmed that Labor's CFMEU tax, or BPIC, raised the cost on Queensland government major projects by between 10 per cent and up to 67 per cent and would have cost Queenslanders $24 billion if this government did not put an end to it.

Cross River Rail, a project denied to Queenslanders for years due to delays under Labor, is estimated to have cost an extra $500 million because of BPIC, with the Centenary Bridge upgrade set to cost an additional $21 million and the Gold Coast Light Rail project up to an extra $468 million. The impact on Queenslanders is real, with the actions of the former Labor government driving construction productivity down nine per cent since 2018 according to the Queensland Productivity Commission. This, in turn, led to 77,000 fewer homes being built across the state and increased rents in the middle of a housing crisis.

We heard last week from the CEO of the Civil Contractors Federation the impact BPIC was having on Queensland construction—for every two hospitals we were building we could have gotten a third for free. Stop and think about that for a minute. BPIC was costing this state an entire hospital just to look after Michael Ravbar and Labor's CFMEU mates. These costs are unacceptable to Queensland taxpayers who entrusted Labor with the government benches for 10 years. They, in turn, pulled every lever to protect, drive profit for and preserve the dominance of the CFMEU in the construction industry.

Many people ask: where did BPIC come from? It is a very good question and one that needs an answer from the Labor members opposite. The interim report says at paragraph 14.2.3—

> As can be seen from the brief history above, trying to identify, with precision, the terms of the BPIC policy is a difficult exercise. The reason for this is that as a policy, it developed in a way that is presently unclear. The evidence, as it is, suggests that it was developed largely in the absence of public consultation, without precise modelling ...

For the last two years this government has ended the influence of the CFMEU on ministers, hanging up the bat phone in the Office of Industrial Relations which gave the CFMEU special treatment. I sacked CFMEU militant official Kurt Pauls who was hand-picked by the member for McConnel for the Work Health and Safety Board, despite allegations being aired of his abuse towards OIR staff. We repealed Labor's CFMEU-enabling laws, including its information-sharing and right-of-entry laws that gave the CFMEU immediate access to worksites. Under the work health and safety legislation we re-introduced the 24-hour right-of-entry notice period on construction sites preventing safety being used as an industrial disputation tool, predominantly by the CFMEU. Helen Burgess, after years of protection by the Labor Party, is no longer employed by the Queensland government.

Based on the evidence it has heard over the preceding months, the CFMEU commission of inquiry's interim report made two urgent recommendations that, in the words of Commissioner Wood, 'warrant immediate attention'. The commission has recommended that the government adopt a new Queensland construction code to set out the expectations of the state in the delivery of major infrastructure projects and a new independent compliance branch—two previous features of Queensland's construction industry that were inexplicably scrapped by the former Labor government. Since receiving the interim report last Thursday, I am pleased to advise the House that the Crisafulli government has accepted the recommendation of the commission, acted swiftly and adopted the new Queensland Construction Productivity Code 2026 which will deliver better value for taxpayers, safer and more productive worksites, an even playing field for industry, and clear and defined accountability mechanisms.

Starting today, the new code will automatically apply to Queensland government construction projects valued at over $150 million, and will: one, support more women and apprentices in construction, requiring successful tenderers to outline measures to recruit and retain women in the workforce and a commitment to apprentices, workforce planning and supervisor training; two, deliver safer construction workplaces with stronger safety requirements, ensuring successful tenderers have a proven record of delivering construction projects safely; three, ensure a more productive construction workforce and better taxpayer value by making contractors demonstrate how they will deliver projects on time and within budget, linking productivity, innovation, workplace management and cooperation to better use of public money; four, help prevent industrial disputes from derailing projects with early identification and management of industrial relations risks and structured dispute resolution processes; five, protect workers' freedom of association and safeguard their rights to join or not join a union without discrimination or victimisation, putting an end to the CFMEU's authoritarian power on construction sites in Queensland; six, no longer will contractors be forced to display the gang-like branding of union flags and propaganda, bringing an end to the fear and intimidation tactics we have seen being used by militant unions across Queensland over the last decade; and, finally, ensure a level playing field, with consistent standards across government funded construction projects and accountability mechanisms embedded in contracts, including clear lines of responsibility for contractors, as well as monitoring, inspection and enforcement mechanisms. Each of these measures is absolutely critical to deliver the $119 billion capital infrastructure pipeline over the next four years—hospitals, roads, public transport, schooling infrastructure, Olympic and Paralympic Games and an arena that Queenslanders need and deserve.

The code is not retrospective. However, line agency ministers may apply to the responsible minister to ensure compliance of the code to projects already under procurement. Further, if line agency ministers want the code to apply to projects under the $150 million threshold, they can apply to the responsible minister for inclusion. Although the code will not apply at this stage to private projects, I would encourage the private sector to align their work practices with the new code, including tearing down the union flags which are designed to intimidate and are not offering freedom of association to workers. Any business wanting to do work for the Queensland government where the code is applicable is expected to abide by the provisions of the code. If they do not, they risk missing out on further Queensland government construction projects.

With respect to recommendation 2 of the interim report, the newly established independent compliance and assurance function contained within the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning will be the responsible agency for the education, compliance and

enforcement of the code. They will report directly to the director-general and not the Office of Industrial Relations. As an immediate measure, a team of six, led by interim general-manager Sarina Wise, will be established from today. This is a scalable response to implement recommendation 2 which will be monitored as the code takes effect. I table a copy of the Queensland Construction Productivity Code 2026 and the government response to the commission of inquiry interim report.

Tabled paper: Queensland Construction Productivity Code 2026.

Tabled paper: Commission of Inquiry into the CFMEU and Misconduct in the Construction Industry—Building Queensland's Future: Interim Report on a Queensland Construction Code, government response.

While the LNP will always stand up for productivity, safety, workplaces that encourage and support women and where taxpayer money is treated with respect, Queenslanders know that Labor will always side with the CFMEU. Why? Because the CFMEU is in Labor's DNA and it will be forever!

Productivity

Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.54 am): After a decade of stalled productivity under Labor, we are working hard across the government to animate productivity and build a stronger economy for all Queenslanders. We are leading the way among the states. We are restoring respect for taxpayer money and we are delivering reforms to cut red tape, boost construction productivity and build the skilled workforce needed to get more projects underway and delivered faster. Productivity underwrites prosperity and it drives long-term economic growth. It improves living standards by increasing the economy's capacity to realise opportunities and adapt to challenges such as geopolitical instability or rapid technological change.

The first piece of legislation I introduced into this parliament was a bill to re-establish the Queensland Productivity Commission that those opposite had abolished. When I introduced it they voted against it. Is it any wonder that productivity lagged so much under their watch. They do not care about productivity. Their mindset is clear; it is why they introduced the CFMEU tax—BPIC. The Queensland Productivity Commission, and now the commission of inquiry into the CFMEU, has made clear the destructive impact that BPIC had on productivity across our state. The QPC's inquiry into the construction sector found that under Labor construction productivity had dropped nine per cent since 2018, delivering 77,000 fewer homes than what would have otherwise been the case. The QPC found that if BPIC had continued it would have cost the Queensland economy $20.6 billion by the end of the decade. Last week the commission of inquiry confirmed that BPIC would have led to an extra $24 billion on top of the $119 billion capex spend across the four years of the forward estimates.

Queensland could not afford Labor's CFMEU tax. That is why the Queensland Productivity Commission recommended it be axed, that is why we abolished it and that is why we are restoring respect for taxpayer money. The Leader of the Opposition has apologised for Labor's CFMEU tax, but the rest of them have not. The Leader of the Opposition owes more than an apology, he owes an explanation. Time's up for the CFMEU tax and time is up for the Leader of the Opposition.

Skills and Training

Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.56 am): The Crisafulli LNP government is rebuilding Queensland's pipeline of skilled workers after Labor's decade of decline left our state facing dire workforce shortages that have been felt right across our regions and our key sectors. Last Tuesday at the CEDA forum I spoke about how, under our Right Skills Strategy, the Crisafulli LNP government is already building momentum alongside industry, TAFE Queensland and other training organisations to turn around the skills shortages that we inherited. Last financial year Queensland saw a record number of apprentices complete their qualifications—13,300 Queenslanders—and we are delivering the biggest expansion of TAFE's physical footprint in decades with greenfield sites at Petrie and Caloundra.

In the construction sector, let me remind the House that Labor left behind a predicted peak shortfall of 50,000 skilled construction workers. That is an entire Suncorp Stadium worth of tradies to find and train. The Crisafulli LNP government's investment in skills and training is already having a positive impact. We are delivering free apprenticeships which has supported almost 32,000 construction related students in 2025-26, more female Queenslanders are getting on the tools and taking up apprenticeships in construction and utilities than ever before and we have seen construction completions at 68 per cent above 2019 levels, but we are not stopping there.

The Crisafulli LNP government's new TradieStart apprentice incentive and the expansion of our successful Small Business Apprenticeship Program are supporting an additional 4½ thousand

construction apprenticeships, with additional incentives available for businesses that employ our future female tradies. This is all part of the fresh start that the Crisafulli LNP government promised Queenslanders because, unlike those opposite, we want to see more Queenslanders and more Queensland women pick up the tools and make the most of the opportunities in Queensland's construction sector. That is why we scrapped Labor's Best Practice Industry Conditions.

Labor and their BPIC let the CFMEU run rampant on Queensland's construction sites. On 11 April 2024, the *Courier-Mail* reported that under BPIC female tradies were driven out of the construction industry due to a toxic male-dominated culture, including reports of snickering and calling a woman in the sector 'dear', 'luv' and worse; and reports of crude comments suggesting another woman unbutton her shirt just 'a little bit'. How did the member for Murrumba respond at that time, given he was the Premier and could have done something about BPIC? The member for Murrumba said that Queensland women 'will work in the hospitals, they will work in the schools'. I table that article from the *Courier-Mail*

Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 11 April 2024, titled ''Toxic' culture blamed for keeping women out of lucrative construction sector'.

As a former nurse, I appreciate more than most the important work our health workers do. Under the Crisafulli LNP government, we also want to see more women work on our construction sites. The Crisafulli LNP government is delivering more construction apprentices, supporting more opportunities for Queensland women to choose the career that they want and rebuilding the skilled worker pipeline needed to deliver Queensland's future.

Procurement

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth)(10.00 am): The Crisafulli government has delivered the biggest reform of government procurement in decades and Queensland businesses are already seeing the benefits. Queensland companies are securing $3.3 billion more in government procurement spending than they were during Labor's last financial year of 2023-24. That is $3.3 billion more backing Queensland businesses, Queensland jobs and Queensland communities. Who would have thought that when government procurement policies are not being written by a militant, misogynistic union you can actually achieve great outcomes.

Labor buried businesses in more than 700 pages of complicated procurement rules across a staggering 23 overlapping documents. One of those documents was their costly Best Practice Industry Conditions, the CFMEU tax imposed on our state's construction industry. The true cost of Labor's cosy relationship with the CFMEU is continuing to be exposed. The independent Queensland Productivity Commission found that if BPIC had remained until 2029-30 then it could have increased construction project costs by up to 25 per cent. A further 26½ thousand homes would not have been built, on top of 77,000 fewer homes built since 2018 because of declining productivity. That is the legacy of Labor.

The Crisafulli government has wasted no time in turning things around. We paused BPIC within weeks of coming to government and we re-established the Queensland Productivity Commission to conduct an independent analysis that made it clear that we needed to urgently and permanently remove Labor's CFMEU tax from our procurement policies. We consolidated those more than 700 pages of policies down to around 50 in one central document and in that document we put value for money, local small and family businesses and practical outcomes at the heart of the Queensland government's $35 billion annual spend.

The results are already showing. Under our new Queensland Procurement Policy, our state's small and medium businesses secured $7 billion in government spending. Regional procurement has grown by almost 16 per cent compared to Labor's policies, delivering an additional $460 million to regional businesses and communities across Queensland. Indigenous procurement has reached a record $814 million, supporting 619 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander businesses. Queensland businesses now account for more than 38,000 of the Crisafulli government's 47,610 suppliers. We are making it simpler, fairer and easier for Queensland businesses to compete. We have introduced an Australian-first pathway for veteran businesses and we are creating more opportunities for female-led businesses and businesses that support Queenslanders with disability. In its first 10 months, all 12 of our purposeful public procurement outcomes have been applied across significant procurements, supporting the local suppliers that workforces most frequently use.

The contrast could not be clearer. Labor's procurement policies drove up costs, they smashed productivity and they left Queensland taxpayers paying the price for Labor's relationship with the

CFMEU. The Crisafulli government has removed the CFMEU tax, cut red tape and opened the door for more Queensland businesses.

Health System

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (10.04 am): The health and ambulance system remains under immense pressure. We have a record number of calls for ambulance assistance and record emergency department presentations, all with more complex and acute conditions. We lose more than 11 per cent of our hospital capacity each and every day, with more than 1,400 stranded Australians taking up hospital beds while they wait for Commonwealth aged-care or disability support. These demands, coupled with a decade of failure to build the hospital beds and hire the health workers we need, have created unprecedented strain on the system. Recently, the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine reported that Queensland had not seen an increase in beds under those opposite for the period 2018-19 per 1,000 of population, despite increasing demand and increasing acuity.

Tragically, I am aware that recently some Queenslanders have passed away while waiting for an ambulance. Any avoidable death is one too many and I can confirm that all of those avoidable deaths are currently being investigated by the Queensland Ambulance Service clinical incident review teams. I pass on my condolences to all of the families and the loved ones of those who passed away in the community. I have also sought assurances from the Queensland Ambulance Service, and indeed the Queensland Ambulance Service Commissioner, with whom I spoke at length yesterday, that the families have been contacted following those tragic circumstances. I understand that Queensland Ambulance Service officers at the senior operations command centre level or higher have reached out to all of the families involved in those tragic events. I continue to liaise with the Queensland Ambulance Service as does the director-general of my department to understand more about these cases.

This morning I have been advised that the pressure is again mounting across several of our major hospitals including Metro South and the Gold Coast. Our hospitals are preparing for another busy day in their emergency departments. I thank all of our dedicated and hardworking frontline staff including the paramedics, the ambos and our ED staff on the front line. The Crisafulli government is pulling every lever available to us to meet this unprecedented demand. New and expanded transit lounges are open or under construction. New CT and MRI machines are planned, underway and being opened. We have hired more than 10,000 new health workers across our system. Importantly, the Hospital Rescue Plan is powering ahead with delivering milestones achieved in Hervey Bay, Rockhampton, Ipswich and at the Prince Charles Hospital, where we will deliver more beds than Labor's failed CEP ever accounted for, putting to bed their disgraceful scare campaign.

Thanks to proper planning and the axing of Labor's CFMEU tax, the Crisafulli government is restoring work site productivity and making up for time lost during Labor's decade of decline. This is no more important than in the health portfolio. The member for Murrumba presided over a government that prioritised his union mates over the construction of the new hospital beds that Queenslanders so desperately need and needed. The health system continues to feel the impacts of those warped priorities today. It was called out over a year ago in the independent review of the capacity expansion program, which found a 20 per cent increase in costs and delay in the delivery of projects as a direct result of BPIC. In late 2023, the member for Murrumba said—

> We certainly will not be moving away from our support for best practice industry conditions ...

He repeated that in 2024.

Mr O'Connor: He was pretty junior back then.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member for Bonney. With the avalanche of evidence from the commission of inquiry, the member for Murrumba is now trying to rewrite history with an apology that is, again, too little too late. The member for Murrumba should have called time's up on BPIC years ago. It now seems his colleagues are calling time's up on his leadership.

Trade Mission, Indonesia

Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (10.09 am): I have returned from my Indonesian trade mission with a clear message: Indonesian companies want to invest in Queensland's resources sector, and the Crisafulli government is actively supporting that investment. Last week, I became the first Queensland natural resources and mines minister in 17 years to lead a ministerial

trade mission to Indonesia, taking Queensland's opportunities directly to investors, building relationships and pursuing partnerships that deliver jobs and development of our resources sector.

Indonesia imported $1.1 billion worth of Queensland coal last financial year, but there is considerably more that we can achieve together. During the mission, I met with major resources and mining services companies, including Sinar Mas, BUMA, Petrosea, Bumi, PAMA and Baramulti, to strengthen our commercial ties. I met with Danantara and the federal minister for investment, Mr Rosan Roeslani, and the Department for Energy and Minerals Resources where we agreed to establish a joint working group to develop a memorandum of understanding on investment in Queensland's critical minerals sector. This will help identify shared priorities and opportunities for closer cooperation with the aim of turning those relationships into investment and commercial partnerships. These are tangible results from a country that sees the opportunity we have to offer and understands that Queensland now has a government that is pro-resources and welcomes their investment.

I also travelled to East Kalimantan to visit the Kaltim Prima Coal mine—or KPC—one of the world's largest coalmines producing some 50 million tonnes of coal per annum and directly employing around 25,000 people. The scale of that operation reinforces the opportunities for Queensland's mining expertise, equipment and technology sectors. Recent investment commitments demonstrate the confidence Indonesian investors have in Queensland. Ithaca Resources has purchased Vitrinite's assets, including the Vulcan coal operation, in a deal worth more than $200 million. Dhilmar, led by Indonesian businessman Alexander Ramlie, as acquired Anglo American's Queensland steelmaking coal portfolio for up to approximately $5.4 billion. That proposed transaction covers interests in Grosvenor, Moranbah North, Capcoal, Aquila and Dawson. BUMA is currently providing contracting services at Blackwater and Goonyella. Bumi is accelerating operations at Mount Carlton and recently acquired Mount Margaret. That is thousands of jobs secured and potentially billions of dollars in economic activity generated, and we want to see more of it.

Indonesia has substantial mineral processing and manufacturing capability. Queensland has the mineral wealth, technical expertise and ambition to expand our processing industries. There are opportunities across critical minerals, battery materials, advanced manufacturing, research and skills development.

For 17 years, no mining minister led a mission with this focus. The Crisafulli government is backing industry through direct engagement and a resources reform agenda that streamlines approvals, makes processes clearer, reduces unnecessary barriers and provides greater investment certainty. We will also back our resources sector here at home, and attracting international investment is part of that commitment. That means jobs, stronger businesses and regional communities with confidence for their future. We have the resources the world needs and a government prepared to pursue investment, build partnerships and deliver lasting benefits for the Queensland communities that underpin our resources industry. We just get it done.

Police Resources

Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (10.12 am): The Crisafulli government is making Queensland safer by rebuilding the front line and ensuring our police have the laws, resources and support they need after a decade of decline under Labor. Just last week, we launched several initiatives during the Queensland Police Service's Recruitment Week of Action, including the expansion of the special constables program—a key recommendation from the commissioner's 100-day review. The program, which strengthens police operational capacity through the retention of specialist officers, has now been expanded to roles including investigations, police prosecutions, scenes of crime and forensic services. It comes as the number of special constables across Queensland has increased from 60 in October 2024 to 103 in August 2026—a 71 per cent increase under the Crisafulli government. We are also streamlining the recruitment process for ADF personnel or people with relevant TAFE or university qualifications, such as justice, legal studies or law, as part of our Accelerated Entry initiative.

During Recruitment Week of Action, I also travelled to Cairns where I was joined by the member for Barron River and frontline officers to launch two recruitment initiatives—Regional Guarantee and Mates in Blue. Regional Guarantee is about giving successful recruits the certainty that they will be able to return to their home region as they build a policing career. Similarly, Mates in Blue is about encouraging applicants to nominate one or more friends to join the Queensland Police with—a mate to join with, train with and serve Queensland communities with. Both these initiatives will help get more police on streets sooner and make Queenslanders safer in their homes and businesses by removing some of those barriers for frontline police officers.

Since the election, the Crisafulli government has delivered more than 2,200 new police officers—600 more than the 1,600 promised after officers left in droves under Labor. The combination of more police and stronger laws is starting to turn the tide on Labor's youth crime crisis, with police data showing victim numbers have fallen 9.6 per cent under the Crisafulli government, after increasing 193 per cent under Labor. We know there is still a long way to go as we continue to deliver the fresh start Queenslanders voted for—more police, stronger laws and fewer victims.

Service Queensland

Hon. SJ MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (10.15 am): Last week, the Crisafulli government launched Service Queensland, a new front door to government services that makes it easier for people to access the information, support and services they need when and where it suits them. Queenslanders have told us they want choice in how they interact with government. They want flexibility to engage online, over the phone or in person, depending on what works best for them. That is exactly what Service Queensland has been designed to deliver.

Under those opposite, Queensland lagged behind every other state in delivering a single front door for government services. Under Labor's decade of decline, they failed to modernise customer service and did not deliver the seamless access customers deserve.

Last week, the Crisafulli government launched Service Queensland, a new front door to government services. Queenslanders will now see the new Service Queensland store in Brisbane City. Now, for the first time at our flagship store in Adelaide Street, our highly trained staff can assist with over 200 different products and services all under the one roof. The store has been designed around the needs of customers and offers a more convenient and connected experience. The store offers extended weekday hours and Saturday trading, providing greater flexibility for customers. Customers also wanted free wi-fi in store, and we have delivered.

Some 1.5 million Queenslanders have seamlessly downloaded the new Service Queensland app. The app provides a secure and trusted way to access digital licences, credentials and services, making it easier for people to interact with government wherever they are. The Service Queensland app works alongside the website, contact centre and service centres to deliver a modern experience that puts customers first.

Last Tuesday, in Far North Queensland, the Crisafulli government launched a Service Queensland mobile service centre—essentially a service centre on wheels. The mobile service centre will improve accessibility, reduce travel times and ensure more regional Queenslanders can access services they need closer to home. When natural disasters strike our great state, as they often do, the mobile service centre will be redeployed to the disaster location to assist those in need, helping them get their lives back together faster.

Service Queensland brings together multiple government services under one recognisable brand, creating a simpler and more connected experience. While more than 80 per cent of Queenslanders are embracing digital services, we know many still value the reassurance of speaking directly with someone who can help. That is why Service Queensland will always provide access to a real person, whether that is over the phone, through online support, or face to face in a customer service centre. Whether Queenslanders are renewing their vehicle registration, accessing licences and credentials, obtaining certificates, seeking government information or accessing support, Service Queensland is making those interactions simpler and easier wherever they are located.

When the Premier created Queensland's first dedicated customer services portfolio, it was an important first step in transforming the way government delivered services. The launch of Service Queensland is another significant milestone in that journey. Good customer service is not just about transactions. It is about trust, it is about convenience, it is about ensuring Queenslanders can access the services they need quickly, easily and in a way that works for them. We are just getting started. More services will be added to Service Queensland in the coming months. Welcome to Service Queensland.

JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

Membership

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.18 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

The member for Scenic Rim be discharged from, and the member for Whitsunday be appointed to, the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ABSENCE OF MINISTERS

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.19 am): I advise that, as the Minister for Primary Industries will be absent for this week's sitting, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development will answer questions for the minister in question time this week. I also advise that, as the Minister for Transport and Main Roads will be absent for today's sitting, the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth will answer questions for the minister in question time today.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise the House that we will be joined in the gallery for question time by participants of Down Syndrome and Intellectual Disability Queensland's Hear Me Out program. Question time will conclude today at 11.20 am.

Ambulance Service

Mr MILES (10.19am): My question is to the Minister for Health. The minister advised the House that he had been recently briefed on a number of preventable deaths that had occurred while waiting for an ambulance. Can the minister advise the total number of deaths he was briefed on?

Mr NICHOLLS: I was briefed on the events that occurred over the weekend. I sought details from the ambulance commissioner on the events of the weekend. I was actually briefed on the events as they occurred during the course of the weekend. I was advised that three events occurred over the course of that time. I ensured all three events were the subject of clinical incident reviews. I am advised that, according to the commissioner's advice to me, these events are relatively infrequent—and we would all be very grateful about that—and are taken with the utmost seriousness when they do occur.

During the course of that, I was also advised by the commissioner of the pressure that the system is under. The pressure is particularly acute in Metro South. Last weekend, there were 12,772 triple 0 calls. Just think about that: from midnight on Friday until midnight on Sunday, there were 12,772 triple 0 calls across the system, with over 70 per cent of those calls being categorised as a code 1 or code 2 event requiring immediate access. We have an expanded clinical hub, which is now double the size of what it was under those opposite. We have more people in the hub, and we have surged a workforce into that hub in order to address those matters.

The sheer fact of the matter is, as I outlined in my ministerial statement, there are not enough beds. Those beds should have been built half a decade ago. As the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine point out in their report, in the five years from 2018-19 to 2023-24, there was no increase in the number of beds per head of population. Over that period of time, the cost of building those hospitals blew out. As the Sangster independent report shows, those hospitals, particularly on the south side, were delayed for variously between six months and two years.

On top of that, there are now more than 1,400 stranded Australians—and I have spoken about this many times in this place—who are occupying hospital beds who should be in aged care being looked after and supported by Commonwealth funding arrangements, not state arrangements. It is a system under pressure. It is my job to fix it, and I will be doing so.

Ambulance Service

Mr DICK: My question is to the Minister for Health. Has the health minister met with the family of a Thornlands man who is reported to have died while waiting for an ambulance?

Mr NICHOLLS: As I indicated in my ministerial statement, the Queensland Ambulance Service have immediately, as is responsible and also appropriate to do so, spoken to the relatives and next of kin of those who passed away over the course of the weekend about which the opposition is asking questions. People might remember the tragic incidents that occurred with Mr Bradford some three weeks ago where, because of a failure to share information, the QAS did not get in contact with next of

kin during the time they ought to have, and I explained that in the House three weeks ago. We have fixed that situation now.

There are now established protocols between police and the Queensland Ambulance Service. When people pass away and there is no readily identifiable next of kin, they are identified by police and that information is passed on directly to the Queensland Ambulance Service. A senior officer of the Queensland Ambulance Service will then reach out immediately to that next of kin. I understand that relatives of all of the people who have tragically passed away in the community awaiting an ambulance have been contacted. They have been advised of the clinical incident reviews. In accordance with their wishes, as I am told, they will be receiving advice on the outcomes of those clinical incident reviews. Some have requested that the advice be provided in person. Others have requested that the advice be provided by email or a telephone call. Some have not needed a face-to-face meeting and have been satisfied with the telephone calls and other correspondence.

I have not received any correspondence from any of the parties involved over the last three or four days in relation to this matter. The appropriate process is for the Ambulance Service, with their skills and knowledge, to respond and offer disclosure, as they have done.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was around whether or not the minister had met with the family.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order, Leader of the House?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister has concluded his contribution and addressed the question in a relevant manner with respect to the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has concluded. I find he was relevant to the question and provided a fair bit of context.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Achievements

Mrs POOLE: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. How has the Crisafulli LNP government acted to tackle the big four crises affecting Queenslanders, and is the Premier aware of a price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the member for the question. I will speak about those big four crises and what we are doing to address them. I acknowledge her work as an assistant minister on the veterans front and the fact that over three dozen Honouring our Veterans Grants have gone out in recent times. I thank all of the members on both sides of the House who have been in touch with their RSLs, and I thank the member for her work in that.

I was reflecting on the last fortnight since we left this place—the people I have met and the challenges I have spoken about in health, housing and mining. I want to reflect on some of my visits with honourable members. Every one of them was about fixing a mess that we inherited and the solutions to those challenges and the ways we are implementing them.

I start with Port Hinchinbrook, where I stood with the member the other day. It has sat as a muddied mess for over 15 years. Finally, this side of the House has the opportunity to deliver the dredging that proud community needs. I think about Hervey Bay—a great city, a great community with an expanding and aging population—where I stood with the members for Hervey Bay and Maryborough to announce the delivery of 25 medical beds, 10 intensive care beds and a helicopter pad. I think about all of the missed opportunities those opposite had to deliver what that community needed and the change that is happening.

I think about the Prince Charles Hospital, where we are delivering on a master plan for that facility, including 104 extra beds. I think about the scare campaign and the apologies of those opposite. I think of Woorabinda, where I went with the member for Gregory, and the fact that the community do not have to boil their water anymore. I think about the new Burton mine, where we have given the signal that we are open for business and people can invest in this state. I think about Great Keppel Island and the sewerage treatment plant and Arrivals Plaza we have delivered, after three successive elections and broken promises of those opposite. I think of the Taroom Trough, where we are drilling, refining and storing our own fuel again.

It is on crime that I want to focus this contribution today. This parliament passed the biggest change to bail reforms in the history of this state and the strongest bail laws in the nation. In less than a fortnight they will be law. I think about the Queenslanders who were living a nightmare under the 'grand theft auto' of those opposite and I think about what is now occurring under the change. There was a 193 per cent rise in victim numbers under them; it is down 9.3 per cent under us. The Insurance

Council said that for the first time in years Queensland is no longer the stolen car capital of the country. We will keep investing. We must keep going with more police, stronger laws and early intervention and rehabilitation. After a decade of failure under those opposite we believe in driving down victim numbers in this state.

(Time expired)

Ambulance Service

Mr MILES: My question is to the health minister. The opposition has been informed that a Townsville man called an ambulance after a fall on 3 November. Despite being a code 1B, when the ambulance arrived an hour later he was already dead. Can the minister confirm if he has been briefed on this incident?

Mr NICHOLLS: I receive briefings on many matters with respect to the health portfolio, as you would expect with more than 200 facilities across the state together with all of the Queensland ambulance facilities. There are many matters that occur on a daily basis that are alerted to either my director-general or the commissioner as well as those that make their way to me.

I am aware of an incident in Townsville with respect to that matter. I am also aware of the steps that had been taken with regard to that particular incident and the events that occurred on that night. If memory serves me correctly, that night the emergency department was at 107 per cent capacity. There were more than 75 people in the emergency department. The work that was being done by the ED people at that time was exemplary in terms of moving people through. Also on that weekend, if memory serves me again correctly, there were more than 120 stranded Australians in the Townsville Hospital and Health Service area—they are people who need proper care but do not need to be in a hospital. You can imagine the difference those 120 beds being available would have made to the flowthrough in the emergency department. Fast Track was implemented and I think there were three unused beds in the emergency department in the fast-stay area. They are of course reserved for motor vehicle accidents or sudden emergencies, so those beds in the ED are retained for that particular purpose. That is again an indication of the problems that were being faced at Townsville.

Members might recall that the extension of the Townsville University Hospital was one of the signature failures of those opposite. They failed to build it. There was no second stage contract; there was only a hole in the ground. Right now there are cranes, piling rigs and workers on the ground at Townsville hospital delivering the works that needed to be done in order to deliver the upgrade. I can advise the House that the request for proposals for the redesigned Townsville hospital have been released. My understanding is that they were released on Friday, Microsoft Outlook notwithstanding. The tenders have gone out for the construction of the additional beds—more beds and more services at the Townsville University Hospital. We are delivering for North Queensland across the board, whether that is the billion dollars into Cairns or the investment into Townsville.

(Time expired)

Industrial Relations

Mr McDONALD: 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 clearing up the culture of fear and intimidation that was allowed to run rampant on Queensland worksites, and is the Deputy Premier aware of a price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Lockyer for the question. He is a distinguished member of parliament. As a former police officer, no doubt he saw one or two things happen on CFMEU construction sites. He would love to be back on the beat. Just as the police minister reminds everyone that he was on the beat, so was the member Lockyer.

Everyone in the LNP government is striving for safe, productive worksites where workers are well paid and safe on construction sites but where productivity returns. That is why we have announced a code effective today. This is in contrast to the Labor Party, which was in power for 10 years.

Last week we had the unbelievable admission from the Leader of the Opposition, who stood up and said, 'I'm taking responsibility now.' After two years as opposition leader he said, 'I'm finally taking responsibility for something I should have taken responsibility for for 10 years.' God knows, he was in a position to do something about it. He was not just a backbencher in the Labor government. He was the deputy premier, he was the premier for 12 months and he was the environment minister. He was a senior minister who sat around the cabinet table that endorsed the CFMEU tax—BPIC. We have seen

this time and time again. A few weeks ago he apologised again for the crime crisis: 'I should have done something about it.' He could have done something about it. Mike Kaiser, his director-general at the time, said the cupboard was bare for policies on youth justice.

Look at what we have done in two years. Look at the commission of inquiry. Look at the construction code we announced today. Look at yesterday's *Courier-Mail*, which stated—

'No hope': Steven Miles urged to resign as Labor leader by Xmas.

I table a copy of the *Courier-Mail* article.

Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 17 November 2026, titled ''No hope': Steven Miles urged to resign as Labor leader by Xmas'.

Union sources are now asking him to resign because the union was a little bit taken aback by his apology. Not only did he throw all of his other shadow ministers under the bus; the union was a little taken aback. We know as well as he does that in 2023 he was quoted in the *Brisbane Times* as saying, 'I am proud of the work I did at those unions. At the end of the day, that is what the Labor Party was formed to do and is the kind of leader I will be—for the unions.' The unions still support BPIC. The unions want BPIC. That is why they are now all leaking against him. As the opposition leader was walking into parliament today there was an article in the *Courier-Mail* titled 'Analysis: Time running out for Labor agitators to push for new leader as Steven Miles under growing pressure', which states—

One person inside Monday's caucus—

not the Liberal National Party's party room—

yesterday said Mr Miles appeared downtrodden and bereft of the energy needed to turn the ship around. They simply asked: "What are we doing?"

That is a very good question, but who is the source from the Labor Party who is continually leaking? Time is up for the opposition leader. Just ask his Labor caucus.

(Time expired)

Ambulance Service

Mr BAILEY: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm if he has met with the family of the Townsville man who died waiting for an ambulance?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Miller for his question. It gives me the opportunity to clarify the information that has been suggested by those opposite with respect to the matter. I am happy to provide a little further detail. I thought I provided a fair bit previously.

On the morning in question a call was received at 3.03 am with respect to a gentleman. That call was triaged as code 2A, which is urgent—but not lights-and-sirens urgent—based on the assessment by professionals at the hub with respect to what was going on. After that, following a review by a senior clinician the code was upgraded to 1C, which is immediate response—not immediately life-threatening but with the potential to become life-threatening. That is done by the professionals according to a system that has been in place for a very many years. It is not something that politicians should have any say in. It is something that is clinically determined by experience and clinical knowledge.

At 3.18 am another call back was made from the clinical hub. The hub was doing its job and phoning back again to speak to the patient—in this case it was the patient's carer—and it was upgraded to 1B. At 3.55 am a paramedic crew was dispatched, arriving at 3.58 am, where they commenced resuscitation. There were some other issues which I will not go into. Then a further paramedic was dispatched. A clinical care paramedic was also dispatched and tasked to the scene and responded, but, regrettably, the resuscitation failed. That is sometimes the case in these instances, particularly with very ill people, that resuscitation does not work. I know that from personal experience. Despite all the best work in the world and all the time in the world, sometimes, regrettably, it just does not work. That was the case at that stage.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I appreciate this is useful information, but if we could ask the minister to be relevant to this particular question about meeting the family.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order on relevance.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being very relevant to the circumstances and the information with respect to responding to the question as asked. I submit to you, Mr Speaker, that he is relevant under 118(b).

Mr SPEAKER: The minister is giving a lot of background information and detail about the particular case. He has 40 seconds left to round out his response to the question as asked.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I think it is important that we understand these cases because they are raised and they are really important. We extend our condolences to all of those who lose a loved one unexpectedly in the community. In this case, as I said, there were a number of complications. This was an elderly gentleman who had many other issues, and I want to put that on the record. Our teams got there and began resuscitation.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You indicated there was not a lot of time left. My point of order is on relevance to the question. Has he met with the family?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have 15 seconds left to respond to the question.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, as I was about to say, on 4 November the QAS contacted the patient's family who expressed their appreciation for the service provided by the Queensland Ambulance Service and advised they had no concerns with the service provided.

Infrastructure

Mr BAILLIE: 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 ensuring major infrastructure is delivered on time and on budget, and is the Deputy Premier aware of a price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Townsville for the question. Let us go to the last part of the question: the price paid. Under Labor, BPIC was retrospectively applied to the Townsville stadium as the first construction item. That led to the increase we have seen—the 10 to 67 per cent price gouging by the CFMEU—because of the dodgy sweetheart deal the Labor Party did with the CFMEU. So, yes, Queenslanders paid a price and it was in the billions. If this government had not stopped BPIC, then at this stage in 2026 there would have been $24 billion more spent on projects because of the Labor government's sweetheart deal with the CFMEU.

The opposition leader has apologised and said he should have done more about it. He was Premier for nearly 12 months. I am struggling to understand what position he should have been in if he was going to do anything about it, because he was the Premier—unless he was going to go to the Governor or maybe the King and say, 'Mate, can you deal with this for me?' He was the ultimate power in Queensland; he was the Premier. He could have done it as Premier.

Mr O'Connor: He wanted to be Blocker!

Mr BLEIJIE: He should have gone to Blocker. I take the interjection. He wanted to be Blocker because the ultimate power under Labor is not the premier; it is Blocker. He should have gone to Daddy Blocker; I take the point.

You cannot trust the Leader of the Opposition because this is what he said in 2023 when he was in a position to do something about BPIC. In the *Australian* on 13 December, he said, 'We certainly will not be moving away from our support for Best Practice Industry Conditions.' He is on the record defending it, doubling down. Then a year later in the *Courier-Mail* on 11 April 2024, he said, 'I'm not going to apologise' with respect to BPIC. He doubled down. He was in a position where he could have, should have and would have done something about it, but he chose not to because the union movement and the CFMEU told him not to. That is the reality of what we are dealing with here.

What is worse is they have not released their 2026 Labor policy platform document. It is in their 2025 document which they released; BPIC is embedded in their 2025 document. I asked them to release the 2026 Labor Party policy platform document to show it is not in there. We know, as well as the Labor Party do, that time is up for the opposition leader. His own colleagues as of today are leaking against him. My colleagues know my great love for the sport of cricket in the state. We have seen some people try to rewrite history over the past week. I have referred to the opposition leader in the past as Labor's nightwatchman. We are now seeing his own political version of 'sandpapergate': spreading his political blame over the whole team when no-one else wants to believe it. Time is up for Labor's nightwatchman.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I go to the member for Greenslopes, I ask members to take their conversations outside. Member for Cairns, you have been involved in a number of these. I ask for some silence in the House.

Ambulance Service

Mr J KELLY: My question is to the Minister for Health. The minister has advised the House that the Townsville University Hospital was at 107 per cent capacity on the night of 3 November. Will the minister advise the number of ambulances that were ramped at the Townsville University Hospital overnight on the night of 3 November?

Mr NICHOLLS: They find nothing and continue digging. When are we ever going to hear those opposite apologise for their failure to deliver the hospitals that were needed? When are we ever going to hear them acknowledge the fact that they failed to fund the Queensland Ambulance Service? When are they ever going to acknowledge the billion-plus dollars we put in in our first budget, the extra 230 staff we have employed in 2025-26 and the surge staff we have put on, the extra 200-plus ambulance vehicles that we have invested in—

Mr Crisafulli: The 10,000 staff.

Mr NICHOLLS:—and the extra 10,000 staff—as the Premier said, and I take the interjection—who have been employed since November 2024 when we came to office? We have fixed up the mess in relation to the failed capacity expansion program that was variously described as 'a mirage of media releases' and 'undeliverable in its current form'. We have released master plans. We have restored birthing at Cooktown and Biloela. We have got services operating. We have introduced new beds. We have opened the 90-bed subacute centre at Ripley and the 35 beds at Hervey Bay. We will be opening new beds in relation to the—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is clear that Ripley is a long way from Townsville so my point of order is on relevance. The question was around the number of ambulances ramped on 3 November.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There was a clear reference in the question to the capacity at the Townsville University Hospital being at 107 per cent. The minister is providing significant context with relation to those matters surrounding that and also capacity across the health system over the last 10 years under the Labor government which failed to invest.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister is giving context to the challenges facing the health system. Minister, the question was around Townsville, so if you can come to that in your response, too, please.

Mr NICHOLLS: What next? Are they going to ask me what the level of fuel was in the back of the ambulances? Is that the pettiness that the opposition seek to raise out of the tragedies of three deaths in the community? They have failed to apologise to anyone for their failed capacity expansion and the fact that they prioritised their mates in the CFMEU, their union mates, over the health of Queenslanders. Are they apologising for the fact that they failed to increase the bed stock available for almost a decade? Are they apologising for the fact that up until 2022-23 their average spend on capital in the health department was only $250 million a year?

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is not some petty matter. My point of order is on relevance. The minister indicated in a previous answer that he was briefed. All we are seeking is the information that would have been contained in that briefing, which is the number ramped on 3 November.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw attention to your ruling of 1 April 2025, where you said—

There is an obligation on ministers to address the question, but the questioner, or any other intervenor, cannot seek to have the question answered in the way they want.

Mr SPEAKER: Just give me one second. Minister, I understand you are talking broadly about issues that are facing health. You have 53 seconds remaining. If you could please focus a little bit more on the Townsville hospital, that would be of assistance.

Mr NICHOLLS: I also need to correct the record with respect to my earlier answer where I said that there were 75 patients in the ED at Townsville. In fact, there were 97 patients in the ED at Townsville that night who had been successfully transported there by the QAS and who also walked in as well. Townsville University Hospital was at 107.2 per cent. With respect to that night, I can advise that the Townsville University Hospital reported two patients for the 24-hour extended stay. The after-hours nurse manager reported no escalations by the ED or by the Queensland Ambulance Service. There was no ramping overnight at the Townsville University Hospital that night.

Housing Supply

Mr BENNETT: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and the Minister for Youth. How is the Crisafulli LNP government focused on building the houses Queenslanders need, and is the minister aware of the price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Burnett for the question. Firstly, I want to thank the member for his contribution over many years to QBuild, our government builder, and the outstanding service that he performed there. We are delivering for his region. Over the entirety of the last decade I can inform him that just 90 social homes were added across Bundaberg— an average of nine homes a year. Since we were elected, we have already delivered 136 social and affordable homes and we have another 100 underway. It was great to see the latest 40 homes where we will be welcoming our new residents to move in by Christmas. Across Queensland we now have more than 7,200 social and affordable homes in our pipeline on top of the 4,100 we have delivered since being elected.

The member asked me about the impact of Labor's policies on housing delivery. We have heard the extraordinary figures of homes that could have been constructed if productivity had just remained at 2018 levels. We have heard what would have happened if BPICs were to remain in this state. Under Labor, housing completions also fell 15 per cent and lot approvals declined 29 per cent. That led to rents increasing by 57 per cent in Labor's final four years alone as housing supply failed to keep pace with demand. They were adding fuel to the crisis with their BPIC policy, and they knew the impact. That is the worst thing.

A June 2024 *Courier-Mail* article reported that 9,400 working days were lost to industrial disputes in Queensland in just that first quarter of 2024. That was more working days lost in Queensland than all other states and territories combined. That article quoted the then premier, who said that the furore over BPICs was overblown and the real problem was engagement with the unions. Apparently it was all about how you engage with the CFMEU. How would the public servants who were in TMR who had their building stormed feel? Is that the sort of engagement we were expected to see by the then premier? How about the public servants who were told that the CFMEU knew where their kids played sport and what buses they caught home? How about having female Cross River Rail workers assaulted on the picket line allegedly by CFMEU thugs? Is that the sort of engagement that the industry was expected to have with the CFMEU?

The Labor Party's relationship with the CFMEU made housing more expensive, it put up rents, it meant that fewer homes were delivered and it meant that more Queenslanders were locked out of the market. Labor spent a decade putting the interests of their CFMEU mates over that of Queenslanders. Their words now are hollow. It is too late to apologise. Time is up for the opposition leader.

(Time expired)

Queensland Hospital Watch

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise why the Queensland Hospital Watch Townsville support pilot, which was to provide clothes and essential items to patients, was stopped?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Waterford for the question. I also want to correct the record with respect to my last answer where I said that there was no ramping. In fact, I misread it. The overnight report noted that there was ramping. I want to be accurate about that, so I am very pleased to be able to correct the record for the purposes of the House. There were at that time four ambulances, as I understand it, on the ramp waiting to off-load. That was the situation there.

In relation to Queensland Hospital Watch, as I understand it, that is an organisation that was founded by some members of the family of Ms Christine White. Members might remember that we had them present in the chamber in relation to questions regarding the sad passing of their mother who had discharged from hospital and passed away at home. They have subsequently commenced an action against Queensland Health and have subsequently withdrawn that action against Queensland Health and have channelled their energies into Queensland Hospital Watch.

They have sought to gain access to Queensland hospitals for a number of purposes. These are matters for which each individual hospital and health service has autonomy and control. The whole purpose of the hospital and health services is that they direct and determine the services they need and how they manage their people in their local areas according to the best needs of their community, so what suits the Gold Coast may not necessarily suit—

A government member: Townsville.

Mr NICHOLLS:—Townsville, exactly. Cairns may have a different need from Metro North. These are matters that are dealt with appropriately at the local level by the chief executive—in Townsville's case, the acting chief executive—who makes a determination about the services.

Can I say in Townsville there is already a volunteer organisation, Brighter Lives I think it is called. You go straight in the front door and they are right there in front of you. It is my tragedy, but I saw the former member for Thuringowa at Brighter Lives last Wednesday when I was up there, who greeted me like a long-lost friend. It is made up of 150 local volunteers who have been volunteering for decades.

A government member: What do they do?

Mr NICHOLLS: They provide care services, support services, packs, guidance and advice—a service that Hospital Watch claimed to want to be able to do. Brighter Lives are already there; they are already doing it. As I understand, the hospital administration has made their own determination with respect to that matter and I leave it with the hospital to determine that outcome.

Transport Infrastructure

Mr STEVENS: My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering transport projects on time and on budget while keeping workers safe from harm, and is the minister aware of a price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr O'CONNOR: I want to thank the member for Mermaid Beach for that question. Of course, the member for Mermaid Beach knows that BPIC left Queenslanders with delayed projects, with massive cost blowouts and with unsafe worksites. I will go straight to the cost element of that question. If BPIC had remained in the Queensland government's procurement policies Queensland taxpayers would be paying an additional $24 billion to deliver exactly the same infrastructure pipeline. The member for Mermaid Beach does make a lot of predictions about a track of a different kind. However, with one project in his community, the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 3, he was absolutely correct in his predictions of the impact of BPIC on that project.

The member for Mermaid Beach has for years talked about the figure of a half a billion dollar impact on that project from BPIC. In their interim report the commission of inquiry backed that in. They found that BPIC added up to $468 million to the cost of that project. The member for Mermaid Beach's community and the member for Burleigh's community endured years of pain for this project. This is a project that in 2019 had funding locked in, but it was not delivered until 2026. That was while the Labor Party were continually defending BPIC. The Leader of the Opposition said in 2024 that 'working on our projects should be one of the best jobs you can get'.

How did that work out for one of the female construction workers on the Cross River Rail site—an electrical safety worker? As she was trying to get into the Dutton Park worksite, the commission has found that, on the group's first attempt to enter, 'a union member aggressively grabbed her arm and pulled her back'. She felt 'trapped and terrified as men linked arms to block access'. As one of her colleagues said, 'She pretty much flew and hit the ground crying'. Is that the best job that you can get, as the Leader of the Opposition described, in terms of BPIC delivering? In contrast, we have permanently removed BPIC and its costly procurement requirements from our QPP. We are focusing on value for money and on achieving delivery milestones.

The Leader of the Opposition has apologised for Labor's BPIC policy, but it is too little too late. This is a guy who wrote his PhD on the union movement and we are apparently expected to believe that he just woke up one morning and thought, 'Well, actually, that government that I was a minister in, that government that I was a deputy premier in and that government that I was the premier in got it all wrong. We should not have looked after our union mates,' yet we do not believe that. This is a member who is doing or saying anything he can to cling desperately on to what little power and influence he has left in this place. Whatever the motivation was for the member for Murrumba to make that extraordinary apology, one thing is abundantly clear: his time is up.

(Time expired)

Ambulance Service

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Health. Leaked images show an ambulance was ramped for seven hours and 30 minutes at Townsville University Hospital. Can the minister confirm that Townsville University Hospital has experienced its worst ramping results under the Crisafulli LNP government?

Mr NICHOLLS: I have to say that it is somewhat interesting to receive a question from the member for Cairns in relation to the Townsville hospital. He is certainly not asking about the Cairns Hospital because he failed to deliver any of the promised beds up there. In fact, it is the Crisafulli LNP government that is delivering beds. We have delivered the first 32 beds, we will deliver another 32 and we have a billion-dollar expansion plan up there all being delivered. I think that, in some respects, the member for Cairns has other issues that he is probably needing to deal with, and we have canvassed those in the past in relation to how we treat women and jokes at their—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. None of that is relevant to the question. He is debating the question and being irrelevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, relevance. Minister, the question was regarding Townsville hospital and ramping, so you have the call.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I just think it is important to reflect on who is asking the question and why and what their motivation is with respect to it. I have given extraordinarily comprehensive answers to all of the questions. I cannot remember a Labor health minister, of which there are three failed ones on that side of the House, giving as comprehensive an answer or taking the responsibility that this government has taken with respect to delivering it. When it comes to the Townsville University Hospital, what did those on that side of the chamber do? They stopped reporting monthly figures. Who was responsible for that? The member for Waterford—

Mrs Gerber: She covered it up.

Mr NICHOLLS:—who covered it up, who promised to see the ramping rate get to 28 per cent within 12 months and saw it get to the worst quarterly ramping rate in Queensland's history, who presided over—

Government members interjected.

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

Mr NICHOLLS:—the elective surgery list blowing out to more than 66,000 by the time we got to office in December 2024 and who failed to properly fund and find the funding for the operations of the Department of Health, leaving a $12 billion black hole and an overdrawn corporately managed budget with no money in there, and she failed to fund the free flu program as well.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The minister could address ramping at Townsville University Hospital.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being relevant because he is providing broad context in relation to many matters pertaining to North Queensland and it is wrong for anyone to submit that there is not a direct relationship between Townsville hospital and Cairns Hospital and these broad health system issues that he is addressing. It is really important that he is given the opportunity to provide that broad contextual basis.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has given a lot of context but, with 28 seconds remaining, I would ask you to come back to the Townsville hospital please, Minister.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. When I look at the numbers in respect of Townsville hospital, this is obviously part of some try-on by those opposite to deflect the blame for their failures.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: As I have acknowledged, the Townsville University Hospital is under the pump and it is under the pump because there are not enough beds that were built because those opposite failed to build them.

(Time expired)

Productivity

Mr LISTER: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. How is the Crisafulli government restoring productivity to Queensland worksites, and is the Treasurer aware of a price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. Honourable member, we are restoring productivity to Queensland worksites through respecting taxpayers' money. That is how we are doing it. The Queensland Productivity Commission found that BPIC was going to cost $20.6 billion by the end of the decade, deliver 77,000 fewer homes and drive up rents. It did not matter what it was; we abolished BPICs on the back of the Productivity Commission because we wanted to restore

productivity to Queensland worksites. The honourable member asks me whether there was a price to be paid from the inaction of those opposite. Honourable member, there was a heavy price to be paid, whether it is at the macro level or the micro level. I think of Cross River Rail that went from $5.4 billion to $19 billion. In the last year of government of those opposite, 148 days were lost on Cross River Rail alone. Whether it was the Coomera Connector that blew out from $1.5 billion to $3 billion or CopperString that went from $1.8 billion to $13.9 billion, there are projects that have blown out across the state.

What is the price to be paid at the macro level? When we came to government Treasury analysis revealed that it would cost $17 billion over five years. That was in 2024. Then in 2025, as we have already heard from the health minister this morning, the Sangster review found that health projects were going to blow out by 20 per cent because of BPICs. In 2025 the interim report of the Productivity Commission found that there would be $20.6 billion in additional cost. Just last week the Deputy Premier revealed that the commission of inquiry revealed that capex will be blown out by 20 per cent, which would be $24 billion on a capex spend of $119.2 billion across the forwards. That is the cost. That is the price to be paid, honourable member.

What did the Leader of the Opposition say about this? I refer to a *Brisbane Times* article from November 2024. What did the Leader of the Opposition say in that respect in 2024 after the election? He described Treasury analysis that the policy was putting pressure on housing affordability as 'made up'. That is what the Leader of the Opposition said. That is what he said about the analysis. The Leader of the Opposition owes Queensland more than an apology; he owes an explanation—who, what, when, where and why? An apology will not cut it from the Leader of the Opposition, because time's up on the CFMEU and time's up for the Leader of the Opposition, especially by 3 December.

(Time expired)

Health System, Workforce

Ms ASIF: My question is to the Minister for Health. Hundreds of Mater health workers, including in Mater's public hospitals, will soon be made redundant or have their pay and conditions cut, some of who join us in the gallery today. Will the minister intervene to save the jobs of hundreds of health workers in our community?

Mr NICHOLLS: The issue with respect to Mater's pathology services is something that I was obviously advised of by Mater at the time they made that decision. I want to acknowledge the difficulty for the pathology service providers who work for Mater, and I did that at the time. There is no doubt that this is a blow. However, with respect to Mater's operations—as the member would well know if she looked at the act in relation to the operations of Mater Hospital—the Queensland government has an agreement that both sides of politics have supported for a lengthy period of time. We are the ones who funded it, of course, in relation to Springfield, and provided $640-odd million, if my memory serves me—that had not been funded by those opposite—to ensure those services continue.

Mr Crisafulli: *Yes Minister*.

Mr NICHOLLS: It was a hospital with no money—no money, no staff. That was the Springfield alternative under Labor. I think it was 186 beds. Those funds are provided to Mater, but Mater, as is the case with HHSs, is responsible for its own operations. It makes its own decisions based on its operational needs. I do not, nor should I, have the power to influence, or indeed interfere in, the operations of Mater's management and their day-to-day operations. It is appropriately and legislatively the purview and the requirement of Mater to do that.

Mater offer many great services. There are many people I am sure in this chamber and throughout Queensland who have either been born or have had their children delivered at Mater. I know my three kids were all delivered there as well. Happy times. There is no doubt it is a significant blow to the people employed by Mater in those pathology services. I understand Mater have taken this matter up directly after meeting with union representatives last week. Mater have made commitments to the workers' representatives and their union, as they should, with respect to dealing with those issues, but they are not matters that fall within my responsibilities or my powers to direct Mater with respect to those employment matters. They are matters for Mater, their employees and their union representatives.

Skills and Training

Mrs YOUNG: My question is to the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering better training conditions for Queenslanders in trades and is the minister aware of the price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Ms BATES: I thank the member for Redlands for her question, and isn't she a better member for Redlands than the previous one! Labor failed to build a single new TAFE campus during their decade of decline, and the last new greenfield TAFE site commenced in 2010. In contrast, the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering the biggest expansion of TAFE's physical footprint in decades through $201.1 million worth of investment in critical training infrastructure. Our centres of excellence will be state-of-the-art facilities in Rockhampton, Petrie, Caloundra and the Southern Moreton Bay Islands to help rebuild our skilled workforce.

I am asked whether I am aware of the price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act. We have also delivered better conditions for Queensland tradies in other ways like scrapping Labor's CFMEU tax—BPIC. Labor's willingness to let their union overlords run the construction industry came at a human cost, too, with women in particular paying the price for intimidation, bullying and sexual harassment on worksites. I refer to *Courier-Mail* on 5 March 2024 where the member for Murrumba when he was the premier said BPIC was 'how we ensure that tradies and other workers on government projects are getting paid appropriately, that their conditions are being met'. The article continued, 'Sure, sometimes some people will focus on the cost of those, but they deliver great value for our projects.' I table that document.

Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 5 March 2024, titled 'Miles defends Health delays'.

The CFMEU tax also cost taxpayers billions, conservatively estimated to be 20 per cent in blowouts. All Queenslanders paid the price for BPIC and the member for Murrumba's failure to act when he was the premier. Unlike Labor, the Crisafulli LNP government respects taxpayers' money and supports safety on our worksites. The *Courier-Mail* this morning reports Labor sources saying, 'Steven Miles should stand down as opposition leader when Parliament breaks next month, to trigger a battle within Labor about Queensland's future'. Another anonymous Labor source said that 'there's no hope for him'. I table that document as well.

Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail, dated 17 November 2026, titled ''No hope': Steven Miles urged to resign as Labor leader by Xmas'.

Mr Bleijie: That'd be the one sitting next to him.

Ms BATES: Yes. I have not seen this many leaks since I last watched the *Titanic*. We have 'Captain Blocker', who has clipped an iceberg; the member for Woodridge, who is zhooshing his way around looking for a lifeboat just like the rival love interest—don't worry: no-one remembers his name either; and then the member for Murrumba and the member for Waterford—'Jack' and 'Rose'—holding onto a door in freezing waters. You can just hear it—'I'll never let it go, Steven!' And, as the credits roll, we hear the dulcet tones of the member for McConnel—'Labor's BPIC will go on and on and on.'

Mr SPEAKER: I remind members that we use correct titles.

Health Workforce Plan

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the minister heed AMA Queensland's calls and release the long promised workforce plan?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Lytton for her question. I thank her for her new-found interest in the health workforce plan. I do not recall her ever mentioning it before. You would almost say better late than never because when we talk about a workforce plan we talk about engaging new people, we talk about retention and we talk about a number of issues with respect to those matters. I would imagine that those on the opposition side will be looking at their own workforce plans. Certainly the member for Murrumba will be working on the 'job employment strategy' and the 'workforce attraction incentive scheme' for a number of people. There will be others looking for their 'pathways to leadership' positions. That will be part of their workforce plan over there.

Mr Bleijie: He can go to one of our new TAFEs.

Mr NICHOLLS: He will be able to retrain. I know he has a doctorate but he may be able to take up one of Minister Bates's free nursing places—one of the 2,000 free nursing places. When it comes to a workforce plan we know that those opposite are all over what the workforce might look like on the opposition benches and who is going to be elevated? Will it be, as the tipping is going on—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is even less relevant than the previous answers.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point of order. Minister, the question was around the workforce plan If you could direct your attention to that please, that would be much appreciated.

Mr NICHOLLS: I was talking about a workforce plan. It was just not the one they wanted me to talk about in my answer—it was theirs.

The issue in relation to the workforce plan is quite clear. We undertook the largest piece of work necessary to understand the needs and requirements of our workforce. Those opposite had a decade to deliver a workforce plan, and what did they do? In the dying months of a dying government, without a plan for the future and in the midst of a health crisis, they rolled out a half-baked workforce strategy. It was released, if memory serves me correctly, in July 2024. It did not take into account the Queensland Ambulance Service. No. The Queensland Ambulance Service was part of it—who would have thought it was not important to include that! We have undertaken that piece of work. We have liaised with the AMAQ. I know of their interest in it, and I thank them for the release of their report today as well.

We are taking the time to understand the needs of the workforce, but in the meantime, we are getting on with the job. We have employed 10,000 more people. We had the largest single intake of graduate interns in Queensland's history earlier this year with 931 new people. We took on more nurses, more midwives and more ambulance service people, with 75 per cent of people working on the front line and the balance in frontline support or necessary administrative roles. We do not need a workforce plan. We are doing it already.

Women

Miss DOOLAN: My question is to the Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering better conditions for Queensland women, and is the minister aware of the price paid by Queenslanders due to a failure to act?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have two minutes to respond.

Ms SIMPSON: Thank you to the member for Pumicestone, who not only brings a desire and an ability to help her local community, but stood up to the bullying, intimidation and the toxic behaviour of Labor on the front line. As the youngest woman elected to this parliament, she has personally demonstrated what it is to stand up courageously for her community. She has an insight into the DNA of the Labor Party.

I am delighted with the construction code that our colleagues, under the Deputy Premier, have introduced to improve the conditions for women in the construction industry. We need all the good women and all the good men building for Queensland. This code will support more women apprentices in construction, deliver safer construction workplaces and ensure more productive construction workplaces.

Let us compare and contrast that with the Labor way. As we have heard, they use toxic, intimidatory processes in the way they act. BPIC was their crowning glory and enabled them to thuggarise the workplace, to abuse women, to threaten them women physically and to threaten their families that they would be subjected to rape and their children would be followed. That was the BPIC code which allowed them to behave in such a way.

On 12 April 2024, the member for Murrumba, the now Leader of the Opposition, said BPIC was all about getting decent conditions on our building sites and conditions that are suitable for women. He talked about women's toilets—then looked the other way when it came to BPIC and the CFMEU physically threatening women. In his own words, he said he did this, he looked the other way and he allowed it. Time's up for the member for Murrumba, the Leader of the Opposition. Time's up for the thuggery of the CFMEU.

Mr SPEAKER: Time has expired.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Speaker? Mr Speaker?

Mr SPEAKER: And the period for question time has expired.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker?

Mr MELLISH: Mr Speaker?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley—

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I seek leave to move—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Hold on.

Mr MELLISH: I've got the call!

Mr SPEAKER: Nobody has the call.

Mr MELLISH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I seek leave to move—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I sought the call.

Mr MELLISH: I received the call, Mr Speaker. You gave me the call.

Mr SPEAKER: You have not been called. I will call the Leader of the House.

Mr MELLISH: Sorry, you called 'member for Aspley', Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I was making a ruling on my call. I heard the Leader of the House. Leader of the House?

MOTIONS

Suspension of Standing Orders

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.21 am) by leave, without notice: I move—

That with respect to the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026:

1. standing order 136(8) be suspended to allow the commencement of the second reading debate despite three calendar months not having elapsed since the tabling of the portfolio committee report; and
2. notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders, debate of the bill is to be considered during government business.

Briefly addressing this motion, it seeks the agreement of the House to bring forward the consideration of the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026 during this sitting week. Without canvassing the subject matter of this bill, the legislation was introduced on 22 April and referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee. I acknowledge and thank the committee's chair, the member for Nicklin, all committee members and the secretariat for their work. The committee completed its examination and reported its findings to the parliament. Accordingly, it is appropriate that the House address this legislation during the current sitting week within the arrangements established for the conduct of parliamentary business.

On behalf of all members, it is worth noting that there is a precedent, with the House having previously exercised its authority to bring forward consideration of private members' legislation before the ordinary waiting period has elapsed. Importantly and finally, I also wish to note that the standing orders of the Queensland parliament expressly provide for suspension, with standing order 5 confining a suspension to the particular purpose for which it is sought. This motion, therefore, concerns the arrangements for this particular legislation, leaves the general rules governing other legislation in place and creates no automatic entitlement for other proposals to receive the same treatment. I commend the motion to the House.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Business Program

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.23 am): In accordance with sessional order 3A I move—

1. That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill and the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill will be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages as follows:
   - (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
   - (b) consideration of the bills in detail together; and
   - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.
2. That the following business will be considered this sitting week within the times as specified:
   - (a) the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill and the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill (cognate debate):
     - (i) the time limits and order for moving the second readings will be: the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity—30 minutes, followed by the member for Gaven—30 minutes;

(ii) member for Gaven to be called on in reply by 8.10 pm today;

(iii) minister to be called on in reply by 8.30 pm today;

(iv) all stages to be completed by 9.00 pm today.

(b) the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill:

(i) minister to be called on in reply by 5 pm on Thursday, 19 November 2026;

(ii) all stages to be completed by 5.30 pm on Thursday, 19 November 2026.

(c) the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill:

(i) minister to be called on in reply by 8.45 pm on Thursday, 19 November 2026;

(ii) all stages to be completed by 9 pm on Thursday, 19 November 2026.

(d) the Transport Affordability Amendment Bill:

(i) the second reading question to be put by 6.25 pm today.

3. If all stages of the bills have not been completed by the specified times, Mr Speaker:

(a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes, any statement of compatibility or any override declaration to their circulated amendments; and

(b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill including clauses and schedules en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate.

As with previous business program motions, this motion today provides certainty to members, clarity about the business before the House and the orderly and effective management of parliamentary proceedings. This week's motion reflects the comprehensive range of legislation on the *Notice Paper* and the practical arrangements required to progress that business in a sensible and structured manner. That includes bringing forward the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill which has just been agreed to by the House. Without canvassing the merits or subject matter of that legislation, it is entirely logical that this be considered in cognate with the government's Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill.

These three bills address related subject matter concerning victims and the justice system. Cognate debates allow for consideration of a coherent debate while, importantly, preserving separate questions and decisions of the House on each bill. Importantly, cognating government legislation with private members' legislation is not some novel parliamentary process or device. There is ample precedent, including under the former Labor government. Those opposite should remember that the former Labor government undertook these processes. It is also worth highlighting that this motion expressly affords equal time to the Attorney-General and the member for Gaven for their second reading contributions at 30 minutes each. It also ensures the shadow minister and member for Gaven has the opportunity to speak in reply as part of the cognate debate on these three bills. Those arrangements are clearly set out for all members in the motion before the House. This motion provides certainty for the scheduled debates on domestic and family violence protection and justice legislation. It also sets out other appropriate times. I commend the motion to the House.



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (11.29 am): We absolutely oppose this motion. Of all the business motions that have been moved by the Leader of the House, this must be by far the most egregious motion I have ever heard in this parliament. This Premier and this government promised Queenslanders that they were going to let the sunshine in. That is what they said: they were going to let the sunshine in. There was going to be no secrecy. There was going to be transparency. There was going to be accountability. What we have seen every single sitting week is that they have kept the sunshine out. They curtail debate. They cognate important bills. They limit the time for consideration in detail. They present amendments at the last moment so stakeholders have no opportunity to debate them to make sure our laws are substantial and there is no opportunity to debate them so that they are better for Queenslanders.

This particular motion is about bills relating to victims. When this government went to the election, supporting victims was not just election commitment No. 107 or election commitment No. 302; it was election commitment No. 1. This government was going to support victims. Here we are in the second half of the term of this government and this is the first time we have seen anything about victims. I know they pretend that all of their ACAT laws are about victims and that they have had to introduce raft after raft of legislation to try to show that they are addressing crime, but the crime rate goes up. It has gone up by 5.2 per cent in the 2026 year.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Coomera, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to the motion that is before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Attorney-General. I remind the member for Coomera that he is now warned under the standing orders. I have been listening to the member for Bulimba. She has been largely relevant to the motion and giving some context. However, come back to the procedural elements of it now and you may continue, member for Bulimba.

Ms FARMER: Two of the bills contained in this motion are about victims. We are in the second half of this term of the government. This Premier and this government told Queenslanders that their No. 1 priority was about victims. We have one bill that is about strengthening victims' rights and implementing a recommendation of the *Ripple effect* report, which was delivered to the Attorney-General two years ago. It has taken her two years to come up with one recommendation from that report. This is about victims who have suffered domestic violence and rape and their experience in the criminal justice system. Is that just a bit important? Yes, it is actually very important!

Another bill included in this motion is about the Victims' Advocate Service—again, their No. 1 priority. This government are so for victims, they are all about victims and they are going to do everything they can. Meanwhile, back at the ranch, this is the second—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. I ask that you bring the member back to being relevant to the motion that we are debating.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Attorney-General, for your point of order. I have been listening to the member for Bulimba and I believe she is being relevant. I ask her to continue.

Ms FARMER: This bill is about supporting victims. Here we are in the second half of this term of the government and this is actually the first thing they have done for victims. In fact, there has been no legislation about victims. These are incredibly important bills, which we will be supporting. The problem for this government is not what they say; it is what they do. These people are big on promises and very light on action. All of the submitters to the inquiry into the Victims' Advocate Service bill really like it. They have been waiting for this for two years. However, they are very worried about how it is going to be implemented. They have a lot of questions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, I ask you to come back to the procedural element of the motion. You are starting to talk about the substance of one of the bills and I ask you not to do that.

Ms FARMER: We have until nine o'clock tonight to talk about three bills relating to victims. This is the dishonour that they are showing victims. This is the disrespect that they are showing victims.

Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (11.35 am): I rise to support the business program motion moved by the Leader of the House. I begin by commending the Leader of the House because, week after week, he brings into this chamber a program that gives the work of this House order, rhythm and clarity. Every member knows what is coming, when it will be debated and when matters will be decided. It is a great motion from the Leader of the House, who is, as many of us like to say, hardwired for excellence. Queenslanders have seen the calm and methodical approach this government brings to governing. This motion brings that same calm and methodical approach to legislating. We certainly have not had a calm and methodical approach to debating from the member for Bulimba.

In a moment, those opposite will say that this motion is extraordinary. They will say 'guillotine' and they will say 'gag'. They say it every sitting week and they really hope that nobody checks the record. I will take a moment to check that record. On 23 August 2018, a Labor leader of the House, the former member for Redcliffe, amended the sessional orders to create a business program motion in the parliament. Members who sit opposite today spoke in favour of it. One called it 'reasoned and sensible'. A few months later, that same Labor leader of the House reported back to the House, stating, 'The business program motion is working.' Labor designed the system, Labor defended the system and Labor used the system for six years. I can tell members that it did not become an attack on democracy on the day they moved to the other side of the chamber.

I turn to what this motion really does. It is an important motion. It brings three bills together in a cognate debate. All of them deal with victims and with justice. One of them is a private member's bill in the name of the member for Gaven. Let us look at what this motion gives to that bill. The member for Gaven has 30 minutes to move the second reading, which is exactly the same amount of time as the

Attorney-General. She receives a guaranteed right of reply. Her bill receives its own second reading question and its own third reading question.

Mrs Frecklington: One she wanted to debate back in April, remember. She wanted to debate it that night.

Mr VORSTER: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General

Honourable members interjected.

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

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, I do not need your help. The member for Burleigh has a very loud voice but, with all the cross-chamber chatter, I could barely hear him. Member for Burleigh, continue please.

Mr VORSTER: When the opposition say that this motion silences them, let's remember that it puts an opposition bill on the floor of this House tonight, with equal time, and brings it to a vote.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, in accordance with the time limits for this motion under the sessional orders, I ask you to resume your seat. The question will now be put.

Mr Power interjected.

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

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

AYES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, 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, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Pairs: Perrett, King; Mickelberg, Richmond.

Resolved in the affirmative.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION

Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (11.43 am): Mr Speaker—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I seek leave—

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

That the member for Aspley be now heard.

Division: Question put—That the member for Aspley be now heard.

AYES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Perrett, King; Mickelberg, Richmond.

Resolved in the negative.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.48 am): I seek leave to move a motion without notice.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, 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, Howard, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Pairs: Perrett, King; Mickelberg, Richmond.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11:50am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow:

1. the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026; and
2. the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026;

and any amendments circulated by the ministers to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION

Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (11.51 am): I seek leave to move general business notice of motion No. 2 standing in my name regarding lower petrol prices and 50-cent fares.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 35:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Mickelberg, Richmond; Perrett, King.

Resolved in the negative.

JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill resumed from 16 September (see p. 2872), Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill resumed from 16 September (see p. 2876) and Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill resumed from 22 April (see p. 1060).

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (11.56 am): I move—

That the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

When victim numbers exploded by 193 per cent under Labor, the aftershocks lingered for those thousands of impacted Queenslanders. There was the horrific event of the crime itself and then there was the bitter realisation that those opposite had failed them with anaemic laws that made detention a last resort and removed breach of bail as an offence, driving a tsunami of youth crime into their neighbourhoods, streets and lounge rooms. There was the physical, emotional, psychological and financial toll, which, until now, victims were unable to fully express in the sentencing court. I say 'until now' because, while victims were sidelined under Labor's soft-on-crime decade of decline, our stronger laws such as Adult Crime, Adult Time and Breach Bail, Go to Jail, which are already turning the tables on offenders, take another step forward with this bill.

We have listened to countless crime affected Queenslanders. They do not merely want their day in court. They are seeking the opportunity to be truly heard through victim impact statements that convey details of harm to the sentencing court as they currently do but go further, allowing greater openness, candour and transparency as part of a more victim centred approach.

The Crisafulli government agrees: victims cannot be subjected to the threat of retraumatisation by a victim impact statement regime that risks compromising their ability to speak freely. The bill ensures this and more through significant reforms to the victim impact process, including recognising for the first time that a VIS provides a therapeutic benefit to victims when they can tell their story in their own words. Victims deserve to have every avenue to justice and every assistance on the pathway to healing. While Labor discarded them, the Crisafulli government has, and will continue to, put victims first.

For background, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill implements recommendation 21 of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's *Sentencing of sexual assault and rape: the ripple effect* report. This called for a comprehensive review of the victim impact statement regime under the Penalties and Sentences Act after gauging strong dissatisfaction from victim-survivors and community members with current practices for providing a victim impact statement. The criticisms included: a lack of clarity around the purpose of victim impact statements; resentment over statement editing or redaction by prosecutors before sentencing; and the lack of opportunity, time and support to provide a statement.

The bill responds with a strengthened trauma informed victim impact statement regime. Further, it introduces an ability for the Victims' Commissioner to provide a community impact statement to inform sentencing proceedings for particular offences. The bill also amends the Coroners Act to ensure families are notified of important decisions regarding coronial investigations and inquests into the death of their loved one.

The bill was introduced to this parliament on 16 September this year and referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee. The committee received 20 written submissions during its inquiry. I thank the committee and the organisations and individuals who made submissions and gave evidence.

In particular, I acknowledge the victims' support and advocacy groups that shared their invaluable insights and experiences in working with victims within our criminal justice system. The committee learned that victims overwhelmingly wanted to be seen and heard by the sentencing court. A core objective of this bill is to deliver victims of crime in Queensland a level of agency they could never have

experienced under the former Labor government. The committee tabled its report on 6 November this year and made one recommendation: that the bill be passed. I will now turn to key parts of the bill.

As I stated, the bill makes amendments to recognise the therapeutic benefit that victims may gain from providing a victim impact statement. This is in addition to the existing purpose of informing the court about harm caused by the offence and underpins other key amendments to ensure victims have a stronger voice in sentencing proceedings. This dual purpose means that victims will be able to recount their story to the sentencing court and contribute meaningfully to sentencing.

One of the bill's critical aspects is to broaden who may provide a VIS to inform sentencing decisions and expand the scope of offences. These reforms recognise that the impact of crime extends beyond the immediate victim and provides more opportunities to apprise the court of the range of harm suffered. A standalone definition of 'victim' is introduced. This expands on the current scope to include persons who have a close personal relationship with the primary victim such as a close friend or an informal carer and witnesses to offences. The definition of a family member is also widened to include a grandparent, grandchild or stepchild. The bill expands the scope of offences beyond offences against the person to include all offences that result in death or bodily harm to a person and all other indictable offences. This will ensure victims of other serious offences, such as property offences like burglary or arson, may make a victim impact statement.

During the committee inquiry concerns were raised around the potential risks of expanding the definition of victim and scope of offences, including delays. However, these amendments are unreservedly targeted at providing more victims of serious crime with the opportunity to participate in the criminal justice process via a victim impact statement. The bill requires a statutory review of the operation and effectiveness of changes to the VIS regime to be conducted two years after commencement.

The *Ripple effect* report found the current process of prosecution editing or redacting statements before sentencing was letting victims down by not validating adequately their experiences. During consultation on the bill victim advocacy and support stakeholders concurred, highlighting victims' desire to tell the court in their own words about the impact of an offence. The committee heard from the Victims' Commissioner, who stated—

> ... many victim-survivors have found it difficult to understand why their VIS has been redacted prior to submission to a sentencing court, leaving them feeling silenced within the criminal justice process and unable to convey their full experience.

Further, Victims 1st supported the amendments. They said change 'would mean victims will have freedom of expression, which they have been unable to fully do in the past.'

The bill sets a new course, delivering for victims by removing the requirement for prosecutors to redact or edit a VIS before tendering it to the court. A limited ability is retained for prosecutors to remove any material from a VIS that is offensive, threatening, intimidating or harassing. These reforms do not alter the fundamental sentencing principles that apply in our Queensland courts. If irrelevant or inadmissible material is included in a VIS, sentencing courts must accept the statement but still only continue to consider material relevant to the sentencing decision. This reflects the existing practice, where sentencing courts may receive irrelevant material and are experienced in attributing to it appropriate weight in the context of established sentencing principles.

The bill maintains flexibility for sentencing courts to consider and respond to any potential delays. The court may adjourn a sentencing hearing having regard to: the interests of justice; whether the victim has had a reasonable opportunity to prepare a statement; and whether the adjournment would unreasonably delay sentencing.

The bill also provides a specific provision that a person who prepares a VIS must not be cross-examined on their statement unless the court is satisfied that the content may materially affect the sentence the court may impose and it is in the interests of justice to allow the cross-examination. For example, this could arise if the victim impact statement contains inconsistent statements, raises concerns about credibility and reliability, or introduces fresh or prejudicial material that may affect the sentence. If the court is satisfied that a person may be cross-examined, the court may make arrangements or give any directions the court considers appropriate to protect the person from unnecessary trauma, intimidation or distress and facilitate the person's effective participation in the proceedings. The bill balances legislative safeguards to protect victims while also ensuring procedural fairness to the defendant. These amendments recognise that cross-examination, should it occur, is a

distressing and traumatic impost on victims and provides protections to best support the therapeutic purpose of a victim impact statement.

Another key reform in the bill is the introduction of community impact statements to inform the sentencing court about harm caused or likely harm caused to an affected community for particular offences. The amendments will allow the Victims' Commissioner to provide a community impact statement surrounding broader harm to a community arising from prescribed offences. In the first instance this will be limited to child exploitation material and serious vilification and prohibited symbol balance offences, with further offences able to be prescribed by regulation. The aim of the community impact statement framework is to give a voice to victims who would not otherwise be represented in the justice process, including where individual victims cannot be identified or where victims cannot, or choose not to, make a victim impact statement. This implements part of transformational recommendation 7 of the Child Death Review Board's *In plain sight: review into system responses to child sexual abuse* report. The board recommended legislative reforms to enable the use of community impact statements in child exploitation cases. *In plain sight* underscores the significant and ongoing harm from offences relating to the possession and distribution of this offensive material.

As part of the committee process, some stakeholders raised concerns around the operation of community impact statements, including: how to identify and consult with communities; distinguishing between general and specific harm; weight given to such statements and potential impacts on sentencing; appropriate evidence; and ensuring disclosure to defendants. Under the bill, the Victims' Commissioner must be satisfied that an affected community exists and that it is in the interests of justice to provide a community impact statement.

The bill establishes a flexible framework to allow the Victims' Commissioner to consider any relevant information, including submissions from any person. For example, this could be made by a member of the public, advocacy or support organisation, government agency or Police Service. The type of consultation considered appropriate will also depend on the nature of the offence.

The bill provides that the Victims' Commissioner may consult with the prosecutor to determine when a community impact statement is suitable. A community impact statement can draw on and attach research, statistics, community consultation and personal accounts to demonstrate the harm typically caused by an offence and its impact on the community. The bill ensures procedural fairness for defendants by requiring prosecutors to disclose the statement to the offender and their lawyer, if represented. As with other sentencing material, judicial officers have discretion to consider the relevance and weight to be given to the material in the statement. The victim impact statement and community impact statement processes are intended to operate together, ensuring sentencing courts receive information regarding harm to individual victims as well as broader community harm.

Stakeholders raised concerns before the committee around the implementation and operation of the reforms, including ensuring the diverse needs of all victims, including those significantly impacted by trauma, would be appropriately supported to prepare a victim impact statement. The Crisafulli government acknowledges legislative reform alone is not sufficient. Victims must also have practical support to navigate the justice system and prepare victim impact statements if they choose to do so. That is why these reforms will be supported by the new Victims Advocate Service, led by the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support—and I thank the minister—operating as a one-stop shop for Queenslanders who fall victim to crime. The Victims Advocate Service will include a 24/7 contact centre and new website, providing a central point for victims to access information, advice, referrals to support services and assistance to navigate the victim support and justice systems.

The bill also makes an unrelated amendment to the Coroners Act. The amendment will require that reasonable steps be taken, as soon as practicable, to notify a family member of the deceased person when a decision or order is made to hold an inquest or reopen an inquest or investigation. This aims to ensure the family is notified of important changes to the status of a coronial investigation into the death of their loved one. Schedule 2 of the Coroners Act establishes who is a 'family member'. The State Coroner's Guidelines assist an investigating coroner in their determination of who is a family member of the deceased.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I will seek to move the following amendments, which have been circulated already, during consideration in detail of the bill. The objectives of the amendments are to: make technical and consequential amendments to the Bail Act 1980, including to ensure that adults who commit a new dangerous driving related offence, which was debated during the last sitting, while on

bail, unlawfully at large or failing to appear are subject to the new bail reforms; amend the bill to clarify the definition of a 'victim' under section 179IA of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to ensure it aligns with and supports the expanded scope of offences under section 179J; amend the bill to clarify information-sharing arrangements between the Victims' Commissioner and the Police Commissioner or DPP to support the effective operation of the community impact statement framework; and make other minor technical amendments.

In summary, this bill from the Crisafulli government is another important step by our government in repairing Labor's damage by continuing our commitment to victims ahead of offenders. We are ensuring victims are not silenced, but seen and heard, with their ordeals acknowledged and the harm they have suffered recognised. While there is more work to do, we are reversing the trend of spiralling crime under Labor's decade of decline. Along with tougher consequences for law-breakers, we are restoring dignity, respect and compassion for victims, with unprecedented trauma informed transparency in the sentencing court.

I would now like to turn to the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill introduced by my colleague the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services on 16 September 2026. Together, the two bills reinforce the Crisafulli government's commitment to strengthening victims' rights and improving the resources available to Queenslanders impacted by crime. Through the Victims Advocate Service bill, we are delivering a $50 million statewide service to help victims understand their rights, access information and find the support they need.

Queensland's justice system involves many different agencies with their own responsibilities and legislative obligations: police investigate offences, prosecutors conduct proceedings, courts determine matters before them, government departments administer assistance schemes, and specialist organisations provide critical support to victims and their families. Each has an important role to play. However, for a victim of crime, navigating this network can be intimidating. Someone who has already experienced trauma should not have to fathom which government department holds the information they need and which organisation can provide assistance, or chase down the right contact for an update on their case; nor should they be forced to repeatedly recount the nature of the offending against them. For too long under Labor, that is how it was for victims' rights across Queensland.

By contrast, we are delivering on our election commitment. The Victims Advocate Service, as I stated, will provide a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week call centre, supported by live chat and a dedicated online information hub. It will give victims of crime somewhere to turn for assistance, regardless of postcode or when they need help. Importantly, rather than simply directing a victim to another phone number, the Victims Advocate Service will provide ongoing support. With false start after false start, Labor failed to produce the dedicated service victims needed to help them navigate the justice system. With this bill, which the Minister for Victim Support will provide further details on in her second reading speech, the Crisafulli government is delivering it.

I now turn to the private member's bill introduced by the member for Gaven on 22 April 2026. It sought to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 to: allow institutions to be held vicariously liable, including retrospectively, for claims for the abuse of children under their care, supervision, control or authority if the abuse is perpetrated by persons in relationships akin to employment; and allow courts to set aside and reconsider certain prior settlements for child abuse claims if it would be just and reasonable to do so.

The Crisafulli government acknowledges the profound pain and lifelong consequences suffered by victims and survivors of historical child sexual abuse. We acknowledge the courage it takes for survivors to come forward, to seek accountability and to pursue justice through what can often be a difficult and deeply personal process. No member of this House should doubt the Crisafulli government's commitment to ensuring that victims have better access to justice after a decade of decline under those opposite. Although the government cannot support this bill, that should not be taken as a lack of commitment to victims and survivors of child sexual abuse.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In fact, it is quite the opposite. The government's position reflects the committee's findings—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Members on my left, interjections are not being taken.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection from the honourable housing minister. They did not oppose, in the shadow attorney's terms, whacking it together. The shadow attorney-general told this House at length she was ready to debate her bill back in April, so I continue.

The government's position reflects the committee's finding that the bill raises significant legal uncertainty, particularly in relation to the proposed akin-to-employment test, its retrospective operation and the question of whether the reforms remain necessary in the light of the recent High Court decision in AA v the Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle. Importantly, the High Court in AA confirmed that institutions owe a non-delegable duty of care to children in their care, supervision or control, thus providing survivors with a significant avenue to pursue civil claims against institutions in circumstances where that avenue was not previously available prior to that High Court decision.

Notwithstanding this major High Court determination, the member for Gaven continued and proceeded with her bill. To make the timeframe clear, on 13 November 2024 in Bird v DP, the High Court ruled that a religious diocese was not vicariously liable for a priest's abuse because he was not an employee, rejecting extensions to relationships akin to employment. On 11 February this year, 2026, in AA the High Court held that religious institutions can owe a non-delegable duty of care to children under their supervision, which can be breached by intentional criminal acts.

Almost two months later the shadow attorney-general introduced this bill to allow vicarious liability including retrospectivity for relationships akin to employment. What the High Court decision in AA demonstrates is that survivors of historical child sexual abuse now have access to expanded legal pathways and the practical operation of those pathways is still developing. In those circumstances, the government is not satisfied that the bill's proposed reforms, which would introduce new areas of uncertainty and potentially extensive litigation, are necessary at this time. The committee in its final report noted—

> ... the Bill relies on the central concept of a relationship 'akin to employment' without providing sufficient guidance as to the relationships that would fall within that test.

The committee was concerned this created uncertainty and could lead to protracted litigation for victim-survivors, the last thing victim-survivors of child sexual abuse want. Accordingly, therefore, the Crisafulli government will not support the opposition's bill.

However, the government remains committed to delivering practical reforms that improve access to justice, strengthens support for victims and ensures our legal system responds appropriately to the profound harm caused by abuse. Importantly, abuse survivors are not without avenues of redress. I will say that again: importantly, abuse survivors of child historical sexual abuse are not without avenues of redress. In addition to the developments arising from the High Court AA decision of this year, survivors may access existing civil litigation pathways and the national redress scheme.

Rather than introducing legislation that may produce uncertainty and unintended consequences, the government will continue to monitor the operation and the practical effect of the AA decision. That is why the government is focused on reforms that provide clear and effective pathways for victims and survivors. The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026 are designed to reduce barriers to justice, improve the experience of victims engaging with the legal system and strengthen accountability for those responsible for serious harm. Together, and importantly, they build on the Crisafulli government's work and our ongoing work that will continue to ensure victims are at the centre of Queensland's justice system and that survivors are supported in seeking recognition, accountability and redress. I commend these bills to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next member, the member for Logan is still on a warning as well as the member for Coomera, who is not in the House.

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (12.25 pm): I move—

> That the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

There are moments in this parliament that should transcend politics where we look each other in the eye and ask: are we doing right by the very people who sent us here? Survivors of child sexual

abuse know exactly what it feels like when someone with power decides that they do not need to be asked. That is exactly what this government has just done though. They have not asked them whether they wanted this bill debated today. There were survivors of child sexual abuse who sat in the gallery when we introduced this bill and who said that this reform was important to them. They talked about the fact that it was disrespectful that the Premier at the time was on his phone and as the Attorney-General—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Members on my right, could you take your conversations outside, please.

Ms Grace: Repeat that.

Ms SCANLON: I will repeat that again for the benefit of the Attorney-General. There were victim-survivors in the gallery who deserve the opportunity to be here when this bill is being debated and yet the government has just denied them that. They are ignoring the voices of victims of child sexual abuse, people who said at the time how disrespectful it was that the Premier was on his phone when this important bill was introduced.

A government member: Really?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection, 'Really?' Yes, really; those are the words of victim-survivors of institutional child sexual abuse that those opposite are now ignoring.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will not stand for quarrelling across the chamber. If it is an interjection and it is taken, there will be a response. Otherwise I ask you to keep quiet.

Ms SCANLON: Those survivors deserved more than a whole lot of bills being whacked together with no notice on reform they care about. The whole point of this bill was that powerful institutions do not get to act without answering to survivors and yet now we have a government not answering to those very survivors. That should apply to the government, too. Instead, we have a government that says they are on the side of survivors and victims and yet we see them act like this. We just saw the government defend the abuse of standing orders and tonight we will see them defend institutions that allowed horrendous acts under their care. Let's remember what this is about: children who are placed in the care of institutions who were let down, who were sexually abused and those opposite are saying those institutions should be defended, not those children. We do not.

Let's not forget that at the time when I introduced this bill to the parliament I said, 'Let's work on this in good faith.' Other jurisdictions have actually passed this reform in a bipartisan way. I turned up to the committee and I said that we were willing to make amendments if the government could work with us to pass this, and the LNP dominated committee said no. At no point has the Attorney-General reached out and said, 'Look, we've got some problems with this bill. We want to work with you.' They have just silenced us and in doing that, they have silenced victims. It is shameful. What we have is the LNP dominated committee sitting there through a pretty lengthy committee process that we tried to truncate at the time, but those opposite said no. They have used the committee dominated by LNP members to say that the entire bill should be voted down and now they want to rush it through the parliament. None of it makes sense.

What I find so offensive and what I think victim-survivors will find so offensive is that there are members of the government like the police minister and like the now child safety minister who, to their credit, did turn up to Survivors' Day. I give them credit for that. Despite the fact that those victim-survivors said that the one thing the government could do is support this bill, it has come into this House today and said no. Dan Purdie, the police minister, wrote on his Facebook page about Graeme, a former Victorian police detective, a survivor and an ambassador. I do not know how the police minister could have listened to what he said and then come into this parliament and ignore him, because that is exactly what he is doing.

As I said, we were willing to work on this in good faith. The government says it has problems with the bill, yet at no point has it offered any suggestions. So, with respect, I do not think it is willing to work in good faith. I think this is more about politics than about the individuals that this affects.

I also want to remind those opposite about the organisations that supported this bill such as the Australian Lawyers Alliance. I know that the Attorney-General laughs at that—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence—deep personal offence—and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney, I have not even given you the call. You have a point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I do. I take deep personal offence to the statement that the shadow minister just made and I ask her to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member, the Attorney-General has taken offence. Will you withdraw?

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. The ALA, which represents multiple law firms, supports the bill in its entirety. Bravehearts strongly supports the intent of the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. It said—

> We consider this reform a critical step toward strengthening institutional accountability, improving survivor access to justice, and reinforcing the responsibility of all child-serving organisations to prevent harm.

The Queensland Sexual Assault Network said it 'supports the bill and recommends its passing as soon as possible'. Full Stop Australia said it supports the bill and Act for Kids says it strongly supports the intent of the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. Even the Victims' Commissioner supported the broader objectives of the bill, yet here we are with the government not listening to them.

We are unapologetically on the side of victim-survivors of child sexual abuse because there was a High Court decision that allowed a loophole that prevents victim-survivors from getting their day in court—from pursuing claims—and the bill would prevent an institution from defeating a claim of vicarious liability solely because the perpetrator was in a relationship akin to employment rather than formally employed. A vote against this bill is a vote against victim-survivors of institutional child sexual abuse plain and simple.

The Attorney-General tries to prosecute this argument that because there has been another High Court decision that makes this bill redundant. That is simply not correct. If it was, then other jurisdictions would not have also introduced and passed laws. On 13 November 2024—and let us remember how long ago this was—there was a High Court decision that effectively closed the ability for people to claim vicarious liability in circumstances that were akin to employment. I want to make very clear to the Attorney-General what the High Court said. It said the issue is squarely in the hands of the legislators, so it gave the parliament—it gave the Attorney-General—the power to change this and she is—

Mrs Frecklington: And two years later, what happened?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection: two years later nothing happened, so we acted. The High Court made it extremely clear that it is in the power of the parliament to extend vicarious liability to—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member needs to address me. There seems to be some discourse across the chamber, so, unless there is an interjection taken, I would ask those on my right to remain silent. Member, could you please address the chair? Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. When a child is abused, they do not experience it through the lens of employment law. They do not lie awake at night wondering whether their abuser was technically an employee or an independent contractor. The pain is the same and the suffering is the same, yet the law will treat them differently. That is what we are seeking to change to close that loophole, because, frankly, if a child is abused by a volunteer or a priest they should be able to get the support that they need. They should be able to get their day in court, and unfortunately right now they cannot because of a High Court decision, or they may not be able to because of this High Court decision. This sends a deeply demoralising and unjust message that says, 'The institution that enabled your abuse—that placed your abuser in a position of power—gets to walk away.' That is not justice, that is not what Queensland stands for and that is what our bill aims to address.

As I have said, the Attorney-General tries to prosecute this argument that the AA decision means that the Bird decision is redundant. The ALA made very clear in the committee hearing that that is not the case. The Attorney's argument does not really make an awful lot of sense when, on the one hand, she says the Standing Council of Attorneys-General is working on reform but then says, 'Actually, we don't need any reform because there's a High Court decision that makes this redundant.' Which one is it, because the two of them do not make sense? As Heather Kerley from the ALA explained—

I want to address the suggestion that the recent High Court decision in AA from February has somehow closed the gap left behind by Bird. It has not.

They are lawyers who work in this field and those opposite are ignoring them. The Australian Capital Territory has passed laws. It said that it was doing that because, frankly, the Standing Council of Attorneys-General was taking too long and Victoria has passed laws. Even the Tasmanian Rockliff Liberal government has committed to introduce laws. I have had a Liberal senator write to me urging me to support law reform in this space. I would have thought that on an issue so serious we could have worked in a bipartisan way. For some reason those opposite are listening to someone, but it is certainly not victim-survivors of child sexual abuse.

I now want to briefly turn to some of the other bills that have just been whacked together, and what a shame it is that I cannot spend this entire contribution talking about our private member's bill, because it is incredibly serious, and what a great shame that those members cannot be here with us today. The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill is also an important area of reform. To be clear from the outset, we support this reform because, frankly, it is Labor reform. What this bill was created on was based on a foundation of work that Labor established through the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and then those matters were referred to the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council to review how rape and sexual assault are sentenced in this state.

In December 2024 the council delivered its report, the *Ripple effect*, which had 28 recommendations. These are good changes. We are glad to see this come before the parliament, but the problem is that again it has taken a long period of time for these amendments to come before the parliament. Mr Deputy Speaker Kempton, you may remember that it was the Labor opposition that moved amendments to enact one of the recommendations from this report which was around good-character references. The government again voted that down despite the fact that I wrote to the Attorney-General at the time again offering to work with it in a bipartisan manner. Those opposite tried to vote that down and then it introduced its own laws, which again we supported, and we then tried to say, 'Let's make them come into effect now rather than victim-survivors having to wait,' and those opposite voted against their own bill coming into effect earlier. This whole process has just been farcical. It is ridiculous.

While we said at the time that it was really good that we were able to force the government to at least do something on good-character references, there were a range of other recommendations that the government could have acted on but did not. Now here we are nearly two years after that report was handed down with one of the recommendations being implemented, but again we do not know where any of those other matters are at. It is a bit like the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. We have no idea what is going on. We have a minister who is no longer in that portfolio and a new minister. Victim-survivors deserve so much better.

They deserved to know, when they rocked up to these inquiries, where on earth these recommendations are at, yet we have just heard silence from those opposite. Where are the other 23 recommendations? Which ones has the government actually accepted or rejected? We are again noticing a pattern from this government. Law reform reports get handed to them. Our government generally provided a statement outlining whether we supported or support in principle those recommendations, and then we sought to work on them as quickly as possible. Those opposite are not even bothering to tell people whether they support them. How disrespectful. Every one of those people, I think, deserve clarity, and unfortunately, they do not have that.

I want to lay out some of the concerns raised with this particular bill. As I said, while we support it, we do not just write a blank cheque with our support. There are legitimate issues that have been raised by, for example, the Queensland Law Society, which warned the bill will impact proceedings in the Magistrates Court. The bill provides for a ministerial review after two years. That review should be tabled in this House. It should test whether these reforms are working and it should look at whether the Victims' Commissioner and the courts have the resources to deliver them. A reform that is not resourced is a promise that is not kept, which is a bit similar to some of the other pieces of law reform we have seen—big promises, and then no information about the modelling or what funding is being provided to those institutions that need to enact this reform.

We echo the words of Ending Violence Against Women Queensland, which urged this government to undertake meaningful consultation with the specialist sector as the proposed reforms are implemented. We know that this government is allergic to scrutiny. We have watched it shut down and silence its critics, but good legislation is not made in a silo at 1 William Street. It is made by listening

to experts and people with lived experience and the government should keep listening as it rolls out these measures.

I will briefly touch on the advocate service implementation but my colleague the member for Bulimba will go to further lengths to outline some of the feedback we have received from stakeholders in relation to the modelling and the demand for these services. We, of course, support an advocate service but we want to make sure the implementation of it actually works. Again, unfortunately, we see bills come into this parliament with none of the additional information that I think stakeholders rightfully deserve.

With the time I have remaining, I want to remind everyone why our private members' bill should get the support of those opposite. Victims of child sexual abuse take years to come forward. They do not just deserve their day in court, they deserve resources to try to heal. It is incredibly traumatic for a victim of child sexual abuse to have the courage to come forward. This bill does not guarantee them justice. It does not guarantee that the court will find in their favour. They still have to appear before the court. They still have to go through a lot of retraumatising processes to try to get justice. Those who want to should be able to.

I have shared before that my uncle is a victim of child sexual abuse. So many of us know someone who has been impacted and a number of us also know people who are no longer with us because the pain and trauma that went with that abuse as a vulnerable child stayed with them so deeply that this world became too much for them. That is why I think what the government has done is so incredibly offensive—

Mr Dick: And mean.

Ms SCANLON:—and mean. I take that interjection. You can disagree with our bill, you can make amendments to it, but to not even give those people the courtesy of knowing that this was going to be debated today is so unjust and cruel.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I take that interjection—disgusting. All of those individuals have been contacting LNP members' offices in the hope that maybe those opposite would think about working in a bipartisan way for once. There are many bills in this parliament that we support the government on because we accept that Queenslanders voted a particular way and they want outcomes. I think most Queenslanders would say that if a priest or a volunteer abuses a child in that institution's care then that institution should be held to account. Those opposite disagree with that, though. The question I have is why? Who is it that they are listening to? Who are they protecting by voting down this bill? As I said, many other jurisdictions have worked together in a bipartisan way to deliver this reform.

I do not accept the arguments put forward by the Attorney-General. I suspect the Attorney-General will come in here and say that there was one barrister who appeared before the committee and raised an objection to the bill. With respect, when we asked that individual how often they worked on those matters, the response was that it was not a regular area of law that they work in. Yet the Australian Lawyers Alliance, which represents several law firms, said that the LNP's argument is actually not right; that they are, in fact, two separate legal doctrines—non-delegable duties and vicarious liability—and that both should be available. For some reason, the Attorney-General is ignoring all of those law firms.

Ms Pease: Like she is doing now.

Ms SCANLON: Like she is doing now. I take that interjection.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence and I ask the shadow minister to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at what the member for Lytton just said and I ask that she withdraws.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member for Lytton, the member has taken offence. Will you withdraw?

Ms PEASE: I withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I think victims of child sexual abuse deserve a lot better. What I suspect the government will do is what they did with regard to good character references. I suspect they will vote down this bill and then come back into the parliament and introduce their own laws. If that does happen, I think every Queenslander should be pretty disappointed that we have wasted so much time when the government could have just engaged with us and made amendments to our bill if they legitimately had concerns with it.

Mr Dick: Playing politics.

Ms SCANLON: I take the member's interjection. They are playing politics.

Mr Dick: Petty partisanship.

Ms SCANLON: Petty partisanship. If that is what they do, that is so incredibly disrespectful to all of the lawyers who gave up so much of their time to help draft this bill and all of the victim-survivors who turned up when we introduced this bill and went through the committee process. The member for Southern Downs may think this is funny, I can assure you—

Mr Lister: It is tragic.

Ms SCANLON: I take that interjection: it is tragic. It is tragic that the LNP are voting against this bill. I remind the member what he is going to be voting on tonight. He is voting to say that institutions of child sexual abuse should be able to get away effectively scot-free. That is exactly what he is voting for.

Mrs Frecklington: It is offensive to the victims.

Ms SCANLON: I take the Attorney-General's interjection. What is offensive to victims is what you are doing today—what the LNP are doing today.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The shadow minister has been here long enough to use correct titles. She is the cat's mother.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I would just remind you to use correct titles. Could you address your comments to me, not to the member for Southern Downs? Thank you.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. What those opposite will be voting on tonight is to say that victim-survivors should not be able to take a claim of vicarious liability against an institution if they are a volunteer or not a direct employee. I do not think ordinary Queenslanders think that is okay. We had a royal commission in this country where so many people appeared and talked about their trauma and how long it took them to come forward, which is why we added the layer of retrospectivity that the Attorney-General just spoke about.

There was a longstanding view that this avenue to justice was available, which is why there were matters that were put forward for years until this was appealed to the High Court. Let's remember who it was appealed to the High Court by. The church, a big institution that has lots of money, appealed and the decision was that actually the law was quite strict. The High Court said positions that are not direct employee relationships should not fall within the claim of vicarious liability, which means that priests or volunteers, or their institutions, will not be subjected to the same legal principle. We think that those institutions should have some level of accountability for those individuals who are placed in positions of trust, positions of authority, regardless of whether they are getting paid or not. That is the point here. I hear the interjections from the Attorney-General. The doctrine of non-delegable duty does not mean that you do not also have a loophole for vicarious liability. That has been explained at length by the Australian Lawyers Alliance.

Mr Smith: The Attorney-General doesn't understand the law.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bundaberg. I would have thought that some issues could transcend politics. It is deeply disappointing.

Ms Grace: How does this hurt anybody? How does this hurt anyone?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member who asks how this hurts anyone. It does not hurt anyone to allow victim-survivors to have their day in court. As I have said, it does not mean they automatically will get a win in court. They still have to prove that that harm did occur. The institution will still be able to mount their case. It just allows them to have their day in court. Right now, because of that High Court decision, they are not able to do that.

There were questions from committee members about the financial viability of institutions as a result of this bill. With respect, my priority is not the financial viability of an institution. If you put someone in a position of authority over a child and they sexually abuse that child, they have some sort of responsibility. This parliament should not be concerned about financial viability of the institution rather than the victim. That is exactly what the government is going to be voting on. This bill, as Maurice Blackburn put forward, merely puts things back to how everyone thought they were prior to Bird—nothing more and nothing less. It does not put organisations or their representatives at greater risk of litigation than they were before the decision in Bird. It will not bankrupt insurers like those opposite have tried to suggest. It returns them to the actuarial positions they had already factored in before Bird.

Ms Grace: Exactly. What harm is it doing?

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. I do not understand what harm those opposite think this bill will do other than provide victim-survivors the opportunity to have their day in court, to get compensation, so they can get therapy. It is expensive to go to a psychologist to try to recover from harm when you were a child and someone abused you. I do not understand how anyone could seriously have sat through the royal commission and listened to those reports from young people, many who are adults now, who have suffered impacts on their relationships. Some of them cannot work anymore, some of them cannot go out and some have taken their own lives. That is the reality of what that trauma does to someone. This bill is about saying we acknowledge that trauma and we acknowledge that that institution owed them better. When a parent puts their child, the most special thing to a parent, into the care of an institution, they expect them to look after their child. If they do not, even if that institution might not have known the full extent, they have some level of responsibility over the people that they put in positions of authority to care for children. I think institutions should be held to account in those circumstances.

We are also aware that not all churches have opposed these reforms. I understand the Catholic Archdiocese has put their views forward. I grew up a Catholic. I have respect for religious institutions and people of faith and their right to have faith, but I do not think that it means an institution should be able to abrogate its responsibility when harm occurs under its watch. That is what this is about. There are other churches who have said that they do not have an objection to this bill. Again, I ask the Attorney-General in her response to outline exactly who she is listening to in saying that those opposite are going to vote against this bill. When Bravehearts, sexual assault services, the Victims' Commissioner and victims themselves are all saying they support this law, I find it really hard to believe how a government that says that they are tough on crime, that they are here to support victims, could justify not supporting them and, in fact, standing with the institutions who harboured paedophiles. That is actually what has happened. For many years these institutions unfortunately were harbouring paedophiles. Those young people who are now adults who have gone through incredible trauma deserve justice. They deserve their day in court.

Of course the Labor opposition supports our bill. We hope that those opposite have a change of heart by tonight. We also hope that some victim-survivors might be able to attend today. How grossly offensive to them that they have not been able to hear the Attorney-General, the first law officer of this state, contribute to this bill or my response—

Mrs Frecklington: I have the response this afternoon.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection. She has the response this afternoon, so apparently victim-survivors are supposed to stop everything, hop in the car and get here.

(Time expired)

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (12.56 pm): The Crisafulli government made a commitment that we would put victims first. Today we are proud to be delivering on one of our most significant election commitments to victims—a nation-leading Victims Advocate Service. Mr Deputy Speaker, I want you to think about what it takes for someone to pick up the phone after they have been through what may be one of the most traumatic experiences of their life: a parent sitting beside a child too frightened to sleep in their own bed after a break-in, a grieving family waiting for a court update not knowing who to call; someone ready to ask for help late at night long after every office has closed. Queenslanders deserve someone to turn to in their hour of need—someone who answers, who listens and who helps them work out what happens next. That will be the Victims Advocate Service. It will be a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week front door for victims of crime to get the help, support and information they need.

The member for Capalaba knows better than anyone why this service is so desperately needed. Before entering this House he spoke about how his family did not get the support they needed after losing his son, daughter-in-law and their unborn child. He said, 'It appears more support is available for the perpetrators than what is available for victims. This needs to change.' That was a grieving father asking the former Labor government for help, but his calls fell on deaf ears. Tragically, he was far from alone. Graeme Kimball's family waited nine months to be connected with support after his son was killed—nine months. Under the former Labor government, victims were passed from agency to agency, forced to retell their stories again and again, chasing updates that never came and fighting for information and support when they needed it most.

During Labor's decade of decline, victim numbers skyrocketed 193 per cent, car thefts went up 101 per cent, break-ins went up 44 per cent and assaults went up 198 per cent. Victims and their families had had enough. They marched outside this parliament, they gave evidence to inquiries, they shared their heartbreaking experiences and they pleaded for change. But Labor did not listen. The Crisafulli government did. The Victims Advocate Service has been designed by Queenslanders for Queenslanders. Through consultation with more than 600 people right across the state, victims told us three things: they wanted one place to start, they wanted to stop retelling their story and they wanted help when they needed it most. That is exactly what this service will deliver. Natalie Merlehan from Voice for Victims, herself a victim-survivor, told the committee—

Victims did not choose this path, so they should not have to fight for access to the information, timely assistance and support that they deserve.

The Victims' Commissioner, Kate Connors, put it really simply: the service 'will take a huge weight off a victim's shoulders at one of the most difficult points in their life'. That is exactly what we want to achieve: a service that takes the burden off victims. Right now the information a victim needs is spread across government. When those agencies do not talk to each other the burden falls back to the victim—another phone call, another form, another time explaining what happened to them. This bill changes that. It does four simple things: first, it breaks down barriers, helping victims access information and connecting them with the services they need; second, it lets the service do the chasing rather than leaving victims to chase the updates they need themselves; third, it gives victims someone in their corner—a family member, friend or trusted support organisation—who can deal with the service on their behalf; and, fourth, it puts victims in control, with strong privacy provisions and penalties of up to two years imprisonment for unlawful disclosure.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Gerber, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Health System, Performance

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): When it comes to health care, the expectations of Queenslanders are pretty simple: if they or a loved one call for an ambulance then that ambulance will arrive and when that ambulance takes them to an emergency department there will be a bed there and healthcare workers to treat them. That is the system that Queenslanders need to have faith in, but that faith is being eroded by this LNP government as is the faith of our hardworking health professionals, paramedics, doctors, nurses, midwives and support staff. They are struggling every day because the government has stacked the system against them, because the government refuses to release a health workforce plan and because the government offered growth funding to our hospitals and then revoked that offer. It is those hardworking healthcare workers who are paying the price and it is sick Queenslanders who are paying the price.

Last week, the health minister proudly released the latest health data and it turns out that he was gaslighting Queenslanders yet again. Yet again, he was trying to tell us that the data is the best ever when the facts are that, at most of our hospitals, it is worse. Ramping is higher than when the LNP came to office. Under the LNP, it is the highest it has ever been at 47.8 per cent. What matters is not just how many ambulances are ramped at our hospitals; what also matters is how long they are ramped there. At the 26 biggest hospitals in the state, paramedic lost time hit 17.3 minutes, which is up from 10.2 minutes in October 2024 or a 70 per cent increase. Looking across all of our public hospitals, lost time has gone from 9.2 minutes to 15.6 minutes, which is also a 70 per cent increase. Every single one of those lost minutes is a minute that that ambulance and those paramedics are not back in the

community saving lives. Every minute spent standing outside the hospital at a ramp is a minute not spent responding to a triple 0 call. When it comes to saving lives, every single minute matters.

Eighteen hours: that is how long a Thornlands man waited for an ambulance, dying before it arrived. For 18 hours, his wife and family watched him deteriorate. Every single minute matters and they had to watch those minutes tick by—more than 1,000 minutes—calling back, calling back, before eventually calling to say that it was too late. At Logan Reserve, a man died after waiting 4½ hours for an ambulance.

This is happening not just in the south-east; things are just as bad in the regions. Today we heard about the tragic case of a Townsville man who lived not far from Townsville University Hospital but who died after it took longer than an hour for an ambulance to arrive. Paramedics tell us that they could not get to him because they were ramped at the hospital. In fact, Townsville University Hospital has seen some of the worst deterioration in ramping figures. This morning the minister first said that no ambulances were ramped that night. Then he had to come in and correct the record for the parliament, saying that there were ramped ambulances that night, after he had already admitted that the emergency department was at 107 per cent capacity. Our Labor team is thinking of those families grieving loved ones who died while waiting for an ambulance. The least that this minister could do is meet with those families and hear from them how the system failed their loved ones.

What we do not know, because the government will not tell us, is how many Queenslanders have died waiting for a specialist outpatient appointment. How many of them have become sicker? There are now 376,669 Queenslanders waiting for a specialist appointment, which is up 6,370 in a month, 50,000 in 12 months and 83,000 since the LNP took office. You could fill Suncorp Stadium with the number of patients being added to that list every single year under the LNP. Behind those statistics are real Queenslanders: Queenslanders who are in pain, Queenslanders who are sick, Queenslanders who are getting worse. On Friday, when asked how many Queenslanders were waiting for a specialist appointment, the minister said that he could not say before going on to say, '... we're certainly not ignoring it.' It sure looks like you are ignoring it, health minister. It sure looks like that to the nearly 400,000 Queenslanders who are waiting. The LNP boasts about the elective surgery waitlist, but you cannot get on the waitlist for elective surgery if you cannot get a specialist appointment. You are stuck in the queue to get into the queue. You are stuck on the waitlist to get onto the waitlist.

How do we address the decline we have seen under the LNP over the past two years? First of all, you need staff. In his own report, this minister has identified that we will be short 46,000 workers and that in regional and remote Queensland we will have a medical shortage of 21 per cent. That is their analysis. They promised us a plan to deal with that. In February 2026, they said it would be later this year and then they said it would be in coming months. On the one-year anniversary of their promise, they said it would be soon before backflipping that afternoon and saying that they may never release it at all.

That is the problem with this Crisafulli government: they are so determined to spin, sell and gaslight Queenslanders into believing that health care is getting better when the data shows that it is only getting worse. There is a 70 per cent increase in time lost at the ramp, 83,000 more Queenslanders are waiting for an appointment, with nearly 400,000 in total, and more people are waiting longer than clinically recommended to get treatment at our EDs, yet all we get from this government is excuses. Those results belong to this government and this health minister. They have to own those outcomes. They promised they would fix ramping but it is only getting worse and Queenslanders are dying waiting for an ambulance. They are dying waiting to get into the hospital. This is a damning indictment on the Premier, the Deputy Premier and their priorities.

In fact, at the weekend, when three or maybe four patients died waiting for an ambulance, the Deputy Premier was busy doing a deal for his big business mates. He embarked on a fire sale of government owned land and then told taxpayers that they would have to foot the $600 million bill for the privilege. That is for an arena that the Deputy Premier said would be free but that now costs $600 million plus the cost to demolish the Gabba plus the value of the Gabba land. There is no question that Brisbane needs a new arena, but this deal looks very good for the developer. Imagine the number of patients that could be treated with that money. Imagine the number of beds that could be built with that money. Imagine the number of beds that could be built with the profits that that developer will see from the 4,000 luxury apartments they will build on land gifted to them by the government.

Then there is the LNP's broken promise project: the new stadium they promised they would never build in the same precinct that Queenslanders were to get a dedicated cancer hospital. It really puts into perspective their priorities. They cut a dedicated world-class cancer centre to support

Queenslanders through the toughest battle of their lives. They put profits before patients. They put their mates ahead of working Queenslanders. They are more interested in building stadiums than hospital beds. Those are the priorities of this Crisafulli LNP government.

Leader of the Opposition

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.10 pm): I come into the chamber to listen to matters of public interest because for the past few parliamentary sittings that have gone by I thought I would come in here to wait for a valedictory speech from the opposition leader. We know it is coming, and those opposite want it to come. If does not happen today, there is only one more sitting week left between now and the end of the year, so I suspect the time is up for the opposition leader. That is when he will deliver his valedictory: it will be his last 10-minute speech in the last sitting week in December. I think he has just proven why his own team members are leaking against him—as at this morning, leaking to the *Courier-Mail*—and why he is not up to the job: his scare campaigns, his blame games.

Let me take one of the points he just raised about the arena. He was happy for the federal government to spend $2.4 billion of taxpayers' money on an arena but not for a state government to spend $600 million. He was okay for $2.4 billion to be spent. When he was the deputy premier he was going to spend $2.7 billion demolishing the Gabba. Then when he was the premier he was going to spend $2.25 billion on temporary seating at QSAC. He wants to lecture people about financial responsibility and respecting taxpayers' money when he was going to spend $2.25 billion on bump-in, bump-out seating at QSAC! It was an embarrassment. When he became premier everyone around the world looked at his plan and said, 'This is guy is not up to it.'

That is why Queenslanders overwhelmingly rejected him. That is why his own party members are overwhelmingly rejecting him. That is why it is hard to get members in front of a camera supporting him. When I left question time today, I stood out on the balcony here and I watched a heap of Labor members scurry down the staircase so as not to be clipped by the *Courier-Mail* journo out on the level 5 balcony. About 25 to 30 minutes later he had the courage to stand with the member for Waterford and the member for Woodridge, and they put on this big brave act—the three of them—like they were this unified team. There is no unity in the Labor Party. They are all over the place.

Can I address the elephant in the room? It is the Labor leadership. It is the Labor leadership that he does not want to talk about but all his colleagues do. They talk to us in the café. They are telling the journos. We can read about it. Everyone is talking about it but the member for Murrumba. Everyone is talking about his leadership but himself. I suspect his colleagues are talking about his lack of Labor leadership and the fact that, if you look at what they have said about him—a frontbencher said, 'We're just bouncing around and sleepwalking to defeat in 2028.' Another senior Labor Party figure said, 'He's a dead man walking.' Another frontbencher said, 'It's reaching the point where we're all asking, "Do we want to go into 2027 and 2028 like this under his leadership?"' Another stated—

> Privately there are people talking, there are whispers. We can't keep going with that (30 per cent vote), that's bad. Certain people have to come to that realisation.

Honourable opposition leader, in all of those quotes from your members over there, they are asking you to please heed that advice. They are asking you to resign because they do not want you to lead the Labor Party anymore because you did not do it very well when you were the premier and you ain't doing it very well as opposition leader.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order, members on my left!

Mr BLEIJIE: I can only but agree with the commentary that his own members are leaking against the Leader of the Opposition. Then, of course, we had the extraordinary apology where he said—

> I'm taking responsibility (and) I'm saying I should have acted sooner.
>
> …
>
> and for not acting sooner, I apologise.
>
> …
>
> It's clear … that our door was left too far open, and that the CFMEU and some contractors misused that policy.

Well, that is what everyone was saying at the time when he was the premier and he did not act on it. He could have stopped BPIC. We suspended BPIC within a matter of months of forming government—like that! I announced it at a Major Contractors Association conference. We suspended it like that—no fanfare, just suspended it. He could have done it. He could have done it when he was the premier. The former treasurer could have done it. The former industrial relations minister could have done it. Look what we have seen in the commission of inquiry interim report. They have talked about eight million documents, 50 days of hearings, countless witnesses telling everyone how the Labor Party was owned lock, stock and barrel by the CFMEU.

Well, there is a change coming. I would say the opposition leadership is as stuffed as a turducken at Christmas. That is what his Labor Party members are saying—not even a Christmas turkey but a turducken. It is that stuffed. It is three times stuffed, as a turducken is. Time is up for the opposition leader. Time is up!

(Time expired)

Health System

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): Queensland's health system is at breaking point. Our health workers and our paramedics are being pushed to the limit and Queensland patients are paying the price. The Premier promised he would heal the health crisis. Remember that, honourable members? He talked about 'real-time data' and 'putting doctors and nurses back in charge'—that would make all the difference. LNP slogans then and LNP slogans now have made absolutely no difference to Queensland.

Just last week the LNP health minister was out bragging about the LNP's ramping data, data that showed ambulance ramping was higher than when the Crisafulli LNP government took office. When patients are waiting for an ambulance or stuck on the ramp waiting to get into a public hospital, this LNP health minister and this LNP government remain more interested in how things look than how things are.

Last night *9News* reported the tragic loss of a Thornlands man who passed away while waiting 18 hours for an ambulance that never arrived. His wife, now a widow, called triple 0 repeatedly, desperately seeking help, until it was too late. Sadly, this gentleman's family are not the only ones facing heartbreak because of the failures of this LNP government. Media reports have also revealed that four Queenslanders passed away over the weekend, including a man from my community of Logan—each loss leaving a family grieving and desperately searching for answers.

We know our paramedics are doing the very best job they can. Incidents like these are heartbreaking for them—the men and women who dedicate their lives to saving lives. But they are increasingly under pressure. Across the top 26 hospitals in Queensland, ambulance ramping is now higher than it was in October 2024. In fact, lost minutes have increased dramatically since the LNP government took office. For September, average lost minutes were the highest they had been under the LNP—lost minutes that tell a story of patients stuck waiting longer in the back of an ambulance, ambulances that should be out in the community responding to calls for help. Can you imagine the anguish of paramedics on the ramp, hearing those code 1 calls and not able to respond? Of course, this health minister and this LNP government refuses to be up-front.

More than a year after the workforce gap analysis was released, the health minister refuses to deliver the workforce plan for the health system that he promised. When asked by journalists, what did the health minister say? No! He denied being committed to a timeline at all. In the House just this morning, the health minister said, 'We don't need a work plan. We're doing the work already.' That is cold comfort for those Queensland families who are grieving the loss of a loved one because of this LNP minister's and this LNP government's catastrophic inability to manage Queensland's health system.

What a surprise it was for every Queenslander on Sunday who woke up and read that this Deputy Premier, the member for Kawana, is gifting $600 million to a consortium of private sector multinational companies for an arena in Brisbane—an arena that the people of Queensland will never own. The federal government was willing to pay for that arena. The federal government was willing to pay for that arena—lock, stock and barrel—but the member for Kawana thought that he was the smartest man in the room and thought that he knew better than everyone. Queenslanders are now paying the price, and they are going to pay $600 million for a Brisbane arena they will never own. 'Fantastic. Great move. Well done, member for Kawana!' That is what Queenslanders are saying ironically and sarcastically.

Imagine what $600 million could do, as our leader has said, for the Queensland Ambulance Service and building the hospitals that this government has delayed. Imagine the impact that would have on the lives of Queenslanders. No matter where we live—in Townsville, in Mackay, in Rockhampton, in Gladstone, in Bundaberg, in Gympie, in Logan or on the south side of Brisbane—our communities are being failed by this LNP government.

(Time expired)

Labor Party, Performance

Hon. AJ STOKER (Oodgeroo—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.20 pm): Over the weekend, Queenslanders heard an extraordinary admission from the member for Murrumba. After years of defending BPIC and the CFMEU tax, he suddenly decided to apologise. Queenslanders are entitled to ask: what exactly has changed? The Leader of the Opposition was not a bystander. He was not a backbencher. He was among the architects of these decisions. He had more power than anybody else to stop them, change them or reverse them. Instead, he has defended them to the dying days of his government and two years beyond. He appears to have done it without consulting the colleagues he is throwing under the bus at the same time—colleagues who still think it is the way to go, even though it costs Queenslanders an extra 10 to 68 per cent to build.

Now, with today's media reports suggesting his grip on power is even more precarious, Queenslanders are expected to believe that he has suddenly seen the light. Come on! This apology looks less like an act of conviction and more like a desperate act of political survival. The truth is the CFMEU tax was no accident. It was not a mistake by a few individuals; it was a product of a government and a party that believed they could ask Queenslanders to pay more while they gave less. The effect in practice is real. When BPIC blows out the quote—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Minister, pause for a moment, please. Members to my left, your contributions have been heard in near silence. I ask you to take note, please.

Mrs STOKER: When BPIC blows out the quote, projects get shelved. That means fewer roads, schools and hospitals built for Queenslanders and higher debt when they do get built. It makes the cost to build so much higher everywhere, and here we take note of the first home buyers busting to get into the market. With it, rents go up. It is inflation on steroids with all of the cream going to their mates. Meanwhile, the low productivity they have entrenched makes every worker poorer.

Despite the sudden apology, the CFMEU tax remains embedded in Labor's platform even today. Perhaps that is the reason they are so keen to hide it. If the Leader of the Opposition is handing out apologies, perhaps Queenslanders deserve some answers about some of the other failures for which they are responsible. Will he apologise for the mess that Labor left behind in Child Safety? Will he apologise to the children of Queensland who were denied the warmth of family-based care as they were stashed in resi care? Will he apologise to the thousands of vulnerable children who were failed by a system that deteriorated under Labor's watch?

Labor inherited from the LNP a quite stable childcare system, with resi-care numbers in the range of 653 to 663. In late 2015, just after the change of government, the numbers were declining, which was a testament to the good work of the then minister, Tracy Davis. When Labor left office, the number of children in residential care was set to peak at nearly—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left! Member for Bundaberg. Member for Pine Rivers.

Mrs STOKER: They do not want to hear it, but the number of children in residential care was set to peak at nearly 3,000. That number had grown exponentially, squandering the good work of the former government. Many had no clear pathway to a permanent family arrangement. Many were spending years moving through a system that had become increasingly reliant on institutional-style placements rather than stable family environments. It just went up and up under Labor, baking in a toxic trajectory.

It has shifted under this government, though. In June 2026, under then minister Camm, the number actually started to decline for the first time in over a decade. It is ongoing work. It is going to be difficult and lumpy, but we are taking it on because we know that kids do better with families. These children do not need another media statement. They do not care about an apology crafted to deflect a leadership spill. They need a government that is willing to confront the crisis and do something about

it. The former Labor government had years to act and abolish BPIC. They had years to act to fix the Child Safety system. Instead, the number of children in care just grew and grew.

Now the Leader of the Opposition wants Queenslanders to believe that, after championing waste, cosy deals and union thuggery for years, he has suddenly become a champion of accountability. Queenslanders do not believe it. While those opposite continue fighting amongst themselves and jockeying for position, this government is focused on delivering the commitments we made to Queenslanders. While Labor fights Labor, we are fighting youth crime. While Labor argues about who should be in the top job, we are working to address the mess that they left behind. Time's up for this hopeless Labor leader.

(Time expired)

Health System

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.26 pm): It is always difficult to speak after Sky After Dark segments, but I am going to give it a go.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I will ask you to refer to members by their correct titles, please, member for Greenslopes. This is your final caution.

Mr J KELLY: I do not know what the Deputy Premier was going on about then, but I think the turducken is one of the greatest innovations of Christmas lunch. I love a turducken, and I will back the Leader of the Opposition every single day of the week in this chamber and outside this chamber.

While I have had a bit of fun to start with, there is no fun in Queensland Health—I can tell you that. Things are very grim. For the second year in a row, we have a whole group of schoolies heading off to celebrate the end of school and they are not going to be safe. We know why they are not going to be safe: the LNP put ideology ahead of evidence. There will be no pill testing this year at schoolies, which means that young people at schoolies will not be safe.

I have spoken many times in this place about nitrous oxide addiction and the damage it is doing to young people. There is 24/7 home delivery. We could have a canister in this chamber before the end of this session if we wanted to. We could stop that right now. The health minister could stop that and the Premier could stop that but they choose not to. They are waiting for a TGA report which is due in February. Merry Christmas, Queensland. You will still be able to get nitrous oxide canisters delivered to your house. How is that for a government that said they were going to keep Queenslanders safe where they live?

What about gender care? We now have NHMRC guidelines, but we are choosing to ignore them. They need to stay out of the medical space. It is not where they should be.

What about palliative care? I have visited most of the community-based hospices in Queensland. Those communities are coming together, raising the funds and delivering the services with very little help. This government has walked away from the end-of-life strategy that our leader was rolling out during our time in government. I commend him for that. Palliative care services are a mess. That is why so many people support my petition.

Let's look at the election commitments. Let's look at what they said they were going to fix in relation to health. Rural maternity health—they are in here making big announcements about level 2 services in Cooktown and Biloela. The experts are not welcoming that, and the majority of mothers who cannot be birthed in those hospitals are not welcoming that.

Let's get onto ramping. I start by acknowledging all of the families who have lost loved ones due to the ramping crisis in this state. We had done the heavy lifting. We had started the virtual ED. We had the co-responder teams. We had increased services. We were on our way to building more beds. When those opposite got in to government they stopped the building and reduced the numbers, except, it seems, in Prince Charles Hospital. I acknowledge the member for Stafford and the tremendous campaign he ran. It was supposedly a scare campaign. It was such a scare campaign that we now have 104 beds, not 93.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr J KELLY: That is right. What about the workforce issues we are facing here? How many times have we been told that we would have a workforce plan in place by now, yet we cannot seem to get that plan out the door. One of the top issues in Queensland Health and health care across this state is how we are going to staff our hospitals and health services moving forward. When I do a shift at the Mater Hospital I am starting to look more and more like the average. It is an aging workforce. It is a

workforce of people who are sticking in there because they have to because we are just not bringing in the young people that we need to bring in. The only way we are going to do that is by putting together a plan and rolling that plan out. That is why when you pick up today's *Courier-Mail* you will read about the AMA saying that 25 per cent of doctors—one in four—are ready to walk out the door because things have become so bad.

What about the 83,000 new patients on the specialist appointment waitlist? There is a woman in my electorate who is waiting for a prolapse repair. She went from being a healthy, active and engaged 85-year-old in her community to someone now who is housebound due to incontinence. She will not leave the house. She was waiting for two years and now she has been told it is possibly another three years. This is disgraceful! Every time someone is on a ramp and at risk of dying, every time someone is waiting for an appointment and every time they are in a town without maternity services it is because of the leadership of the LNP—the Premier and the health minister. This is why Queenslanders are not getting the health care they need.

(Time expired)

Springfield Central State High School

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (2.31 pm): We have heard a lot over the last few days and the last few months about BPIC—the CFMEU tax which increased costs on government-funded construction projects. One of the most remarkable contributions on last night's news was from the member for Springwood, who said with a straight face, 'The policy was not robust enough to prevent misuse and weaponising of them by bad actors.' I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that he is the bad actor. He should be nominated for the Oscars. We know that the member for Springwood had his hands all over the BPIC policies, yet he was trying to say that bad actors rendered them ineffective for Queenslanders.

Our students, teachers and communities did not escape the consequences of BPIC CFMEU tax. I will give the House an example, because it came to mind this morning when we heard from the health minister and others about the increased costs we have across government. The story that came to mind was one I remembered from when we came into government and I became the minister: Springfield Central State High School.

After the election Bob Sharpless, Maha Sinnathamby and Jim Varghese came to see me and tell me all about Springfield. I am always aware of Springfield, one of our fastest growing communities. They expected classrooms, learning spaces and facilities that would support the next generation of young Queenslanders. They had every reason to expect it because the former Labor government had announced it. In the 2021-22 state budget the Department of Education received an allocation of almost $136 million to deliver two stages of the new senior campus at Springfield Central State High School, but it became another example of how BPIC requirements drove up costs, reduced productivity and delayed the delivery of vital public infrastructure.

In June 2022 the Department of Education withdrew the tender for stage 1 of the new senior campus for Springfield Central State High School following receipt of higher than anticipated tender prices that exceeded the $100 million BPIC threshold. The consequences were immediate and dramatic. A revised cost estimate was completed that incorporated the application of BPIC. I want the chamber and those who will read this later to look at these numbers. The revised estimate placed the total project cost at $225.3 million, consisting of $173 million for stage 1 and $52.3 million for stage 2—almost 70 per cent, or $90 million, more than the original budget allocation.

Think about that for a moment, Mr Deputy Speaker. It did not create more classrooms. It did not educate more students. It did not provide additional teachers. It did not provide better learning outcomes. Instead, it represented money that could no longer be directed towards the education infrastructure Queensland communities desperately needed. Projects had to be redesigned, delayed, rescoped or reconsidered. Across the state I constantly have state school principals talking to me about how they would like new schools, upgraded facilities or additional educational supports. It is young Queenslanders who have missed out. We heard from the CFMEU commission of inquiry that the cost of government-funded construction projects increased by at least 20 per cent, but I have given you the example of Springfield Central State School where there was an extraordinary 70 per cent increase. Those consequences are particularly serious for education. It means there are fewer classrooms delivered, fewer learning spaces built, fewer opportunities to address enrolment growth, and fewer resources available to support teachers and school staff.

That is why we have acted decisively. We have implemented the new Queensland Construction Productivity Code and established independent compliance oversight to restore accountability, productivity and value for money across government-funded construction projects. Queenslanders deserve infrastructure that is delivered safely, lawfully, efficiently and at the best value for taxpayers. They deserve schools that arrive when communities need them—not years later because of costs that have spiralled out of control because of the deliberate policies of those opposite. We heard about dire straits this morning. What Labor did through BPIC was get money for nothing for their union mates. Queenslanders deserve a construction system that rewards productivity, innovation and accountability.

Industry leaders have welcomed these reforms. Major contractors, civil contractors, electricians and the Property Council have all supported a more productive framework that delivers better outcomes for Queenslanders. The person who needs to answer for this is the opposition leader. People know that I love to quote Shakespeare, so here it is from *Henry IV, Part 2,* 'Uneasy lies the head that wears the Crown.' Time is up!

Health System

Ms ASIF (Sandgate—ALP) (2.36 pm): When will this government and the health minister start prioritising the health of Queenslanders? Our health system is at absolute breaking point. You should be able to access health care when you need it. When a loved one or yourself is feeling unwell and calls an ambulance, there is an expectation it will arrive. Unfortunately, over the weekend that was not afforded to at least four people. There have been media reports that at least four people have tragically lost their lives while waiting for an ambulance, and just weeks ago we heard of an Annerley man who lost his life while waiting for paramedics. I would like to acknowledge the families and the loved ones of the people who have lost their lives. While the minister will not take any responsibility or accountability, I would like to apologise for the fact that our health system has failed them. It has failed to provide them with the vital health support they needed. I am sorry, and I promise that we will keep fighting for answers to make sure this stops happening or to prevent this from happening again.

Queenslanders deserve transparency when it comes to what is happening with our health system and what the government is doing to tackle this health crisis. Recently I heard from a constituent, Ann, who told me that she called an ambulance but waited over 10 hours before one was made available to her. She was left waiting in agonising pain and in desperate need of medical assistance. Dwayne, who runs a small business in Deagon, was diagnosed with cataracts and placed on a surgery waitlist at the Prince Charles Hospital. While he waited his condition deteriorated so rapidly that he was not able to do basic tasks, drive or do anything at all. Dwayne repeatedly contacted Queensland Health to try to get looked at, explaining to them how bad the situation had become. Unfortunately, he was not able to get anything done. He considered remortgaging his house so he could afford to have the surgery performed privately. Out of sheer desperation he contacted my office. We have been in conversation with him trying to get him the support he needs.

All of this is occurring while the government claims that there is no health crisis and things are going well. People are in desperate need of health care and they are not getting it under this government. I am hearing concerns every single day from paramedics and health workers in my community who are asking for support and funding from the government. We need more to tackle the issues they are facing. All of this is happening while they are working double shifts and overtime to make sure they can get to the people who need them most. They are trying and they are desperate for support. It is not their fault; they are doing their best. Unfortunately, there are not enough resources available to make this happen.

The minister refuses to release the long overdue workforce plan. I am not sure what the minister is hiding exactly. Our public hospitals are set to privatise services that are being provided in them. The Mater, which provides public services, is going to make 430 workers redundant but we desperately need those workers in our healthcare system. This will lead to more delays when it comes to testing and caring for Queensland patients. It will affect people who need cancer treatment and blood tests to make sure their treatment is being delivered in a timely manner.

Some of the health workers who are affected by this were here today. They came to see the health minister but, unfortunately, the minister did not think it was appropriate for him to even say a hello to them or acknowledge the hard work they do providing care for sick Queenslanders. I am not sure how the minister thinks he can continue to not act when health care is in such bad shape in Queensland. It is time for the minister to step up, take responsibility and accountability, and fix the health crisis that is happening under his watch. These workers desperately need the minister to do something. There is over $821 million of public funding so that public hospitals can provide a service.

I am not sure how the minister could come into the chamber today and say that it is not his responsibility. It is his responsibility because the government runs public hospitals and his department provides funding to these public hospitals to do this very job. It is your responsibility, Minister. It is time he takes responsibility and does his job appropriately because people are literally losing their lives while waiting for an ambulance under his watch. There are workers under so much pressure but they cannot afford to take on another shift because they have to look after their kids at home. They are already working overtime and double shifts and there is only so much they can do. They are at breaking point. Our health workers are considering leaving the health industry because there is so much pressure on them right now. I call on the minister to release the plan and do his job.

Leader of the Opposition

Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (2.41 pm): I rise on a question that Queenslanders are entitled to ask: that is, who is actually leading the Labor Party? Last Thursday the Leader of the Opposition apologised for BPIC. He did not volunteer it; journalists had to press him repeatedly on it. When he finally got there, he said that he 'could have and should have acted sooner'. On that, the whole House agrees. It was an ersatz apology, offered only when his own job was on the line.

Consider what that apology was for and what it meant in my community. The commission of inquiry into the CFMEU examined the Gold Coast Light Rail stage 3. It found that Labor's policy, the former premier's policy, added up to a blowout of $468 million—for just that one project—and as much as 67 per cent. Labor called it Best Practice Industry Conditions. As long as they are here in this chamber rewriting history, let's rewrite the acronym. Queenslanders know what BPIC actually stands for; it stands for 'Botched Policy for Increasing Costs'.

Economists, though, call it out in a different way. They measure opportunity costs. It is not only what the former Labor government overspent; it is what Queenslanders went without. Queenslanders went without properly maintained power stations. I think about the workers in Callide who for years warned that neglected maintenance could end in an incident. Well, that generator blew up and close to half a million customers lost power and families paid again on their electricity bills. That is the legacy of BPIC and the Leader of the Opposition. Queenslanders went without hospital beds, as well as wards that never opened and shifts that were never staffed, and they went without homes. The Productivity Commission established that 77,000 fewer homes were built because of the policies of the former premier, the now Leader of the Opposition. We all know that Queensland paid more and got less.

I want to turn my attention to the Leader of the Opposition's new-found love of arithmetic. Unfortunately, it is the wrong arithmetic. When the light rail bill was climbing by hundreds of millions, he kept no tally; cost blowouts did not rate a mention. However, when the numbers in his own caucus start to move, all of a sudden he gets the calculator out. I am sure he could tell you to the very last vote who is with him and who is with the member for Waterford—or is it Woodridge, or is it Gaven? That is his record in one line. He counts his numbers but never the cost of his incompetence.

His own side has now delivered its verdict. This morning's *Courier Mail* reported that his colleagues were blindsided by the apology and that Labor sources want him gone when this House rises on 3 December. One said, 'There's no hope for him.' These are not my words or our words; they are Labor's words. The apology that was meant to save him has only made things worse. He is literally scraping the barnacles off the sinking ship of his leadership. He says that BPIC will never return under his leadership. I do not mean to frighten Queenslanders, but on current reports that guarantee expires on 3 December. The same sources also say that one thing keeps him in his job: Labor's campaign against this government's sensible industrial relations reforms. That just tells us that he is held in place not by confidence but by the calendar.

Even his own deputy would not back him the morning after the election, and two years on the member for Woodridge is still not saying. None of this should surprise us. The member for Murrumba has form. On election night, when everyone was watching at home and knew the result, he would not concede. He congratulated his own team but not the incoming Premier. A Labor elder, the late Graham Richardson, called that performance 'as graceless as it was pathetic'. The Leader of the Opposition could not accept the verdict of voters that night and he cannot bring himself to accept the verdict of his colleagues now.

Mr Smith interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Bundaberg, you are warned under standing orders.

Mr VORSTER: To make a very plain point: a party that cannot settle its own leadership cannot be trusted with the leadership of this state. Time's up for the Leader of the Opposition.

Leader of the Opposition

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.46 pm): The member for Murrumba has spent two years trying to convince Queenslanders that he has had nothing to do with the failures of the former Labor government. Queenslanders are not buying it. He was the deputy premier and then he was the premier and he sat around the cabinet table while Labor presided over a youth crime crisis, while they weakened consequences for offenders and while they entered into a sweetheart deal with the CFMEU that left Queensland taxpayers paying the price.

The member for Murrumba cannot run from his record, he cannot hide from Labor's decade of decline, and he certainly cannot pretend that he was not part of it. Under Labor, serious repeat offenders spiralled out of control, victims and their families were left traumatised, and Queenslanders were crying out for stronger laws. What did the member for Murrumba deliver? More excuses, more failures and the same weak approach to youth crime.

Those opposite are still keeping Queenslanders in the dark when it comes to their policy platform. We know what their last state policy platform said. It said it was going to raise the age of criminal responsibility and it was going to remove mandatory sentencing. Is it any wonder they are keeping their current policy platform a secret from Queenslanders? The member for Murrumba has a habit of defending Labor's disastrous policies until the political pressure becomes too much.

Nowhere is that clearer than Labor's CFMEU tax—their BPIC policy—which drove up construction costs and left Queensland taxpayers footing the bill. That money should have been delivering for Queenslanders. Instead, Queenslanders were left paying the price for Labor's cosy relationship with the CFMEU. Who was sitting around the table? The member for Murrumba. Who became the deputy premier? The member for Murrumba. Who then became the premier? The member for Murrumba. If only he was in a position to change the CFMEU tax or do something about Labor's BPIC policy!

Now he is desperate and hanging on by a thread and he comes out and apologises. After defending the BPIC, Labor's CFMEU tax, his whole premiership and deputy premiership and while he was around the cabinet table, he comes out in opposition and apologises. This is an extraordinary backflip but one that is so disingenuous it is not even funny. They are hiding their current policy platform, and why do you reckon they are hiding that? It is because we know that their last one said they were going to bring BPIC back.

They should be honest with Queenslanders and release their state party policy platform because Queenslanders deserve to know where he really stands. The member for Murrumba simply cannot wash his hands of the decisions that were made under his watch. We know that his Labor colleagues were blindsided by his apology. None of them have actually apologised for the CFMEU BPIC tax. None of them have come out and apologised.

In fact, the member for Murrumba let the cat out of the bag in the disastrous train wreck of a press conference. When he was asked by a journalist whether his Labor colleagues support him, he said, 'All of our shadow ministers support the statement I have made and you're welcome to—ah, ah. That is as much as I can say or expect of them.' He almost said, 'And you're welcome to ask them,' but then he had to eat those words because journalists cannot ask them because they do not support him—and he knows it. One Labor Party colleague said, '...after what he did last week, there's no hope for him.' No hope—that is from his own party this week! It came out his own party room on Monday. His own colleagues are saying he signed his death warrant. He is a dead man walking. They want him gone before Christmas. That is not us saying it. That is from leaks from his own front bench, his own Labor Party colleagues.

The member for Murrumba is on borrowed time. He spent years defending Labor's sweetheart deal with the CFMEU. He failed to act when Queensland needed leadership on the youth crime crisis, and now his belated apology has only exposed the divisions within his own Labor Party. He had his chance. He could have done something, but he failed to deliver. Queenslanders have already passed judgement on his record, and now his colleagues are doing the same. While Queensland families are preparing for Christmas, getting their trees ready and buying the presents, Labor is sharpening their knives for their own Christmas turkey—no, wait, turducken. Is that what the Deputy Premier called it?

It is a turducken. There's the turkey, there's the duck, there's the chicken—you're all stuffed by Christmas!

Health System

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (2.52 pm): The government can talk politics all they like; we will keep talking and advocating for patients in Queensland. Queenslanders dying before an ambulance arrives is becoming all too common under this health minister and this Crisafulli government. Last month the late Mr Bradford, formerly of Annerley, called triple 0 with chest pains. He lived only streets from the PA Hospital and waited more than two hours for an ambulance but, sadly, was found deceased when paramedics finally arrived. Last night *9News* reported that a 77-year-old man in Thornlands died after waiting 18 hours for an ambulance—18 agonising hours for him and his family. His wife called triple 0 at midday on Friday. The call was classified an urgent 2A response but no ambulance arrived. Ten hours later, at 10 pm, he called again—still no ambulance. His wife called again at 1 am and again at 4 am—still no ambulance. At 6.11 am she received a call back from the Ambulance Service and sadly found her husband dead on his walker.

What happened then? After 18 hours, once he had been found deceased, paramedics arrived within six minutes. Something is desperately wrong there. *9News* reported that a police officer involved in the case said this was 'at least the third sudden death in Redlands where QAS had been significantly delayed in attending'. I repeat: it was the third sudden death in Redlands. Why is there silence from the members for Redlands and Oodgeroo, a minister and an assistant minister? Have they demanded an explanation from the health minister for these totally unacceptable delays and tragedies in the Redlands? All I hear from them is silence—a deafening silence.

What is Premier Crisafulli doing while the number of these deaths escalates? Premier Crisafulli has been congratulating himself on ramping when in fact ramping is up significantly under his LNP government. Let's look at the government's own figures. In Queensland's top 26 hospitals ramping was 38.4 per cent at the last election. In September this year it was up to 41.8 per cent. Proportionally, that is a ramping increase of nearly nine per cent, yet the Premier and the health minister keep congratulating themselves with cherrypicked political spin figures by comparing recent figures with those from last year's disastrous flu season, which they botched and mismanaged because of a failed vaccination program.

At Cairns Hospital ramping has soared from 26 per cent to 48 per cent since the LNP were elected—nearly doubling—with almost half of ambulance patients waiting longer than 30 minutes to be transferred into the ED. There has been not a word from the members for Barron River and Mulgrave. As their constituents are suffering from an enormous decline in emergency department performances they are silent. At Mackay Hospital ramping has risen from 37 per cent to 48 per cent, and the number of patients overdue for planned surgery surged from 215 to 565—a 163 per cent increase at Mackay Hospital. Once again the member for Mackay is mute on the specialist waitlist crisis while his government delays the Mackay Hospital expansion for years.

At Rockhampton Hospital ramping has risen from 33.9 per cent to 46.9 per cent—a nearly 50 per cent increase. The specialist outpatient list has blown out from 10,623 to 18,326—a staggering 72.5 per cent increase. The members for Rockhampton and Keppel should be raising hell with the minister. Instead, they prop him up while we are seeing patients propped up in ambulances waiting for care. We see the same story at Redcliffe. The specialist waiting list there is up 1,874 patients since the election of this government. Again, we see a mute member for Redcliffe doing nothing about it. In Townsville we see ramping is rampant. We also see the expansion delayed and their commitment to 2,200 beds by 2028 dumped by this government.

Health is in crisis in Queensland after two years and two budgets of Premier Crisafulli and his arrogant and out-of-touch health minister, Nicholls. Hospital expansions have been delayed for years, ramping is rampant and worse than under Labor; the Queensland cancer centre has been dumped; there is a specialist waitlist crisis which the minister will not say a word about; and he promised a health workforce plan by midyear, but he cannot get support in cabinet because he is a weak minister who cannot get support for something that is crucial to solving the crisis. While we have billions in public funds invested in four new stadiums, when no new stadiums were promised by the LNP, it is distressed patients suffering in ramped ambulances who are paying the price. It is triple 0 callers who are literally dying before help arrives 18 hours later who are paying the price for those stadiums.

The LNP can talk politics. We will keep talking about patients and we will keep doing it all the way to hold this government to account for their absolute incompetence on the health front.

Health System

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (2.57 pm): Of course, we have had many members on this side of the House today talk about the state of the health system and the appalling reports that emerged of four Queenslanders who tragically lost their lives whilst waiting for an ambulance to turn up. One was a man in Thornlands who waited 18 hours. That is a long time. His wife waited 18 hours. Imagine your wife or your husband being that unwell that you called an ambulance and you waited for 18 hours. Imagine the panic, the fear and the anxiety for 18 hours—18 hours until an ambulance arrived. It was not until she rang to say that he had died that the ambulance then turned up within six minutes. Imagine how awful the paramedics must feel, knowing how busy they are, knowing how hard they are working but knowing they do not have the resources they need to get to Queenslanders who call triple 0. I do not think it is too much to ask that, when Queenslanders pick up the phone and call triple 0, an ambulance arrives.

A man in Logan Reserve, in my own community, waited 4½ hours with chest pain and passed away before the ambulance got there. We have heard about a man in Townsville. This is too many Queenslanders losing their lives waiting for an ambulance. I do want to acknowledge that I remember the case of Wayne Irving. I remember that he was ramped at the hospital and he passed away. I remember his name. I remember talking to his family multiple times—sitting down with them and hearing from them firsthand about their anxiety, their frustration and their anger at the system that let down their dad. I think as the health minister the most important thing you can do to improve the system, to ensure that when tragedies like this happen they do not happen again, is to hear firsthand from the people who are impacted by the system, who have lost a loved one.

Why is this health minister too busy or too important to sit down with people who have lost a loved one? I tell you what: that is the motivation that you need to make sure it never happens again—having to sit with people who have lost their father, their mother, their grandparents, their wife, their husband, their children. Sitting down with them and hearing from them is the best thing you can do as health minister. It is the most important thing you can do as health minister, and that is what this health minister is refusing to do. Why can't these families be heard by this health minister to make this system better? Let's be clear: this system has gotten a lot worse under this LNP government, which promised to fix it. It has had two years, yet it has gotten worse on almost every measure. The worst ambulance ramping in the history of Queensland has happened under those opposite. We have had four people in a weekend lose their lives waiting for an ambulance. This is the state of the health system in crisis, and what does this Premier have to say? He says that the ramping figures are the best they have ever been. We now have a Premier so focused on the spin that he is gaslighting families who have lost a loved one. Take responsibility. We all know that the system is under pressure. I must have stood in here almost every day talking about a system under pressure, but I always took responsibility and I always met with families. That is what this health minister is refusing to do.

The Leader of the Opposition has also talked about the huge blowout that we have seen on our surgery waitlists and our specialist waitlists. I think about those poor people who are waiting to see a specialist to know whether or not they have a very serious condition and they need urgent surgery. They will not know because they cannot get in to see a specialist. There are thousands and thousands more Queenslanders not knowing and living with that uncertainty. I am sure everyone in this House has had a loved one who has had an appointment with a GP and they have said, 'We really need to get you in to see a specialist.' They are living with that anxiety and fear but unable to get to see the specialist to know what help they need. That is what is happening under this health minister and this Premier, and it is not good enough and it is time they took responsibility.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Tourism Industry

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (3.01 pm): There are tourism operators across regional Queensland who get up every morning, open their doors, employ Queenslanders and work hard to build their businesses. They do not ask for much. They want confidence to invest, certainty to employ and the opportunity to get ahead, and the last thing they need is uncertainty coming out of Canberra, but that is exactly what they have been dealing with as a result of the federal government's proposed changes to the working holiday-maker visa program.

Working holiday-makers are an important part of our cities, our towns and, importantly, of regional Queensland. They work in our hotels, restaurants, cafes, on our farms and in our tourism attractions. When they are not working, they are travelling. They are spending money in local businesses, staying in regional communities and experiencing everything that makes Queensland the home of the holiday. They are workers and they are visitors, and regional Queensland particularly benefits from both. That is why the uncertainty surrounding federal Labor's proposed changes has mattered so much. Tourism operators have been raising concerns about their ability to attract and retain workers and travellers have been left questioning whether Australia is the right destination for their working holiday. Regional Queenslanders should not have to fight Canberra just to get common sense, but we have seen this approach before. We saw it with disaster recovery funding, we saw it with fuel security, and now we are seeing it with working holiday-maker visas.

Today we have seen the federal Labor government make significant changes to its original working holiday-maker visa proposal—and we welcome that—but this is becoming a familiar pattern from the federal Labor government. It does not look before it leaps and, by the time it backflips, confidence has already been undermined and businesses are left dealing with the uncertainty. When Queensland's tourism industry raised concerns about the proposed changes, our Premier and our government listened. We stood alongside them and took their concerns directly to Canberra, because these are the people who invest in our regions, employ Queenslanders and keep local economies moving. They know what their businesses need and they deserve a government that backs them when their livelihoods are on the line.

Today the federal government has now proposed increasing third-year visa places from 5,000 to 25,000. That is a significant improvement. We also welcome transitional arrangements for eligible travellers and the increase to the second-year visa from 88 days to 120 days in regional Australia. However, let us be clear: a change in announcement does not automatically restore confidence. That takes certainty, it takes practical arrangements that businesses and workers can rely on and it takes a federal government that understands the consequences of its decisions for regional Australia and regional Queensland. I thank the Queensland Tourism Industry Council, particularly CEO Tash Wheeler, the regional tourism organisations and the operators right across the state who stood up and made their voices heard. Their advocacy has delivered a better outcome, but there is still work to do.

As the old saying goes, the devil is in the detail. Unfortunately, Canberra has already done a lot of damage and other destinations are competing for those travellers. We need to see the detail and, more importantly, we need to see these changes translate into people arriving, working and travelling across regional Queensland.

To anyone already here on a working holiday visa or thinking about coming to Australia, Queensland welcomes you. We are the home of the holiday. We have the experiences, the people, the lifestyle and the opportunities. We want you here, working in our businesses and experiencing everything our great state has to offer. We will not judge Canberra by its announcement; we will judge these changes by whether regional Queenslanders get the workers, the certainty and the opportunities they deserve.

LIQUOR AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (3.06 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Gaming Machine Act 1991, the Gaming Machine Regulation 2002, the Keno Act 1996, the Liquor Act 1992, the Lotteries Act 1997, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, the Wagering Act 1998 and the Wine Industry Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026.

Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.

I am pleased to introduce the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The road to delivering the best Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032 draws strength from a world-class city with a thriving night-life and entertainment economy. We have been listening to the owners of our pubs, clubs and small licensed venues and what we have heard repeatedly is that Labor let them down by increasing regulation and making it harder for them to do business here. That is why the Crisafulli

government is acting now, injecting businesses and communities with confidence that will accelerate the evolution of Queensland's night-life and entertainment assets. After Labor's decade of decline, there were too many pubs and clubs struggling to survive. The Crisafulli government is backing them in as we prepare to welcome the world in 2032 by activating local night-life precincts and supporting local artists, festivals and cultural experiences while ensuring safer nights out for everyone and strengthening long-term industry collaboration and stewardship.

The games present a once-in-a-generation opportunity for global focus and visitation and for the state's hospitality and tourism industry to shine. Beyond 2032, the legacy of a vibrant, sustainable, resilient and truly international night-life and entertainment sector is limitless, but the groundwork must be laid now by making it easier for pubs and clubs across Queensland to operate with more flexibility and less red tape without compromising safe and responsible service or safe and inclusive venues and precincts. Last year I held a meeting with key representatives of Queensland's licensed hospitality sector including the Queensland Hotels Association, Clubs Queensland, Australian Venue Co., Endeavour Group, Independent Brewers Association, Retail Drinks Australia, Queensland Distillers' Association and the Night-Life Economy Commissioner. During that meeting I heard that the former Labor government had failed to listen and respond to issues impacting licences, including: outdated extended trading laws; archaic restrictions on external advertising; and a failure to support the live music industry.

The Crisafulli government has already made changes in response to several matters raised during this meeting including but not limited to: introduced measures to make venues safer by allowing operators to leave the doors of empty gaming machines open after gaming ends for the day; removing cheques as the default for certain gaming machine payments, aligning with the broader phase-out of cheques in Australia's payment system; and progressing a regulatory change to authorise the use of facial recognition technology at licensed liquor and gaming venues for particular harm minimisation purposes, providing clarity for licensees. OLGR is limiting onsite desktop compliance checks during peak hours, updating training and guideline materials to better support licensees and streamlining licensing processes to improve efficiency.

When we came to government, we discovered that a number of commissioner guidelines were outdated, to the detriment of the sector. We are ensuring the Commissioner for Liquor and Gaming is reviewing the guidelines and making changes to bring them into the 21st century. Similar feedback was also provided to Queensland's Night-Life Economy Commissioner, JC Collins—to whom I have to give a quick shout-out: thank you, JC, for bringing Powderfinger back—who included recommendations to address these issues in his report, *Moonside: the Queensland Night-Life Economy Commissioner's report 2026*. I do thank JC, the commissioner, for his work to deliver the Moonside report, and all the stakeholders who have provided feedback on opportunities to reduce red tape for licensed venues and support a vibrant night-life economy for Queensland after a decade of decline.

The Queensland Nightlife Economy Action Plan 2026-2032 is the Crisafulli government's response to that report. I sincerely thank the member for Bonney, the Hon. Sam O'Connor, for his work leading our government's response. Our plan outlines the government's vision for vibrant, safe and uniquely Queensland night-life experiences ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Since the action plan was released I have met with many people, including members of the Cairns Suburban Liquor Accord with the member for Barron River—and I thank her very much for that engagement with her local community; and the member for Keppel at the Capricorn Coast Liquor Accord in Yeppoon. The member for Keppel and I had a very fruitful meeting which included the local police. It was excellent. Through all of those stakeholder meetings we have constantly heard how welcomed these reforms are not only by the liquor accords but also by local communities and industry stakeholders. These meetings including local licensees, police and representatives of the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation demonstrate how communities can work together to support a safe and vibrant nightlife in their local areas. I have to give a shout-out to the member for Keppel. I heard up there that he rarely misses one of those meetings—it is really good that he is so invested. He only misses them if he is down here at parliament which apparently happens quite often.

These communities have been waiting for a government to listen and respond to the issues that are impacting their industry, which is exactly what we are doing through this bill. Specifically, this bill delivers three key actions from the action plan, including: establishing a new framework for government to declare automatic extended trading for licensed venues to support events of local, regional or national significance; modernising the outdated extended trading hour permit framework; and allowing external advertising of prices and discounts for responsible, on-premises liquor consumption.

The bill also introduces various red-tape reduction reforms to respond to issues directly raised by the industry. These changes are important and are designed to support our local pubs, clubs and small licensed venues to open and trade when events and opportunities arise in their communities right across Queensland. It comes as our government continues to work to install Queensland as the events capital of Australia. I note that my ministerial colleague the member for Glass House already thinks we are the events capital—he is working on it very hard. We can say that because there has been a $2.7 billion events boom since the Crisafulli government took the benches—

Mr McDonald: Just getting started.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—and we are just getting started. Over two years, Queensland has welcomed new events including the exclusive Queensland Football Series; Australia versus Brazil; the Royal Edinburgh Military Tattoo; the Wallabies and British & Irish Lions Test match; and the World Surf League Championship Tour, which I know the member for Currumbin was very excited about.

While those opposite planned to slash tourism funding by 95 per cent, the Crisafulli government, backed by Destination 2045 and a record $1 billion tourism investment, has secured and supported more than 360 events, attracted more than 1.2 million visitors and generated more than 9.7 million visitor nights from the reef to the outback, the beaches, cities, towns and regions including Somerset and the South Burnett. The events pipeline includes the Pacific Airshow, Supercars in Townsville, the AACTA Awards, Savannah in the Round, the NRL Magic Round locked in until 2032 and Queensland confirmed—this is really exciting—as Australia's home of the first ever Anzac Day Bledisloe Cup matches in 2027, 2029 and 2031.

The bill I present today, the detail of which I now turn to, builds on this momentum, opening the way for more Queenslanders and visitors to participate in our buzzing night-life economy with more flexible trading arrangements right across our much loved pubs and clubs. First, the bill establishes a new declared significant public event framework, providing government with a practical and flexible mechanism to support events of local, state and national significance through temporary extended liquor trading hours, following consultation with key stakeholders.

This reform builds on the resounding success of the Crisafulli government's extended trading hours trial for the Socceroos' World Cup qualifier against Egypt earlier this year, which enabled hundreds of licensed venues across Queensland to open and bring communities together to celebrate and support the national team in a safe and responsible environment. It was so successful. The police said it was a success, pubs said it was a success and clubs said it was a success. To all of those boys and girls who watched the sun come up while watching the Socceroos on the big screen—I was having a coffee; it was just such a lovely morning. My husband was drinking Guinness along with some of my colleagues including—I am going to put her in it!—the member for Currumbin. The new framework will create opportunities for Queensland businesses, tourism operators, pubs and clubs and hospitality venues to maximise the economic and social benefits that significant events bring to local communities.

Importantly, it will allow the government to tailor extended trading hours to the needs of specific events including major sporting fixtures, cultural celebrations, festivals and other occasions that attract visitors and generate economic activity. Depending on the nature of the event, extended trading arrangements can apply in targeted local areas to support regional events from across the state for events of broader significance. The power also allows extended trading hours to apply not only on the day of the event but also on the days immediately before and after, where appropriate. This will help Queensland capture the full economic and tourism benefits associated with major events and encourage visitors to stay longer in local communities. The bill also allows trading hours to be declared for early morning events, including for international televised events or sporting fixtures involving Australian athletes, such as the Los Angeles 2028 Olympic and Paralympic Games and the French Alps 2030 Olympic and Paralympic Winter Games.

While these reforms support economic growth and community participation, public safety remains paramount. Requirements under the Liquor Act, licence conditions and responsible service of alcohol obligations will apply, including ID scanning requirements where applicable. The bill also enables event-specific licence conditions to be imposed where necessary and requires consultation with the Police Commissioner when considering declarations, ensuring community safety and operational requirements remain at the forefront of decision-making. Importantly, the extended trading opportunities available under this framework are in addition to the six late-night extended hours permits available to licensees each year, ensuring venues retain flexibility to respond to both significant public events and their own business needs.

Second, the bill modernises Queensland's extended hours trading permit framework by providing greater flexibility for licensed venues to use their existing permits when it best supports their businesses and local communities. Under the current arrangements, venues must meet restrictive 'special occasion' criteria when applying for late-night trading permits. They are also generally prevented from obtaining permits for consecutive days or for more than one day in a calendar month unless those permits relate to the same event. These outdated restrictions can limit a venue's ability to respond to changing local demand and can force businesses to choose between supporting different events that happen to be close together. The bill removes the requirement for licensees to demonstrate that a permit is linked to a special occasion and allows them to apply for multiple permits in a month where it makes sense for their business and community. For Queensland businesses, this means greater certainty, less administrative burden and more flexibility to respond to opportunities, support local events and welcome more patrons through their doors. It also means venues will no longer be placed in the difficult position, as I have said, of having to choose between seeking extended trading for different events occurring on consecutive days or within the same month.

For Queenslanders, these changes will help ensure local venues can better support community celebrations, sporting events, festivals and other occasions that bring people together, while contributing to vibrant local economies and supporting jobs across the hospitality sector. Importantly, the bill maintains existing harm minimisation safeguards by retaining limits on the number of permits that can be granted each year. This reform strikes the right balance between reducing unnecessary red tape, supporting local businesses to grow and prosper and ensuring Queenslanders can continue to enjoy safe and vibrant hospitality and entertainment precincts.

Third, the bill will remove the ban on external advertising of on-premises liquor prices and promotions. This commonsense change will give Queensland hospitality businesses greater flexibility to promote their offerings, helping venues attract customers, boost trade and support local jobs. For Queenslanders, it means more transparency and choice. Whether it is a happy hour, meal deal or special promotion, people will be able to easily see what is on offer and make informed decisions about where they choose to spend their hard-earned money. Importantly, this reform does not weaken Queensland's responsible service of alcohol laws. Unacceptable advertising practices and promotions, including those that encourage excessive or rapid consumption of liquor, will remain prohibited. This change is about reducing unnecessary restrictions while maintaining strong safeguards, supporting local businesses to grow and giving Queenslanders greater access to information and value when enjoying a meal or drink with family and friends.

The bill will also implement various liquor and gaming red tape reduction measures as part of the Crisafulli government's focus on reducing red tape for small business and helping Queensland hotels and clubs—and their communities—to prosper. The bill will allow non-contiguous office and warehouse premises under an artisan producer licence. This means an artisan producer licence holder would be allowed to have separate office and warehouse facilities under one licence for wholesaling purposes aligning with existing legislative provisions applicable to producer/wholesaler licensees who undertake similar wholesaling activities as artisan producers.

The bill will increase the duration of the licensee course certificate to align with the validity period for an approved manager qualification. Making both qualifications valid for five years reduces the regulatory burden for licensees and approved managers. The bill will also provide greater flexibility in approved manager requirements by increasing allowable travel time away from a premises from one to two hours provided they remain contactable. The amendment will make it easier to staff venues and manage workforce shortages and better cater for regional environments. As well, the bill will allow certain on-premises documents to be stored digitally, such as licence documents and training certificates, rather than requiring hard copy documents to be kept on the premises.

Mr Watts: It's a nightmare!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection. It is a nightmare. The changes will provide clarity—the member for Toowoomba North knows all about that—cut red tape and modernise record keeping. In addition, the bill will remove direct and/or mandatory cheque references from the keno framework, while ensuring cheques can still be used via existing chief executive approval processes, where required; remove mandatory fingerprint and photograph requirements for keno, lotteries and wagering employee licence applications; remove the requirement for licensees to keep a register of gaming machines—noting the Office of Liquor and Gaming Regulation can access the information on the register by other means such as electronically; and replace the requirement for the chief executive to approve the format and wording of keno and wagering agency agreements with a simple notification of changes.

Unlike those opposite, the Crisafulli government recognises that strong and safe nightlife economies make thriving communities. Our government is committed to supporting the state's hospitality, tourism and liquor industries by slashing red tape and allowing them to get on with serving their communities. After Labor's decade of decline, the state of Queensland is open for business. We are getting on with the job of positioning Queensland as the events capital of Australia, with a night-time economy for now, the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games and generations to come. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (3.27 pm): 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 Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee.

JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 3704, on motion of Mrs Frecklington, and Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 3704, on motion of Ms Scanlon—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.28 pm), continuing: The Victims Advocate Service is a service that takes the burden off victims. Right now the information a victim needs is spread across government departments. When those agencies do not talk with each other, the burden falls back on the victim: another phone call, another form, another time explaining what happened to them. This bill changes that.

This bill means that the service will be available to all victims of crime, including those whose property has been stolen, damaged or destroyed. I thank the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business and his department for their work to make sure this service is accessible and easy for Queenslanders to use. In particular, I thank all the victims who gave evidence to the committee inquiry. Those victims relived some of the hardest moments of their lives and they did it so that the next person would not have to. I sincerely thank them for their time. Those victims will be pretty disappointed with the Labor opposition's statement of reservation, which completely ignores Labor's own failures and tries to rewrite history.

Labor had seven years worth of research into victims' experiences. They had a business case for a statewide victims' portal and repeated recommendations calling for victim advocacy services in Queensland, but they failed to deliver. In 2017, Labor set up the One-Stop Shop Strategy and

Implementation Office to deliver on the former LNP government's plan to make government services simpler, clearer and faster for Queenslanders. As part of that work—this is back in 2017—the office examined the experiences of victims of crime and identified the need for a statewide victims' portal. A business case was prepared. Guess what Labor did? Did they fund it? Did they deliver it? No, they did not! In fact, in December 2020 they defunded it. They closed the office and victims were left waiting for a service that was called for back in 2017.

In 2023, Labor conducted yet another inquiry into the support provided to victims. The very first recommendation of that Labor inquiry was a victims' advocacy service to help victims navigate the criminal justice system. Did Labor deliver it then? No, they did not! In the statement of reservation, the member for Bulimba criticised us for delivering the Victims Advocate Service in two years. Since 2017 they sat on recommendations. Their own 2023 inquiry found that victims need this service. Did they deliver it in the seven long years that the report sat on their desks? No! In fact, they defunded the taskforce that they set up to deliver it. It is completely disingenuous for Labor opposition members to now stand in this chamber and criticise us for consulting with Queenslanders and delivering the Victims Advocate Service in two years. I was the deputy chair of the 2023 Labor inquiry. I listened to victims tell us what they had been through. I heard their cries for help. I heard how the system had let them down and how they were left to navigate it alone. I heard how they were sick of the Labor Party conducting inquiries but not taking any action. While Labor failed to listen, we on this side of the House committed to delivering and here we are today, delivering the Victims Advocate Service.

That is not all that the Labor statement of reservation attempts to rewrite. Their statement of reservation attempts to blame the Crisafulli government for the gaps that frontline organisations have had to fill as a result of Labor failing to deliver for victims. Let's be very clear: those gaps did not begin in October 2024 when the Crisafulli government was elected. For years, victims and their families called out for change. For years, they fought to be heard. Labor is trying to rewrite history and it is quite extraordinary.

Under Labor's legislative changes in 2017 and 2023, they expanded the eligibility for financial assistance without the proper planning and support needed to manage the increased demand. Do members know what the consequences were for victims? It was devastating. In 2022, victims were left waiting more than 550 days for financial support. The member for Bulimba is going to stand up right now and try to rewrite history and blame us when the backlogs and the delays happened under her watch. The Crisafulli government inherited a VAS system riddled with backlogs and delays because they failed to prioritise victims. In fact, under their government, victims were left waiting 550 days for support. They now seek to portray the backlogs and lengthy processes as a new problem that the Crisafulli government has created, which is absolutely farcical.

We are getting on with the job of delivering for victims of crime and the Victims Advocate Service is part of that. Not only have we delivered record funding for victims; we are delivering the service that Labor failed to deliver since 2017. Why? Because we are a government that prioritises victims of crime.

Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (3.34 pm): As always, the member for Currumbin talked all about us and not about them. I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on three bills related to victims. We will spend four hours and 40 minutes debating these bills and 10 minutes on consideration in detail. These are bills about victims. If ever there was an example of this government being all talk and no action, this is it. Their audacity is breathtaking. They went to the election and have spent every waking moment since the election telling Queenslanders that supporting victims is their No. 1 priority—not No. 102 or No. 307 but their No. 1 priority. Then—quick as a flash—they wait two years to introduce any legislation about supporting victims. They cognate those bills and introduce a truncated timeframe in a huge breach of trust for the people to whom those bills are aimed.

My colleague the shadow attorney-general has already spoken to the strengthening victims' rights and civil liabilities bills. I will limit my comments to the Victims Advocate Service bill, which we support. We will always support legislation that supports victims of crime. The idea of a one-stop shop that can effectively triage victim inquiries is clearly needed and supported by stakeholders. The Victims' Commissioner stated—

> Victims often report that agencies provide contradictory information and they struggle to get the referrals they need to the non-government agencies that could provide them with support. If it operates as intended, the VAS will take a huge weight off a victim's shoulders at one of the most difficult points in their life.

Similar comments were made by the majority of stakeholders who submitted to the committee.

Supportive stakeholders raised a number of suggestions for improvements to the system. I hope that the government will listen to those concerns and act on them. Certainly the concept of a Victims Advocate Service is welcome, but we are concerned about its implementation. Will the government deliver on the commitments they make in this bill? As the Victims' Commissioner said, if it operates as intended, the VAS will take a huge weight off a victim's shoulders at one of the most difficult points in their life. The big question is, will it operate as intended? Has the government thought through the resources required for its implementation and its impacts on government and non-government services and, therefore, their ability to deliver for victims? Many stakeholders put forward those questions.

The reason we worry about these things is that, unfortunately, this LNP government has form for not delivering. They make big promises that never come to anything, especially on crime. Their promises on crime were at the top of their list of promises and are most outstanding for not being delivered. This government was going to fix crime but in fact, despite desperately introducing one piece of legislation after another and promising victims and Queenslanders that this time it is going to work, in 2026 crime rates actually went up by 5.24 per cent, which of course means more victims.

This government talk themselves up as the champion of victims. The Premier staked his leadership on it, but he has been fudging victim numbers ever since so that he does not have to resign. Given the way they talk themselves up you would think that we would have victim initiatives coming out of our ears. However, the only thing they have to show for those promises is these three bills that are directly about victim support and that are being debated this week, but they have slashed the time available for that debate. It has taken two years to get to this point—and, no, I do not count any of the ACAT bills. They promised that the VAS would be a priority but they did not deliver for two years. Only now are we debating the bill.

What else has this government, which said they were all about supporting victims, done for victims? Absolutely nothing is the answer to that! They have literally not one thing to show for all of their proclamations of support for victims. They promised big but they did not deliver. Victims must be feeling like it is groundhog day. Not only have they done nothing for victims but, in fact, the only support that has been provided for victims two years in is the support that was set up by the Labor government, and they are taking many of those initiatives backwards. We know—and we have admitted—that there was so much more to do for victims. There was a lot to do. Notwithstanding that, it has been successive Labor governments that have strengthened victims' rights and increased financial assistance, and the LNP has not added to that.

Labor established the framework for Queensland's first independent Victims' Commissioner and the Sexual Violence Review Board to identify systemic problems, promote victims' rights and examine their experiences of the justice system. They established Queensland's first charter of rights for victims. They committed more than $215 million over five years from 2023-2024 to enhance support for victims of crime in Queensland. They set up the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, a process significantly informed by victims. There is quite a bit more.

What has this government, who said they were the knights in shining armour for victims, done? I will tell you. Despite shouting it from the rooftops, they have still, two years in, not set up the Victims Advocate Service. There are extreme delays in responding to and processing calls to Victims Assist Queensland, and huge staff turnover. There are allegations of fraud by VAQ with no action from the government. Workers who were specifically employed to assist victims had their employment terminated. In respect to the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, we do not even know if the 277 recommendations, which were substantially informed by victims, are being implemented. Let's not even go there with victim numbers, which I referred to earlier.

I turn to some of the specific issues I have raised. To the implementation delays, one of the terrible consequences of this delayed delivery is that significant burden has been placed on non-government organisations. We had the Victims 1st submission telling us that the Premier had given them the responsibility of 'being' the VAS while everyone was waiting for it to be set up. The submission stated—

> In October 2024, the now Premier told me I was the Victims' Advocate Service until such time it was established after he formed government.

They are an unfunded volunteer organisation.

Then we have Voice for Victims, also an unfunded volunteer organisation, referring victims to the appropriate agencies and getting the support for them, providing financial support to victims who cannot

afford the remedies they need or who certainly cannot wait the 18 months to two years it sometimes takes for VAQ to make their payment claims. Ben Cannon, from Voice for Victims, on 4BC recently stated—

> Victims need immediate support and they need it when they need it, not when the government's ready. We're also a victim of this. As an agency, Voice for Victims, we help people immediately and we wear the costs ... At some point we hope to get those back, but we're also part of this wait.

We have problems with VAQ. Given the central importance of VAQ in providing financial relief to victims, it can be anticipated that VAS will frequently make referrals to it. An excellent *Courier-Mail* article of 27 September outlines the many problems we are unfortunately coming to understand about VAQ that I was not allowed, by the committee chair, to ask about during the public hearing. They include: victims receiving less compensation and waiting longer for claims to be processed, as more and more people seek help; victims paid out $20 million less in compensation, and waiting for up to a year or longer for their claims to be processed; and high staff turnover which has caused wait times to blow out. There are human stories behind all these statistics.

Last week, the member for Currumbin was urging people to report VAQ fraud, yet yesterday Michael McKenna in *The Australian* reports that she has been 'sitting on a mountain of evidence' while the government seems 'too scared to do anything about it'. They want to talk about leakers? Government whistleblowers told *The Australian* that—

> .. cabinet had been expected to decide on reform earlier this year, but it had been delayed several times because of the complexity of the issue and fear of political backlash.

Victims deserve action, not political cowardice. If there is fraud, investigate it, crack down on it and throw the book at the perpetrators.

This government either does no modelling on anything or, if they do, they consistently refuse to release it. It does not matter what legislation, what policy or what service we are talking about, we have no idea if they have modelled the impacts. Stakeholders are worried about that in the context of the VAS—at the potential impacts on both government and non-government services. While all supportive of the VAS, they want to know, with the likely increased referrals, what is the likely demand? What resources will be required to meet the demand? Will that demand on non-organisations be funded?

We heard during estimates, following the LNP's decision to remove restorative justice conferences as a sentencing option for certain offences, that 16 temporary FTE victim liaison officers with restorative justice did not have their funding extended. Four times this year, Victim Assist staff have had to take their own department to the Industrial Relations Commission to secure permanency, and four times the department lost. The commission rejected the excuses from the minister's department about future funding uncertainty. This government claims to stand with victims while making the workers who support them fight for job security.

We will monitor this implementation. On behalf of Queenslanders, on behalf of victims, we have an eye on these people and if they fail yet again, if these are yet again big promises that have no intent for action behind them, we will say that out loud. They need to know we are watching.

Mr HUNT (Nicklin—LNP) (3.44 pm): I proudly rise as Chair of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to support the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 and Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026. Together, these bills send a clear message: in Queensland victims of crime will no longer be treated as an afterthought in a justice system that exists to protect them.

In relation to the Civil Liability Amendment Bill, I acknowledge some survivors may be disappointed by the committee's recommendation not to support it. However, our examination confirmed existing pathways to justice, strengthened by recent High Court decisions, identified significant drafting and definition uncertainties in the poorly drafted bill, as acknowledged by the member for Gaven herself during the committee's public briefing. She said she was open to amendments on those critical aspects of the bill. Those issues should have been resolved before the bill was introduced, not rushed for political purposes. Survivors deserve carefully considered, workable legislation. Regrettably, that bill as presented falls far short of that standard.

We will always be a government that puts victims first. I spent a large portion of my 33 years in the Queensland Police Service as a detective in the CIB and later in the child abuse unit, investigating offences, working with children and families, and standing alongside people on some of the worst days of their lives. I saw the fear after a home had been broken into, the devastation of families affected by

violence and the lasting damage inflicted on abused children. I saw something else far too often: victims who had done everything asked of them, who had found the courage to report an offence, given evidence and endured a long court process, only to walk away feeling the justice system had failed to hear them. That disappointment stays with people. They ask, 'What about us? Who is listening to what has been done to our family?' After those 33 years in policing, I can say that the harm caused by crime does not end when an offender is arrested or sentenced. The consequences can last for years, sometimes a lifetime.

That is why I am proud to be part of a Crisafulli LNP government that is changing that balance. We are putting victims first, rather than continuing to place the rights and interests of offenders ahead of those who have suffered at their hands. That does not mean abandoning due process or the rule of law; it means refusing to accept that fairness to an offender requires the silence of a victim. These two things are not the same.

The first bill makes vital changes to victim impact statements. For too long, a victim could carefully put into words the consequences of a crime, only to find parts of that statement crossed out, edited or removed before it reached the sentencing court. Think about what that says to somebody who has already lost so much control. They finally find the strength to explain what happened to them and then somebody else decides which part of their experience they are allowed to express.

Victim impact statements will no longer be subject to routine editing or redaction by prosecutors, although offensive, threatening, intimidating or harassing content may still be removed. A court will not be able to reject a statement merely because it may contain what, at law, may amount to irrelevant or inadmissible material, and the judicial officer must still apply the law in determining the sentence.

The victim should be allowed to tell their story. We heard that loud and clear from victims. A victim impact statement serves the court by explaining harm, but it can also give a victim the opportunity to say in their own words what the offence has taken from them. We should not underestimate how important that opportunity can be.

The bill also recognises that people close to a victim may carry the consequences of an offence. It gives victims more choice in how a statement is presented: personally, through someone they nominate, or by pre-recorded audio or video. It also restricts circumstances that allow cross-examination about a statement. Those are practical, trauma informed changes.

The bill also recognises that crime can injure an entire community. The Victims' Commissioner will be able to provide community impact statements for specific offences, especially those involving child exploitation material, serious vilification and prohibited symbols. From my work in the child abuse unit, I know firsthand that offending involving child exploitation material cannot simply be dismissed as conduct affecting nobody in particular because an individual child has not been identified in a particular proceeding. The broader harm matters, and sentencing courts should be able to hear about it. I thank the Family and Child Commissioner, Luke Twyford, for the very powerful evidence he gave before our committee on that very subject.

The second bill deals with another frustration I had throughout my policing career. When a victim reports a crime, suddenly they are expected to navigate police, prosecution, courts, corrections and support agencies, often while traumatised. They have to chase answers, repeat painful details and work out which door to knock on next. They did not choose to become involved in the justice system, and we should not expect them to become experts in government bureaucracy simply to get help. The new Victims Advocate Service will provide a central front door to information, guidance and referrals. Backed by a $50 million commitment over five years, with ongoing funding, it is designed to offer a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week call centre and online support, supported by liaison officers across government agencies. It will help victims obtain the information they are lawfully entitled to receive while protecting privacy and confidentiality. It will work alongside specialist support organisations, not replace them.

Importantly, the service will also assist victims of property crime. Someone whose home has been entered and whose car has been stolen may have escaped physical injury, but that does not mean they escaped harm. The loss of security in one's own home can be profound. These victims deserve recognition and a clear pathway to support, too. This service has been shaped through consultation with more than 600 people, including victims, advocates and frontline organisations.

The contrast with the decade of decline of the former Labor government could not be clearer. They knew for years about the fractured system, but when Labor left office in 2024 there was still no statewide victims advocacy service. Victims had heard enough promises. They needed action.

Our government is delivering that change: a justice system that listens more carefully, communicates more respectfully and makes it easier for victims to get the assistance they need. I am proud to support these important reforms. I acknowledge the courage and determination of victims and their families who have fought for change. Their experiences remind us why this work matters and why we must never stop striving for a justice system that listens, responds and delivers. Every victim deserves to be heard, treated with dignity and supported in their pursuit of justice. That is the commitment of this government and one that I am proud to be a part of.

Ms McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (3.53 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the plethora of bills currently before the House. At the outset, I say that I am absolutely astounded. There are two bills that are worthy of consideration and generally supported, but there are some concerns around the effectiveness, modelling and operationalisation of them. The intent is commendable, and we want to see the promise of it delivered.

We have four hours and 40 minutes, minus the minister's and shadow minister's time. For a government that is all about victims and putting them front and centre, this is a pretty poor effort. When we get to the private member's bill, 'astounded' just does not cover it. 'Appalled' is not even strong enough. From the outset, I must declare a perceived conflict of interest in this private member's bill. I withdrew from the committee process for the consideration of the bill and I have sought advice from the Clerk on whether to contribute to this debate. I was unsure whether I would. I may potentially be eligible for legal recourse that the current setting does not allow. I say 'potentially' because I have not sought legal advice around this possible bill.

In her contribution, the Attorney-General said that, without the bill, there are still legal options available under civil and redress schemes. Well, Attorney-General, no, there are not. If the Attorney-General had bothered to speak to those who were sitting in the gallery when the bill was introduced, she would know that many victims of institutional child sexual abuse have no recourse. This bill was to address this. Dignity, compassion, respect—the Attorney-General threw those words out in her speech like confetti when it came to talking about victims, but smashing these bills together does not show any compassion or respect for the victims of childhood sexual assault.

Those with lived experience who have suffered untold indignities throughout their life—and I spoke to them when they were in attendance during the bill's introduction—they hold their heads high with unbelievable grace for what they have suffered. Perhaps the Attorney-General has hoodwinked her caucus into believing this bill was not required. Alternatively, it is required but it requires action at the national level. It is one or the other.

Maybe they have been bamboozled by the Bird v DP or the AA decision. I get it. I would have thought the first law officer of Queensland would be all over it. Perhaps the Attorney-General has experience in historic child sex abuse civil litigations that we are unfamiliar with, notwithstanding what the actual legal experts in the field say. We should look at all of the submitters and how many people who have legal experience in the field who were saying this is necessary—but, no, the committee will take the advice of the one person who has no experience necessarily in this field and run with that because this is about the ideology. The private member's bill is looking to address something this government has failed to do for two years.

Mr Head interjected.

Ms McMAHON: Do you find child sex abuse funny, Minister? Do you, Minister?

Mr Head: You had 10 years to do it.

Ms McMAHON: Do you, Minister?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr J Kelly): Order! Your comments should come through the chair.

Ms McMAHON: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. For the misinformed member opposite, the High Court ruling was not handed down until you guys were elected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member, I ask you to make your comments through the chair, please. You have the call.

Ms McMAHON: The reason we have this bill is there was a judgement. If the member had actually bothered to read the committee report rather than sit there and joke and laugh like this is nothing—every time that member talks about victims, every time that member sits there and talks about victims, there are victims of child sexual assault who know that he could not be bothered to read the report for

him to make such a statement. He said that we had a decade to do it. No. The court case decision was handed down in November 2024. Why educate yourself? We can do good things in this place.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, make your comments through the chair, please.

Ms McMAHON: Why educate yourself on this issue? We can do good things in this place. We have committees that are doing this. We could read the submissions. We could read the stories of those with lived experience—but, no. Today we could be voting on something that could change the outcome for these victims.

We could do that. This place could do that today. It is not hard to move an amendment. In fact, the committee could have even recommended an amendment. But it was just, 'No, we won't support this bill.' Those opposite could not accept the legal advice contained in the submissions which said the Attorney-General is misguided and mistaken. The committee could not accept that based on the legal evidence the Attorney-General might be wrong. I quote—

> There has already been some worrying commentary ... In Queensland ... the Attorney-General ... told parliament the need for reforms post-*Bird* had been "overtaken" by the AA decision. Views like this misunderstand both decisions.

We can admit when we make mistakes and we can change it for the better. It is not irretractable. If the Attorney-General is not comfortable with the current wording all it takes is an amendment. We can pass it today with a simple amendment. These victims do not even get the opportunity to hear what this government thinks of their suffering. Apparently there is other redress available. No, Attorney-General, there is not. As a result of such decisions there are many victims of childhood sexual assault who have no recourse. They fall through the gaps. They fell through the gaps 20, 30, 40, 50, 60 years ago. We have the opportunity today in this House to make it right, to give them some recourse. It is not difficult. This side will support any amendment that will make this go through.

Why are some victims of crime worthy of this government's attention but others are not? It is like there is some kind of class system of victims. If you can put them in front of the TV and get them to support you, we will support them. There are so many victims who are just asking to be considered. It would not take much from this government today. Let me be clear: if this law does not change, childhood victims of sexual assault will have no claim. That child falls through the gaps. They have been falling through the gaps for decades. It would only take an amendment, a vote of yes, to correct that.

We can do good things in this House if we stop playing the partisan ball when it comes to victims. We support the two government bills. We absolutely have concerns, but we know it is in the interests of assisting victims in this state. We support that. I know it is political to stand up and say 'that side doesn't support victims'. That is all partisanship and whatever. We support the two bills, but why can we not see that historic victims of childhood sexual assault need to be protected as well? When those opposite vote no without even the prospect of an amendment, what they are saying to victims of childhood sexual assault is that they are not a worthy victim for this House to consider. If those opposite bring forward an amendment, we will vote for it and we can protect them now.

Mr FIELD (Capalaba—LNP) (4.04 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate on the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026. As I am sure many members of this House can appreciate, these two pieces of legislation are of particular significance to me. Unless you have been through the criminal justice system as a victim of crime, it is difficult to appreciate just how complicated and daunting that process is.

Depending on the nature of the offence, victims may find themselves dealing with the police, the courts, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and Queensland Corrective Services, among others. Each of these agencies has its own responsibilities and processes. It is often left to victims and their families to work out to whom they need to speak, what information they are entitled to receive and what support is available to them. I know from personal experience that, following the accident involving Matt, Kate and Miles, the system under the former government failed to provide our family with any support. We were left to figure out everything for ourselves while also dealing with the grief of losing beloved family members. The process carried on for years through court proceedings and appeals, and our family was just expected to find our own way through.

I called for greater support for victims at the time in the form of a one-stop shop, but the former government let not only us but also all victims down yet again. I acknowledge those groups and organisations that have stood with victims and stepped up to fill that void but, at the end of the day, that responsibility should lie with the government. That is why I am particularly pleased the Crisafulli

government is establishing the Victims' Advocate Service here in Queensland. Our government has committed $50 million over five years and $10 million per year ongoing to establish and deliver that service. The service will provide a single statewide point of contact for victims with a dedicated contact centre operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week, a live-chat function and an online information hub. The model has been informed by extensive consultation through 13 regional consultation sessions and 18 targeted stakeholder sessions involving more than 600 people, including 135 victims of crime.

One aspect of the legislation I particularly welcome is the breadth of application. The service will extend to victims of property offences and will be available irrespective of when the offence occurred. For some victims and their families dealing with the criminal justice system can continue for many years, particularly where there are appeals or parole considerations. I know from personal experience the toll this can take, as the process seems to drag on endlessly. It is entirely appropriate that those already going through this process will be able to benefit from this service.

Victims will be able to authorise the service to obtain information from government agencies on their behalf. This work will be supported by dedicated liaison officers embedded across government agencies. The legislation removes certain legal barriers to information sharing without altering a victim's existing entitlements to information. There are also provisions allowing victims to nominate a family member or another trusted person to act on their behalf alongside appropriate safeguards concerning privacy and confidentiality. Importantly, the service will also work alongside the specialist victim support organisations already operating across Queensland. Victims will be able to return to the service for future assistance, with systems in place to track their inquiries and referrals so they are not required to start from scratch each time they need help.

The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill addresses another important aspect of a victim's experience with the criminal justice system: their opportunity to be heard during sentencing proceedings. The bill amends the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to strengthen the victim impact framework, recognising the important role these statements play in informing the court of the harm caused by an offence and providing a therapeutic benefit to victims themselves. The opportunity to explain in your own words how a crime has affected you and your family is an important one. The legislation broadens the scope of offences for which a victim impact statement can be provided to include all indictable offences and summary offences resulting in a death or bodily harm. It also expands the definition of a victim to recognise the harm suffered by those who have a close personal relationship with a person directly affected by an offence.

I particularly welcome the changes concerning the editing and redaction of victim impact statements. During the committee inquiry, the Victims' Commissioner highlighted the frustration experienced by victims who have had parts of their statements removed before being presented to court, leaving them feeling that they had been unable to convey the full extent of their experiences. This also happened to me. The bill removes the general requirement for prosecutors to edit or redact these statements. Prosecutors will retain the ability to remove offensive, threatening, intimidating or harassing material, and courts will continue to disregard material that is irrelevant or inadmissible when determining a sentence.

The legislation also limits the circumstances in which a victim can be cross-examined on the contents of their statement and provides greater flexibility on how statements are presented, including through prerecorded audio or video recordings or by nominating another person to read their statement aloud. Furthermore, the bill introduces community impact statements which the Victims' Commissioner will be able to prepare to inform sentencing courts of the broader harm caused by certain offences including child exploitation material, serious vilification and prohibited symbol offences.

There are also amendments to the Coroners Act 2003 requiring the Coroners Court to take all reasonable steps, as soon as practicable, to notify a family member when a decision or order is made to hold or reopen an inquest, or to reopen an investigation into the death of their loved one. Families seeking answers about the circumstances of a loved one's death absolutely deserve to be kept informed on any new development.

As a member of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, I had the opportunity to examine both bills. The committee considered 18 submissions on the Victims Advocate Service bill and 20 on the strengthening victims' rights bill. I was particularly pleased to see support for these reforms from Voice for Victims, an organisation whose advocacy I know well. I want to thank all those who contributed to both inquiries and my fellow committee members for their work. The committee has

recommended that both bills be passed. I look forward to seeing the Victims Advocate Service commence its work in December and to the implementation of the strengthened victim impact statement framework.

I want to thank the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and the Attorney-General for their work in bringing these bills before the House. I also want to acknowledge the many Queenslanders who, drawing on their own personal experiences, have dedicated years to advocating for improvements to our criminal justice system. I know how much time and effort goes into that advocacy, and I am pleased to see those contributions reflected in these reforms. I am proud to be part of a government that is delivering for victims of crime. I commend both bills to the House.

Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (4.12 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this cognate debate. I start at the outset by saying that the Labor opposition will always support legislation that genuinely assists victims of crime, reduces unnecessary trauma and improves how Queenslanders experience the justice system. However, we cannot ignore the glaring gap between the Crisafulli LNP government's political rhetoric and its actual track record in delivering support to victims.

Let me first address the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill. The Labor opposition supports the recommendations and expert advice of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council. In 2023 the former Labor government gave the Sentencing Advisory Council terms of reference to review sentencing for sexual assault and rape offences. This work was largely driven by the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, and didn't they do a fantastic job!

That culminated in the landmark December 2024 report, the *Ripple effect,* which made 28 detailed recommendations to better protect victim-survivors. This bill finally implements recommendation 21 of that report by introducing a more trauma informed approach to victim impact statements. For too long, the redaction of victim impact statements has been deeply antitherapeutic, stripping victims of their voices and restricting their ability to speak freely about the harm they have suffered. By creating a clear dual purpose—recognising both the therapeutic benefit to the victim and the need to inform the court—and by allowing statements to be given even if they contain material deemed inadmissible or irrelevant, this bill brings Queensland into line with other jurisdictions. It also rightly expands the offences for which statements can be provided and allows a trusted family member, friend or carer to present a statement on a victim's behalf.

The bill also introduces community impact statements for child exploitation material offences, as well as serious vilification and prohibited symbol offences. Allowing the Victims' Commissioner to present these community impact statements ensures the broader harm to the community is recognised by the courts. However, we know that the Queensland Law Society raised concerns regarding potential impacts on the flow of proceedings in the Magistrates Court. That is quite worrying, so I would urge the government to conduct a statutory review of the community impact statement regime to ensure it is achieving its intended purpose and to consider whether additional resourcing is required for the Office of the Victims' Commissioner and our courts.

Furthermore, we must ask: why has this bill taken so long and where is the rest of the response? The *Ripple effect* report was handed to the Attorney-General in December 2024, yet almost two years later the LNP government has still not tabled a formal government response or provided a status update on all 28 recommendations. Queensland's victim-survivors should not have to wait this long. We call on the Attorney-General to table a formal government response and provide a status update so Queenslanders can be assured that the sentencing of sexual assault and rape is being treated with the seriousness it deserves.

This pattern of delay and broken promises brings me to the second bill before the House—the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026. When a person in Ipswich or anywhere across Queensland becomes a victim of crime—whether it is a stolen car, a break-in or a violent assault—they need immediate support. The Victims Advocate Service is intended to be a central entry point that provides coordinated information and referrals. In principle, that is a very sound objective and Labor supports it. However, I have deep reservations about whether this LNP government is capable of delivering it.

During the 2024 election campaign, the LNP promised a victims advocate service. They promised to establish it in their first budget and then promised to design and deliver it in their most recent budget. Yet it took more than two years just to introduce the legislation. In the meantime, who was left holding the flag? It was unfunded community organisations. Astonishingly, the group Victims 1st revealed in

their committee submission that in October 2024 the now Premier told them that they 'were' the victims advocate service until the official service was established. Basically, the government relied on unfunded volunteers for two years while they dragged their feet. That is simply not good enough. More critically, a centralised referral service is only as effective as the frontline services at the other end of the phone. As Voice for Victims rightly told the committee, a referral service cannot succeed if frontline organisations lack the capacity to provide timely assistance.

What is the state of the government's own flagship frontline financial support—Victim Assist Queensland? Under this Crisafulli LNP government, Victim Assist Queensland is in crisis. When Labor was in government, we invested in Victim Assist Queensland to drive down wait times, we hired additional victim liaison officers and we established the Office of the Victims' Commissioner. However, as of 30 June this year there were at least 4,460 applications stuck under assessment. How has this government treated the workforce that is trying to clear that backlog? At estimates, we learned the LNP failed to renew the contracts of additional victim liaison officers funded by Labor.

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

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

Mr HUNT: My point of order is on relevance. I think the member is straying far from the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. I think the member is being broadly relevant.

Ms HOWARD: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your guidance. As of 30 June this year, there were at least 4,460 applications stuck under assessment. How has this government treated the workforce that is trying to clear that backlog? At estimates, we learned the LNP failed to renew the contracts of additional victim liaison officers funded by Labor. Even worse, four times this year frontline staff in Victim Assist's financial assistance unit had to drag their own department before the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission to fight for permanent employment, and four times the commission ruled against the government.

Meanwhile the recent media reports have also exposed deeply troubling allegations of fraudulent claims and systemic issues within the scheme alongside stories of genuine victims being turned away and left feeling retraumatised by bureaucratic hurdles. Queenslanders are tired of being told to take this government on trust. Services like the Queensland Sexual Assault Network and the Red Rose Foundation have made constructive recommendations to ensure this new service operates as a genuine, warm referral pathway that delegates functions to specialist sexual and domestic violence services rather than acting as a passive call centre. The government must listen to them and it must ensure those specialist services are funded to meet the demand.

While we are debating bills that claim to strengthen victims' rights we must also look at what happens when the Crisafulli government is presented with a real opportunity to stand with survivors and chooses to sit on its hands. Earlier this year the Queensland Labor opposition introduced our own private member's bill, the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026. That bill directly responds to the High Court's November 2024 decision in Bird v DP, which found that institutions could not be held vicariously liable for child sexual abuse committed by a priest because he received a stipend rather than a wage and was therefore not technically an employee.

In handing down that judgement, the High Court explicitly stated that reforming the law of vicarious liability is properly the province of the legislature. The High Court handed responsibility directly to parliaments. Victoria acted and the ACT acted yet the Crisafulli LNP government has done nothing, leaving Queensland behind and creating a cruel two-tier legal system where a survivor's pathway to justice depends on an employment technicality. Labor's bill closes that loophole. It amends the Civil Liability Act 2003 retrospectively so institutions can be held vicariously liable for abuse perpetuated by individuals in relationships akin to employment such as volunteers, religious leaders and office holders. Survivors should not have to keep waiting while this government sits on the sidelines instead of doing the hard work of law reform. If the LNP is genuinely committed to victims, they should support Labor's bill and give all survivors their day in court.

In conclusion, victims of crime deserve every possible tool to help them navigate the justice system. We will closely scrutinise the rollout of the Victims Advocate Service and we urge this government to end the delays, to properly fund frontline services and to support Labor's civil liability bill so every Queensland survivor receives genuine justice. They deserve nothing less.

Mr KRAUSE (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.22 pm): I rise in support of the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026. These bills represent another important step in the Crisafulli government's commitment to restoring balance in Queensland's justice system by putting victims back at the centre of the process where they belong. For too long victims were treated as spectators in a system that often seemed more concerned with the circumstances of offenders than the experiences of those who suffer the consequences of crime. I heard the contribution again from the member for Capalaba today and his reflections on that process. These reforms continue to correct that imbalance.

The bills before us must also be considered in the broader context of what Queenslanders endured during Labor's decade of decline. For 10 years the former Labor government presided over a justice system that increasingly failed victims. While crime continued to rise, victims' voices were too often ignored. Communities across Queensland became less safe and many Queenslanders lost confidence that justice was being done in the system and lost confidence that the justice system was delivering the outcomes that they expected and deserved and that they felt justice demanded.

Instead of focusing on the rights of victims, those opposite repeatedly prioritised the interests of offenders. We saw weakened youth justice laws starting in 2015 and 2016, the removal of effective deterrents and a system that too often overlooked the people who were left to pick up the pieces of crime after it had been committed. That brought about the youth crime crisis in so many communities right across Queensland. It was not just in the urban centres. Rural and regional Queensland communities were some of the most heavily impacted by that youth crime crisis. The impact of that crisis was felt in the Scenic Rim electorate as well. If the consequences of crime and the youth crime crisis were not visited upon people directly, so many people experienced it through their friends and relatives living in other parts of Queensland who were affected by the youth crime crisis over that decade of decline.

One of the strongest messages I heard from constituents was that it seemed like victims and community safety were forgotten. Queenslanders voted for change and that is what these bills continue to enact through our justice system. These bills form part of a broader commitment to ensure victims are heard and respected throughout the justice process. They complement the government's commitment to stronger laws, greater accountability and a justice system that recognises the real impact that crime has on all of our victims of crime, their families and also the communities in which it occurs.

The Victims Advocate Service bill delivers on the government's commitment to establish a nation-leading $50 million Victims Advocate Service. It has been developed after lots of consultation with victims, families, advocates and frontline organisations to ensure it provides the support where it is needed most. Importantly, it will provide a genuine one-stop shop for victims and victims will have access to information and support when they need it regardless of where they live. This will be particularly important for regional communities, including rural communities in the parts of Scenic Rim I represent, where sometimes distance can be a real impediment to accessing government funded services across a variety of government services including when it comes to victim support. As I said, residents of rural and regional Queensland face these issues of distance so the ability to connect through that dedicated service will certainly enhance the place of victims in the process.

I particularly welcome that the service recognises victims of property crime as well as those who have suffered physical injuries. I have met local victims of crime whose homes have been broken into and whose vehicles have been stolen. While the offences may not always result in physical harm, these victims also feel violated, vulnerable and unsafe in their own home. That is a real impact that for too long has not been given enough heed in all of the debates about the criminal justice system. Those experiences matter and that is why these reforms are coming forward: to recognise that fact. The Victims Advocate Service will ensure people do not have to navigate complex systems alone. It will provide a dedicated pathway to access that support.

The second bill before the House, which is the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, further strengthens the positions of victims within Queensland's justice system. One of its most significant reforms is in relation to victim impact statements. For many victims, providing one of those statements is one of the few opportunities they have to tell the court how an offence has affected their life and that of their family. It is more than a procedure; it is part of providing a voice to victims of crime and an opportunity to be heard and seen. The bill broadens eligibility, expands access across a wider range of offences and allows greater flexibility in how victims present their statements

whilst also reducing unnecessary trauma by limiting circumstances in which those victim impact statements may be subject to questioning or, indeed, redaction or amendment by the court.

After a decade of Labor's decline, Queenslanders elected a government that promised to put victims first, to work to restore community safety and rebalance the justice system and to put community safety and the rights of victims at the top of the tree when it comes to our justice system. For the residents of Scenic Rim and for victims throughout Queensland, these reforms represent a significant step forward in that rebalancing. I support both bills and urge all members to do the same.

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (4.28 pm): I rise to make my contribution to this cognate debate not just of the two bills addressed by the member for Scenic Rim but three important bills. They are three bills that all deserve serious consideration on their own but, instead, we have 10 minutes for a contribution on the three bills. This is the shoddiest of processes and the government should feel very ashamed of its complete disregard for our role in here, for the victim-survivors and for advocates who I know are affected by particularly one of these bills and for anyone who wants to have any faith in the institution of the Queensland parliament. I will move on. Time is short.

The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill is a bill that I will not be opposing. There is no disagreement that victims deserve accessible and supportive processes to report crime and to voice and process the impacts that that crime has on them and to heal. This bill introduces a trauma informed approach to victim impact statements that is broadly in line with the Sentencing Advisory Council's recommendation. I do want to expressly recognise the concerns raised by various submitters, especially regarding the inclusion of inadmissible or irrelevant evidence in victim impact statements. I genuinely share these concerns, but I will not oppose those changes. What I will say though is that those concerns make all the more important the thoroughness of the two-year review that is built into this act. The government needs to ensure that these changes are properly considered through that review and in terms of the potential unintended consequences for both the courts broadly and for the victims who are engaging with these processes. The risk of opening up appeal possibilities through widening victim impact statements is one thing that I do not think has had anywhere near enough consideration.

Ultimately, the expansion of victim impact statements is really an acknowledgement that the criminal legal system has not been functioning in a way that supports healing for victims and promotes accountability. On the other hand, we have had, for many years now, restorative justice options that have offered an opportunity for victims to be heard by offenders beyond the confines and the strictures of very complicated criminal law processes and they have offered an opportunity to seek transformative and meaningful outcomes. For victim-survivors who want that option it absolutely should be available, but this government, true to form, defunded adult restorative justice conferencing for sexual violence and rape cases in October last year. Moreover, the LNP has taken away from other victims the opportunity for restorative justice conferencing by expressly removing restorative justice as a sentencing option. It is incredibly short-sighted and it is simply doing the wrong thing by victims under the guise of being tough on crime.

I want to specifically address the bill's introduction of community impact statements to the court process. These statements allow the Victims' Commissioner to effectively prepare a statement that is made on behalf of affected communities rather than directly impacted individuals for consideration during sentencing proceedings. In the bill this is limited to offences of child exploitation material and serious vilification, but it also applies to the prohibited expressions and symbols offences. Moreover, additional offences can be prescribed by regulation. These are the offences that the LNP introduced under the guise of fighting antisemitism when in fact it has done nothing of the sort. I will say at the outset: if I were the government, I would not hold my breath in the hope that these laws will withstand a constitutional challenge, and I want to express here my full support for Justice for Palestine and the other applicants who are challenging these atrocious draconian laws in the High Court.

We remember that the government's so-called combating antisemitism laws banned these two expressions that have historically been used to express support for a free Palestine. This is a government that is prepared to cherrypick not just which victims it thinks deserves recognition or respect but also who it thinks represents the views of an entire community. To date, the only people who have been charged under the government's prohibited expression laws have been speaking out against genocide and ethnic cleansing. I have watched people be arrested for saying the words, 'From the river to the sea, Palestine will be free.' It is an expression of support for Palestinian people and a call for the liberation of those same people who are facing and experiencing genocide and ethnic cleansing.

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

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

Mr HUNT: It is on relevance. As passionate as the member is about this particular subject, it has nothing to do with the bill, I would suggest.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, if I could respond to the point of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sure.

Mr BERKMAN: As I made clear in my contribution, the bill actually introduces a process for the creation of community impact statements specifically in relation to these offences that the government has introduced and that people are being charged with, so my contribution is directly relevant to the bill.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member has not responded with an appropriate point of order. The member for Nicklin was raising a matter of relevance, but I would raise the issue of unparliamentary language.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, but what unparliamentary language?

Ms SIMPSON: The banned phrase that refers to a genocidal act.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice on that.

Mr BERKMAN: Might I respond to that point of order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, member.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I have simply recited words that are written in Queensland legislation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sure. Thank you, member. I did not hear any unparliamentary language. I have just sought some advice. Member, I understand you are making a broader point about the legislation. I will let you continue but, as we have given advice in previous relevance rulings, your contribution should not be solely on that point.

Mr BERKMAN: Of course. There is a broad cross-section of our community that is standing up against the violence and the genocide in Gaza, including members of Australia's Jewish community. In fact, members of the Jewish community have been arrested under those provisions, so how it is that the Victims' Commissioner could prepare a community impact statement that actually reflects the views of Australia's Jewish community as a whole is completely beyond me. These are not antisemitic phrases and so, ultimately, it is the rogue state that is flouting international law, committing atrocities against the people of Palestine and claiming to do so in the name of the Jewish community. That is what is endangering Jewish communities, not people standing up against war crimes. So again I will ask: how might the Victims' Commissioner present a community impact statement in those circumstances?

As Sisters Inside has suggested, for these community impact statements to be effective, consultation with an affected community should be a requirement and there must be an explanation of whose views were sought, how disagreement was handled and what limits apply to the statement's claim to represent that community. I do welcome broadly these changes that allow victims to engage with legal processes in a way that do not retraumatise them and that are oriented towards their rehabilitation and their healing. I will not oppose this bill but I urge the government to reconsider its pattern of homogenising entire communities to suit its political objectives, and I hope that this will be considered in how community impact statements are used.

Briefly addressing the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill, again this is, on its face, a great function, but there is pretty minimal statutory guidance on exactly how it will operate. I am very supportive of increased access to information for victims in their matters, but we do not know, to be perfectly frank, how this is going to be funded and to what extent the budget will support it. The effectiveness of the Victims Advocate Service will ultimately be up to its implementation and whether the service providers that victim-survivors are referred to are adequately resourced and funded, so it is not just the budget of the Victims Advocate Service but also the agencies that people are being referred on to. Given that, it is hard to know how effective this could be when through the committee process we were not allowed to discuss any data. I genuinely struggle to understand how it is that the current wait times for Victim Assist, for example, are somehow irrelevant to the committee's inquiry on this. Far be it for me to reflect on the decisions or rulings of the chair throughout that

committee process, but clearly the effectiveness of the Victims Advocate Service and the real benefit that might be seen for victims will depend on precisely those matters.

I am going to finish with some comments on the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. This is a bill that I wholeheartedly support, and I want to take a moment at the outset to express my gratitude and deepest respects to all of those victim-survivors who have done advocacy around this issue and additionally to the member for Macalister, whose contribution I hope struck some people pretty hard in here. Justice delayed is justice denied and victim-survivors should not have to wait any longer to address the gaps that this bill is intended to deal with.

Sure, there were some issues raised through the committee process or uncertainty about the precise formulation of the bill, but there is no denying that the uncertainty it intends to address must be addressed and it could have been through the passage of this bill. Victim-survivors are still today being let down by the LNP's political games. The committee could have engaged. This government could have engaged with the bill in good faith and made recommendations to address any issues that they saw with it. It could have made express recommendations for the government to undertake additional work but it did not. Now we have three bills to be squeezed into 10 minutes before the day is done. It is disgraceful.

Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (4.40 pm): It gives me great pride to stand yet again in this House taking a further step to put the rights of victims ahead of the rights of offenders. Over the last two years, this government has used this place to strengthen laws and to provide the resources that our police need to restore safety where we live. But, of course, restoring safety is only one part of the equation. The other part is early intervention and rehabilitation. The third component of our approach to restoring safety—to restoring lives here in Queensland—is dealing with the aftermath of a decade of decline in which Labor's crime crisis had torn apart families, upended lives and ruined communities from Cape York to Coolangatta and all the way out west. Not one community in Queensland was left untouched by weak laws.

Although I am only newly elected in this place, as a Queenslander I could see, looking from the outside in, that the root cause of these cultural problems around crime had to do with the weak laws passed in this place. Those opposite, when occupying the government benches, weakened laws and put the rights of offenders ahead of the rights of victims. Their ultimate conceit is that everybody is a victim including the perpetrator—there could never have been consequences for actions under their watch because there was never any accountability.

During this cognate debate we have an opportunity to support the passage of two bills in particular: the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill that will put the rights of victims ahead of the rights of perpetrators by recognising that there are victims and victims are different from offenders. We are achieving that, not only with the right language but by ensuring there are structures within the serving of justice that look after the interests of a victim. The Victims Advocate Service is an incredible reform which has been a long time coming. It is an important reform because what it says is that the resources and the attention of the state will be placed on the individual who has been wronged and that is a really important cultural signal to be sending. It says that if the laws have been insufficient that we will hold the hands of those navigating trauma and complexity to make sure that they are made whole. I say those laws are insufficient because for 10 years Labor made sure that the system was set up against the rights of the victim.

Earlier today our Minister for Customer Services rose in this place and during a ministerial statement talked about the establishment of Service Queensland. He spoke about a new way of the state orientating itself to the customer, to the resident and to the Queenslander—to take a Queenslander customer-centric view in order to understand the needs of that Queenslander and to meet them in that moment as efficiently as possible. Although Service Queensland will provide an opportunity to meet the needs of Queenslanders as they go about their everyday business, quite plainly the desire to serve the Queenslander has taken root in the very DNA of this government. When we have an opportunity to examine legislation that looks at the victim and the needs of the victim we are thinking about how we reduce complexity for the victim. How do we give more emotional space, financial resources and clarity to allow that victim to get on with the job of healing rather than dealing with bureaucracy? How do we shift the burden from the victim to the state and then have the state carry out

that necessary work as efficiently as possible? That is precisely the system that the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill will achieve.

I might also take this opportunity to reflect on the community impact statements which will now be a feature of the way that sentencing will occur in Queensland. I want to strongly associate myself with the comments of the member for Nicklin, the chair of the committee that looked into this and all of the contributions, in fact, of those opposite. What we have been prepared to do is to recognise that sometimes there are victims who do not have voices and that there is a role for somebody to step into that vacuum and to grant them that voice to ensure justice can be done. The member for Nicklin talked about child exploitation material during his contribution. It is a reprehensible class of crime with many victims I am sure never getting the justice they deserve, but, when there is an opportunity to do justice, it is important that we speak up on behalf of a class of victim who are the most vulnerable—the ones who have been most imperilled. To have community impact statements giving a voice to this class of victim, I think, is a fundamental reform to the way that justice will be carried out.

During the course of the debate, we have heard those opposite talk about victims—'What about the victims?' and 'You had all of this time to look after victims'—that is their taunt to us; their challenge. I find it quite galling to sit in this chamber and hear that from those opposite because I do think about the DNA lab debacle that the Attorney-General had to sort out. The member for Maiwar and I will probably agree on nothing, but if we were to get close to agreeing on something, I might pick up on his earlier remark that, 'Justice delayed is justice denied.' When I think about those women who for hundreds and hundreds of days had to sit quietly grieving in unimaginable personal anguish wondering whether they would ever get their day in court and wondering if perhaps that was not a possibility because the former Labor government had so mismanaged that DNA forensics laboratory, it causes me great anguish. That is why it is so galling to hear those opposite talk about victims. When their laws created the victims they did not do what was necessary to meet the needs of the victims—in fact, they denied that there was ever a problem. There was never any justice for victims under those opposite.

To talk about child exploitation material—a very sensitive and horrible topic—makes me think about all of those many children who were sexually assaulted in the care of the state in a failing residential care system presided over by those opposite. They walk in here and they talk about victims and victims' rights, but when they had the resources and the machinery of government at their disposal they did nothing.

I find myself on firm footing because in a former incarnation of this government, the need to provide victims with a one-stop shop was identified. We figured out that victims should not carry this administrative burden and we were to do something about it. As fate would have it the government changed, but the job was still there to be done. Through the course of 10 years Labor left unfunded an opportunity to put in place systems, policies and portals to put the victim first. They did not want that information available publicly. I suppose they could never look victims in the eyes because they were too busy trying to create more of them under this misguided notion that perpetrators could be victims too. Nothing could be further from the truth. You cannot have risk and reward without consequences for action.



Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (4.50 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill and to highlight the importance of the reforms that Queensland Labor has introduced through our Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. The Queensland Labor opposition will always support legislation that strengthens victims' rights, improves access to justice and ensures that those who have experienced crime receive the support that they badly need and deserve. Supporting the intent of these bills does not mean giving the Crisafulli LNP government a free pass on its failure to deliver meaningful support to Queensland victims, because there is a significant difference between promising to put victims first and actually delivering on the services that they need. Victims of crime deserve more than just promises, they deserve action.

I will begin tonight with the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill. Queensland Labor supports this bill because we support the recommendations and expert advice of the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council. The council's *Ripple effect* report identified systemic barriers faced by victim-survivors, particularly women, when navigating the sentencing process for sexual assault and rape. The report was delivered to the Attorney-General in December 2024, yet almost two years later Queenslanders are still waiting for a formal government response to its 28

recommendations. That is simply not good enough. The Attorney-General should immediately provide an update on the implementation of every single recommendation.

This bill implements recommendation 21 by introducing a more trauma informed approach to victim impact statements. Importantly, it recognises their dual purpose: informing the courts of harm caused by offending and also acknowledging the therapeutic benefit for victims who choose to share their experiences. It also allows a trusted family member, a friend or a carer, to provide a victim impact statement on behalf of a victim. The bill introduces community impact statements for certain offences, recognising that the harm caused by criminal offending can extend beyond an individual victim. These are important reforms, and Queensland Labor welcomes measures that ensure victims have a stronger voice throughout the justice process.

I now turn to the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill. The Crisafulli LNP government promised Queenslanders a Victims Advocate Service at the 2024 state election, yet more than two years later we are only now seeing the legislation required to progress that promise. The government claims the delay was necessary for consultation. While Labor supports meaningful consultation, it cannot become an excuse for failing to deliver timely support. When someone becomes a victim of crime they need the assistance immediately. While the LNP has delayed establishing this service, frontline organisations have been left struggling to meet the growing demand that continues today.

The situation at Victim Assist Queensland is particularly concerning. As at 30 June this year, at least 4,460 applications remain under assessment. Between November 2024 and June 2025 victims waited on average 72 days just to have an assessor appointed and 105 days to receive their first decision. Behind every application is a Queenslander who has experienced crime and is seeking to rebuild their lives. Media reports have also revealed that some psychologists providing services through Victim Assist Queensland have waited up to 18 months for payment. That is unacceptable. What is the point of establishing a victims advocate service if all it does is refer vulnerable Queenslanders to another lengthy waiting list. We know the LNP's form on waiting lists. This government must demonstrate that it understands the demand for this service and has committed the necessary staffing and resources that are required.

While the Crisafulli LNP government continues to talk about putting victims first—we hear it all the time—Queensland Labor has taken action to address another significant injustice facing survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. That is why Labor introduced the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. I acknowledge that the LNP have had to rely on the Labor opposition to ensure that the book was filled for the rest of this session. In November 2024 the High Court handed down its decision in Bird v DP. That decision found that a priest was not an employee of a church for the purposes of vicarious liability, meaning that the church could not be held legally responsible for his actions on that basis. I have met with an adult who has gone through that process. This decision exposed a significant gap in the law, potentially denying survivors of institutional child sex abuse access to justice and also to the compensation that they deserve.

Survivors should not be denied justice simply because their abuser was classified as a volunteer, a contractor or a member of the clergy rather than a formal employee. The law should not allow institutions to escape accountability because of a technical employment arrangement. Other jurisdictions, including Victoria and the ACT, have already taken legislative action to address the consequences of the Bird decision, yet the Crisafulli LNP government has failed to deliver equivalent reform in Queensland.

The Attorney-General has suggested that the subsequent High Court decision in AA v The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle has overtaken the need for legislative reform, but these decisions address fundamentally different legal principles. The AA decision concerns non-delegable duties of care, while the Bird decision concerns vicarious liability. They are separate avenues through which survivors may seek justice. While the AA decision provides an important avenue for victims, it does not resolve the gap in vicarious liability exposed by Bird. Queensland Labor believes survivors deserve every appropriate avenue to pursue justice. That is why we worked with legal experts, including Maurice Blackburn and the Australian Lawyers Alliance and consulted with victim-survivors, their families and organisations, including Micah Projects, to develop our legislation.

Our bill seeks to close this loophole and ensure that those institutions can be held accountable for abuse committed by individuals acting within those organisations even where a traditional employment relationship does not exist. This is not about politics; it is about ensuring that survivors are not denied justice because of a legal technicality. While Labor has introduced this legislation from opposition, we remain willing to work constructively with the government to ensure the strongest possible protection for survivors. If amendments are required to strengthen legislation, we are prepared to consider them because getting this right is far more important than who receives the political credit.

Queensland Labor recognises that there was more work to be done to improve victims' rights when we left government. We remain committed to pursuing a justice system that protects victims in Queensland and holds those offenders and institutions accountable to ensure support is available when victims need it most. The Crisafulli LNP government cannot continue making announcements while leaving victims waiting for meaningful action and the help that they need.

Whether it is improving victim impact statements, addressing delays in Victim Assist Queensland or closing legal loopholes that prevent survivors of institutional child abuse from seeking justice, the responsibility of parliament is clear: victims deserve to be heard, they deserve to be treated with dignity and they deserve a justice system that works for them. Queensland Labor will continue holding this government to account and fighting for reforms that genuinely put victims first.

Debate, on motion of Mr Butcher, adjourned.

TRANSPORT AFFORDABILITY AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 11 February (see p. 140).

Second Reading

Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (5.00 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Today, the choice before the LNP government could not be clearer: the government could back Queensland Labor's Transport Affordability Amendment Bill and support Queenslanders struggling with the cost of fuel or they could play politics and support the fuel companies that are profiting from it. This should not even be a choice, but we know that the LNP will always put the interests of multinational corporations and their mega profits over those of everyday Queenslanders. We know that a government that prioritises enriching its mates and that wasted $50 million on blue billboards and turning the state's colours from maroon to blue will never be on the side of Queenslanders.

Our bill will deliver cheaper, fairer fuel pricing through increased transparency and greater market regulation. There are no rhyming slogans, hollow words or empty promises. These are real reforms that would put money back into the pockets of Queenslanders. The reforms in our bill will give Queenslanders certainty because Queenslanders have all been there, standing at the bowser, watching the numbers climb higher and higher, trying to do the math before they fill the tank, wondering what bill they can defer or what they can go without this week and wishing they had the chance to fill up earlier when fuel was cheaper. Filling up the car is fast becoming unaffordable for many families across the state.

The evidence that Brisbane motorists in particular are paying more is clear. For three years in a row, Brisbane has taken out the top spot for fuel prices across the country. That is not a three-peat that we should be proud of. The RACQ's analysis shows that the retail margins for unleaded fuel in Brisbane are more than double those in Perth. I will say that again: the retail margins in Brisbane are more than double those in Perth. Our fuel price cycle lasts six weeks, giving Queenslanders only eight chances a year to get cheap petrol. Meanwhile, Perth's weekly price cycle provides 52 opportunities each year to get cheaper petrol. With kids to drop off at school and work to get to, waiting six weeks to be able to fully fill up their car is not a luxury that Queenslanders can afford.

The ACCC explains that petrol price cycles are not driven by movements in wholesale prices or underlying costs. Instead, they are the result of pricing decisions made by petrol retailers. That is why our bill takes the very best parts of the Western Australian government's FuelWatch system and builds on them. Retailers must provide notification of the next day's retail price for each type of fuel by 2 pm, with the prices publicly available from 2.30 pm. More importantly, these reforms require fuel retailers to lock in the prices of fuel for 24 hours. This model means that motorists will not have to deal with the

frustrating daily roulette and will have the freedom to make an informed decision about when and where to fill up.

Fluctuating fuel prices have seen prices jump from day to day, with prices rising by at least five cents a litre more than 3,000 times in a single month. Our daily five-cent price cap would fix this. Prices could rise by only five cents per litre from one day to the next. Retailers would be free to lower prices at any point in a 24-hour period and that would still allow for competition in the market. I know that this is something that has been hard for government members to get their heads around, including the Treasurer given his comments yesterday, but that is what this bill will do.

Whilst Queenslanders struggle to afford fuel prices, the conglomerates in the fuel industry are profiting off these record-high fuel prices. Ampol's profits for the year so far increased by more than 300 per cent to $857 million. Viva Energy's profits are up by 154 per cent to $774 million. Despite the fearmongering, QUT modelling shows that retailers will remain profitable and viable under this model. Retailers can easily adjust their retail prices, even with the introduction of a daily price cap, given that price movements are known ahead of time. Our bill will provide a fair deal for Queensland motorists and address the worst anticompetitive behaviour rife in the fuel market.

Our proposed regulation will promote meaningful competition and provide reasonable petrol prices to motorists. Together, these reforms will deliver transparent, fairer prices. Imagine, instead of stressing over a missed opportunity to get cheaper fuel, you can plan ahead and not get caught short. RACQ modelling shows that our reforms could save Brisbane motorists up to 23 cents per litre. This could deliver an annual saving of almost $1,200 for a family that fills up two cars each week. That is almost $1,200 back in the pockets of Queensland families every year.

The NRMA has warned that the average unleaded fuel price is almost 58 cents a litre higher than before the United States conflict with Iran first began. This has led to price gaps of more than a dollar a litre between the cheapest and most expensive fuel prices in towns. However, what did the Treasurer say just yesterday about this bill? The Treasurer, who said he would work hard to prevent a downgrade on his watch but then delivered a downgrade, the first in 17 years, said—

> ... Labor's latest thought bubble would increase prices while discouraging the very discounting that puts money back into Queensland motorists' pockets.

Clearly, he either does not understand the fuel market or does not want to. He cannot manage the state's budget and he does not want to help struggling families manage their own budgets.

Queenslanders are hurting but the pain does not stop at the bowser. Analysis from the RBA demonstrates that fuel costs are pushing up underlying inflation throughout the economy and this is expected to continue. Treasury data shows that higher fuel prices were the biggest driver of higher headline inflation in October's CPI data, up by 9.4 per cent in October and up by almost 24 per cent in the year. The RBA says that the higher costs of retail fuel will have a direct effect on consumer prices because, over time, higher fuel prices contribute to rising consumer prices as higher input costs are passed on. Higher fuel prices increase transportation costs, which pushes up the prices of household goods and, again, it is Queenslanders who end up paying more.

In its report, the LNP controlled committee admitted that fuel price increases are impacting household budgets across Queensland and, despite acknowledging this reality, it recommended voting against our bill to address these constantly rising fuel prices. This is a committee whose chair called a bill designed to address cost-of-living pressures a political stunt. Isn't the real political stunt opposing real cost-of-living reform just because it is Labor's idea? The former minister, the member for Whitsunday, said that members on that side of the House fill their four-wheel drives with diesel and—

> We on this side of the House know what that means to the hip pockets of our constituents.

If it is true that the LNP understands how the cost of diesel is hurting their constituents, why aren't they doing anything to bring the price down?

Queenslanders are sick of this government playing politics. They want tangible real-world cost-of-living solutions and that is what this bill is all about. The reality is that there are many Queenslanders who are worried about the mounting pressures on their household budgets—pressures such as when the fuel light comes on at the same time as the car rego bill, up by nearly 30 per cent over the past two years, is due. Filling up your tank should not fill you with dread and it should not wreck your budget. That is exactly why we introduced this bill. The Premier said his government would 'do everything we can to try and find a system that can lower people's cost of living and fuel is one'. It is almost two years since he made that comment and, instead of having cheaper fuel prices, the people

of Queensland are paying the price of having an LNP government. Clearly, the Premier did not do everything he could try; he did nothing.

What has this government done the make transport more affordable? It scrapped the Miles Labor government's zero emissions bus program and instead announced that it would purchase 630 new diesel buses. The government struck more than 35,000 train services from the network and introduced an e-bike tax, punishing e-bike owners for choosing a more affordable form of transport and pushing more people back onto our roads. There is the LNP's fuel security plan that they pinned their entire Stafford by-election campaign on. 'Drill it, refine it, store it' is less of a policy and more like a deranged version of the game bop it! The Premier is siding with petrol barons rather than commuters filling up their tanks.

We have also seen the LNP's journey with the Miles Labor government's 50-cent fares. First, they scoffed at it. Their own shadow transport minister called our 50-cent fares a con job. Then the LNP saw how Queenslanders embraced our initiative to lower public transport fares, ending cost pressures as a barrier to greater public transport accessibility. There was a 21 per cent increase in public transport patronage across the state, saving Queenslanders more than $400 million in transport costs. The LNP has tried to take the credit for our 50-cent fares policy, but Queenslanders know that it was Queensland Labor that introduced that generational reform. Since imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, maybe we should be flattered.

The bill expands on our 50-cent fares legacy and seeks to increase transparency by making the decision to increase public transport fares an act of parliament, removing the government's ability to act in secret, behind closed doors. The LNP believed in their own spin a little too much because they appear to be very confused. In a tabled document from September 2025, the transport minister stated that Labor's 50-cent fares had been implemented permanently from February 2025. When I spoke to the committee on this bill, the committee chair said, '... I am pleased that our government implemented permanent fares'.

At the public hearing for this bill, the member for Cook emphatically said, 'Permanent is permanent.' Lo and behold, three weeks later, this government proudly announced that they had then locked in 50-cent fares forever with their Revenue (Cost of Living Relief Locked-in Law) and Other Legislation Amendment Act—there always has to be a slogan. While I must commend the LNP for their continued efforts to uphold a great Labor policy, something just does not add up here. Were 50-cent fares made permanent in February 2025 or were they made permanent in June 2026? Even their own fable is inherently inconsistent. What is true is that the Crisafulli LNP government is failing to govern for Queenslanders.

The Premier said that Queenslanders are under immense pressure. For once I can say he absolutely right. Queenslanders are under pressure—at the bowser, at the checkout; it just does not stop. I commend my bill to the House and everyone getting gouged at the bowser.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Before I call the Treasurer, I recognise the former member for Capalaba, Don Brown, in the public gallery.

Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (5.10 pm): You would think for a private member's bill that the member for Aspley would actually give it a bit of gusto, a bit of energy like he actually believed in what he was arguing here tonight.

The government's position is clear: we cannot support a bill that will leave Queenslanders paying more for fuel at the bowser. That is the truth. Under the opposition's thought bubble, Queensland motorists could be paying an additional 35 cents a litre every week—every week! That is an extra $20 a week for Queensland families. It is over $1,000 a year. It is pretty basic economics: a price cap becomes a target. A retailer could increase its price by five cents today, another five cents tomorrow and another five cents the day after, but, when the opportunity comes to discount, the retailer has a reason to think twice.

Labor has managed to design a system that would encourage prices to creep upwards while discouraging the very discounting that puts money back into motorists' pockets. That is the system they have designed. That is why the committee reports that the proposed measures could risk higher average fuel prices overall for consumers. It comes from the same Labor that wanted government owned petrol stations to deliver under its disastrous 'Stevo's servos' policy, and now, having had that policy rejected by Queenslanders, Labor is back with another reckless experiment in government price controls—same policy, same failed Labor economics.

I want to acknowledge the work of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee—which you happen to chair, Mr Deputy Speaker McDonald—its secretariat and the members of the community who made submissions and gave evidence to the inquiry. That process has comprehensively examined the proposal before the House. The question was simple: would this bill actually make fuel cheaper? The committee's answer was no. The committee recommended that the bill not be passed due to concerns about the impact on competition, increased compliance costs and the potential for higher fuel prices overall.

Labor likes to point to Western Australia. It talks about FuelWatch and daily price notification, and it claims that Queensland should follow the same approach. But no other Australian jurisdiction has introduced Labor's proposed five-cent increase on daily price increases. Western Australia requires retailers to notify tomorrow's prices by 2 pm and hold those prices for 24 hours, and the West Australian Premier, Roger Cook, when asked about fuel caps, said they would not be undertaking it. Victoria and the Northern Territory also have daily price notification arrangements that allow discounting below the notified price. None of those jurisdictions impose Labor's five-cent restriction on increases between days. Labor is proposing an additional restriction that has not been tested anywhere in Australia, and it wants to take the risk on Queenslanders.

The RACQ has undertaken modelling that assumes particular responses from retailers and motorists. It assumes that combining a five-cent cap with Western Australian-style arrangements, but it is only drawn from Greater Brisbane assumptions only. It has never been tested in the real world, with real-world examples. They are not demonstrated savings, and Queenslanders deserve more than a theoretical saving generated by an untested model.

There is also a question that those opposite have never adequately answered: if this thought bubble was such a great idea, why didn't they introduce it during the 10 years of the Labor government? Why didn't they do anything for 10 years? They had 10 years to strengthen fuel competition. They had 10 years to improve Queensland's fuel security, and 10 years to encourage investment in local production, refining and storage. What did they do? They left Queensland exposed to the same international pressures that are hurting motorists today and failed to reverse the decline in our sovereign fuel capabilities. Instead of pursuing the structural reforms needed to strengthen fuel supply, they came up with 'Steven's servos'. Who could ever forget? It was the member for Murrumba, while he was premier, who said—

We don't control global oil prices and we can't force privately owned petrol retailers to charge less at the bowser.

The member for Murrumba also said that his 12 state owned servos would operate on a cost-recovery basis—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Fair Trading Act 1989, which this bill amends, does not address public ownership of assets such as service stations. Therefore, the minister is not being relevant.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I have been listening to the Treasurer and he is providing some context to the bill. I take the point of order, but I think the Treasurer has made that point and is moving onto other points. Continue being relevant please, Treasurer.

Mr JANETZKI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Imagine the opposition leader's fuel policies, whether it be fuel caps or the state owned service station idea that he was proposing on a cost-recovery basis. We know that those opposite cannot get the economics right and we know they cannot get cost recovery right. What would have happened, I wonder, with 'Steven's servos'? Would BPICs have applied to those? When it comes to cost recovery, we know that happens under those opposite. Just look at Cross River Rail—$5.4 billion to $19 billion. What about a couple of jets to go and deliver a birthday cake to the member for Bundaberg? What about—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Fair Trading Act, to which this bill pertains, is in no way relevant to ownership of assets or capital programs et cetera, and I ask you to direct the member to be relevant.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Treasurer, as other deputy speakers and, indeed, Mr Speaker has ruled in relation to the question of relevance a number of times, you are able to go out to provide some context around the bill. However, if you could make the main thrust of your contribution in relation to the specifics of the bill, that would be appreciated by the House. Please continue.

Mr JANETZKI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. When it comes to fuel prices and the fuel plans of those opposite and the member for Murrumba, I must say I would not want the member for Murrumba

operating a fuel station. However, if he did, I would not even trust him to heat up the sausage rolls, I would not trust the member for Murrumba to heat up the Chiko rolls, and I would not trust the member for Murrumba to put up the fuel prices outside because he has shown himself time and time again that he does not understand how to run a functioning opposition. I would not trust him to run a fuel station.

It is not just the government that is rejecting the opposition's thought bubbles; it is stakeholders across the board. You only need to look at some of the feedback from stakeholders over time about the Leader of the Opposition and his plans. In *The Australian*, the NRMA interim chief executive stated—

> We are concerned small, independent-run stations will be chased out of the market by a taxpayer-funded competitor who undercuts them.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Treasurer is being deliberately misleading and is not being relevant to what is in the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Misleading is a different matter. Relevance is the point of order. Treasurer, once again, if you could continue to be relevant to the bill.

Mr JANETZKI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. We have had others say that their interventions are wildly bizarre. Their interventions would reduce supply, which would ultimately increase prices. It not only would be a waste of public money but also would have detrimental effects on the industry and would only result in higher prices in the future. It is not just the government that is rejecting their untested, deeply flawed policies; it is stakeholders, and it would be consumers as fuel prices increased. They have proven themselves to have learned nothing.

The same Labor Party that has started debating this bill tonight very half-heartedly could not even get 50-cent fares right in this bill—their own private member's bill. They could not even get the Crisafulli government's permanent 50-cent fares right. This Transport Affordability Amendment Bill excludes significant services from the permanent 50-cent fares, delivered by the Crisafulli government, including Brisbane City Council ferries and the Gold Coast Light Rail. They cannot even get their own private member's bill right. They cannot even get it right. They are so dysfunctional and so poorly led that they could not even get it right. It was only the Crisafulli government that locked in permanent 50-cent fares. It was our government that locked them in law.

We are also focused on the structural drivers. We are talking about long-term, cost-of-living relief for Queensland through our Queensland Fuel Security Plan and real-time price transparency for motorists. Our Fuel Security Plan is building Queensland's ability to drill, refine and store fuel locally, reducing our reliance on global supply chains, and building a stronger, more resilient state. We are unlocking the enormous potential of the Taroom Trough, accelerating domestic fuel supply, expanding local refining capacity and strengthening fuel storage and infrastructure resilience across the state.

Additional gas and around 300 barrels of high-quality light oil a day are already being produced in the Taroom Trough—and it was a privilege to be there recently—with more than $1.2 billion committed to exploration and appraisal. Producing more oil and gas at home means greater supply, greater resilience and less reliance on imports.

We already have fuel price reporting requirements that mean retailers must report price changes within 30 minutes, and that is available through additional apps. Queenslanders can also compare prices across their local area.

Labor has brought a bill into this parliament that will make petrol more expensive. In contrast, we are opening up the Taroom Trough, backing local refining and unlocking investment. The answer to fuel security is more supply and stronger competition, not Labor's five-cent increases. That is why we oppose the bill.

(Time expired)

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.22 pm): I rise to support Labor's Transport Affordability Amendment Bill. This House has an opportunity to do something very important for Queenslanders. This bill is that opportunity. It is something practical to help families who are sitting around the dinner table talking about how to make ends meet, talking about which bills they can pay and when. These are the conversations happening around our state.

Queenslanders are working hard. They are trying to do the right thing. They are looking at their budgets and trying to work out where they can find another saving. For many of them, there is very little left to cut. They still need to get to work, take the kids to school or go to appointments. They still need to buy groceries and keep a roof over their heads. They cannot put a pin in those things until the price of petrol comes down. That is why our transport affordability bill matters.

The Premier, the Deputy Premier and the Crisafulli LNP government have a choice: they can back Queenslanders and help deliver cheaper petrol or they can put politics ahead of affordability. Queensland motorists are getting smashed at the bowser. Our bill offers sensible changes that could help today.

Our bill would cap daily fuel price increases at five cents a litre. It would also require service stations to tell Queenslanders today what tomorrow's price will be. That means that people would know whether they should head out and fill up before the price increases or whether they can afford to wait. It would give them a chance to plan, a chance to avoid a more expensive tank of petrol. It is simple, but it would make life a little bit easier for so many families. Right now, Queenslanders need that help.

Most people know the frustration of driving past a service station in the morning thinking they will fill up on the way home only to find the price has jumped by the afternoon. They were at work all day and did not have the time or energy to keep checking fuel prices. By the time they got back to the service station near home, the cost of filling the tank had skyrocketed. For someone with enough money in the bank that might just be an annoyance, but for someone trying to make their pay last until the end of the week it can mean changing what they buy at the supermarket. It can mean they only put enough petrol in the tank to get through the next couple of days, hoping for the best.

Last month, 391 service stations in Queensland increased the price of fuel by more than five cents a litre on 1,910 occasions. That is 1,910 times that our bill could have helped save Queenslanders at the pump. Behind those numbers are people who have no choice but to keep driving and keep paying: the apprentice travelling between job sites, the nurse finishing a late shift, the parent doing the school run before heading to work and the small business owner whose vehicle is essential to earning a living. They cannot change their working hours or rearrange their responsibilities around the petrol price cycle. They need a government that is prepared to do something to help.

By voting against this bill, the LNP will show that they just do not get it. They do not understand the pressure that Queensland families are under. They do not understand the dread of having to fill up the family car when there is already barely enough money to get through the week. They do not understand how frustrating it is to hear a Premier promise support then watch him refuse an opportunity to deliver it.

For three years straight now Brisbane has recorded the highest average unleaded petrol prices of any capital city—three years. Queenslanders have every right to ask why they keep paying more. They have every right to expect their parliament to consider sensible changes to improve that situation. We hear a lot about global oil prices and, of course, international conditions affecting the cost of fuel, but motorists in other Australian capitals buy fuel from that same global market. That does not explain away the persistent difference in what Queenslanders have to pay, nor does it excuse a government from looking at the things it can change here in Queensland.

The RACQ's own modelling shows that our proposal could save motorists up to 23 cents a litre. That is a potential saving worth taking seriously. For a 50-litre tank, it could mean a saving of $11.50. For a household filling two cars, it could mean a saving of $23. That money could be for groceries, school expenses or another bill.

The LNP members of the committee which looked at this bill asked for modelling and the RACQ provided it. Now those opposite are seemingly uninterested in what it had to say and the savings that would be delivered. That modelling also found, contrary to what the Treasurer just said, that small chains and independent retailers would not lose sales volume or profitability under the proposed changes, yet the government still refuses to support them. The Premier himself said that he would look at fuel price caps. That was almost two years ago. Since then, Queenslanders have been paying the highest prices. At some point the Premier needs to explain what he is waiting for. What more does he need before he is prepared to act?

We have given him a proposal to consider. We have brought legislation to the parliament. The RACQ has provided modelling to show what it could mean for motorists. At some point, saying you will look at something has to turn into doing something. The Premier also promised Queenslanders cost-of-living support for as long as they were struggling. Well, they are still struggling. They need more than another slogan or another photo opportunity. This Premier's slogans and glossy brochures might be clever politics but they do nothing to help someone watching the price climb as they fill their car. They do nothing to ease the conversation around the dinner table about which bill has to wait. Queenslanders need support now and there is something the parliament can act on now. The Premier does not have to agree with Labor on everything to agree that Queenslanders are doing it tough and Queensland motorists deserve a better deal. He does not have to like the fact that it was Labor that

brought this proposal. He simply has to consider whether it would help the people he promised to serve. That should be the test.

The bill also sought to lock in 50-cent fares for good. I am proud that Labor delivered 50-cent fares. We understood what cheaper public transport could mean. We knew that the cost of getting around was putting pressure on Queenslanders and we acted. The LNP called 50-cent fares a political stunt, but they have since accepted that Queenslanders deserve those savings. They should apply the same common sense to cheaper fuel because just as many, if not more, Queenslanders need their cars. For people in regional communities, for families in the outer suburbs like mine, or for workers starting before sunrise or finishing late at night, driving is often essential. Those Queenslanders deserve practical help with the cost of getting around too.

I acknowledge the member for Aspley for bringing this bill before the House and continuing to make the case for cheaper transport. He understands that affordability matters every time someone leaves home and he has brought forward a practical proposal to help. That is the approach that Labor will continue to take. We will listen to Queenslanders about the pressures they are under and we will develop sensible proposals. We have been constructive on this issue. We have outlined changes the government could support and we have given the Premier an opportunity to work with us to deliver them. He should take that opportunity. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (5.32 pm): If there is one thing Queenslanders have learned about the Labor Party it is that when Labor does not have an answer to a problem its solution is always more government intervention, more regulation, more red tape and more control. Inevitably, it is Queensland families who would be left paying the price despite the spin you will hear on social media. That is exactly what we are seeing with this bill.

Labor wants Queenslanders to believe that it has discovered the secret to cheaper fuel, but when you look a little deeper there is no convincing evidence this bill will deliver cheaper fuel for Queenslanders. In fact, it risks doing the exact opposite. It risks driving up prices at the bowser, discouraging competition and leaving Queensland families worse off. Who is behind it? An opposition leader who has nothing left in the tank, the same desperate opposition leader who went to the last election promising government owned petrol stations. Does anyone remember 'Stevo's servos'? Queenslanders certainly do. The then Labor government—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. Mr Deputy Speaker, you were the chair of this committee. I am sure you are intimately aware of the Fair Trading Act, to which this bill makes amendments. The question of public ownership or government ownership of assets is entirely outside the scope of this bill, so my point of order is on relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Thank you, Manager of Opposition Business. The point is on relevance. We are talking about service stations and there were a couple of different policy positions. The member for Bonney has only just started talking about that argument, so I believe he is in line with other Speakers' rulings. He is entitled to go off the topic briefly and then come back to the substance of the bill.

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Deputy Speaker, just as you rejected that point of order, Queenslanders rejected that idea at the ballot box in 2024. Apparently, the Leader of the Opposition still has not got the message. He could not convince Queenslanders that Labor should run service stations so now he wants to dictate how service stations run in Queensland. This is 'Stevo's servos' by stealth—different name but same failed thinking.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Speaker ruled on this with the previous speaker, the Treasurer, so my point of order is on relevance. I would also ask you to ask the member to use proper titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Manager of Opposition Business. The second part of the point of order certainly has relevance. My ruling was directly in line with the Deputy Speaker's ruling before in that it is okay for speakers to go off topic but then come back to the substance of the bill. Member for Bonney, I ask you to withdraw the incorrect title.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. Once again, as with that failed approach, Queensland families could end up paying the price for Labor's economic incompetence. Let's look at what this bill proposes. Labor wants to impose a five-cents-a-litre cap on the price of fuel increases between pricing periods. It sounds simple enough when you put it in a press release, but fuel markets are not simple. Prices fluctuate, retailers compete, discounts are offered, motorists shop around, and when the government starts

interfering with those competitive pressures there can be serious unintended consequences. Under Labor's proposal, Queensland motorists could face an additional 35 cents per litre over the course of a week, and it would be locked in law. For a family buying around 57 litres of fuel a week that could mean an extra $20 they have to pay, which would add up to more than $1,000 a year. It is money that Queensland families cannot afford to pay.

Perhaps the most extraordinary part of this entire debate is that even Labor's own colleagues in Western Australia have warned us about the dangers of government intervention in fuel prices. Western Australia Labor Premier Roger Cook considered imposing fuel price caps earlier this year. What did he say? He warned that retailers could simply move to the maximum price, that it would distort the market and it could create further disruptions to the fuel supply chain. His government ultimately decided against introducing a price cap like this. Here we have a Labor Premier on the other side of the country recognising the risks of interfering with fuel prices, but the member for Murrumba is still trying to convince Queenslanders that more government control is the answer. You cannot regulate your way to cheaper petrol. Importantly, Western Australia does not have Labor's proposed five-cent cap. No Australian jurisdiction has this. Labor has taken elements of other schemes, added in their own price restriction and decided that Queensland families should be their grand experiment.

Warnings about this approach are not just coming from the government. Submitters to the committee warned that Labor's proposal could increase baseline fuel prices, discouraging discounting and weakening the competition. One submission warned that artificial price restrictions could drive up the floor price of petrol. Another warned that retailers could become reluctant to reduce prices because doing so might limit their ability to respond to future price movements. That is the fundamental problem with Labor's approach. It assumes that controlling price movements will automatically make petrol cheaper. If retailers respond by keeping prices higher to protect themselves against future increases then Queensland motorists will lose. If discounting becomes less attractive—like if supply continues to be an issue—Queensland motorists will also lose. If smaller independent retailers face additional costs and restrictions then competition will suffer.

Queensland needs more competition in the fuel market, not less. Queensland already has mandatory fuel price reporting. Retailers must report changes within 30 minutes of them happening. That means motorists can compare prices, find cheaper fuel and make informed decisions about where they fill up. Importantly, retailers remain free to compete and offer discounts. That is a good thing. It is how a market should work. Labor had a decade in government—a decade to improve competition, a decade to strengthen Queensland's fuel security, a decade to deliver meaningful reform—yet, after 10 years in office, the best idea they could take to an election was 'Stevo's servos'. Now, from opposition, they want another—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order relating to the use of correct titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bonney, I ask you to use correct titles.

Mr O'CONNOR: Thank you. Now, from opposition, they want another attempt at government control of the fuel market. This is not a serious long-term plan to improve affordability; it is just more politicking from an opposition that has run out of ideas.

We have already seen Labor's attention to detail when it comes to transport legislation. Its original proposal for permanent 50-cent public transport fares would have left out the Brisbane City Council's ferries and our Gold Coast Light Rail network, which I am so very passionate about. Imagine that: a bill supposedly designed to protect affordable public transport fares that failed to capture major public transport services. Those provisions have since been ruled out because the LNP's permanent 50-cent fares have now been locked in law under our government, but it tells Queenslanders everything they need to know about the standard of policy work coming from those opposite. They cannot even get the details of their own legislation right.

In contrast, the Crisafulli government is focused on doing the things that will actually make a difference—that is, increasing supply. You do not put downward pressure on the price of something by trying to cap it; you do it through increasing supply. We are opening up opportunities in the first new oilfield in a generation in the Taroom Trough. We are strengthening Queensland's fuel security and our sovereign capability to provide for our own state. More than $1.2 billion in private investment has been committed to exploration and appraisal programs in the Taroom Trough. We are supporting additional refining and fuel infrastructure, we are facilitating up to $100 million in private investment for additional fuel storage at BP's Bulwer Island facility, and we are investing $25 million to support renewable diesel production at Ampol's Lytton refinery. These are practical measures designed to strengthen Queensland's long-term fuel security and supply resilience.

I see the importance of delivering supply every day in my own portfolio of housing because the fundamental principle is exactly the same. You cannot fix a housing crisis without building more homes. You cannot address long-term fuel security without increasing supply and strengthening our capability to produce, refine and store fuel right here in Queensland. Everything Labor did failed to deliver the housing supply that Queensland needed to see. Everything they did added fuel to the fire and smashed the delivery of that supply. They left behind a housing crisis that has put enormous pressure on families right across our state, and now they want to apply the same failed thinking to fuel: more government intervention instead of addressing the underlying supply challenges, and more political stunts instead of practical solutions.

The Crisafulli government is focused on delivering the homes Queenslanders deserve and strengthening the fuel security our state depends on. That is what a serious government should be focused on, not another unmodelled intervention dreamed up by a desperate opposition leader—a leader who is hanging on by a thread. Queenslanders are already dealing with cost-of-living pressures. Families are watching every dollar. They are comparing prices at the supermarket, managing their household bills and looking for savings wherever they can. They do not need to see a Labor Party determined to interfere with the market in ways that would make filling up more expensive. The Crisafulli government will not support a proposal that could leave those families paying more at the pump. We oppose this bill.

Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (5.43 pm): It is always great to follow the member for Bonney. Anyone who argues, as the member for Bonney has, that the fuel market is currently working is obviously being driven around in a ministerial car with a ministerial driver. No-one in my electorate would tell you that the fuel market is currently working. I do not know about other members here, but no-one is saying that to me. They are telling me that the cost of living right now is the No. 1 priority faced by every Queensland household, and fuel prices are right up there with energy costs, rent and groceries. I am proud to stand here and support the Transport Affordability Amendment Bill and to congratulate the shadow minister for transport, the member for Aspley, and also the Leader of the Opposition for showing actual leadership when it comes to delivering real cost-of-living relief.

Queenslanders cannot stop travelling when fuel prices go up. Parents do not have the luxury of not taking their children to school or not visiting a GP. When households are already stretched, every additional dollar spent on transport is a dollar that is not available to be spent on something else. This bill provides an opportunity to do something about it, yet today the government will choose to stand alongside and protect the interests of multinational fuel companies, rather than side with the very Queenslanders who elected them to govern.

One of the first things the now opposition leader, the member for Murrumba, did when he was premier two years ago was to introduce 50-cent fares. Who remembers those times when we actually had a premier who prioritised public transport and affordability? The Miles Labor government's 50-cent fares was the most significant transport reform I have seen in my time. We know who introduced that and Queenslanders know who introduced that and who was behind that, and no amount of trying to reframe history is going to change that.

Mr SPEAKER: Just a moment, member for Cooper. It is getting very noisy in the chamber. The member for Cooper is the only one who has the call.

Ms BUSH: The evidence presented to the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee was compelling. RACQ, which represents more than 1.7 million members, told the committee that the South-East Queensland fuel market is failing consumers. These are strong words from an organisation that ordinarily prefers markets to operate without government intervention. RACQ found that in 2024 a typical two-car household in Greater Brisbane paid about $324 more for petrol than the equivalent household in Perth. Why should Queenslanders be paying more for fuel than any other jurisdiction? We cannot put that difference down to international oil prices because RACQ also found that Brisbane's average gross retail margin was 22.5 cents per litre compared with 11 cents in Perth and Adelaide despite broadly similar wholesale prices.

Our committee heard how the current fuel market is failing Queensland motorists. If the government reject today's reforms, Queenslanders are entitled to ask them what alternative they propose. We know that it will not be an investment in public transport infrastructure or active transport infrastructure. We have seen what they have done to Queensland Walks and we have seen the cuts they have made to public and active transport, including cutting and dismantling the dedicated infrastructure team that sits in DTMR.

The No. 1 economic priority of any government facing household pressures should be making everyday life more affordable. That means examining fuel prices and protecting affordable public transport. Markets have an important role in our economy, but markets should be working for the people and we know right now that the fuel market is not doing that. I commend the bill to the House and urge members opposite to take up the offer to deliver practical cost-of-living relief for all Queenslanders today.

Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (5.47 pm): I am pleased to be able to make a contribution in this debate. I follow the deputy chair of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, and I appreciate her comments with regard to the affordability of petrol. I was very pleased we were able to examine the detail of this bill. We had arguments both for and against the bill. What is philosophically at the base of all of this is the difference between the Labor Party and the LNP. That is, the Labor Party loves to have government intervention and to try to control systems with more red tape and bureaucracy, while the LNP wants to let free market choice occur. Independent service stations—small mum-and-dad operators—were the ones who were most fearful of this bill, and they are the ones who would be driven out the backdoor with different economics in place.

We oppose the bill before us today. It was not a very well-thought-out bill. Actually, it was well thought out in the politics. I will give the member for Aspley credit because petrol prices were soaring because of the global problems that we had and he has been able to grab hold of this and say, 'Let's just have a minimal increase of five cents.'

Of course mums and dads in the community will say, 'That sounds like a good idea,' but it is not until they get into the nitty-gritty of it and get a good understanding of what that actually means that they will realise that no, it will not be a limit of five cents; it will actually cost about $20 a week or $1,000 a year. As others have said—and I will associate myself with the words of both the Treasurer and the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth, who very sensibly talked about the five cents being a goal that could be achieved, not two cents per day or three cents a day. When you try to control the market, the market does different things. I again come back to the philosophical difference between the Labor government wanting to have more control and being able to do 'bigger government'—in my words—and the LNP letting the free market do what it does.

I must say that, as chair of the committee, I did raise a couple of issues and I tabled a document with regard to the former Labor government's temporary 50-cent fares—'temporary' is what it said in the budget papers—and the allocated period of six months for a trial. That is what the former Labor government did. That is why I was very pleased to say it was a political stunt because they were trying to get elected. Things were pretty desperate and they thought, 'Let's throw these 50-cent fares in as a trial just to test the market and see what happens.' The LNP came along and said, 'No, we're going to make it permanent,' and that is exactly what we did. We funded it into the forwards across each of the years. It is permanently funded, so that part of this bill fell away and was not relevant. That was long before this bill came to the House. I say to the member for Aspley in terms of the politics of it that saying to mums and dads, 'Let's just cap the increase to five cents,' it sounds very good until you get into the details of it.

I really appreciate the efforts that we as a government are making, and I recognise the Minister for Natural Resources, Dale Last, for the efforts he is making. I go back to May 2025 when he issued different permits to drill for oil and find more resources in the state. That is a better solution in terms of the long-term cost-of-living arrangements in Queensland and having sovereignty. It was back in May 2025 that those permits were issued to unlock that resource. That is what I want to associate myself with, not trying to cap increases at five cents and market control.

Those efforts are occurring. We are drilling, we are refining and we are going to store our own diesel and other products. That is an amazing opportunity for us to do as a government, as well as looking at that long-term cost-of-living relief—not just the long-term opportunity that sovereign capability regarding fuel gives us but also the permanent 50-cent fares. A great number of people in my community travel to Brisbane or to South-East Queensland and park at Redbank, Dinmore or one of the other stations along the way and make use of those 50-cent fares. They leave home at 10 or 11 o'clock, outside of peak hour, and make use of those fares—something they could not do previously. I really appreciate the efforts of our government with regard to that. Again, that is a far greater saving than the five-cent-a-litre cap on fuel would have.

The other thing that people tell me is that their whole commuting arrangements have changed. They are able to park their car at a station. They do not have to pay the high cost of parking in town because they get on a 50-cent train or bus to come to town and then they head back home. They are

saving the cost of that parking as well. That is another great cost-of-living element that is associated with the current government's policy that I believe all of us here in the House should pay a great deal of respect to that, instead of this ploy of being able to control the service stations with regard to their fuel pricing.

This is a cost-of-living arrangement. I want to also associate myself with the efforts of the Treasurer and what we are doing with regard to electricity prices for residents and business. That fundamental aspect of being able to keep the lights on, keep our coal-fired generators going and generate more power through gas and the coal-fired arrangements are part of our genuine cost-of-living arrangements.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The bill pertains to the Fair Trading Act and regulations. It does not apply to electricity maintenance or operation. I ask you to suggest the member be relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, you are on the committee. You are aware of the contents of the bill, so I will ask you to be relevant to the bill.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the guidance. As I said in my contribution, I really want to associate myself with the cost-of-living savings we introduced. This was one proposal of a policy with regard to the five-cent cap but, as I have said, I believe the 50-cent permanent fares not only saves people in terms of the cost of car parking and their fare but also leads them to make some lifestyle choices, and that is a great aspect. In regard to affordability and cost-of-living arrangements, I believe what we have done with regard to electricity prices is great. I believe that is relevant to the bill. It is a different policy consideration.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I think the member and chair of the committee is wilfully defying your guidance, Mr Speaker, on relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, I would urge you to be relevant to the bill.

Mr McDONALD: I will turn to the other parts of the bill. I do thank you for your guidance. One of the things that this government has been able to do is look at having state sovereignty with regard to our oil and other fuel products so that we do not have to control that market. Instead, we can have a long-term fundamental cost-of-living arrangement. What the Crisafulli government has been doing is not just a sugar hit. It is not just trying to put in place some things that might appeal to people. We are looking at the long-term advantages of many policy positions, whether that be the cost-of-living arrangements or others.

I will come back to the point of the Transport Affordability Amendment Bill as proposed by the member for Aspley. The committee did receive a lot of submissions to the bill. There were some that were supportive of it and some that were not. As I have said, small and family business, the small operators, were the ones that were fearful of this. They believed that many of them would go out the back door because of the change in the economics of it. With regard to the five-cent proposal, there was very much a strong sense—and not just because of our political philosophy of having a free market economy—to ensure it was not just a race to put prices up.

I certainly support the cost-of-living arrangements that we have been talking about—the things that we have put in place, such as the permanent 50-cent fares and not allowing non-government intervention with regard to service stations, as proposed in this bill. I certainly believe we should be opposing the bill. I do believe that this is an attempt by the former government—they could have done this while they were in government, but they did not. This is just a political stunt to gather back some ground. This is just an attempted sugar hit that will not produce good outcomes. It will actually produce bad outcomes for Queenslanders.



Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (5.59 pm): I rise to speak on the Transport Affordability Amendment Bill 2026 today because Queenslanders want cheaper fuel. People in my electorate of Kurwongbah want cheaper fuel. We have some of the higher prices in the Moreton Bay region across our local servos and I know people want relief. Experts have told us that this bill can deliver by limiting the daily increase of fuel prices to five cents a day. The member who just resumed his seat was saying that it would be a five-cent saving. I say to the chair of the committee: no, it is limiting the increase of fuel prices to five cents per day. It also requires fuel companies to report tomorrow's fuel prices at 2 pm every day. This new transparency will allow householders to budget better for petrol knowing what prices will be from day to day.

As has been mentioned by the chair and the deputy chair, who have already spoken, I am on the parliamentary committee that inquired into this bill. I want to thank the secretariat for its work during our

inquiry. Thanks also to the departmental officers and other stakeholders such as RACQ, which appeared before us and provided modelling for this and was very supportive, as well as all who made submissions about this bill. The shadow minister for transport appeared before the committee and I want to thank him for his work on the bill. As many Queensland families know, it can cost around $200 to fill up an average tank on an average dual cab ute at today's diesel prices. Whatever your brand—Toyota, Ford, Holden or Mitsubishi—that is a fair chunk of the weekly income. This five-cent-a-day cap on fuel price increases could provide real cost-of-living relief to millions of Queenslanders who do not have the capacity to absorb a fuel spike because an overseas shipping lane gets blocked or a fuel company decides to juice up its margins.

As the RACQ has modelled, implementing this cap on price increases could bring down fuel prices by 23 cents a litre overall. This evidence was presented to our parliamentary committee. For a family filling up two cars, that could be the difference between getting to work and having full stomachs at the dinner table. For tradies putting in hundreds of kilometres a week just getting to and from job sites, filling up numerous times in a big week, that amounts to an incredible saving. It certainly would add up. These changes could put real money back in the pockets of Queenslanders. I reckon that is more useful than another LNP slogan or turning the maroon state blue.

Right now in Brisbane our petrol cycle is around six weeks compared to around 2½ weeks in Adelaide and weekly cycles in Perth, where retailer margins are around half of what they are in Brisbane. This means more consumers here having what is left of our wages dictated by whatever a fuel company decides to charge the morning we need to fill up. In other places like Perth you can plan your fuel stop around your pay cycle. We do not think it is fair that drivers who get paid on a Tuesday should pay wildly different prices to those who get paid on a Thursday—something we see a lot of here because the power rests with the petrol companies and their profit margins. This bill can change that. This bill can bring power back to consumers.

The last part of this bill which I will touch on briefly relates to Labor's legacy 50-cent fares. We wanted to make sure that any future proposal about changes to 50-cent fares was scrutinised by the parliament, with notice, and voted on. The LNP says it has already fixed that. I cannot complain. Maybe it could adopt some other Labor ideas like electric buses instead of diesel buses. In fact, those buses would benefit from this bill if it were to pass. While the Crisafulli government has scrapped Labor's energy rebates and car rego discounts, Labor has been working on solutions. While the LNP spends big on blue billboards and four-word slogans, Labor is committed to delivering cost-of-living relief to Queenslanders, because Queenslanders deserve policy that puts money back in their pockets. This bill means households can budget their fuel bills without being beholden to a market the RACQ has described as 'failing'. It is in our power to fix those failings right here, right now. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (6.02 pm): It is a long afternoon and I was tempted to speak on something in the hour and a half I was sitting here. Having listened to what I can only describe as drivel from the other side, I thought I better inject something like rational debate and economics into this debate with regard to what I would describe as the Hugo Chavez of Venezuela oil price and petrol pricing option introduced by the member for Aspley. Under those opposite, the commissars are back and the politburo is in control. Here we go: petrol rationing is back on and price rises are back in. No longer do those opposite believe in the power of the market. No longer do they believe in the power of people to make their own choice. No longer do they believe in small and family enterprises to make a quid and to earn a dollar. What they believe in is state owned power, state owned petrol stations, state control of the pricing and the enormous bureaucracy that has to go with it to police it and make it all work. That is what we get under the comrades of the Labor Party.

Do not take my word for it: look at what happens when you introduce price controls for fuel, because they tried it in the United States, and what happened? People got a taste of life in the Soviet Union. They queued up for hours waiting to get in, so demand went up and supply went down and no-one won. It was like putting a brick on the top of a kettle and turning up the heat. All that happened was the underlying inflationary problem was disguised and no-one got anything. There was less fuel, there was less incentive for people to supply fuel and the consumer lucked out. Let's not talk about the mates rates deals that will happen—the black market that flourishes when you put price caps in in relation to fuel.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: The believers say, 'Oh', because we remember them. Remember the price controls and the rationing that was introduced? That is the basics of the economics of the 21st century Labor Party—put a cap on prices, reduce supply, increase demand and think it will benefit people. What it will do is empower the big fuel retailers because they have the capacity to weather the increase in prices being capped. They have the capacity because they own their own places, but the small businessperson who runs their own private place cannot weather that. They do not have the share market and the shareholders sitting behind them or the big banks sitting behind them. All this will do is entrench the big fuel companies and reduce the market competition, which is already being reduced here in Brisbane. What it does not address is the underlying inflationary aspects of it and what those opposite do not address is their comrades in Canberra's fault in increasing inflation across the board. We have even had Michelle Bullock say, 'Oh no, the international oil prices are not the cause of inflation in Australia.' She said that in November 2026 in a Senate inquiry. What she said is that there is low productivity under Labor and Jim Chalmers is spending too much—his expenditure is blowing out—and all of the things they talk about are leading to the inflationary stuff.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As much as we are enjoying this enlightening journey, it is not relevant to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Thank you. I was listening to the minister intently and I believe he was talking about fuel prices and quoting the Governor of the RBA who was talking about the cost of living. I believe he is being totally relevant to the bill, so there is no point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I respect your wisdom and your recollection, because I do recall those on the other side talking about international oil prices and oil shocks and those sorts of things. When we talk about the cost of something, the cost of something is what the market determines it to be and it is determined around the supply and the demand for that product, and nothing more so than petrol. The only people who seek to do this are the Labor Party. Not one economist would support it. Not one small businessperson would support it.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge.

Mr NICHOLLS: The only people who support it—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge!

Mr NICHOLLS:—are the commissars—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge!

Mr NICHOLLS:—and the forelock-tugging politburo members on the other side of the House who—

Mr Dick interjected.

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

Mr NICHOLLS:—if they had their way, would introduce price controls on everything.

Opposition members interjected.

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

Mr NICHOLLS: They tried it on—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Member for Woodridge, you are warned. Member for Logan, you are warned. I tried to call you to order and you completely did not hear me. You are both warned.

Ms McMillan interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mansfield, you are warned too.

Mr NICHOLLS: As my friend the member for Chatsworth said, the price is in the elasticity of demand, and those opposite are the only ones in the 21st century who believe they can do something about it by capping fuel prices in the way that they propose in this bill. It is a fallacious argument. It has been disproven time and again by experience. Economists will argue against it until they are blue in the face. It happens whether it is rent controls, it happens whether it is price controls on fuel, it happens

whether it is the price controls on bananas. This is failed economics from a failed party with a failed platform.

All they really want to do is emulate the failed policies of Hugo Chavez and all the commissars over in Venezuela to try to buy a few cheap points. The very people they seek to benefit will be the ones who pay the highest price. It is always the case that those who can afford to will be able to afford it. Those who cannot will pay a higher price for doing so. I urge everyone to exercise common sense, the benefit of experience and basic economics. Vote this bill down. It does not even deserve the consideration it has been given in this place to date.



Ms BOURNE (Ipswich West—ALP) (6.10 pm): The health minister could have spent the last 10 minutes talking about those four people who are deceased and calling those families to let them know that will never, ever happen again.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have two points of order. The first one is that I take personal offence and the second one is that what the member is talking about is completely irrelevant.

Ms BOURNE: I withdraw. I rise to speak in support of the Transport Affordability Amendment Bill 2026. If you live in Ipswich West, chances are you rely heavily on your car, whether it is getting to work, doing the school run or popping down to the shops. For many people there is simply no alternative. Brisbane motorists are paying more for unleaded petrol than motorists in any other Australian capital city and that price flows out to places like Ipswich. RACQ's report showed that unleaded retail margins in Brisbane are more than double those in Perth and that Brisbane's price cycle lasts about six weeks, providing only eight chances to get cheap fuel each year, while Perth's weekly cycle provides 52 weeks. It also showed that motorists could save up to 23 cents a litre under our proposed bill. For someone filling up a 60-litre tank once a week that could put over $700 back in their pocket each year. For many local families and pensioners it could mean staying in their rental, keeping on top of mortgage repayments, or helping to pay for the weekly grocery shop. This would be real structural cost-of-living relief that could ease the pressure on household budgets.

Why won't the government support this bill? It is an opportunity to support Queenslanders while they face an affordability crisis, especially when there is no clear plan to help families with rising costs. Congestion on our roads is getting worse. People are spending people are spending longer waiting to get to work and home in their car, burning through fuel. How does the LNP government explain not supporting making fuel cheaper to the people I represent? Yet again, when a solution is on the table, all we see from the government are delays and an inability to act.

They simply do not seem to care about the people of Ipswich West. When will they deliver the Mount Crosby interchange? Construction was due to start this year but has had its funding pushed into the never-never. While Labor's 50-cent fares continue to offer relief to commuters, it remains difficult for many of my constituents to take advantage of that relief. There continue to be delays in the Ipswich bus service improvement program. This should have commenced by now but the minister remains silent on the timelines. These transport infrastructure projects are crucial for our growing community, particularly given Ipswich City Council's released draft structure plan anticipates up to 20,000 new homes and 50,000 residents across Rosewood, Walloon and Thagoona over the next decade.

If we want to tackle growing congestion, we need to think of viable ways to encourage people to leave their cars at home. One way is to offer reliable, affordable and frequent public transport. Due to the lack of alternatives people in my electorate have no choice but to drive, paying through the nose for petrol, sitting in traffic on roads that should be upgraded and watching more houses go up around them without knowing when the infrastructure will follow. The least this government could have done today was support a bill that could help to bring down the cost of living when filling up cars. I thank the shadow transport minister for an amazing bill.



Mr MELLISH (Aspley—ALP) (6.13 pm), in reply: When it comes to the contributions from some of those members opposite regarding this bill, some of the arguments they were making were pretty bizarre. We did not hear any industry leaders referenced. We did not hear anyone sourced at all. We did not hear comments opposing the bill attributed to anyone. It was quite remarkable.

The Treasurer kicked off and talked mostly about the proposals of the former government that were totally unrelated to the bill. He could not name a single stakeholder opposing the bill when we kept asking, 'Who?' He even misquoted a stakeholder talking two years ago about measures that are not in the bill. The Treasurer of the state, in his main opposition to the bill, could not quote a single person opposing it.

The member for Bonney was nowhere near the bill either. We know the member for Bonney is the acting as the Minister for Transport today, and we know he has a lack of attention to detail—the same lack of care as the substantive position holder, it seems. He has the hybrid electric ministerial car and the fuel card, so we know he is not worried about petrol prices too much. It looked like he was quoting someone, but then he did not actually attribute the quotes to anyone. It is a new form of debating in this chamber when you can just quote no-one and put that forward as fact to support your argument. It is going to open up a world of possibilities going forward! Some of the most egregious things the member for Bonney was saying was when he said, 'It is how the market should work.' There you have it. The LNP are happy for Queenslanders to get ripped off. They are happy for people to pay more at the petrol bowser than they need to. They are happy for families to struggle to pay for their groceries and struggle to pay their bills because 'that is how the market should work'.

At times, you see the mask slip in this chamber. 'That is how the market should work'—that is what those on the other side believe when it comes to government. They go on about how terrible it is to interfere in the market. Then, in the same breath, a few of the speakers slip into their oil and gas plan. They slip into the Taroom Trough. They are very happy to interfere in the market there. They are very happy to help out petrol companies. They are very happy to help out oil barons. It is okay to interfere in that market—that is fine. But, when it comes to interfering in the market of mum and dad trying to fill up the Tarago, you cannot possibly do that—no, no. That is economic vandalism: trying to interfere to save Queenslanders money. It is absolutely ridiculous.

We go on to the member for Lockyer. I have a lot of respect for the member for Lockyer from my days on the committee. Sometimes he takes a balanced view on bills and his views are reasonable. I was interested to hear his philosophical contributions. I think he made some great contributions. If I have quoted him right, he said, 'When you try to control the market, the market does different things.' I think that is a great quote. I expected a bit of Adam Smith from those opposite today, maybe a bit of Milton Friedman. I think quietly there might be a few Keynesians over there who might want to agree with it, but we have some 'Lockyer-isms' now. We have the 'Lockyer School of Economics'. 'When you try to control the market, the market does different things'—there we go. Again, we talked about the philosophical differences of those opposite. They want to let the market rip. They want to let the market decide—that is all fine—and then they all pivot onto the Taroom Trough. They all pivot onto their oil and gas plan and it is okay to interfere in the market again. It is pretty ridiculous.

We know we have the Third Way in economics—maybe we have the 'Lockyer way'. I suppose it is better than the 'downgrade way', which is the Treasurer at the moment. Then, of course, we saw this amazing contribution by the man who wants to be treasurer—the former treasurer, the member for Clayfield—so keen was he to come in and lecture us. We did not hear about the Magna Carta today, thank God.

Mr de Brenni: There was no mention of Strong Choices

Mr MELLISH: There was no mention of Strong Choices. I take that interjection from the member for Springwood—that $90 million plan he had that got knocked back at the 2015 election. We heard about commissars and Hugo Chavez. He gave us a lecture on price controls, but maybe he forgot that the Premier himself in early 2025 said he wanted to look at this. Maybe that is why he is health minister. Maybe he has been too forthright in the past on issues, accusing the Premier of having Hugo Chavez politics and being a commissar for looking at this policy.

Of course, we have not heard from the Premier much since early 2025 on petrol prices. He has run a mile from this bill. He does not want his side to back it. He does not want to give people cost-of-living relief. This would not actually cost the government much. This would not cost the budget bottom line much but it would really benefit Queenslanders' bottom lines. Queensland families would feel the benefit from this bill, yet this government cannot bring themselves to pass a Labor bill. They cannot bring themselves to give a win to someone else. Perhaps the health minister should be worried about ramping on a day like this. He should be worried about the deaths of people who have died while waiting for ambulances. You would think that would be his priority—but, no, he wants to come into this chamber and lecture us.

Maybe his only interest in ramping is to save fuel. If ambulances are ramped they are not out on the road saving people's lives. It is completely ridiculous for him to come in here. We got another great quote from the member for Clayfield: 'The cost of something is what the market determines it to be.' Well done on his first-year macroeconomics lesson! That is absolutely outstanding. He is giving us all a lecture. I cannot wait to hear more from him in the future. That will not get him out of being health minister. We know he does not want to be in that position. We know he wants to be Treasurer. No

amount of lecturing on economic models and price controls and 'the cost of something is what the market determines it to be' will get him out of that position. It is completely ridiculous for him to come in here and make that argument when he has plenty of other things to do.

We heard much from the government in relation to the RACQ modelling. They wanted to see the modelling. They asked me about five or six questions in the committee hearing around 'Where is the modelling?', 'What is the modelling?', 'Do you have modelling to prove this?' Then when they got the modelling they did not want to read it. We did not hear a single reference to the modelling in their contributions. 'We want to see the modelling?' 'We demand to see the modelling?'—until they actually see the modelling. The RACQ's modelling would reduce prices by 23 cents a litre. They did not do this work overnight. They spent a long time researching this policy. They put in the hours. It is not my modelling, or that of the member for Murrumba, this is the RACQ's modelling.

They could not find a single stakeholder to oppose this. They made some vague references to people who do not want to see it happen. When it comes to the actual measures in this bill Queenslanders want to see it happen. Queenslanders want to see price relief at the bowser. They know they are under pressure from this government on a range of fronts and this government is doing nothing. The RACQ have said that the market is failing to deliver reasonable petrol prices to consumers and are calling for a five-cent cap on the amount that fuel companies can increase their prices by on any given day. Those opposite said the five cents was plucked from thin air. That is from the RACQ's direct modelling. What do people in the regions say? The Central Highlands Regional Council said—

Council's position is any mechanism that can reduce the large price swings suffered by Queensland motorists needs full consideration, particularly if such a mechanism can be implemented without increases in costly bureaucracy.

The SDA, the union that represents a lot of low-paid young workers who have to drive to their jobs, who cannot get public transport under this government's stalled public transport rollout, said—

The SDA is concerned about impact of increasing fuel prices and the potential increase of 50 cent public transport fares on retail workers. Costs associated with transport directly affect the quality of life experienced by all working people required to commute and attend a workplace. The SDA strongly supports any measures to regulate fairer fuel prices and deter fare increases.

Mr de Brenni: How much does it cost the Premier to go from his house to his electorate?

Mr MELLISH: I take the interjection from the member for Springwood. Those opposite do not care about petrol prices for people. They do not care about Queensland motorists being taken for a ride. Every time people pull into a petrol station they are reminded of the price of petrol. Consider a casino worker driving more than 30 kilometres each way to Brisbane for five shifts a week. If petrol jumps 30 cents a litre, that is nearly $8 more a week just for fuel to get to work that they have to budget for—around $370 over 48 working weeks. That is money they have worked hard to earn disappearing at the bowser. Consider a teacher aide who on the way to school drives past petrol at $2.20 but by the time she finishes work finds it is $2.50. That is an extra $15 on a 50-litre tank. It is the same petrol, at the same service station but at a much higher price. Queenslanders are being absolutely taken for a ride.

I mentioned earlier that the fuel cycle in Queensland is up to six weeks. It is not good enough. That is eight chances a year for Queensland families to fill up. Western Australia, which has price controls, has a one-week cycle. That is 52 times a year. They can plan their life around it, plan their spending. They can budget for it.

This Premier does not want Queenslanders, local families who are struggling, to have any cost relief simply because this is a Labor measure brought in through a private members' bill. We know those opposite did not want to keep 50-cent fares. They called it a scam. It was only when it was overwhelmingly endorsed, backed and used by the public did the LNP then try to claim it as their own. They tried to claim they made it permanent. One cannot trust them on public transport. There were 35,000 services scrapped this year and I would not be surprised if the latest patronage data—we know they are being sneaky with that—has eroded some, if not all, of the benefits made through 50-cent fares. Public transport is about use, regularity and habit. Under this government people got out of the habit of using public transport. They were forced onto the roads and to pay more at the bowser every single week. This government does not care about the cost of living. They do not care about making fuel affordable for Queenslanders.

This government should endorse this bill. This is a solid bill that has quality research behind it. The RACQ back it. Stakeholders back it. The government could not quote a single stakeholder opposing this bill. To oppose this bill is pure politics.

Ms Scanlon: How much does the Premier pay to get to his electorate?

Mr MELLISH: I take that interjection from the member for Gaven. How much does the Premier pay—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): In accordance with the business motion agreed to by the House and it being 6.25 pm, I will now put the second reading question.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 35:

ALP, 33—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.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Perret, Linard; Mickelberg, Whiting

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

JUSTICE LEGISLATION (STRENGTHENING VICTIMS' RIGHTS) AMENDMENT BILL

VICTIMS OF CRIME ASSISTANCE (VICTIMS' ADVOCATE SERVICE) AMENDMENT BILL

CIVIL LIABILITY (HOLDING INSTITUTIONS ACCOUNTABLE FOR CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 3736, on motion of Mrs Frecklington, and Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill resumed from p. 3736, on motion of Ms Scanlon—

That the bills be now read a second time.



Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (7.30 pm): I rise in strong support of the two important bills being debated cognately today, the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill and the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, which represent a clear and long-overdue shift in Queensland. They put victims first, they deliver on the commitments Queenslanders voted for and they begin to fix a system that for far too long left people who had already suffered harm feeling invisible, unsupported and retraumatised.

As the member for Thuringowa, I speak for the communities in Townsville and across North Queensland that lived through 10 years of escalating crime under Labor. Families, small business owners, elderly residents and young people were forced to navigate a fragmented system while dealing with the aftermath of violence and violation. Under the previous Labor government, victim numbers rose dramatically, services were spread across departments, people were left repeating their stories again and again, and many simply fell through the cracks. These bills change that.

The Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill establishes the framework for a nation-leading $50 million victims advocate service. This a genuine one-stop shop designed by victims for victims. Extensive consultation involving more than 600 people, victims of crime,

their families, advocates and frontline service providers shaped this model. It provides a single statewide point of contact through a 24-hour, seven-day-a-week call centre live chat and a dedicated online information hub. Victims will be able to reach out for help at any time, no matter where they live in Queensland.

This is a practical response to what victims and grassroots advocates have told us repeatedly. The service will work alongside existing specialist victim support organisations rather than replace them. It will strengthen coordination and referral pathways so that people are connected with the right support for their individual circumstances. Importantly, it will provide ongoing navigation support. Systems will track inquiries, referrals and outcomes so victims are not forced to start from scratch every time they need help. For victims, information-sharing arrangements supported by liaison officers embedded across seven government agencies will reduce the burden of chasing updates from different departments.

I acknowledge the powerful and practical submissions made by Victims 1st, led by Lyndy and George Atkinson. They work at the coalface every day. They help victims navigate Victim Assist, the Queensland Police Service, the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions and the courts. They attend hearings, they help prepare impact statements and they sit with people through the darkest periods of their lives. In their submission on the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill, Victims 1st made the case clearly: for years they effectively acted as an informal victims' advocate service because a proper one did not exist. They assisted hundreds of victims while meeting with agencies and ministers to explain what was going wrong on the ground. They welcome the creation of a dedicated service as an essential entry point that gives people hope. They support a 24/7 call centre and online hub. They highlighted the importance of including victims of property crime—those who wake to find their homes broken into, their cars stolen and their sense of safety destroyed. They stressed that the new service should act as a guiding hand through a complex system with proper information sharing and tracking so people are not lost in bureaucracy.

The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 is equally significant. It reforms the victim impact statement framework so that it is more trauma informed and more meaningful. For the first time, the therapeutic value of allowing a victim to tell their story in their own words is formally recognised. Eligibility is expanded to all indictable offences and to summary offences resulting in death or bodily harm. This includes property related offences such as burglary, arson and the unlawful use of a motor vehicle—offences that have caused real trauma in my electorate and right across North Queensland communities. The definition of who may provide a statement is broadened to better reflect modern families and support networks, including grandparents, grandchildren, stepchildren, carers and close supporters. Flexibility is increased so that statements can be presented in writing, read allowed by the victim or nominated person, or given by prerecorded audio or audiovisual means. Unnecessary redactions that strip statements of their force are restricted. Cross-examination is limited. A community impact statement framework is established so that the broader harm caused by offences such as child exploitation material and serious vilification can be properly placed before the court.

Again, Victims 1st spoke powerfully to these changes. They describe the frustration and devastation that victims feel when, on the eve of sentencing, large parts of their carefully prepared statements are redacted. They said that too often a victim has been silenced while the court hears about the offender's background. They welcome the greater freedom for victims to speak of the true impact of injuries, financial loss, changes to daily life and ongoing fear. They support allowing trusted supporters to read statements, noting that victims often feel more comfortable with someone who has walked the journey with them. They endorse the expansion to property related offences and the recognition of the broader ripple effect on families and communities. These are not abstract policy points; they come from people who sit with victims week after week and see the difference between a system that treats people as afterthoughts and one that treats them with dignity.

I note the broader consultation that informed these bills. Hundreds of victims, family members, advocates and organisations across regional Queensland, including in North Queensland, took part in the development of the victims advocate service model. The committee process heard from a range of submitters who, while raising constructive points, largely recognised the need for these reforms. The committee recommended that both bills be passed and that recommendation is the right one.

These bills do not claim to solve every problem overnight—no single piece of legislation can—but they make a decisive change in direction. They replace fragmentation with a clear entry point. They

replace limited constrained impact statements with a more flexible and respectful process. They recognise that victims of property crime also suffer real harm. They give bereaved families better notification rights in the coronial process and they place the lived experience of victims and grassroots advocates at the centre of the design. This puts victims first, just as we promised.

In my community of Thuringowa, people know the human cost of a system that left victims to fend for themselves. They know the difference between being treated as an afterthought and being treated with dignity. I have said that twice because I think it is very important to bear in mind when we listen to victims. These bills are part of the broader work that the government is doing to restore safety, hold offenders to account and put the rights of victims ahead of the rights of offenders. I thank the victims and advocates who gave their time and their hard-won experience to the consultation and committee processes. Their voices have shaped better law, their voices have been heard and we support them. I commend the bills to the House.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (7.38 pm): I rise tonight to speak on the cognate debate on the following bills: Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026. Queensland Labor supports reforms that protect victims and ensure access to justice. Victims deserve dignity and a system that listens. But support does not give the Crisafulli LNP government a free pass.

Community organisations, including Voice for Victims and Victims 1st, have carried an extraordinary burden. Victims 1st told the committee it had operated as an interim advocacy service. Unfunded organisations should not shoulder responsibilities the government promised to undertake. The new service must strengthen frontline organisations, not transfer costs. The government must confront pressures within Victim Assist Queensland. As we know, between November 2024 and June 2025, victims waited an average of 72 days for an assessor and 105 days for an initial decision. As at 30 June 2026, at least 4,460 applications remained under assessment. Reports have highlighted psychologists waiting up to 18 months for payment and victims up to two years for reimbursement. A referral is not assistance if the receiving service cannot respond. The government must explain how it will manage demand, particularly in regional, rural and remote Queensland. At estimates, contracts for additional victim liaison officers funded by the former Labor government had not been renewed.

The Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill is an opportunity to improve victims' experiences. Labor supports the Queensland Sentencing Advisory Council's *Ripple effect* report, delivered in December 2024, yet the LNP has not responded publicly to its 28 recommendations. The Attorney-General must explain what has been implemented and when outstanding action will occur.

This bill implements recommendation 21 through a trauma informed approach to victim impact statements. Victims can explain the physical, psychological, emotional and financial consequences of being offended against. Removing substantial portions from a victim impact statement leaves the victims feeling silenced.

The bill allows statements, despite material that might otherwise be considered irrelevant or inadmissible. It permits prerecorded audio or audiovisual presentations, or presentation by a trusted family member, friend or carer. However, the concerns expressed by the Queensland Law Society, Bar Association and Youth Advocacy Centre about unproven allegations and delays deserve consideration. Victims' rights and procedural fairness must both be protected.

Community impact statements recognise that offending can harm whole communities, even where individual victims are not identifiable. Initially, they apply to child exploitation material offences and serious vilification and prohibited symbols offences. The two-year review must assess whether the reforms work and whether agencies have sufficient resources.

I acknowledge submissions from HOME, HOPE and PTK, and contributions from Bindal Elder and Cultural Authority, Carl Lymburner and Irene Leard. They highlighted offending impacts in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities and the importance of culturally appropriate communication.

The bill improves communication with bereaved families under the Coroners Act. Families deserve timely information about coronial investigations and inquests.

The Victims' Advocate Service must be more than a directory. It should follow the Red Rose Foundation's no-wrong-door approach, stay engaged and provide warm referrals. Specialist sexual violence services need consent-based referrals, appropriate advocacy roles and funding.

The Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill raises a fundamental question: whose side is this government on? The Crisafulli LNP government has let down Queensland victims of institutional child abuse. Its position sends a disgraceful message that protecting institutions matters more than victims' access to justice. Quite frankly, the government is on the side of offenders rather than victims when it recommends rejecting legislation designed to close a loophole and hold institutions accountable. Labor developed these laws with legal experts and listened to Queenslanders and victim-survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. We have considered the legal issues and consulted those with expertise and lived experience. Institutions must not escape responsibility because the person who abused a child was a volunteer, a religious representative or someone in a relationship akin to employment. A child does not understand employment contracts or distinguish between an employee and a volunteer. The harm is the same, the betrayal of trust is the same and the need for accountability is the same.

The High Court's decision in Bird v DP on 13 November 2024 exposed this injustice. The Court found that existing vicarious liability laws did not extend to relationships akin to employment and made clear that extending the law was a matter for parliament. Labor has acted by bringing forward legislation to restore that pathway to justice, yet the Crisafulli government wants parliament to reject it. The Attorney-General has suggested that the subsequent decision in AA v Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle resolved the problem. That is incorrect. Bird v DP concerned vicarious liability; AA concerned non-delegable duty of care. They are separate doctrines, and one does not automatically replace the other. The Australian Lawyers' Alliance made that distinction clear to the committee.

The government cannot hide behind national discussions and the Standing Council of Attorneys-General. National consistency must not excuse inaction. The ACT has passed legislation unanimously, Victoria has progressed reforms, Western Australia's parliamentary committee has recommended action, and Tasmania's Liberal government has committed to reform. So, the question is: why is Queensland's LNP government standing in the way?

The royal commission found that victims took, on average, 24 years to disclose child sexual abuse. That is 24 years of trauma, silence and fear. Survivors should not face another legal loophole protecting institutions rather than victims. The Crisafulli government cannot claim to be the greatest advocate for victims while recommending that legislation restoring an avenue to justice be rejected.

On the eighth anniversary of the National Apology to Victims and Survivors of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, Queensland had an opportunity to turn words into action. Instead, the LNP committee majority recommended rejecting this bill. That is a failure of leadership and accountability. Justice should not depend on whether an abuser was paid, volunteered or held another position of institutional authority.

Mr CHIESA (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (7.48 pm): I rise in this cognate debate to ask a fundamental question: what does our justice system look like from the point of view of a victim? For a victim, the process does not begin and end with an arrest. It can mean the shock of a break-in, months of uncertainty about a court case or the grief of losing someone they love. At the very time they need answers, too many Queenslanders have been left wondering which agency to call and whether anyone is listening. That has to change. Holding offenders accountable is essential, but supporting victims is every bit as important. A victim must not become an afterthought once the legal process begins.

There is a record here that the Labor Party cannot simply wish away. The former government repealed the youth breach-of-bail offence, weakened its approach to serious repeat offending and left communities across regional Queensland demanding change. Recorded victim numbers rose by 193 per cent and the number of serious repeat youth offenders rose by 64 per cent over a five-year period during Labor's decade of decline. We are starting to see some positive movements. Victim numbers are down by 9.6 per cent—that is progress, but much more work needs to be done.

The first government bill, introduced by the Attorney-General, strengthens the rights of victims during sentencing. It starts with something that sounds straightforward: when somebody has been harmed by a crime, they should have a genuine opportunity to tell the court what that harm has meant to them. A victim impact statement should not be treated as another form to be processed or an account

to be cut down until the person who lived through the offence no longer recognises their own words. It informs the sentencing court. It also gives the victim a chance to be heard. This bill recognises both purposes.

The bill broadens the range of offences for which statements can be given, including indictable property offences. That matters. A person whose home has been broken into or whose vehicle has been stolen may not have suffered a physical injury but the damage to their sense of safety can be profound. It also expands who can provide a statement, recognising the harm experienced by people who are close to a victim.

The bill reduces unnecessary editing of victim impact statements while preserving the court's responsibility to disregard irrelevant or inadmissible material. It places stronger limits on cross-examination about those statements. It gives victims greater choice in how they speak to the court, including through a recorded statement or by asking someone else to read their words. These are practical, trauma informed reforms. A victim who is too distressed to read aloud in a courtroom should not lose their voice because of that distress.

The Victims' Commissioner will also be able to prepare community impact statements for certain serious offences, including child exploitation material, serious vilification and prohibited symbol offences. Harm does not always stop with one victim; it can reach a whole community.

The bill also requires reasonable steps be taken to notify families when significant decisions are made to hold or reopen coronial inquests or investigations. Families searching for answers deserve to be kept informed, not left wondering what is happening. The Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee recommended that this bill be passed. I support that recommendation.

The second government bill is about something equally fundamental: knowing where to turn after becoming a victim of crime. It establishes the Victims Advocate Service, backed by a commitment of $50 million over five years, with $10 million a year ongoing. What happens now is a victim reports an offence and then deals separately with police, prosecutors, courts and support agencies. They call one office and then another and have to repeatedly explain what happened. Each retelling can bring back the trauma. That is not a system designed around victims. The Victims Advocate Service is intended to change that.

It will provide a central point of contact, a round-the-clock telephone service, online information and practical help navigating the system. Liaison officers across seven government agencies will help coordinate information and referrals rather than victims having to chase updates themselves. Victims will also have greater control over who can engage with the service on their behalf, with safeguards for privacy and confidentiality. Importantly, this service is not intended to replace the specialist community organisations doing critical work. It is there to help people find and connect with the right support and to remain a point of contact as the circumstances change. Its design followed consultation with more than 600 people, including victims and service providers, with regional consultations, including in Townsville.

For Hinchinbrook, that regional dimension is particularly important. Whether someone lives in Ingham, Cardwell, Tully or Townsville's Northern Beaches, they should not have to know the structure of the Queensland government to find help. Someone coping with a home invasion should be able to make one call and find out what happens next. Someone living a long way from a specialist service should be helped to reach the right people, not left with a list of numbers.

There is also an improvement for victims of property crime. The impact of a break-in or a stolen car does not disappear because no-one was physically injured. People lose sleep and stop feeling safe in their own homes. They deserve recognition and guidance too.

Let us contrast that with Labor's record, because the need for this reform did not suddenly appear after the last election. Labor established a one-stop shop implementation office in 2017 but closed it in 2020 without delivering a statewide victims' portal. In 2023 a parliamentary inquiry made its first recommendation: a pilot victims advocate service. Labor supported that recommendation in principle, yet when Labor left office in October 2024 Queensland did not have the statewide service that victims had been calling for. There is an important difference between commissioning another report and delivering something victims can actually use.

The Crisafulli government has committed the funding, consulted those who understand the system's failures and brought forward legislation that provides for commencement in December this year. This is the difference between talking about change and actually delivering it.

We should not forget the problems victims faced with financial assistance either. Under Labor, the average time to decide non-urgent Victim Assist Queensland applications reached 539 days in 2021-22. Improvements were recorded later, but victims should never have to endure delays of that scale. The new advocate service is not a substitute for fixing financial assistance processing, and we must continue improving the services to which victims are referred. Giving people a clear pathway, reliable information and someone to help them navigate it all is an important step forward.

I turn briefly to the private member's bill introduced by the member for Gaven. Firstly, I acknowledge the profound pain and suffering endured by victims and survivors of historical institutional child abuse. They deserve justice, accountability and meaningful avenues for redress. The Crisafulli government, through the work of the Attorney-General, continues to work with the states and territories through the Standing Council of Attorneys-General to carefully consider the implications of recent significant High Court decisions and the legal options now available to survivors of historical abuse.

The Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee recommended that this bill not be passed in its current form, finding that the proposed changes could introduce legal uncertainty. Survivors deserve carefully considered legislation that provides clarity and certainty rather than reforms that risk creating further uncertainty.

We should not forget about Labor's record. Despite the recommendations of the 2017 royal commission and repeated commitments, the former Labor government failed to deliver an operational reportable conduct scheme. The Crisafulli government delivered that scheme, which commenced on 1 July this year. Our government remains committed to stronger protections for vulnerable children, while carefully considering further reforms to support survivors of historical abuse.

These two government bills reflect the approach Queenslanders voted for: stronger laws, greater accountability and meaningful support for victims. One gives victims more opportunity to be heard and the other helps them find the assistance they need. After years of drift and delay under Labor, we are putting practical reforms before this House. Justice is not only about the consequences faced by an offender. It is also about the dignity, safety and voices of the persons harmed.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (7.57 pm): I begin by expressing my deep disappointment. Frankly, I think it is egregious that these three incredibly important pieces of legislation are being considered together in a cognate debate. Each deals with significant and complex issues. I have so much to say about each of these bills, and each deserves proper scrutiny, careful consideration and its own debate in this House. We are talking about the rights of victims, access to justice and accountability for institutional child abuse. These matters deserve far more than a rushed, truncated debate. The victims, survivors, advocates and stakeholders who took the time to make submissions to these bills deserve better from us.

I rise to speak firstly to the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill. For too long, women who have experienced sexual violence have been let down by the very system they turn to for justice. We have heard heartbreaking stories from victim-survivors who have found the courage to come forward only to feel judged, blamed, dismissed and powerless. I have long fought for and helped deliver a justice system that does better by women. That is why I welcome this bill and the important reforms it delivers, and that is why we are calling on the Crisafulli government to stop dragging its feet on the broader reforms that victims have been waiting far too long for.

These reforms are the result of years of advocacy by victim-survivors, women's organisations and legal experts. The *Ripple effect* exposed serious and systemic barriers faced by victim-survivors, particularly women, in our justice system. It contained 28 detailed recommendations, and almost two years into government we still have not seen a formal response from those opposite. It is not good enough. Let's not forget that when Labor tried to fast-track this legislation in September the LNP voted against even allowing an urgency motion to proceed.

This bill does contain important reforms, and one of the most significant is to victim impact statements. For too long victim-survivors have faced uncertainty and frustration about what they can say, how they can say it and whether their words will be heard. The *Ripple effect* report found that the practice of redacting those statements was anti-therapeutic and the bill has recognised that, but recommendation 21 from that report does not exist in isolation. For example, recommendation 22 calls

for clear responsibilities across justice agencies so victim-survivors know who can help them prepare a statement, what information they can include and where they can turn for support.

Recommendation 23 addresses another critical issue: ensuring a victim-survivor is never disadvantaged simply because they chose not to provide a statement. I can imagine that some women are not ready to put their trauma into words. Some do not want their perpetrator to know the full extent of the harm they have suffered. Their silence must never be mistaken for the absence of harm. Again I call on the Attorney-General to tell Queenslanders that this government will implement these recommendations.

The bill also introduces community impact statements. This is particularly significant for offences involving child exploitation material, serious vilification and prohibited symbols. We know that the harm caused by these offences can extend far beyond an individual victim, but we also acknowledge the concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society about the additional demands these reforms may place on the Victims' Commissioner, prosecutors and our courts. They also need to be properly resourced.

I will also address the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill. Labor will be supporting this bill because we believe that victims of crime deserve timely, accessible and meaningful support, but again I note that it has taken over two years to bring this legislation forward. This government has refused to release its modelling on how this new service will impact already stretched frontline organisations, so again whilst we support the bill we will be watching closely to ensure it is properly funded, adequately staffed and delivers meaningful supports.

I now turn to the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026. Every survivor of child sexual abuse deserves the chance to seek justice and hold institutions accountable. A 2024 High Court decision exposed a legal loophole that has made it harder for some survivors to pursue justice simply because their abuser was not formally employed by the institution responsible for their care. Whilst other states and territories have taken action, the Crisafulli LNP government has failed to act. That is why Queensland Labor introduced legislation to close this loophole.

Survivors have already endured unimaginable trauma. They should not face additional barriers to having their voices heard. Justice should not depend on the employment status of an abuser. It is abhorrent that this government has chosen not to support this bill. I table a statement from the National Survivors Foundation that was released today. It opens with—

If the Queensland Government blocks Vicarious Liability Legislation, they have turned their back on thousands of Survivors.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 17 November 2026, by the National Survivors Foundation, titled 'Queensland Parliament – Vicarious Liability Legislation Debate'.

Mr Ryan: Shame! That's what they are doing.

Ms FENTIMAN: I take that interjection: shame! The statement goes on to say—

This would be an especially disappointing decision to take exactly one week after National Survivors' Day.

This bill should be above politics. It is something that advocates, victim-survivors and stakeholders have called for. We are talking about survivors of institutional child sexual abuse, people who have endured unimaginable trauma who are simply asking for a fair opportunity to seek justice.

Labor has made it clear from the beginning that we would be willing to work with the government to get this legislation right. If there are concerns about the drafting, let's fix them. That is exactly what happened in the ACT when the legislation passed unanimously. Victoria also achieved bipartisan, unanimous support, but here in Queensland the LNP-dominated committee recommended that the bill not be passed. Now with its majority in the House the LNP government will vote this down.

I stood up with survivors Diane Carpenter and Val Cooper and the member for Gaven, the shadow attorney-general, and we spoke about how important this legislation is. They spoke about what this legislation would mean to them. Diane Carpenter was a ward of the state. She said that when she was eight years old she was sexually abused by a priest. She said—

For all survivors this is what we want ... Everybody deserves a pathway to justice.

Val spoke about the childhood stolen from her and said—

I was busy surviving while others were laughing and playing.

These are women who have shown extraordinary courage not just in sharing their stories but in fighting for change. I table pictures of Val Cooper and Diane Carpenter that include childhood photos of them. I thank them for their bravery and putting their stories on the record.

Tabled paper: Photographs depicting Diane Carpenter and Val Cooper.

I understand that many victim-survivors who deeply care about this are currently at a lived experience forum in Sydney. It is such a shame that this government has rammed through these laws on a day when those victim-survivors could not be here to join us for this debate. That is what else this government has taken away from those victim-survivors—the ability to be here for this debate to listen to our contributions. These people have shown incredible courage coming forward and sharing their experiences. They spent years seeking justice and accountability. How can those opposite look these survivors in the eye and tell them that closing this legal loophole is not worth supporting? I am lost for words, Madam Deputy Speaker, about what this must say to those victim-survivors. I do believe there are still some things that are above politics that are worthy of bipartisan support, and this is one of them. Those opposite should be ashamed.

Mr Ryan: They can still vote for it.

Ms FENTIMAN: I take that interjection. There is still an opportunity to vote for this bill.

Mr KEMPTON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Twice now the member has taken an interjection from another member who is not in his seat.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Thank you. If you just go ahead now and finish your contribution, member for Waterford.

Ms FENTIMAN: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I would urge all of those members opposite to think about supporting this bill. It is not too late to show those victim-survivors that they deserve a pathway to justice, because they do. I thank them for their courage.

Mr BAROUNIS (Maryborough—LNP) (8.07 pm): I rise today to speak on the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill 2026 and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill 2026. Both of these amendment bills are instrumental in strengthening the rights of victims within our communities.

The objectives of the justice legislation amendment bill 2026 are to: provide a strengthened, trauma informed approach for victims to provide a victim impact statement as part of a sentencing proceeding; introduce the ability for the Victims' Commissioner to provide a community impact statement regarding harm to an affected community as part of the sentencing proceeding for child exploitation material or serious vilification and prohibited symbols offences; and clarify the notification requirements under the Coroners Act 2003 to ensure a family member of the deceased person is made aware of a decision or order made to hold an inquest or to re-open an inquest or investigation into a death.

For a decade the former Labor government weakened Queensland's youth crime laws, which saw victim numbers increase by 193 per cent. Victims were pushed to the sidelines and struggled to have their voices heard. The Crisafulli government is continuing to change that.

This bill from the Crisafulli government marks another important step in repairing Labor's damage and taking serious crime seriously by giving victims more opportunity to be heard in sentencing courts through a strengthening of the victim impact statement regime. The bill also delivers important reforms to Queensland's coronial system by ensuring family members of a deceased person are notified when a coroner decides to hold, open or reopen an inquest or investigation into a death. The change will provide families with greater transparency, certainty and support during coronial proceedings.

For too long, victims have expressed frustration about their ability to have their voices heard during sentencing proceedings. These reforms are about ensuring victims are heard, respected and supported at every stage of the process. They are about treating victims with dignity, respect and compassion.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Maryborough, the time allocated for the debate is now finished so I ask that you resume your seat. Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House, I call the member for Gaven to reply to the second reading debate.

Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (8.10 pm), in reply: I rise to reply to the debate on the Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill. There are 20 minutes for

the LNP to change their mind. The members for Theodore, Caloundra, Pumicestone and Mackay could cross the floor tonight. The member for Mackay has done it before. This is the moment to put victims of child sexual abuse ahead of paedophiles and the institutions that harbour them. Who do those opposite support?

I said a lot this morning. I will not say it all again because I only have 20 minutes, but I want to name what is happening here tonight. This government is about to vote down a bill that does one thing. It gives survivors of child sexual abuse a fair chance to hold institutions to account. Voting that down is cruel, and I want every member opposite to understand why survivors feel so deeply about this. Some of them are here with us tonight. I want to acknowledge Jessie, Colleen and Colin in the gallery, as well as Mark and Angela from Micah Projects who stand beside victim-survivors every day. Thank you for being here. Many others wanted to be here but, as has been outlined, they are interstate at a lived experience conference. They had no idea this was being debated so they could not be here this evening. They have sent me their words and they have asked me to read them into the record of this parliament, and I told them I would. Jessie Harlow told me this—

Children's lives still do not matter.

Sit with that. That is how this decision lands for people that it affects. Colin wrote—

Members of church organisations may not be paid to do the work of educating and caring for children in their community. But they hold very significant roles ... They must be held responsible.

The fact is though that the government of the day took those children from their families and placed them in religious organisations or elsewhere. They also made promises they did not keep to the family members or the safety of those children.

In not passing this legislation the government is giving a significant loophole to past and future perpetrators to continue to harm children.

Colleen Stevenson asked the question this government still has not answered. She said—

They go to their vocation of caring/education children and for this they receive stipends and other benefits. Why then are they not held accountable and the organization that gives these benefits not held accountable?

Another survivor who asked not to be named wrote—

A vote against the Private Members Bill is a vote for continued injustice.

Then we have Graeme. He has written a statement for this debate and I want to read it in full because it is powerful. Graeme is a survivor. He was a police detective for nearly 30 years. He is a National Survivors' Day ambassador. He said—

As a victim-survivor of childhood sexual abuse, a former Police detective of nearly 30 years and a National Survivors' Day Ambassador, I am deeply disappointed by the Queensland Government's decision not to support this proposed reform.

Only weeks ago, I stood in Queensland Parliament speaking about the importance of 'Honouring Every Survivor'. I was genuinely encouraged by the personal conversations and expressions of support I received from members of Parliament. To now see that sentiment apparently not reflected in support for this legislation leaves me confused, frustrated and profoundly disappointed.

What makes this particularly difficult is that following the event, I was tagged and acknowledged in social media posts by members who publicly associated themselves with the occasion and its message of supporting Survivors. I welcomed that recognition at the time as a genuine expression of shared commitment. In light of the Government's position on this Bill, I now find myself questioning the sincerity of that support. It feels like a serious breach of the trust I placed in those conversations and the intent of the day itself.

Having experienced the justice system from both sides, I know how difficult it already is for Survivors to seek accountability. The legal status of an offender's relationship with an institution should not, in itself, deny Survivors a pathway to seek redress.

Honouring Survivors must mean more than attending events, sharing photographs, tagging advocates on social media and offering words of support. It must mean being prepared to act when opportunities for meaningful reform arise.

This should not be about political allegiance. It should be about fairness, institutional accountability and ensuring that Survivors are not left carrying the consequences of abuse alone.

Those are Graeme's words. Members opposite posted the photos. Tonight, they will vote against him. I table a copy of a Facebook post by the police minister and people like the member for Hinchinbrook who just got up and said why he was not going to vote for this bill.

Tabled paper: Extract from social media featuring posts from the member for Ninderry, Hon Dan Purdie MP, in relation to National Survivors Day.

Every one of those survivors is asking this House for the same thing: a pathway to justice—not a guaranteed win; just a fair go in court. Tonight, the government will look across this chamber at Jessie, Colleen and Colin and tell them 'no'. That is cruel and there is no softer word for it. Let's be honest

about what a no vote means. It means telling a survivor who finally found the courage to come forward decades later that their case may now be dead—not because it did not happen but because the man who abused them was not on the payroll. It means telling older survivors to wait while the government 'monitors' a court decision. Some of them do not have years to wait. Some of them will not see the end of it.

It means pointing survivors to a redress scheme that closes in seven months and calling that an avenue. It means standing in photos on National Survivors' Day and voting against survivors a week later, and it means doing all of that on a day when survivors were not even told that this bill was being debated—survivors who have spent their lives being told their pain is inconvenient, that the institution's reputation matters more, that the money matters more. Tonight, this government is telling them the same thing again. That is why this is cruel. It takes people who were let down as children and lets them down again as adults.

I will go through the Attorney-General's reasons not because they justify this but because they do not. The Attorney-General told the House that voting against this bill should not be taken as a lack of commitment to survivors. With respect, survivors do not measure commitment in speeches or the vibe of the thing; they measure it in votes, in law reform. Those opposite heard the statements I just read out from survivors. A speech will not change that; a vote, though, would.

The heart of the Attorney's case in the High Court decision in AA handed down in February is essentially the reason for them voting down this bill, and her comments deserve a serious answer. The government's argument is this: they claim our bill creates uncertainty. However, the Attorney-General then told this House that the practical operation of those pathways from the AA decision are 'still developing'. That is her assessment, not mine. On the one hand, they say they cannot support our bill because it creates uncertainty, but then they say survivors should rely instead on a pathway that the government itself says is still developing. Perhaps what she actually means is the kind of uncertainty the institutions prefer.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Nanango, the member is not taking interjections, thank you.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask that you reflect on the massive sigh from the member and whether that is a reflection upon your decision. All I did was say that I had taken offence and I asked her to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much, member for Nanango. Member for Gaven, if you could continue.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you. I withdraw. Perhaps what she actually means is the kind of uncertainty the institutions prefer. Second, these are two different doctrines. They ask two different questions. A non-delegable duty asks: was this child in the institution's care, supervision or control when the abuse happened? Vicarious liability asks something else: did the institution put this person in a position of power and trust that made the abuse possible?

Mrs Frecklington: Correct.

Ms SCANLON: I take the Attorney-General's interjection; she says 'correct'. Those questions overlap, but they are not the same and survivors fall through the gap between them. Think about Bird itself. Father Coffey abused a young boy in the boy's own family home—not in a school, not in a dormitory but in his home—on a pastoral visit. Was that child in the care, supervision or control of the Diocese of Ballarat while he sat in his own lounge room? I know what the institution's lawyers will say. They will say no and they will say that in case after case. Think about the priest on a home visit, the scout leader who drives a child home, the volunteer coach on a weekend away or the youth leader at a camp. These are the cases where vicarious liability does the work and these are exactly the cases this government is choosing to leave exposed.

The Attorney-General spent some time on dates. She pointed out that the AA decision came down on 11 February and I introduced this bill about two months later.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General, could you please not disrupt the speaker by calling out across the chamber.

Ms SCANLON: She pointed out that the AA decision came down on 11 February, and I introduced this bill about two months later. The inference was that I ignored the AA decision. I did not ignore it. I read it, and so did the Victorian parliament and Victoria passed its vicarious liability reforms on 17 February this year, six days after the AA decision.

Mrs Frecklington: And New South Wales?

Ms SCANLON: I will get to that in a moment. They had the decision in front of them. They looked at it and they legislated anyway because AA does not close the gap that Bird opened.

There is another date the Attorney-General did not dwell on. Bird was decided on 13 November 2024. This government had been sworn in just weeks before, so every single day since Bird the pen has been in the government's hand. The High Court said plainly that reshaping vicarious liability is a matter for the legislature. That means this parliament. That means the LNP's Attorney-General. This morning those opposite interjected and said 'and two years later what's happened?' I agree with that question. Two years later, two years of delay under this government, survivors have been waiting for two years so we acted.

The Attorney-General relied on the committee's finding that 'akin to employment' lacks sufficient guidance. That phrase did not come out of nowhere. Courts applied the akin-to-employment test for years before Bird. The Victorian trial judge applied it in Bird. The Victorian Court of Appeal applied it. Both found the diocese liable.

The royal commission recommended that organisations be liable for people in akin-to-employment relationships and New South Wales has had 'akin to employee' in its Civil Liability Act since 2018, put there by a Liberal government, moved by a Liberal attorney-general. Their law even lets regulation spell out who is in and who is out.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Attorney-General. I will ask you not to interject again or you will be on a warning.

Ms SCANLON: Here is the thing: if the concern is a definition, the answer is an amendment, not a no vote. If the Attorney-General wants to change the wording, we said we were willing to make changes. If she wants to make a regulation-making power to set out who is covered, put it up. That offer has been on the table since April. It is still on the table now. What survivors cannot accept is being told the words are not perfect so the answer is nothing.

The committee warned this bill could lead to protracted litigation. The Attorney called that the last thing survivors want. She is right about one thing: survivors do not want protracted litigation. Let's be clear about who causes it, though. DP won at trial. He won again in the Court of Appeal. Then the institution took him all the way to the High Court with deep pockets and won. That is protracted litigation: a survivor who had already won twice dragged through a third round by an institution, as I said, with a lot of money and power. This bill does not start that fight; it ends a fight the institutions started.

The Attorney raised the bill's retrospective operation as a concern. Retrospectivity, though, is not a flaw in this bill. It is arguably the whole point of it. The royal commission found survivors took, on average, almost 24 years to tell anyone what happened to them. A law that only covers abuse from tomorrow does nothing for every person who has already been hurt. It would be a law for no-one or barely anyone. This parliament has done this before. In 2016 Queensland abolished the limitation period for child sexual abuse claims. It applied to abuse that happened decades earlier. We did that because we accepted a simple truth: that survivors do not come forward on the law's timetable. The law has to meet them where they are.

The Attorney said it twice, so I will answer this directly. She said survivors are not without avenues of redress and she pointed to the national redress scheme. Here are the facts, though, about that scheme. It closes to new applications on 30 June 2027. That is about seven months away. There is a maximum payment amount. Redress matters. For many survivors, it is the right choice, but it was built as an alternative to the court for people who do not want to go there. It was never meant to replace courts for those who do. Pointing survivors to a scheme that is about to close as the answer to a gap

in the civil law is not an avenue; it is a dead end with a deadline. The existing civil litigation pathway that the Attorney mentioned is the very pathway Bird narrowed. That is why we are here.

We have also heard the argument that this would put too great a burden on local clubs, schools, churches and institutions. Joe Stroud, the Chair of the National Survivors' Day, wrote to me about that argument. He called it churlish and self-serving. He said it is 'designed to shield bottom lines ahead of community safety'. He also said, 'If a community organisation cannot responsibly guarantee safe services for our children, they have no business in providing them.' I agree. Colin and Colleen made this point better than anyone. These are not casual helpers; they are life members. They hold titles and roles. Many receive stipends and benefits. If an institution can hand out the benefits, it can carry the responsibility.

There is one more point on cost. When an institution walks away, the cost of abuse does not disappear; it lands somewhere: on our hospitals, on our mental health services, on the disability system, on our taxpayers. Joe Stroud made that point, too. This bill puts the bill where it belongs, with the responsible institution, not the taxpayer. Every member opposite who talks about protecting taxpayers should think about that. This government also talks a lot about victims, about putting victims first, about being tough on crime. Joe Stroud said it best, though. The Queensland government 'cannot say that that they are tough on crime if in the same breath they are weak on justice'.

This decision comes exactly one week after National Survivors' Day. A week ago members of this government stood beside survivors. Graeme has told this House what it felt like to be tagged in those photos. Tonight when it actually counts, those opposite will vote against them. I say to every single member of the government who attended that event, who gave those victims hope: I hope you hang your head in shame tonight. You gave those victims hope and tonight you are refusing them justice.

I want to end where I started, with survivors—

Mr Ryan: They can cross the floor.

Ms SCANLON:—and I take the interjection. Those opposite could cross the floor. There are still three minutes for them to decide that they got this wrong. They could move amendments. They could work with us like so many other jurisdictions that passed these laws unanimously did—LNP, Greens and Labor working together—but this parliament, this stubborn Crisafulli government, would rather say no to victim-survivors because they care more about their political pride.

This bill does not guarantee anyone a win. Survivors still have to prove what happened. Institutions can still defend themselves, often with much more money and deeper pockets. All this bill does is stop an institution walking away on a technicality about whether the man it put in charge of children was on the payroll.

Ms McMillan: Who are they protecting?

Ms SCANLON: I take that interjection from our shadow child safety minister. Who are they protecting? It is a legitimate question.

Ms McMillan interjected.

Ms SCANLON: Why are those opposite protecting those institutions? Jessie Harlow had a message for survivors and for this House—five words: 'Don't let the bastards win.' Tonight every member decides—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, member for Gaven. That is unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw. Tonight every member decides which side they are on. Members opposite do not have to do this. There is still time to choose differently.

I want to use the remaining minute to acknowledge the survivors who have travelled here today despite the fact that they only found out about this bill being debated at about lunchtime today. That should demonstrate to the government how seriously people take this that they have given up their ordinary lives—I am sure they had a busy day and had things to do—to come here to send a message to the government to do better.

We can work on this in a bipartisan way and get this done for victim-survivors, but the government does not seem interested. It was incredibly disrespectful to join all of these bills together in a cognate debate given that each one of them is important and matters to different victim-survivors. Unfortunately,

despite the fact that at the time when we introduced this bill we tried to truncate the committee process to get justice for victims, those opposite said no then but for some reason now in the last minute they need to vote on it. I suspect that that is because they are ashamed of what they are about to do and they hoped that no-one would notice. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House, I call the Attorney-General to reply to the second reading debate.

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (8.31 pm), in reply: It is like the last 10 years just has not happened. It is like every time we have come into this chamber to talk about historical child sexual abuse it just never happened. It is like when we in opposition moved to make sure retrospectivity for historical child sex abuse never happened. It is like those things never happened. When in opposition we pushed that. I recall the day when the now health minister was the then leader of the opposition and I was the then deputy, so how dare we sit here and be lectured by those opposite who chose to do nothing for 10 years! When victim-survivors were screaming for something to be done about historical child sexual abuse, what did those opposite do? Nothing! We called for retrospectivity, so to sit here and be lectured like I do not know about historical child sexual abuse I say shame on the shadow attorney-general.

I thank all honourable members for the heartfelt responses to this important bill—I thank them all very much—but those opposite have lost all sight of victims across Labor's soft-on-crime decade of decline. The Crisafulli government is focused on them.

Ms Grace: A 'decade of decline': is that all you can do on something as important as this!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I made one interjection and I was told I would be warned.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): One moment, Attorney-General. Member for McConnel, your interjections are not being taken.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Our government is focused on victims, unlike those opposite over the former 10 years, and that is the difference. The government acknowledges the profound pain and the lifelong consequences suffered by victims and survivors of historical child sexual abuse. We recognise the courage it takes for survivors to come forward and seek accountability and to pursue justice through what, as I said before, is often always a difficult and deeply personal process. No member of this House should doubt our government's resolve and commitment to ensuring victims have better access to justice after the decade of those opposite doing nothing. We will continue to deliver strengthened victims' rights, and that is what this amendment bill is all about.

In terms of the victim impact statement, victims have more opportunity to be seen and heard in sentencing proceedings while through the victims of crime assistance amendment bill introduced by the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services essential supports and services that were absent under those opposite will be rolled out for victims of crime.

I will now address some of the matters raised by honourable members during this cognate debate, and those opposite surely do have a short memory. As I have just alluded to, when the former government, of which the shadow attorney-general was part, moved amendments to the Civil Liability Act in 2019, it specifically chose not to include vicarious liability. The LNP opposition at the time moved amendments to include non-delegable duty into the statute, and then what happened? The Labor government, including the shadow attorney-general, voted against it, but now I get lectured to. It is just convenient. Goodness me, and the shadow attorney-general talks about playing politics? What a short memory she has!

Our proposed amendments were consistent with the principles of the recent High Court decision in AA v The Trustees of the Roman Catholic Church for the Diocese of Maitland-Newcastle. That was back in 2017 when we proposed it. Those opposite voted against it, including the shadow attorney-general on her high horse. The shadow attorney-general and those opposite would now have Queenslanders believe that there is nothing for survivors of sexual abuse—no pathway to compensation and no access to support. That is plainly wrong. There are significant existing avenues, as there should be, for victims to access compensation and support.

We know that rights existing under civil liability law in Queensland are retrospective in application, as they should be, as is the High Court's AA decision. In that case the High Court of Australia held that, in circumstances where a non-delegable duty of care is owed, the duty holder may be liable for the

intentional criminal conduct of its delegates. The finding is momentous as the High Court has departed from the longstanding authority in New South Wales v Lepore. I note that the shadow attorney-general decided not to mention that one. As a consequence of that decision, organisations can be held directly liable for the criminal wrongdoing of their delegates, including—and I want to say this because the shadow minister got it wrong—employees, priests, teachers, volunteers and carers. This may be something that the shadow attorney-general continually dismissed or glossed over as she accused us in government of protecting institutions and denying the victim's right to support or their day in court. Those allegations are simply offensive. Moreover, her statements have—

Mr Power interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, Attorney-General. Member for Logan, your interjections are not being taken.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker, because I note that even the shadow attorney-general is not agreeing, and for this reason—her statements are legally incorrect and irresponsible. They risk causing—and this is an important point—unnecessary duress to survivors who may wrongly conclude that they have no options available to them when in fact the opposite is true and in terms of the legal reasons that the member for Logan continues to go on about. Just listen to what I am saying. Just listen. There is a High Court decision that enables that.

Mr Mander: You're a woman. He won't listen to women.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection—I will 100 per cent—and I note that we listened in silence. There you go: a female Attorney-General. I note he did not say anything then.

Mr POWER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I take personal offence to the comments the member for Everton made and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: We know that the shadow attorney-general continually dismissed or glossed over that. Queenslanders are entitled to expect more from someone with designs—I know everyone thinks she wants to be the leader, but right at the moment she wants to be the state's first law officer. They are entitled to accuracy. That matters, as serious historical child sexual abuse should not be exploited for political point scoring. They are entitled to the truth. Indeed, the fact that the shadow attorney-general has chosen to build her argument on a proposition so fundamentally at odds with the law begs the question why. One can only surmise she is seeking to misrepresent the law, despite the resulting anguish, fear and concern for survivors of historical child sexual abuse.

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the comments made by the Attorney-General and I ask that she withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. It is damaging, it is reckless and it is self-serving. It is straight from the Labor playbook of pretence when it comes to prioritising victims of crime.

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again I take personal offence at the comments made by the Attorney-General and I ask her to withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. Turning to some of the other extraordinary claims from the member for Gaven, she says that this government is in the business of protecting paedophiles by opposing this bill. That is a new low. It is a revolting assertion and one that she should reflect on. If the member for Gaven wants to talk about governments that fail to protect children, I have one name for her—Ashley Paul Griffith; the most prolific child sex offender in Queensland's history. When this government came to office we were determined to understand how that horrific offending was allowed to continue for so long.

Ms Grace: How dare you blame us for that?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. I dare because it was the former Palaszczuk-Miles government which said that they would bring in the Reportable Conduct Scheme in 2017.

Ms Grace: That is an absolute insult.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection. In 2017 the then premier of Queensland agreed to bring in a reportable conduct scheme to protect children, and what did they do? They did nothing. It took the Crisafulli government to come in and protect Queensland children from the horrific

child sex offences that were happening in our childcare centres. We did that. The number of reportable offenders that have now been referred to police is well over 60. I think they protest just a tiny bit too much.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I have some order please from both sides of the chamber?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That was in 2017. It took the Crisafulli government to come in and bring that in—not just for childcare centres but for all institutions—to ensure we were protecting children, and we continue to do that. That is why we had to establish the commission of inquiry.

Ms McMillan interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, Attorney-General. Member for Mansfield, your interjections are not being taken.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: That is why we had to establish the commission of inquiry. There had been a decade of failures for children in institutions under state care—under those opposite who sat around the cabinet table and now come in here and act like they actually support victims.

I beg to differ. Obviously we know about the chronology of events surrounding Ashley Paul Griffith. There has been an identification of multiple missed opportunities to detect, disrupt and stop his offending—that is something they could have done.

Mr Minnikin: And they should have done it.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Exactly. We brought it forward. Labor had years to implement a reportable conduct scheme and they failed to deliver. It was left to the Crisafulli government to deliver that, and we have. We did not delay. We fast-tracked the implementation of the Reportable Conduct Scheme because protecting children from paedophiles who were known to people working in those systems is not something we simply put out a media release about. We acted, and we continue to do so each and every day. We know that the agenda of the former Palaszczuk-Miles government was to just put things out by press release—to never follow through, to never do the hard work and to never take on that pain—and yet those opposite come in here and dare to talk about protecting Queensland children from paedophiles. It actually is gobsmacking.

At least some members opposite might understand why those on this side of the House bristle when the member for Gaven talks about the protection of child sex offenders—someone who had a position in cabinet, someone who should and ought have voiced her concern as to why the then government was not doing more to protect children in this state by bringing forward a reportable conduct scheme. It was something that the former Premier committed to, but obviously she was in the wrong faction. I am happy to say the name Annastacia Palaszczuk. She obviously could not get it through cabinet. She said it publicly, but then they all just decided to not do anything. Why? The question is why? Talk about the protection of children in Queensland from paedophiles in this day and age.

Ms SCANLON: What about today?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Exactly. What about today? I take that interjection. That is why I am very proud of our record to ensure those 60 people who under those opposite were allowed to work in those institutions and childcare centres—

Ms CAMM: Not anymore.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Well, they were not prevented. It is like the last 10 years has not happened. My goodness me. Queenslanders are entitled to ask a simple question: if the member for Gaven can make claims so completely detached from the facts on an issue as grave as child sexual abuse—

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the comments made by the Attorney-General and I ask her to withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. How can Queenslanders have confidence in the judgement of the shadow attorney-general on any matters of law?

I now turn to some other pronouncements from the member for Gaven. She actually said that every other state and territory is legislating in a similar manner to this bill. That claim does not stack up. Here are the facts: while some jurisdictions have enacted various reforms in this area, many have not, including New South Wales, South Australia and the Northern Territory. When the member for Gaven

attempts to portray Queensland as some lone outlier it is pretty obvious that the shadow attorney-general does not deserve a seat around the Standing Council of Attorneys-General. If she did, wouldn't she have fought, like I did, to bring forward a reportable conduct scheme and make it nationally consistent with all of our laws? I do not think so.

Equally, the member for Macalister claims that without the amendments in the proposed civil liability bill child sexual assault victims do not have recourse to support redress or compensation, that is simply not accurate. It is, once again, a misrepresentation of the existing law. The member's accusation that the government is 'victim shopping' does not deserve repeating, but is simply offensive. This is too important of an issue for exaggeration and selective facts. It needs to be highlighted before the House that Australian jurisdictions have taken different approaches. There is no uniform national model and no basis for the member for Gaven trumpeting that every other state is pursuing the same course, because that is simply not true. If the member for Gaven wishes to argue for her bill she should do so on facts, but maybe that is the problem.

A government member: Therein lies the problem.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Therein lies the problem, I take that interjection.

Ms SCANLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask the Attorney-General to withdraw.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. The bill's shortcomings were noted by the committee. I would like very much to thank the committee and everyone who contributed to the committee inquiry. The committee considered it would create uncertainty and cause already protracted litigation to extend it further. Specifically, concerns were expressed about expanding vicarious liability to relationships akin to employment when the term lacked definition or statutory guidance as to when a relationship would satisfy that test.

It is a similar story—and I will not have time to get to it—when we look at the contribution from those opposite on the government's Strengthening Victims' Rights bill and the Victims Advocate Service bill. The members for Gaven and Bulimba criticised the government for being too slow to implement victims' legislation. They even went as far as saying, 'It was all them.' Let's be clear: once again, when Labor was in government they did everything to put the rights of offenders first and those of victims last. We know victims were unsupported and isolated. Those opposite might carp on about what they describe as extreme delays in the establishment of the VAS, the Victims Advocate Service, but I cannot imagine how they can talk about the decade they were in government and did not do anything. The Victims Advocate Service has at every stage been designed by victims for victims.

I very much want to thank all the honourable members who have contributed constructively to this debate, who came to it with the spirit of delivering greater protections and agency for victims of crime. I thank them for recognising our government's prioritisation of victims and supporting reforms that will meet those victims at their trauma with openness, compassion and help to map a way forward.

I express again my gratitude to the committee, acknowledging especially the efforts of the chair, the member for Nicklin. I would like to thank the hardworking Department of Justice staff who assisted including Sakitha, Jess and Charlotte. Thank you very much to all of my team who worked very hard on this cognate bill.

Together, the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill and the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill strengthen victims' rights to deliver substantively improved and coordinated support to victims of crime in Queensland. I would also like to give a massive shout-out to the first ever minister for victims in this state—and what a stellar job she does! With that, I commend these two bills to the House.

Question put—That the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Division: Question put—That Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

In division—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Be very careful if you want to be here for the next vote.

AYES, 35:

ALP, 33—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Mickelberg, Whiting; Perrett, Linard.

Resolved in the negative.

Consideration in Detail (Cognate Debate)

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (8.59 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 4, after line 6—

insert—

(1AA) Part 1A, other than sections 2C and 2D, commences on the later of the following—

(a) immediately after the commencement of the *Breach Bail, Go to Jail and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026*, section 4, to the extent it inserts definition *prescribed offence*, paragraph (a);

(b) the date of assent.

(1AB) Sections 2C and 2D commence on 1 March 2027.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon Frecklington's amendments.

Tabled paper: Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility to Hon Frecklington's amendments.

In relation to this I just wanted to let the House know that amendment No. 1—

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, time has expired. It is now nine o'clock.

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bills having expired, I will now put all remaining questions necessary to pass the bills including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister without further amendment or debate. I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 2 is outside the long title of the bill and therefore requires leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That clause 2, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendments Nos 2 to 7, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

2 After clause 2

Page 4, after line 10—

insert—

Part 1A Amendment of Bail Act 1980

2A Act amended

This part amends the *Bail Act 1980*.

2B Amendment of s 6 (Definitions)

Section 6, definition *prescribed offence*, paragraph (a), after 'offence'—

insert—

against a provision

2C Insertion of new s 55

Part 5—

insert—

55 Transitional provision for Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Act 2026

(1) From the commencement, schedule 1, entry for Criminal Code is taken to include a reference to an offence committed before the commencement against former section 328A of the Criminal Code.

(2) In this section—

former, in relation to a provision of the Criminal Code, means the provision in force from time to time before the commencement.

2D Amendment of sch 1 (Prescribed offences)

(1) Schedule 1, entry for Criminal Code, entry for section 328A—

omit.

(2) Schedule 1, entry for Criminal Code, after entry for section 334C—

insert—

- section 334I (Driving motor vehicles dangerously)
- section 334J (Interfering dangerously with the driving of motor vehicles)
- section 334K (Operating non-motor vehicles dangerously)
- section 334L (Interfering dangerously with the operation of non-motor vehicles)

3 Clause 10 (Insertion of new s 1791A)

Page 8, line 28 to page 9, line 32—

omit, *insert*—

(1) A ***victim*** is a person who suffers harm because of the commission of an offence mentioned in section 179J, including, for example—

(a) a person who suffers harm because the offence is committed against the person; or

(b) a person who suffers harm because the person is a family member or dependant of a person mentioned in paragraph (a); or

(c) a person who suffers harm because the person has a close personal relationship with a person mentioned in paragraph (a); or

(d) a person who suffers harm as a direct result of intervening to help a person mentioned in paragraph (a); or

(e) a person who suffers harm as a direct result of witnessing the offence committed against a person mentioned in paragraph (a); or

(f) a person who suffers harm because the person would have been a family member of an unborn child whose life was destroyed because the offence was committed against a person mentioned in paragraph (a); or

(g) a person who suffers harm because the person incurs financial loss or damage to the person's property because of the commission of the offence.

4 Clause 10 (Insertion of new s 1791A)

Page 9, line 33, '(4)'—

omit, *insert*—

(2)

5 Clause 16 (Insertion of new ss 179O and 179P and pt 10C)

Page 18, lines 10 and 11, from 'may' to 'community.'—

omit, *insert*—

may—

(a) ask the director of public prosecutions or the police commissioner for information relevant to the offence; and

(b) consult with the affected community.

6 Clause 17 (Insertion of new pt 14, div 28)

Page 21, line 29—

omit, *insert*—

Part 14—

7 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 23, lines 17 to 20—

omit.

Question put—That clauses 3 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill

Mr SPEAKER: The House will now consider the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill.

Question put—That clauses 1 to 10 stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 10, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Question put—That the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Question put—That the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendment No. 8, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as circulated—

8 Long title

Long title, before 'the *Coroners Act 2003*'

insert—

the *Bail Act 1980*,

Question put—That the long title of the Justice Legislation (Strengthening Victims' Rights) Amendment Bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill

Question put—That the long title of the Victims of Crime Assistance (Victims' Advocate Service) Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.04 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Pollock, Mrs I; McEachren, Mrs N

Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (9.04 pm): Tonight I rise to recognise two remarkable women from the Gladstone region who have reached extraordinary milestones. Mrs Iris Pollock, and I acknowledge her grandson Wes who is in the gallery tonight, celebrated her 100th birthday on 27 October. Mrs Nellie McEachren celebrated her 110th birthday on 5 November 2026.

Iris was born in Gladstone in 1926, the youngest child of Henry and Annie Barnes. Her early years were spent travelling with her family as her father worked as a drover and they moved from place to place. After leaving school at the age of 13, Iris worked as a housekeeper and dairymaid before taking a job at the bakery in Mount Larcom, which is certainly a great part of the world. It was there that she met her future husband, Reginald Pollock.

Iris and Reginald married when Iris was 19 and they settled at Cedarvale, where they raised eight children, including two sets of twin girls. Being a twin myself, I acknowledge the challenges that they must have had during that time. Today, their family has grown with an incredible 17 grandchildren, 38 great-grandchildren and 35 great-great-grandchildren. For more than 60 years, Iris worked tirelessly on the family farm milking a large herd of cows twice a day. My family did the same thing so I know how hard that must have been for her. She continued living independently in the same family home until the age of 98, which in itself is something special. She had an extraordinary working life and is a wonderful example of determination, resilience and dedication to her family.

Tonight I also acknowledge Nellie McEachran who has reached the incredible age of 110 years. Nellie has witnessed more than a century of change. She continues living in her own home, cooking her own meals, doing the grocery shopping, popping in to seeing her butcher and even managing the stairs—probably better than I do at the current time. Nellie also visits some of her children in their nursing homes. She is an amazing lady.

The independence and spirit of both of those amazing women is something that we can all admire. What stands out is the respect the people of the Gladstone region have for those two amazing women. I acknowledge those lovely women and the support they each receive from their families and the whole region. To those two amazing women, congratulations and happy birthday.

Bonney Electorate, Local Legends Community Awards

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (9.07 pm): Last week I was very proud to host my seventh annual Local Legends Community Awards, which recognise the incredible people, small and family businesses, community clubs and organisations that make our part of the Gold Coast so special. Tonight in this House, I acknowledge them.

The Young Person of the Year finalists were Tilly Brown from A.B. Patterson College who volunteers with the Labrador Girl Guides and has set up a Christmas charity for families in need, the Secret Santa Service; and Issy Sullivan, a Griffith University student who supports Indigenous education and leadership, is a member of the Australian government's national Youth Steering Committee and volunteers with the guild and Girl Guides. Our winner was Rahaf Afif from Parkwood, who is this year's Benowa State High School captain, a Queensland Youth Parliament member, an Air Force cadet and Zonta volunteer where she organises birthing kits for developing countries.

The Volunteer of the Year finalists were Maria O'Neill, a Parkwood local and dedicated Rotary and Salvation Army volunteer who makes handmade hygiene bags for people experiencing hardship; and Shirley Neild, the founding president of the Filipino Community Council of Queensland and a champion for her community. Our winner was Mary Galic who has dedicated a decade to running music groups, drum circles and playgroups through the Benevolent Society at our much loved Women's Space at Labrador.

The School Staff Member of the Year finalists were Danijela Rigby, a Southport State High School teacher who helps students with disabilities overcome challenges and get to graduation; and Brooke Coupar from Musgrave Hill State School who does an outstanding job supporting our prep students through the KindyLinQ playgroups and also the school choir. Our winner was Jason Baggs, the grounds officer from Labrador State School, who goes and above beyond to keep Labrador looking beautiful.

For community club or organisation of the year, our finalists were: Queens Cricket Club, an iconic Chirn Park club that has seen a record number of juniors; and the Labrador Scout Group. Our winner was the winner being the Thriving Multicultural Communities, TMC, from Southport and Labrador who support our migrant and refugee communities.

Our small business of the year finalists were: Rev-It-Up Pizza in the Aqua building at Labrador, whose owners Peter and Peisie have revitalised this family business through great food and friendly service; the Chirn Park Basque Cheesecake and Champagne, where Zac and Laura have created a much loved place to grab a treat from. Our winner was Harbour Town Florist, where Silvana and her team go above and beyond to support locals.

Thank you to the Southport Sharks Aviary Rooftop Bar for hosting us. Thank you to my Labrador office team of Letwin, Deb, Alli and Amity for helping host these awards. It was wonderful to acknowledge people, and I am so very proud to be their local MP.

Algester Electorate, Transport Infrastructure

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (9.10 pm): In my electorate of Algester, residents are becoming increasingly frustrated with growing traffic congestion. Whether you are dropping your kids off at school, making your way home after work or just trying to get around the Algester electorate, more and more residents are finding themselves caught in gridlock on roads struggling to cope. As the Crisafulli LNP government cuts and delays vital transport infrastructure and public transport projects into the never-never, it means more Queenslanders—and more people from the Algester electorate—will spend even more time stuck in traffic and more money on the increasing cost of fuel.

The member for Aspley introduced Labor's transport affordability bill providing a solution to fuel spikes, but today the LNP refused to back it in. The RACQ Annual Fuel Price Report shows Brisbane has now had the highest average unleaded prices of any capital city for three years straight, and the Algester electorate is experiencing this firsthand.

Communities deserve a government that is acting on rising cost-of-living pressures. Instead, what we have seen today is that Queenslanders who could have been saving close to $1,200 a year under Labor's plan have been kicked to the kerb by this LNP government. This is a government that could not even allow full debate on the member for Aspley's private member's bill, guillotining the voices of representatives here in this House.

The people of Algester electorate also deserve a government that is acting on public transport, but instead what we are experiencing is bursting buses and a total go-slow on public transport

infrastructure. For a number of years, I, along with the members for Jordan and Logan, have been advocating for the Salisbury to Beaudesert passenger line, delivering key business planning stations, corridor protection and the consultation stage on locations for the train stations planned for 2025. A passenger rail connection would give residents a genuine alternative to sitting in traffic every day. It would take pressure off already congested roads in the Algester electorate. But what have we seen from this LNP government when it comes to this important work? The public consultation on planned train stations has not happened, and it would appear that the project has been pushed into the never-never.

As we know, more and more people are moving around our electorate as we are now one of the fastest growing regions in the state. You only need to go to a suburb like Pallara, where we are seeing thousands—literally thousands—of new homes being approved by the LNP Brisbane City Council with no upkeep of the actual road infrastructure that is required to move people around. That is putting pressure on every aspect of residents' lives in the Algester electorate.

What we need is a government that is listening to the needs of the people that live in this electorate and live in Queensland, but what we get is a government that is all about spin, all about dodgy deals for their mates and not about serving the people of Queensland. Queensland deserves better. Queenslanders will get better because the Labor plan is the only one looking after Queenslanders.

(Time expired)

Whitsunday Electorate, Community Services

Ms CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (9.13 pm): The Whitsunday Leisure Activity Centre, lovingly known as 'PATCH' was a grassroots community initiative developed by local families. The Proserpine Activity Therapy Centre for the Handicapped was established in 1976, and I am proud that it was my grandparents, Coral and Stanley Camm, along with other families who had children with intellectual disabilities who established this incredible organisation, with the original manager of Gordon Steele, followed by Wally Hinschen, and today Jayne Milner, an incredible human being, and her incredible staff go above and beyond to support individuals and have become extended family to many. They have celebrated 50 years, and what an incredible milestone it was for connection and participation, particularly for those with a disability and senior residents also living across the Whitsundays. It is history that shows that, when families and volunteers come together, they can achieve the incredible.

To my Aunty Mel, Kaylene, Nigel, Jimmy, Alan, Colin and many of the other participants, you do incredible work in our community which we value, and we congratulate you. We also look forward to opening the time capsule in 2076 with all of what they have contributed.

I think everyone in this House has either participated, volunteered or at least observed Parkrun. Tim Oberg, my constituent who founded Parkrun in 2011, has done an incredible job. He has been recognised for his outstanding community impact as part of the QUT alumni. I want to thank him and his family for the incredible movement he has created.

I also want to share an incredible movement that I think all of us should take the opportunity to embark upon and grow in our local communities. I was proud to support the Healthy Kids Project which grew the RAD Run Club. That program has commenced in Cannonvale State School, St Brendan's Catholic Primary School in the Northern Beaches, Mackay, and also down here at Ironside State School. I know Angie Kelly, the former Deputy Speaker's sister, has jumped on board with the program at her school.

I want to encourage all members to create RAD Run Club in their electorates as a movement for young kids, particularly in the lead-up to the Olympics and Paralympics. It is accessible to all. Tim has done an incredible job designing something that will be accessible and not time-consuming for teachers or educators and something that all children can participate in. I encourage all members to reach out. I am happy to provide information. I know Tim is happy to visit their schools. If we can get our young people moving and create a movement like Parkrun, our community will be all the better.

Logan Electorate, Transport Infrastructure

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (9.16 pm): Unfortunately, I rise to inform the House that there is significant congestion at the Green Road and Frederick Street intersection. You are thinking, 'How does Linus know that? He has not even been out there all day; he has been in parliament all day.' The answer is pretty simple: every day there is congestion at the Green Road and Frederick Street intersection. It

often backs up all the way through to Browns Plains. Many in this House know what it is like to be caught in that traffic and to be held up. They also know that traffic going down Green Road sometimes goes into the service lane and goes over the rumble strips. Then, most disturbingly, they attempt to duck back into the traffic, causing accidents and difficulties.

Some in the House may not know that the federal government has had to intervene with the council in order to change the intersection on Frederick Street. They are going to block people coming across that intersection because the intersection has become that dangerous. With all that, you would think that this government, with all of their blue ads on TV, would find the funding to improve the intersection by illuminating the lights, doing a flyover, and putting one of the worst pieces of congestion in Logan into the past. They have not. In fact, this government made a promise that in the first quarter of 2025 they would put out a plan for community consultation on how they would illuminate those lights, but they have broken that promise. They have left thousands of residents stranded from Munruben, Mundoolun, Greenbank and Jimboomba because they all have to go through that intersection every day. This is a terrible outcome and it is indicative.

Last week, the shadow minister for transport introduced and released *Slow lane: a state of congestion* issues paper on transport in Queensland. There is no greater example of the failure of the LNP government about *Slow lane: a state of congestion* that the LNP have created than the Green Road-Frederick Street intersection. That is why we went out with the shadow transport minister to see firsthand how bad this intersection was, and how the LNP had broken their promise to release a plan to go forward to illuminate those lights on that intersection. The member for Algester is here. She knows how bad congestion is getting. That is why she advocated today for a rail line, which I support, in that area. This is another component, where we are in a slow lane. We are in a state of congestion in Queensland under the LNP.

Cairns Aviation Skills Centre

Mr JAMES (Mulgrave—LNP) (9.19 pm): I rise tonight to acknowledge a remarkable achievement for Far North Queensland and our local aviation industry. Recently, I had the privilege of representing the Hon. Ros Bates MP, the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, at the Cairns Aviation Skills Centre awards ceremony, where we celebrated not only the achievements of graduating students but also an extraordinary milestone: the graduation of the centre's 1,000th student since opening its doors in 2004. The ceremony marked the graduation of 22 students, taking the total number of graduates beyond 1,000 for the first time. It was a proud moment for the students, their families, their instructors and the wider aviation community.

Located within the Cairns Airport precinct, the Cairns Aviation Skills Centre has become a vital training hub for aircraft maintenance engineering, delivering industry focused training and hands-on experience using real aircraft and helicopters. Since opening in 2004, the centre has helped build a highly skilled local workforce that continues to support one of the most important industries in our region.

At the ceremony, we heard from industry leaders who reflected on how far the centre has come and the important role it continues to play in preparing young people for rewarding and highly skilled careers. Graduates gain qualifications in areas such as avionics, aircraft mechanical engineering and aircraft line maintenance, providing direct pathways into employment opportunities across Australia and beyond.

What makes this achievement particularly significant is the role aviation plays in the economic future of Far North Queensland. We often think of aviation in terms of tourism and transport, but behind every aircraft is a highly skilled workforce keeping those aircraft safe, reliable and operating efficiently. The aviation maintenance sector is a major contributor to our local economy, with Cairns' maintenance, repair and overhaul industry contributing more than $36 million annually. As demand for aviation services continues to grow across our region and throughout the Asia Pacific, so too does the need for skilled local workers.

The centre is also helping prepare students for the future through training in remotely piloted aircraft systems and emerging aviation technologies, ensuring our workforce remains ready for the opportunities of tomorrow. I would like to congratulate Chris Pigott and the team from Aviation Australia, and the staff and industry partners, including Cairns Airport, for their commitment to developing local talent and strengthening Far North Queensland's aviation industry.

Morayfield Electorate, Road Infrastructure

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (9.22 pm): The residents of Morayfield have been left frustrated, inconvenienced and understandably angry by the installation of a centre median island on Graham Road, Morayfield as a result of a government department putting bureaucracy ahead of common sense. Local residents have been ignored, local businesses have been disadvantaged and families have been forced to change their daily routines because of a decision made by this government.

Let's be clear about what has happened: a centre median island has been installed on Graham Road, restricting movements that local residents have relied upon for decades, including the ability to make U-turns. This was not something that local residents asked for, and it was not something that the community was even properly consulted about. Instead, the requirement for this median island was imposed by the Department of Transport and Main Roads as a condition associated with a development approval.

Who was asked about the consequences? Who spoke to the residents who use Graham Road every single day? Who considered the inconvenience to families, the additional travel time, the impact on local businesses and the practical difficulties created for people simply trying to get home? The answer, as far as the affected residents are concerned, is: nobody. We are talking about parents dropping children off at school, people travelling to work, residents accessing local businesses and families trying to go about their daily activities.

I have been standing side by side with these residents and local businesses, advocating and fighting for them. I commend these residents and local businesses for speaking up against this government's decision. As reported in the *Sentinel* and on *9News Queensland*, the impact of this government's decision is significant, with residents saying the change has added around 10 minutes to their daily commute. What about the impacted businesses and community organisations? They should not have to pay the price for this decision of this government, which was made without properly understanding the consequences for the people who live and work in this neighbourhood.

That now brings me to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Remarkably, after all of the frustration, complaints, community anger and media attention, the minister has now indicated that the government will backflip on this decision and support the restoration of U-turns at this location. It begs the obvious question: if the minister now accepts that U-turn movements should be restored, why was this arrangement imposed in the first place? Why were the residents not consulted? Why did it take public controversy and sustained community pressure for the government to reconsider? The government should listen to the community rather than respond to media pressure.

(Time expired)

Redlands Electorate, Training

Mrs YOUNG (Redlands—LNP) (9.25 pm): In the Redlands, our coastline is one of our greatest natural assets, but I believe it represents something much bigger. It represents economic opportunity—opportunity for new industries, skilled jobs and local businesses—and, importantly, an opportunity for our young people to build their future in the Redlands.

Our marine economy already supports tourism, boating, fishing, transport and countless small businesses. As these industries grow, so too does the demand for a skilled workforce. That is why I am passionate about delivering our commitment to establish a TAFE marine centre of excellence on Russell Island, creating training and career pathways for our Southern Moreton Bay Island communities. I acknowledge the minister, who is in the House tonight, for the work that she and her department have done on this.

I have been working with TAFE Queensland, the Boating Industry Association, the Redlands Regional Jobs Committee, the SMBI Chamber of Commerce, local high schools and local stakeholders to help shape this opportunity. This is not just about building a training facility; it is about connecting education with industry and creating pathways into real jobs.

I grew up in the Redlands. I went to school in the Redlands. Like many young people, my career initially took me out of our community. I eventually returned to establish my own business, creating opportunities and building a future in a place I have always called home. I want the next generation to have those same opportunities without necessarily having to leave in the first place. That is why I want our local schools to play an important role in this journey.

Imagine students from Victoria Point State High School, Faith Lutheran and Calvary, Kimberley and Carmel colleges being introduced to careers in marine engineering, vessel maintenance, maritime

operations and emerging environmental industries. Students will be connecting with employers, exploring apprenticeships and seeing opportunities they may never have considered.

We have the natural assets, industry expertise and local talent to create the opportunities in the Redlands, and protecting our marine environment and growing our economy are not competing priorities. They can and they should go hand in hand. For our island communities, this is particularly important. Their future should not be defined by the challenges of their geography but by the opportunities it presents.

The future of the Redlands is not just about managing growth; it is about creating opportunity, strengthening local industries and giving the next generation every chance to succeed. I want our young people to look out across Moreton Bay and see more than a beautiful coastline. I want them to see their future.

Remembrance Day

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (9.28 pm): Remembrance Day has passed. The wreaths are beginning to fade. The love and gratitude we share for our fallen and returned service men and women and their families should not end when the ceremonies do. The impact of their sacrifice continues daily through generations—the freedoms as well as the hardships.

Stories matter. I ask residents to share their family memories and record them with our historical society. There is an old saying: history does not repeat itself but it often rhymes. The stories of our recent past help us appreciate the lives we have today and safeguard against repeating what they went through. My mother, her parents and her grandparents grew up in times when rationing and poverty were everyday realities in Queensland. My aunt collated family letters that reveal a world many of us can scarcely imagine.

As children they worked the farms because their fathers were unable to, either because they were away at war or they had returned with visible and/or invisible wounds. After the birth of her fifth child my grandmother was committed to an asylum thousands of miles from home, suffering from what we now recognise as postnatal depression. My grandfather told her children that she had died. Unable to care for them, he sent them to live with others. My mum did not see her family again for many years. Her happiest memory was tasting an orange for the first time. Today we see good food discarded every day, including oranges.

She travelled alone to Sydney at 15 to attend night school and married a serviceman. His invisible injuries were not understood, with their marriage breaking down as a result. Mum raised us first in a stranger's shed with no power or water. My siblings said that I was lucky because, as the youngest, I was first to bathe in the small plastic tub. You can imagine what the water was like by the time five had washed in it. There was no government assistance. Hardworking families could go hungry. Mum worked two jobs to keep a roof over our heads, moving between boarding houses, caravan parks, sheds and shared accommodation. She never complained.

Remembrance Day reminds us that honouring is more than laying wreaths. 'Lest we forget' is more than a phrase to repeat: it is a promise to make every day to remember those who never came home and those who did; to never lose sight of their sacrifices and that of their families; to give gratitude by appreciating, valuing and caring for what we now have; and to do everything we can to prevent history from repeating itself. We need to make them proud in a way that honours them, ensuring their stories are told. There are no winners in war. We must always remember. Lest we forget.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I call the honourable member for the second best farming region in Queensland—the member for Lockyer.

Lockyer Electorate, Schools

Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (9.31 pm): Thank you very much, Deputy Speaker. I am pleased to be an associate of yours in our great farming region.

Tonight I am very excited to give thanks to all of our schools. We have 470 grade 12 students who are going to be graduating. I have five great schools: Faith Lutheran College Plainland, with principal Tyson Kenny; Laidley State High School, with principal Michael Clarkson; Sophia College, with Narelle Dobson and her team; Lockyer District High School, with Belinda Walker and her team; and Lowood State High School, with Stacey Bowen and her team.

The 470 kids across each of those schools have been given such a great grounding in life. I will not bore the House tonight by reading through each of the different mottos and values that the schools

have, but I want the students to know that—and I was pleased to write to each of them and congratulate them on their journey to complete grade 12—is that they have been given great values, a great upbringing and a great standing. It is the things you know that are going to ensure you are lifelong learners. Thank you to all of the principals, teachers and support staff at the schools. Thank you to the P&F and P&C associations for their support in raising money for the schools and providing a great education.

I also congratulate the parents and all of the students for the wonderful journeys they have had throughout their schooling lives. This is not the end. This is the start of a great future. As I say to many of the students, the better you do at school the greater the window of opportunity across many different areas you will have. I want the students to take solace from the fact they have been given a great upbringing and they have been taught great skills. When they ask themselves whether they can do something, I can tell them that they certainly have been given the right upbringing to ensure their future will be a success. Thank you to all those who are involved. Once again, congratulations to all of the 470 students across our five great high schools. You have a great foundation. The future ahead is very exciting. In the words of Nike, just do it! I am sure you will be successful.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.34 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, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richmond, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young