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

Thursday, 19 November 2026

Subject — Page

PRIVILEGE **3851**
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House **3851**
Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the member for Bulimba. 3851
REPORT **3853**
Auditor-General **3853**
Tabled paper: Auditor-General Report 4: 2026-27—Information systems 2026. 3853
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS **3853**
Visitors to Public Gallery **3853**
Absence of Minister **3853**
PETITIONS **3853**
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS **3853**
Productivity **3854**
Housing Supply **3854**
Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting construction of houses. 3854
Home Ownership **3855**
Housing Supply **3856**
Health System **3857**
Best Practice Industry Conditions **3857**
Education **3858**
Foster and Kinship Carers **3859**
Sport **3860**
ABSENCE OF MINISTER **3860**
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE **3860**
Ambulance Service **3860**
Ambulance Service **3861**

PT WEIR
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

JL HURLEY
ACTING CHIEF REPORTER

Infrastructure ... **3862**
Ambulance Service ... **3863**
Weinam Creek, Infrastructure ... **3864**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3865**
Housing Supply ... **3866**
Tabled paper: Extract, dated 21 July 2021, from the Facebook page of the former member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown, in relation to the Olympics. ... 3866
Health Workforce Plan ... **3867**
Crisafulli LNP Government ... **3867**
Queensland Health ... **3868**
Housing Supply ... **3868**
Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 February 2024, from various representatives from Master Builders Queensland, Housing Industry Association Limited, UDIA Queensland, Real Estate Institute of Queensland and Property Council of Australia, to the former minister for housing, local government and planning and minister for public works, Hon. Meaghan Scanlon MP, in relation to Best Practice Industry Conditions (BPICs). ... 3869
Crisafulli LNP Government, Donations ... **3869**
Transport Infrastructure ... **3870**
Crisafulli LNP Government, Public Service ... **3871**
Infrastructure ... **3872**
Queensland Hospital and Health Services, Artwork ... **3873**
MOTION ... **3873**
Personal Explanation, Member for McConnel ... **3873**
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ... 3876
Resolved in the affirmative. ... 3876
PERSONAL EXPLANATION ... **3876**
CFMEU ... **3876**
CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL ... **3877**
Introduction ... **3877**
Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. ... 3877
Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes. ... 3877
Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights. ... 3877
First Reading ... **3881**
Referral to Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee ... **3881**
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL ... **3881**
Second Reading ... **3881**
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS ... **3891**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3891**
Labor Party, Performance ... **3892**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3892**
Thuringowa Electorate, Class of 2026 ... **3893**
Health System ... **3893**
Hinchinbrook Electorate, Infrastructure ... **3894**
Health System ... **3895**
Member for Gladstone; Mundubbera Regional Forum ... **3895**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3896**
Resources Industries ... **3897**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3897**
Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting a dining area at Bundaberg Hospital. ... 3898
Logan Shooting, Update ... **3898**
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services ... **3898**
Mirani Electorate ... **3899**
Thriving Kids ... **3899**
Southern Downs Electorate, Wind Farms ... **3900**
Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence between the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, and the Director, Engineering & Construction of Acciona Energia Australia, Mr Andrew Tshaikiwsky, in relation to MacIntyre Wind Farm. ... 3900
Health System ... **3901**
Run for Orla ... **3901**
Rental Security ... **3902**
Betterment Funding ... **3902**
STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE ... **3903**
Report, Motion to Take Note ... **3903**
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY ... **3914**
Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates and Referral of Auditor-General's Reports ... **3914**
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT ... **3914**
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL ... **3914**
Second Reading ... **3914**
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. ... 3928
Resolved in the affirmative. ... 3928
Consideration in Detail ... **3928**
Clause 1, as read, agreed to. ... 3928
Clause 2, as read, agreed to. ... 3928

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to. 3929
Insertion of new clause— 3929
Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Amanda Stoker's amendments....3929
Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Amanda Stoker's amendments....3929
Amendment agreed to. 3929
Amendments agreed to. 3929
Clauses 5 to 96 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to. 3932
Third Reading 3932
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time. 3932
Resolved in the affirmative....3932
Long Title....3932
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT 3932
Petition Responses and Answers to Questions on Notice, Due Dates....3932
LEGAL PROFESSION (STRENGTHENING DISCIPLINARY MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL 3932
Second Reading 3932
Consideration in Detail 3956
Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments....3956
Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments. 3956
Amendments agreed to. 3956
Clauses 1 to 98 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to. 3958
Third Reading 3958
Long Title....3958
ADJOURNMENT....3958
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services 3958
Carina Barber Shop....3959
Prince Charles Hospital 3959
Gold Coast Events 3960
Health System 3960
Tabled paper: Extract of article from *The Courier Mail* online, undated, titled ''Worst it has ever been': Premier's emergency meeting with top public servants'. 3961
Rockhampton Electorate, Historical Buildings 3961
Health System 3962
Toowoomba North Electorate....3962
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services 3963
Coomera River, Erosion 3963
ATTENDANCE 3964

THURSDAY, 19 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.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 27 July 2026 the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services wrote to me alleging that the member for Bulimba misled the House on 15 September 2026. The minister alleged that the member made deliberate misleading comments in her contribution to the debate on the Youth Justice (Circuit Breaker) Amendment Bill. There were four distinct statements that were alleged to be misleading. The first statement was—

Again this year she opened and closed the tenders before legislation had been introduced so providers could not be sure of what they were tendering for.

The second statement—

That is a clause which no-one has ever seen or heard before.

The third statement—

The young people will be denied access to their families and to cultural connection.

And the fourth statement—

We know that Woodford is at least six months late—another stuff-up by this government.

The member provided a basis for statements one, two and four. While I accept that the member has explained these statements, I wish to stress that I make no finding as to the correctness or otherwise of that explanation except to note that a basis does exist. Accordingly, I consider the member for Bulimba has made an adequate explanation for statements 1, 2 and 4. Statement 3 is clearly a dispute on the outcomes of a policy decision and it is not a matter of privilege. I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the member for Bulimba.

I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 27 October 2026, the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services wrote to me alleging that the member for Bulimba misled the House on 15 September 2026.

The matter relates to a statement by the member for Bulimba during her contribution to debate on the Youth Justice (Circuit Breaker) Amendment Bill.

Specifically, the member said:

Statement 1: "Again this year she opened and closed the tenders before legislation had been introduced so providers could not be sure of what they were tendering for."

Statement 2: "That is a clause which no-one has ever seen or heard before."

Statement 3: "The young people will be denied access to their families and to cultural connection."

Statement 4: "We know that Woodford is at least six months late—another stuff-up by this government".

First statement

The Minister advised that the Bill was introduced on 25 June 2026 and on the same day she released a ministerial media statement confirming the procurement process had opened. The expression of interest closed on 23 July 2026.The Minister also advised that the expression of interest documentation set out the proposed Circuit Breaker program and the services that were being sought by prospective providers.

The Minister submitted that the member would have known her statement was false because she substituted into the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee during its inquiry into the Bill. The Minister notes that the Director-General confirmed directly to the member during a public briefing on 17 July 2026 that the procurement process remained open.

Second statement

The Minister explained that the proposed clause provides a reasonable excuse from the additional obligation to report harm or suspected harm to the Director-General where a matter might tend to incriminate the reporting entity, and that a materially equivalent protection has existed in youth justice legislation since 2002.

The Minister also submitted that the protection against self-incrimination is a longstanding common law protection and is also recognised in statute as a fundamental legislative principle.

Third statement

The Minister submitted that the Director-General advised the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee (JICSC) at the public briefing that the Circuit Breaker was not intended to sever youth's relationships with their families, guardians, service providers or existing supports and that providers would be required to maintain collaborative relationships and have necessary technology to facilitate those relationships.

Fourth statement

The Minister submitted that any delays at the Woodford Detention Centre were because of the increased costs that only became known after the election in October 2024.The Minister also advised that she had outlined the cost increases at the relevant Estimates Hearing on 5 August 2025 in response to a question from the member.

I sought further information from the member for Bulimba about the allegations that have been made against her, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

First statement

The member advised that by 'introduced' she meant when the bill is introduced into law which occurred on 21 September 2026. The member also submitted that despite this, the procurement process started earlier than the introduction of the Bill into the House. She provided a ministerial media release from 18 September 2025 which stated 'the market engagement process to deliver Circuit Breaker Sentencing is now open and closes on 9 October 2025.'

Second statement

The member submitted that each example provided by the Minister of similar provisions dealt with the self-incrimination defence for individuals. She submitted that proposed section 282X(4) is the first time the defence has been provided for entities and said this was an extending of the protection that had not been seen before.

The member provided quotes from evidence given to the JICSC hearings by the CEO of the Queensland Family and Child Commission, Queensland Public Guardian, Legal Aid Queensland the CEO of the Youth Advocacy Centre as evidence that the provision was a departure from existing obligations.

Third statement

The member advised she does not dispute that the Minister and the Director-General intend for the program to provide adequate family support. She submitted that she was reflecting on comments made by submitters that regardless of its intended function, the effect of the legislation will be to deny the young person access to their families and cultural connection.

As evidence of this she provided quotes by the Justice Reform Initiative, Queensland Public Guardian, YFS Community Legal Centre and Helping our Mob Everywhere who each raised concerns about family connection.

Fourth statement

The member provided a screenshot of the Department website from 6 November 2025 in which it states that 'Stage 1 of the facility is currently expected to be constructed in Quarter 1, 2027. She then provided a screenshot of the current Department website which says, Stage 1 of the facility is currently expected to be constructed in Quarter 3, 2027.'

The member submitted that the delivery dates were revised by the government through updates to the Department website through 2025 and 2026 so could not have been the result information they were made aware of in October 2024.

Standing Order 269(4) requires that in considering whether such a matter should be referred to the Ethics Committee, that I should take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter.

I consider the member has provided a basis for Statements 1, 2 and 4.

With respect to Statement 1, the member has advised that she meant the procurement process commenced prior to the bill being made into law. She further submitted that the preliminary procurement stages occurred in 2025 before the introduction of the bill and provided a ministerial statement to support this position.

With respect to Statement 2, the member provided evidence from stakeholders that the provision in question was novel in comparison to the other provisions given as examples, because it applied to entities rather than individuals.

With respect to Statement 4, the member provided evidence that Stage 1 of the Woodford Youth Detention Centre was to be constructed in Quarter 1 of 2027 but is now to be constructed in Quarter 3 of 2027.

While I accept that the member has explained these statements, I wish to stress that I make no finding as to the correctness or otherwise of that explanation, except to note that a basis does exist.

Accordingly, I consider the member for Bulimba has made an adequate explanation for Statements 1, 2 and 4.

I consider that Statement 3 is clearly a dispute on the outcomes of a policy decision. The Minister has argued that family and cultural connections are required to be maintained in the legislation, whereas the member has argued that despite this intention there is evidence that those connections will not continue uninterrupted. This does not constitute deliberately misleading.

I **will not** be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee

REPORT

Auditor-General

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General *Report 4: 2026-27—Information systems 2026*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General Report 4: 2026-27—Information systems 2026.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

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 Gowrie State School in the electorate of Condamine.

Absence of Minister

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have 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.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following e-petition, sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

Kelso, Battery Energy Storage System

Ms Marr, from 796 petitioners, requesting the House to request the responsible Minister to urgently intervene and stop the proposed battery energy storage system from proceeding at the Kelso site.

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

Homelessness

1,220 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the State Government to work with Local Government Councils, other State Governments, and the Federal Government to solve Australia's homeless situation by providing rent free modern living pods in council owned caravan parks.

Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1986

146 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce legislation to establish a judicial mechanism to completely expunge spent convictions for individuals who meet the rigorous Criminal Law (Rehabilitation of Offenders) Act 1986 rehabilitation criteria and who pose a zero public safety risk.

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Productivity

Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.35 am): Mr Speaker, our government is turning up to work to deliver the infrastructure Queenslanders need.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: From our growing cities to regional communities we are investing in the roads, the rail, the hospitals and the homes that will shape our state for generations. Queensland has reached a record 50,000 homes under construction. The housing pipeline grew by more than 25 per cent in just 12 months—faster than any state or territory. We know there is much more work to do, and we know tax changes in Canberra will impact the quarters ahead, but we must unlock more supply. The fundamentals of our state are strong and we must deliver more homes for a growing state. That is why our landmark Residential Activation Fund is delivering the essential infrastructure needed to get housing markets moving.

We have unlocked the potential for more than 174,000 new homes right across Queensland and we are delivering results in every corner of the state, including Murrumba and Waterford. This month we also selected Gather Brisbane to deliver the new Gabba Entertainment and Housing Precinct. The precinct will unlock almost 4,000 new homes alongside public spaces, entertainment and commercial opportunities. At Northshore Hamilton we are progressing another major transformation. Over 2,000 homes are planned across five sites supported by investment in roads, water and sewerage. We have made a record investment in social and community housing and thousands of new homes are underway. We are helping first home buyers get into the market with stamp duty abolished on new builds.

We are also making it easy to build. Our new Queensland Housing Code is streamlining design and site requirements for the first time in more than 15 years. We are removing unnecessary barriers, reducing cost and giving builders greater certainty. However, delivering this pipeline also requires a productive construction industry.

During Labor's decade of decline we saw what happens when profits for union mates are put before productivity—construction costs rise, projects are delayed and Queenslanders miss out. That is why we have taken decisive action. BPIC has been permanently abolished. The new Construction Productivity Code will ensure safe, lawful and productive workplaces. We know Labor's housing crisis cannot be solved overnight but our direction is clear: we are unlocking land, removing barriers and restoring confidence in the construction industry. We are building the infrastructure needed to support new communities and we are delivering more opportunities for Queenslanders to achieve the security and stability of a home of their own. Every Queenslander deserves a place to call home and our government is determined to show up and deliver.

Housing Supply

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.38 am): Premier, I suggest we dispense with ministerial statements and go straight to question time! If only an opposition showed up to do their job and work—but this government will show up. We are securing Queensland's housing foundations after a decade of decline under Labor. Since the election, the Crisafulli government has declared four new housing priority development areas, providing over 44,000 new homes over 25 years: Southern Thornlands PDA, 8,000 homes; Mount Peter PDA, 18,500 homes; North Harbour PDA 5,900 homes; and Halls Creek, 12,000 homes.

This is true in Redlands. Last week, I was pleased to join the member for Redlands to turn the first sod on the Southern Thornlands PDA. We have also announced $4.5 million to deliver critical trunk infrastructure in her electorate, with the RAF fast-tracking more than 760 new homes. This takes the total investment through the RAF in the Redlands to $8.8 million, unlocking more than 850 homes. It is all part of our commitment to deliver one million new homes by 2044. Our $2 billion Residential Activation Fund is also unlocking over 174,000 homes. The member for Woodridge, in the media in the last couple of weeks, wanted to know what 'unlocking' meant. He did not know the definition of 'unlocking'. The irony is that when he made this statement he was in the Fraser Coast region. I am happy to table for the benefit of the member for Woodridge pictures of houses that have been 'unlocked' and built under the Residential Activation Fund.

Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting construction of houses.

The definition of 'unlocked' is unlocking a block of land so a builder can build a house on it. You need a block of land to build a house on. You need the infrastructure, like sewerage and stormwater—he is fake talking again, pretending he knows what he is doing. Maybe the member for Cairns is going to run for opposition leader. They are doing the numbers right now. It is on right now. They are doing the numbers against the member for Murrumba.

Mr Crisafulli: Where is he?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Premier.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Continue with your ministerial statement, thank you, Deputy Premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: We know the Labor Party continue to demonise the property and development industry and oppose their participation in our democracy. They do so whilst still being happy to go to all the Property Council functions, particularly at Christmas time I have noticed. They demonise the property industry for 12 months and then they are happy to go to meet the Property Council, particularly at Christmas. Nice to see you, opposition leader, thank you for joining parliament today. Talking of the opposition leader, as luck would have it, I am aware the Leader of the Opposition has recently received a letter from the Property Council of Queensland. That letter states—

Recent comments inviting Queenslanders to draw their own conclusions about the relationship between developer donations and government policy decisions, references to the development sector as the 'white shoe brigade', and statements suggesting that greater participation by the property sector in the political process increases corruption risks all risk contributing to a perception that the industry is somehow inherently untrustworthy.

Without successful partnership with public sector investment and expertise, Queensland will not achieve the housing, infrastructure and legacy outcomes expected from Brisbane 2032

...

Public statements that imply corruption, favouritism or hidden motives without evidence undermine us all.

That is what the Property Council have written to the Leader of the Opposition. Interestingly, they gave a bunch of examples in the letter to the Leader of the Opposition. The examples they use are comments demonising the property sector by the member for Gaven. This letter has landed in my lap and it only went to the opposition leader. It just went to the opposition leader. I think you can draw your own conclusions from that—a letter that is received by the opposition leader, the member for Murrumba, attacking the member for Gaven in the midst of everything that is happening at the moment. Draw your own conclusions. They have directly quoted the member for Gaven in the letter.

Mr O'Connor: Who went to their lunch on Friday, by the way?

Mr Langbroek: Last Friday on the Gold Coast.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney and the education minister. The member for Gaven attended the Property Council function at the Gold Coast last week while at the same time the Labor Party continue to demonise the property sector that is building the infrastructure—the houses, the hospitals, the institutions, the education facilities—that Queenslanders need and rely on from the $119 billion infrastructure fund. Let me end on this: they are not only demonising the property sector—they are getting letters from the property sector saying stop demonising us—but also accepting developer donations from the very industry they are demonising. If they want to lecture people on developer donations and demonise the property sector, stop taking donations and stop going to the Christmas parties.

Home Ownership

Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.44 am): Every Queenslander should be able to aspire to be a home owner, but for too many and for too long the dream of home ownership was just a pipedream. A decade of Labor turned aspiration into a nightmare. We have seen low productivity, dwindling housing supply and soaring construction costs. Over the past two decades home ownership rates fell faster in Queensland than in any other state. It has hit younger and lower income demographics the hardest. Under Labor Queensland was at the bottom of the ladder when it came to home ownership—the worst performing state in Australia—and that was the legacy of those opposite.

We know how they got there. The Queensland Productivity Commission found that under Labor construction productivity since 2018 had dropped nine per cent. That meant 77,000 fewer new homes were built in the midst of a housing crisis. We are focused on lifting productivity across the construction

sector. We abolished Labor's BPICs, the CFMEU tax—which they have now acknowledged, even apologised for—that was damaging to the Queensland economy.

Government members interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: Sort of. We will come to that. We are making changes and we are improving the performance, with the strongest economic growth of any state announced yesterday. We have changed regulatory settings to make it easier for Queenslanders to get into the housing market. We have abolished stamp duty for first home buyers purchasing a new home and our Boost to Buy scheme is opening the door for more home owners. Independent reports are highlighting that the proportion of Queenslanders who lived in a home that they own lifted from 63.5 per cent in 2021 to 64.9 per cent in 2025. We are investing billions to increase housing supply, including unlocking 174,000 homes through the $2 billion Residential Activation Fund. We have the strongest residential construction activity in the country—up 35 per cent in two years. There are 52½ thousand homes under construction, which is the highest on record. It is early days but we are seeing green shoots that indicate our multifaceted approach is working. Under Labor Queensland was at the bottom of the ladder when it came to home ownership, but we are taking the first steps to restoring the dream of home ownership in Queensland.

Housing Supply

Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (9.46 am): The Crisafulli government is delivering more social, community and affordable housing supply across Queensland after a decade of decline under Labor where supply was smashed by their CFMEU tax. Today I want to share some incredible figures that show just how much of a turnaround our government has overseen in our first two years. Behind every one of these homes is a Queenslander who deserves a place to call home, a family who was struggling to find an affordable rental, an older Queenslander facing housing insecurity or someone who has spent months, sometimes years, without a stable place to live. That is exactly why we are so determined to build more housing.

As at 31 October, more than 4,100 social and affordable homes have been delivered by our LNP government. Another 7,287 homes are currently underway across Queensland. That means we have now delivered or have underway 11,900 social and community homes towards our election commitment of 53,500 by 2044. That is 22 per cent of our target delivered or in the pipeline. When we break those figures down by region, the contrast with Labor's decade of decline could not be clearer. In the Wide Bay and Burnett region, which I visited just a couple of weeks ago, Labor added 331 homes in 10 years. We have already delivered 311 homes in two years. In Ipswich Labor added 213 social homes in 10 years. We have already delivered 191 homes in two years. In the Redlands Labor added 120 homes in 10 years. We have already delivered 102 homes in two years. In some regions, in fact, we have gone further than what Labor managed to deliver in a decade. In the Mackay and Whitsundays region Labor added just 41 social homes over their entire decade in power.

Ms Camm: They sold them off.

Mr O'CONNOR: They sold some off, too; I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. We have already delivered 147 social and affordable homes since coming to government. In just two years we have added more than 3½ times the number of homes Labor added in a decade.

In Moreton Bay, in the community of the member for Murrumba, the reason so many vulnerable people are struggling with housing is because, in one of the fastest growing regions in Queensland, just 529 social homes were added over Labor's 10 years in power. Thanks to the advocacy of our local members such as the member for Everton, the member for Pumicestone and the member for Redcliffe, we have already added 613 social and affordable homes across the region, which is more than Labor managed in a decade, and we have more than 800 further homes underway. Those are not just numbers on a spreadsheet. They represent Queenslanders who now have a place to call home and the thousands more who will in the years ahead.

We are also empowering community housing. After promising 500 homes to be delivered in our first two years, we have now delivered more than 1,500 homes on church and charity land in our first two years. That is what happens when you unlock those sites, when you cut red tape and when you work with the community housing sector instead of putting barriers in their way. Labor had 10 years to plan for population growth and deliver the homes that Queensland needed to see. Instead, they added an annual average of just 509 social housing properties a year. The waitlist grew by around 80 per cent and their CFMEU tax, BPIC, drove up construction costs by at least 20 per cent, making it even harder to deliver the homes that Queenslanders desperately needed to see. Everything they did made the housing crisis worse and Queenslanders paid the price.

Our government is taking a very different approach. We are reforming our building regulations, we are removing the barriers to construction, we are unlocking more land, we are backing community housing providers to deliver and we are ramping up to deliver 2,000 social and community homes every year from 2028. However, we know there is more work to do and, although that is the case, in our first two years we have proved to Queenslanders that the change we promised was absolutely worth backing.

Health System

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (9.51 am): The hospital bed shortage we inherited from Labor has left the Queensland Health system under sustained pressure. As we answer record numbers of triple 0 ambulance calls, treat record numbers of people in our emergency departments and perform more emergency and elective surgeries than ever before, we are doing so from a position of significant disadvantage. Our hardworking clinicians are effectively starting 10 metres behind the start line.

Despite having a decade to do so, the failed former premier and health ministers opposite failed to build the hospital beds this state so desperately needs. Even today, they are failing the leadership test. They refuse to stand up to their Canberra comrades and demand the funding to free up the more than 1,400 acute hospital beds occupied by stranded Australians awaiting Commonwealth aged-care and disability supports. For a decade those opposite knew the system was in crisis and in a last ditch effort scrambled together a plan that was described by independent expert Sam Sangster as an 'exercise in futility' and entirely undeliverable.

When they should have been healing the health crisis of their own making, Labor cooked up plans for the benefit of their CFMEU mates, all at the expense of Queensland taxpayers. Labor's CFMEU tax meant not one of their half-baked hospital bed projects could be delivered on time or on budget. The independent Sangster review revealed that car park costs had skyrocketed to $250,000 per space compared to $40,000 in other metro jurisdictions throughout Australia, onsite productivity was 20 per cent lower than in other Australian jurisdictions, the program suffered a $7 billion budget blowout and projects were delayed by at least six months to three years. Despite the overwhelming evidence, those opposite continued to defend the policy as well intentioned.

We know the member for Murrumba is trying to rewrite history with his 'too little too late' apology yet some of his colleagues thought it was too much too soon. Yesterday, the members for Woodridge and Waterford were dragged kicking and screaming into this place to issue their own forced apologies. However, who haven't we heard from?

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at those words and I ask the honourable minister to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, the member has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. Who haven't we heard from? That is the question. We have not heard from the members for McConnel, Springwood or Gaven. Those opposite abandoned Queenslanders when they failed to build the hospital beds that were needed and now most of those opposite are abandoning the member for Murrumba.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask you to ensure ministers are acting in accordance with your rulings on ministerial statements.

Mr SPEAKER: I have talked about ministerial statements before. I ask you to come back to your ministerial statement.

Mr NICHOLLS: They failed to build the hospital beds we need and now they are failing to support the member for Murrumba. Queenslanders called time's up on a failing government and now the Labor caucus is calling time's up on a failed opposition leader.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You just drew the minister's attention to your rulings and he wilfully defied that. I suggest to you that that is highly disorderly.

Mr SPEAKER: I remind the next ministers to speak that these ministerial statements are straying. I have spoken many times about personal attacks. Some have now descended into that area. I ask you to be careful and talk about things that are relevant to your portfolio but keep the personal attacks out of it.

Best Practice Industry Conditions

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.55 am): There is a repulsive irony in Labor and the CFMEU cooking up the world's dodgiest procurement policy and calling it 'best practice industry conditions'. Was this some kind of sick joke? Sick perhaps, but it was not a joke. As integrity minister, I recount the testimony of Office of the Industrial Relations senior executive Andrea Fox. She was locked in a room with Michael Ravbar where it was foretold she would be 'dragged downstairs and thrown out of the building onto the street'. Former Master Builders Queensland CEO Grant Galvin's life almost squandered after years of union pressure. He told the CFMEU commission of inquiry—

I'm lucky I'm here today.

…

… I had a mental breakdown and attempted to commit suicide.

Violence, bullying, fear, intimidation, misogyny: those were the overlords of Best Practice Industry Conditions. They ran riot on building sites and paraded under the noses of those opposite. Former TMR deputy director-general Amanda Yeates initially met with Michael Ravbar in the company of the then minister and member for Miller at 1 William Street. Ravbar's first words to her were 'you're a woman, get me a coffee.' I apologise, Mr Speaker: I do not want to mislead the House. Ravbar's first words to her were 'you're a woman, get me a glass of water.'

Mr Bleijie: Did he tell him not to do it?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. Did the minister of the day tell him not to do that? The silence would have been deafening. It still is deafening. It is deafening.

Having established through the commission of inquiry that best practice was tantamount to deplorable character, what have we learned about BPIC's dividends for the construction sector? The independent Queensland Productivity Commission, reinstated by the Crisafulli government, found productivity in the state's construction industry has dropped by nine per cent since 2018, resulting in 77,000 fewer homes built in Queensland. One of those former ministers, warned by peak industry bodies of BPIC blowouts, was the shadow attorney-general—the housing minister who simply failed or forgot to build homes in this state.

Mr O'Connor: The then housing minister.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The then housing minister. The commission's interim report confirms that Labor's BPIC CFMEU tax inflated costs on government funded construction projects by at least 20 per cent. Queenslanders would have been fleeced of $24 billion had this government—the Crisafulli government—not stepped in and sent BPIC to the grave.

Rising from the ashes of Labor and the CFMEU's mercenary tactics, the Crisafulli government's Queensland Construction Productivity Code is setting new expectations for major state government funded construction projects, delivering better value for taxpayers and safer and more productive worksites that are lawful and respectful. After Labor's decade of decline, confidence and health are already returning to sites as we get on with the job of building the future Queensland needs.

Education

Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (9.59 am): Queensland's education system is powered by more than 100,000 dedicated staff, and the Crisafulli government is backing them. Since coming to government, we have delivered an additional 2,339 teachers and teacher aides, with teacher numbers now at record levels. In fact, our increase in teachers is more than double that delivered in Labor's final four years combined. Permanent teacher retention remains above 94 per cent, while vacancies have fallen to just 0.82 per cent as at 1 November—more teachers in classrooms, more support for students.

We are not just increasing teacher numbers, we are giving teachers back their time. After a decade of Labor's bureaucratic burden, we are cutting red tape through reforms like OnePlan. Information that once took teachers around 25 minutes to locate can now be accessed in just two or three clicks. As teachers themselves have said, it is a game changer.

While we are making every education dollar count, this week's revolution about Labor's BPIC CFMEU tax shows just how badly those opposite failed Queensland taxpayers. The greatest example is Springfield Central State High School. In the 2021-22 state budget, the former Labor government allocated almost $136 million to deliver two stages of the new senior campus at Springfield Central State High School. Then, in 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. Following the tender withdrawal, a revised cost estimate was completed incorporating the application of BPICs. The revised estimate placed the total cost—remember, originally $136 million—at $225.3 million. That is nearly $90 million in additional costs—not for more classrooms, not for more teachers, not for better educational outcomes; just a bigger bill for Queensland taxpayers and more money for nothing for union mates of those opposite. Labor's legacy was more bureaucracy for teachers and inflated costs for school infrastructure.

Our government—the Crisafulli government—is delivering the opposite: more teachers, less red tape and better value for every education dollar, because Queenslanders deserve classrooms, not cost blowouts, and teachers focused on students, not paperwork.

As thousands of year 12 students graduate this week and next, I want to congratulate them on reaching this important milestone. To our graduates: be proud of what you have achieved, thank those who helped you to get there and embrace the opportunities ahead. Your next chapter is just beginning.

We are delivering a fresh start and a better future for Queensland students. We are making sure that teachers can focus on the next generation rather than the next form, and that is how we are delivering a fresh start and a better future for Queensland students.

Foster and Kinship Carers

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) (10.03 am): Children in out-of-home care face some really difficult situations. When parents are unable to meet their responsibilities, the wider Queensland community must wrap around them. I see that in the great work done by foster and kinship carers around this state. As I engage with them, they are candid about the challenges, but I am also encouraged by the big hearts of the people who choose to serve in this space. That is why I am so pleased that this government is delivering better supports to them. The Crisafulli government's investment into supports for foster and kinship carers is 150 per cent higher than the legacy left by those opposite. In fact, the 2026-27 budget increases the funding that is provided for family-based care services by a further $35.5 million.

Foster carers want to be able to offer their foster child the same sports and extracurricular opportunities as they do for any other children that might be in their family. It is how they help to deliver stable and normal. That is why we have listened and backed them in with a $1,500 boost to the annual allowance to help them cover those costs. It is the least we can do for the people who are prepared to provide the stability and day-to-day encouragement and healing that is needed to make positive futures for these kids happen.

We have invested $7.186 million on a pilot for practical supports for carer households. It reflects the feedback we received that there were experienced, capable foster and kinship carers who were falling out of their caring roles and returning children who were in otherwise safe and stable placements because they had practical needs that the system at that time was not flexible enough to help them meet. We have listened, we have stepped in and we are addressing that. We have launched the professional foster care pilot to deliver on our commitment to children and young people with disabilities and complex needs by providing approved carers with individual supports and an annual allowance of up to $100,000 to help them with that challenging task.

The Anastassiou commission of inquiry highlighted that the availability of foster carers in Queensland plummeted over the last 10 years. It is yet another symptom of Labor's decade of decline, but the Crisafulli government is determined to turn that around because vulnerable children do better when they have a safe, stable and loving family. We have invested in the recruitment of new foster carers and we are seeing strong interest, which tells me wonderful things about the character of Queensland's families. There has been nearly 500 inquiries that have come through to September.

We have improved processing times for the screening of potential foster carers to get safe and appropriate people into these important roles ASAP. We are wrapping around them better local supports and training with an investment of more than $7 million through the practical supports for carer households pilot.

To anyone considering taking this step, thank you so much for having a heart that is open. There is a long way to go to rebuild this system after Labor's decade of decline, but I thank every foster and kinship carer, every child safety worker and every community-based organisation who are working with us to serve these kids with passion and with care every day.

Sport

Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (10.07 am): The Crisafulli government is making the biggest investment into grassroots sport in Queensland's history. Our government has invested in our Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program and in our Play On! Sports Vouchers program. At the heart of that investment are our local sporting clubs who are the backbone of our towns and regions throughout Queensland. That is why I am proud today to announce that next week we will be opening a new grant to assist our grassroots sporting clubs.

Our government is backing grassroots sporting clubs and volunteers who run them through a new program called Club House Grants. This is a $4.5 million initiative to support grassroots clubs in their operations. It offers funding of up $3,000 to eligible clubs and organisations to help them with the things they need most to better serve their communities. We are backing our local clubs with the support that they need. The funding will support clubs with upgraded sporting equipment, volunteer recognition programs, first aid training courses, sign-on days, come-and-try days and carnivals, as well as investment in the coaching and officiating courses. Of course, it is important that we invest in officiating courses, particularly as Queensland continues to search for the next great home-grown NRL referee after my retirement. It will fund around 1,500 projects across the state and, importantly, 60 per cent of these will be outside the south-east because this is a government that backs our regions and understands the challenges our regions face. We want to ensure that everybody gets their fair share.

Right across the state, from Cooktown to Goondiwindi, Mount Isa to Maryborough, all the way from Cairns to Currumbin, grassroots clubs and volunteers are at the heart of sport, playing an important role in bringing our local communities together. The Club House Grant aims to make our clubs stronger for participants and volunteers, no matter where they are in the state.

These grants expand our successful Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program, backing Queensland clubs. We are delivering a legacy that will last beyond the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games after a decade of underinvestment in community sport under the former Labor government. This is a key component of the Queensland government's Sport Strategy *Queensland spirit: the road to 2032*. By strengthening our clubs and giving more kids opportunities to participate, we are maintaining Queensland's place as the home of sport in Australia. The Club House Grant will open later this month and remain open until April next year. I strongly encourage all eligible clubs and organisations to apply and share in the funding to help make sport and active participation even better for their communities.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.10 am): I advise that, as the Minister for Transport and Main Roads will be absent from 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: Question time today will conclude at 11.10 am.

Ambulance Service

Mr MILES (10.10 am): My question is to the Minister for Health. The opposition understands that on 9 November a man in Coomera called triple 0 and it was triaged as a mental health call-out. Sadly, they died before an ambulance arrived several hours later. How many ambulances were ramped at nearby Logan and Gold Coast hospitals on the night of 9 November?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the opposition leader for the question. I start off by thanking our hardworking paramedics, ambulance officers and ED clinicians who turn up on time and do the job they are meant to do when the roster says they are meant to do it. They are aware of their start time and where they should be. They do appear and they do make a significant contribution to addressing these issues. They are working in very complex and difficult circumstances.

That is why we have spent so much time in negotiation with our paramedics in terms of their enterprise bargaining, getting them nation-leading wages and conditions. That is why they overwhelmingly supported the proposal we put to them last year. I think it was the biggest number of

votes in favour of an enterprise bargaining agreement that had occurred in at least a decade with the paramedics and the United Workers Union, and I thank them for that.

I have indicated in the past that there are 1,400 stranded Australians in Queensland hospital beds requiring palliative care. I have indicated that there is a hospital bed shortage and that we are getting on with the job of fixing it, and it is my responsibility to do so. I have indicated that we have put $1.6 billion into the Queensland Ambulance Service this year alone on top of the $1 billion four-year investment to uplift the capital expenditure of the QAS—a fund that had not been increased since 2008-09.

More than 200 new ambulance vehicles will be delivered this year. We actually planned for another 230, I think it was, additional paramedics. In fact, over the June-July period, in consultation with the commissioner, more than 400 paramedics were stood up because we were aware of the increasing surge in the system.

Mr MILES: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My question was very specifically about ramping on the night another Queenslander died waiting for an ambulance. My point of order is on relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: Once again, a question of this detail should probably be a question on notice. The minister may be privy to that, and he is talking about the ambulance pressures at the moment. I find he is being relevant.

Mr NICHOLLS: There is a very substantial amount of work that is going in to fix up the problems we inherited from those opposite—a very substantial amount of work is going into it. For anyone who passes away—as I have indicated in a number of answers to questions in the past—we, of course, express our condolences and our sympathy to their loved ones and their family.

These types of circumstances are always the subject of a clinical incident investigation. Matters such as the availability of crews from hospitals in the surrounding area, the activity of the QPACH, the activity of the State Operations Coordination Centre and the clinical hub responses are all part of that investigation. The events on that night will be investigated if, as I say, there are concerns in relation to the passing of the person or the patient involved.

(Time expired)

Ambulance Service

Mr RYAN: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise how many ambulances were ramped at Caboolture Hospital overnight on 27 June when a Bribie Island man died after waiting over two hours for paramedics to arrive?

Mr NICHOLLS: I think the terms of that question speak to where the minds of the opposition are in respect of this matter. If it is a serious question, I would invite the member to write to me with those details and seek an appropriate response, which is what all responsible members should do. In fact, there are clear lines of communication to my office to be able to do that.

I am aware, of course, of a gentleman's loss of life—and I think it was a loss that was referred to in a news report last night—and it was referred to my office. I sought additional details with respect to that matter, including details of the presentation, the call-backs and the interactions. People often are interested to know—and the member has raised it—the questions in relation to interactions.

In relation to that matter, firstly, my understanding is that the gentleman involved—and I extend our sympathies to his family, his loved ones and his next of kin, who understandably would be distressed. Where there has been a delay, that will be investigated. In this instance, I understand that a very comprehensive investigation has taken place and that the family have been involved in ongoing negotiations with the Queensland Ambulance Service. By my record, there have been more than 40 pieces of correspondence and telephone calls between the family and the QAS as recently as 19 October.

The family contacted my office on 23 September. They also contacted, I believe, news.com on that day. They were followed up two days later by the Queensland Ambulance Service for another time. They continue to engage with the Queensland Ambulance Service on many matters. They sent an email, I believe, to the Queensland Ambulance Service either yesterday or this morning in relation to this matter. They have lodged a complaint with the Office of the Health Ombudsman as well.

As I understand from the material I have been provided with respect to that matter, the family have a number of issues that they wish to raise. They wish to raise the issues with respect to compensation, corrective action, medical review and individual accountability. They are the matters that

have been raised again. Those matters are all being appropriately dealt with by OHO and potentially the Queensland Ombudsman, if a complaint is made there. They have been dealt with on many occasions. There have been meetings with the family involved on a number of occasions as well. That is the situation. That is the work that the QAS do.

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

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I will deal with the point of order.

Mr de BRENNI: Clearly, the minister has very detailed information. We sought information about the number of ambulances ramped on that evening.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being completely relevant to the question as asked under standing order 118(b). Therefore, he should be able to continue his lengthy and substantial contribution in relation to the question as asked.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister said at the beginning of his contribution that the detail could be provided if they wrote to the minister or asked a question on notice, which goes back to the comment I made earlier. It is difficult to go to that level of detail in question time. There are other ways to source that information. The minister is being relevant. There is no point of order.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, tragically—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have another point of order on a different matter?

Mr de BRENNI: I am just seeking your clarity and guidance, Mr Speaker. Is the minister, therefore, taking the question on notice under standing order—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No, that is not what he said.

Mr de BRENNI: They are the options—my understanding—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr de BRENNI: My understanding is that the standing orders allow for the minister to take it on notice under standing order 113 or to answer the question in a relevant way. I am just seeking your guidance whether or not he is doing either of those.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is not an opportunity for the Manager of Opposition Business to provide, as he sees fit, guidance to the minister in relation to how he answers the question. The minister is providing substantial and detailed information. As you previously ruled, this would have been a question which was better put as a question on notice if there was additional information that the opposition wanted. I submit to you, Mr Speaker, it is not an opportunity for the Manager of Opposition Business to provide directions to the minister as to how he answers the question.

Mr SPEAKER: As I said earlier, at the beginning of his response the minister suggested a couple of ways that detail could be made available. I find he is being responsive to the question that was asked about ambulances. If there is a request for further detail, as the minister said, there are ways to do that either by writing to the minister or questions on notice. Minister, you have the call.

Mr NICHOLLS: During the course of the investigation it was indicated there was a missed number in a dial in a call-back, and that is to be regretted. The loss of life is to be regretted. To correct the member's question, I understand the patient sadly passed away at Caboolture Hospital after being picked up by the ambulance and being given treatment by not only the Ambulance Service but also a critical care paramedic they met on the way to the hospital, and he sadly passed away at the Royal Brisbane Hospital.

Infrastructure

Mr HUNT: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering the generational infrastructure Queensland needs, and is the Premier aware of any admissions that saw a lack of critical infrastructure delivered?

Mr CRISAFULLI: By being productive, disciplined, united and delivering; that is the answer to the member's question. I was with the member in Nicklin the other day. I am under no illusions about how difficult the challenges are for many people who live in his community, but there was a sense of optimism on the ground which I have not felt in a long, long time in Nambour. I will point to some of the things the honourable member has delivered. After a lot of false promises and talk over many, many years it was amazing to see the police beat serving the community. It was amazing to see the work of the Everyday Foundation, which helps the most disadvantaged in the community. It was amazing to see progress on the Nambour Connection Road. I want the people whom the member represents to know how valued they are by this government and how much I can sense Nambour is on the up and up, as you always say, member. Well done to you.

The member talks about generational infrastructure, and when he does he talks about roads, rail, health, housing and schools. This government is delivering them all. I reflect on a project that is happening at the moment on the Sunshine Coast. Yesterday, Minister O'Connor spoke about the Wave stage 2 contract design and preconstruction—that section from Caloundra to Birtinya—and the delivery of the opportunity for people to catch public transport all the way to the airport. On the Gold Coast, for the first time in generations there is a transport plan that will deliver generational infrastructure. Expressions of interest have opened for the light rail extension to Harbour Town that the member spoke about in his first speech to this place. The Bruce Highway has been subject to generations of neglect. Those opposite laughed at us when we did our costings on 80-20. They laughed at us when we said we would go to Canberra and get our fair share. I acknowledge two things: firstly, a federal government that listened; and, secondly, a state government that was prepared to stand up to Canberra. There are 150 projects either completed or underway right now in Queensland. As a kid, I believed that nothing would ever happen to roads and parts of roads because no-one would care about North Queensland. To know that those projects are now underway really does fill my heart with joy.

It is more than just roads and rail though: there are 22 new schools, including nine special schools, and more teachers than ever before staffing them; there are three new and 10 extended hospitals and more health workers than ever before to staff them; and there have been four quarters of record growth in housing, four times the amount of social housing under construction, and more TAFE teachers to train the next generation than ever before. That is what delivery looks like.

The member asked about alternate policies. The alternative is there is $119 billion in infrastructure in this state at the moment and it is delivering 20 per cent more projects because their CFMEU mates do not run the show in this state anymore.

Ambulance Service

Mr DICK: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise how many ambulances were ramped at Caboolture Hospital overnight on 25 September when a Ningi man waited almost three hours with life-threatening bleeding?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for the question. The member for Woodridge will no doubt be celebrating the fact that in our budget, unlike every budget he put forward, we have funded more health workers. The member for Woodridge's last budget would have seen 1,700 fewer health workers employed.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words used by the minister and ask him to withdraw.

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

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. I would have thought that the member for Woodridge would celebrate our investment in the additional health workers that would not otherwise have been funded under the 2024-25 Labor government budget. I leave it to members to draw their own conclusion as to who was responsible for putting that budget together. I am sure people will be able to do that. That budget did not fund the billion dollar investment we are putting into the Queensland Ambulance Service and that budget failed to fund the health service with respect to the Hospital Rescue Plan that is currently underway to the tune of over $7 billion for which those opposite have still failed to stand up and answer for in public or release the documents to as the motion of the House last night called for. That is the reality of the health system that we inherited. There are too few beds, too many stranded Australians and too little activity by those opposite, whose only theme was it was the best they could do in the time they had available.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order: relevance. The question relates to the number of ambulances that were ramped when a man waited three hours—

Mr SPEAKER: It is on relevance.

Mr DICK:—with life-threatening bleeding, not the 2024-25 budget.

Mr SPEAKER: It is not a chance to make a speech. Your point of order is relevance. Minister, if you could address whether you have that data at hand or not and respond to that question.

Mr NICHOLLS: The question is in the same form as the previous question from the opposition in relation to a request for information and detail. We know where it is obviously going. There are more ambulances on the road. There are more paramedics engaged in the Queensland Ambulance Service now than there were six months ago and certainly many more than there were two years ago.

In respect to the gentleman who presented at the Caboolture Hospital, again I believe this is another item that was in the media this morning, if memory serves me correctly. That gentleman made a phone call. As I recall him saying in his media interview, he had cut his hand. I think he had been glazing. He requested an ambulance, of course. It was appropriately triaged. There were a number of calls made backwards and forwards. The triage category was upgraded. An ambulance was dispatched at a period of time in accordance with the triaging determined by the clinical hub. The gentleman was picked up. In this instance, he was also joined by a critical care paramedic to support the management of the patient. The critical care unit arrived on scene at 2.15. They commenced transport to the hospital, and from Bribie Island I think they then went to the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital—

(Time expired)

Weinam Creek, Infrastructure

Mrs YOUNG: My question is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government progressing the Weinam Creek car park after years of delays, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any omissions that saw less infrastructure being delivered?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Redlands for the question. It was great to join her and acting mayor Julie Talty recently to announce that early works are commencing on the Weinam Creek car park. We are building a big, beautiful car park for the people of Redlands that the Labor Party failed to build. The former Labor member for Redlands, Kim Richards, did not do it. She talked a lot about it but did not do it. Grubby Don Brown talked a lot about it. He did not deliver it and now he is going to do all of these things in council. I would say—

Mr SPEAKER: That is unparliamentary. I would ask that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: Don Brown?

Mr SPEAKER: It does not matter who it is—

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER:—it is unparliamentary.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw: Don Brown, the former member. I would say to the people of Redlands that, if he could not deliver anything in 10 years when he was in Labor, he ain't going to do anything as a candidate for mayor.

More importantly, let's talk about the issue with the Weinam Creek car park. There was no plan for it, no productivity and no budget for it. Who was the former treasurer of the state then? Oh, it was the member for Woodridge. They talked a lot about the Weinam Creek car park but they never delivered it, and I wondered why. If memory serves me correctly, I am sure that when the member for Woodridge was treasurer he introduced the legislation to abolish the Productivity Commission in Queensland. Is it any wonder there was no productivity on construction sites? The member for Woodridge did not like what they were saying about productivity and he just abolished it.

There were also leaks against the opposition leader, and we know the opposition is not very productive in their own ranks. I know the opposition leader likes a good poll—because he did the Lady Cilento poll, even though he had to get his own office voting for it—so I want to do a hands up straw poll with the leadership team over there: the members for Waterford, Woodridge, Murrumba, Gaven and McConnel. Who was the member of the leadership team who told the *Courier-Mail* that they were not on the leadership call last week when BPIC was discussed? It has to be only one of four. It is either three to your left or one to your right, because that is the leadership team. One of them did not join the call when the opposition leader discussed apologising for BPIC.

Has the opposition leader asked the one to his right: 'Hands up. Was it you?' Who wasn't on the call? It is a pretty easy question. One of them was not on the call, and the one who was not on the call is the one who is leaking against the opposition leader. We know his love of polls and it is an easy poll. Just ask the question: which of your leadership team is leaking against you?

Mrs Frecklington: There's one hand up.

Mr BLEIJIE: No, I think it is one of them. I suspect the member for Woodridge was not on the call. I encourage him to answer this question: does he back the opposition leader, or does he believe time is up for the opposition leader, like we all know?

(Time expired)

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Premier. At the Premier's crisis meeting last night with the health minister, the director-general and the ambulance commissioner, can the Premier advise whether he directed the minister to see the value in meeting with families of Queenslanders who have died waiting for an ambulance?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am very grateful for the question from the aspiring leader of the opposition, and I will say the following.

Mr SPEAKER: Use proper titles, thank you.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The member for Waterford, Mr Speaker, and I will tell you what I reflect when I speak to the honourable health minister. I tell him to keep on employing the staff that you never employed, keep on building the beds you never built and keep on taking up the fight to Canberra that you never had the ticker for.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Honourable members are to address the parliament through the chair and not directly attacking other members.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I will deal with the House. Premier, I was just about to make that same point. I ask you to put your comments through the chair and use less of the 'you'. Please use proper titles.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Thank you. Mr Speaker, I will tell you why it is so important for the health minister to do it. In less than two years, the health minister has added 10,000 extra health workers in this state. I am not talking about employed 10,000; I am talking about a net increase of over 10,000. In the last budget delivered by the member for Woodridge, with the member who asked the question as the former health minister, there was a reduction in staff. Can you believe it? In the middle of a health crisis, in order to try to fudge the figures, they were prepared to back out of employing staff. For 10 years, they did not increase the number of beds per head of population in this state, and they wonder why there is a backup of people waiting for a hospital bed. Look at what is underway: three new hospitals, planned and funded; 10 upgrades; accommodation for staff across the board; and maternity services back in regional Queensland.

I come to the final point. In the last couple of weeks, I have had a series of other meetings, and I want to thank the premiers across the political divide across this country. We have an issue with stranded Australians and it has to be dealt with. I have great admiration for the premiers particularly in South Australia and New South Wales because they are doing what no-one I am looking at now had the ticker to do. They are calling out Canberra, despite their political colours being the same. I was always prepared to do it against a then Liberal government when I sat in the Leader of the Opposition's shoes and I saw a failing. I did it all the time, but he does not have the ticker to do it because deep down he is just a creature of the Labor movement. That is why he backed in BPIC, that is why he continued to defend the CFMEU, and that is why he turned a blind eye to what the Attorney said when women were subjected to abuse—because he will always put his political colours ahead of the interests of Queensland.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the Premier could be relevant to the question about meeting with families—

Mr SPEAKER: So it is on relevance?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier is being completely relevant under 118(b) to the question as asked. It is a frivolous point of order from the Manager of Opposition Business.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I will let you answer the question.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The difference between me and the Leader of the Opposition is that, for over half a decade, I have been prepared to make sure that we are there standing shoulder to shoulder with those who need a world-class healthcare system. The Leader of the Opposition refused to do it when he had a chance, but I am not going to miss the chance to build a better health system. I am not going to miss the opportunity to put in more beds and more nurses and to take the fight up to Canberra. I am going to make sure those people who deserve the dignity of aged care but who are occupying health beds are given that dignity so we can free up those beds for Queenslanders in their hour of need.

Housing Supply

Mr FIELD: 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 bolstering Queensland's housing supply, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any admissions that saw fewer houses delivered?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Capalaba. That is a great question because we are delivering housing in your electorate of Capalaba, in Oodgeroo and in the electorate of Redlands. Everywhere across the state, we are delivering housing. Why are we delivering housing in the good member for Capalaba's electorate? Because we are delivering infrastructure in the electorate, including a great whitewater rafting centre which we are building and backing, as is the Paddle Worldwide federation. It is part of our Olympic and Paralympic plan to get things back on track and build the infrastructure, creating hundreds of jobs for the construction industry.

I can tell the member for Capalaba this: the whitewater centre in Capalaba will not have BPICs attached to it like was going to happen under the Labor Party. I saw the wannabe mayor, Don Brown, running around opposing this whitewater centre, but I table a copy of a Facebook post he made when he was in government. He said, 'Congratulations also to the Mayor for putting forward the Birkdale land for the whitewater facility.' I table that from Don Brown's Facebook post back in the day where he backed the whitewater centre.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 21 July 2021, from the Facebook page of the former member for Capalaba, Mr Don Brown, in relation to the Olympics.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Double Don, I take the interjection from the education minister. We are backing it and we are backing it without the BPIC that was imposed by those opposite, including the former industrial relations minister. We have seen the former industrial relations minister mentioned time and time again at the commission of inquiry. We heard of the disgraceful behaviour from the former minister for industrial relations, the member for McConnel, with testimony against her, and we have not heard boo from her—

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker—

Mr BLEIJIE: Until now. She is going to explain herself.

Ms GRACE: I take offence to the words and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and has asked you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. If people had watched the testimony from witnesses, they would be nothing but offended by what happened for 10 years under the Labor government. It was all overseen by the former minister for industrial relations: the whole policy, the games, the chaos, the CFMEU meetings they had, all of it.

Mrs Gerber: Protection racket

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: the protection racket. The member for McConnel had a chance yesterday with the motion that was passed by this parliament. The Leader of the Opposition stood up here and said that the Labor Party were supporting that motion yesterday. Point 8 of that motion was that the member for McConnel be given an opportunity to explain herself and apologise to the people of Queensland because of BPIC. It was supported and endorsed by the Leader of the Opposition, yet the member for McConnel said absolutely nothing. There was an opportunity to get on the speaking list but the member for McConnel did not say anything. She has not apologised for BPIC. She has not apologised for the protection racket she had for the CFMEU and the other union mates in the construction industry.

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think there are a couple of things there. I take offence to the use of the term 'protection racket', and I also believe it is unparliamentary.

Mr SPEAKER: Hold on a second while I take some advice. Two things: if the member has taken personal offence, I would ask that you withdraw; and the term 'protection racket' has been deemed to be unparliamentary before, so I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The member for McConnel was here yesterday when the motion was moved and the fact that she did not speak to that motion basically says that she does not back the Leader of the Opposition. She does not want him in the leadership position—

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

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. I would say this to the member for McConnel: speak about it then. Get up and speak about your admiration for the Leader of the Opposition, because the member for McConnel knows that time's up for the Leader of the Opposition.

(Time expired)

Health Workforce Plan

Mr BAILEY: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm how many times the health workforce plan has been reviewed by, or rejected by, cabinet?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Miller for his question. I was going to say that he has been here for a long time, but in my view he has obviously been here for too long of a time and he has obviously not familiarised himself with the rules regarding cabinet. Cabinet is cabinet.

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

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We have a point of order from the member for Miller.

Mr BAILEY: I take personal offence to those comments and ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence—

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw, Mr Speaker. Let me reassure the House that the Crisafulli cabinet operates under proper Westminster cabinet procedure. We do not make cabinet appointments via unknown email trails that get deleted and subsequently have to be investigated, as has happened by people who self-describe themselves as 'very foolish ministers'. That is nothing that we do. We do it appropriately. We do it through the cabinet, and we certainly do not do it at the behest of our mates in the union movement. We do not send emails backwards and forwards with friends in the ETU and others; we do it through a proper process. Cabinet considerations and deliberations remain in confidence with cabinet. I do not intend changing a practice that has been established for more than 400 years and, despite my desire to serve in this place, I do not intend to be here in 400 years time to change that rule.

Crisafulli LNP Government

Ms MARR: My question is to the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training. How is the Crisafulli LNP government budgeting Queensland taxpayers' money carefully and responsibly, and is the minister aware of any admissions that saw taxpayers' money wasted?

Ms BATES: I thank the member for Thuringowa for the question. The Crisafulli LNP government is restoring respect for taxpayers' money, just as we promised. We are calmly and methodically continuing budget repair by maintaining expense growth well below revenue growth each year across the forward estimates. We are delivering ongoing cost-of-living relief through our lower electricity prices under our Energy Roadmap, our Back to School Boost and our Play On! sports vouchers and the LNP's permanent 50-cent fares. We are also investing a record $119.2 billion to build the homes, the hospitals, the schools, the roads, the rail and all other infrastructure that Queensland needs, and that is why, to ensure we deliver this capital pipeline with care and responsibility for Queensland's money, the Crisafulli LNP government scrapped Labor's CFMEU BPIC tax. Commissioner Wood's conservative estimate is that Labor's BPIC drove up the cost of government infrastructure projects by 20 per cent.

I was asked about admissions that saw taxpayers' money wasted. Last week we got an admission from the member for Murrumba after he spent years defending BPIC and the CFMEU. It is

too little too late. The member for Murrumba was the premier and could have acted sooner to stop Queenslanders' money from being wasted. Sorry really does seem to be the hardest word for Labor to say, because it was not until yesterday afternoon that Labor members finally admitted the disastrous impacts of its BPIC on Queensland taxpayers and worksites when Labor supported the Deputy Premier's motion condemning BPIC. I refer to the member for Waterford's contribution in the House yesterday. She said—

I am very happy to come in here and stand by the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I think he has shown enormous leadership and courage in admitting that we got it wrong. He has apologised. We have apologised. I apologise ...

Why did it take so long for the member for Waterford to apologise for BPIC? Is it because she used her maiden speech in this place to thank Michael Ravbar and the CFMEU? Is it because she felt ashamed of failing to speak up for women on Queensland worksites who were subjected to vile misogyny from the CFMEU, including rape threats? The member for Waterford had the audacity to lecture about women's safety and financial management, but when it is time for her to put the interests of Queenslanders ahead of the CFMEU she ducks, dodges and weaves. Member for Waterford, it is time to get your white suit out and put your yellow jacket on because the member for Murrumba does not have long left. Time's up for the Leader of the Opposition, but it will be Jackie Trad who will determine when the member for Waterford shows her hand. She sat around that same cabinet table and was aware. They were all the architects. She is one of the architects of the CFMEU and BPIC. She owes her seat to it and she thanked it for its help, but do you have the numbers this time? Have you got Jackie Trad and the member for Miller ringing around for your numbers, because it did not work very well last time?

(Time expired)

Queensland Health

Ms BOYD: My question is of the Minister for Health. Can the minister explain why the deputy director-general of workforce recently left their role?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for her question. The deputy director-general, Mr Scott Bennett, had been in the role for, I think, 12 months. He was originally from Victoria. His family were in Victoria and he had family and personal reasons that meant that he wanted to return to Victoria. With Queensland Health being an employer of choice for more than 10,000 more employees over the last two years, we were amenable to that decision. This is something that Mr Bennett thought about, and I want to pay tribute to him for the work that he has done as director of the workforce division, but we obviously will not stand in the way of someone who wants to go back and be with their family and spend time with their family for their personal reasons. I do not propose to go into it in any further detail. The only comment I would make in relation to it is that it is starting to become a question of how low will the Labor Party go.

Housing Supply

Mr MOLHOEK: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth. How is the Crisafulli LNP government building more housing for Queensland's growing population, and is the minister aware of any admissions that saw fewer homes for Queenslanders?

Mr O'CONNOR: I want to thank the member for Southport for his constant interest in delivering more homes for Queensland, and I will start with the good news, member. Since we were elected, we have delivered 4,106 social and affordable homes across Queensland and we have another 7,287 social and affordable homes underway. Just last week I joined the Deputy Premier to kick off construction on 114 homes in the small part of our Southport community that I represent which will be the first homes for sale within the health and knowledge precinct for people to take part in home ownership, which is a great thing.

This is of course after BPIC smashed supply, which we know the opposition leader has now admitted. There were *Courier-Mail* reports over the weekend which indicated that that admission from the opposition leader could pave the way for a challenge from the member for Gaven, who apparently is 'not tainted by BPIC'. Well, I have bad news for the anonymous sources that leaked to the *Courier-Mail*: the member for Gaven knew. In February 2024 when she was the housing and building minister the Master Builders, the Urban Development Institute of Australia, the REIQ, the HIA and the Property Council wrote to the member for Gaven saying—

… (BPICs) … have flow-on impacts on housing, infrastructure affordability ...

…

Large unit developments … are becoming too expensive to build …

…

We are already at a point where projects are not proceeding ...

I table that letter from February 2024.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 February 2024, from various representatives from Master Builders Queensland, Housing Industry Association Limited, UDIA Queensland, Real Estate Institute of Queensland and Property Council of Australia, to the former minister for housing, local government and planning and minister for public works, Hon. Meaghan Scanlon MP, in relation to Best Practice Industry Conditions (BPICs).

What was the member for Gaven's response to that? Nothing: I do not have a single record in the department of a response to that extraordinary letter from every single housing delivery stakeholder. The member for Gaven constantly runs misleading scare campaigns. In fact, she only remains in this House because of a disgusting fear campaign run at the last election which has been proven wrong and will continue to be proven wrong.

Ms SCANLON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw, but the member cannot hide from the facts and she certainly cannot hide—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We do not withdraw and then start the next sentence with 'but'. A withdraw is unequivocal.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The member cannot hide from her record. She cannot hide from the facts. She cannot hide from the fact that BPIC fuelled the housing crisis. She cannot hide from the fact that she sat around the cabinet table, hearing those impacts for years, and did nothing about it. She did not even have the courtesy of responding—

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Honourable members are to refer to other honourable members by their title, not by a name like 'she'.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes. You are aware of that, Minister.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member for Gaven, the former failed housing and building minister of Queensland who sat around the cabinet table—

Ms SCANLON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. I should have mentioned as well that the member for Woodridge was the leadership partner mentioned in that *Courier-Mail* report to be alongside the member for Gaven mounting that challenge. That is very interesting. The member for Gaven knew about the impact of BPIC. She failed to act but she must say sorry to Queenslanders now.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Donations

Mr BERKMAN: My question is to the Premier. A family trust linked to property developer the Lancini group has donated $100,000 to the LNP just months after being selected to develop previously public land at Northshore Hamilton. Will the Premier direct his party to return this donation to avoid any perception of improper influence?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the honourable member for the question. As the honourable member knows, donations are always declared and so they should be. I make this point though: the member for Maiwar asked about housing and I want to talk about housing because it is very important. The site the member spoke about is a classic example of a site where nothing was happening because of those opposite. It sat vacant. They refused to do anything about it.

We went through an open and transparent process. What will happen on the back of it is that people will have an opportunity to have a roof over their head. That is one of the greatest gifts a government can give any Queenslander. I look at what has been done and what is happening right across the housing chain. I know that we are making progress. I say to the honourable member that we have a long way to go, but we are making progress, and I will tell him why.

It starts with an infrastructure pipeline to open up opportunities to make sure that there is the ability for someone to go and develop a block of land. It might not be sexy work, as the Deputy Premier says, but it is essential work. It is essential. Those opposite never did it because they were only ever about doing short-term things. The difference is that we have an infrastructure minister, a housing minister and a roads minister who are determined to deliver the kind of infrastructure that opens up opportunities.

The Residential Activation Fund, which has been criticised by those opposite, is unashamedly a fund about bringing houses to market. That is the focus of it and it is working. To know we are approaching 200,000 extra blocks of land that will come on the market because of the RAF shows that we are heading in the right direction.

Then there is social housing. I am mindful that the member is very passionate about that, and I acknowledge that. Have a look at the progress—

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question went nowhere near social housing. It is about whether the donation from the Lancini group will be returned by the LNP.

Mr SPEAKER: Your point of order is on relevance?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier answered the question in the first part of his answer. He is being responsive to the question as asked with respect to the land and housing aspects. As the member would know, when it comes to donations, they are a matter for the organisational wings of the parties. He answered the question at the beginning of his answer.

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, did you have a further point of order?

Mr BERKMAN: Indeed, I did. The suggestion that the question was answered by saying that the donation was declared goes nowhere to answering the question of whether it will be returned.

Mr SPEAKER: I thought the member declared both aspects. Premier, continue.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I gave the honourable member his answer right at the beginning—that is, that things must be declared transparently and accountably, and that is the way it should be. Those rules were set up by those opposite and, indeed, governments before, and that is the way it should be.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order again. The Premier is obviously entitled to not answer the question, but he cannot pretend the question is other than what was asked, which is: will the donation be returned?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order in relation to the member for Maiwar's point of order is that he cannot debate the question as asked. He has asked the question. The Premier is being responsive. He has directly answered the question and is providing additional information with respect to the land and housing elements which were contained within the question as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, there is no point of order. The Premier has the call. He has answered the question as he sees fit.

Mr CRISAFULLI: In the remainder of my time I want to say why it is important. It is important because over 2,000 homes will be delivered on that site—and nothing would have happened under those opposite. That is the fact of the matter. I ask myself: what if the government had not changed and that site was not developed? What if the government was not prepared to build infrastructure and deliver homes and give people an opportunity to have a roof over their heads? What if the government was not prepared to increase the number of social houses by four times? What if Mr Wood donated $1.6 million to your party and you said nothing?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will have order.

Mr Berkman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, I caution you.

Transport Infrastructure

Mr LEE: My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government building the transport projects to get Queenslanders home sooner

and safer, and is the minister aware of any admissions that saw more congestion and descoped transport projects?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Hervey Bay for the question. I commend him for his advocacy for the intersection upgrade at Booral Road and Boundary Road that is being delivered after years of Labor delays. I thank him for his advocacy. In my substantive portfolio of housing and public works, I think he visits the sites of our builds in his electorate weekly. He certainly gives us updates on them, and we appreciate it. He is delivering after a decade of decline, after Labor failed to invest in Queensland's roads during that decade of decline.

Labor did not complete one rail crossing removal project in Brisbane. In fact, the last traffic tunnel that opened in Brisbane was Legacy Way back in 2015. They did not start construction on a single new tunnel in that time. They botched projects like the Northern Transitway, the cost of which blew out to more than triple what was promised by the overrun overlord, the member for Miller, and his apprentice, the member for Aspley.

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

Mr SPEAKER: I think I can pre-empt this one. You have a point of order, member for Miller?

Mr BAILEY: Yes. The member is experienced—correct titles.

Mr SPEAKER: We do use correct titles, thank you.

Mr O'CONNOR: I was not asked to withdraw. That was a KPI from Brent. I had to get that one in.

Mr SPEAKER: Use correct titles.

Mr O'CONNOR: The project was descoped to stop at Rode Road rather than going through to Hamilton Road as originally planned. The former Labor government left Gympie Road as an abandoned construction site, which our government has cleaned up. The member for Aspley could not even complete a level crossing removal in his own electorate at Beams Road.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence. I drove over it yesterday.

Mr SPEAKER: You take personal offence?

Mr MELLISH: Yes.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. I note the member's acknowledgement of this government delivering what he could not. The member for Aspley presided over a $6.7 billion QTRIP blowout, which is money that could have gone towards new projects to reduce congestion. Congestion got worse under the former Labor government because they were too busy putting cash into the pockets of their CFMEU mates instead of dealing with it. The member for Miller is very quick to take offence in this House but he has not apologised to Queenslanders for BPIC. Where is the member for Miller's apology? The member for Miller described the CFMEU storming his own TMR building in 2022 as just 'unions being unions'.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That comment is not true. I take personal offence and ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. We look forward to his appearance at the commission. The 20 per cent that BPIC would have added to the—

Mr SPEAKER: This is the second time you have done that. When you withdraw it is unequivocal, you just withdraw.

Mr O'CONNOR: I withdraw. The 20 per cent that BPIC would have added on top of the cost of projects would have been $4 billion that we would not have had to put towards them. We are investing in a transport network across our state to get Queenslanders home sooner and safer. We are building a better rail network. We have announced the successful contractor for the Wave. We have opened EOIs for light rail to Harbour Town. We have five rail crossing removals as part of the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project underway. We are delivering for Queensland.

(Time expired)

Crisafulli LNP Government, Public Service

Mr MILES: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise if he was present when the Deputy Premier asked taxpayer funded ministerial staff to raise their hands if they were a member of the LNP as reported by Nine News?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. It is a question from someone who appointed a member of the Labor Party and a convicted fraudster as the chief public servant of this state. I will explain the irony to you, Mr Speaker. I am just going to compare and contrast. The Leader of the Opposition is asking about the Deputy Premier asking political staffers whether or not they are members of his political party. The Leader of the Opposition was prepared to put a self-confessed electoral rorter as the chief public servant in this state. I need everybody to grasp this. He was prepared to compromise the hard work of Queensland's public servants by appointing a former Labor MP and a self-confessed electoral rorter as their chief. Please! It took Peter Beattie—

Mr MILES: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was whether the Premier was at a meeting.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you have heard the question.

Mr CRISAFULLI: The Leader of the Opposition asks about the Deputy Premier asking political staffers whether or not they are a member of a political movement and I am contrasting it with the Leader of the Opposition corrupting the independence of the Queensland Public Service. The fact that the Leader of the Opposition would ask this question shows that they have learnt nothing. A copy of the Coaldrake review remains on my desk because it is a guiding star for me. I say to every single public servant—you know what I do, Mr Speaker?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier you have the call. Address your comments through the chair, please.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will tell you what I do regularly. I walk the floors of our Public Service. I do it a lot, and I will tell you why.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I have just called for order.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Actually, I am going to take the interjection from the member for Waterford who did not do a lot of walking. She did not walk those floors. I will tell you why I take—

Mr MILES: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Premier still has not said whether he was at that meeting.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier is directly responding to an interjection from the member for Waterford.

Mr SPEAKER: The member is responding to an interjection at the moment.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. There are two reasons why I want to take the interjection from the member for Waterford. The first is I want to comment on it and the second is I want to contrast the way that I treat the Public Service to the way the member for Waterford did. I take the interjection—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Waterford, you are warned for that outburst.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Those opposite do not know the difference between political staffers and public servants. When I walk the floors I say this to public servants: I want them to be able to continue to deliver for this state; I want them to give fearless and frank advice. They will have views one way or another, and that is of no relevance. They need to be part of the delivery and they are. I want to say to the public servants in this state: you are doing a good job. On every metric things are improving. Part of the reason is it is led by a genuinely independent Public Service. The public servant who heads the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is not a former Labor MP or a self-confessed rorter; it is someone who I am proud to have lead the Public Service.

Infrastructure

Ms CAMM: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering the corrections infrastructure

necessary to keep Queensland communities safe, and is the minister aware of any admissions that saw corrections facilities delayed?

Mrs GERBER: What a great question from the member for Whitsunday. You betcha I am aware of the critical delays and infrastructure that were not delivered by the previous Labor government. It took the Crisafulli government to deliver the first new prison in Queensland in a decade. That's right—the LNP government in 2014 delivered the business case. Those opposite had 10 years to deliver a new prison. Did they do it? No, they did not. When it comes to youth detention centres, did they deliver the Woodford detention centre? No, they did not—and why? Because of the blowouts and delays resulting from their sweetheart deal with the CFMEU and BPIC.

Just yesterday Labor supported our motion acknowledging BPIC was a disastrous policy that cost Queenslanders billions of dollars. Now Labor's factional allies have called for senior shadow ministers who are tainted by that policy to be removed—that's right. The *Australian* reports a factional ally of Miles said there is a broader need for 'fresh blood'. Those senior ministers who are tainted need to be removed and the member for Bulimba was called out as one of those senior ministers tainted and needing to be removed by her own factional allies. And why? Labor's youth—

Mr Bleijie: Plenty of time to farm.

Mrs GERBER: The Deputy Premier has picked up on where I am going! Labor's former youth justice minister, the member for Bulimba, was the farmer who planted the seeds that resulted in our youth crime crisis. She sowed those seeds with detention as a last resort. She fertilised them with weak laws and now her own party is calling for the farmer to be put out to pasture. And why? Because they know—as do the senior leadership team, the members of their own caucus and their factional allies—that the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Murrumba, is a goner. They want those people tainted by him gone, too. They want fresh blood.

Mrs Frecklington: He needs to be harvested.

Mrs GERBER: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General. He needs to be harvested. They know he is critically wounded and they know his time is up. Queenslanders reaped the rotten harvest that the member for Bulimba sowed. They reaped it—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! You are starting to stretch into unparliamentary discourse.

Mrs GERBER: I withdraw. Victim numbers rose 193 per cent under her. That is why her caucus wants her gone. That is why they are calling for the member for Bulimba to resign and the member for Murrumba as well.

Queensland Hospital and Health Services, Artwork

Ms ENOCH: My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise why Queensland hospital and health services were instructed to remove Indigenous artwork from their official emblems?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute.

Mr NICHOLLS: I want to say thank you to our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander workforce. In fact, one of our members was a recipient of an Australian of a Year award: Noel, up in Cairns, a great guy whom I have spent some time with. I also want to acknowledge our new First Nations Health Officer, Sam Wild, who has come to us and is doing great work and is liaising with people like the new CEO of QAIHC, Kieran, who is going to do a fantastic job working with the Indigenous liaison officers across the system. I have given no instruction whatsoever. I do not know what the member is even referring to.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MOTION

Personal Explanation, Member for McConnel

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.10 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of standing and sessional orders be suspended to enable the Member for McConnel to immediately make a 10-minute personal explanation to explain how the CFMEU influenced her decision-making whilst holding ministerial office in the former Labor government.

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.10 am): Mr Speaker—

Government members interjected.

Mr DICK: I am speaking in response to the motion.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just get some advice. I call the member for Woodridge.

Mr DICK: This is another attempt by the government to subject members of this House to pressure: to suborn them, to use the majority of the government to make members do things that the government wants them to do. This is not an appropriate use of the parliament's time. It is a political game by the LNP. When there are so many serious issues to be debated in this chamber—the domestic and family violence bill is one—this government wants to use its power to punish other members of this House. This is an absolute abuse of power. There is a very serious commission of inquiry underway in this state—an extremely serious commission of inquiry.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members are going to be warned very, very shortly.

Mr DICK: There is a very serious commission of inquiry where very serious allegations are currently being tested. Very serious evidence has been presented before that commission of inquiry and all witnesses, all named individuals, will have the opportunity, if it is in the purview of the commissioner, to respond to allegations and claims made against them. That is the appropriate and, can I say, the fair way for any named individual to be dealt with. That is how commissions of inquiry work. For this parliament, in a highly inappropriate fashion, to come over the top of the commission, to try to influence the commission on what the findings of that commission might be, on what the findings of the commissioner might be, by using the government's majority to demand members of this House make statements I think seeks to do two things: it undermines the power of the parliament, because it abuses the power of the parliament, and it undermines the commission of inquiry. This is a commission of inquiry where the government has appropriated $100 million to investigate those matters this government says need to be properly investigated. That is an enormous amount of taxpayer funds to investigate these matters. If it is that it is so serious in the minds of the members of the executive, if it is so serious in the minds of the Premier and the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer, who has permitted that allocation of funding, then let the commission do its work.

The only conclusion that Queenslanders could form from this motion is that the government wants to use the commission of inquiry entirely for political purposes. The Labor opposition has been absolutely clear. We have said from the start: let the commission do its work. We have said if we are called as witnesses we will respond and we will comply with any requests from the commission. In fact, the government has authorised indemnities for certain individuals to enable them to prepare their case. That is the same for any person, any minister in a current or former government, who might be brought before any court or required to appear in any proceeding, including before a commission of inquiry. That is the appropriate way for individuals to put their case if there are cases to be put to them.

For the government to come in today, when there are serious matters for this House to debate, and say individual X is to answer to us, individual X is to answer to the government, individual X is to answer to the parliament, I think is inappropriate. It is inappropriate for the government to target the member for McConnel who we know may very well have to give evidence in the commission of inquiry. I think that is highly unfair. It is inappropriate and it is a misuse of the parliament and its power.

In addition, the motion contains imputations. It contains matters that should properly be tested by the commission where parties can be legally represented, where counsel assisting can test matters and propositions put before the commission. The government wants to ask the member for McConnel to a make a 10-minute personal explanation. The reason this motion is being moved today is because the motion that the Deputy Premier moved yesterday completely backfired on the government. It was a waste of the parliament's time. Now, because the Deputy Premier could not get his way yesterday, he has demanded of all members of the government, including the back bench and the executive, that they have to come into the House and hear him speak again to move and to attack the member for McConnel. This demonstrates everything Queenslanders need to know about the LNP government, the LNP executive, the LNP Deputy Premier and the LNP Premier. They will do anything to promote their political purposes. If they genuinely believed the commission of inquiry was a place to investigate and make findings of truth then they would let the commission of inquiry do its work. The member for Kawana wants to use this parliament as a political plaything because he thinks he is smarter than everyone else. This motion is showing up the member for Kawana for who he is. It is showing every Queenslander the true face of the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Relations.

Members of the opposition will oppose this motion. I call on members of the crossbench to oppose this motion too because it is an abuse of the parliament's time and it is an abuse of the parliament's power. If the parliament was to pass this motion who is next to be subject to the pressure

of this government? None of us on this side of the House will bow to the demands of the Deputy Premier. We will not support this motion. We will not comply with this motion if it is passed.

Mr Power: interjected.

Mr DICK: That's right. As the Deputy Premier has said in this House, the commission of inquiry is better than the top 10 on Netflix. He said other members of this chamber—the member for Burnett in particular—would be cancelling their subscription to online series because the commission of inquiry is better than those Netflix series.

What a disrespectful way to treat the commission just as this motion disrespects the commissioner and disrespects the commission of inquiry and the process that all of those members opposite claim is an inquiry into the truth. If that is the case, they should vote against this motion as well. They should stand against the abuse of this parliament by the executive. We have had other members opposite cross the floor on matters of principle. I say to all members of the LNP: cross the floor on this matter of principle because it is an abuse of the parliament and it is an abuse of the power of this place. If there is any truth to these allegations then they will be properly investigated. This motion should be opposed.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.20 am): Mr Deputy Speaker—

Honourable members interjected.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Members, the quarrelling across the chamber will cease, particularly the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Currumbin. The Deputy Premier has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr MILES: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, Leader of the Opposition?

Mr MILES: No, I had the call.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I had not given anyone the call. I was warning the member for Currumbin and the member for Pine Rivers to cease their quarrelling. You are not warned under the standing orders, members. The Deputy Premier has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Woodridge says that the member for McConnel does not answer to the government. That is right, but she does answer to the parliament. That is what this motion is about. It is a motion that the member for McConnel be afforded the opportunity to explain herself and her role in the CFMEU for 10 years. There is only one person mentioned in the motion. It is not the Deputy Premier, it is not the Premier and it is not the opposition leader. It is the member for McConnel. One person is being given the opportunity to explain herself. It is a very simple motion.

I liked listening to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who says, 'This is disgraceful.' They did it to Mark McArdle. The Labor Party moved the same motion in relation to Mark McArdle when he was not even in the chamber. Do members remember when the opposition leader was last in office? When he became Premier, he ordered shadow ministers to go back in their diaries for 12 months. That was not legislated. It was not about the law. He ordered that that be done, in this House, for political purposes. The member for Woodridge should not lecture anyone about the abuse of process in this House. Pot, kettle, black, member for Woodridge!

The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says parliament should be discussing very serious issues. I say to the member for Woodridge: this morning the Attorney-General disclosed from the royal commission evidence from a former CEO of Master Builders who said he contemplated suicide. That is a serious matter. Does the member for Woodridge not think that one contemplating suicide is a serious matter for debate and that the former industrial relations minister should be held accountable for her actions or, more importantly, her inaction?

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for McConnel. Deputy Premier, would you withdraw?

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for McConnel! You have made your point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: The great thing is that when this motioned is passed, if it is passed, the member can have 10 minutes to talk about all of this and the allegations that have been raised. This motion is not necessarily just about the commission of inquiry. It is about behaviour for 10 years as the industrial relations minister in the Labor Party. It is not just about the commission of inquiry. Allegations have been raised in the commission of inquiry but a lot more than those have been raised. It is far broader than the allegations raised in the commission of inquiry. There are a lot more questions to be answered by the member for McConnel than have been raised in the commission of inquiry.

The member for Woodridge talks about the cost of the commission of inquiry at $100 million. That pales into insignificance compared to the cost of BPIC on projects that they put in place. That is why it is a voluntary position for the member for McConnel to explain herself. She owes an explanation to parliament—not to government, but to parliament—to workplace health and safety officers, to independent officers in the Office of Industrial Relations and, more importantly, to the people of Queensland. I move—

That the question be now put.

Motion agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice from the Clerk.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. A moment ago, the Leader of the Opposition sought the call and made it quite clear to you that he intended to speak to the motion. I ask you to take that into consideration before you put that question.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand. A motion has been moved by the Deputy Premier. I will put that motion.

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

In division—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): The Deputy Premier and the member for McConnel will cease quarrelling across the chamber. Member for McConnel, you are aware of the sessional orders and other rules in relation to the use of mobile devices. I ask you to adhere to them, please.

AYES, 49:

LNP, 49—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, 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, 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, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pairs: Mickelberg, Boyd; Perrett, King.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

CFMEU

Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (11.30 am): I rise to speak on the motion. I do not intend to influence, undermine or interrupt the work of Commissioner Wood. I have publicly denied allegations. Labor put the CFMEU into administration. We called out the behaviour. I will comply with any order provided to me by the commission, but I will not comply with the political bullying of the Deputy Premier and the Crisafulli government.

CRIMINAL CODE AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (11.32 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1980, the Criminal Code, the Evidence Act 1977, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Summary Offences Act 2005, the Surat Basin Rail (Infrastructure Development and Management) Act 2012, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995, the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026.

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

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

I am pleased to introduce the Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The bill continues the Crisafulli government's delivery of a criminal justice system that is fair and efficient, that holds offenders accountable and that keeps Queenslanders safer. This latest strengthening of laws introduces new offences and tougher penalties for driving that causes death or grievous bodily harm, for engaging in violent behaviour that causes grievous bodily harm, and for trespass related conduct. As well, we are boosting assistance for vulnerable witnesses with reforms that will increase the pool of witness intermediaries who provide invaluable court support.

This bill drives home the Crisafulli government's commitment to improving safety on Queensland roads. It builds on reforms already made by the Criminal Code (Dangerous Driving) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026, which was aimed at those who choose to threaten the lives of fellow Queensland road users by dangerously driving, operating or interfering with a vehicle.

In its report on the dangerous driving bill, the hardworking State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee—and I thank the chair, the member for Lockyer—recommended the government consider the merits of creating a specific offence of knowingly participating, directly or indirectly, in an unlawful race or speed trial that results in, or contributes to, the death of, or grievous bodily harm to, another person. This bill implements in accordance with, and strong response to, that exact recommendation of the committee.

Let me assure the House it has not been done in a vacuum. I would like to pay tribute to the courage of Jasmin and Raymond Bermudo who turned wrenching pain over the loss of their son Kyle into a public campaign for bolstered laws on our roads. Kyle was 21, a Gold Coast nursing student with a caring professional's big and natural heart. He was only months from graduating as a nurse when he was fatally struck by a car while he was crossing the road after work in March 2024. This was not a blameless tragedy. The vehicle responsible was engaged in an unlawful street race.

In the dark days since, Kyle's grieving family have embraced his legacy, organising a walk—a fundraising effort to feed the homeless. 'Kyle loved to help people,' his mum said. Jasmin and Raymond also, and rightly, brought the case for tougher dangerous driving enforcement to lawmakers and police.

Along with the member for Bonney, I have met with them. They are gentle, loving people on a selfless mission to prevent another family living the nightmare of their loss. Their call was heeded by the Crisafulli government with our dangerous driving legislation. After the passage of those laws, Jasmin said, 'It's been a long journey, but finally our voice was heard.'

I again would very much like to thank my colleague, the member for Bonney, for his strong advocacy on behalf of Kyle and the Bermudo family in relation to these laws. I would like to quote Jasmin when she said—

> We cannot bring Kyle back. We will carry this loss for the rest of our lives. But if speaking out can prevent another family from experiencing what we have experienced, then we will continue.

The Crisafulli government had not resiled either. On behalf of the Bermudos, other heartbroken victim families and every Queenslander who deserves protection from reckless driving behaviour, we are, with this bill, directly targeting street racers.

Street racing and speed trials are a life-endangering folly. They will not be tolerated on our roads, nor will the hoons behind the wheel. It is currently an offence under transport law to take part in, organise

or promote a race or a speed trial on a road without a permit, and races and speed trials are circumstances of aggravation for dangerous driving.

The bill strengthens the law to better reflect the seriousness of this type of offending. I will note that both my and the member for Mudgeeraba's electorates are adversely affected by the hoon cartels that continually race on our roads. It creates a specific offence in the Criminal Code for driving a motor vehicle in a race or a speed trial—hooning—and causing death or grievous bodily harm. The maximum penalty for this new offence is 600 penalty units, which is $103,000, or seven years imprisonment. The court must also disqualify the person from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for at least one year. The creation of a specific offence with an appropriately severe penalty reflects the shocking consequences of this type of offending and the culpability of the driver. The offence ensures drivers are held accountable for their behaviour and the harm done to victims who have been injured and family members who have lost loved ones is recognised.

The bill also reforms the existing transport law offences for racing or speed trials. The changes separate offending involving motor vehicles such as cars and trucks, offending involving non-motor vehicles such as bicycles and skateboards, and offending involving organising or promoting the race or speed trial. The bill doubles the penalty for driving a motor vehicle in a street race or speed trial. The new maximum penalty is 60 penalty units or nine months imprisonment. The offender must also be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for at least one year. Driving a vehicle other than a motor vehicle in a street race or speed trial or organising or promoting a street race or speed trial will be punishable by up to 40 penalty units or six months imprisonment.

I acknowledge that some stakeholders suggested further reforms to the committee inquiry into the dangerous driving bill, particularly in relation to criminal responsibility. Criminal responsibility is, and remains, a complex area of the criminal law. The general rule is one of personal responsibility—that is, each individual is responsible only for their own actions and not for the actions of others.

While the rule has exceptions, and in certain circumstances a person may be held accountable for an offence committed by someone else, criminal responsibility under the exceptions is assessed on a case-by-case basis considering those circumstances. I understand why, in the context of a particular case, these stakeholders suggested changes to criminal responsibility for street race offences. However, automatically making every person responsible for the actions of other people in relation to one type of driving offence would have significant unintended consequences, including creating inequity in the way different offences are dealt with. Further, to also recognise the seriousness of driving carelessly, the bill introduces charges for careless driving.

The bill creates a specific offence in the Criminal Code for carelessly driving a motor vehicle and causing death or grievous bodily harm. The maximum penalty for the new offence is 400 penalty units—that is, $69,080 or five years imprisonment—and the offender must be disqualified from holding or obtaining a driver's licence for at least nine months. Many Queenslanders are aware of the horrific head-on collision that precipitated changes to the careless driving offence in 2018. The circumstance of aggravation that the offending caused death or grievous bodily harm was introduced following a coronial inquest into the death of Mackay grandmother Audrey Dow and the finding that the previous offence framework did not adequately reflect the seriousness and consequences of the offending.

The new offence in the Criminal Code for careless driving causing death or grievous bodily harm reflects the gravity of the offending and especially recognises the harm caused in a standalone offence. While the new offence does not differentiate between licensed and unlicensed driving in the same way as the existing offence, it strengthens the consequences for these offenders. The new offence is an indictable offence, a more serious category of offending, with the maximum penalty to be more than doubled and the offence recognised as a serious offence under the Adult Crime, Adult Time framework.

The bill ensures an appropriately significant maximum penalty is available to the court in sentencing an offender, considering all of the circumstances, including the offender's traffic history and licence status. Additionally, to reflect the seriousness of this offending and the potential for catastrophic consequences, even when it does not cause death or grievous bodily harm, the bill increases the penalty for carelessly driving a motor vehicle. The new maximum penalty is 60 penalty units or nine months imprisonment.

As well as strengthening our laws on high-risk, irresponsible driving, the bill amends the Criminal Code to establish a new offence for recklessly causing grievous bodily harm. After the youth crime crisis of Labor's soft-on-crime decade of decline, where victim numbers soared by 193 per cent, we are making offenders accountable with stronger laws and tougher penalties, alongside record investment in early intervention and rehabilitation.

The guiding principle is to put victims ahead of offenders, and it is evinced in the statute books—Adult Crime, Adult Time; Jack's Law; Breach Bail, Go to Jail. We know that, from talking to thousands of Queenslanders who have experienced the horrors of crime directly or indirectly, they want us to keep going. Many of them, like Jordan Richardson, are victims of violence. Jordan suffered a lifelong brain injury and other disabilities after a king-hit attack. His victim impact statement is simply devastating. He said—

I'm so sick of everyone telling me how lucky I am to be alive ... the reality is, I don't feel lucky. Why would I?

One day I'm a happy 22-year-old kid with a promising future walking home from a night out with friends.

Two weeks later, I regain consciousness after being cowardly king hit. While the punch didn't end my life, it has certainly changed it forever.

I lost three weeks of my life unconscious and incoherent in a hospital bed. I spent that time at the mercy of God and doctors. Multiple skull fractures, bleeding on the brain. Tubes breathing for me, tubes feeding me and tubes keeping my body and brain alive.

I had to learn how to talk, walk, eat and function all over again ... being told you can't go to dinner with your family because your brain forgot how to chew and you could choke when eating.

The hard truth is that my recovery will never be over and I'll never go back to the person I was before.

It is in light of the advocacy of Queenslanders such as Jordan's mum, Christine, that the government with this bill is strengthening the laws against offenders who engage in behaviour that seriously injures another person, ensuring they are held accountable commensurate with their culpability. The Criminal Code contains a range of offences to criminalise violence, including two offences relating to causing grievous bodily harm. One offence is unlawfully causing grievous bodily harm and another more serious offence captures intentionally causing grievous bodily harm.

That has left a gap in the offence framework when the offender does not intend to cause the harm but they are reckless as to causing the harm. This bill closes that gap. It creates a new offence for unlawfully and recklessly causing grievous bodily harm to another person. For the new offence, a person recklessly does grievous bodily harm if they are aware of a substantial risk that their conduct could do bodily harm and engage in the conduct when, having regard to the circumstances known to them, it is unjustifiable to take that risk.

An offender is taken to have recklessly done grievous bodily harm if the harm is caused by deliberately punching, kicking or otherwise hitting a person to the head or neck unless the striking occurs as part of a socially acceptable function or activity such as a sporting event and it is reasonable in the circumstances.

Grievous bodily harm is a serious injury. It is the loss of a body part or organ, serious disfigurement or an injury of such a nature that would endanger life or cause permanent injury if left untreated. Grievous bodily harm has severe consequences for the victim, their family and the community. The repercussions for the offender must take a proper measure of the harm caused. Let me be clear: this is about people who show a reckless disregard for seriously injuring another person. The new offence captures offenders who know there is a substantial risk they will cause bodily harm and persist with their behaviour anyway. Offenders who recklessly cause grievous bodily harm, whether it is through a coward's punch, an act of domestic violence or any other form of violent behaviour, will be, and should be, brought to justice. The new offence, with a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment, achieves this.

Queensland was built on the back of agriculture, and our farmers must be able to get on with the job of feeding and clothing the nation and fuelling the state's economy. It is not for them to suffer activists seeking to disrupt or damage their operations, so the bill also includes reforms to strengthen trespass laws which extend to defence sites, given their criticality to national security and community safety. Queensland's agricultural and defence manufacturing sectors operate across vast territory. While the criminal law provides strong protections against unlawful entry into buildings, vehicles and other structures, equivalent safeguards are not available for land-based industries crucial to the state's economy, security and wellbeing.

Existing trespass offences under the Summary Offences Act 2005 recognise the unique nature of agricultural land, but the penalties do not adequately reflect the seriousness of the harm that can result from unlawful incursions. Unlawful entry onto agricultural and defence manufacturing land is a gravely serious matter. Trespass on farmland poses risks to our farmers' businesses, their crops, stock and employees as well as their families. The bill recognises the seriousness of trespass on agricultural land with an intent to, for example, steal equipment, damage crops, kill livestock or injure a worker by

introducing a specific offence to the Criminal Code. A person will commit an offence punishable by seven years imprisonment if they unlawfully enter or remain on land used for an agricultural purpose with an intent to commit an indictable offence.

The new offence is aggravated, exposing an offender to a higher penalty of 10 years imprisonment if the land is fully enclosed by a fence or other barrier and the offender gains entry by a break—that is, by passing over, under or through a fence or barrier such as by opening a gate, cutting the fence or climbing a wall; the offender actually commits an indictable offence, other than an offence committed in gaining entry to the land by a break; or the offender uses or threatens to use violence, is armed with a dangerous or offensive weapon, instrument or noxious substance they intend to use to commit the indictable offence, is in company with one or more persons, possesses or operates a drone they intend to use to commit the indictable offence, or damages property, other than in the course of gaining access to the land by a break.

The offence is further aggravated, exposing an offender to 14 years imprisonment, if the offender gains entry by a break and one of the other circumstances of aggravation is present. For example, if the offender enters the land by cutting a hole in the fence and, once on the land, damages farming equipment.

The offence also applies to land used for a defence manufacturing purpose—that is, land used to manufacture, assemble, test, repair, maintain, modify or store vehicles, weapons, equipment or technology for the Australian Defence Force or the defence force of another country in compliance with Commonwealth law. This reflects the important role the defence industry plays in protecting our national security and the risk trespassing on land used for this purpose with intent to commit an indictable offence poses to the security of Australia and our allies as well as to the businesses, their workers, our economy and the trespassers themselves.

Further, the bill increases the penalties for offences relating to trespass under the Summary Offences Act 2005, Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, and Surat Basin Rail (Infrastructure Development and Management) Act 2012. Tougher maximum penalties for the existing summary offences better mirror the seriousness of the offending and the impacts on business, transport infrastructure, the economy and our communities.

I want to talk about the importance of the agricultural industry in terms of manufacturing and the pork industry in the Nanango electorate. The Nanango electorate houses many agricultural production facilities, including abattoirs, packaging facilities and the like. Pork and beef are huge industries in my electorate. The Swickers factory at Kingaroy is the largest pork processing plant in the Southern Hemisphere. Pork is unlike other industries because if a trespasser goes onto agricultural land that houses pigs, biosecurity rules state that those animals must be euthanised. Because biosecurity has been breached, they cannot continue going through the manufacturing process. This bill is vitally important in order to secure the pork industry in Queensland and ensure we are looking out for our agricultural producers. They are as important to our economy as every other single industry.

The trade minister, who is sitting right here in this House, spends a lot of her time promoting not just our valuable pork industry but our valuable beef industry to the world. I thank the trade minister very much, because those manufacturing and agricultural industries keep the Nanango electorate alive all the way down from the manufacturing facilities at Kilcoy and Coominya up to Kingaroy and out to Maclagan, where there is even a small manufacturing facility for our beef, sheep and pork products.

I just wanted to divert for a second, Mr Deputy Speaker Krause. As a strong, loud member of this parliament who supports the agriculture industry, you would understand exactly what I am getting at. This is vitally important. I am very proud to be able to deliver that part of my bill for agricultural producers across Queensland. As I am now someone who grows a bit of beef, I want to make sure that everyone knows it is not okay to trespass.

Finally, the bill amends the Evidence Act 1977 to enable a broader range of people to be appointed as witness intermediaries. Witness intermediaries are professionals who play a key role in providing communication support to certain vulnerable witnesses in court proceedings that relate to child sexual offences, including the victims of such crimes. Once more, we are placing the victims of horrific child sexual offences at the heart of our justice system, ensuring they have the best and most appropriate support and resources.

Currently, people who have tertiary qualifications in occupational therapy, psychology, social work and speech pathology can undertake this role, and they do play an important role and I thank them. The bill expands eligibility for appointment as an intermediary to persons holding certain tertiary qualifications in education, medicine or nursing as well as persons with a Certificate IV in Aboriginal

and/or Torres Strait Islander Primary Health Care Practice. This amendment will, therefore, increase the number of intermediaries available for appointment and enable witnesses to be better matched with intermediaries suited to their needs. This is particularly in relation to the great need for people who require someone who understands Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander primary health care. This is really important to us, and that is why we are making this amendment to expand eligibility for appointment as an intermediary. It will ensure that people who are suffering through this horrific and traumatic time in their life can have the care and guidance they require. This amendment will enable people who have those relevant qualifications and live in rural and regional Queensland to assist as intermediaries, because not everyone who is subjected to the horrific offence of child sexual abuse live in Brisbane.

The bill delivers strong reforms to improve safety on our roads, combat violence in our community, protect the security of our agricultural producers, farmers and manufacturers and our defence interests, and provide wider support for vulnerable victims. We are ensuring hoons on our roads are held accountable with stronger laws and heavier penalties for street racing. I have to give a shout-out to the member for Mudgeeraba, who has been dealing with the Mexican hoon cartel—

Ms Bates: For 10 years.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—for 10 years, and we hear about it often. There you go, member for Mudgeeraba; hopefully, you can stop now. We are ensuring thugs who perpetrate violence and recklessly cause grievous bodily harm face consequences that reflect the seriousness of their actions. Victims of crime who were sidelined under Labor's decade of decline are front and centre of the Crisafulli government's mandate to make Queensland safer. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (12.03 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 McDonald): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 18 November (see p. 3844), on motion of Mrs Stoker—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (12.04 pm), continuing: Look at our local courts and our local tragedies. Queensland courts data records 1,348 initiating DVO applications were lodged at the Ipswich Magistrates Court alone in 2025-26 and a further 384 in the first four months of 2026-27 to the end of October. Those numbers only capture a fraction of the harm occurring behind closed doors. Expert evidence to the committee stated that up to 80 per cent of victim-survivors do not engage with police.

I want to briefly acknowledge the courage of the member for Redcliffe who last night shared her personal experience of domestic violence. Her account, in particular, of not being believed by police is a really powerful reminder of why we must continue working to ensure that every single victim-survivor is heard, believed and supported.

Queensland continues to face an alarming rate of domestic violence order breaches, with contraventions rising by more than 255 per cent over the decade from 2013-14 to 2022-23. The real tragedy lies in the 25 Queenslanders killed in domestic and family violence incidents in the 19 months during 2025 and the first half of this year. In Ipswich, those statistics have devastating human faces. Just last month, our community was shattered when a 28-year-old Ipswich man was charged with domestic violence murder following the death of his three-month-old baby boy from catastrophic internal

injuries. A 28-year-old woman was fatally stabbed in Leichhardt in July 2024. A 19-year-old woman in Bundamba was allegedly murdered by her partner in February 2023.

When the police minister stands up and claims that domestic violence rates are falling because QPS figures show a 10 per cent drop in calls for service between 2024-25 and 2025-26, Queenslanders simply do not believe it. During the Education, Arts and Communities Committee inquiry, stakeholder after stakeholder contradicted the minister. The Salvation Army testified that their Queensland domestic and family violence sessions jumped by 20 per cent over the past year. The Women's Legal Service confirmed year on year increases in demand. The Brisbane Domestic Violence Service run by Micah Projects told the committee that demand for their support has risen by at least 20 per cent every year. They noted that, while police referrals have stagnated, thousands more victim-survivors are seeking help directly because they do not feel safe navigating the criminal justice system.

The QPS's own answers to questions on notice revealed that the proportion of assaults flagged as domestic and family violence dropped from around 60 to 62 per cent in mid-2025 to as low as 48 per cent in July this year, while DFV referrals fell by 23 per cent, but that is not a real drop in violence. This is a government that has already been caught out on multiple occasions manipulating crime metrics to protect the Premier's political promises. While the Crisafulli LNP government claims the crisis is easing, what has it done to the funding that supports domestic and family violence services? It has ripped a staggering $140 million out of these services.

This brings me directly to this bill before the House and the amended police protection direction, PPD, framework. Less than 12 months after the Crisafulli government's initial PPD framework commenced operation, we are back in this chamber trying to patch up its botched rollout. Yet, extraordinarily, this government is pushing ahead with significant changes without conducting a formal independent review of how the existing framework has operated over its first nine months. Even the ANROWS study into victim misidentification announced more than 13 months ago is still only in its commencement stage. As Micah Projects and the Queensland Law Society both warned the committee, pressing ahead with major reforms before completing the promised review risks undoing hard-won progress on DV reform and exposing victim-survivors to unintended consequences. Most alarmingly of all, this bill removes that vital safeguard that prohibits police from issuing a PPD where either the aggrieved or the respondent is in fact a police officer.

Let's be very clear about what this change means. It means that, when a Queensland police officer is accused of perpetrating domestic violence or is a party to a DFV incident, frontline officers will now have the discretion to handle that matter internally through a PPD or decide not to issue a PPD without automatic independent oversight from a court. Even the Crime and Corruption Commission told the committee that there is no clear rationale for unwinding this safeguard. The CCC stated explicitly that giving police discretionary power to issue or not issue a PPD when a colleague is involved creates inherent corruption risks. When expanding police powers, independent oversight should be strengthened, not dismantled. Both the CCC and the Victims' Commissioner urged the government to establish the police integrity unit recommended by the A Call for Change inquiry. More than two years later, the Crisafulli government has allocated zero funding, held no meetings with the CCC on the proposal since April and has failed to make any meaningful progress. Despite broad support for the reform, the Attorney-General's response remains the same—the government is 'giving careful consideration' to the matter.

Victim-survivors in Ipswich and right across Queensland deserve better than a government that cuts $140 million from frontline support, fudges crime statistics to claim a political victory, ignores warnings from the Crime and Corruption Commission and refuses to establish an independent police integrity unit while stripping away safeguards in police-involved domestic violence cases. The Queensland Labor opposition will always back reforms that genuinely support our hardworking frontline police and keep victim-survivors safe, but those reforms must be grounded in evidence, independently reviewed and built with victim-survivors at their very centre. Because this bill does not meet this threshold, we cannot endorse it.

Ms JAMES (Barron River—LNP) (12.11 pm): I rise in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. In Queensland more than half of all assaults recorded by police are related to domestic and family violence—not violence between strangers, not random acts of aggression but violence occurring in homes, violence occurring between partners, violence occurring between family members and violence witnessed by children. The sickening reality is that domestic and family violence is rarely a single incident. What begins as manipulation can become threats, what begins as threats can become violence, and what begins as repeated breaches of protection orders can end in tragedy. That is why recognising early warning signs

is so important and that is why the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is so important. To Queensland, to Far North Queensland, to every victim who has spoken out and to every victim who has not found their voice yet, this legislation is for you.

Despite a decade of promises under the former Labor government, the scale of the problem continued to grow. During Labor's decade in government, domestic and family violence offences increased by 218 per cent. Today, more than half of all assaults recorded by police in Queensland are related to domestic and family violence, and the rate of police recorded domestic and family violence related sexual assaults doubled between 2014 and 2024 and 27.4 per cent of Australian women aged 18 years and over have experienced domestic violence. Under Labor, Queenslanders saw a government that was willing to talk about domestic and family violence but unwilling to deliver the reforms needed to better protect victim-survivors and hold perpetrators to account. The Crisafulli government, however, was elected with a commitment to put victim-survivors first and, since coming to office, we have taken significant action to strengthen our response to domestic and family violence.

Despite the deplorable misinformation from those on the other side, we have actually increased domestic and family violence funding by 45 per cent compared to Labor's last budget. We have also instilled Polair to Cairns to act faster when domestic violence is taking place. Polair can monitor from the sky from kilometres away, track perpetrators and act accordingly. We have improved the DVConnect answer rate from just 41.9 per cent under Labor to 84 per cent today, ensuring more victim-survivors can access help when they need it most. We have also invested $40 million to expand embedded workers into police stations and strengthened support for victim-survivors, opened three new Beyond DV hope hubs and established a dedicated North Queensland crisis hotline to improve access to support services. In Cairns we have also delivered a dedicated domestic violence safe room at the Cairns Courthouse to provide victim-survivors of domestic and family violence with a secure space away from alleged offenders while they await court proceedings, helping reduce trauma and improve safety throughout the justice process. We have recognised that protecting victim-survivors requires more than strong laws. It requires practical support, safe spaces and a system that puts their safety and wellbeing first.

The LNP government has also taken decisive action by introducing and passing laws that criminalise coercive control, recognising that domestic violence is not just physical, because no-one should live in fear, intimidation or under someone else's control. We have also invested further in the Cairns domestic violence co-responder team, ensuring that police and DV specialists can provide coordinated trauma informed support. I want to thank the incredible police officers and team from Relationships Australia who do this important work in Cairns. I also want to thank the domestic violence services workers like Womens Centre Far North Queensland, Ruth's Women's Shelter and the Cairns regional domestic violence team for all of the work that they do. They work in incredibly difficult circumstances. This bill is another important step in ensuring that victim-survivors are protected, perpetrators are held accountable and frontline police have the tools they need to intervene earlier and more effectively.

One of the most important things that this bill does is that it recognises that, when someone has experienced domestic and family violence, protection cannot wait. This bill makes police protection directions the primary domestic and family violence response available to police, ensuring that victim-survivors can receive immediate, on-the-spot protection when they need it most. The Queensland Police Service and Queensland Police Union both supported these reforms because they will reduce unnecessary administrative burden on our police and allow officers to spend more time protecting victims and less time completing paperwork.

This bill also expands the use of electronic monitoring for high-risk domestic and family violence offenders. For victim-survivors, protection orders can provide important safeguards, but they should never carry the burden of constantly looking over their shoulder and wondering whether an offender is complying with those orders. Electronic monitoring provides an additional layer of accountability and protection and it sends a clear message that protection orders are not optional and breaches will not go unnoticed. These reforms strengthen the tools available to courts, to police and to law enforcement to monitor high-risk offenders, intervene earlier and improve compliance with court imposed conditions. Whilst no single reform will eliminate domestic and family violence, technology should be used wherever possible to help protect victim-survivors before harm occurs, not simply respond after the harm has already been done.

These reforms did not happen overnight. For 12 years we witnessed a state being tarnished by escalating crime under a government that failed to act. During the committee process Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon told the committee that frontline police had been calling for better tools

to protect victim-survivors since as far back as 2015. Reflecting on her experience working across North Queensland, including Townsville and Mount Isa, the deputy commissioner spoke about the need for greater immediacy when responding to victims at risk. During the committee process the Women's Legal Service Queensland highlighted the importance of recognising repeated breaches for what they often are—part of an escalating pattern of coercive and controlling behaviour. Frontline services understand that repeated breaches are rarely isolated incidents. Beverley Schimke from the Rockhampton Women's Shelter told the committee that these reforms represent a huge step towards keeping people using violence accountable, and that is exactly what this bill seeks to achieve—better protection for victim-survivors, earlier intervention and stronger accountability for perpetrators.

In Far North Queensland we all know too well the devastating consequences of domestic and family violence. Last year our community was left shocked and heartbroken following the death of a Mount Sheridan woman after she made the courageous decision to leave an abusive relationship. Like so many victims, she was trying to take steps towards safety and for a better future. Instead, her life was tragically cut short and her daughter was left without a mother, a family was left grieving and a community was left searching for answers. Whilst every case is different, tragedies like this remind us of a simple truth: domestic and family violence rarely appears without warning. There are often signs, and too often those behaviours can be dismissed as isolated incidents when, in reality, they may be indicators of increasing danger.

This bill recognises that reality. It recognises that repeated breaches of protection orders are not merely administrative matters. They can be early warning signs. They may be indicators of escalating risk. In some cases, they can be indicators that lives are in fact at risk. That is why early intervention matters. That is why stronger protection matters. That is why these reforms matter. We cannot wait for a tragedy before recognising the warning signs and we cannot measure the success of these reforms by the number of pages in this bill. We must measure them by something far more important: fewer children growing up with fear, fewer women living under threat and fewer Queensland families experiencing the devastating consequences of domestic and family violence.

Ms MULLEN (Jordan—ALP) (12.19 pm): I rise to contribute to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Domestic and family violence is one of the most serious and persistent social and justice issues facing Queensland. Victim-survivors deserve protection, perpetrators must be held accountable and our justice system must respond with urgency, compassion and confidence. These are fundamental principles that the government will find no disagreement with from members on this side of the House.

However, supporting stronger protections for victim-survivors does not mean giving the government a blank cheque to introduce legislation without proper evidence, adequate consultation or sufficient consideration of the unintended consequences. In fact, the seriousness of domestic and family violence makes it even more important that we get this legislation right. You may be feeling a strange sense of deja vu, Mr Deputy Speaker McDonald, because it was just over a year ago that we were in this chamber raising similar points on the previous amendments presented to the House.

The government presented those reforms as an important and well-considered step forward. We were told they would streamline police responses, reduce pressure on the courts, provide immediate protection to victim-survivors and improve the efficiency of the domestic and family violence response system. Now, 12 months since the commencement of those provisions, this LNP government is once again trying to fix the mess it has made. You would be forgiven for thinking that perhaps this LNP government would learn from its mistakes—measure twice before cutting once. Instead, we see these amendments presented without a formal independent review or analysis on the current existing framework.

As the member for Ipswich only just mentioned, the ANROWS study into misidentification that was announced by the former minister over 13 months ago is only just in its commencement stage. Submission after submission by key sector stakeholders and experts raised this concern. The Queensland Law Society stated—

> QLS is therefore surprised to see a significant shift towards the use of PPDs within 10 months of their commencement—together with the removal of safeguards that were said to mitigate against risks identified by submitters—without publication of evidence of the impact of PPDs or consultation.
>
> ...
>
> It is certainly our position that that review should take place before we tinker with the parts in case we make things worse and not better. That is a potential unintended consequence.

The Queensland Services Union added—

The current framework has not yet been independently evaluated. Before further expansion, the Government should undertake and publish an independent review of its operation ...

Micah Projects stated in their submission—

Progressing significant structural reforms, without wholistic consideration of downstream system impacts threatens the success achieved in Queensland in our response to DFV. Making further changes ahead of the statutory review process, without clarity of the analysis from the initial 9 months of operation is not recommended.

We have seen this kind of routine far too many times by this LNP government—introduce rushed legislation, provide limited or even no time for consultation, ignore stakeholder feedback and recommendations, curtail debate in parliament, push it through the House and 12 months down the track bring it back with new amendments to patch over all the mess that has become immediately obvious, and then rinse and repeat. It is a shambolic performance and an indictment of this LNP government.

When we heard from stakeholders last year, misidentification was one of the most serious issues raised. What has become clear is that stakeholders continue to hold those concerns about PPDs and how they will be operationalised. I want to particularly acknowledge the comments from the Ethnic Communities Council of Queensland, who highlighted the significance of these changes through a cultural lens, especially when considering the compounding barriers to safety and justice for multicultural women such as language, financial dependency and social-cultural expectation. They said—

Removing existing restrictions on when PPDs may be issued and broadening available conditions increases the importance of culturally informed risk assessment, unconscious bias safeguards, supervisory review, and clear reasons. Cross-PPDs require particular scrutiny because misidentification of the predominant aggressor can expose victim-survivors to criminalisation.

This bill does not adequately resolve those concerns, and many stakeholders have gone further in their new submissions to say that these issues are now exacerbated by the amendments which remove safeguards that were previously in place for the issuing of a PPD, particularly when the aggrieved or respondent is a police officer. The Crime and Corruption Commission stated—

The CCC considers there are inherent corruption risks associated with discretionary powers which allow police to issue a PPD where a police officer is involved either as a respondent or aggrieved. The CCC has concerns the discretion introduced through this Bill enabling police to issue PPDs in circumstances where a police officer is an aggrieved or respondent may elevate risks associated with police responses to DFV, undermine trust and legitimacy in the QPS, and result in increased complaints to the CCC about police responses to DFV.

The Victims' Commissioner shared similar concerns, stating—

... I hold concerns about implications for victims' safety with respect to some of the amendments that remove restrictions on the issuing of PPD.

...

I am concerned that if victim-survivors do not have confidence in the integrity of the QPS response, they may not seek help from police, to the detriment of their own safety and that of their families.

This feedback was supported by evidence provided during the committee process which highlighted that up to 80 per cent of victim-survivors do not engage with police in their experiences currently. That represents up to 80 per cent of calls being under-reported.

At the same time, several stakeholders—including the Brisbane Domestic Violence Service, the Salvation Army and the Women's Legal Service—all shared statistics that demand for their services has increased up to 20 per cent year on year. Only today, services are speaking out in the media telling the government there is unprecedented pressure in the last six months and they need more resources. I want to take this moment to acknowledge the services that provide such important work in my own electorate—the Domestic Violence Action Centre, the Centre for Women & Co. and Beyond DV.

This should be a warning siren for this government from those on the front line of domestic and family violence. Instead, we saw the police minister trying to claim a political victory in the *Courier-Mail* over a supposed 'downward trend' in domestic and family violence offending. I was taught that when something does not add up it probably is not true. With this LNP's government history for fudging figures, I know whose data and whose lived experience I have more faith in, and Queenslanders know as well.

If the Crisafulli government was serious about supporting victims of domestic and family violence and ensuring public confidence in police oversight, they would not be sitting on their hands when it comes to the recommendation for the introduction of a police integrity unit. Both the Victims' Commissioner and the CCC made it clear how vital a PIU would be especially when considering the substantial expansion of powers in this bill. The Victims' Commissioner stated—

Further, independent oversight of these vastly expanded police powers and responsibilities will be vital to maintaining both community and victims-survivor support for these reforms.

The Crime and Corruption Commission stated—

The CCC notes the community concern about police responses ... maybe amplified when the establishment of a PIU to deal with complaints against police officers has been recommended but not yet implemented.

The establishment of a police integrity unit must come before frontline officers are provided with significant additional powers. It goes to the heart of building confidence with the system of removing real and perceived conflicts of interest from police oversight. It has been in the hands of the Attorney-General for over two years now, yet there is seemingly no progress. This needs to be resolved, and I urge the government to get on with the job.

Women's safety should never be negotiable. It should never be a political slogan, an election promise or an issue that receives attention only when there is public pressure. That is why the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations are so important. That taskforce undertook extensive consultation. They listened to victim-survivors, they heard from frontline workers and they examined the failures within our justice system. Their recommendations were clear: Queensland needed meaningful reform, better protection for victim-survivors, greater accountability for perpetrators and a justice system that properly understands the experiences of women.

Women cannot afford government inaction. Every delayed reform has consequences because behind every recommendation is a woman who may be experiencing violence, a child living in fear or a family desperately seeking help and protection. We know that escaping domestic and family violence is not easy. It takes enormous courage. Women often face financial insecurity, housing difficulties, concerns for their children and fear of what might happen if they leave. When women finally reach out for help, the system must be there for them. That means adequately funded frontline services, access to crisis accommodation, specialist domestic violence services, culturally appropriate services for women from multicultural communities, and a policing and justice system that treats victim-survivors with dignity and respect. Women's safety cannot wait, justice cannot wait, and the lives of children and women cannot be put on hold while the government delays action.

I say to the government that victim-survivors deserve more than a revolving door of legislative amendments and more powers that have not yet been adequately evaluated. They deserve a system that works, with safeguards that are robust, culturally responsive and properly tested, and they deserve a government that takes responsibility when its previous reforms have not delivered. This bill fails to deliver on those needs. That is why the Queensland Labor opposition is not supporting the bill.

Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (12.29 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I am pleased to commend this bill to the House. As the member for Thuringowa, I want to speak about what domestic and family violence means to my community. It happens in our neighbourhoods, behind the doors of homes in our suburbs and far too often in circumstances that those around the families may never see. It affects mothers, fathers, children, grandparents and extended families. Its consequences can be felt long after the violence itself has occurred.

Home should be the place where people feel safest. It should be where children grow up feeling secure and families can live without fear. Sadly, for too many Queenslanders, that is not their reality. Townsville has experienced a significant domestic and family violence challenge for many years. Behind every statistic is a real person—a parent trying to protect their children, a person frightened in their own home or a family struggling to find a way forward.

I will always stand in this parliament and fight for victims, so there is another issue I feel compelled to address. When we are talking about domestic and family violence we must be extremely careful about the message we send to our community. I am concerned by the Labor opposition's scare campaign around the availability of domestic and family violence support services. This is not just another political disagreement. The potential consequences of these messages can be very real for vulnerable people.

When someone experiencing domestic violence hears claims that support is unavailable or there is nowhere to turn, they may just believe it. They may decide not to make that phone call. They may decide not to approach a support service. They may believe that asking for help will lead nowhere. That is where these messages become extremely dangerous. We know that coming forward is already an incredibly difficult step for many victim-survivors. Fear, shame, financial dependence, concern for children and threats from perpetrators can all prevent people from seeking assistance. The last thing those people need is further uncertainty about whether help is available.

To use the fear and vulnerability of victim-survivors in political messaging is deeply irresponsible. It is a disgraceful exploitation of an issue that should be above political pointscoring. There is a very real risk that such messages discourage vulnerable people from coming forward and seeking the assistance they need, potentially placing them and their children at greater risk. We should be doing everything possible to encourage people to reach out, reassure them that support is available and make sure they know they are not alone.

There is a responsibility on every member of this parliament to consider the impact our words have beyond this chamber. Domestic and family violence is too serious an issue for fear and uncertainty to stand in the way of someone seeking help. Our message on this side of the House to victim-survivors must be clear: please reach out, please seek support and please know that you are not alone. These are members of our community and they deserve our attention and our support.

I want to acknowledge the hardworking men and women of the Queensland Police Service serving Thuringowa and the wider Townsville community. Our local officers, including those based at Kirwan Police Station, are on the front line of this issue every single day. They are attending incidents in our suburbs, responding to calls for help, protecting children, supporting victims and holding perpetrators accountable. Their work does not finish when they leave a property. There are investigations, protection arrangements, paperwork, court processes and ongoing responsibilities to ensure victims remain safe. I want those officers to know that their work is recognised and appreciated by us and by the community. They deserve the right tools, the right support and legislation that allows them to do their jobs as effectively as possible. That is one of the reasons I strongly support this bill.

One of the most important changes is making police protection directions—or PPDs—the primary response available to police when dealing with domestic and family violence. This is a practical reform that will make a real difference. It allows officers to put immediate protections in place for victims while reducing unnecessary administrative processes. It also expands the circumstances in which a direction can be issued, increases its duration from 12 months to three years and provides police with a broader range of conditions to protect victims. Think about what that means for someone who has finally found the courage to call the police. They are not looking for complicated processes or lengthy delays; they are looking for someone to help keep them safe. These reforms help deliver that.

During the committee process, Queensland Police Service Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon spoke about the need for more immediate processes to protect victims—something frontline police have been seeking since 2015. She explained that police protection directions provide an effective way to deliver immediate protection while reducing administrative processes that consume valuable frontline police resources. We need to listen to the people doing this work every day. They understand the pressures, they understand the risks and they know where improvements can be made. I stood with the Premier at Kirwan Police Station last year and really listened to those very officers. I thank them for their honesty and guidance on how we can make real change for those providing the protection and for those needing it.

I strongly support tougher consequences for people who repeatedly breach domestic violence protection orders. When the perpetrator repeatedly ignores that order they are disregarding the safety of another person and potentially placing an entire family at risk. This bill introduces a new offence for repeated contraventions of domestic violence orders and police protection directions. It also increases the maximum penalty for breaching a police protection direction to three years imprisonment or up to five years in circumstances of aggravation. We must send a clear message that violence, intimidation and controlling behaviour are unacceptable and that repeatedly disregarding protecting measures has serious consequences.

I welcome the changes that make court proceedings safer for victim-survivors. It takes enormous courage for someone experiencing domestic and family violence to come forward and seek help. The last thing they should face is further intimidation or trauma through the legal process. This bill strengthens protections around direct cross-examination and access to sensitive information during domestic violence proceedings. The justice system should provide a pathway to safety and accountability. It should never become another means by which a perpetrator can continue to exert control over their victim.

I also support the expansion of access to the electronic monitoring pilot across Queensland. This provides another important tool to manage the risks posed by high-risk perpetrators. We cannot address domestic and family violence through policing and legislation alone. We need accessible support services, crisis accommodation and counselling. We need schools, sporting clubs, community organisations and families to recognise warning signs and to know where to direct people for help. I

welcome the new North Queensland crisis hotline, the investment in embedded support workers in police stations and the expansion of the co-responder pilot. These initiatives recognise that our response must go beyond attending an incident. We need to connect people with the right support and help them find a pathway forward.

I want to acknowledge the community organisations and frontline workers across Townsville who do extraordinary work supporting victim-survivors. Their compassion, commitment and practical assistance make an enormous difference to people rebuilding their lives. We must also remember our children. Children who grow up witnessing violence can carry those experiences throughout their lives. We have a responsibility to break that cycle. We want the next generation of Thuringowa children to grow up in homes where they feel safe, respected and loved.

No single piece of legislation will eliminate domestic and family violence overnight but we can make our response stronger. We can give the police better tools, make protection more immediate, strengthen consequences for perpetrators and make the justice system safer for victims. As the member for Thuringowa, I want families in our suburbs to feel safe in their homes, I want our children to grow up without fear, I want our local police to have the resources and legislative support they need and I want every person experiencing domestic violence to know there is help available.

To the community organisations and support workers who stand beside victim-survivors: thank you for the compassion and care you provide. To anyone experiencing domestic and family violence: you deserve to feel safe, you deserve support and you deserve a future free from violence. This bill is an important step towards delivering that. For these reasons, I support the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (12.38 pm): I rise to give my contribution on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This is a bill that lumps together a small positive step to recognise patterns of escalation in domestic and family violence with a really significant expansion of a police-based response which contradicts the evidence and expert advice. I will specifically highlight the significant concerns that have been raised around police protection directions and the major expansions because this change is a step in the wrong direction. What we learned through the independent Commission of Inquiry into Queensland Police Service Responses to Domestic and Family Violence is that QPS is not properly equipped to respond to domestic and family violence. At best, QPS is a service geared at responding to violence, not preventing it. Importantly, it still lacks the appropriate and necessary independent civilian-led oversight that that inquiry also called for.

I will start with police protection directions, of PPDs. In effect, this bill significantly shifts us from court-based intervention, with some intervention by police in confined lower-risk circumstances, to a primarily police-based response in the first instance with the power to issue a PPD for up to three years. The submissions overall demonstrate significant opposition from the specialist service providers who know this space, who know how the system works and who see firsthand the consequences of QPS responses that are not trauma informed and victim focused and appropriate to the circumstances. Legal Aid Queensland said in as many words that this shift will 'neither protect victims of domestic and family violence nor safeguard procedural fairness for respondents'.

There are many changes in this bill. Some of the most significant are the removal of circumstances that currently prevent an officer from issuing a PPD. For example, in circumstances where the aggrieved or the respondent is a child or, alternatively, circumstances where the aggrieved or the respondent is a police officer. Particularly in the case of children, this is an indication that both parties may be in need of protection or there are issues around whether the person in need of protection can, in fact, be identified. The CCC, as so many other members have highlighted, made clear that this creates a very real corruption risk. This should have been a message that we took away from the commission of inquiry.

The QPS annual report itself, as I understand it, outlines that there were 70 direct allegations of domestic and family violence by a police officer. The CCC explains for us how this creates a very real risk of a conflict of interest and difficult power dynamics within the QPS and officers who might be attending a DFV callout. This is clearly one of those examples where the power to make a direction should be retained by the court.

The CCC submission points out the recommendation to establish an independent police integrity unit. That has not been implemented. I completely agreed with the second reading amendment that was proposed by the shadow attorney-general. I think we absolutely should not be proceeding with amendments like this without a properly constituted civilian-led independent police integrity unit. We

have to take with a grain of salt the comments from the opposition in this space. They missed the opportunity to implement that recommendation, to have an independent police integrity unit in place, before the change of government in 2024. As it stands, there is still no avenue to raise complaints about police conduct unless they reach an unreasonably high threshold. Importantly, there are huge numbers of complaints that cannot be dealt with independently—many thousands of complaints including over 5,000 misconduct allegations. Seventy per cent of those allegations I understand ended with no further action. There has not been reported in that annual report a single officer face a dismissal.

The results of the CCC's 2025 Corruption Perception Survey suggest that there continues to be a very high level of concern amongst the community about police responses to and police perpetrated domestic and family violence. This is just one reason of many—but a very important one—why we need that independent police oversight, as I have been saying, as I have been bringing to this House, year after year, since that commission of inquiry.

On the question of children being the subject of a PPD, I think there should be no question that children using violence should have a therapeutic response. Their circumstances are typically complex. This is not an appropriate circumstance for frontline services, such as the QPS, to make snap judgments. In that context police will also be able to issue a PPD even if there are family law or child protection orders in place. This creates a very serious risk of confusion which will almost inevitably lead to inadvertent or wilful breaches in some circumstances.

If we look to the submission from the Gold Coast Domestic Violence Prevention Centre, the feedback from those with lived experience of domestic and family violence is that the DFV service system is complex and hard to understand and even harder to navigate. The bill would allow for police to issue cross directions—that is, directions in respect of both people involved in an incident—if the police officer reasonably believes both parties are in need of protection and it is not possible to determine whether one person's need for protection is greater than the other. This is instead of the existing system where a referral to a specialised domestic and family violence court allows determination of whether cross directions are appropriate. The people involved in those circumstances are currently able to access duty lawyers and other interventions that reduce the risk of misidentification and properly consider whether cross directions are appropriate in all the circumstances. The question remains what is the rationale to bypass this process and leave it in the hands of QPS in the moment.

Police will be able to impose a broader range of conditions on PPDs and include exceptions to those conditions—that is, circumstances where they do not apply. The bill also removes the process for police reviews of PPDs, citing feedback that these were onerous. No real justification is provided. This is just another operational police efficiency argument. All of this falls on the shoulders of the QPS that, as the commission of inquiry told us, is not equipped to deal with them and, on top of that, the significant influx of new and relatively inexperienced QPS officers.

There are some limited safeguards, with requirements for police to file an application for protection orders with the court in certain complex circumstances, but otherwise any guidance about when to issue a PPD as opposed to when to make a court application will be moved into policy documents. It is all contingent on the police having the skills to correctly identify the person most in need of protection. We know that that will particularly affect, as other members have stated, those who are culturally and linguistically diverse.

Legal Aid Queensland make the point that this bill represents a huge transfer of power from the courts to police to dictate responses to domestic and family violence. The LNP is again taking significant steps to erode the power of the judiciary. This has all the same authoritarian vibes that we get from countless other pieces of legislation that this government has introduced. The Gold Coast Domestic Violence Prevention Centre said—

> In the proposed legislation, there is a real risk that police will become investigator and adjudicator and curtail the liberty of citizens for up to three years without court oversight.

That is authoritarian. There is less opportunity for intervention, as the Salvation Army put in its submission. I am out of time so I will not quote it.

Requiring attendance at court gives an opportunity for proper explanation and to link in with services, especially those that are directed at behavioural change for people using violence. That is the work of prevention. The other interventions that this bill is proposing are not. The government continues to fund more police instead of prevention. It is a blunt instrument. This is all before the fundamental fact is considered: that police are responsive after the fact of the violence. The funding should be diverted to evidence-based behaviour change intervention programs and services and ensuring that victim-survivors have what they need to overcome the impacts of violence. This is legislation that

ignores the advice from the services, it transfers an extraordinary amount of power to the Queensland police and it does all of this in a context where we do not have the independent oversight of QPS that we desperately need.

Mrs POOLE (Mundingburra—LNP) (12.48 pm): I rise to speak in strong support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. From the outset, I thank the ministers, the committee chair and the committee members for the work that they have done on this bill. I remind the community that everything that we on this side of the House do is about strengthening the legislation and making our communities safer. As the member for Mundingburra, the Assistant Minister for Community Safety and a former Queensland police officer with 28 years experience, this issue is particularly close to my heart. Domestic and family violence is an absolute scourge in our society. It is the No. 1 call for service for police officers throughout Queensland. Sadly, the Townsville policing district is no different.

I have spoken in this House before of the experiences that I have had working in this area. I have seen the fear in the eyes of victims. I have seen children caught in the middle of a violent and frightening situation in the early hours of the morning who go on to believe that that behaviour is normal in a relationship. Sadly, all too often they go into domestic and family violence relationships themselves because they believe that such a relationship is normal. I have also seen firsthand the frustrations of our police who desperately want to protect someone but are constrained by the legislation and the processes that they are given at the time. That is why I am proud to stand on this side of the chamber and give our police the extra tools, resources and powers they need to protect our communities, especially in domestic and family violence situations.

When someone reaches out for help, they should not have to wait for protection. Police officers have to make split-second decisions to help protect our communities and these extra powers will help them to do that. This is also about the victims. It can take a victim-survivor, on average, seven attempts to leave an abusive relationship. That takes incredible courage and strength. Often victim-survivors reach out to family, trusted friends, helplines, doctors and the service people who work in this area multiple times before they feel safe or they feel ready to take action. Why does reaching out and leaving take multiple attempts? It is because often it is the most dangerous time for a victim-survivor. That is why this bill is so important.

The Crisafulli government is committed to making our communities safer so that people are safer where they work, safer where they play and safer where they live. Everything that we as a government do is about strengthening the laws and supporting our police. This bill introduces police protection directions, PPDs, as the primary response to domestic and family violence. It ensures our police can respond to victims sooner and reduce the accompanying administrative burden. It ensures vulnerable victims can receive immediate on-the-spot protection and when someone repeatedly ignores a protection order it provides consequences.

I take a moment to address the claims of those opposite that the danger of misidentification is one of the reasons not to implement instant protections for victims. This is despite evidence from the Victims' Commissioner and the CEO of the Women's Legal Service that the reforms the QPS have put in place to address that are working well. In fact, when asked whether the Women's Legal Service Queensland had any significant experience with misidentification with PPDs, the CEO, Nadia Bromley, replied—

> We do not have experience of significant misidentification in relation to police protection directions, no.

That says it all.

The bill introduces new offences for the repeated contravention of DVOs and PPDs, and increases the maximum penalty for the contravention of a PPD to reflect the serious nature of this type of offending. That is what this bill is about: it puts the rights of victims first, it holds perpetrators to account and it gives our hardworking police officers the tools they need to do their job to keep our communities safe.

One of the most significant reforms in this bill makes police protection directions the primary police response to domestic and family violence. That means that police can provide immediate on-the-spot protection to victim-survivors without unnecessary delays and administrative processes. It also extends the duration of these directions from 12 months to three years and expands the conditions that police can impose. As a former police officer, I cannot overstate the importance of these reforms. When police attend a domestic violence incident, often they are walking into an extremely volatile situation. They must assess the risk, identify the person most in need of protection, ensure any children

are safe and take appropriate action. All of that takes time. These reforms mean less time tide up in unnecessary paperwork and more time for our police to protect Queenslanders.

I want to echo the words of now Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon who told the parliamentary committee that police have been calling for more immediate ways to protect victims from as far back as 2015. I had the pleasure of working alongside now Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon as a work colleague in the former juvenile aid bureau when she was first transferred to Townsville, having been promoted to sergeant. I had the pleasure of working alongside her and watching as she was promoted through the ranks of the Queensland Police Service to her current position of deputy commissioner. Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon has responded to some horrific and traumatic calls for service to protect the Queensland community. I have never met a more professional, more responsible, more ethical or hardworking police officer so when she makes these statements we need to heed the warnings. That is what we have done as a government. She has also specifically referred to discussions in Townsville and Mount Isa from more than a decade ago. I know from experience just how important these calls for reform are.

I also note that the Queensland Police Union have strongly supported these changes and recognise that streamlined police protection directions will deliver immediate and long-lasting protection. If I have to sum up this legislation in a nutshell, that is it: it is delivering immediate and long-lasting protections and it is about putting the rights of victims before the rights of offenders. If we can do that by strengthening legislation so that not only are we putting the rights of victims first and supporting them but we are also supporting our police with more boots on the ground and the powers, tools and resources they need to do their job as well as taking away the frustrations of not being able to protect the most vulnerable in our communities then, as a government, we have a responsibility to do that. That is why this bill, which strengthens the legislation, is so important.

In the time that I have left, I want to thank all of the people who work in these areas, not just our police but also every person and organisation that works in this very challenging area. It is also a very rewarding area when victim-survivors and their families get the support they need because they have a government that provides that support. That is so very important. We are really proud to be a government that supports that.

Again, I acknowledge the impact that domestic and family violence has in our communities, on our families and on none more so than children. During my years of working in the child protection area, I saw the lasting effects that exposure to violence can have on young children. That is why it is so very important that, as a government, we do everything in our power to strengthen the legislation and give our police the support they need to keep our communities safe. Finally, I thank all of our hardworking police for everything that they do day in, day out. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Poole, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 pm to 2.00 pm.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): This week we have learned of seven Queensland families who have lost loved ones while waiting for an ambulance under the LNP's watch. When the health minister was asked whether he would meet with the families, with the loved ones of those who died, what did he say? He said he would 'consider the value of it'. How heartless from this health minister—a heartless health minister weighing the value of 30 minutes of his time against the lives of Queenslanders. These were lives lost. We say to the health minister, 'We know your time is valuable, but so are those lives.' We call on the health minister to value them. Seven Queenslanders who lived, loved and were loved, who worked and built families and served our community—at least one of them served our country in the Defence Force—should be valued. They should be worth 30 minutes of his time.

We all know that time is valuable, like the time our ambos are wasting while stuck at the ramp. That time should be valued. The time Queenslanders have spent waiting for an ambulance that is stuck at the ramp should be valued. The time a family stuck in the distressing situation for a thousand minutes—18 hours waiting for an ambulance for their husband and father—should be valued. Time spent at the ramp is valuable, too. In fact, time spent at the ramp is time stolen from our ambos that could be spent out there saving lives in the community. But this heartless health minister thinks his time

is more valuable. The time patients have spent being treated in TV rooms and dining rooms—in one case dying overnight only to be found by a cleaner in the morning; the time a patient at the Prince Charles Hospital spent before taking their own life in a toilet—three hours—this heartless health minister should value that time. He should not weigh his time against the value of a life, and, if he does, it shows how heartless he truly is.

Labor Party, Performance

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (2.03 pm): I think about the lives that we value, the children of this state who are now protected because we have a reportable conduct scheme. I think of the lives of the mums who live in regional Queensland, those women who can now give birth in Biloela, in Cooktown and other areas. I value the lives of those women who have been raped or sexual assaulted whose rape kits—601 of them—were left on the shelf under those opposite. Those are the lives we value. We value the lives of those Queenslanders whose homes were being broken into, whose cars were stolen or who were waiting for ambulances under those opposite. I think of those Queenslanders in rural and regional Queensland who could not get mental health beds. I think of those Queenslanders who could not—

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: They laugh about mental health in rural and regional Queensland. As a founding member of the South Burnett Suicide Prevention Group, I say shame on each and every one of you. Shame on you!

For 10 years, Queenslanders sat by and watched what those opposite—the failed former health ministers; the three of them who are sitting there, one of whom calls himself the leader—did about the health system. What did they do? They broke it! They brought in BPIC which meant an extra 20 per cent in building costs, agreeing to $25 billion less for Queenslanders in the health system. I think about all of the health workers who, under those opposite, were going to be sacked. I think about the 10,000 new health workers that we have, thanks to the Crisafulli government.

Seriously! This leader, in his dying days, comes in here to try to say to the back bench, 'Look at me. Nothing to see here.' We have heard about all the secret phone calls and the secret leadership call. Which one was it? We assume it was the member for Gaven. Who was leaking?

For 10 years, the now Leader of the Opposition, who spent much of his time as Premier and health minister, dares question the extra funding, the extra hospitals and the lack of beds because of those opposite. There was no new planning for any extra beds. I think about the Toowoomba Hospital that we in regional Queensland are going to get because of the Crisafulli government. I think about all the extra beds at Coomera because we no longer have BPIC. That is what good governments do—governments that deliver for the people of Queensland.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.06 pm): Queensland's health system is in crisis. Queenslanders have died waiting for an ambulance that never arrived. Families and friends have lost loved ones. I do not know what has been worse this week—the lack of straight answers from Queensland's heartless health minister or the complete lack of empathy and sympathy shown by him in the parliament this week. Queenslanders have every right to demand answers from Premier Crisafulli and health minister Nicholls.

When questions were put to the health minister, he refused to be straight with the people of Queensland. The minister ducked, he dodged, he dived and then the health minister did what he does best—he pointed the finger at everyone but himself. The health minister, when asked whether he would meet with families, said he would 'consider the value'—the value of meeting with families who have lost a loved one in tragic circumstances. There is a crisis in the health system in Queensland and the health minister is struggling to 'find the value.'

Does the member for Pumicestone see the value in meeting with families seeking answers? How does that member return to her community and explain to families that if they should request a meeting with the health minister, he would 'consider the value' in meeting with them? With constituents dying in Thornlands and Victoria Point, will the member for Redlands—the assistant minister to the Deputy Premier, no less—act and call on her own LNP health minister to meet with the families? What about the members for Townsville, Mundingburra and Thuringowa? When those members return to Townsville, will they call on the health minister to see the value? Maybe they can ask Special Commissioner for Regional and Rural Queensland, Andrew Cripps—maybe he might do better.

Our state's health system is failing, and this Premier and this heartless health minister refuse to take responsibility. Let me remind the House what the Premier said when he announced his government would 'deliver a contemporary Queensland Health workforce plan'. The Premier said, 'It is about patient care, and I will always put patients first.' That is what he said. Did he put patients first when he reduced growth funding for hospitals? Did he put patients first when he delayed the expansion of the Townsville University Hospital, when he delayed the construction of the Redcliffe Hospital? What will the member for Redcliffe tell her constituents about putting patients first?

What about the Bundaberg Hospital? Was the Premier putting patients who had been left in the staff TV room first when he delayed the new Bundaberg Hospital? Right now, Queenslanders are dying waiting for answers and waiting for ambulances to arrive. The Premier and his health minister must put Queensland patients first and answer those questions today.

Thuringowa Electorate, Class of 2026

Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (2.09 pm): Just in case this is my last chance to speak in this chamber for the year, I rise today with a full heart to speak about something that fills me with genuine pride and joy: the graduation of our year 12 students across Thuringowa. I am certain this is a feeling I share with all members in this House. These proud, beautiful humans are finally finishing school. They are the sons and daughters of our community. They have grown up in our neighbourhoods, played in our parks and volunteered at our local events, and they now stand at the threshold of the next chapter of their lives.

Across Thuringowa State High School, Kirwan State High School, Heatley Secondary College and Ryan Catholic College, this week has been filled with tears, laughter, proud parents and well-earned celebrations. I have been privileged to meet so many of these year 12 leaders over the past year. What has struck me most is not simply their titles but the way they have quietly stepped up for their peers, strengthened school culture and left their schools better places than they found them. Mr Deputy Speaker, if you spent even a short time with these young people, you would leave feeling hopeful. They are thoughtful, kind and deeply connected to the community that raised them. They are the very best of Thuringowa.

I have been fortunate to attend some of their graduation ceremonies and awards nights. There is something deeply moving about watching a young person walk across the stage, certificate in hand, knowing that the years of effort, friendship and quiet determination brought them there. Of course, they have had their formals—the long-awaited night of celebration with friends who have become like family.

I pay special tribute to our teachers and school staff. For 13 years they have guided, challenged and believed in these students. The impact of a great teacher is never forgotten, and our community is richer for their dedication. To the parents, guardians, carers and families, this milestone is yours to share as well. You have driven them places early in the morning, listened to them on the hard days and cheered their quiet victories. Parenting is rarely easy, and this achievement belongs to every household that has walked this journey.

To our graduating class of 2026, my message is simple and from the heart: be brave, surround yourself with good people, find mentors who lift you higher, stay curious, keep learning and, above all, be happy. Your school years are only the beginning. The world will bring challenges you cannot yet see, but it will also bring opportunities that will surprise and stretch you.

In my role as Assistant Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, I am more determined than ever to make sure the pathways for young people in our community are clear, practical and full of possibility. After meeting so many of these inspirational students, I am filled with optimism not only for Thuringowa but also for Queensland. To every member of the class of 2026: congratulations! Our community is proud of you. We all believe in you. We cannot wait to see the difference you will make to our community.

Health System

Mr MARTIN (Stretton—ALP) (2.12 pm): This week we have heard deeply disturbing accounts of Queenslanders dying whilst waiting for ambulances, but the pressure is not just in our major hospitals. I rise to raise serious concerns about 13 HEALTH and what it shows about the state of Queensland's health system under the Crisafulli LNP government.

A constituent from my electorate contacted me after his husband became seriously unwell with gastro symptoms, including repeated vomiting. They called 13 HEALTH—a service designed to give

Queenslanders timely advice from a qualified nurse. On Friday, 23 October they called 13 HEALTH and waited 30 minutes. Later that weekend, just after midnight on Sunday, 25 October, they called and waited for 45 minutes. That was 45 minutes of sitting at home late at night with a sick family member unsure of whether to head to emergency. They had used this service previously and connected in about two minutes. What has happened to this service?

Another constituent attended the Eight Mile Plains Satellite Health Centre on 20 October and was told that they could face a four-hour wait. That centre is supposed to take pressure off our emergency departments. When people cannot get timely advice or care, some give up and go straight to already overcrowded EDs and others stay home when they actually need urgent attention. Either way, the system takes another hit.

With everything we have heard in question time this week about Queenslanders dying, we might have expected some compassion from the health minister. Instead, when asked whether he would personally meet the grieving families, he said he would 'consider requests and take them on board'. Wow! That is not exactly compassionate. It is a little bit heartless, if you ask me. He did not just say 'yes'. He did not say 'of course'. He just used cold, bureaucratic language.

These families deserve more than condolences and bureaucratic mumbo jumbo. They deserve a minister who is prepared to look them in the eye and take responsibility. Queenslanders would be forgiven for wondering what meetings the health minister would take without consideration. If the Premier asked to meet him, would he respond with, 'I'll consider your request, Premier, and take it on board'? I don't think so. He would have to meet the Premier. If he has to meet the Premier, then why not grieving families? It is not just that the LNP health minister is heartless; it is that the LNP's priorities are wrong.

Queenslanders do not need another billboard telling them how good the government is. They need ambulances that arrive. They do not need a movie ad promoting the government. They need a nurse who answers the phone. They do not need more blue branded junk mail. They need a hospital bed and the nurses, doctors and health and hospital services that Queenslanders deserve.

Hinchinbrook Electorate, Infrastructure

Mr CHIESA (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (2.15 pm): Regional Queenslanders do not ask for special treatment. They just want their fair share of safer roads, reliable infrastructure and essential services close to home. They expect the government to deliver, not make false promises. Over the past few weeks we have seen what delivery looks like in Hinchinbrook.

On the Bruce Highway, construction is underway between Gairloch and Ripple Creek, north of Ingham. The road will be widened and drainage improved. Having grown up in this area, I know firsthand how this stretch of road has disrupted communities during wet seasons for decades.

Last Friday another safety upgrade was announced south of Cardwell. On this 3.8-kilometre stretch of highway, there have been 21 crashes, including seven fatalities, sadly, recorded between 2019 and 2025. This project is being delivered under the 80-20 funding agreement secured by the Crisafulli LNP government. These works are about getting people home safely.

The announcement that means so much to me, Cardwell and the wider region is Port Hinchinbrook. Last Friday I joined the Premier to announce that dredging was underway. After more than a decade of deterioration and uncertainty, there is finally a pathway forward. The government has committed $64 million over two years. The contractor has been appointed and will remove half a million cubic metres of debris and spoil. Contrast that to the half a billion dollar extra cost that was imposed on the Cross River Rail. This will restore all-tide marina access. This was a by-election commitment, and now it is being delivered. It will help unlock tourism, investment and jobs well beyond Cardwell.

We are also improving access to services. Last week I joined Minister Steve Minnikin in Lucinda to launch the Service Queensland Mobile Service Centre. Service Queensland offers more than 200 government services. The mobile centre will bring those services closer to home in places like Lucinda, Mission Beach, Mourilyan and Rollingstone from 30 November, helping people in these regions access face-to-face services. Minister, how many more mobile services could you have provided with half a billion dollars?

Last Thursday I was pleased to join the Premier to launch Ingham's new CT scanner. In just five weeks it has performed 147 scans, with over 2,000 scans expected to be done annually. Minister, how many more CT scanners could you put in regional Queensland with half a billion dollars? That means

fewer unnecessary trips to Townsville or Cairns for people who are at their most vulnerable. It is better health care closer to home.

There is a lesson here. Last week's CFMEU inquiry interim report estimated that Labor's Best Practice Industry Conditions policy added more than $670 million to just three projects. Its current estimate is a 20 per cent impact on construction costs. Imagine how much more regional infrastructure we could have had. Instead of backing safer regional roads that prevent deaths, they backed their CFMEU mates. Instead of backing more CT scanners in regional Queensland, they backed their CFMEU mates. Instead of backing infrastructure that supports our kids and jobs, they backed their CFMEU mates. Instead of backing regional Queensland, those opposite backed their CFMEU mates.

Health System

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.18 pm): I rise to speak on behalf of my constituents Amanda and Iain. They have worked hard all of their lives and paid their taxes. They believe in the public health system and thought that it would be there for them when they needed it. As Iain said, 'If you don't speak up, nothing gets done.' Amanda and Iain, I will help you to speak up. Let me describe what has happened. Amanda has MS. She needs a hoist to get in and out of bed and chairs. Iain has health issues, including multiple myeloma. They are both in their 60s.

Their GP advised them that Amanda needed to go to hospital for treatment for a UTI because this could not be managed at home. There is no way Iain could transport his wife to hospital, as much as he wanted to, so he called for an ambulance at 7.30 pm. Iain called three more times to check on progress. Iain explained patiently that the last time this had happened Amanda deteriorated very quickly and ended up in ICU for two weeks. She was lucky to survive that. At 6.30 am the next morning Iain cancelled the ambulance because carers had arrived and he thought they might be able to get Amanda to the hospital. That is an 11-hour wait. Amanda could easily have died. When the ambulance finally did arrive they did not have a stretcher or appropriate equipment to transport Amanda. She was eventually referred to the Hospital in the Home and she was given IV antibiotics.

This is appalling. We could have had another death of a person waiting for an ambulance. I know how hard health professionals like paramedics, nurses and doctors work. I know how hard they take it when someone dies from something that could have been prevented if there were only more resources, more time or a better system.

As the deputy chair of the health committee, I am publically calling for the committee to self-initiate an inquiry that investigates the flow-on effect of health and hospital service growth funding reductions on: hospital ramping, emergency department flow and triaging in Queensland hospitals; Queensland Ambulance Service response times; and patient outcomes and care in Queensland emergency departments. Look at the publicly available minutes of the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee. We have no inquiries, we have no bills to review, and our oversight is very light. We have not touched anything to do with an actual bill in five sitting weeks. We have time and we have the resources for this inquiry.

Queenslanders are rightly looking for answers and they are not getting them from the heartless health minister. They are certainly not getting them from the heartless and distracted Premier and Deputy Premier, who spend their whole time playing political games. They have lost sight of how to fix a real problem for a real Queenslander. The real crisis in Queensland Health is the crisis of leadership. The Deputy Premier, the Premier and the health minister are all responsible for this. No amount of finger-pointing will change this. Queenslanders deserve answers.

Member for Gladstone; Mundubbera Regional Forum

Mr HEAD (Callide—LNP) (2.21 pm): It is nice to know that members of the Labor Party care about the healthcare system in Queensland because, frankly, they did not seem to care about it during their decade of decline when they were in the grips of chaos and crisis. I have spoken at length about the failures we inherited from those opposite in the Queensland Health system. I would like to remind them of those failures once again.

I would also like to talk about Butcher's big bill on Gladstone ratepayers. The member for Gladstone has been running around telling the people of Gladstone that the increases to their water bills has 'nothing to do with me; nothing to see here' and that it has nothing to do with the project he started as the former minister for water. He is trying to suggest that it is all the fault of the LNP. He is misleading his community completely. Of course he is welcome to come in here, there was even a motion yesterday—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. On a number of occasions today Speakers have had to remind members to use proper titles. I note the member for Callide used an improper title during his contribution just now, so if you could address that, please.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Thank you, Manager of Opposition Business, I did not quite pick up on that. Member for Callide, I remind you to please address people by their correct titles.

Mr HEAD: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Gladstone continues to tell his community that it has nothing to do with him. He needs to own up and start copping it on the chin, because we know the facts of the matter. It was his project. He never put up the money and locked in any budgeting to ensure the community of Gladstone was not going to see those water bill increases. It is time for the member for Gladstone to come clean to his community and front up and own up to his own mistakes. We know that those on that side of the chamber cannot own up to their own mistakes. I am calling on the member for Gladstone to own up to his mistake and say sorry to his community. We worked hard to find $10 million to support ratepayers in the Gladstone community because the LNP understands the consequences of Labor's failures in that region and we continue to support them. I will certainly continue working with the current water minister to fix the former water minister's failures. He is also Gladstone's local member.

I also place on the record my thanks to the Minister for Resources for hosting a fantastic Mundubbera regional forum recently in the North Burnett. There were stakeholders from all across the electorate, including farmers and various business owners. Importantly, our student leaders had the opportunity to present a panel to the room. There were many senior department heads in the room as well. It was great to hear from those kids in our schools about what is important to them in the region. It was a great opportunity. We know that the North Burnett is a fantastic agricultural community and it deserves opportunities like every other part of the state. It was great to work with the North Burnett Regional Council to advocate to host that regional forum. It was certainly great to see a regional forum in Mundubbera in the electorate of Callide.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Mrs NIGHTINGALE (Inala—ALP) (2.25 pm): I rise to address a comment the health minister made in this chamber on 27 August. During his reply on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill he described Labor's thinking as something that 'would confound the best brains anywhere on the planet, certainly in the psychiatric wards of our most major hospitals'.

The health minister used psychiatric wards as a political put-down. I interjected at the time because I found it unacceptable. I still do. It was shameful. As a former mental health nurse, I have worked with people experiencing severe mental illness. I have supported young people in distress and spoken with families who were frightened about what might happen to someone they love. For some, walking through the door to seek treatment takes enormous courage. They worry about being judged and about what people will say, and they worry about a diagnosis that will change how others see them. We have spent years trying to break down that stigma and then the minister responsible for their care stands in parliament and uses a psychiatric ward to get a laugh at the opposition's expense.

The minister can criticise Labor; he does it often enough. He can challenge our arguments and defend his legislation. He should be able to manage that without dragging people receiving psychiatric care into his insults. He should know better. Those wards are workplaces for dedicated nurses, doctors and allied health professionals. They are places where Queenslanders receive treatment, recover and begin putting their lives back together. The people there deserve respect from the person responsible for the system caring for them. Of all the debates to mock psychiatric care in, it was a bill changing the Mental Health Act—powers that decide when a person can be detained for psychiatric examination, decisions about some of the most serious things the state can do to a person's liberty—yet this was how the minister chose to contribute to this debate: to insult the very people under his care in his attempt to insult the opposition.

What message does that send? It tells every Queenslander who has ever worked up the courage to ask for help that their minister thinks their suffering is a laugh line. That is the record of this heartless health minister, who now treats psychiatric wards as a punchline. We have seen more of this lack of compassion on display this week in the chamber. Sadly, this comes as no surprise to me because this is the same minister who sat at the heart of the Newman government as its treasurer as it closed down the Barrett Adolescent Centre, resulting in the tragic deaths of three young people. I had hoped he would have learned from that tragedy. Instead, I have seen arrogance grow in its place. He has had the

chance to reflect and apologise; he has done neither. I call on the minister to withdraw those remarks and apologise to Queenslanders living with mental illness. They deserve better.

Resources Industries

Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (2.28 pm): I rise to speak on a matter that will impact thousands of Queensland jobs and the future gas supply for not only this state but also the nation. I have been vocal in my concerns that Canberra's proposed domestic gas reservation scheme will undermine future gas supplies, Queensland jobs and investment. That is a concern shared by many Queenslanders. Let me be clear: Queensland households and manufacturers need reliable gas at a competitive price, but Canberra's current scheme to carve up existing production and artificially oversupply the market undermines that intent. Here in Queensland we know that the only real solution is more supply. It really is simple economics, something Canberra does not seem to grasp. You cannot regulate your way to more gas, but the right policy settings can encourage new investment, open more land for exploration and unlock new production. That is what we are doing right here in Queensland.

Recent modelling from Wood Mackenzie shows Canberra's proposed scheme will push the domestic price of gas below what it costs companies to produce, making projects uneconomic and forcing domestic focused producers out of the market. The forced sale component will encourage buyers to wait, making it harder for producers to secure long-term commitments. These conditions will make projects uneconomic, halt future investment and jeopardise the future of Queensland's gas industry and the thousands of workers who rely on it. Canberra's own impact analysis identifies risks to domestic production, investment and LNG exports.

Queensland deserves a serious answer from Canberra on how it intends to address those risks, yet Canberra has failed to consult meaningfully. This is another example of the federal Labor government introducing policies with disastrous unintended consequences. Queensland already has its own domestic reservation scheme. The Crisafulli government has a coordinated land release program that opens up Queensland's highly prospective Taroom Trough, Surat-Bowen and Cooper-Eromanga basins. We continue to release acreage with the Australian market supply conditions that guarantees 100 per cent of production is supplied into the domestic market. We have policies that guarantee a pipeline of future supply.

The federal Labor government have given a carve out to their mates in Western Australia. We are calling on them to recognise the work that Queensland does securing and supplying the east coast gas market. Importantly, the question must be asked: where does the Queensland opposition leader stand—with Queenslanders, or with his federal Labor government colleagues? Does the opposition leader and the shadow resources minister, the member for Logan, support a scheme that pushes out Queensland producers? Does the opposition leader stand with the thousands of Queenslanders who work in the industry and the communities that exist off the back of the gas sector? Queenslanders deserve to hear his answer in this House. We call on the federal government to release the modelling it has used to develop this flawed scheme.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.31 pm): The heartless health minister had two chances to answer questions yesterday on behalf of the people of Bundaberg, on behalf of the staff of the Bundaberg Hospital and on behalf of the patients of the Bundaberg Hospital. We did not get a straight answer from the heartless health minister. The heartless health minister said that he had been briefed on the matter of a gentleman passing away overnight in a TV room. I very much doubt the minister was actually briefed because, if he had been, he would have been able to give a response yesterday similar to what Wide Bay health has said today.

That gentleman was not removed from the ward and put into the TV room; instead, he was waiting in the TV room to be admitted to a ward. He had to wait in a TV room overnight, only to be found unresponsive by clinicians the next morning. It is not acceptable that that occurs in our hospitals, and it is not acceptable that, when asked a direct question as to the validity of the allegations that had been put to the opposition, the health minister could not state what had occurred, despite saying he is briefed on significant matters. Well, maybe a Bundaberg local dying in the TV room of a hospital, while waiting to be admitted to a ward, is not significant enough for the health minister. It is heartless from this health minister if that is indeed his approach to these matters.

What about the heartless nature of this minister who refused to even look at the image that the member for Miller tabled yesterday? Instead, the heartless health minister said that it was a well-known public image that was posted on a patient's Facebook page. Wrong. It was an image of the patient replacing the original patient. That is right; the patient who put the original post on Facebook in the early hours of the morning was subsequently moved back into a ward—after he made his public complaint known—only to be replaced by a second patient. The minister did not have the gumption or the respect to look at the image that was tabled yesterday of a patient suffering in a dining room. That is what that image was: another patient.

I note that the minister said I was seen 'scuttling around'. No, I went in and visited patients last week at their request. I went into the PARAS unit, which is somewhere this heartless health minister should go. If the heartless health minister visited the nurses and all of the staff, he would know what they told me: that patients are regularly being put in the dining room of the PARAS unit. That is not good enough. For the minister's benefit, I table these two images. This one is the second patient, heartless health minister.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member, I ask you to just table it. Do not use a prop, please.

Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting a dining area at Bundaberg Hospital.

Logan Shooting, Update

Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.34 pm): I rise to update the House on a serious matter of public interest. I can confirm that, after an extensive and complex investigation into a crime that shocked Queensland, five teenagers are in custody over a deadly drive-by shooting at Fitzys Loganholme last month. Four people—a teenage girl and three men who were standing outside a boxing event—were shot. Tragically, Vana-Reese Schuster-Togiatau suffered serious gunshot wounds to her head and neck. The 19-year-old died days later. I wish to put on the record my heartfelt condolences to her family and friends. My thoughts are also with the three men who were injured. I have no doubt I speak on behalf of every member in this place in passing on those condolences.

Nothing will bring this young woman back, but this action by police is a step towards justice. This morning Queensland police executed a number of search warrants around the Logan district and arrested five juveniles. Detectives have just provided an update to the media about the investigation, and it would be inappropriate for me as police minister to go into any further operational details. However, I would like to acknowledge the work of police on behalf of Queensland. Teams of police—the Logan District Criminal Investigation Branch, the Homicide Investigation Unit, the organised crime group and other members of the state Crime Command—have been working around the clock to get to this point. On behalf of the Crisafulli government and all of Queensland, I would like to thank them for their hard work. From experience, I know there is still a long way to go but this is another example that shows our police will stop at nothing to serve and protect, to make Queensland safer and to seek justice for victims and their loved ones. The Crisafulli government values our police and the work that they do.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (2.36 pm): I find it ironic that, when the health minister and Crisafulli government cherrypick ramping data which shows an improvement, they want to take all the credit; however, when ramping like we have seen this month is out of control, it is always someone else's fault. They always blame someone else when ramping does not meet the cherrypicking that they want.

Ambulance ramping remains high, despite the health minister's best efforts to spin the data. We hear nothing from the members for Cairns, Gladstone, Rockhampton and Mackay—even though they are supposed to represent those regions—but ramping in those areas is getting worse. For example, at the Cairns Hospital it was 26 per cent in October 2024, before the election, but it went to 48.6 per cent in September 2026. Prior to the 2024 election, David Crisafulli promised that patients would be put first. His government's decisions—to delay hospital builds while trying to score cheap political points, to delay a hospital workforce management plan, to not provide growth funding for HHSs and to remove the Workforce Attraction Incentive Scheme—have resulted in the health system being severely impacted with people crying out for help.

Seven people have died waiting for an ambulance in the past three weeks. This resulted in a crisis meeting last night between the Premier, the health minister, the DG of health and the QAS commissioner. The health minister reaches out to them, but he will not reach out to the families who are the victims of these tragic events. The excuse from this heartless health minister is that he has not received a request for a meeting from the family. What about doing his job and reaching out and doing the right thing?

Meanwhile, the loved ones have been left dealing with the bureaucracy and they are demanding answers. They want to know why it took hours for someone to arrive and look after their loved ones. They want to know why someone who committed suicide in the Prince Charles Hospital was found dead by cleaners hours after it occurred. They want to know why cleaners found someone dead in the TV room of the Bundaberg Hospital. They want to know why ambulances did not arrive at Victoria Point, Bethania, Caboolture and inner-city Brisbane. Families deserve those answers direct from the minister. The minister needs to explain to them what is going on in health and what is happening with our health services. Why is he blaming everyone else? After two years in government, things are getting worse and everyone knows it except the minister.

Mirani Electorate

Mr G KELLY (Mirani—LNP) (2.39 pm): Today I want to highlight two important matters for communities across my electorate of Mirani. The first is the growing spread of unmanaged leucaena across Central Queensland. This week I tabled the second part of a petition with 338 signatures calling for greater action to address this growing problem. Together with the earlier online petition, more than 1,500 Queenslanders have now signed in support of stronger action on management of leucaena. I want to acknowledge Helen Tame from Hay Point who has been raising concerns about the spread of leucaena and its impact on our environment. Leucaena has an important role in our agricultural industry when properly managed, but when it spreads into waterways, roadsides and natural bushland it becomes a serious problem. Landholders are concerned about how quickly it is spreading and the long-term impact on our environment and productive agricultural land. This petition calls for a more coordinated approach and I look forward to the minister's response.

Another important issue for regional communities is our water security, and I am pleased to say that there is fantastic news for Mount Morgan. After years of drought, water restrictions and relying on water being trucked in to Mount Morgan, Mount Morgan finally has a secure water supply. The completion of the $88.2 million Mount Morgan water supply pipeline is a huge milestone for the proud community, with the three levels of government working together. This is about much more than water coming out of the tap; it is about giving Mount Morgan the confidence to grow. With reliable water now flowing, one of the biggest barriers to future growth has been removed. I acknowledge everyone involved in delivering this project, particularly the people of Mount Morgan who have waited a long time for this day.

Fresh water brings fresh opportunities. While we are focused on delivering for regional Queensland, those opposite are focused on themselves. Reports of growing unrest within Labor's ranks paint a picture of a party divided and directionless and questioning its own leadership. One Labor source described the situation as simply moving the deckchairs on the *Titanic*. Forget about the deckchairs on the *Titanic*: when the *Titanic* went down, she went quick. We all know that history. While the member for Murrumba struggles to keep his own team together, the Crisafulli government is getting on with delivering for Queenslanders.

Thriving Kids

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (2.41 pm): Six weeks has gone by since states and territories across the country have begun the rollout of Thriving Kids as part of the NDIS reforms, but not in Queensland. Queensland remains the only state or territory yet to sign on to Thriving Kids even though the Premier himself signed the bilateral agreement underpinning the reform at the beginning of this year. The Commonwealth did the work to prepare for the rollout and other states and territories did the work to prepare for the rollout, but not Queensland. The former disability services minister failed to give Queensland families confidence and certainty about what Thriving Kids will look like in our state. There has been no planning or analysis of need made public and no indication that Queensland families can have any confidence in the government's readiness for the future. The reality is that every day a commitment is not made is another day a Queensland child living with disability and their family are left without the certainty needed for their future care and support.

Service providers have told me that they are ready to deliver the services needed for Thriving Kids. The children and families impacted by this lack of action say that they are worried about what the future holds. Providers and families tell me that, without clarity and certainty, they will likely have no option but to present to already strained hospital emergency departments and join the long waitlists for specialist hospital services for the support their children need, putting even more pressure on our hospital system. We know that the specialist waitlist under this LNP government and this heartless health minister is ballooning out of control, with more than 83,000 more Queenslanders waiting for a specialist appointment compared to when the LNP took government. Without a plan for Thriving Kids, there will likely be even more young children waiting for that help, with more families forced to rely on public hospital outpatient clinics, paediatricians and child development services, emergency departments and other occupational therapy and assessments.

Imagine being the mother of a child who is exhibiting developmental delays and not being able to access the health care your child needs to give them the best possible chance to thrive because of this LNP government's failure to do the work. Imagine being one of the loved ones who has lost their spouse or their father or their uncle due to the fact that they have not been able to receive the assistance they have needed from an ambulance because it has been ramped at a hospital because of the inaction of this heartless health minister. It is time for this heartless health minister—who this week demonstrated an appalling lack of empathy, I must say, towards families who have lost loved ones waiting for an ambulance—and the new disability services minister to do the work and put Queensland families first. It is time to roll out Thriving Kids and it is time to prevent strain on our health system.

(Time expired)

Southern Downs Electorate, Wind Farms

Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (2.44 pm): I have heard a lot of members on the Labor side of the House grumbling today about funding for things, yet I wonder how much more we could have done with the $20 billion that those opposite threw away on BPIC and have finally been forced to apologise for and acknowledge the cost of.

I rise yet again to speak about the scourge of wind farms in my electorate, in particular the MacIntyre Wind Farm, which was approved under the previous Labor government where, given the way it did things, local voices were silenced and it was all rubber stamped in Brisbane. We are now reaping the bitter fruit of that decision by the former Labor government. I had five members of my community in my office in Warwick last week talking about what they are going through in dealing with Acciona Energia, the operator of that wind farm. They are being pressured to sign off on the reconfiguration of lots—that is, the establishment of a lot that the wind turbines stand on on their properties—but they are being asked to do so without seeing the formal plans so that they would have a real idea about exactly how much land is involved and where it is on their property, and I think that that is unacceptable. I have raised this issue with Acciona Energia many times over many months now, and I table for the benefit of the House a collection of correspondence which is just the written correspondence and does not refer to all of the meetings I have had with Acciona Energia right up to the highest level of the company in Australia.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence between the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, and the Director, Engineering & Construction of Acciona Energia Australia, Mr Andrew Tshaikiwsky, in relation to MacIntyre Wind Farm.

When these landowners do not sign-off—as they should not, I suspect, because they are being asked to sign something sight unseen—they are being punished, and they are being punished in ways which really hurt rural landowners. If you own a farm or a property, you need to be able to borrow against it for improvements. You need to be able to subdivide it or lease it. You need to be able to sell your land. That is the nature of agribusiness in my electorate of Southern Downs, yet Acciona is using its powers under the contracts that it has signed to prevent that and to coerce good, local citizens who host these wind farms to sign the thing sight unseen.

In addition to that, Acciona Energia has been behaving badly in other ways. Its maintenance of the turbines, especially when it conducts the maintenance in situ on the turbine, is resulting in fibreglass and polyurethane foam being distributed over my constituents' properties, potentially being eaten by their stock and contaminating their wool, which is completely unacceptable. Acciona denies that this problem exists when I have seen evidence with my own eyes that it is happening. There is also rehabilitation which should have been done as part of the conclusion of the project which has not been done. That is another thing which is making landowners in my electorate wish that they could resist this. I have said in no uncertain fashion to Acciona Energia that if it does not look after the landowners who host its turbines now how will it look after the community in the future? I say to it that it has no

future in my electorate and perhaps even Queensland because I will be opposing its wind farm unless it gets its act together.

Health System

Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (2.48 pm): This afternoon I rise to talk about health. It has been a sad week in health, with Queenslanders losing their lives while they wait for ambulances. There are families grieving and wanting answers, and my thoughts are with them at this time. My thoughts are also with the first responders on those scenes. All of our paramedics do the best job that they can every day to help Queenslanders. They can only work with the resources they have, and it is clear that right now they need more resources. The Crisafulli LNP government was arrogant enough to think that tragedy like this would not happen under its watch. It has expanded transit lounges to try and change the story told by ambulance ramping, yet we have seen it hit record highs this year. I have heard stories from patients who have recently seen children and seniors with IV drips in chairs and in beds in the hallways of hospitals and stories about incessant beeping as nurses are run ragged trying to monitor those who are not admitted to wards.

I am far from a health professional and I do not have the answers, but I know that the LNP denying there is a problem is not an answer; it is just heartless. When we were in government we redeveloped the Caboolture Hospital and built new parking at Redcliffe Hospital—and that is just in my neck of the woods. We embarked on what was the biggest hospital expansion plan in Queensland history, with almost $30 billion for health in our last budget.

The way I see it is that I do not know what the LNP couldn't stand—whether it was the colour of the bunting at the sites or other conditions on worksites—but they shut down our plans only to resurrect them in a so-called rescue package with nice blue bunting. What does that cost Queensland? No doubt that cost will be hidden like most LNP costs seem to be.

When we were in government, Labor built satellite hospitals. There are two that service my constituents—one in Kallangur to the east of my electorate and one in Caboolture, just past our northern border. I have had excellent feedback from constituents who have been to those facilities. Those facilities are something that the LNP could embrace—another solid Labor legacy. Instead, when they came to power, one of the first things they did was rename them, which did nothing except cause confusion—and that is on the LNP.

When we were in government, Queensland Labor worked with federal Labor to introduce free TAFE for nursing students in recognition that we need more health workers. I am glad they have kept that Labor legacy going—so far anyway, but you never know with this mob.

The LNP could learn some lessons from Labor, rather than fudging the figures on waiting lists, turning their backs on the feedback from grieving families and playing politics with paramedics. Our health system is something that touches the lives of all Queenslanders. Right now, sadly, it is a system in crisis under this heartless health minister.

Run for Orla

Ms DOOLEY (Redcliffe—LNP) (2.50 pm): Orla Agnes Shealy—I want to utter her name in this chamber and to have her name recorded in *Hansard*—a beautiful three-year-old Redcliffe girl who died 14 November 2025 of childhood cancer, daughter to parents Eamonn and Una Shealy and sister to Chlodagh and Eireann. I rise today to speak Orla's name in Queensland parliament on behalf of her parents and our Redcliffe community. I want to speak about our extraordinary community who wrapped their arms around the Shealy family through their phenomenal event Run for Orla held just last Sunday, one year since Orla died. It was a powerful morning filled with love, laugher, generosity and, above all, a profound reminder of what a village really looks like.

Run for Orla was the vision of her parents, Eamonn and Una, to help turn their indomitable love for Orla into action, purpose and hope. There are simply no words to describe the heartbreak of losing a child. Yet, through the depths of their grief, Eamonn and Una have managed to turn their love and loss into something extraordinary—something that will now make a difference in the lives of other children and families facing childhood cancer.

The response from our community was absolutely overwhelming. A thousand people came together to run, walk, volunteer, cheer, celebrate and remember through a three-, five- and 10-kilometre run or walk, followed by a morning of family-fun activities including a special appearance from Bluey,

Paw Patrol and our very own Dolphins Phinny, as well as running celebrities Australian Pat Carroll and Irish Olympian Sonia O'Sullivan.

I give a shout-out to all of our local organisations who helped make the day such a success: the Moreton Bay Irish Running Club, the Moreton Bay Road Runners, the Redcliffe Dolphins, the Sunrise Runners, the Redcliffe Man Walk, the Redcliffe City Lions Club, Irish dancers Scoil Ard Rince, Happy Feet kids show and the Scarborough ukulele band SUPers. To every volunteer, sponsor, local business, stallholder, performer, participant, runner, walker and donor: thank you. I was very humble to be one of the sponsors and a community ambassador for this event.

Together, Run for Orla has raised a whopping $94,000 for Camp Quality. These funds will help Camp Quality continue the important work supporting families navigating the reality of childhood cancer. May Orla's light continue to shine. Thank you, Redcliffe, for getting behind this great event.

Rental Security

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (2.53 pm): What happens when you treat a rental property as nothing more than a business and forget that it is actually someone's home? I want to spend the next few minutes reading just a few of the comments that I received from people on social media when I asked them about rental security. I will start with a comment from Jane, who said—

My lease being 12 months is a deadline that hangs over my head as a single mum with one income. Knowing how hard it will be to get approved for somewhere else causes me so much stress. I don't know if I'll be evicted or the rent raised some crazy amount. I don't want to move again even though I'm paying above market rate.

Another person commented—

I'm really worried. Lease expires in January, and I'm scared they'll either not offer a new one or they will, and the rent will be jacked up. We already dealt with a 50% weekly rent increase when the last landlord decided he wanted to sell and we had to move.

Danni commented—

I've moved so many times there's certain boxes I just don't even bother unpacking.

This is what life is like for renters in Queensland and across Australia. This is what they have come to expect, but it is not normal. If you are a renter in Germany or France or the Netherlands, most leases are open-ended. In Ireland they have recently introduced new laws that set new tenancies at a minimum of six years. This is reflected in one comment I received from another person who said—

Moved here from Germany—my parents have neighbours who have rented the same place for 30 years. No regular inspections, you're allowed to paint walls, open-ended rental contracts, if you stay long enough the landlord has to give you a year's notice ... Even with an excellent landlord renting in Australia sucks

I could not agree more. That is reflected in so many more comments from people living here in Australia. Another said—

I've lived in over 15 houses in 20 years. My nervous system is shredded to heck and I have zero community roots. It's not just a house, it's the shops you go to, your neighbours, the transport nearby, friends in the area, your work, gardening, your investments in the places you live, the things you get involved in. You lose it all.

Annabelle commented—

This is the first house in a decade I have stayed in for more than 12 months, and I'm still too nervous to unpack and settle in.

One parent observed—

I just want to make sure my son can stay at the same school and maintain a friend group

Is that too much to ask? According to the major parties, yes, it is. We have seen Labor and the LNP refuse to end no-ground evictions. Both of them back unlimited rent hikes, and the government and their mates seem to think that people just need to buy less clothes or scrimp on groceries or avocado. One final comment was from Blake, who said—

Living in constant fear of rent increases or the house being sold every 12 months is soul-destroying. I just want the security of owning my own home, but with prices exceeding $700k, how is that even achievable ... We're told we can't afford a mortgage, yet pay more in rent. Make it make sense.

It does not make sense.

(Time expired)

Betterment Funding

Hon. A LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (2.56 pm): As members would be well aware, especially those members on this side of the House, Queensland is the most disaster prone state in the nation. It takes me back to the 2023 floods in the north-west. I recall the member for Murrumba flew up to Burketown only after the opposition leader had been there. I also recall he spent the least amount of time possible that he could on the ground. He did not even go to flooded homes. Even then his commitment was very superficial.

How disappointing are the members opposite. The Leader of the Opposition has been forced into an apology for the BPIC debacle, yet we hear the architects are leaking against him—and I think they are all there in the front row. The member for Murrumba's commitment was not there in Burketown in 2023 and his leadership is in tatters now. He did not have the compassion in that flooded community and he has not had the courage to call out the federal government's silence on disaster recovery betterment.

I will talk a little more about Burketown just in case the member for Murrumba needs an update since his photo-op in 2023. In 2023 the Burketown airport went under water. It is now completed. It is a $24 million project, of which $8 million was funded through the Betterment Fund, and the airport is now flood-proofed for a lifetime. I do want to thank the Burke shire and also Mayor Ernie Camp for their hard work and for making sure that the infrastructure in their community is now flood-proofed for the rest of their lives.

Building back better is not simply about infrastructure. It is about protecting communities, supporting local economies and ensuring that Queensland is better prepared for the next disaster. The Crisafulli government will keep fighting to make sure betterment funding stays for Queenslanders. We have made betterment a priority in our government. I cannot say the same for the Labor opposition. The need for betterment has been highlighted by a decade of neglect and declining infrastructure and resilience under Labor. Queenslanders were too often left waiting for critical upgrades that would have strengthened resilience in the next disaster.

The member for Murrumba is so distracted by his leadership woes that he has forgotten Queenslanders when it comes to standing up for betterment funding. We know the leaks on the Leader of the Opposition are coming thick and fast from the Labor Party and from Labor members, and we know that time is up for the Leader of the Opposition.

STATE DEVELOPMENT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND WORKS COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note

Resumed from 29 October (see page 3611) on motion of Mr McDonald—

That the House take note of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee Report No. 15, 58th Parliament, *Consideration of Auditor-General Report 5: 2024-25—Preparing for the Brisbane Games*, tabled on 6 November 2025.

Mr RICHMOND (Stafford—ALP) (2.59 pm): The Brisbane 2032 Olympics provides Queensland with an opportunity to deliver general infrastructure that benefits Queenslanders for decades to come. However, there is a risk that this opportunity will be squandered by a Crisafulli government too focused on the glitz and glamour of the red carpet—a government more focused on containing the evidence of escalating infrastructure costs rather than containing cost escalations themselves. The Auditor-General's report *Preparing for the Brisbane Games* sets out the stakes. It report states—

Without a consolidated games budget that clearly defines what will be included and excluded, there is an increased risk of unforeseen and unmanaged cost escalations.

That should be a concern to all of us. We are still waiting for the LNP to release the consolidated whole-of-games budget. Instead, Queenslanders are being asked to take a leap of faith, to blindly trust—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): One moment please, member for Stafford. Members for Nicklin, Mundingburra and Whitsunday, your interjections are not being taken.

Mr RICHMOND: They do not like hearing about their record, Mr Deputy Speaker. This LNP government are asking us to blindly trust that everything will be okay just because the LNP say it will. Unfortunately for those opposite, Queenslanders have seen this movie before. They saw it in the 2024 election campaign when the LNP said they would defy the laws of fiscal gravity and increase spending while reducing debt. That ended with ministers searching cupboards for highlighters and Queensland

suffering its first credit rating downgrade in 17 years. S&P Global specifically identified the pressure of infrastructure expenditure—including on the Olympics—on the state's finances.

While the LNP conduct themselves comically, the tragedy is that their financial mismanagement costs Queenslanders. Analysis suggests that this credit rating downgrade could cost Queenslanders up to $1.1 billion in an additional interest payment by 2030—money that will not be available for our schools, our hospitals, our roads and law enforcement. If the LNP mismanage the games budget as they have mismanaged the state budget, what will Queenslanders be forced to go without? This week has provided a very clear answer to that, and it is essential frontline health services. How much of the Olympics budget blowout has been covered by the cuts to growth funding presided over by those opposite? Is it the blowout in the Olympics budget that has provided the basis for this LNP government to delay critical health infrastructure like the beds that are so desperately needed?

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance in relation to the report.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I note the report is around Olympic funding and Olympic infrastructure. Whilst you can use other material for some context, please come back to the main emphasis of the report.

Mr RICHMOND: I understand why the health minister does not want to talk about the ramping crisis under his watch—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stafford, I have just given you guidance over relevance—that is not relevant. Come back to the report, please.

Mr RICHMOND: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find it personally offensive and ask that he withdraw.

Mr RICHMOND: I withdraw. A consolidated budget would let Queenslanders judge the trade-offs that the government is making. Without one, ministers can announce projects, shift costs between agencies and leave the public guessing about the final bill. Queenslanders do not pay taxes for fun. They expect that their government will invest their money responsibly in the services and infrastructure that allow them to live a dignified life and provide for their family so that they can get ahead. The Crisafulli government owes it to them to be up-front, explain their plan and be accountable for it. Accountability matters because this government—

Mrs Poole: What's your plan?

Mr RICHMOND: I will take that interjection, 'What's our plan?' Our plan is to actually deliver the health infrastructure that is desperately needed to ensure people do not die waiting for an ambulance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stafford, I gave you guidance around relevance. Your comments are not relevant to the report. I ask you to remain relevant to the report. I understand that there may have been some interjections. Come back to the report. I am not going to caution you again.

Mr RICHMOND: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Accountability matters because this government has a strained relationship with the truth. We have a Premier who said that he did not support a new stadium but now he is building one at Victoria Park. We will have a new aquatic centre at Spring Hill and an expansion of the RNA showgrounds.

The aquatic centre was not recommended by the independent authority appointed to conduct this 100-day review. When the Leader of the Opposition questioned the cost and suitability of the aquatic centre, what was the response? The response from the Deputy Premier was, 'Well, swimming is really popular,' and that gives you an insight into those opposite. If you are a big multinational, if you have social capital, and if you are popular in the media, they will not touch you. But if you are a vulnerable Queenslander, if they think they can silence you and if they think they can cut funding from your budget and get away with it, they will do exactly that. This is a government that would prefer the glitz and glamour of the red carpet rather than investing in essential services for Queenslanders.

(Time expired)

Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (3.06 pm): I rise to speak on the report titled *Consideration of Auditor-General Report 5: 2024-25—Preparing for the Brisbane Games*. The Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games presents one of the greatest opportunities in Queensland's history. They offer a unique chance to showcase our state to a global audience, strengthen our economy, improve infrastructure and leave a legacy for future generations.

The Olympic movement has a proud and enduring history. Originating in ancient Greece around 776 BC, the original games were held at Olympia and brought together athletes across the Greek world in a spirit of excellence, competition and unity. The first recorded Olympic champion was Coroebus of Elis, winner of the stadion race. Visitors received not wealth or medals, but an olive wreath and the honour of representing the very best of human achievement. The modern Olympic Games was revived in Athens in 1896 and has since grown into the world's largest sporting event, inspiring billions of people across the globe. The values that underpinned those first modern games in Athens—excellence, perseverance and international cooperation—remain just as important today as Queensland prepares for 2032.

The Auditor-General's report provides an important assessment of the government's arrangements and planning currently in place for the Brisbane games. It acknowledges that significant progress has been made and concludes that the governance framework has been effectively designed. However, it also identifies areas where further work is required to ensure the games are delivered successfully and provide value for Queenslanders. A clear theme throughout the report is the importance of strong governance, accountability and transparency. Queenslanders expect major projects to be managed effectively, responsibly and with robust oversight and clear decision-making processes.

After a decade of red carpets, uncertainty, changing plans and an excessive focus on announcements rather than outcomes, the Crisafulli government is restoring confidence through disciplined governance and a commitment to getting the fundamentals right. The report highlights the need for a consolidated whole-of-games approach. This is critical to ensuring taxpayers have confidence in how public funds are being managed. Strong financial oversight, accurate forecasting and regular reporting will help identify risks early and keep projects on schedule and within budget. Risk management is another key recommendation. Delivering an Olympic and Paralympic Games requires coordination across multiple agencies, levels of government and major infrastructure projects. Effective risk management frameworks are essential to ensuring Queensland can successfully deliver an event of this scale while protecting taxpayers from unnecessary cost blowouts.

The games are about far more than sport; they are about creating opportunities and leaving a legacy that benefits communities right across Queensland, including regional centres like Hervey Bay. Our next generation of Hervey Bay Olympians and Paralympians can be inspired by local sports legends such as Matt Hauser, Jade Wall, Kiera Stephens and Raissa Martin. For Hervey Bay, Brisbane 2032 also presents significant economic opportunities. As the world turns its attention to Queensland, we have a chance to showcase our region's unique attractions, including Fraser-K'gari, our world-famous whale watching experiences, pristine beaches and welcoming lifestyle. The international exposure generated by the games could attract new visitors from across Europe, Asia and North America, helping local tourism operators, accommodation providers, restaurants and small businesses thrive.

The games also provide an opportunity to strengthen Queensland's reputation as a premier tourism destination. While many visitors may come initially for Olympic events, the broader objective must be encouraging them to explore regional Queensland and extend their stay. Hervey Bay is perfectly positioned to benefit from that increased international interest. Queensland is entrusted with a remarkable responsibility. The Auditor-General's report provides valuable guidance to ensure the Brisbane 2032 games are delivered with the strong governance, transparency, financial discipline and accountability that Queenslanders deserve. I commend the report to the House.

Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (3.11 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Auditor-General's *Report No. 5: 2024-25—Preparing for the Brisbane Games*. That would be the Olympic Games that the former Labor government secured for Brisbane. I am proud to have been part of that team. I have said this before and I will probably say it again: not one member of the Crisafulli LNP government can say they secured the games for Queensland—not one. What we do have in common though, I am sure, is that we all want to see a great games. We want to see Queensland shine on the world stage. We are looking forward to the economic benefits that will flow into our state and we want to see solid legacy projects transforming communities across our regions.

The Auditor-General provides an important check and balance system for government and public sector spending and performance. The report we are noting today falls under the purview of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, of which I am a member, and pertains to the 2024-25 financial year. The report examined the governance arrangements and planning process for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games that Labor secured for Queensland. Limited

assurance was provided that the governance structure was fit for purpose and that risk management strategies and budget oversight in place.

I could be wrong, but I reckon we will hear a lot of talk from those opposite about 'limited assurance' in this report with the implication that Labor could have done things better. We are always looking for ways to do things better and that is why the Queensland Audit Office is so important. Let me just explain the term 'limited assurance' for anyone who has not read the report. Under the Auditor-General's framework, in this particular review only a limited assurance could be provided. That is because some implementation needs to have happened before a framework, governance structure, budget et cetera can be assessed against outcomes. After that, if deserved, the Auditor-General can provide a reasonable assurance. In this case, it was too early days and 'limited' means just that—limited or constrained.

As our committee report points out, the subject report predated the recommendations from the LNP's 100-day review into Olympic planning and the Premier's backflip on no new stadiums. There will be more audits as we traverse the runway to 2032, and I will be very interested to see what they have to say. I note the Auditor-General's findings that various changes to governance arrangements since Brisbane was awarded the games have led to pauses and some changes in planning. That might be the stadium the Premier was not going to build causing a kerfuffle again.

The Auditor-General also found that the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee has developed key plans that outline its vision and key milestones and our committee noted that they include a legacy strategy. Our committee report also notes that the governance mechanism for revised games leadership bodies were put in place when the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 passed in June last year. Some might remember the disappointment I expressed that the LNP would bundle up a bill that concurrently set back the renewable energy sector, making it harder to get projects approved, giving the Deputy Premier more power to pursue his anti-renewables agenda. We asked the LNP to split the bill and they would not. Ultimately, we voted for it because Labor did not want to hold up Olympics preparation activities, because Labor began this game-changing journey, because Labor wanted to get those legacy projects locked in. Legacy projects like a new indoor sports centre for the Moreton Bay Central precinct in Petrie—a sports centre touted to be one of the largest multi-use indoor sports facilities in South-East Queensland, with audience capacity of up to 10,000 and catering for basketball, netball, volleyball, futsal, pickleball and, most excitingly, bringing games boxing events to the heart of Moreton Bay.

The Auditor-General made four recommendations across three broad categories: managing risk; monitoring cost; and sustainability. Interestingly, the Auditor-General has examined—and will continue to examine—not just legacy benefits, but climate targets too, recommending that a sustainability strategy include determining who is required to report emissions, from where and any exclusions from CO_2 emissions reporting.

Our committee made three recommendations after examining this report, and I will conclude with those: one, that the Legislative Assembly note the contents of this report; two, that the Auditor-General continue to monitor governance structures over the course of the games delivery program to ensure they remain operationally effective, and that those findings be reported back to us here; and, three, that the Auditor-General in future audit reports relating to the delivery of the games routinely report on the implementation status of recommendations made in previous reports. I am proud to be part of the team that brought the games to Queensland. It is great to see we were on the right track then. Let's hope the evolving circus performance of the Crisafulli LNP does not de-rail the Olympics like they temporarily derailed our trains.

Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (3.15 pm): I rise to speak to the motion to take note of report No. 15 of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee concerning the Auditor-General's report titled *Preparing for the Brisbane Games*. I would like to thank the chair and member for Lockyer and the committee for its work.

Not long ago I was out at the Toowoomba showgrounds with a pony club at one of their competitions. I was asked multiple times the question: 'Is it really happening here, Trevor?' Some of the participants, particularly some of the younger girls who had their ponies there, were really excited about the Olympics coming to Toowoomba. Obviously my answer was yes. That conversation brings this report back to what matters: the people who should benefit. Clear responsibility, careful spending and lasting benefits is what we want to achieve out of the Olympics. That is exactly what the Crisafulli government has set it up to do.

The Auditor-General found that changes to governance had interrupted planning. Queensland had 11 years to prepare compared to the usual seven. We should have been making the most of that advantage but under Labor we saw it squandered with a Gabba rebuild going from $1 billion to $2.7 billion before that was abandoned and then we were going to go to QSAC—I do not know how we were going to get everybody there. It was a mess. Queenslanders are entitled to expect better.

The opening ceremony has a fixed date. We cannot change direction and expect the deadline to move with us. The Crisafulli government has put a delivery plan in place following the 100-day review and strong governance arrangements, including the games leadership group. That matters because someone has to be responsible for the decisions and for the cost of getting that work done.

The agreement with the Commonwealth supports a $7.1 billion program for 17 new and upgraded venues across Queensland. That is a substantial commitment of public money and every dollar needs careful oversight because we want to get the very best for our local communities out of that dollar that is committed. I support the committee's recommendation for the Auditor-General to keep examining governance and report on whether earlier recommendations have been implemented.

For Toowoomba, the opportunity is substantial. Under our delivery plan the showgrounds are proposed to host Olympic equestrian and Para-equestrian events. The proposed upgrades include an international standard cross country course, additional arenas, warm-up and training areas and much better stabling. Planning and approvals are already underway. Local users must continue to have a say as those works progress. Picture it: the world's best riders competing on the Darling Downs. We might not have the Palace of Versailles, but we will have a bunch of cockatoos flying through some gum trees, which will give the world a different look at country Queensland.

We have the people who volunteer their time, organise competitions and help young riders. Chris Burton's Olympic success shows that someone from our region knows exactly what can be achieved. These games will give us an opportunity to build on that. I also want to be sure about what local families will find at the showgrounds after the games. What will be left behind? What will the legacy be? We want the showgrounds to be used, to be booked and to hold lots of events. At the moment, Queensland championship equestrian events are held in Tamworth because we do not have a facility in Queensland. That is a shame. During their decade of decline, they had an opportunity to give us an equestrian centre but they never did.

As a former small business operator in hospitality, I know what a difference it makes to a town like Toowoomba when a big event comes to town. The legacy from the Olympic infrastructure development at the showgrounds will be about the ongoing activities that may be held there. Every cafe owner, venue operator, restaurateur, motel operator and others will benefit from it. Everybody knows what happens when events like FarmFest or the Toowoomba Show are held and everybody comes along or brings their displays. This will be a leading world-class facility in Queensland. That is the opportunity that we are being presented with. The Auditor-General is making sure that we get the best bang for our buck and that we have clear responsibility, careful spending and local and lasting benefits. I support the report.

Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (3.21 pm): Queenslanders want the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games to be a success. They want world-class venues, they want a lasting legacy for our communities and they expect that those commitments, made by this government, will be delivered. They also want and deserve to know what those commitments are going to cost. The Auditor-General has made it clear that greater clarity is needed around what is actually included in the games budget.

Recommendation 2 of the *Preparing for the Brisbane games* report calls for a consolidated whole-of-games budget, including detailed budgeting guidelines that clearly define what costs are included and what costs are excluded. The department agreed to that recommendation so where is it? Queenslanders need to know. Where is the consolidated whole-of-games budget that gives Queenslanders a very clear picture of what these games will actually cost? This is not just about putting a number on a page. The Auditor-General warned that, without a consolidated games budget that clearly defines what is included and what is excluded, there is an increased risk of unforeseen and unmanaged cost escalations. That makes transparency even more important as we get closer to 2032.

Queenslanders have heard the Premier argue that keeping individual venue costs confidential protects taxpayers and prevents cost blowouts. However, the Auditor-General has stressed the importance of setting appropriate and realistic budgets. Queenslanders deserve confidence that the budgets for these projects are based on realistic costs and that expenditure can be properly tracked against them. Recent developments only reinforce the importance of that transparency.

S&P Global recently downgraded Queensland's long-term credit rating from AA+ to AA, citing a weaker budgetary performance. That decision puts an even greater spotlight on the state's finances and the importance of disciplined infrastructure spending. When billions and billions of dollars are being committed to games infrastructure, Queenslanders deserve clarity about what projects will cost, what is included in the games budget and what financial commitments taxpayers are ultimately responsible for.

That brings me to public-private partnerships. During the public briefing into the Auditor-General's report, an important point was made about maintaining a clear and consistent scope for the games budget. If the government changes what is counted and what is not counted over time, Queenslanders cannot properly compare the costs or understand the true financial position. Last year, evidence at estimates indicated that public-private partnerships would follow the advice of the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority and be included in budget totals. This year, the same assurance was not provided. That raises legitimate questions that need to be asked.

If a public-private partnership creates a direct cost to government, Queenslanders deserve clarity about whether that cost will appear in the games budget. We have already heard about that this morning. This is about clearly defining responsibility. It is also about clearly defining the budgets that are attached to them. It is about allowing Queenslanders to see whether the commitments that have been made to them are being delivered within those budgets, which they should be telling people about.

The Auditor-General's report also highlights sustainability. It recommends that the government's sustainability strategy and plans provide clarity and transparency about what it means to deliver a more sustainable games, including clear definitions, benchmarks and also targets. Again, the key words are 'clarity' and 'transparency'. The opposition supports delivering the infrastructure Queensland has been promised. This is not about walking away from projects such as Victoria Park or regional games infrastructure. The government has made these commitments and now it must deliver them. It must also be transparent with Queenslanders about what these commitments cost.

2032 presents an enormous opportunity for Queensland and we want to see the games leave a lasting legacy for sport, infrastructure and communities right across our state. Delivering that legacy requires proper planning, realistic budgeting and also transparency. Let us be transparent about the cost of the venues that the government has promised to deliver.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (3.25 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion to take note of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee report No. 15, *Consideration of Auditor-General Report 5: 2024-25—Preparing for the Brisbane games*. The 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games represent an extraordinary opportunity not only for Brisbane but for all of Queensland and Australia as a nation. They also represent a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for the communities we represent. That opportunity can only be realised through diligent planning, responsible investment and the delivery of infrastructure that continues serving Queenslanders long after the closing ceremony. That is exactly why this report matters. The Auditor-General identified significant shortcomings in governance, risk management and financial oversight under the former state Labor government. Importantly, I note that all four recommendations made by the Auditor-General have been accepted and work is well and truly underway to address them. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government welcomes that scrutiny. We are determined to deliver the games with clear accountability, certainty and a lasting legacy.

What a contrast that is to the former Labor state government. Brisbane secured the games in July 2021 yet, after more than 1,200 days, Labor left office without a settled venue plan and without construction underway on the major games venues. Who could forget Labor's revolving door of failed announcements? The Labor member for Kurwongbah certainly has a short memory. Firstly, the cost of the Gabba rebuild was originally touted at $1 billion, rising to $2.7 billion before being abandoned by Labor. Then came the extraordinary proposition of a temporary stadium at the Queensland Sport and Athletics Centre, despite serious questions about transport, value for money and legacy. Labor had years to get this right. Instead, all Brisbane and Queensland got was uncertainty, wasted time and failed political leadership.

Queenslanders deserve better and under the Liberal National Party state government they are finally getting it. Our government commissioned the independent 100-day review, established the 2032 Delivery Plan and secured a $7.1 billion venue infrastructure program, in partnership with the Australian government, with clearer responsibility for delivery. For Brisbane, that means investment in a new 63,000-seat Brisbane Stadium, a national aquatic centre, improvements to the Queensland Tennis Centre and an athletes village at the RNA showgrounds that will transition to housing after the games.

These are not simply facilities for a fortnight of international competition; they are investments in the sporting, housing and community infrastructure our growing city will need for decades. Importantly, the legacy must reach beyond the major precincts.

A genuine Olympic and Paralympic legacy cannot be measured by venues alone. It must also be measured by what happens at the local football clubs, the tennis courts, the swimming pools and the community sporting grounds. That is why I am particularly proud that the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's $250 million Games On! Grassroots Infrastructure Program is being delivered. This is practical investment and it empowers local clubs, supports volunteers, expands participation and gives the next generation of athletes the facilities they deserve.

I have seen what that commitment means firsthand in my own electorate of Moggill in the western suburbs of Brisbane. It was fantastic to recently welcome the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, the Hon. Tim Mander MP, to the University of Queensland Football Club at Akuna Oval in Kenmore to announce more than $1.4 million through the Games On! program to deliver new facilities and clubhouse infrastructure that is being built there in collaboration with the club, with them also committing $1.4 million. Our local UQFC is an outstanding grassroots club supporting more than 1,400 players, including over 1,200 juniors, as well as coaches, volunteers and families who make community sport possible. Women and girls account for more than one-third of its membership. The planned redevelopment will provide modern, accessible changing rooms and amenities that better meet the needs of every player. For a club that has worked so hard to grow participation, this investment is transformative.

The Auditor-General specifically looked at the legacy of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. This is what a meaningful 2032 legacy looks like. When Brisbane welcomes the world in 2032, of course we want world-class facilities and unforgettable moments, but we also want young Queenslanders—indeed, all Queenslanders—to be able to benefit from what we build today. Certainly, I know my ministerial colleagues understand that with the contributions they are making as a part of the Crisafulli LNP government to this infrastructure. Labor delivered confusion and delay. The LNP is delivering the games.



Hon. ML FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (3.31 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Auditor-General's report, *Preparing for the Brisbane games*. No doubt in 2032, the eyes of the world will be on Brisbane in respect to the games. I want to reflect in terms of what built momentum for these games. Some may suggest that the Commonwealth Games 2018 was that momentum that provided the opportunity for us to win the games by the Labor government. I want to reflect on some of the funding costs involved in those games, despite the fact there is quite significant variance with regard to numbers and the size of those games. It is estimated that those games cost $1.86 billion, and the Queensland government put in $1.5 billion towards those games. Once again, a success by the Labor government in 2018 in the delivery of those games and the legacy that that provided.

Notwithstanding that, the Auditor-General's report has made it clear this government needs to be up-front about what is included in the scope of the games' budget. I know, from speaking with many of my constituents in Ferny Grove and across this state, that is the view of many Queenslanders as well: what will these games cost?

If you reflect on S&P Global's downgrading of the Queensland credit rating, they have stated that the increased infrastructure spend related to the games means overall cash deficits will be larger. That is exactly why the Premier and the Deputy Premier need to be up-front and explain exactly what this cost will be for all the venues that they propose.

There are other concerns as well. I will reflect on some of the comments made by the chair of the CCC with respect to a possibility of increased corruption involved in the delivery of these games and the infrastructure around that. We need to be mindful of the overall effect with respect to the cost, as those who have concerns about it have raised. Notwithstanding that, we, the Labor opposition, do support wholeheartedly the Olympic Games, and it will be a success.

The auditor says that greater clarity is needed on what is included in the games' budget. If you turn to recommendation 2 in this report, it states that the department should develop 'a consolidated whole-of-games budget. This should include developing detailed budgeting guidelines and clearly defining what costs are included and excluded from the games budget.'

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Member for Coomera, you will cease your interjections.

Mr FURNER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I am not taking those ridiculous interjections. The Premier says that keeping costs secret prevents blowouts, but the Auditor-General, during the public hearing on this report, stated that 'setting appropriate budgets which are as accurate as possible' is vital to keeping costs down. She referred to the 2004 Athens games that had 50 per cent cost overruns as an 'example where budgets perhaps have not defined actual costs and been realistic in expectations'.

I have also seen media reports in regard to what this might do in respect of traffic congestion in terms of modelling in 2032, warning that traffic on major highways will slow to 22 kilometres per hour. No major upgrades have been expected or indicated for corridors before 2032. Therefore, costs for building infrastructure for the delivery of the games for Olympians, spectators and the security guards—all those incidental facts that add to the delivery of the games—need to be explained to Queenslanders.

As I indicated at the start, the eyes of the world will be on these games and also the eyes of Queenslanders who want to know what is going to happen in terms of the overall costs, what is this government delivering, what will the government need to deliver these games, and also to make sure they do not have deficits with respect to what has been indicated by S&P and others. When it comes to the overall cost of these games, let's be up-front. Let's make sure this government delivers and does not keep secret what the overall cost will be and what the effect of shortfalls will mean. Will it be the case that they will cut jobs? Are they going to cut infrastructure? Are they going to cut delivery on important things like more schools and more hospitals? These are the things that the government needs to be up-front on and explain—

(Time expired)

Mr MOLHOEK: Speaker—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr FURNER: They need to be up-front, Deputy Speaker—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, I have asked you to stop interjecting. You are warned under the standing orders. Member for Ferny Grove?

Mr FURNER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, but I think I might be finished. I do not need another five minutes to explain what this government is cutting in respect of these games—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much. Time has expired.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (3.36 pm): I rise to speak on the committee report on the Olympics and delivering the games. I absolutely want to commend the committee on the work they have done in preparing the report. At the outset, I want to say how incredibly proud I am to be part of a government that is delivering for Queensland—the Crisafulli government—and the team that have turned this around and put the games back where they need to be—a high priority with a positive focus, and delivering it in such a way that Queenslanders now understand what is happening, how they will be delivered and what the benefit of these games will be to Queensland.

I know you will be shocked to learn this because you probably think I am a lot younger than I am, but I was privileged to be on the Queensland Team Fund board for the 2000 Olympics as the general manager of the Macquarie Austereo radio group. We had the broadcast rights for the Sydney Olympics. Part of the responsibility was that we had to raise money to support Queensland athletes. We raised over $2.5 million which, 26 years ago, was quite a lot of money to support our athletes. It was an incredible experience.

Through that time, I was exposed to many encounters with Olympic teams from around the world, with the Olympic committee and representatives from Sydney, and it was an incredible privilege, to say the least. Part of that experience was that I got to attend a number of events, including the opening ceremony at the Sydney Olympics. What a week that was! To be down there amongst athletes from all over the world, to be trading pins, to be talking to others who had come just to watch the games, to be in Sydney enjoying a meal out and a cruise on the harbour, and all of those things, was just an incredible experience.

I share that to provide context because I do not think we really understand how big this is going to be for Brisbane, how exciting it is going to be for Queensland, how expansive will be the opportunities that come with the games and the momentum that that will drive in terms of world attention, in terms of tourism and in terms of local business and commerce.

One of the mistakes that we made with the Commonwealth Games was we created an expectation that all of the business was going to happen during the two weeks of the games. The reality was that the business was in the lead-up to the games. I spoke to many venue operators on the coast. Some had geared up for the two weeks and were disappointed. Those who had geared up in the two-year lead-up made a lot of money because of the tradespeople who were working on the coast building venues, brightening up the town, fixing footpaths, preparing roads and expanding services throughout the city. There is so much else that goes on around the games apart from the venues. It is important to note that the real opportunity is in the lead-up to the games and in the first year or two after the games.

There is another reason the games are important—it is one of the reasons I have been so heavily involved with local sport on the Gold Coast, it is why I got involved with the Titans and the Suns and it is why I am a life member at Runaway Bay Juniors Leagues Club and involved with a number of other groups—that is, sport is really important for our kids. What these games do is provide inspiration. What national sporting teams do is provide inspiration for young people to get involved. Particularly now when we look at the distractions of scrolling on social media, devices, the fear about AI and growing levels of anxiety amongst young people not only in Australia but also globally, it has never been more important, I believe, to encourage young people to be involved in sport.

I had one very simple rule for my boys: they had to play at least one team sport while they were living under my roof. It taught them the importance of getting along with people. It kept them healthy. It kept them out of trouble. It eased boredom. I cannot stress enough how excited I am with the opportunities that will come with these games.

Ms PUGH (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (3.41 pm): I rise to speak to the Auditor-General's report. The Olympic and Paralympic Games should be a time of unmitigated excitement for Queensland. At the end of the day, as other speakers have outlined, these games are for the people of Queensland. They are not only for the spectators but also for the athletes who will compete. Most importantly, they are for the next generation of kids who will use the legacy infrastructure they create and who will be inspired by the amazing athleticism we will see over the course of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

We have just had trophy season, which is always so uplifting. Netball, soccer, cricket, archery—you name it, we do it in Mount Ommaney. I will take a quick moment to thank the hundreds, actually thousands, of volunteers who support our local sport and physical activity clubs. We are really blessed in Mount Ommaney with an abundance of volunteers.

People want to be excited about the games, but they are also rightly sceptical about their delivery and whether the LNP government is being up-front with Queenslanders about the costs. The Auditor-General's report makes it clear that the government needs to be transparent about what is included in the scope of the games budget. S&P Global, in downgrading Queensland's credit rating outlook, stated that the increased infrastructure spend related to the Olympics means overall cash deficits will be larger, which is exactly why the Premier and Deputy Premier must be up-front about what each venue is costing. The government's changing language on public-private partnerships seems in direct contrast with the Auditor-General's advice. The audit says—

Greater clarity is needed on what is included in the games budget.

Recommendation 2 of the report states—

... the Department of Sport, Racing and Olympic and Paralympic Games develop a consolidated whole-of-games budget. This should include developing detailed budgeting guidelines and clearly defining what costs are included and excluded from the games budget.

Queenslanders have every right to expect that they will be informed of the total cost of the games and that the government will be transparent with them. The department agreed to recommendation 2, but it has been radio silence from the government since. Where is the consolidated games budget?

The Auditor-General's report speaks to the importance of delivering real and transparent costs for every single project this government says it will deliver for the games. I want to reflect for a moment on one of the key points of the Auditor-General's report—that is, the legacy strategy of the games. This long-term legacy strategy has four key themes: sport, health and inclusion; connecting people and places; a better future for our environment; and economy of the future. We know that sport is all about bringing people together. Indeed, that is what the Olympics is all about on a spectacular and global scale.

We know that it is about bringing people together on a global scale, but we also know that, as the member for Southport outlined, it is about bringing people together at a grassroots level—our young

soccer players at Stormers, Oxley and St Cats; and our Centenary and Jaggies netballers, who along with other netball clubs advocated so hard to me and their local members to get netball included in the Olympics.

It is not just about kids playing. There are more and more studies recognising the importance of adults connecting through sports. We need to ensure the facilities we invest in are strong and suitable legacies for our community.

We had a wonderful event here this morning at Parliament House. It is International Men's Day. We know that sport is a protective factor for mental health for both men and women. From reading the legacy part of the Auditor-General's report, we know that delivering these facilities is actually important for the mental health of Queenslanders. Sport is a protective factor in keeping Queenslanders more mentally healthy. It is incredibly important. We could say it is actually going to save lives. I think we can do both. We can deliver amazing legacy benefits for our community, but we need the LNP government to be up-front and honest with Queenslanders about the total cost of the games.

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (3.46 pm): I rise to contribute to the report into preparing for the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032. At the outset, I want to reflect on some of the comments that have been made in the chamber today. The member for Southport mentioned the Commonwealth Games we hosted in 2018. We have to learn the lessons from what actually transpired at those games. One of the biggest issues we had with the Commonwealth Games in my region, which is at the northern end of the Gold Coast—it was a Gold Coast Commonwealth Games—was the exodus of the local population. They were worried about traffic or congestion. The issue was all of those locals did not have the chance to enjoy the games. They did not enjoy those fantastic games. Therefore, this is about ensuring all Queenslanders can enjoy the Olympics in 2032. We want to host a games that is going to make a lasting impression on the younger generations.

The other thing is we need to ensure we are developing athletes. That is why the Crisafulli government has been spending vast amounts of money on enhancing local sporting facilities. Even in my electorate of Theodore, money is being delivered to a local soccer club, the AFL and cricket. It is so important that we get young people out there and interested and participating in these types of sports.

I would like to reflect on the member for Mount Ommaney's comments about mental wellbeing. Yes, getting out there and playing sport is good for our mental wellbeing. Therefore, inspiring the next generation to be Olympic champions is what the Brisbane games is all about. It is about Queensland, Australia winning the medal tally. It is about us coming No. 1. We will be on the world stage. We are going to show off how beautiful and precious our state is. Also, we are going to have infrastructure that will be game-changing for generations to come.

It is about building a legacy in my region, across South-East Queensland and throughout Queensland. It is critically important that we get it right. That is why the Crisafulli government has now taken control and ensured the delivery plan is going to be well and truly ready before the games. This is a legacy for our region. On the Gold Coast, for example, one of the sports we are going to get is hockey, which I know my good friend the member for Bonney is certainly very proud of. My good friend the member for Toowoomba North is very proud of his equestrian events. This is about building infrastructure and disseminating it through Queensland so all of Queensland enjoys what we have to offer.

Yes, tourism is the lifeblood of the Gold Coast. The Gold Coast is built on tourism. We have the theme parks, but we have so much more to show off in Queensland. We will have whitewater rafting in the Redlands area and sailing in Townsville. That is why it is critically important that we promote to our local population and the domestic tourism market how important the games are. We must learn from the mistakes of the Commonwealth Games. People were scared off and left the area. During the Commonwealth Games in my electorate there was hardly anybody on the M1 during that whole period. People left because they thought it was going to be a quagmire. We need to think what transpired back then to ensure the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games are the best games that have ever been held anywhere on this planet.

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (3.51 pm): I am sure that after listening to that speech the people of Queensland are going to be full of confidence that these games are going to be delivered. We have now learned that the LNP have taken control and, according to the member for Theodore, we are going to have a delivery plan before the games. Wow, we are going to get a plan before the games! Won't that give confidence to the people of Queensland that the LNP are in charge and are going to at least have a plan before the games start.

A big part of having a plan is to have a budget. Most plans that I have dealt with have a budget. This Auditor-General's report shines a light on the fact that we do not have a very good budget—or any budget that we know of. I will comment on some of the things the member for Southport said. He pointed out that we really do not understand how big these games are going to be. How could we understand how big these games are going to be when we do not have any financial understanding of these games? When you try to measure big projects you generally measure them by looking at the budget, and we do not have that. Yes, we do not have any idea how big this is going to be, but we certainly do want to have an idea of how big this is going to be. That is what the people of Queensland want.

Do we all remember that 'no new stadiums' promise? Do members remember the Premier who said that, when he says something, he means something? In this case he said 'no new stadiums', but what he actually meant was three new stadiums.

Ms Pease: It's four now.

Mr J KELLY: Is it four? We might be getting more. No wonder the audit was scathing. It is clear the Auditor-General believes that the government needs to be upfront about what is in and what is out of this Olympic budget.

We had a recent announcement by the Deputy Premier around the new stadium in Woolloongabba adding hundreds of millions of dollars to the cost. Have they modelled what the cost of this means for the overall games budget? Have they also modelled what the cost of knocking down the existing stadium at the Gabba will be and what that means? I can tell you what they will have modelled and calculated: they will have calculated to the dollar the amount of donations they are going to be getting out of developers from this.

Personally, I just cannot believe that we are going to bulldoze the Gabba, with over 100 years of sporting history in this state. This is a ground where cricketing history has been made, a ground where I have personally watched amazing feats by Dean Jones, Shane Warne and Brian Lara, just to name a few, and a ground where the Brisbane Lions turned the VFL in a truly Australian game by winning not one, but two three-peats at the Gabba. All of that is just going to be bulldozed. Instead of just bulldozing the stadium why don't they think about some community sport there instead? Why don't we preserve some of the legacy? If they want to talk about legacy, the legacy for our community is that we are going to bulldoze a piece of history and bulldoze a whole lot of money into the LNP's bank accounts. I know they have certainly modelled that.

We need a lot more housing in our part of town; there is no question about that. We have so much potential up Logan Road. We have so much potential through Stones Corner, Greenslopes, Coorparoo and Buranda that has hardly been touched yet. Why are we bulldozing history? Why are we walking away from our history? It is absolutely disgraceful. Everybody who loves cricket in my part of town is really concerned about that.

The Premier apparently says that the reason we have do not have a budget is because we are keeping it secret to prevent budget blowouts. This government loves transparency and openness, and here they are hiding their budget. It is probably in a little box in a little table right next to the health workforce plan. That is another one they have been keeping secret. This is a government that came in and said, 'We're going to be open. We're going to be transparent', but here we have yet another example—

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr J KELLY: Exactly. Not about Olympic costs, not about the health workforce plan. That is another thing they are going to keep secret. These will be great games if we can get this right but, like all Queenslanders, I have serious concerns about the capacity of this government to deliver these games or to deliver anything else in this state.

Mr JAMES (Mulgrave—LNP) (3.56 pm): I rise today to speak on the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee Report No. 15, 58th Parliament, *Consideration of Auditor-General Report 5: 2024-25—Preparing for the Brisbane games.* The audit identified several areas requiring ongoing attention, including: risk management, budget practices, governance accountability and the monitoring of delivery outcomes. The Auditor-General recommended stronger whole-of-games risk management, the development of a consolidated games budget, improved monitoring of spending, and greater clarity around sustainability targets and reporting. It is important to note that all relevant agencies accepted these recommendations.

These recommendations go to the heart of responsible government. Queenslanders expect transparency, accountability and careful stewardship of public funds. They expect projects of this scale

to be managed professionally and they expect parliament to play an active role in oversight. That is why the committee recommended that the Auditor-General continue monitoring governance structures throughout the life of the games delivery program and regularly report back to the Legislative Assembly.

I want to focus particularly on what this means for regional Queensland. Too often when major events are discussed the conversations centre exclusively on the host city. While Brisbane will naturally be the focal point of the games, the benefits must extend well beyond the south-east corner. The Olympic and Paralympic Games belong to all Queenslanders. Every region should share in the opportunities they create. For Cairns and the electorate of Mulgrave the games represent a once-in-a-generation opportunity to secure infrastructure, investment and international exposure that would otherwise take decades to achieve.

One of the clearest examples is Barlow Park in Cairns, where works have commenced. For many years Cairns has argued for improved sporting infrastructure capable of supporting elite competition, community sport and major events. A modern Barlow Park would not simply be an Olympic venue or training facility; it would provide a lasting community asset that could host national sporting competitions, attract visiting teams, support grassroots participation and encourage further investment in sport and recreation across the region.

The tourism opportunities are enormous. Increased international exposure can drive growth in visitor numbers, support local businesses, create employment opportunities and encourage additional private sector investment in accommodation, hospitality, aviation and tourism infrastructure. For the people of Mulgrave, this means jobs, it means opportunities for local businesses, and it means support for family owned tourism operators, hospitality workers, transport providers and countless small businesses that form the backbone of our regional economy. The people in Cairns, Gordonvale, Edmonton and throughout Mulgrave expect that investment in the games will not come at the expense of essential services and infrastructure in regional Queensland. We must ensure spending on the games is carefully managed so that funding for hospitals, schools, roads and community services remains protected.

Debate, on motion of Mr James, adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

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

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (4.00 pm): I seek to advise the House of the determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved that, pursuant to standing order 136, the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee report on the Criminal Code and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 15 January 2027.

The committee has also resolved that, pursuant to standing order 194B, that Auditor-General's *Report 2: 2026-27—2026 status of Auditor-General's recommendations* be referred to the Governance, Energy and Finance Committee; Auditor-General's *Report 3: 2026-27—Major projects 2026* be referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee; and Auditor-General's *Report 4: 2026-27—Information systems 2026* be referred to the Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (4.00 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 1 December 2026.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3891, on motion of Mrs Stoker—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Ms BOLTON (Noosa—Ind) (4.02 pm): The crisis of domestic and family violence is ongoing. Across Queensland and Australia, the statistics do not tell the whole horrific reality. DVConnect report consistent, record-high demand for frontline support services, despite fluctuations in recorded homicide statistics, noting that police figures do not capture the full scale of trauma, fear and coercive control. Queenslanders continue to die at the hands of supposed loved ones, with nine in the first half of this year. We must do whatever it takes to end the devastation. Amendments in this bill contain measures that are undeniably necessary. The introduction of specific criminal offences for repeated flagrant breaches of DVOs within a 28-day window sends a clear message to serial perpetrators: just stop. Similarly, expanding and streamlining the videorecorded evidence-in-chief framework across all magistrates courts is a practical increase that spares victim-survivors the severe trauma of repeating their stories over and over in what can feel like hostile environments. However, concerns have been raised.

First, moving entirely to a police protection direction, PPD, framework removes immediate judicial oversight from domestic violence matters, as we have heard. Our police do an incredible job under immense pressure. For years, they have been taking on responsibilities that were traditionally the purview of others. Now they are tasked with being judicial officers. As submitted, giving police the power to issue directions lasting up to three years without prior court scrutiny risks a rise in misidentification and systems abuse where a sophisticated perpetrator manipulates the system to lock down a victim-survivor before a magistrate ever looks at a file. Regardless, as I said earlier, something must be done, as the police can currently be called to the same address multiple times a day or week. As we have heard, each callout can require two officers and a total of eight hours. It has been reported that over 70 per cent of Noosa police time is spent in residents' homes responding to DV and mental health callouts. This is not fair to them or victim-survivors.

Second, organisations also raised the lack of public consultation and the expansion of electronic monitoring trials before a full statutory review of prior pilots. While the statewide expansion of the 24/7 electronic monitoring pilot is a positive move, if governments are going to deploy surveillance technology, we need absolute transparency, which is increasingly difficult to obtain in this House. Parliament must see rigorous, independent data proving these trackers deter high-risk offenders, rather than relying on a high-tech bandaid to mask what at times is a lack of frontline police resources. Groups such as the Red Rose Foundation have welcomed stronger enforcement against repeat offenders, alongside calls for careful safeguards. The Victims' Commissioner raised concerns that the complexity of the offences could lead to reduced accountability for perpetrators and delays for victims.

As has been raised for years, we cannot simply monitor or imprison our way out of a systemic cultural crisis that has been decades in the making. Electronic monitoring and expanded police orders only trigger after a threat has escalated. They do nothing to fix our broken housing pipeline or the desperate underfunding of frontline community-led support services that work to prevent violence in our households and on our streets. I have spoken to a number of Noosa residents in the middle of the night who are staying in a home with a perpetrator and not reporting it because there is no alternative accommodation; that tells a story in itself.

We support this bill because DV victims need immediate protections and communities want their police back visible on the street. However, we need a commitment from government to those transparent reviews, as well as a much larger investment in prevention, including housing, mental health supports, step-up step-down addiction recovery programs and individual case management. At the same time, we need mandatory wellbeing and anger behaviour management embedded into our schools on a weekly basis. This will break the cycle of anger, abuse, addiction and associated contributors to domestic violence.

I thank the minister, the department, the committee and all of our frontline organisations which deal with this scourge that is a blight on our state and country. I want to send a call-out to our many organisations across Queensland, including Zonta. They continue to plea for an end to violence, including on the walks that we do. Ultimately, we must all say no.

Mrs KIRKLAND (Rockhampton—LNP) (4.07 pm): I rise in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This legislation continues the Crisafulli government's rollout of new and improved laws that place victim-survivors ahead of offenders. The bill places victims at the centre of our domestic and family violence response, and it strengthens accountability for those who choose to use violence. Domestic and family violence continues to devastate lives, families and communities across Queensland. It does not discriminate; it affects people of every age, background and postcode. Every piece of data collected reveals a person—most often a

woman but also men and, sadly, children—whose sense of safety has been shattered and whose future depends on the willingness of government, court, police services and communities to act on that data, not simply talk about it.

The Crisafulli government has taken up the baton and is delivering for those people behind the data. We are acting where those opposite failed to act. In fact, as Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon explained during the committee process, these reforms are about ensuring our collective response remains focused on the safety, protection and wellbeing of victim-survivors and their children. She also noted that frontline police have been calling for more immediate tools to protect victims since as far back as 2015. This bill strengthens police responses, improves protections for victim-survivors during court proceedings, introduces stronger consequences for repeat offenders and expands electronic monitoring across Queensland. It is a practical reform package designed to improve safety outcomes and intervene earlier when people are at risk.

One of the most significant reforms is making police protection directions the primary domestic and family violence response available to police. This will allow officers to provide immediate protection without unnecessary delays and expand the conditions and the duration available under the directions, ensuring that our police can act quickly when these vulnerable Queenslanders need help the most. In response to the argument raised by those opposite—basically their only argument—on the potential of misidentification as a reason to not implement instant protection for victims, I draw the House's attention to the response from the CEO of Women's Legal Service Queensland when asked whether the service had any significant experience with misidentification. CEO, Nadia Bromley, replied—

> We do not have experience of significant misidentification in relation to police protection directions, no.

I was particularly pleased that the committee visited Rockhampton, where we heard firsthand from service providers, from victim-survivors and from law enforcement about the realities of domestic and family violence in Central Queensland. Regional communities face unique challenges. Distances are greater, services can be stretched and victims often experience isolation from support networks. Despite these challenges, we heard about the extraordinary commitment of local organisations and frontline workers dedicated to supporting families and breaking these cycles of violence. The committee heard evidence from local stakeholders, including Rockhampton Women's Shelter. During the inquiry, Beverley Schimke described these reforms as 'a huge step' towards holding people who use violence accountable. That view reflected what we heard throughout the inquiry—stronger protections and stronger accountability must go hand in hand.

I also acknowledge the many organisations across Rockhampton working every day in the domestic and family violence sector, including the Rockhampton Women's Shelter, DVAC, Anglicare Central Queensland, Centacare CQ, Girls Time Out, Queensland Police Service specialist units, Queensland Health frontline staff, CQ Healthy Families, Helem Yumba CQ Healing Centre, Women's Health, Information and Referral Service CQ, the high-risk team and the VOCCA team. Their work changes lives through crisis accommodation, counselling, advocacy, court support and safety planning. Legislation alone is not enough; it must be supported by investment in practical infrastructure.

Most importantly, these reforms send a very clear message: the safety of victim-survivors comes first. For too long victims have been forced to navigate systems that were slow, complex and unable to provide immediate protection. This legislation delivers faster intervention, stronger legal protections and meaningful consequences for those who continue to use violence. Throughout the committee process police, victim advocates and frontline service providers expressed their broad support for the objectives of the bill. We heard the need for timely intervention, stronger accountability and systems that put victims first. Those fleeing domestic and family violence are often forced to run, hide and rebuild their lives in fear. These reforms provide swifter intervention and stronger consequences for offenders who repeatedly breach their orders.

I am proud that Rockhampton's voice was heard through the committee process, I am proud of the local services supporting victim-survivors every day and I welcome the investments in our courts and our hospital that strengthen local responses. This legislation will not end domestic and family violence on its own. It is a significant step forward. It strengthens protections and it improves police responses. It strengthens court processes and it reinforces accountability for perpetrators. I had the privilege of being a co-author of a book where I reflected on my own personal domestic and family violence experience about fleeing, about how difficult that process is. This bill goes to great lengths to make certain that victims like myself in the community know that not only does the government have their back but that the police have been given the tools that they need to respond quickly to make

certain that women like myself are not hiding, hoping not to be found. For the reasons that I have outlined here today, I fully commend this bill to the House.

Mr HEALY (Cairns—ALP) (4.15 pm): As we all know in this chamber, domestic and family violence is one of the most serious challenges confronting Queenslanders, and it does not just happen in the south-east; it is all over our state, and it is concerning. It destroys lives, it fractures families, it traumatises children and it leaves lasting scars across generations. Addressing it demands more than political slogans, tougher penalties and expanded police powers. It demands leadership, it demands accountability and it demands sustained investment in the services that protect vulnerable Queenslanders. Let there be no mistake: Labor supports stronger protections for victim-survivors, effective policing and appropriate consequences for perpetrators. We recognise the extraordinary demands placed upon frontline police officers and the importance of ensuring that they have the tools necessary to respond effectively, but stronger laws do not automatically mean safer lives. Legislation that expands police powers without adequate safeguards, proper scrutiny or corresponding investment risks creating new injustices while failing to address the underlying crisis.

The Crisafulli LNP government has chosen to expand its police protection direction framework before properly evaluating whether the existing arrangements are working. Introduced in January 2026, the framework has already attracted serious questions about its effectiveness and limited use by police. However, rather than first conducting a comprehensive review, the government proposes extending these directions from 12 months to three years, removing existing restrictions on their use and introducing additional criminal penalties. These are substantial powers with profound consequences for both individuals and for families. Most concerning is the removal of safeguards governing circumstances under which police may issue protection directions, including cases involving police officers themselves. This raises fundamental questions about independence, oversight and public confidence, particularly when the government continues to delay establishing the police integrity unit recommended by the A Call for Change commission of inquiry in 2022. The government cannot credibly demand greater public confidence in expanded police powers while failing to implement an important independent integrity safeguard. This is essential.

Equally troubling is the continuing risk of misidentifying victim-survivors as perpetrators. Domestic and family violence is frequently characterised by coercive control, intimidation, manipulation and patterns of abuse that may not be immediately apparent during a single police interaction. A victim defending themselves, resisting intimidation or attempting to protect their children can be mistakenly identified as the aggressor. Under this bill, the consequences of such mistakes become considerably more serious. A system intended to protect victims must never become a mechanism through which the victims themselves are punished. These concerns are not hypothetical. They have been raised by respected legal and specialist organisations, including the Queensland Law Society and none other than the Salvation Army. The Salvation Army's submission is particularly significant because it reflects the practical experience from the frontline workers supporting people escaping violence. Its message is unmistakable: legislative reform alone will not deliver sustainable safety.

The Salvation Army has called for three essential investments. The first is an investment in regular, targeted and mandatory specialist police training to reduce the misidentification of victims-survivors and improve understanding of domestic and family violence as a pattern of behaviour. This is a science and they are saying it needs to be studied. The second is an investment in co-responder and embedded specialist practitioner models, ensuring police are supported by professionals equipped to assess complex circumstances, identify coercive control and connect victims with the appropriate sources—which we all know has been a challenging area. The third is an investment in proper training, resources and information for specialist services and victim-survivors concerning the expansion of electronic monitoring. They are practical, evidence informed recommendations from an organisation working directly with people experiencing violence. These are their recommendations.

They deserve more than polite acknowledgement. They demand a meaningful commitment of resources, yet the government approach places legislative expansion ahead of the comprehensive investment necessary to make those reforms effective. Electronic monitoring may provide an additional protective measure, but technology is no substitute for support, effective risk assessment or, more importantly, timely intervention. A monitoring device cannot provide emergency accommodation. It cannot secure a family's financial independence. It cannot deliver trauma counselling or guarantee that a victim has somewhere safe to go.

The Salvation Army has also highlighted a devastating reality: victim-survivors continue to remain in, or return to, dangerous circumstances because they cannot access affordable housing, crisis

accommodation or financial security. I hear this from a number of providers across our city of Cairns. What protection does the government genuinely offer a woman who has the courage to leave an abusive relationship but has nowhere safe to take her children? A protection direction may establish legal boundaries but, without housing, income security or accessible support services, these boundaries can offer limited practical protection.

The government must recognise that domestic violence prevention is inseparable from housing policy, social services, mental health support and, most importantly, economic security. You cannot legislate a woman into safety while leaving her without a roof over her head. Children must also be recognised as victims in their own right, with appropriate child centred risk assessment, information sharing and, just as importantly, specialist support.

There are equally serious questions about transparency and accountability. Parliamentary data indicates that the proportion of assault victims recorded with a domestic violence flag declined from approximately 60 per cent to as low as 48 per cent in July 2026. That represents a substantial change requiring independent explanation, particularly alongside reported reductions in police protection notices and domestic violence calls for service.

These figures do not, by themselves, establish whether actual violence has increased or decreased, but they raise legitimate questions about the changes in reporting, recording practices and police responses. Queenslanders deserve reliable statistics, not political interpretations designed to manufacture an appearance of success. This is why Labor has called for an independent community safety statistics bureau. Public confidence depends on accurate, transparent and independently scrutinised information. The government should be judged by whether fewer people experience violence, whether victims receive timely protection and whether perpetrators are held to account, not simply whether recorded figures decline.

Domestic and family violence is far too serious to become an exercise in political presentation. The Crisafulli government has an obligation to demonstrate that its reforms are evidence based, properly resourced and, more importantly, supported by those working on the front line. Instead, it is asking parliament to endorse significantly expanded powers before the existing framework has been adequately evaluated and without demonstrating the comprehensive investment sought by specialist service providers. Queenslander deserve better.

Labor believes meaningful reform must combine effective laws with independent oversight, specialist police training, integrated frontline responses, safe accommodation and properly funded victims-survivor services. We believe they are essential to dealing with these challenges. They are not competing priorities; they are essential parts of the same responsibility. A government's commitment to protecting victims should be measured not by the power it announces but by the safety it delivers and provides. Until the Crisafulli LNP government addresses these fundamental shortcomings, Labor cannot support this bill. The safety, dignity and rights of Queenslanders deserve nothing less.



Ms CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (4.24 pm): I am pleased to contribute to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I want to firstly acknowledge the work of Minister Leahy in her introduction of this bill, as well as the carriage of the bill by Minister Stoker, who will work hard to implement the bill. I also want to acknowledge the work of the police minister. It has been a thoroughly collaborative—

Mr Stevens: Team effort.

Ms CAMM: Thank you: a team effort. It has been a collaborative experience in my role as the former minister working alongside the police minister and his team to make sure that we monitored the PPD framework and bring forward future tranches of reform, which is what this bill aims to do. We were elected on a platform of putting victims first and holding perpetrators to account. We were elected to bring forward any reform possible that would further protect victims, and that is victims of crime and victims of domestic and family violence.

I cannot help but reflect on the contributions of those opposite who, over a decade of decline, firstly, never worked collaboratively with the specialised sector—with the legal service, with the justice service and with the Queensland Police Service—when it came to responding to domestic and family violence. What they failed to do was deliver on the recommendations of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce. What they failed to do was even monitor basic fundamental services like DVConnect, where we saw a complete failure in the call-answer response rate of 41.9 per cent, which our government improved to now 84 per cent. What has that done? That has helped support our frontline police because they are the first responders to domestic and family violence.

I am proud to be part of a government that is empowering its Queensland Police Service to give them the tools to expand the frameworks. We have already heard from victim-survivors. In my own electorate I have heard from a first-year constable who delivered the first PPD. The fact that they could deliver a PPD without the court process, to ensure that power and protection was given immediately, was welcomed by victim-survivors. We have heard that evidence. I thank the work of the committee, the committee chair and all of the members of the committee who heard submissions, particularly from Nadia Bromley, who heads up the Women's Legal Service and is respected by both sides of the House. Nadia also worked closely with us and gave constructive feedback, along with the Victims' Commissioner, on how we can better improve the PPD framework.

We will not wait like those opposite, who waited 10 years and still could not deliver a coordinated, collaborative response to domestic and family violence. I have heard the members' contributions. We are delivering 10 new domestic violence refuges for women and children right across the state when those opposite failed to invest in even the basic maintenance of those facilities. We have also delivered $40 million to embedded workers in Queensland police stations alongside this expanded legislation. Why is that important? It is important because sometimes when people are seeking help they do not just want a police response; they actually want a social response. This allows that choice by ensuring those resources are there.

We have also expanded the co-responder pilot because we will evaluate it and make sure that it hits the mark. We have also opened three new hope hubs and delivered the North Queensland crisis hotline. Not only have we doubled the capacity of DVConnect's hotline; we have expanded the hotline to North Queensland.

It is a sad day in Queensland's history when the Labor Party cannot support victim-survivors of domestic and family violence. It is an even sadder day when they cannot support the frontline Queensland Police Service who have been dealing with this high demand left by the failure for those opposite to act.

This government will continue to work in the interests of victim-survivors. We have already done that with our Breach Bail, Go to Jail. We will continue to deliver any reform that delivers the electronic monitoring pilot because we are prepared to try new things in an effort to drive down victim numbers when it comes to domestic and family violence. Why? Because women and children in this state deserve it.

Those opposite can sit here late this afternoon, but I hope they proudly say when they go back to their constituencies, when they are receiving calls from women and children—victims of domestic violence—when they are out visiting their local police stations and frontline staff that they voted against giving them the tools, the resources and the frameworks they need to be able to do their job to protect women and children in this state.

I will finish by thanking and acknowledging the hard work of the Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety, and particularly those who work under Deputy Director-General Hope Peisley across policy and legislation. They have worked tirelessly for months on this framework and legislation. I know they have worked very closely also with the Minister for Police's department and the commissioner. I wish Minister Stoker all the success in delivering this and ensuring it is implemented in a way that I know will go a long way towards protecting victim-survivors.

Ms McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (4.30 pm): In preparing this, I thought I would look at my contribution from August last year. To be honest I really could have just repeated that speech because nothing in this bill addresses the concerns that were raised then. What this bill does is lump improvements in addressing repeated offending and enhancing protection for victim-survivors in court proceedings and the expansion of electronic monitoring—all commendable improvements for victim-survivors—with the biggest change in the police response to DFV in 10 years.

I have experience in this area. I was the senior project officer, the senior sergeant at the Domestic, Family Violence and Vulnerable Persons Unit in the QPS, when the *Not now, not ever* recommendations were being implemented under the former Labor government. Despite what we just heard—that Labor did nothing in DV and did not even work with the police in that 10 years—I was there in the DV unit implementing the recommendations that were funded and implemented under the Labor government. I am—

Mr McDonald interjected.

Ms McMAHON: I absolutely understand that complex DV issues cannot be solved by single bullets. I said this in the last one. I was there consulting with the DFV sector with DJAG and our domestic

and family violence coordinators when we drafted the PPNs—the paperwork, the forms and the processes. It was, as some may say, a calm and methodical approach. The protective assessment framework was sector-led by those who are the experts. Remember when this government said they would listen to the experts. This bill expands the PPD framework. We were told that the PPD framework would have safeguards. The sector had concerns about the misidentification of the person most in need of protection. Those opposite waxed lyrical about the safeguards contained in the 2025 bill. The member for Mulgrave stated—

Strict safeguards will be in place. For example, PPDs must not be issued where either party is a child or a police officer ...

He continued—

These exclusions ensure fairness and protect the integrity of the process. Importantly, these measures help prevent misidentification and ensure support goes to the most in need.

What does that member say now about the removal of those safeguards that he so valiantly identified as part of the integrity of the system? The member for Mundingburra also cheered these safeguards. She said—

We have also built-in safeguards. ... there are exclusions where a PPD will not be appropriate.

She then went on to give examples of where PPDs are inappropriate where, in fact, this bill now deems them to be appropriate. What happened? The member for Mundingburra said that these protections are 'strong, balanced and, above all, designed to keep victims safe'—spoken with such conviction, and she has now backflipped. I guess these protections 'designed to keep victims safe' are not as important anymore.

The member for Moggill also spoke in support of the 'clear exclusions'. He said—

For example, PPDs cannot be used if the aggrieved or the respondent is a child, if the matter involves a police officer ...

Oops, that will no longer be the case. The member for Moggill also had the audacity to iterate concern over the impact of responding to domestic and family violence on our police officers. I quote—

There are obviously the impacts that it has on our first responders—our police officers and others—who are called to these incidents.

I hope he expresses the same concern for our first responders when the upcoming IR bill strips them of eligibility for claims for psychological injury.

The member for Southern Downs doubled down. He complained that police officers are spending an inordinate amount of time dealing with domestic and family violence but not face-to-face stuff in detecting to the crime and detecting offences and prosecuting offenders. Wow! Maybe the member thinks domestic and family violence is not real policing, with real offenders needing to be prosecuted. But, wait, there is more. The member criticised experts and advocacy groups for victims disagreeing with PPDs. He goes onto say—

I quite expect that they might because their job is to represent the narrow interests of the particular sector or group that they seek to represent ...

Member, that particular sector or group they seek to represent are victims of domestic and family violence. I will make sure that the sector workers in his area know what his thoughts are on their narrow interests. He then went on to complain about some sort of a vacuous obsession with getting it absolutely right. Do you know what happens when you do not get it right? Misidentification.

Mr McDonald: Ten years of Labor government.

Ms McMAHON: It is all about politics for the member for Lockyer—not about victims. It is about politics and what they can slam here in a speech. There is nothing in this bill about protecting victims. It is all about police efficiency. It is not about protecting victims. We raised it last year and we raise it again, because the safeguards we were told would prevent this have been stripped away. In fact, when I gave my contribution last year and I raised concerns about misidentification, the police minister interjected saying, 'Lucky there are safeguards.' Here we are a year later removing them. Let's be clear: this is more about police efficiency and removing unnecessary admin burden from police than protecting victims.

Those who have contributed to this debate have been at pains to quote the Queensland Police Union of Employees and the QPS on the efficiency of PPDs but failed to quote the victims' advocates concerns about PPDs. I note in her contribution the former minister managed to drop Nadia Bromley from the Women's Legal Service. Let's have a quick look at her submission for those who did not read it. The summary of the positions outlines the four changes. The first is the replacing of the PPNs with

PPDs. In her submission she goes on to say that the Women's Legal Service Queensland supports proposals 1, 2 and 4 in principle. At no point does she say that they support proposal 1—replacing PPNs with PPDs. The former minister avoided that in her contribution.

I expected that they might have done the evaluation that they said they would do. This was meant to be a government based on evidence. It was meant to be listening to the experts. We were meant to get a review, an evaluation of it. Are PPDs effective? Are they at risk of misidentification? We could have had the results to look at and say, 'Actually, these work. We have the evidence to show that it works. Let's expand it.' But no they have not even started or undertaken the evaluation. All of a sudden they say, 'We need to expand it.' This is not an issue of the Queensland Labor Party not trusting police.

Mr McDonald: Yes, it is.

Ms McMAHON: You can read anything into it and verbal me all you like, member for Lockyer, but I am not taking your interjections. I will quote from the one inquiry that no-one has managed to mention in the debate so far and that is the commission of inquiry—the one that the QPS ran. We hear about commissions of inquiry all the time in this place. That commission of inquiry acknowledged that police are dealing with a very complex problem and that it will not be easy to find a solution. Of all the recommendations from this commission of inquiry, which was specifically about police responses to domestic and family violence—and I said it in my speech last year—not one of those recommendations suggested PPDs or anything similar. In fact, it involved greater safeguards. We are very simply calling for a police integrity unit. So many of the submitters, those who work in the field, those who just want to see the right outcome, want to see a police integrity unit. All we are asking for is a police integrity unit. Police have nothing to hide.

Mrs YOUNG (Redlands—LNP) (4.40 pm): Every Queenslander deserves to feel safe in their own home. For most of us, home is where we feel most secure, it is where we raise our children, spend time with our family and escape the pressures of everyday life, but for far too many Queenslanders, home is the very place they fear the most. Domestic and family violence does not discriminate by postcode, income or background. It happens in communities right across Queensland, including my own electorate of Redlands. Behind closed doors there are people living in fear of their partners, children witnessing violence no child should ever have to see and families trying to find the courage to escape dangerous situations. As a mother myself, I think about the environment we want our children to grow up in. We teach them about respect, kindness and treating others with dignity. We want them to understand that healthy relationships are built on trust and not fear or control. As lawmakers we also have a responsibility to ensure when those values are violated, the law protects people. A protection order should mean protection. When someone repeatedly ignores that order there must be consequences. That is why I support the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026.

The legislation is another important step in the Crisafulli government's commitment to putting victims first, holding perpetrators to account and restoring safety where Queenslanders live. One of the most significant reforms is making police protection directions the primary police response to domestic and family violence. When someone calls police because they fear for their safety, time matters. They should not be left waiting unnecessarily for protection or navigating a complicated system during one of the most frightening moments of their life. Under these reforms, police will have greater powers to issue protection directions immediately, with their duration increasing from 12 months to three years. The conditions available to police will also be expanded, providing more comprehensive protection for victim-survivors. Importantly, the bill retains a pathway to the court where judicial oversight is required, including matters involving Family Law and child protection orders. These reforms recognise the realities of domestic and family violence and the demand placed on frontline police.

In Redlands our police serve a geographically diverse community, from our mainland suburbs to the Southern Moreton Bay Islands. Our officers respond to incidents, protect families and support vulnerable people across communities with very different needs. Every hour spent navigating unnecessary administrative processes is an hour that could be otherwise spent protecting another Queenslander. During the committee process Queensland Police Deputy Commissioner Cheryl Scanlon highlighted that police had been asking for more immediate protection mechanisms as far back as 2015. That is more than a decade of frontline officers asking for better tools to do their jobs. Our government is listening and we are acting.

Another important reform is the introduction of stronger penalties for repeated breaches of domestic violence orders and police protection directions because repeated breaches are not simply isolated incidents, they can be part of an escalating pattern of intimidation, coercion and control. A

perpetrator who repeatedly ignores a protection order demonstrates a complete disregard for both the law and the safety of the person that it is intended to protect. This bill creates a new offence for repeated contraventions and increases the maximum penalty for breaching police protection directions to three years imprisonment or five years in aggravated circumstances. It also aligns penalties for breaching police protection directions with those applying to domestic violence orders. Consistency matters because from a victim's perspective the fear and danger associated with a breach does not change depending on whether protection was issued by a police officer or a court. An order repeatedly ignored without meaningful consequences risks becoming little more than a piece of paper. Victims deserve better. They deserve confidence that when the law says they are protected that protection will be taken seriously.

Another important aspect of this bill is the additional protection it provides victim-survivors during court proceedings. For someone experiencing domestic and family violence, coming forward takes enormous courage. I want to acknowledge my colleagues, the member for Redcliffe and the member for Rockhampton, for bravely sharing their personal experiences here in the House during this debate. It is very brave of them to add weight to what we are talking about here during this debate. Reporting abuse, speaking with police and participating in legal proceedings can be very traumatic and confronting. The last thing we should allow is for that process to become another opportunity for a perpetrator to intimidate or control a victim-survivor. This bill strengthens protections around direct cross-examination and access to sensitive information during domestic and family violence proceedings. Abuse does not always end when a relationship ends. Sometimes the legal process itself becomes another means of exercising control. Our justice system must never become another weapon in the hands of someone using violence. The bill also expands the electronic monitoring pilot statewide and requires courts to consider electronic monitoring conditions in particular circumstances. Electronic monitoring is not a substitute for strong policing or specialist support services, but it provides yet another tool to strengthen accountability and respond to risk.

As the member for Redlands, I know the strength of our community. We have dedicated police officers, health professionals, community organisations and volunteers who work every day to support Redlands families, but I also know domestic and family violence can happen in any street, any suburb and to any family. It can affect the young mother trying to protect her children, an older Queenslander experiencing abuse or children carrying the trauma of what they have witnessed. In communities like our Southern Moreton Bay Islands, geography and transport can create additional challenges in accessing services. That makes timely police responses, accessible support and coordination between services even more important. We cannot expect people experiencing violence to navigate unnecessary barriers just to reach safety.

Our responsibility does not end when a protection direction is issued. That is why the Crisafulli government's broader investment in domestic and family violence responses matters. Our government has increased domestic and family violence funding by 45 per cent compared with the former Labor government's final budget. We are delivering $40 million for embedded workers in police stations and expanding the co-responder pilot. Importantly, the DVConnect call-answer rate has improved from 41.9 per cent under Labor to 84 per cent under the Crisafulli government. That means more Queenslanders getting through when they reach out for help. When someone finally has the courage to pick up a phone we need someone to answer them.

Domestic and family violence is far too serious for political pointscoring, but governments must be accountable for their decisions and the results. Over the former Labor government's decade in office, domestic and family violence offences increased by 218 per cent. For too long frontline police and the sector called for stronger and more immediate protection mechanisms. Our government is taking a different approach: we are listening to police, listening to the sector and putting victim-survivors at the centre of these reforms. Of course legislation alone will not eliminate domestic and family violence. It requires education, prevention, early intervention, strong community leadership, properly supported services and stronger laws, because that matters. They provide practical tools to protect people and make clear that violence, intimidation and repeated disregard for protection orders will not be tolerated.

I want the children growing up in the Redlands today to inherit a Queensland where respect is expected, violence is never excused and victims know the law is on their side; where asking for help means they are being heard; where needing protection means action can be taken; and where repeatedly disregarding the law has consequences because safety in your own home should never be a privilege but should be something that every Queenslander can count on. This bill delivers faster protection, stronger accountability and a justice system that puts victims first.

Mr J KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.50 pm): On Saturday night, I went to a fantastic art show at the Kaye West Studios in Camp Hill. I thank Kaye for supporting that show, which was put on by artist Carissa George. Carissa is a registered nurse who has experienced domestic violence. She survived and uses her artistic talents to raise money for organisations that support people impacted by domestic violence. She also uses her artistic talents to help women rebuild their confidence. The show was called *Autonomy*. It raised money for the Lovewell Foundation, an organisation that supports women who are rebuilding their lives. Kaye's studio is only a few doors down from the Zig Zag Young Women's Resource Centre, an organisation that supports young women impacted by sexual or domestic violence. Carissa works with Zig Zag and also with BeyondDV, assisting with resilience and recovery programs. The event was held not far from the location of the murder of Hannah Clarke and her children. I acknowledge Sue and Lloyd Clarke and the Small Steps 4 Hannah foundation for the work they have done to get laws in place to deal with coercive control and to raise money to support so many other domestic violence organisations. It was really great to see them at Whites Hill State College last Tuesday night, helping to give out an award named after their daughter Hannah, who was a captain of that school.

The good people at Lovewell, Zig Zag, BeyondDV and Small Steps 4 Hannah work hard to prevent domestic and sexual violence, and to help women rebuild their lives after they have been impacted by domestic and sexual violence. They give selflessly so that we can live in a community free of domestic violence and a community where victim-survivors are supported to rebuild their lives. We owe it to those organisations to work hard in this parliament to get right these laws and any laws aimed at preventing domestic and sexual violence.

About a year ago, we introduced police protection directions and now we are back to fix the mess made by the botched rollout of those laws. The Crisafulli government claims they listen to the people of Queensland so I am at a loss as to why, when the sector says those laws should be subject to an independent review, they have ignored that. If that was done, we could learn from these powers and the police might be able to more effectively use them to help victims of domestic violence. I acknowledge the police who are on the front line of dealing with domestic violence.

I have been at the Holland Park courthouse on days when domestic violence hearings are held. The staff there do a fantastic job supporting the victims of DV, as does the Women's Legal Service. However, this happens long after the damage has been done and often after the damage has been repeated. When I have spoken to officers and people in my community about these laws, they believe that giving police the capacity to issue orders to protect victims quickly is a good thing. However, if stakeholders are calling for a review before moving forward and if the CCC and the Victims' Commissioner express concerns, don't you think a government that listened—supposedly—would do just that and listen?

When I was elected in 2015, the *Not now, not ever* report was released and it started a process that I thought was bipartisan. After the report's release, there were some more tragic murders. My community came together to hold a vigil for the victims of domestic violence. I worked with Terri Butler, the then federal member for Griffith, to organise that vigil. We invited the LNP councillors and the former LNP member for Greenslopes, Ian Kaye, to participate and I am pleased that they did. Ian did great work as part of the taskforce that produced the *Not now, not ever* report. It was a pleasure to have his involvement and he will always have my respect for being involved in that taskforce. It is a shame that that spirit of bipartisanship does not seem to continue now.

I think the amendment put forward by the member for Waterford should have been supported by the parliament. The reason we need to get a police integrity unit in place is best summed up by the General President of the Queensland Police Union when he described these powers as, in essence, frontline constables being asked to discharge quasi-judicial functions on a dark suburban driveway amidst conflicting accounts and extreme time pressures. I know police officers want to do the right thing and often acknowledge the very suboptimal situations in which they have to execute these powers. It seems a no-brainer that we would want to have mechanisms for reviewing decisions made in difficult situations without the benefit of time, information or a calm environment in which to make those decisions.

On Saturday night, Carissa was raising money for the Lovewell Foundation because you need money to run services. Whenever I visit organisations that support people impacted by DV, whether they are in the prevention, emergency response or recovery field, they always discuss resourcing. Yesterday, I heard the police minister and other LNP members calling out Labor members for misleading the parliament about resourcing for the DV sector. If those members are so certain that what Labor members are saying is false, I wonder if they will be writing to the Speaker about that.

What I am certain about is the number of people who work in the sector and tell me about the impacts that funding cuts are having on their ability to support people impacted by domestic violence. The government can pass any laws it likes to try to stop DV, but if the resources are not there to back up the police, the DV services, the courthouses, the volunteers and, most importantly, the victims of DV then the laws really amount to nought. Perhaps the police minister believes his own rhetoric about the decrease in DV in our community. I would desperately like for that to be true but, sadly, the evidence does not back up his statements.

If the police minister and the Crisafulli LNP government are honest about the problem in our community, if the government listened to the sector, the CCC and the Victims' Commissioner about the need for a review of the existing powers, if the government listened to the sector and allocated appropriate resources to tackle DV and if the government acted in a truly bipartisan manner and worked with the member for Waterford to improve the bill—if all of that happened—we might have laws that are truly effective in preventing domestic violence. The Queensland Labor opposition will support reforms that provide frontline police with better supports and systems so that they can better protect victim-survivors and keep the community safe—if all of those things were in place.

I really hope these laws work and that the police have more tools at their disposal to assist the victims that they respond to. Like all Labor members of the House, the sector and the police, I would much rather we were operating on more than just hope. We should not run this parliament based on hope. We have enormous capacity and resources at our disposal. We could be reviewing these powers and we could be getting this right, but the parliament has made a decision not to do that, which makes it extremely difficult to support these laws. We owe it to people like Carissa, all the victim-survivors, all those who dedicate their lives to preventing DV and all those who support victims on their recovery journey to get this right.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lee): I call the member for Gregory.

Mr DILLON (Gregory—LNP) (4.57 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I welcome your first stint in the chair. Thank you very much for your acknowledgement.

This is one of the most serious issues facing our time. I feel no small amount of honour to stand in this place and speak to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. In the few short moments that I will have to give my contribution, I want to talk about two things: leadership and the need for legislators to, at times, take ownership, step forward and provide solutions. We have heard all manner of complaints from those opposite who do not trust our police to do this and are worried about misidentification. Who do they trust? At this time, as we talk about taking leadership and ownership as legislators, do we trust the people on this side where our ranks are filled with police officers and, unfortunately, victims or do we trust those who backed the CFMEU and Michael Ravbar? Who has their radar right? Where in this community of 93 legislators do Queenslanders place their trust when it comes to looking after women, children and men—but particularly women and children and, in my case, the women and children of regional Queensland where the tyranny of distance is so great?

The distance that people live from a police station is not something that any amount of resourcing of police or any amount of skills will ever fix. Women and children who live hundreds of kilometres away have neighbours or acquaintances walking police through a house to a locked bedroom or a barricaded door because the perpetrator who is lurking outside has put them into a state of fear. Who do we trust? We trust this side. We have heard from all manner of people throughout both the inquiry and in the time this debate has been extended over the last three days. We have heard that misidentification is not the issue that those on the opposite side are trying to make it out to be. We heard from Nadia Bromley who has stated, 'We do have experience with significant misidentification in relation to PPDs.' We could not be clearer—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lee): Member for Gregory, I ask you to take your seat. Under the provisions of the order agreed by the House, I call the minister in reply to the second reading debate.

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) (5.00 pm), in reply: I wish to begin my contribution in reply to this debate by acknowledging and thanking the contributions of survivors, stakeholders and parliamentarians throughout the course of the debate. In particular, I acknowledge and honour the member for Redcliffe for her powerful contribution last night. What an incredible woman the people of Redcliffe have representing them, channelling the worst of experiences to drive real change in her community and for the safety of women everywhere. What an incredible role

model you are, and I thank you. I could say something similar about the member for Rockhampton's contribution.

This bill delivers on the Crisafulli government's commitment to put victims first, to hold perpetrators to account and to give police the tools they need to do their important job in protecting our community from domestic and family violence. There is no doubt that domestic and family violence is a complex problem that we need to be tackling from many angles and that we need to use many different levers to get it done. We all need to play our part. The Crisafulli government is playing its part. We did it in the bill to introduce police protection directions around about 12 months ago, in which we deliberately and carefully tackled the red tape that frontline police officers said was keeping them from answering enough of the calls from victims for help. We did it by introducing the Electronic Monitoring Pilot for high-risk and repeat offenders, and back then this government made a commitment to keep listening, to keep working and to keep reforming until the safety Queenslanders deserve is delivered. The safety of victims everywhere, but particularly victims of domestic and family violence, is central to the commitment of the Crisafulli LNP government. That is why we are delivering this tranche of reforms.

This legislation delivers just one part of many in the Crisafulli government's commitment to restore safety for all Queenslanders wherever they live. It introduces reforms to the police protection direction framework, making it the primary response to domestic and family violence. It expands the timeframe of the protection it offers and it further cuts the red tape that police face by repealing the police protection notice framework. It listens to police calls for greater simplicity so that laws are applied properly and efficiently with consistency right across the state. That consistency is good for everyone. What that means in practical terms is that more victims will have their call to the police answered in their hour of need and have it answered properly. It means more police at more doors, rather than preparing for endless court proceedings or doing excessive paperwork at their desks. It empowers police to do what they do best, and, as was explained in the committee process, the Queensland Police Service have invested seriously in training to ensure these directions are properly used.

I might mention at this juncture the claim that has been raised by those opposite to suggest that there is a corruption risk associated with the narrow category of cases where a police officer themselves is accused of domestic and family violence. It goes without saying that such a situation is a very serious one. Domestic and family violence is not acceptable for a police officer and it is not acceptable for anyone. But there are a few observations to make about that claim.

The first is to say that this discrete risk has been contemplated and addressed by the Queensland Police Service in its supervision and governance arrangements that it has already put in place. Before the committee, Deputy Commissioner Scanlon made this really plain, outlining the reporting and supervision arrangements for officers in this situation, their oversight by Ethical Standards Command and their further oversight by the Crime and Corruption Commission. In the committee's report, there is clear recognition of the depth of commitment from the Queensland Police Service to domestic and family violence training and capability. It is described in the report as—

> ... at every stage of an officer's career, from recruit training through the early years of service and into ongoing professional development. Recruit training includes approximately 133 hours of DFV related learning and assessment, covering victim-centred and trauma-informed response, coercive control, risk assessment, investigations and practical scenario-based learning. First year Constables undertake further dedicated DFV training and workplace assessments, while service officers continue to receive compulsory, specialist and leadership training

in domestic and family violence. The purpose is, to again quote from the report, to—

> ... embed DFV capability throughout an officer's career, supporting effective prevention, response and investigation while reinforcing victim safety and offender accountability.

Of course, with that oversight and with that training, we have accelerated the impact by adding over 2,000 more officers to the Queensland Police Service.

It was disappointing to hear from the member for Waterford and a number of those opposite comments that suggest they are not aware of these training requirements because every time they stand up here and say that the police cannot be trusted to do this important work, they undermine the capabilities of police, and every time they do it, we remind them of the investment they are making in that capability.

I move to talk about court oversight because a number of Labor's members have, one by one, argued that there is a lack of appropriate court oversight for police protection notices—

Ms McMillan: Well, there is.

Mrs STOKER: The amendments and existing legislation maintain provisions and safeguards to ensure there is appropriate judicial oversight. I might outline some of that because it sounds as though some of those opposite continue to be unable to see it. This legislation will require that police consider whether a matter should proceed for court consideration. It is something they have to turn their mind to in the course of executing their duties. Officers will be required to seek any views or wishes of the aggrieved to inform that decision. Additional to this, section 100ZA remains available to all parties to request the court review process, ensuring court oversight is maintained. Importantly, police protection notices ensure victims are afforded immediate protective measures without the need for court involvement.

In committee, the member for Mansfield expressed concern about police response times and, of course, that is an appropriate thing about which to be concerned. It is vital—

Ms McMILLAN: It absolutely is.

Mrs STOKER: I agree with you, member for Mansfield, it absolutely is important. It is vital that we have as many calls for help answered by police as soon as it is possible to do so. But then in this chamber, Labor, through a number of their members, tell us they will not support this bill, a bill that is at its very core a measure to get more police to the door of those who need it faster, to get protection in place faster.

It is not a position that is congruent. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot say you want faster, more effective responses while you stand in the way of reform to streamline and speed responses. You cannot say you support urgent action to keep people at risk of domestic and family violence safe while in almost the same breath you seek to delay this bill with an amendment to make it conditional on the delivery of a recommendation of a Premier Palaszczuk-era inquiry—one, I might add, that those opposite failed to action during the Palaszczuk government and that they failed to implement also under the Miles government. For 22 months it sat in their hands and now suddenly they feel the urgency.

Progress on the safety of women, children or anybody facing domestic and family violence should not now be held hostage by the failure of past Labor governments to implement their own policy. Labor have said that they will vote against this bill whilst simultaneously claiming that they want urgent action to keep people safe from domestic and family violence. That is a position that cannot be reconciled. It is a position that does not stack up.

Several of the contributions from those opposite claimed that they believed the bill failed to address the risk of misidentification of the victim of domestic and family violence. Misidentification of a victim is an important risk about which to be alive. Those opposite, though, seem not to have engaged with the substantial work this bill does to guard against misidentification, preferring to peddle fear over serious engagement with the tools that are in this bill that exist to ensure the right person is offered protection by police and the right person is held accountable as perpetrator.

This bill purposefully introduces safeguards for complex matters involving a police protection direction to take account of the risk of misidentification and protect against injustice of this kind arising—like cross-PPDs for situations of conflicting and contested allegations, like an exception to the requirement that a PPD must be issued after an arrest to allow the police officer to waive this requirement if they identify the person in custody is the person most in need of protection in a relevant relationship. Very importantly, when a woman is named as a respondent in a PPD, it automatically triggers a gender-centred review for oversight, normally within 24 hours. This is delivered by district domestic and family violence specialists who provide—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Minister, hold it there. There is too much cross-chamber discussion. I am having difficulty hearing the minister. Keep quiet or take your conversations outside, please.

Mrs STOKER: These district domestic and family violence specialists provide specialised quality assurance and operational support to make sure the right calls are being made on this important issue. In the event that there are deficiencies identified, there are mechanisms in the bill for it to be corrected.

At best, the opposition's narrative on misidentification denies the incredible progress that police training and capability has made in understanding the power dynamics and the behavioural presentations of victims and perpetrators. It ignores the feedback from submitters to the committee about what they are seeing on the ground. Let me give the House an example. The contribution of Nadia Bromley from the Women's Legal Service before the committee is a great example because of the depth of her frontline experience. Ms Bromley noted that she has not observed any significant

misidentification issues arising from the police protection directions. It is also important to recognise that the protocols in place within the Police Service are there to prevent misidentification. The Victims' Commissioner noted before the committee—

> I have heard that the gendered review process is working well in some parts of Queensland. I have heard members of the sector say that they feel it has been working well to address those issues.

A measure of how seriously the government takes the issue of misidentification risk is that we have commissioned ANROWS to deliver a states-first study into misidentification. It has been interesting, colleagues, to hear Labor now say that they do not want this bill implemented until the research is delivered. If domestic and family violence is the urgent and serious issue that I think we should all agree it is, we must be prepared to walk and chew gum—reform and keep at the cutting edge of the best available research as it emerges. We can do both. That research, that information, will only be emerging because of the action taken by this government.

Whilst we are acting now, we are also ensuring the appropriate reviews are carried out simultaneously. We are providing the opportunity for those who do the research to provide advice on opportunities to improve without letting it be a reason to do nothing at all. Let's be real: Labor had 10 years to do that research. If it is as important as they now say it is—and it is important—why did they not do anything? They cannot now claim that the absence of the results of the study is a justification not to act. We can do good work now and we can do more good work when we have that research.

The member for Waterford contributed much on this issue. I say through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the member for Waterford served as minister for 1,652 days across two terms and did not commission this research. She did not cut the red tape. She did not get more police to doors or implement safeguards again misidentification. Do you know what? The Crisafulli government is doing the work. We are implementing the safeguards and protecting the victims who were not protected before. Issues such as misidentification are addressed by this bill. The topics should not be used as a reason now to block or prevent further reform. On the contrary, they should motivate us all to prioritise delivering the safeguards in this bill.

We have also heard the opposition claim that meaningful reform should be delayed by the need for yet another review, yet another inquiry. I will be plain: the answer is no. We can and must act now to help police keep the vulnerable safe in their hour of need.

I will move to consider some of the other matters that are delivered by this bill. It introduces new offences for the repeated contravention of a domestic violence order or a police protection direction. It is delivering tougher penalties for those perpetrators displaying a pattern of repeated violent behaviour. Consequences for actions are key to changing behaviour. When coupled with social support, early intervention and perpetrator prevention programs, stronger penalties deliver on our government's commitment to safety where Queenslanders live—wherever they live.

The bill also protects victims through the civil court process by implementing a framework for how sensitive materials are to be viewed, obtained or copied during and after civil proceedings. This ensures a self-representing person using violence does not use court materials to further systems of abuse.

Finally, it expands the electronic monitoring device pilot statewide, protecting victims and holding perpetrators to account. The bill requires that magistrates give consideration to implementing a monitoring device condition on a non-standard domestic violence order, and it will require magistrates to provide reasoning if they decide not to implement one.

Another important element that seems not to have cropped up much in the course of debate is the requirement that there be a statutory review of this bill as soon as practicable within one year of commencement. That makes good on our commitment to deliver the reforms we need now whilst continuing to be open to evaluation and improvement, because that is what good policy does.

I think it is appropriate now that I address yet another scare campaign that Labor has sought to spread through this debate about domestic and family violence funding. That narrative ignores the reality of current funding levels, which, when you look at the details, are 45 per cent higher under our government compared to the final budget of the former Miles Labor government. There has been no reduction in funding to our front line, despite what those opposite have said.

That funding increase is making a difference. It is delivering: an extension to the co-responder pilot; $40 million for embedded domestic and family violence workers in police stations—and I know that they are highly valued; $10 million to embed specialist and women's health specialists; three new Hope Hubs; a doubling of the capacity of Womensline; a new North Queensland 24/7 crisis support

service; 10 new or replaced domestic and family violence shelters; an independent domestic and family violence peak body; and—

Ms McMillan interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mansfield, the minister is not taking your interjections.

Mrs STOKER: The Crisafulli government has also improved the DVConnect call answer rate. It is now at 84 per cent, which is more than double what it was under the previous government. When Labor say that legislative reform is not the only way to address this issue, I will be candid: they are right. Do you know what? They failed at both avenues. They failed to deliver the funding and they are failing to back the legislative reform that is required. Instead, Labor have taken this debate as an opportunity to play games and run scare campaigns. It does not do the subject justice.

This is a bill that reflects the commitment of this government to keep pulling every available lever until we deliver a safer community, to keep being guided by those working on the front line, hearing their feedback and adopting a stance of continual improvement. That has always been what drives better outcomes in our community, whether that is for a business, an individual, a community organisation or for a government. Gathering the best evidence and using it to drive improvement will always be a value of this government.

In contrast, we have had an interesting mix from those opposite of demands for urgent action, demands to pause reform pending more reports, demands to wait for research, as though learning and research has a final destination rather than being an ongoing thing, and demands to shelve it until we do policy work around a police integrity unit that those opposite never got around to doing in the decade they were in power, all while attempting to shift accountability for their record. It simply does not wash. In the few seconds I have left I am going to draw from the contribution of the member for Ferny Grove. His last line was, 'It is time to act.' It is time for all of us to act and support this bill.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 49:

LNP, 49—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, 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, 33:

ALP, 32—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Pairs: Mickelberg, Scanlon; Perrett, de Brenni

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Ms FENTIMAN (5.26 pm): I rise to speak to clause 2 of the bill and seek some clarification from the minister following the debate that occurred this week. Clause 2 sets out the commencement of the bill as a date to be fixed by proclamation. Yesterday I moved a reasoned amendment to the second reading seeking to delay the passage of the bill until such time as the government had implemented a police integrity unit.

I have two questions for the minister: on what date will the proclamation be decided or made; and when that proclamation occurs will the minister commit to victim-survivors that the government will immediately proceed with the implementation of the police integrity unit to help protect against domestic violence committed by and against police officers?

Clause 2, as read, agreed to.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mrs STOKER (2.57 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mrs STOKER: I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 After clause 4

Page 9, after line 2—

insert—

4A Amendment of s 26 (When can a court make a protection order)

Section 26(b)—

omit, *insert—*

(b) the court is hearing a proceeding for, or convicts a person of, a domestic violence offence; or

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Amanda Stoker's amendments.

Tabled paper: Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Amanda Stoker's amendments.

Ms McMILLAN: I rise to speak to amendment No. 1 moved by the minister and note it inserts a new section 26(b). I have perused the explanatory notes and they provides a general reasoning for the insertion of the new section, so my question seeks a simple clarification. Can the minister advise the House why this amendment was not included in the original bill as introduced by acting Minister Leahy?

Mrs STOKER: I will provide some information in relation to the amendments. I think they will be helpful in assisting the member for Mansfield with the question she has asked. These amendments make pretty minor and technical corrections, consequential amendments and editorial refinements to the bill. Importantly, they do not alter, expand or change any of the substantive policy outcomes that it delivers.

The Crisafulli government's commitment to supporting victims, holding perpetrators to account and giving police the tools they need remains exactly the same. Rather, these amendments are intended to improve the clarity, accuracy and operation of the legislation to ensure consistency across the statute book and to support the effective implementation of the reforms that have been delivered through this bill. Members will appreciate that, when significant legislative reforms are progressed, particularly when there is a complex area of law such as domestic and family violence—and, indeed, one that is as important as this one—it is prudent to ensure that all those interconnected provisions continue to operate—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I hate to interrupt you, but it is now 5.30 pm. Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate.

Question put—That the minister's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the minister's amendments Nos 6 and 11 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 2 to 25, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

2 Clause 10 (Amendment of s 66D (Request for information))

Page 13, lines 2 and 3, 'to be fitted with the monitoring device'—

omit.

3 Clause 26 (Amendment of s 100Q (Explanation))

Page 28, after line 15—

insert—

(2A) Section 100Q(3)(g), 'the police commissioner under subdivision 4 or'—

omit.

4 Clause 27 (Insertion of new ss 100QA—100QC)

Page 32, lines 24 to 26, from 'under section 177' to 'ends'—

omit, *insert*—

in relation to the respondent and the aggrieved, the police protection direction ends at the time section 177 applies in relation to the respondent for the order

5 Clause 28 (Amendment of s 100R (Duration))

Page 34, after line 4—

insert—

(8A) Section 100R(4), 'Subsection (3)(e)'—

omit, *insert*—

Subsection (3)(d)

(8B) Section 100R(4), after 'under'—

insert—

section 100QC or

6 After clause 31

Page 36, after line 24—

insert—

31A Amendment of s 100ZC (Effect of application)

Section 100ZC(2) and (3)—

omit.

7 Clause 43 (Insertion of new s 160AA)

Page 45, line 20, after 'examined'—

insert—

only

8 Clause 44 (Amendment of s 161A (Accredited media entity may apply for copy of transcript of proceeding for application))

Page 46, line 16, 'Section 161(1A)'—

omit, *insert*—

Section 161A(1A)

9 Clause 44 (Amendment of s 161A (Accredited media entity may apply for copy of transcript of proceeding for application))

Page 46, line 17, 'section 161(2)'—

omit, *insert*—

section 161A(2)

10 Clause 51 (Amendment of s 189 (Evidentiary provision))

Page 51, after line 7—

insert—

(1A) Section 189(3)(b) 'or 102'—

omit.

11 After clause 51

Page 51, after line 9—

insert—

51A Amendment of s 189C (Police protection directions register)

(1) Section 189C(2)(e)—

omit.

(2) Section 189C(2)(f)—

renumber as section 189C(2)(e).

12 Clause 54 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 55, line 23, 'named person,'—

omit.

13 Clause 54 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 56, after line 4—

insert—

(3A) Schedule, definition *named person*, paragraph (c)—

omit.

14 Clause 73 (Amendment of s 25A (Immediate suspension in particular circumstances))

Page 63, line 16, before 'Section'—

insert—

(1)

15 Clause 73 (Amendment of s 25A (Immediate suspension in particular circumstances))

Page 63, after line 21—

insert—

(2) Section 25A(2)(b)—

omit.

(3) Section 25A(2)(c), 'police protection notice until the order or notice'—

omit, *insert*—

interstate police domestic violence order until the order

(4) Section 25A(2)(c)—

renumber as section 25A(2)(b).

16 Clause 84 (Insertion of new ch 24, pt 31)

Page 68, line 23, '208(2)'—

omit, *insert*—

209(2)

17 Clause 93 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 11)

Page 71, line 9, 'div 11 '—

omit, *insert*—

div 12

18 Clause 93 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 11)

Page 71, line 12, 'Division 11'—

omit, *insert*—

Division 12

19 Clause 93 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 11)

Page 71, line 17, '208'—

omit, *insert*—

209

20 Clause 93 (Insertion of new pt 8, div 11)

Page 71, line 23, '28A,'—

omit.

21 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 74, lines 9 to 11—

omit, *insert*—

3 Section 12H(3)(c), from 'or (iii)' to 'release conditions'—

omit, *insert*—

applies—be accompanied by a copy of the domestic violence order, police protection direction or interstate police domestic violence order

22 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 74, lines 12 to 18—

omit.

23 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 81, line 4, before '178, 179'—

insert—

177A,

24 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 81, line 6, after '177AA,'—

insert—

177A,

25 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)

Page 82, line 20, after 'conditions'—

insert—

, first mention

Question put—That clauses 5 to 96 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 5 to 96 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 49:

LNP, 49—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, 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, 33:

ALP, 32—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Pairs: Mickelberg, Scanlon; Perrett, de Brenni.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Petition Responses and Answers to Questions on Notice, Due Dates

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, due to the Christmas shutdown period, in accordance with standing order 7, responses to petitions tabled on Thursday, 19 November 2026 under standing order 125 and answers to questions on notice asked on Thursday, 19 November 2026 under standing order 114 are due on Monday, 4 January 2027. The *Notice Paper* and the questions on notice and petitions databases reflect this due date and the Table Office will advise relevant departmental officers.

LEGAL PROFESSION (STRENGTHENING DISCIPLINARY MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 12 May (see p. 1249).

Second Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (5.37 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Queenslanders expect allegations of professional misconduct against lawyers to be dealt with promptly and fairly. When cases sit unresolved for years, confidence suffers—the public confidence in the justice system, and the welfare of practitioners who are the subject of disciplinary matters. There are no winners when allegations fester. Complainants, lawyers, courts and the wider community all deserve a timely outcome.

Yet the Crisafulli government inherited exactly the opposite from Labor: a system stymied by delays, with the average legal disciplinary matter taking 93 weeks to finalise at the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, QCAT—almost two years. Those opposite knew there were growing problems at QCAT but failed to act. When we came to government, the statutory review of QCAT was overdue and had not been progressed. Labor kicked the can down the road and the cases continued to mount—93 weeks in purgatory for complainants seeking answers and lawyers trying to clear their names.

The Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026 is fixing this unsustainable Labor legacy by ensuring disciplinary matters are dealt with faster and by the right court. That court is the Supreme Court of Queensland. The Supreme Court is the natural home for serious questions about professional ethics and standards. These matters concern officers of the court, professional responsibility and public confidence in the administration of justice. Equally, QCAT has an important job to do. Queenslanders rely on the tribunal to resolve everyday disputes and claims involving communities, tenancies, guardianship and consumers. Legal practitioner matters carry a significant judicial and registry load. Every Queenslander stands to benefit when those resources are freed up, allowing QCAT to focus on its broader workload.

I will now touch on some important background to the bill. Unlike those opposite, soon after coming to office the Crisafulli government commissioned a statutory review of the QCAT Act conducted by the Hon. David Thomas. I had requested that consideration of QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction be prioritised and delivered ahead of the broader review, resulting in the preliminary *QCAT Act statutory review 2025-26: legal practitioner jurisdiction report*. Indeed, the preliminary report found the legal practitioner jurisdiction was straining the resources of QCAT, particularly the availability of judicial members. It made 23 recommendations and this bill gives effect to each of them by transferring the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court; transferring other related matters involving the right to practise as a lawyer or claims on the fidelity fund from QCAT to the Supreme Court; retaining the Legal Practice Committee's jurisdiction to hear claims of unsatisfactory professional misconduct; clarifying how decisions of the Supreme Court for the legal practitioner jurisdiction can be appealed to the Court of Appeal; and retaining QCAT's jurisdiction to review a decision by the Queensland Law Society to disqualify a person as an external examiner and hear applications to set aside costs agreements under the Legal Profession Act.

I would like to extend my thanks to the Hon. Mr Thomas for his thorough report, including his team who helped him, on the legal practitioner jurisdiction and for his extensive work on the full review, which the government is now considering. On 12 May 2026 the bill was introduced into the House and referred to the very hardworking Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee for consideration. I want to thank the member for Nicklin, the member for Thuringowa and the member for Capalaba and the members of the Labor opposition who contributed to this committee report. I thank all committee members for their thorough consideration. I would also like to thank the stakeholders who made submissions, in particular the Queensland Law Society and the Australian Lawyers Alliance, which have provided strong support for this reform.

I will now turn to the bill in more detail. Legal professionals—solicitors and barristers—must meet professional standards and obligations. Failure to do so can result in complaints and disciplinary action. More serious failures may also lead to criminal prosecution. A disciplinary regime promotes the administration of justice in Queensland and protects the public. It also safeguards the reputation of the legal profession and deters misconduct. Queenslanders deserve confidence that lawyers are held to the highest standards. QCAT currently has original jurisdiction to hear and determine a disciplinary proceeding application brought by the Legal Services Commissioner for an order against an Australian legal practitioner. QCAT also currently has power to conduct a merits review of a decision made by the Legal Practice Committee, which hears and decides less serious matters involving unsatisfactory professional conduct against legal practitioners that will not result in the legal practitioner being 'struck off' or suspended from practice, as well as 'conduct complaints' against law practice employees.

QCAT also currently hears a range of other related matters which affect the ability of a person to operate as a legal practitioner in Queensland. Most of these concern decisions of the Queensland Law Society, Bar Association of Queensland or Legal Practitioners Admissions Board about the issue,

renewal or cancellation of a practising certificate. While they are not disciplinary matters, they are similar because they ultimately involve a consideration of whether a person is a fit-and-proper person to provide legal services in Queensland. QCAT currently has the power to conduct a merits review of these decisions and has original jurisdiction to make some declarations or orders. It is so vitally important that we protect the reputation of legal practitioners in the state because there are so many people now purporting to be a legal practitioner online and using fake services for, for example, conveyancing. It is a real scam and it is an issue that is affecting the industry across the board.

The amendments in the bill will alleviate QCAT of the burden of the legal practitioner jurisdiction, as I said, by transferring it to the Supreme Court. Proceedings in the Supreme Court will generally be conducted in the same manner as they have been at QCAT. However, the bill does not specify all procedural matters which will give flexibility to deal with certain matters through court rules, as the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 and the Uniform Civil Procedure (Fees) Regulation 2019 will apply to proceedings, subject to relevant provisions in the Legal Profession Act. I note that some concerns were raised in submissions to the committee about the appropriateness of applying existing Supreme Court rules to the legal practitioner jurisdiction.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lee): Members, there is too much discussion on the right side of the chamber. I am trying to listen to the Attorney-General's speech. I ask you to take your discussions outside, please.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, because it is riveting stuff.

Ms Grace: They're your side, your people.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I know; thank you, member for McConnel. I am actually telling my side that it is riveting, because I did note the level of conversation. However, I take this opportunity to remind the House that new section 581PA of the bill provides that, when hearing these appeals or matters, the court is not bound by the rules of evidence and the court can inform itself in any way it considers appropriate and act with as little formality and technicality as possible. This preserves the historical QCAT approach to these proceedings.

Following the passage of the bill, if this House agrees, the Department of Justice, in consultation with the Rules Committee, will consider whether amendments to court rules or fees are required in relation to the jurisdiction before the changes commence. The bill will continue to require that both a legal professional member and a layperson member be appointed from a panel to assist the Supreme Court to decide disciplinary applications. The bill also provides that the court may only continue in the absence of a panel member if it is in the interests of justice and not continuing would cause undue delay or costs. This ensures fairness, maintains the integrity of the process and preserves the benefits of including panel members in the proceeding.

To encourage participation by the profession, the legal professional panel member will be entitled to remuneration in addition to lay panel members, who are already remunerated. In relation to costs orders for disciplinary proceedings, the bill will enshrine the decision in Pennisi v Legal Services Commissioner, which clarified how costs are awarded in disciplinary proceedings with mixed findings for multiple charges. The bill will make clear that nothing in the existing costs provisions requires the court to make a costs order against the respondent lawyer for the whole proceeding when some charges have been successfully defended. If allegations fail, practitioners should not automatically bear costs associated with those unsuccessful claims, and that is commonsense fairness.

The bill provides that a decision of the Legal Practice Committee, including about a legal practice employee, may be appealed to a single judge of the Supreme Court by way of a rehearing on the evidence before the committee. However, the Supreme Court may give leave to introduce further evidence—whether fresh, additional or substituted—if the court considers the further evidence may be material to the appeal.

The bill transfers the current review rights to QCAT for other related matters including decisions of the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Legal Practitioners Admissions Board to the Supreme Court in its original jurisdiction as appeal rights. These appeals will be by way of fresh hearing by the Supreme Court, meaning the appeals will not be dependent on identifying an error of fact, law or exercise of discretion in the original decision, and the Supreme Court will be able to consider fresh evidence.

The bill also transfers to the Supreme Court a range of matters in the legal practitioner jurisdiction that require an order or decision of QCAT in the first instance. The bill provides that each party will be responsible for their own costs unless the court considers the interests of justice require a costs order.

This will ensure proceedings generally remain the same as currently conducted by QCAT and that access to justice is preserved in transferring these matters to the Supreme Court.

The bill also clarifies how decisions of the Supreme Court for legal practitioner matters are appealed. Under the bill, decisions of the Supreme Court in relation to an appeal from the Legal Practice Committee for a discipline application can only be further appealed to the Court of Appeal with leave and on a question of law.

QCAT will retain two components of the legal practitioner jurisdiction which the report considered were not directly connected to disciplinary matters. These are reviews of decisions of the Queensland Law Society to disqualify a person as an external examiner and applications to set aside a costs agreement for which the Supreme Court will also have jurisdiction alongside QCAT. Importantly, the bill provides that neither of these types of matters are required to be heard in QCAT by a judicial member. Finally, the bill is to commence on proclamation, which will allow any supporting rules to be developed beforehand.

With this bill, the Crisafulli government is responding to expert advice and strengthening disciplinary matters for legal practitioners by delivering change in the best interests of the legal profession and the justice system. The legal practitioner jurisdiction, including the disciplinary framework, is designed to promote the administration of justice and protect the public. It safeguards the reputation of the legal profession, while deterring misconduct, but this cannot happen while disciplinary matters are gathering dust. That is why the reforms will alleviate the burden of the legal practitioner jurisdiction on QCAT and the commensurate strain on resources that became entrenched. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (5.52 pm): I rise to speak on the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. Queenslanders deserve a legal disciplinary system that protects the public, upholds professional standards and treats everyone fairly. Queensland is well served by its legal profession. I look back fondly on my years as a solicitor, representing nurses, doctors, public servants and everyday workers including those who had experienced discrimination or sexual harassment. I know firsthand just how important access to justice is and why our legal system must work for everyone. I understand that when someone seeks legal advice they are often at their most vulnerable. They are trusting you with their livelihoods, their families and sometimes their future. That trust comes with enormous responsibility. The overwhelming majority of lawyers work hard, act with integrity and make an enormous contribution to our communities. A strong disciplinary system protects not only the public but also the reputation of those who do the right thing.

This bill transfers legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court, implementing the recommendations of the independent review conducted by former QCAT president, the Hon. David Thomas. These are serious decisions. A finding of professional misconduct can lead to suspension or a practitioner being struck off. It is appropriate that matters of this significance are heard in Queensland's highest court. The Supreme Court already has a longstanding role in supervising the legal profession. The Labor opposition welcomes reforms that allow courts to manage the workload of the jurisdiction more efficiently and effectively.

I acknowledge that the bill retains a legal practitioner and a community representative on the hearing panel and not only preserves the Legal Practice Committee's role in less serious matters but also provides that decisions of the Legal Practice Committee will be appealed to a single judge of the Supreme Court.

The bill makes changes to costs which we do not oppose. It gives effect to the Court of Appeal's approach in Pennisi so that when a practitioner successful defends some allegations they are not left paying the costs associated with allegations that were not proven.

I acknowledge that the changes contained within the bill have broad support from across the legal profession including and the Queensland Law Society and the Australian Lawyers Alliance. I thank those organisations for their contributions to the committee process, along with committee members and departmental staff. Supporting this bill does not mean ignoring the practical questions about how it will work.

While Labor supports the bill, I do want to raise some legitimate concerns put forward by the Queensland Law Society about access to justice. I do note the Attorney's comments in relation to these issues. The transfer to the Supreme Court introduces structural barriers for self-represented parties, particularly in reviews of Fidelity Guarantee Fund matters. That fund protects clients who have lost money because of a practitioner's dishonest default. We are talking about everyday Queenslanders—retirees, families and small business owners, sometimes representing themselves, trying to recover

relatively modest amounts of money. We know that Supreme Court filing fees and legal costs can be higher than QCAT and can be more complex. Representatives from the Queensland Law Society have made it clear that forms, filing guidance, fee setting and procedural simplicity are needed so that those review rights remain practical and accessible. The last thing we want is for everyday Queenslanders to be priced out of or deterred from exercising their legal rights.

The department advised the committee they will consult on consideration if potential rule and fee changes are required before the new jurisdiction's commencement. Labor expects the Crisafulli government to follow through on that commitment.

The test for this bill is simple: will it uphold the high standards Queenslanders rightly expect of the legal profession? Yes. Will it provide a fair process for practitioners and complainants? It takes important steps in that direction. Will the system remain accessible for everyday Queenslanders? That depends on what the government does next. Labor supports this reform. Now the Crisafulli government needs to ensure it works in practice, not just on paper. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr HUNT (Nicklin—LNP) (5.57 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. The principle behind this legislation is straightforward. When Queenslanders seek legal advice or representation, they place a great deal of trust in the person acting for them. They may be buying a home, resolving a family dispute or defending a criminal charge, often at a difficult time in their lives. They have every right to expect the highest professional standards and a disciplinary system that responds properly when those standards are called into question. That means accountability and fairness. Complaints must be taken seriously, practitioners given an opportunity to respond and decisions reached within a reasonable time.

As chair of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, I had the opportunity to examine this bill in detail, hear directly from stakeholders and consider the evidence presented to the committee. Following that examination, the committee recommended that the bill be passed. The case for reform is compelling.

The independent review undertaken by the Hon. David Thomas found that, as at August 2025, the average time to finalise a legal practitioner matter in QCAT was approximately 93 weeks—93 weeks. That is almost two years for an allegation to be resolved. Think about what that means in practice. For a member of the public who has made a complaint, it can mean almost two years without an answer. For a lawyer facing an allegation, it can mean almost two years of uncertainty hanging over their career and reputation. For the wider community it means nearly two years in which confidence in the regulatory system can be weakened. Queenslanders deserve better.

The review also identified the pressure this specialist jurisdiction was placing on QCAT, including on its judicial members and registry staff. We know QCAT performs enormously important work. It deals with residential tenancies, guardianships, consumer matters and the everyday disputes that affect Queensland families. Moving this specialist jurisdiction will allow QCAT to direct more resources to those everyday matters.

The answer is not to weaken professional discipline or lower the standards expected of lawyers. It is to place these cases in a forum with the authority, experience and capacity to deal with them effectively. That forum is the Supreme Court of Queensland. The Supreme Court already occupies a special position in the regulation of the legal profession. It admits practitioners and it holds an inherent supervisory jurisdiction over who practices before it. Lawyers are officers of the court and their duties extend beyond their clients to the proper administration of justice. Serious questions about their conduct belong before that court.

This is not a radical departure from Queensland's legal history. Before the establishment of QCAT, legal disciplinary matters were dealt with by Supreme Court judges sitting as the Legal Practice Tribunal. Under the current arrangements, legal practitioner matters have continued to require judicial members and have largely been conducted as court-like proceedings. This bill brings that jurisdiction into line with that practical reality without carrying the additional administrative burden of the tribunal structure. Under these reforms, disciplinary applications brought by the Legal Services Commissioner will be heard by a single Supreme Court judge. That gives greater flexibility to allocate cases and use established case management processes to move matters towards resolution. No legislation can promise that every matter will be quick. What this bill does is establish a better structure for cases to be managed and determined without unnecessary delay.

Importantly, this is not simply about moving files from one registry to another. The bill implements all 23 recommendations of the Thomas review, including changes that retain the safeguards and practical features of the existing disciplinary framework. For example, disciplinary proceedings will

continue to draw on the expertise of a legal professional panel member and the perspective of a lay panel member. That balance is important. The professional member brings specialist knowledge, while the lay member represents the community's perspective.

The bill allows proceedings to continue without a panel member only where the interests of justice support it and further delay or cost would otherwise result. That is a sensible balance between efficiency and fairness. The bill also clarifies the treatment of costs where proceedings involve several allegations and only some are proved. It gives statutory effect to the approach recognised by the Court of Appeal in the Pennisi decision. A practitioner should not automatically be required to pay costs attributable to allegations they have successfully defended. That is the ordinary principle: that a fair process should reflect what has actually been established. We can demand high standards of conduct while still insisting upon fair treatment for those who are accused.

There are other important protections. The Legal Practice Committee will retain its role in hearing unsatisfactory professional conduct matters. The bill clarifies appeal pathways including appeals to the Court of Appeal where applicable. Appeals from decisions of professional bodies in transferred matters can be heard afresh, including new evidence. Some might hear the words 'Supreme Court' and assume a more rigid process but the legislation deliberately preserves appropriate procedural flexibility. For those related matters, the court is able to proceed with as little formality and technicality as appropriate. The general position is that parties bear their own costs unless the interests of justice require otherwise. The aim is to have these matters heard by the Supreme Court while keeping the process straightforward and accessible.

What was especially significant during the committee inquiry was the breadth of support for the central reform. The Chief Justice, the QCAT president, the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland supported transferring this jurisdiction. The Australian Lawyers Alliance also supported the bill. At our public hearing, Queensland Law Society Chief Executive Officer Matt Dunn described the transfer to the Supreme Court as 'a very good thing' and said the society was 'very supportive'. Mr Dunn also drew attention to something that can be overlooked in discussions of court lists and case numbers: the human cost of delay. He spoke of the significant mental health impact on legal practitioners waiting for disciplinary proceedings to be finalised. A strong process does not leave an accusation hanging indefinitely. It investigates properly, decides fairly and provides an outcome.

The Crisafulli government has taken a practical, evidence-based approach. The Attorney-General commissioned an independent examination, prioritised this jurisdiction and brought forward legislation to implement its recommendations. Rather than accept the delays as inevitable, this government is acting to improve how the system works. That is what good justice reform should look like: identify a problem, listen to expert advice and put forward a workable solution.

This reform also sends a wider message about the standards we expect. The overwhelming majority of Queensland lawyers serve their clients with skill, honesty and dedication. A credible disciplinary system protects their reputation as well as protecting the public. When misconduct is established, there must be proper consequences. When allegations are not substantiated, practitioners deserve a timely resolution that allows them to move forward. Both outcomes matter to the integrity of the profession.

I want to thank the individuals and organisations who contributed to the committee's inquiry, my fellow committee members, the secretariat and the Department of Justice. I also acknowledge the Attorney-General for advancing these reforms. Ultimately, Queenslanders should not have to choose between a disciplinary system that is rigorous and one that is fair and efficient. We can and should expect all three. This bill puts serious disciplinary matters before the court best placed to hear them. It reduces the pressure on QCAT and strengthens public confidence in the profession and the justice system.

Mr RUSSO (Toohey—ALP) (6.06 pm): Before I commence my contribution on the bill, I should notify the House that I am a solicitor and also a member of the Queensland Law Society. I support the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill. The Queensland Labor opposition supports a disciplinary system that protects the public, upholds the integrity and standards of the legal profession and ensures disciplinary matters are resolved fairly and efficiently. However, supporting this legislation does not mean giving the Crisafulli LNP government a free pass on its handling of these important reforms. The legal practitioner jurisdiction review report was provided to the Attorney-General on 29 October 2025 and the government tabled its report on 12 May, the day this bill

was introduced. The central reform is to transfer the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to the Supreme Court.

Findings of professional misconduct can result in suspension from practice or removal from the role of legal practitioner. Such decisions can end careers and have profound consequences for the individuals concerned. The Australian Lawyers Alliance observed these decisions effectively end careers and are quasi-criminal in their consequences. The seriousness demands an appropriately rigorous process. Importantly, the Supreme Court already possesses a longstanding inherited jurisdiction to supervise and discipline members of the legal profession. That jurisdiction exists separately from QCAT's statutory disciplinary jurisdiction and will remain unaffected by this legislation. Under the existing arrangements, legal practitioners disciplinary matters in QCAT must already be heard by a sitting or former Supreme Court judge. That requirement has contributed to difficulties in securing sufficient judicial availability. Transferring the jurisdiction to the Supreme Court will provide access to a broader pool of judges and greater flexibility in managing these specialist proceedings and that is a practical benefit of this reform. The problem is not simply where these matters are heard, it is whether the system has capacity to deal with them promptly, fairly and efficiently.

For consumers waiting for complaints to be resolved, that is unacceptable. For practitioners facing allegations that may threaten their livelihoods and reputations, it creates enormous uncertainty. The Legal Services Commission warned that delays weaken deterrence and increase potential risks to the public and consumers of legal services. The Queensland Law Society also highlighted the significant mental health impacts that prolonged disciplinary proceedings can have on practitioners. Justice delayed in these circumstances serves nobody. However, the government should be careful about presenting this reform as some great solution to QCAT's overall workload. The benefit is not the removal of some enormous volume of cases from QCAT. It is access to more judges and improved flexibility in resolving specialised disciplinary matters. Queenslanders relying on QCAT for other disputes still deserve timely access to justice. The opposition will continue to hold the government accountable for those broader responsibilities.

The bill also preserves important safeguards. A legal professional member and a lay member must be appointed from a panel to assist the Supreme Court in determining disciplinary proceedings. This ensures that professional expertise and the community's perspective remain part of the process. The right to legal representation is preserved, and the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules will apply where they are not inconsistent with the Legal Profession Act. Existing proceedings will generally transfer to the Supreme Court unless QCAT has already commenced hearing and deciding the application. The bill also clarifies costs arrangements by codifying the approach established in Pennisi v Legal Services Commissioner. That approach recognises that a practitioner should not automatically bear the costs of an entire disciplinary proceeding where some charges are successfully defended or not proven. As the Queensland Law Society explained to the committee, where three charges are brought and only one succeeds, costs should relate to that successful charge rather than the entire proceeding. That is a fair and sensible approach. Disciplinary proceedings must be rigorous, but fairness must operate in both directions.

The opposition supports transferring related decisions involving the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Legal Practitioners Admission Board to the Supreme Court. Appeals will be heard afresh, allowing the court to reconsider the facts, receive fresh evidence and make its own independent determination. However, there is one area where the opposition expects the government to do considerably more work before commencement to enable proper access to justice.

The Queensland Law Society raised legitimate concerns about the impact of transferring certain review matters to the Supreme Court. Fidelity Guarantee Fund matters can involve relatively modest claims brought by former clients who are representing themselves. These are not necessarily people with the financial resources to engage lawyers or navigate complex Supreme Court procedures. Higher filing fees, increased legal costs and more complicated processes can create unseen substantial barriers. The Queensland Law Society warned that, without clear procedural guidance, proportionate fees and flexibility in costs, some claimants could effectively be prevented from exercising their review rights. A right of review means very little if ordinary Queenslanders cannot afford to exercise it. The department advised the committee that it would consult on potential changes to rules and fees before the new jurisdiction commences. The opposition expects that consultation to produce practical outcomes. Clear forms, accessible filing guidance, appropriate fees and straightforward procedures must be in place. Efficiency cannot come at the expense of accessibility.

The bill appropriately retains two components of jurisdiction within QCAT. These are merits reviews of Queensland Law Society decisions disqualifying external examiners and applications to set

aside costs agreements, with the Supreme Court also retaining jurisdiction where relevant to disciplinary proceedings. These matters will no longer require a judicial member, allowing QCAT to be constituted at the president's discretion.

The committee also examined fundamental legislative principles and human rights compatibility, including the transitional regulation-making powers and their two-year sunset provision. It was satisfied that the proposed safeguards were adequate. Importantly, this reform has broad stakeholder support including from the Chief Justice, the QCAT President, the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Australian Lawyers Alliance. The Queensland Law Society expressed strong support, while the Legal Services Commissioner identified an opportunity for better outcomes for complainants, practitioners and the regulatory system.

The opposition supports this legislation because it is a sensible reform. The government must address access to justice, properly resource implementation and continue tackling delays throughout QCAT. The Crisafulli government should not confuse passing legislation with delivering results. Queenslanders deserve a disciplinary system that is timely, fair, accountable and accessible. The opposition will support the bill, but we will judge the government on whether it delivers those outcomes.



Mr FIELD (Capalaba—LNP) (6.16 pm): I am pleased to make my contribution on the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill implements all 23 recommendations of the Hon. David Thomas's review of the legal practitioner jurisdiction of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The principal reform contained in the bill is the transfer of that jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland. As a member of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, I had the opportunity to consider the bill in detail and the submissions received from stakeholders. I thank all those who contributed to the inquiry. The committee found the bill to be compatible with human rights and recommended that it be passed. I am pleased to support that recommendation.

We saw broad support for these reforms from legal stakeholders throughout the consultation process. The Queensland Law Society, the Australian Lawyers Alliance and the Legal Services Commissioner all supported the transfer of the jurisdiction to the Supreme Court. The Australian Lawyers Alliance considered the Supreme Court to be the appropriate forum for these matters given its existing disciplinary jurisdiction over the legal profession. The Queensland Law Society was similarly supportive of the transfer, while raising some practical issues associated with the move from a tribunal to a court. The Legal Services Commissioner also raised some drafting issues but supported the overall direction of the bill.

These reforms are long overdue. Under the former Labor government, legal practitioner disciplinary matters surged and pressure on QCAT continued to mount. Despite that growing pressure, the former government failed to release its consultation paper or progress the statutory review of QCAT. When the Crisafulli government came to office, that review was overdue. On 30 January 2025, the Attorney-General commissioned the Hon. David Thomas, a former Supreme Court and Federal Court judge and former president of QCAT, to undertake the statutory review and requested that the legal practitioner jurisdiction be examined as a priority. The figures in the Thomas review show the extent of the problem our government inherited. In 2020-21, there were 17 new legal practitioner disciplinary matters filed with QCAT. In 2023-24, that number reached 51. A further 40 new matters were filed in 2024-25. In that financial year alone, QCAT conducted 105 hearings in the legal practitioner jurisdiction.

As of August 2025, the average time taken to finalise a legal practitioner application was approximately 93 weeks. That is almost two years. That is too long for complainants waiting to have their concerns addressed, it is too long for practitioners whose professional reputations may be affected while allegations remain unresolved and it is too long for the Queensland public. At a public hearing, the Queensland Law Society outlined the significant impact that these delays can have on the mental health of practitioners. Whatever the eventual outcome of a disciplinary matter, it is unreasonable for someone to be left in that state of uncertainty for years.

The review identified another issue with the existing arrangements. These matters are already largely heard by sitting, acting or retired Supreme Court judges, often in hearing rooms at the Supreme Court itself, yet the administration of these matters remains the responsibility of QCAT. The Supreme Court already admits legal practitioners to the profession and has inherent jurisdiction over their discipline. Indeed, prior to the establishment of QCAT, these matters were heard by Supreme Court judges sitting as the Legal Practice Tribunal. It makes sense that the court that admits lawyers to the profession should also oversee its most serious disciplinary matters.

Under this bill, disciplinary applications will be heard by a single judge, with the Chief Justice able to manage the allocation of those matters directly. The court will be able to use its established case management processes to deal with proceedings more efficiently. Importantly, the bill preserves the key safeguards that currently apply to disciplinary proceedings. A legal practitioner and a layperson will continue to be appointed to assist the judge, ensuring that the views of both the profession and the wider Queensland community are represented. The Legal Practice Committee will retain its jurisdiction to deal with unsatisfactory professional conduct, with its decisions appealable to the Supreme Court. The bill also transfers related matters to the Supreme Court, including appeals concerning practising certificates and claims against the fidelity fund.

The committee considered the Queensland Law Society's concerns about costs and practical arrangements for people representing themselves. In these related proceedings, the court will conduct its proceedings with minimal formality and technicality, with each party generally bearing its own costs unless the interests of justice dictate otherwise. Another important reform concerns the treatment of costs in disciplinary matters, reflecting the decision of the Queensland Court of Appeal in Pennisi v Legal Services Commissioner. A practitioner should not automatically be required to pay costs relating to allegations that they have successfully defended simply because other allegations were proven. This is a reform that also received the support of the Australian Lawyers Alliance.

An effective disciplinary framework must deliver both accountability and fairness. The transitional arrangements recognise that proceedings are already underway. Matters that QCAT has commenced hearing or deciding will generally remain there, while those not yet heard will transfer to the Supreme Court. QCAT will also retain certain responsibilities under the Legal Profession Act, including jurisdiction to hear applications to set aside legal costs agreements. This is a targeted transfer of jurisdiction that will allow QCAT to devote more of its resources to the matters that affect Queenslanders every day including residential tenancy disputes, guardianship matters, consumer claims and neighbourhood disputes.

Legal practitioners are rightly expected to meet high standards of professional and ethical conduct. Queenslanders who entrust their affairs to a legal practitioner deserve confidence that those standards are upheld and the vast majority of practitioners who do the right thing deserve that same confidence.

These reforms respond directly to the significant delays that developed under the former government. They ensure that matters concerning legal practitioners are dealt with in the appropriate forum, with greater protection for the public without compromising procedural fairness. I commend the Attorney-General for bringing forward these reforms and I commend the bill to the House.



Ms McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (6.24 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. I was a member of the committee that considered the bill. I thank the secretariat and those who submitted and attended the hearings.

The primary aspect of the bill that I will focus on is the proposal to transfer legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, QCAT, to the Supreme Court. The background to this is that a statutory review of QCAT was commissioned by the Attorney-General in January 2025. However, QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction was prioritised ahead of the broader review. As a result, that report was completed and tabled by the Attorney-General on 12 May 2026, at the same time that this bill was introduced to effect those changes. From the outset, I acknowledge that this bill was drafted in conjunction with significant stakeholders and even they acknowledged their contribution during the drafting of the legislation.

One of the things that pre-empted this particular need was the case load of the legal practitioner jurisdiction within QCAT. In layperson's terms it means that when complaints are made against legal practitioners then those matters are dealt with by QCAT. However, the committee was advised that there is generally a 93-week turnaround time in processing those case loads. That is an unbelievable burden on an individual who is facing professional discipline and in many cases might have sanctions imposed upon them while their matter is being dealt with. Certainly a bill that will do something to expedite that particular process has the support of the Queensland Labor Party.

We talk about the load being taken off QCAT and we acknowledge that there is an extensive QCAT case load that has contributed to that 93-week blowout. However, in terms of the scale of cases that are being considered by QCAT for legal practitioner jurisdiction, the committee was advised that, as at 1 June 2026, the total number of matters being dealt with by QCAT of that particular type was 43 as opposed to the thousands of others that are currently active in QCAT. Whilst we acknowledge the

move from QCAT to the Supreme Court will expedite that particular case load, the loss of 43 cases from QCAT is not going to make a serious dent in the overall QCAT case load.

I note that many of the submitters, including the Australian Lawyers Alliance, the Queensland Law Society and the Legal Services Commission, have voiced longstanding support for this reform. They acknowledged that it broadly reflected the feedback provided during the earlier consultation processes. I note that in their speeches the shadow Attorney-General and, in this case, the shadow Treasurer outlined some questions that remain. I call upon the Attorney-General to answer those questions in her reply speech. I have no further information to add to the debate on this particular riveting bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Sitting suspended from 6.28 pm to 7.30 pm.

Ms MARR (Thuringowa—LNP) (7.30pm): I rise to speak in support of the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. As a former member of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, the committee recommended that it be passed, and I support that recommendation. This bill is about making the system that holds lawyers to account work better for people who rely on it, the ordinary Queenslanders who make complaints, the practitioners facing allegations and the wider community that expects high standards from the legal profession.

Right now, serious disciplinary matters involving legal practitioners sit with QCAT. These are not minor administrative issues. They involve allegations that can end a career and affect public confidence in the justice system, yet they have been stuck in a system under real pressure. The average time to finalise these matters has stretched to almost two years, and that is simply too long. For someone who has made a complaint, two years is a long time to wait for answers. For a practitioner under investigation, it is a long period of uncertainty that can take a heavy personal and professional toll. The Queensland Law Society itself noted the significant mental health impact on lawyers waiting years for matters to be resolved. For the community, delayed outcomes weaken the sense that the rules are being applied fairly and promptly. Justice delayed is justice denied.

The independent review by the Hon. David Thomas looked closely at this. Mr Thomas, a former Supreme Court and Federal Court judge and former President of QCAT, made 23 clear recommendations. The bill implements all of them. The central recommendation is to transfer these matters to the Supreme Court of Queensland. That makes practical sense. The Supreme Court is the court that admits lawyers to the profession in the first place. It has always had an inherent responsibility for supervising the profession. Before QCAT existed, these matters were heard by Supreme Court judges as the Legal Practice Tribunal. Even under the current system, many of these cases are already heard by Supreme Court judges or retired judges. What this bill does is remove the unnecessary duplication and place the jurisdiction properly where it belongs.

The bill transfers legal practitioner disciplinary applications from QCAT to the Supreme Court. Related matters, such as appeals about practising certificates and fitness-to-practise decisions will also move to the Supreme Court. Existing cases that have not yet been heard will transfer across so they can be dealt with under the new arrangements. Importantly, the bill keeps the practical features that help the process stay fair and grounded. The Legal Practice Committee will still deal with claims of unsatisfactory professional conduct. Panel members, one from the legal profession and one layperson, will continue to sit with the judge in disciplinary matters. That mix of professional knowledge and community perspective is valuable and worth keeping.

The committee heard from the Australian Lawyers Alliance, the Queensland Law Society and the Legal Services Commissioner. There was broad support for transferring these matters out of QCAT. Stakeholders recognised the problems caused by long delays and the benefit of placing these matters in a court better equipped to manage them. The Chief Justice, the QCAT President, the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association all supported the transfer.

We also looked at whether the bill respects fundamental legislative principles and human rights. The committee found that it does. While moving to the Supreme Court may involve different filing fees in some cases, any impact is reasonable when weighed against the clear need for more timely decisions. Access to justice is not only about the right to file a case, it is about getting a hearing and a decision within a reasonable time. Delays currently reduce the deterrent effect of the system and can leave both complainants and practitioners in limbo.

There is another practical benefit. Moving these specialist matters frees up scarce QCAT resources. QCAT deals with everyday disputes that affect ordinary Queensland households, residential tenancies, guardianship, consumer claims, tree disputes and neighbourhood issues. When judicial and registry sources are tied up with complex legal practitioner cases, everyone else waits longer. This

reform allows QCAT to focus more on the matters that most frequently affect Queensland families and communities. This will be welcomed in my community.

In Thuringowa and across North Queensland, we expect the systems that regulate professions to be fair, efficient and reliable. Being a lawyer is a privilege and should be one of respect, and Queenslanders rightly expect high standards from those entrusted to act on their behalf. When processes drag on for nearly two years, confidence suffers for complainants seeking answers, for practitioners trying to clear their names and for the public who rely on a trusted legal profession.

This bill takes a practical step to address that. It does not reinvent the wheel. It simply places serious disciplinary matters where they more properly belong, while keeping the safeguards that protect fairness and community input. It strengthens accountability without sacrificing fairness, and it helps ensure those who do the right thing, the vast majority of lawyers, are not undermined by a system that cannot deal promptly with those who do not.

I thank the chair, the committee, my fellow committee members, the secretariat, the Department of Justice and everyone who made submissions or appeared at the public hearing. Their input helped shape a careful and practical piece of legislation.

If I may take a moment to sincerely thank the committee members and the secretariat, past and present, for the honour of serving on this committee. It has been a genuine privilege to work alongside you all. I will miss the experience, the constructive cooperation and the committee itself now that I am no longer a member of the committee. I want to thank you very much for the two years of learning from all of you. I support the bill and commend this bill to the House.

Dr O'SHEA (South Brisbane—ALP) (7.36 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026 which amends the Legal Profession Act 2007 with regard to disciplinary matters affecting legal practitioners. In addressing this bill, I would first like to acknowledge the work of the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee in considering the detail of this bill, the stakeholders for their thoughtful contributions, and the hard work of the Parliamentary Service staff in supporting the committee in its review of this proposed legislation.

Our community expects that if someone puts their trust in a solicitor or barrister in our state that the legal practitioner will act in a professional manner and be honest, fair and ethical in carrying out their duties. The vast majority of our legal profession conduct themselves in such a way. I would like to thank the myriad members of the legal profession in Queensland who act with scrupulous fairness and integrity in providing clear and timely advice to their clients to help them make informed decisions about their legal matters. However, when there are allegations of professional misconduct concerning a legal practitioner, the public needs to be confident that these complaints will be properly investigated and appropriate action taken to protect public trust in the proper administration of justice.

The amendments in this bill give effect to recommendations arising from the *Legal practitioner jurisdiction: report*—the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act statutory review 2025-26—and I would like to thank former Supreme and Federal Court judge and past president of QCAT the Hon. David Thomas for his work undertaking the statutory review.

The report identified several issues with the current arrangements for managing serious complaints against legal practitioners, and made 23 recommendations which this bill addresses. The principal reform of this bill is the transfer of legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from QCAT to Queensland's Supreme Court. The bill also clarifies procedural arrangements, appeal pathways and costs provisions related to these matters being heard by the Supreme Court.

Currently, QCAT is responsible for deciding serious legal practitioner disciplinary matters which may result in suspension or removal from the role. These matters are heard by sitting or retired Supreme Court judges and are conducted largely in court facilities. The *Legal practitioner jurisdiction: report* identified delays within the current system, with legal practitioner matters taking an average of 93 weeks to be finalised by QCAT. Those delays appear to be due mainly to the availability of judicial members rather than the volume of legal practitioner matters themselves. In the 2024-25 financial year, there were only 105 hearings related to the legal practitioner jurisdiction compared to over 28,000 QCAT cases across all jurisdictions in the same period.

Transferring responsibility for serious legal practitioner disciplinary matters back to the Supreme Court is sensible and appropriate. Disciplinary applications will be heard by a single judge of the Supreme Court in its original jurisdiction, allowing access to a broader pool of judicial officers and enabling the Chief Justice to manage the workload of the Supreme Court judges more efficiently. Importantly, under the bill, many of the existing procedural features of the QCAT process are retained.

Parties will continue to have a right to legal representation, and the bill also preserves the use of both a legal professional and a community member to assist the Supreme Court in its consideration of a disciplinary matter. Including members of the profession and the community in the complaints and disciplinary process ensures both views are represented to reflect fairness and accountability in the disciplinary proceedings.

The bill also provides that decisions of the Legal Practice Committee in relation to unsatisfactory professional conduct which are currently appealed to QCAT may instead be appealed to the Supreme Court. The merit reviews that QCAT undertakes of decisions by the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Legal Practitioners Admission Board on the issue, renewal, suspension or cancellation of a practising certificate would also be appealed to the Supreme Court under the provisions of this bill.

The committee received three submissions from stakeholders which were all generally supportive of the bill. The Legal Services Commissioner in her submission stated that transferring the responsibility for the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction to the Supreme Court—

... will be an opportunity for improvement, that will ultimately provide better outcomes for complainants, the legal profession and all involved in the regulation of the legal profession.

The commissioner did, however, propose amending the definition of 'disciplinary body' in the bill to ensure the Court of Appeal, which may hear appeals of disciplinary decisions made by the Supreme Court, has full powers in disciplinary matters. The Australian Lawyers Alliance in their submission pointed out that findings of professional misconduct, with subsequent suspension or removal from the role, are career-ending and that the Supreme Court was the appropriate forum for those weighty determinations. They stated—

Moving the work from QCAT to the Court ... properly aligns the seriousness of the decision with the rigour of the process.

Similarly, the Queensland Law Society generally supported the bill. During the public hearing, they acknowledged the delays that currently exist in matters being dealt with in QCAT and that, as a consequence—

... there is ... a significant mental health impact on legal practitioners who are awaiting finalisation or determination of particular disciplinary matters against them.

They confirmed—

... the transfer to the Supreme Court as being a very good thing ...

Ultimately, this bill represents a considered response to the findings of the statutory review. It recognises the serious nature of legal practitioner disciplinary matters and, through transferring responsibility for these proceedings to the Supreme Court, seeks to uphold the integrity and standards of the legal profession to protect the public, ensure disciplinary matters are resolved fairly and efficiently and retain public confidence in the regulation of the legal profession. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (7.44 pm): I rise to support the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026—a practical reform that strengthens accountability in the legal profession and makes better use of Queensland's justice system. In my electorate of Southport, access to justice is not just an abstract concept; it is something that affects residents and families in their everyday lives. According to the 2021 census, 42.6 per cent of occupied private dwellings in the Southport electorate were rented, while almost one in three were flats or apartments. These figures highlight the importance of an accessible and efficient Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

As the local member, my office regularly hears from constituents who are navigating residential tenancy disputes, body corporate disagreements and complex housing matters. I have also assisted residents concerned about the rights and responsibilities of retirement village operators. These are real issues affecting people's homes, financial security and quality of life. Not every one of those disputes is dealt with by QCAT, but the tribunal has a vital role in resolving tenancy, retirement village and other everyday disputes and hearing certain body corporate matters and appeals. That is why the efficient operation of QCAT is so important.

By transferring specialist legal practitioner disciplinary matters to the Supreme Court, this bill is intended to free up valuable judicial and administrative resources, allowing QCAT to focus more of its attention on the everyday disputes affecting Queenslanders. For the people of Southport, and the people of Queensland for that matter, this reform represents an important step towards a justice system that is more efficient, accountable and responsive to the needs of the community.

When people engage a solicitor or a barrister, they are often placing some of the most important matters of their lives in that person's hands: their homes, their livelihoods, their businesses and sometimes their futures. They are entitled to expect the highest professional standards and to know that if serious concerns are raised there is a fair and effective process for dealing with them.

The figures in the statutory review should concern every member of this House. As at August 2025, the average time taken to finalise an application in QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction was approximately 93 weeks. That is almost two years—two years for a complainant seeking answers; two years for a practitioner seeking to respond to an allegation and, where appropriate, clear their name; and two years of uncertainty for the public. Those figures relate specifically to legal practitioner matters, not to ordinary tenancy cases, but they demonstrate why this specialist jurisdiction needed attention. Delays of that magnitude can undermine confidence in professional regulation and weaken the disciplinary system's ability to protect consumers and deter misconduct.

The former Labor government had the opportunity to confront these problems. The statutory review of the QCAT Act was expected to be completed in early 2024, yet Labor failed to release the departmental consultation paper and progress consultation with stakeholders. The review remained overdue. Queenslanders deserved a government willing to address that problem rather than leave it for somebody else. The Crisafulli government has taken action. Our Attorney-General, Deb Frecklington, commissioned the Hon. David Thomas, a former Supreme Court and Federal Court judge and a former QCAT president, to undertake the review. His report made 23 recommendations, and this bill gives effect to all 23.

At the centre of the bill is a straightforward change: transferring legal practitioner disciplinary matters from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland, together with related matters involving the right to practise and claims on the fidelity fund. This is a sensible fit. The Supreme Court admits practitioners to the legal profession and has an established supervisory role over them. Serious questions about professional conduct, ethics and fitness to practise belong in a forum equipped to deal with them. Importantly, Supreme Court judges were already involved in hearing many of these matters through QCAT.

The reform removes an unnecessary layer of administration and enables the Supreme Court to manage its own proceedings more directly. It does not mean throwing out procedural fairness. Disciplinary applications would ordinarily be heard by a single Supreme Court judge with assistance from both a legal professional panel member and a lay member. That preserves the perspective of the profession and the wider community. The bill also retains procedures designed to keep proceedings as informal and accessible as possible and maintains avenues of appeal. We should not have to choose between an efficient system and a fair one. Queenslanders deserve both.

Another important element is the clarification of costs. When allegations against a practitioner are not proven, the law should not be interpreted as automatically requiring that practitioner to pay the costs associated with those unsuccessful allegations. The bill clarifies the position, including where some allegations are upheld and others are not. That is a fairer approach and consistent with the guidance of the Queensland Court of Appeal. It is worth remembering that disciplinary proceedings affect real people on both sides. For consumers prolonged proceedings can mean anxiety, expense and the feeling that their concerns are going nowhere. For practitioners, unresolved allegations can carry serious professional and personal consequences. The Queensland Law Society has highlighted the mental health impact of long-running matters. Timely, impartial decisions serve everyone.

This is not reform pursued without consultation. The review drew on substantial expertise and key stakeholders, including the Chief Justice, the president of QCAT, the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Australian Lawyers Alliance, who all supported moving the jurisdiction. The parliamentary committee recommended that the bill be passed and found it compatible with human rights.

I will return to Southport. A constituent trying to resolve a tenancy dispute, an older resident navigating a retirement village issue or a family seeking the tribunal's help with a consumer matter should have the confidence that our institutions are properly organised and resourced. The bill will not on its own eliminate every QCAT delay, but taking a resource intensive, specialist jurisdiction out of the tribunal is a responsible step towards allowing it to concentrate on those matters. Where the former Labor government allowed an overdue review to languish, the Crisafulli government has undertaken the work, listened to the experts and brought forward a practical solution. It is about protecting consumers, treating practitioners fairly and restoring confidence that serious disciplinary allegations will be dealt with in an appropriate forum and without unnecessary delay. This is good for the legal

profession, good for the administration of justice, good for the people of Southport and good for the people of Queensland. I commend this bill to the House.

Hon. LM LINARD (Nudgee—ALP) (7.52 pm): I rise to speak on the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. From the outset I own that I am a member of the Queensland Law Society, subject to assessment by the Legal Practitioners Admission Board and ultimately the processes that this bill deals with. This does not, in my assessment, serve as a conflict of interest; rather, as a strong professional interest in the regulation of the legal profession in Queensland.

The current framework for disciplining legal professionals in Queensland, primarily under the Legal Profession Act, has the important and dual role of promoting the administration of justice and protecting the public as well as safeguarding the reputation of the legal profession by deterring misconduct. It is a robust framework. Legal professionals in Queensland are held to high professional standards and are subject to a broad range of obligations imposed on them, primarily by the Legal Profession Act but also the Legal Profession Regulation and under the guidelines, including the Australian Solicitors' Conducts Rules—and rightly so. Legal professionals hold a privileged position of trust within the community, frequently advising individuals during their most vulnerable life events, with clients reliant on their lawyer's competence, confidentiality and honesty to safeguard their personal freedom, sensitive data or financial assets, depending on the nature of the matter. Alleged breaches of these standards can result in complaints by clients, other legal professionals or judicial members, often relating to communications with clients and billing, but such complaints may also extend to conduct outside of practice.

The legal practitioner jurisdiction, including the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction, was transferred to QCAT in 2009—we have heard many members before me refer to this—when the former Legal Practice Tribunal was amalgamated into QCAT. This amalgamation was intended to promote consistency in procedure and decision-making, to provide opportunities for members to consolidate and develop their skills, and to improve registry support for these matters. However, on review the Hon. David Thomas, in his *Legal practitioner jurisdiction: report*, tabled on 12 May, came to the view that this consistency had not been achieved. The bill therefore provides for the transfer of the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland, to be heard initially by a single judge.

His report found that the Supreme Court is in the best position to hear serious disciplinary matters, given it otherwise has both inherent and legislatively conferred jurisdiction over the legal profession. Of course, lawyers in Queensland are formally recognised and admitted by the Supreme Court as qualified and fit to practice law. The Supreme Court is the supervisory court in matters affecting the conduct of members of the legal profession. It has a clear interest, of course, in the legal profession maintaining high standards. The report further concluded that the Supreme Court is better equipped and has greater flexibility to deal with the reported increase in the volume and complexity of legal practitioner disciplinary proceedings and has a greater number of judges and the registry expertise to handle these matters.

This is an important point, and again many have mentioned that the current average timeframe to finalise an application is around 93 weeks. This is not only unsustainable for both QCAT and the Legal Services Commissioner but can have a significant impact on the consumers of legal services and legal practitioners themselves. Complaints against a practitioner are often accompanied by a high level of stress, given the potential impact of serious complaints on a practitioner's career, their repetition and their livelihood. In some circumstances, they can also result in criminal charges. Improving the timeframe to finalise such matters from an average of just short of two years, however complex, is a very worthy goal and one, I have no doubt, that the legal profession is very supportive of.

On this point and others raised within the review the report considers that transferring the legal practitioner jurisdiction to the Supreme Court is in the best interests of the legal profession and the justice system, a view broadly supported by stakeholders, including the Chief Justice, the QCAT president, the Legal Services Commissioner and the peak representative legal profession bodies in Queensland—the Queensland Bar Society and the Bar Association of Queensland. The Labor opposition supports a disciplinary system that protects the public, that upholds the integrity and standards of the legal profession and that ensures disciplinary matters are resolved fairly and efficiently. We therefore support the bill, which gives effect to the review recommendations.

In reviewing submissions to the bill, while supportive, I note the Queensland Law Society raised concerns with respect to how the new arrangements operate in practice, particularly for people dealing

with fidelity guarantee fund matters. Additionally, the Legal Services Commissioner identified technical problems in the proposed appeal provisions, including uncertainty about the precise powers of the Court of Appeal in disciplinary matters.

When parliament creates a new statutory framework we should make that framework as clear as possible. People should not have to wait for a future court case to determine what parliament actually intended the legislation to mean. As the commissioner put it, the problem can be resolved without the need for judicial determination of the intention of parliament.

I trust that the issues raised by these learned stakeholders and our regulators are being given the due consideration they deserve to ensure these reforms are truly delivered in the best interests of the legal profession, the justice system and therefore those it should serve. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (7.58 pm): Many years ago, I was privileged to be admitted to the legal profession as an Australian lawyer and an officer of the court. During my brief time as a lawyer, I gained a deep appreciation of the significant responsibilities that accompany legal practice and the importance of maintaining public confidence in our justice system. It is from that perspective that I rise to support the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill is about strengthening Queensland's legal disciplinary framework to facilitate a more timely, efficient and fair administration of justice. These reforms are important not only for legal practitioners but also for the clients they serve.

For communities such as Hervey Bay and the wider Fraser Coast, confidence in the legal profession matters. When people seek legal advice during some of the most difficult periods of their lives, they deserve to know that professional standards are upheld and that complaints and disciplinary matters are dealt with promptly and fairly. Equally, legal practitioners deserve a disciplinary system that is agile, effective and transparent.

The former Labor government knew there were growing problems at QCAT and left a system where allegations waited years to be resolved. The Legal Profession Act 2007 plays a crucial role in regulating legal practice, protecting consumers and supporting the administration of justice across Queensland. This bill advances those objectives by implementing the 23 recommendations arising from the statutory five-year review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act. The review was commissioned by the Attorney-General, the Hon. Deb Frecklington, in January 2025. The QCAT Act requires a statutory review every five years to ensure the tribunal continues to operate effectively and remains fit for purpose.

The statutory review was led by the Hon. David Thomas, a former Supreme Court and Federal Court judge, president of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and president of QCAT. His considerable expertise provided a strong foundation for a thorough examination of Queensland's disciplinary jurisdictions. The review considered two principal matters: the legislative framework governing the functions and operations of QCAT; and the operation of various professional disciplinary lists, including legal practitioners, and whether QCAT remains the most appropriate forum for these matters. One of the most significant findings of the review was the need to address longstanding concerns regarding delay within the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction.

The primary recommendation, and the centrepiece of this bill, is the transfer of legal practitioner disciplinary matters from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland. The rationale for this reform is compelling. Presently, the average time to finalise a legal practitioner disciplinary application in QCAT is approximately 93 weeks. These delays can have serious consequences for complainants seeking resolution of their matters, legal practitioners awaiting final determinations and the broader public's confidence in the administration of justice.

At present, QCAT exercises original jurisdiction over disciplinary proceedings brought by the Legal Services Commissioner against a legal practitioner. However, the evidence gathered during the review clearly demonstrated that the current arrangements are no longer fit for purpose. To support the Supreme Court in assuming this jurisdiction, the bill introduces the use of panel members in determining disciplinary applications. Both a legal professional member and a lay person member must be appointed from a panel of members. This is an important safeguard. It ensures disciplinary decisions benefit from both legal professional expertise and a community perspective. For the residents in Hervey Bay and across Queensland, a community representative on the panel ensures public confidence that community expectations are central to the disciplinary process. For practitioners, it ensures decisions are informed by an understanding of professional obligations and practice realities.

The consequences of the current QCAT backlog were succinctly apprehended by the Legal Services Commissioner, whose submission said—

> The growing concern is that while professional conduct matters are not able to be addressed by QCAT in a timely way due to competing demands on resources, there is less deterrence achieved, both personal and general.

A legal disciplinary system that cannot respond promptly risks undermining public confidence and accountability.

Further to the transfer of disciplinary proceedings to the Supreme Court, the bill makes several complementary reforms to ensure continuity and clarity. It retains the Legal Practice Committee's jurisdiction to hear claims of unsatisfactory professional conduct, clarifies appeal pathways to the Court of Appeal and preserves QCAT's jurisdiction in relation to certain specialist matters, including reviews of decisions by the Queensland Law Society concerning external examiners and applications to set aside costs agreements under section 328 of the Legal Profession Act 2007.

Turning now to the issue of costs orders, clause 44 of the bill clarifies how costs will be awarded in disciplinary proceedings, involving mixed findings for multiple charges of prescribed conduct. This amendment codifies the principles established in Pennisi v Legal Services Commissioner, which examined how costs should be assessed and awarded under section 462 of the act. Specifically, a new section 807 makes it clear that a disciplinary body is not required to order costs against a practitioner for allegations that are ultimately not proven to constitute professional misconduct or unsatisfactory professional conduct.

This bill strikes an appropriate balance between protecting the public interest and ensuring procedural fairness for practitioners. The bill furthermore modernises appeal arrangements for disciplinary matters. Under these reforms, decisions of the Legal Practice Committee will be appealed to a single judge of the Supreme Court by way of a rehearing on the existing evidence. In addition, review rights currently exercised through QCAT in relation to decisions of the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Legal Practitioners Admissions Board will instead be exercised through the Supreme Court's original jurisdiction. These changes create a more coherent and streamlined framework for resolving disputes and disciplinary matters.

The bill further sets out the procedural and cost arrangements in relation to appeal matters. In hearing these matters, the Supreme Court will not be bound by the rules of evidence and may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate. The bill also established a default position that each party bears its own costs unless the interests of justice warrant a difference outcome.

The bill preserves the existing standard of proof by requiring that the Supreme Court be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that an allegation is made out. This ensures consistency with the approach adopted by QCAT. Clause 95 also contains transitional provisions. A new section 807 allows for transitional regulations to support the effective implementation of the reforms.

In closing, this bill implements the 23 recommendations arising from the Hon. David Thomas's 2025-26 statutory review of the legal practitioner jurisdiction under the QCAT Act. The bill addresses a system that has become burdened by unacceptable delays. When disciplinary matters take up to 93 weeks to reach finalisation, confidence in the administration of justice is inevitably diminished. That outcome is unfair to complainants, unfair to practitioners and contrary to the broader public interest.

After a decade of decline, the Attorney-General is to be commended for bringing forward a consultative, well-considered and decisive package of reforms that will strengthen the integrity of Queensland's legal disciplinary framework. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (8.07 pm): I rise to contribute to the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. Labor supports a disciplinary system that protects the public, upholds the standards of the legal profession and resolves complaints fairly and without delay. The opposition will support this bill. Every day, Queenslanders place their trust in lawyers during some of the hardest moment of their lives—a mother leaving a violent relationship, a family navigating a child protection matter, a grandparent settling a loved one's estate. As local members, we know these matters all too well.

In my portfolio, I see how much depends on that trust. When it is broken, people need to know there is a strong, fair and timely system to hold practitioners to account. This bill implements the recommendations of the legal practitioner jurisdiction review, led by the Hon. David Thomas. Its central change is to move disciplinary matters for lawyers from QCAT to the Supreme Court. When a lawyer is found guilty of a serious misconduct, they can be suspended or struck off altogether. That can end a career. As the Australian Lawyers Alliance put it, moving this work to the court properly aligns the

seriousness of this decision with the rigour of the process. The Supreme Court already has a longstanding inherent power to supervise and discipline members of the legal profession, and this bill does not change that. In QCAT, these matters must already be heard by a sitting or former Supreme Court judge.

Moving them to the court gives access to a broader pool of judges and more flexibility. That matters because the delays have been significant. I have spoken to many women, particularly from my electorate and across Queensland, who have experienced those delays. The average time to finalise one of these matters was around 93 weeks. That is close to two years of uncertainty for the person who made the complaint and for the practitioner waiting for an outcome. The Queensland Law Society told the committee about the real mental health toll that that waiting and anticipation can take.

The reform has broad support, including from the Chief Justice, the QCAT president, the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland. The Legal Services Commissioner described it as an opportunity for improvement that will ultimately provide better outcomes for complainants, the legal profession and all involved in the regulation of the legal profession. The bill also brings some welcome fairness to costs. It codifies the Pennisi approach so a practitioner who successfully defends some charges is not ordered to pay the costs of the entire proceeding. As the Queensland Law Society's General Counsel told the committee, if only one of the three charges succeeds, costs are ordered on that one charge alone and it is so much fairer. However, a reform like this is only as good as its implementation, and I want to put on record a concern about access to justice.

Some of the decisions that will now be appealed to the Supreme Court involve the Fidelity Guarantee Fund. That fund exists to help people whose money has been lost through a lawyer's dishonesty. These are often modest claims made by former clients representing themselves and sometimes by people who are already vulnerable. The Queensland Law Society warned that without clear guidance, proportionate fees and flexibility on costs there is a material risk that affected claimants will be effectively deterred or prevented from exercising review rights. The department has told the committee it will consult on court rules and fees before this jurisdiction commences. The opposition expects the work can be done properly so that review rights remain practical and accessible for ordinary Queenslanders, not only for those who can afford Supreme Court fees.

I also want to put this bill in perspective. The Attorney-General has framed it as a relief for QCAT's workload. In 2024-25 QCAT held 105 hearings in this jurisdiction out of more than 28,000 matters lodged across the whole tribunal. The real pressure point has been finding available judges. This bill is a sensible step, but it will not fix the delays Queenslanders face across the rest of the tribunal. That takes proper resourcing—proper funding—and we know that this LNP government is light on both. Queenslanders deserve a legal profession they can trust and a system that deals with complaints fairly and quickly. This bill helps deliver that, and I commend it to the House.

Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (8.12 pm): I am pleased to rise to make a contribution to the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill. At the outset I commend our Attorney-General for bringing this bill into the House and commend the committee for its work on the bill. I note that there were only three written submissions on the bill and that it is getting a great deal of support in the House tonight.

One wish that I have for people in life is that they never have to engage a solicitor or a barrister, and that is not because I do not like solicitors or barristers—I have some friends who are solicitors or barristers—but purely and simply, coming from my life in the Police Service, if you are dealing with police, something has gone wrong. If you are dealing with a solicitor or a barrister, something else has gone wrong and it is a complicated world. If you put three different solicitors or barristers in a room and ask them for opinions, often they will come up with different opinions. It is likewise with police officers. They will often come up with different opinions too, but we know, going from the criminal justice profession into the civil world and the legal profession, that having good lawyers or barristers of a quality nature means that you can rely on that advice and have confidence in that process.

This bill is all about the 23 recommendations that David Thomas put together after being asked by the Attorney-General. Again, I am proud to be part of the Crisafulli government which is calmly and methodically putting in place changes to improve Queenslanders' lives. If we have a judiciary and a legal system that is well serviced, fair, timely and consistent, then it is a great start for Queenslanders. Likewise, those solicitors or barristers amongst us in the legal profession may, from time to time, face different opinions, because that is what it is. If you are giving advice to somebody with the best of intentions but end up in a legal proceeding and that advice does not come true, then obviously people

may be aggrieved by that. You need to have a very robust and fair process for those legal practitioners to have it dealt with professionally and have the right checks and balances in place.

Many in the House tonight have not talked about the balance of probabilities review that the committee talked about that could go forward, so I want to spend some time on that. I note that there is not going to be a change from the balance of probabilities standard of proof to beyond reasonable doubt, which I am very familiar with. The beyond reasonable doubt standard is so very high that it is very challenging for any criminal court or judicial proceeding to achieve. The balance of probabilities is a fair 51 per cent that the old scales of justice used to apply. The reason I raise that is that members of the legal profession understand that if there is a complaint made against them it will go to the decision-maker on the balance of probabilities. The advice that they give at the outset is well researched and usually right, but obviously there are different opinions. If someone is aggrieved over that process and if it is going to be dealt with on appeal, then we need to ensure that that is done well.

Others in the House tonight have spoken about the seriousness of going to court. As I said at the start of this contribution, I hope that people never in their lives have to engage a solicitor or a barrister to help them with difficulties because it means that they are confronting some very challenging things in life. That is very stressful. I am fortunate to not have been in that situation very often in my life. I am very relieved to know that I got good advice and was able to come out the other side very well, so thank you very much, Minister.

Mr Nicholls: That's all right. Happy to help.

Mr McDONALD: Yes, I really appreciate your advice. We are talking about industrial relations disputes, human resource disputes and employment disputes. It is not always about dividing fences or building problems. There are some very serious life-changing events that people are often confronted by in the legal profession. Again, I use that as a basis because that is the human face of it. People are getting opinions and then being confronted with challenges in life and have to go through a judicial process with a legal professional, so I welcome the Attorney-General bringing this bill into the House that addresses those 23 recommendations by David Thomas. We have to ensure that we have a very professional, robust, fair and timely judicial system for not just people facing QCAT and the courts but also for legal practitioners.

I again mention the issue of costs. This bill and the committee's report was very sensible based on stakeholders' views and the department's response in that costs will be shared and it will be a fair process. We all have a sense of the concept of fairness. If somebody is faced with four or five different matters and a number are cleared, we should expect that that would be treated fairly in terms of cost, or if it is completely cleared then the costs may be shared between the parties unless there is some other challenging finding that might be held for that person.

I come back to the bill. I thank all of those involved in the legal profession and all of those who may never need to have a solicitor or barrister representing them. It is a very honourable profession. All of those I have met are honourable people who try to do the best for people in challenging situations.

Mr Nicholls: Keep digging, Jim.

Mr McDONALD: I was trying to get out of my original statement. I will go back and reinforce that original statement and say that I do genuinely hope that people never have to engage a solicitor or a barrister in their life because that means they are not facing difficult or challenging situations—

Mr Hutton: Fame or fortune.

Mr McDONALD:—and they will not have to depart with a lot of money. I thank the member for Keppel. In all seriousness, I do wish that for people.

Mr Nicholls: I'm writing your will for you, mate. Don't worry.

Mr McDONALD: Thank you very much, Minister. I appreciate it. This is about a sensible outcome. The recommendations that Justice Thomas provided to the Attorney-General were sensible. Once again, I thank her for bringing the bill into the House following those recommendations. All 23 recommendations have been accepted to ensure Queensland's legal profession is held to account but also that that is done in a fair and timely way.

As we have seen for people who are dealing with challenging things in their life, the timely resolution of justice has not happened on some occasions. If you are waiting 12 months to have something heard then that is very challenging. I question whether that is an appropriate time to see justice done. We want to make sure that things are done in a timely way for people so that they can get back to living their normal lives.

I also want to go back to the important point regarding QCAT matters being referred to the Supreme Court. That is a really sensible recommendation. Quite honestly, I would normally say that if you are moving things to a higher level then that is not the best process. For the legal profession it is a sensible approach. The balance of probabilities is the right standard so that people have confidence that the complaints they may receive when there is a difference of opinion are going to be dealt with professionally to the highest judicial standards and will not be caught up in the QCAT process, where we are working to improve timeframes.

I support the recommendations that David Thomas made and I support the Attorney-General's bill. I thank all of the departmental staff and the ministerial staff for all the work they have done on this bill. I am very pleased to commend the bill to the House.

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (8.22 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset I note that, while I am not a current member of the Queensland Law Society, nor do I hold a current practising certificate, I am admitted as a solicitor of the Supreme Court of Queensland. I think it is important to put that interest on the record for this debate.

Given the extent of the debate and the furious agreement of all members here, it would be open for me to move that the question be put, I think. That being said, I understand the member for Clayfield might want to inform us of the history of the legal profession and disciplinary matters, so I will not move that motion quite yet. Notwithstanding that, it would be open for me to move that.

As an interesting aside, I was admitted to the profession on the same day and in the same session as the member for Waterford. As those familiar with legal admission ceremonies would know, the order for admission is determined by your university grades. For this moment, and this moment only, I will reluctantly admit that the member for Waterford may have been admitted a few spots ahead of me—but only a few.

I want to make it clear that the Queensland Labor opposition supports this bill. That is because we support a disciplinary system that protects the public, upholds the integrity and professional standards of the legal profession and ensures disciplinary matters are resolved fairly, efficiently and with appropriate regard to the seriousness of the allegations involved. We recognise that public confidence in the legal profession is fundamental to the administration of justice.

Queenslanders must have confidence that legal practitioners are held to appropriate public and professional standards, that complaints are dealt with properly and that serious misconduct is subject to an effective and independent disciplinary process. Equally, legal practitioners who are the subject of disciplinary proceedings are entitled to a fair hearing and timely resolution of these proceedings. This bill represents a sensible reform to the way those responsibilities are administered in Queensland.

One of the principle objectives of the bill is to implement the recommendations of the legal practitioner jurisdiction review undertaken by the Hon. David Thomas, former president of QCAT. The central recommendation of that review was that the legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction, currently exercised by QCAT, should be transferred to the Supreme Court of Queensland. As many speakers have acknowledged, and as the committee heard through the committee process, this is an appropriate recommendation and one that is being implemented by this bill.

The Supreme Court has a longstanding inherent jurisdiction to supervise and discipline members of the legal profession. That jurisdiction exists independently of the statutory jurisdiction currently exercised by QCAT, and it will remain unaffected by this legislation. There is a sound institutional logic in having serious disciplinary matters determined within the Supreme Court, particularly when those matters involve findings of professional misconduct, suspension from practice or, in the most serious circumstances, removal from the roll of legal practitioners.

These are not minor administrative matters. They can have profound consequences for professional standing, livelihood and reputation of the practitioner concerned. More importantly, in my view, they can also have significant consequences for the clients and for public confidence in the legal system. Our legal system only works as effectively as it does because people have confidence in it. People have confidence in it because of the standing of those who participate as advocates and as advisers as part of that system. If those participants are not held to a high standard, it undermines the very foundations of our legal system.

Moving the jurisdiction to the Supreme Court provides access to a broader pool of judges and gives the Chief Justice greater flexibility to allocate and manage these specialist matters. It is a practical reform that should assist in reducing delays and improving the timely resolution of proceedings. A

disciplinary system must be rigorous, but it must also be capable of delivering decisions within a reasonable timeframe. The transfer to the Supreme Court provides an opportunity to improve the management of these matters and make better use of judicial resources. There are also other important aspects of this legislation that deserve recognition, and many members have highlighted those in this contribution.

This is an important bill that will continue to enhance public confidence in the legal profession. It is important to ensure the government continues to properly resource QCAT and the Supreme Court of Queensland to ensure continued confidence from that perspective. The opposition expects the Crisafulli government to take that resourcing and those bodies seriously. It also means of course that the justice system and access to it must be independent and seen to be independent.

The legal profession occupies a position of considerable trust in our community. Queenslanders rely on legal practitioners to provide confident advice to act ethically, to protect their interest and to uphold the law. When that trust is breached there must be an effective disciplinary system capable of holding practitioners capable. Equally, that system must be fair to those practitioners, independent in its operation and accessible to members of the public.

This bill makes a sensible change to the institutional arrangements governing serious legal practitioner disciplinary matters. It recognises the Supreme Court's longstanding supervisory role over the legal profession, provides greater flexibility in the allocation of judicial resources and seeks to improve the timely resolution of proceedings. It also makes worthwhile improvements to cost arrangements and maintains important professional and community participation in disciplinary decisions.

The opposition supports a discipline system that protects the public, maintains confidence in the legal profession, treats practitioners fairly and ensures people who have legitimate complaints or claims can access justice. As foreshadowed earlier in my contribution, it would be open for me to move that the question be put, but I will not do that quite yet. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms JAMES (Barron River—LNP) (8.30 pm): Ninety-three weeks—that was the average time it was taking to finalise a legal practitioner disciplinary matter in Queensland under the former Labor government. Ninety-three weeks is almost two years. It is long enough for a child to be conceived, born and celebrate their first birthday; long enough for complainants to be left waiting for answers; long enough for legal practitioners to be left waiting for certainty; and far too long for matters that go directly to public confidence in Queensland's justice system. Justice delayed is justice denied. That is why this bill is necessary.

At first glance, the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill may appear to be a highly technical piece of legislation affecting only members of the legal profession. However, at its heart this bill is about something much broader: it is about trust. Queenslanders face enormous trust in legal practitioners during some of the most significant moments of their lives: purchasing a home, preparing a will, navigating a family dispute, establishing a business or seeking justice through the courts. People rightly expect legal practitioners to act with integrity, professionalism and competence. They also expect that when those standards are not met there are strong, fair and efficient systems in place to hold practitioners to account.

Public confidence in the justice system does not begin and end in the courtroom. It relies upon confidence in the institutions and professions that support it, including the legal profession itself. Public confidence in the justice system takes years to build but can be undermined very quickly when people lose faith in the institutions that support it. This bill delivers that confidence. It implements all 23 recommendations arising from the independent review of Queensland's legal practitioner disciplinary jurisdiction conducted by the Hon. David Thomas. It delivers practical reforms that will strengthen accountability, improve efficiency and ensure disciplinary matters are dealt with in a way that maintains public confidence in Queensland's legal profession and justice system.

When disciplinary matters remain unresolved for extended periods, it is not only complainants who are affected. Practitioners, regulators and the broader community are also left waiting. The review found that one of the key reasons for these delays was the existing jurisdictional arrangement whereby legal practitioner disciplinary matters are heard through QCAT, despite the Supreme Court already exercising significant responsibility for supervising and regulating the legal profession. Unfortunately, despite these issues being known, the former Labor government yet again failed to act. While delays continued to grow and disciplinary matters stretched towards two years for a resolution, Labor allowed the status quo to continue. Unfortunately, despite these issues being known, they failed to act—another thing they have failed to act on in Queensland. This is not an isolated example.

Time and time again, Labor identified problems, commissioned reviews and glossy brochures, and received recommendations, only to leave meaningful reforms sitting on a shelf collecting dust. Queenslanders saw it in youth justice, where repeated warnings were ignored while crime escalated. They saw it in community safety, where expert advice was too often followed by delay rather than action. They saw it with the CFMEU, where concerns about cost blowouts, bullying and intimidation were swept under the rug. They also saw it here, where disciplinary matters continued to stretch toward two years for resolution while the status quo remained unchanged.

Queenslanders deserve better than governments that identify problems but fail to fix them. The Crisafulli government is taking a different approach. When expert reviews identify practical reforms that strengthen public confidence and improve the operation of our institutions, we act. That is exactly what this bill does. The Supreme Court is the right forum and a key reform contained in this bill is the transfer of legal practitioner disciplinary matters from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland. This is both a sensible and appropriate approach. The Supreme Court already admits legal practitioners to the profession, the Supreme Court already regulates officers of the court and the Supreme Court already plays a central role in maintaining confidence in the administration of justice. It is, therefore, entirely appropriate that the most serious disciplinary matters involving legal practitioners are determined by Queensland's highest state court.

In fact, it raises a really simple question: if the Supreme Court is responsible for admitting legal practitioners to the profession, if it already regulates officers of the court and, if it ultimately oversees the administrative justice in Queensland, why should the most serious disciplinary matters be heard anywhere else? This reform streamlines the process, removes unnecessary duplication and places disciplinary matters before the court best equipped to deal with issues of professional conduct, ethics and fitness to practise.

This reform also reflects a broader approach being taken by the Crisafulli government to cut the red tape left behind by the former Labor government. The *Queensland Nightlife Economy Action Plan 2026-2032* is reducing red tape for venues and supporting live music and hospitality businesses. The Small and Family Business Action First Statement is reducing regulatory burdens and making it easier for small businesses to operate, and the government procurement reforms are simplifying procurement processes and improving access to Queensland businesses.

Importantly, these reforms are not being driven by government alone. The committee heard loud and strong support from key stakeholders across the legal profession including the Legal Services Commissioner, the Queensland Law Society and the Australian Lawyers Alliance. That support carries significant weight. These are organisations that work within this framework every single day. They understand its strengths, its shortcomings and the practical realities of how it operates. The Legal Services Commissioner advised that these reforms would deliver best income—sorry, better outcomes: that was a Freudian slip—for complainants, practitioners and regulators alike. The Australian Lawyers Alliance recognised the serious consequences that can flow from findings of professional misconduct including suspension or removal from practice and supported to the transfer of jurisdiction to the Supreme Court, as the appropriate forum for matters of such significance.

These are not reforms being imposed upon the profession. These are reforms supported by those who understand the system best and who engage with it every single day. Rather than allowing those recommendations to sit on a shelf like the former Labor government did, the Crisafulli government is implementing all 23 recommendations of the review. That is because we are a government that listens, we are a government that acts and we are a government that delivers. When opportunities exist to strengthen Queensland's institutions, improve accountability and restore public confidence, we will not hesitate to act.

While Labor was comfortable with a system that would leave matters unresolved for almost two years, the Crisafulli government believes complainants, practitioners and the public deserves a lot better. That is why we are implementing all 23 recommendations of the independent review, reducing unnecessary delay and ensuring serious disciplinary matters are dealt with by the appropriate court. These are sensible reforms, they are practical reforms and they are reforms that will strengthen public confidence in Queensland's legal profession and our justice system for years to come. Labor failed to act. We are fixing it, and I want to thank the minister, her team and everyone who has worked towards this.

Mrs KIRKLAND (Rockhampton—LNP) (8.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. This is an important bill that strengthens confidence in Queensland's justice system. It improves accountability within the legal

profession and, most importantly, it ensures disciplinary matters involving legal practitioners are resolved more quickly, fairly and effectively. The bill is about ensuring Queenslanders can have confidence that the legal profession is subject to a disciplinary framework that is robust, timely and fair. It addresses a problem that is becoming increasingly difficult to ignore, a problem that affects our communities—that is, the lengthy delays in finalising disciplinary matters involving legal practitioners.

The statutory review undertaken by the Hon. David Thomas found that as at August 2025 legal practitioner disciplinary matters were taking an average of approximately 93 weeks to finalise through QCAT. That is nearly two years. Such delays undermine public confidence, weaken deterrence and place unnecessary strain on complainants, practitioners and the justice system itself. It is unfair to all parties involved. The bill responds to the recommendations of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal statutory review and implements all 23 recommendations relating to legal practitioner jurisdiction. It transfers legal practitioner disciplinary matters from QCAT to the Supreme Court of Queensland while preserving fairness and accessibility within the disciplinary process.

The Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee carefully examined the bill, considered submissions from stakeholders, received departmental briefings and held a public hearing. After considering the evidence, the committee found the bill compatible with human rights and recommended its passage. Importantly, every stakeholder who made a submission supported the transfer of the legal practitioner jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court. If the Supreme Court admits lawyers to the profession, it is entirely appropriate that the Supreme Court also be responsible for determining the most serious disciplinary matters involving legal practitioners. The court already exercises an inherent supervisory role over the profession. In fact, before the creation of QCAT, these matters were heard by Supreme Court judges. This reform therefore represents a sensible realignment of responsibilities rather than the creation of a new system.

The bill will ensure disciplinary matters are heard by a single Supreme Court judge, enabling better case management and more efficient resolution of matters. Existing proceedings that have not commenced substantive hearings will transfer to the Supreme Court, ensuring a seamless transition. At the same time, many of the existing procedural safeguards will remain in place, helping to preserve accessibility and fairness for all parties involved. One of the features I particularly support is the retention of both legal professional panel members and community representatives to assist the court in disciplinary matters. These provisions ensure the disciplinary process continues to benefit from professional expertise while also maintaining a strong community perspective. This strikes an appropriate balance between accountability, fairness and public confidence.

The bill also provides important clarity around costs orders. It ensures legal practitioners who successfully defend allegations are not automatically required to bear costs associated with matters that are ultimately not proven. Accountability remains essential, but so too does fairness. These amendments reflect the approach already recognised by the Queensland Court of Appeal and supported by stakeholders throughout the consultation process.

While this legislation concerns the legal profession, its benefits extend far beyond lawyers and legal regulators. Every Queenslander has an interest in the integrity of our justice system. Consumers of legal services deserve confidence that complaints will be assessed properly and dealt with promptly. Delays not only create uncertainty but can also weaken public trust in professional standards and disciplinary processes. This bill strengthens protections for Queenslanders who rely on legal services and reinforces the high standards that are expected of legal practitioners. Importantly, this bill will also free up significant judicial and administrative resources within QCAT. By removing a highly specialised jurisdiction, QCAT can focus its attention on matters that directly affect many Queensland households, including tenancy disputes, guardianship matters, consumer disputes and neighbourhood disagreements. Every Queenslander who relies on QCAT stands to benefit from a tribunal that is better able to focus its resources on its core workload. For those of us representing regional Queensland communities, that matters greatly. In Rockhampton and across Central Queensland, people expect justice institutions to operate efficiently and effectively. Whether it is a family dealing with a tenancy dispute, a small business involved in a consumer matter or a vulnerable resident seeking an outcome through a guardianship application, delays create real-world consequences. Any reform that allows QCAT to devote greater attention to these matters and reduce pressure on its workload will be greatly welcomed by many regional Queenslanders.

The benefits of timely justice are especially important in regional communities. Residents of Rockhampton deserve the same confidence in the legal system as those living in Brisbane. They deserve confidence that complaints involving legal practitioners will not sit unresolved for years and that disciplinary matters can be determined efficiently by the most appropriate court. By streamlining

these processes, this bill helps ensure the justice system remains responsive and credible regardless of where a Queenslander lives.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Rockhampton, I hate to stop you, but the time is now 8.45 so I will call on the Attorney-General to reply.

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (8.45 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their exciting, riveting speeches! I apologise to the honourable Minister for Health who was absolutely ready and raring to go to speak about his illustrious legal career.

Mr Nicholls: The Briginshaw principle.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The Briginshaw principle! There are so many people who would have loved to have spoken a bit longer on this bill. Before I get to the substance of what I want to talk about, I do want to call out one of the members of the government, the member for Lockyer, who tried to say that he hopes that we never have to use lawyers. What a shameful contribution! As a former practising lawyer I want to remind the House and the member for Lockyer of the hard work these professionals do in wills and estates and conveyancing. Where would the world be without these good lawyers? That is why this bill is important. To the member for Lockyer, thank you for supporting the bill but I did want to correct the record in relation to the importance of hardworking lawyers all across Queensland.

As I outlined earlier, the primary change that the bill brings is a transfer of the legal practitioner jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court as recommended by the Hon. David Thomas as part of the statutory review into QCAT. I would like to put on the record the Crisafulli government's thanks to the former justice Thomas for his interim report on the QCAT review and for the enormous amount of work undertaken delivering the broader QCAT review. Mr Thomas consulted widely in the process of reviewing the legal practitioner jurisdiction at QCAT, especially with the courts, heads of jurisdiction, the registries within the Department of Justice, the Legal Services Commission and professional bodies such as the Queensland Law Society, the Bar Association of Queensland and the Australian Lawyers Alliance. This reform will alleviate the current substantial burden on QCAT and provide for the Supreme Court to supervise the legal profession under the Legal Profession Act. The shift is quite simply in the best interests of the legal profession and the justice system.

I am very pleased to have been able to pursue these reforms, which have extremely broad support across the profession. They will better support the legal practitioner disciplinary framework for solicitors, barristers and law practice employees and they will promote the administration of justice. They will better safeguard the reputation of the legal profession and protect the public from professional misconduct. I thank the hardworking Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee, ably led by the member for Nicklin, for all of their work on the inquiry into the bill. I had the benefit of reviewing the *Record of Proceedings* of the public hearing of the inquiry. I make the point that none of the members of the opposition asked any questions of our legal stakeholders at the hearing—not one.

To his credit, the member for Maiwar did pose a question, but none of the Labor members on the committee even bothered to ask one. The QLS, in particular, took time out of their busy schedule to make a submission and to appear before the committee. Tonight I was keen to hear from the shadow Attorney-General on her thoughts on the bill. However, I was pleased that at least the member for Waterford was here to share remarks on behalf of the opposition.

Since coming to office, as a government we have massively increased judicial resourcing across all Queensland courts. Specifically, earlier this year the Crisafulli government provided extra funding for an additional Supreme Court judge, the first funded in almost a decade. Through the 2026-27 state budget, the Crisafulli government is also investing $11 million over five years plus $2.4 million annually to appoint additional Supreme and District Court judges and $29.3 million over four years, with $3.3 million ongoing for judicial and court support services to reduce delays. This announcement of additional resourcing and funding was warmly welcomed by the QLS and other legal professional bodies.

I also thank the QLS for their input into the drafting process and for their contributions at the committee hearing. As a government, we value consultation with our stakeholders. I acknowledge the comment of the CEO of the QLS, Matt Dunn, at the committee's public hearing, when he said—

The consultation has been excellent up to this stage and will undoubtedly continue to be so.

Of course, all Supreme Court judges will be able to hear these types of matters upon their transfer to the court. The legal profession will have the benefit of the full complement of Supreme Court judges to determine disciplinary hearings, introducing far more flexibility than currently available under QCAT.

The Supreme Court is the appropriate court to preside over these types of matters and is ultimately responsible for the administration of legal practitioners who, from that point, become officers of the court.

I will now address other matters raised by honourable members during the course of this debate. I note that the shadow Treasurer raised concerns regarding costs that may apply to proceedings in the Supreme Court. Other than disciplinary applications that have their own rules regarding costs for the Legal Services Commissioner, the bill provides that each party to a proceeding will bear their own costs. However, the court can make an order for a party to pay costs if necessary, in the interests of justice. This preserves the costs arrangement that currently applies to the proceedings in QCAT.

On fidelity fund claims, in line with recommendation 20 of the report of Hon. David Thomas, the bill ensures that legal practitioner proceedings will generally continue to be conducted in the same way as they currently are in QCAT, including appeals concerning fidelity fund applications. This is achieved through the bill providing the Supreme Court is not bound by the rules of evidence, may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate and must act with as little formality and technicality as possible. Further, Queensland has entrenched this approach over decades. As I am advised, it is the same procedure that applied when legal practitioner matters were previously heard by Supreme Court judges sitting as the Legal Practice Tribunal, before QCAT. I note that the honourable member for Clayfield might have been around in those days, but I digress.

Mr Nicholls: But I wasn't before the tribunal.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Exactly. That is a good point, absolutely as a practitioner—

Mr Nicholls: They hadn't caught up with me by then.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am not taking that interjection. The Supreme Court retains flexibility to address certain issues through court rules if required. Importantly, the existing fee reduction scheme for applications to the Supreme Court will also apply to legal practitioner matters, providing significantly reduced fees in cases of financial hardship or if the applicant holds a social security concession card or is receiving certain types of legal assistance.

One further point I would like to make is that some members opposite have remarked that QCAT heard only a small number of these types of matters. I think it was the member for Mansfield who talked to this issue. I want to reassure the member that, whilst they may number in the hundreds as opposed to the thousands, these matters can be complex, they can be long running and they are very registry intensive. Removing the jurisdiction entirely will provide immediate relief.

I foreshadow to the House that I intend to move some amendments during consideration in detail on the bill. They were circulated this morning, so I note all members have had an opportunity to have a look at them. The amendments will address certain issues of a technical nature that were raised throughout the inquiry process. They really provide technical clarification to ensure that certain decisions or orders made by the Supreme Court under the legal practitioner jurisdiction can be appealed to the Court of Appeal, even where the decision or an order is made under a section of the act that is different to the section under which the proceeding was originally commenced. For example and for clarity, in case I do not get to it, the Legal Services Commissioner may start a disciplinary proceeding under section 452 of the act, but the Supreme Court may make an order in that proceeding under section 456 of the act. This will address a technical issue raised by the Legal Services Commissioner and will ensure the provisions operate as intended.

Secondly, the amendments will clarify that orders made by the Court of Appeal in appeals relating to a discipline application must be implemented and enforced by entities with functions under the Legal Profession Act, including requiring the Legal Services Commissioner to notify corresponding legal professional bodies in other states and territories of those orders. This will ensure that orders of the Court of Appeal in appeals relating to a discipline application are implemented and enforced similarly to orders of the Supreme Court and the Legal Practice Committee.

Finally, the amendments will also clarify that failing to comply with orders of the Court of Appeal in appeals relating to a discipline application is capable of being unsatisfactory professional misconduct or professional misconduct. This will ensure that orders of the Court of Appeal in appeals relating to a discipline application are treated similarly to orders of the Supreme Court and Legal Practice Committee. I feel there needs to be a test after this. It very much feels like we are about to go into an exam period. I have touched on the amendments because it is very important that I clarify those matters. The amendments will address certain issues that are technical in nature and were raised throughout the inquiry process. I very much thank all of the submitters to the committee inquiry.

Once again, I thank all honourable members for their considered contributions during this debate. I also thank all who have worked on this very important bill including, of course, Leighton and Joanna. They are very hardworking people in the department of justice. I also thank the members of Leighton's and Joanna's team who have spent an inordinate amount of time working to prepare this bill so that we can debate it in the manner in which it ought to be debated. Often I get an opportunity to sum up these debates but then run out of time. I have no idea how that happens. A couple of sittings ago we debated a really big bill that Leighton worked on and I did not have the opportunity to mention him so, to Leighton and his team, thank you very much.

Queenslanders rightfully place high expectations on those entrusted to act on their behalf in legal matters. The same standards protect the reputations of the vast majority of lawyers who do the right thing. I want to give a shout-out to all the lawyers from both sides of the House, including the shadow Treasurer, who have taken on this amazing profession. We had to sit here and listen to the member for Lockyer—I am still on this—tell us that hopefully he never has to use a lawyer. Goodness me! I will get over that one day. I will find the most expensive estate lawyer I can and send him along. I hope that he has an up-to-date will and power of attorney.

I do not want to waste anyone's time, but I do want to reiterate to the House one point: the standard of our profession is extraordinarily high in Queensland. All legal professionals have a very high standard. It is again important to note: please do not go on Airtasker and do not go on a site that is not reputable and take the option for a conveyance, a will or an estate. Seek out a qualified lawyer. Look them up at the Law Society of Queensland to make sure they have a good reputation and not someone who has ever had to face the scrutiny of what we are talking about today.

That is why this bill is important. I again thank the opposition for the bipartisan manner in which this has been debated. It does strengthen the integrity of the profession. It reinforces accountability mechanisms while preserving procedural fairness. The Supreme Court admits lawyers and is the natural home for interrogating professional ethics and standards, while every Queenslander with a matter before QCAT will benefit when judicial resources are freed up. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, the question is—

That the bill be now read a second time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Mr SPEAKER: Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate. I call the Attorney-General to table the explanatory notes to her amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (9.01 pm): I table the amendments, the explanatory notes to my amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments.

Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Deb Frecklington's amendments.

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the Attorney-General's amendment No. 8 is outside the long title of the bill and therefore requires leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the Attorney-General's amendment Nos 1 to 10, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

1 Clause 9 (Amendment of s 46 (Suitability to hold local practising certificate))

Page 14, line 9, before 'Section'—

insert—

(1)

2 Clause 9 (Amendment of s 46 (Suitability to hold local practising certificate))

Page 14, after line 11—

insert—

(2) Section 46(2)(d)—

insert—

(ia) a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal; or

3 Clause 21 (Amendment of s 185 (Refusal to grant or renew registration))

Page 17, after line 12—

insert—

(1A) Section 185(2)(c), 'body, including'—

omit, *insert*—

body, or a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal, including

4 Clause 37 (Amendment of s 420 (Conduct capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct))

Page 24, line 16, after 'body'—

insert—

, or a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal,

5 Clause 43 (Amendment of s 461 (Compliance with decisions and orders))

Page 27, after line 4—

insert—

(1) Section 461, heading, after 'orders'—

insert—

of disciplinary bodies

6 Clause 43 (Amendment of s 461 (Compliance with decisions and orders))

Page 27, line 5, before 'Section'—

insert—

(2)

7 After clause 43

Page 27, after line 7—

insert—

43A Insertion of new s 461A

After section 461—

insert—

461A Compliance with disciplinary orders of Court of Appeal

(1) This section provides for the application of section 461 in relation to an order (a ***disciplinary order***) of the Court of Appeal made on an appeal against—

(a) a decision or order of the Supreme Court made in a proceeding under section 443(4), 452(1)(a) or 469(1); or

(b) an order of the Supreme Court mentioned in section 459(4).

(2) Section 461 applies in relation to a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal as if—

(a) the reference in section 461(1) to an order of a disciplinary body included a reference to a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal; and

(b) a reference in section 461(1) and (2) to an order, whether of the Supreme Court or the committee, made under a stated provision of this Act (the ***nominated order***) included a reference to a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal of a similar nature to the nominated order; and

(c) the reference in section 461(3) to the Supreme Court included a reference to the Court of Appeal.

8 After clause 50

Page 29, after line 21—

insert—

50A Amendment of s 488 (Failure to comply with order of a disciplinary body)

(1) Section 488, heading, 'a disciplinary body'—

omit, *insert*—

disciplinary body or other particular orders

(2) Section 488, 'disciplinary body under this Act'—

omit, *insert*—

disciplinary body or the former disciplinary body, or a disciplinary order of the Court of Appeal, under this Act

9 Clause 52 (Insertion of new chs 6B—6D)

Page 39, line 3, 'under a'—

omit, *insert*—

under, or in a proceeding under, a

10 Clause 97 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 64, after line 7—

insert—

disciplinary order, of the Court of Appeal, see section 461A(1).

Question put—That clauses 1 to 98 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 98 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.02 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (9.02 pm): This week we have heard heartbreaking reports of at least seven potentially preventable deaths across Queensland and, tragically, one of those deaths happened in my community of Waterford. On Saturday, a man in Bethania reportedly suffered breathing difficulties. He had choked on his own medication. His son called triple-0 at 9.03 pm, again at 12.45 am and again at 1.00 am. Tragically, he is believed to have suffered a cardiac arrest and passed away.

This gentleman visited my electorate office just in August to let my team know that his wife had just passed away. My staff remembered him as a lovely man and spoke so warmly of their interaction with him. I understand he was also fondly remembered by former staff from the Waterford electorate office. This is devastating, and my thoughts are with man's family, friends and with our local Logan community.

Sitting down with grieving families was always something I did as health minister. I believe it is the most important thing you can do. I never had to consider the value or the importance of these meetings like this LNP health minister. I knew there was inherent value in it because in difficult times, Queenslanders just want to know they are being listened to. I genuinely cannot understand the priorities of this health minister.

When questioned about ambulance ramping in Townsville, he said, 'What next? Are they going to ask me about the level of fuel that was in the back of the ambulance?' I find that response extraordinary. There is one word for it—heartless—a heartless health minister. These families deserve compassion and accountability. This health minister should be picking up the phone, reaching out to every one of these families, offering to meet with them. 'Tin Man Tim'—if only he had a heart.

Finally, I want to say to our paramedics, our emergency medical despatchers and frontline health workers: thank you. I thank you because every day you face situations most of us will never experience. You carry those experiences with you, shift after shift after shift. You do not just deserve our thanks, you deserve respect, support and the resources to do your job. If this health minister sat down with those families, understood what they went through and committed to making sure that never happened again, that would start with making sure our frontline health workers have the resources they need. We stand with our frontline health workers and we are thinking of you.

(Time expired)

Carina Barber Shop

Hon. SJ MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (9.05 pm): I rise this evening to acknowledge one of Chatsworth's most prominent small and family business owners, Mr Theo Petrou. Theo is no ordinary businessman. In 1986, at 15 years of age, he began working for his father's newly opened business, Carina Barber Shop, along Old Cleveland Road, after leaving school, later succeeding him as owner following his father's retirement in 2000.

October this year marked the 40th anniversary of his successful and prominent barber shop which, in 2023, was voted among Brisbane's top 10 barber shops by the *Courier-Mail*. This is a testament to not only the exceptional customer service his business provides but also the dedication and perseverance he has demonstrated over many years. We on this side of the chamber know how challenging running a small business can be, so reaching four decades of continuous service in the same precinct is a remarkable achievement and one that deserves significant recognition.

The barber's chair is a renowned feature and hallmark of countless milestones in the lives of men across Chatsworth, particularly for many of life's firsts. It is also a place where rapport is driven, connections are made and generations share their stories. During this 40-year period, Theo has watched young boys grow into young men, and young men grow into fathers. He has listened to the evolution of individual livelihoods and developed a myriad friendships along the way.

Theo was one of the first small business owners I got to know when I was first preselected to run for the seat of Chatsworth back in late 2010. He has a very strong grasp of politics and always provides full and frank advice—some would say very frank advice—when he is passionate about issues that affect small and family business.

Running a solo small family business requires an extraordinary level of dedication, resilience and business acumen. After succeeding his father, who was a wonderful businessman in his own right, Theo continued his family's legacy in 2000. Theo employed his first manager in 2018 to grow their operations and he has employed six new employees to continue his father's great legacy. Recognising the importance of youth engagement in employment and small business, Theo is currently mentoring a young apprentice of 17 years of age who, as a child, was inspired by the same great barber service Theo provides.

The success of Carina Barber Shop has not been one of luck but one of hard work, diligence and the pursuit of excellence in all ambitions. Despite the many challenges endured over the years with changing economic circumstances, the Chatsworth community's trust and loyalty remained—and continues to remain—for Theo and his conscientious team at Carina Barber Shop.

Theo has curated an iconic local men's barber shop. It is beloved by Chatsworth's residents as well as visitors across Brisbane's eastern suburbs, and continues to maintain a stellar reputation as one of Brisbane's most popular barber shops. Theo is a passionate and successful businessman. I express my sincere congratulations to Theo and his team and I wish them all the very best endeavours as they continue to grow the Carina Barber Shop.

Prince Charles Hospital

Mr RICHMOND (Stafford—ALP) (9.08 pm): I rise to express my deep sadness at the news of the passing of a man at the Prince Charles Hospital this week. I extend my condolences to all who knew and loved that person. Sorry, I think I misidentified their gender. I want to express my condolences to all who knew and loved the person who passed away. I also convey my sorrow and anguish for the health workers at the Prince Charles Hospital. My sister is a nurse at the Prince Charles Hospital. She has told me of the toll that it takes on her when she has been in the room when someone's life support

has been turned off, and to find a patient in the circumstances in which this patient was found must weigh particularly heavily on our health workers.

I want to make a couple of comments about the way in which this health minister has interacted with this issue and with the Prince Charles Hospital in general. When he announced the release of the Prince Charles Hospital master plan, the health minister said that there had not been any new investment in the Prince Charles Hospital for 30 years. I hope that he was misquoted or that the clip was misconstrued because that is a lie.

Mr SPEAKER: You will withdraw that. That is unparliamentary language.

Mr RICHMOND: I withdraw. That is incorrect. Had he walked around the hospital site, he would have seen Jacaranda Place—a site that was built to replace the Barrett Centre, which was closed by those opposite, where children took their lives because they did not have access to the health care they needed and deserved. For the health minister to stand up at the site where the replacement facility was built and say that there had been no new investment in the Prince Charles Hospital is a disgraceful slur. It dishonours the memory of the people who took their lives and it dishonours all of the people who have received treatment at Jacaranda Place.

The case of the health minister is that the tragedies we are seeing are a consequence of a lack of beds. It is not business as usual. We are in a state of emergency. The health minister should actually do something about it. When releasing the Prince Charles Hospital master plan, he told the media that the tenders would not go out until the second half of next year. As people continue to lose their lives, this health minister needs to recognise that those tenders need to be released urgently and those beds need to be built now.

Gold Coast Events

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (9.11 pm): I had the great pleasure last week of representing the Minister for Tourism at the launch at Q1 on the Gold Coast of the 2027 Australian Academy of Cinema and Television Awards, which is to be held next February at HOTA on the Gold Coast. The Crisafulli LNP government has extended financial support for the event for the next two years as part of its investment in tourism and events in Queensland, demonstrating its commitment to making Queensland the events capital of Australia. Whether it is sport, the arts, music or entertainment, the Crisafulli government is determined to get Queensland on top.

The launch was compered by ebullient host Shane Jacobson, always known as 'Kenny' to me, who was glowing in his support and acclamation for the Gold Coast as the perfect destination for the celebration of all things wonderful in the film and television industry. With a booming film industry on the Gold Coast becoming a serious economic driver in our economy, homegrown actors such as Margot Robbie and Anna Torv are starring across the world. Baz Luhrmann has made a home at Burleigh on the Gold Coast, and film and television production across the Gold Coast, with its myriad film-worthy locations, is an exciting generator of jobs and tourism.

The 2027 awards event is anticipated to deliver more than 10,300 visitor nights and generate more than $5.8 million for the state's economy. That is why the Crisafulli government, through Tourism and Events Queensland and Screen Queensland, is proud to continue its support of this event.

Also on the Gold Coast in the last two weeks was the Pan Pacific Masters Games, attracting a record 16,000 competitors to the Gold Coast for that period across a wide variety of sports. It even attracted the Leader of the Opposition to the weightlifting competition with an eye-popping performance. This magnificent event generates around $28 million for the Gold Coast economy, with about 80,000 visitor nights and visitation and entertainment investment. It further cements the reputation of the Gold Coast as the events capital of Queensland.

I had the pleasure of launching the Pan Pacific Masters event of clay target shooting in all disciplines at the Gold Coast Clay Target Club near Jacobs Well, where I am a life member. In my opening speech to the competition, I referred to the Crisafulli government refusing to buckle to the kneejerk political reaction by the Albanese federal government and the Minns New South Wales Labor government to the horrific Bondi attack by imposing more ridiculous restrictions on law-abiding, responsible shooters. The applause was deafening. The Pan Pacs on the Gold Coast happen every two years and is just another way the Crisafulli LNP government is full on in its support for tourism and events in Queensland.

Health System

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (9.14 pm): Under this heartless LNP government, the health system is in crisis, and it is getting worse. Despite the extraordinary hard work and best efforts of local doctors, nurses, health workers, support staff, paramedics and emergency medical dispatchers, as noted in the *Courier-Mail* today, it is the 'worst it has ever been'. I table that headline from the *Courier-Mail*. This week Queenslanders have heard about heartbreaking tragedies involving at least seven potentially preventable deaths. We are hearing from frontline workers that these potentially preventable deaths are a result of a system in crisis—a crisis caused by this LNP government.

Tabled paper: Extract of article from *The Courier Mail* online, undated, titled ''Worst it has ever been': Premier's emergency meeting with top public servants'.

We heard of a Bribie Island man who died after his wife made repeated triple 0 calls seeking emergency help. I extend my sincere condolences to that poor gentleman's family and friends. Having lived most of my life in the Caboolture area, I know lots of people who live on Bribie Island. One of their greatest fears is that, when they need an ambulance, one will not get there in time. If one does get there, they worry that they will die in the back of the ambulance on Bribie Island Road. When it comes to emergencies, time matters. At the moment, we are seeing that time is being stolen from people who need help under the LNP health crisis.

As tragic as all of this is, we get the impression that this heartless government is reluctant to even engage, let alone meet, with Queenslanders impacted by these heartbreaking tragedies. In fact, tonight on TV news we saw that this family from Bribie Island has contacted the health minister's office on multiple occasions. It was not once and not twice but on 11 September, 18 October, 21 October, 21 October again, 27 October, 28 October, 1 November, 2 November and 17 November. They have contacted the health minister's office many times. We heard from the TV reports that they have not had a reply. They have not had a reply from this heartless government.

What minister would not respond to someone in those tragic circumstances, let alone those who are desperate to connect? I wonder whether this heartless minister sees any value in even responding to this terrible tragedy. This is a health system in crisis under the LNP. This is a heartless government which is not putting the resources where they are needed, and Queenslanders are dying as a result.

Rockhampton Electorate, Historical Buildings

Mrs KIRKLAND (Rockhampton—LNP) (9.17 pm): I wish to acknowledge an important campaign that is currently underway in Rockhampton to preserve our historic former drill hall and the Central Queensland Military and Artefacts Museum at 40 Archer Street. Recently, the local veterans organisation known as The Blank Cheque Movement launched a community support campaign calling on the Rockhampton Regional Council to preserve this significant site and for the museum to remain at its current location. The campaign recognises the importance of protecting both heritage-listed buildings and the military history they contain for future generations of Central Queenslanders.

The site became a Defence Force reserve in 1901 and served as Rockhampton's principal military training depot for almost a century. The drill hall, constructed in 1906, played a vital role in recruiting, training and preparing generations of Australian service men and women, including during the First World War and the Second World War. The collection sits in the very place where history happened. Generations of Australians trained, gathered and departed from this location to serve their nation. The Central Queensland Military and Artefacts Museum preserves stories and artefacts spanning conflicts from the Boer War through to the modern service. Many of the items have been donated by local veterans and families, ensuring the stories of Central Queensland's service men and women were not lost.

I recognise the work of the Blank Cheque Movement and its founders, veterans Bradey and Charlene Livermore, together with the movement's dedicated members. Their connection and support, advocacy and community engagement is helping build stronger outcomes for those who have served, and continue to serve, in our communities. Places such as the drill hall and military museum provide much more than historical value; they create opportunities for remembrance, recognition and connection. They honour those on whose shoulders we stand—those who fought for our freedoms. For veterans and their families, these places help keep service and sacrifice visible. For younger generations they provide a deeper understanding of the contribution made by local men and women in uniform.

This community support campaign for the preservation of the drill hall and military museum currently has around 500 signatures. It aligns strongly with the Queensland Veterans and Veterans' Families Strategy 2026-32 released by Premier David Crisafulli. One of the strategy's key pillars is

commemoration and recognition, ensuring veterans' stories are preserved, shared and honoured for future generations. The drill hall museum is exactly the kind of initiative that supports those objectives on a local level. As a community, we have a responsibility not only to support today's veterans and their families but also to protect the places that tell their stories. The former drill hall and Central Queensland Military and Artefacts Museum is irreplaceable. Thank you.

(Time expired)

Health System

Ms McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (9.20 pm): I will begin my contribution by thanking the hardworking frontline health workers across Queensland. They are at the coalface of a health crisis that can be laid at the feet of a heartless health minister. I spent many years working alongside our first responding ambos and, believe me, there were many, many times I really hoped they would get to a job before I did. I know how much Queenslanders need them when in a health crisis.

It is not just our ambos, medical dispatchers and health workers who are affected by this crisis; it is everyday Queenslanders who are paying the price. This week we have heard that no less than seven Queenslanders from across the state have died in what were potentially preventable circumstances. Craig from Logan Reserve passed away at home after waiting over 4½ hours for an ambulance. Another from Bethania, whom the member for Waterford referred to, passed away in his home after waiting 5½ hours. Imagine that, when you are not even 10 minutes drive from Logan Hospital. Families are devastated, and rightly so. They have every right to demand answers and they have every right to expect an explanation or, at the very least, a courtesy phone call or response from the health minister.

Those Queensland families deserve answers about why the Crisafulli government has delayed hospital beds, slashed growth funding and stalled its workforce plan. So much for a vaunted Hospital Rescue Plan. On the northern Gold Coast everyone who visits Costco or the Westfield at Coomera can see the monument to the LNP's pettiness and inaction. Those elevated towers are a constant reminder that the Coomera Hospital is not going to be delivered by 2027 courtesy of the LNP. In fact, no beds will be online at Coomera until 2031 perhaps. That is four years of no beds at all. By then, in 2031 a constructed Coomera Hospital built and finished could be on stage 2 of the amount of beds that Coomera would need. But no, there will be four years of no beds and no hospital between Logan Hospital and the Gold Coast University Hospital. These are beds our region desperately needs. Beds save lives; beds can end the ramping.

Speaking of the heartless health minister, last night I joined many parents online as part of the Queensland Children's Gender Service waitlist. I was there with many other parents who have kids on that waitlist. Five hundred days is the response time for those vulnerable kids—500 days.

(Time expired)

Toowoomba North Electorate

Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.23 pm): This month thousands of young Queenslanders will walk out of the school gate for the very last time. I rise to congratulate the year 12 students of 2026 who have done their schooling and education in Toowoomba North. To every school leaver I say: you have put in the hard yards, you have backed yourself and you have earned this moment. You are stepping into a Queensland that has never offered more. Whether it is a trade, a university degree, getting straight into the workforce, starting your own business or taking some time travelling around Australia or overseas, do it with a spring in your step and a good attitude and you will go far in this world.

None of these students got here alone. Behind every one of them are parents, grandparents, loved ones and carers who have sat at kitchen tables and helped them get there. They have had dedicated teachers in the classroom, and to every teacher who went the extra mile—thank you. Tonight I would like to recognise our Toowoomba North schools and their 2026 student leaders.

At Toowoomba State High School, principal Therese Sippel tells me that Jade, Tyler, Tahreem and Dimity have done a fantastic job. At Wilsonton State High School, Brett Bizzell had John, Arlia, Sienna and Luke. At Highfields State Secondary College Scott Rowan had Mia and Cadoc. At Fairholme College, Dr Leigh Hobart, the principal there, had Bronte, Miranda and Alexandra. At the Glennie School, Mrs Emma Lowry had Izabella and Amelie. At Toowoomba Grammar School, Dr John Kinniburgh had Hugh, Luke and Peter as school leaders. The Toowoomba Anglican School, with

principal Mr Nick Johnstone, had Zeke and Sophie. Toowoomba Christian College, with principal Kerrin Budden, had Benjamin and Maya as their school leaders. At the Industry School I thank Ms Charmaine Cridland for her work with that particular cohort and their leaders Fletcher and Hayley. At Mary MacKillop Catholic College out at Highfields, Mr Chris Gabbett, the principal there, had Caitlin and Nazareth help him through the year. At St Mary's College, Mr Brendan Stewart had Max and Ari. The school starts at grade 5 and he took them all through. At St Ursula's College, Mrs Deidre Young had Ainslie and Emma. At St Saviour's College, Ms Jessica Wade had Ayen and Abinaybi. They are the leaders who have led the cohort of grade 12s in Toowoomba North.

I have a lot of schools in my little electorate and they all do a fantastic job. They all have their strengths and opportunities, and I say a big thank you to the teachers, the P&Cs and P&Fs and everybody who has put the effort in to get the year 12s to where they are. Thank you very much.

Minister for Health and Ambulance Services

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (9.26 pm): Tonight I want to speak in this adjournment debate and associate myself with the comments and very serious and thoughtful contributions made by members of the state parliamentary Labor Party, in particular the member for Waterford, the member for Morayfield, the member for Stafford and the member for Macalister. All of those Labor members spoke of avoidable tragedies that have befallen Queensland families because of the crisis that is engulfing the Queensland health system, led by a heartless health minister.

I also tonight want to say three names in this House: Will Fowell, Talieha Nebauer and Caitlin Wilkinson Whiticker. They are the three young people who died following the closure, without replacement, of the Barrett Adolescent Centre by the LNP government led by Campbell Newman. The irony of all of this—perhaps it is not irony—is that a direct line can be drawn in relation to those deaths and the deaths we have heard about in the House this week between former treasurer Nicholls and Minister for Health Nicholls. It was the member for Clayfield who forced the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Centre when he was the treasurer of Queensland. It is now the member for Clayfield, as the Minister for Health, who is presiding over the collapse of Queensland's health system. What did we see in the House this week? We saw no apology. We saw no contrition. We saw a man who sought to blame everyone else but himself, a man who said to the community that he was in deep conversation with one of those families.

Tonight, thanks to the reporting of Channel 9, we found out that the heartless health minister, the member for Clayfield, has been caught out. Not only does he refuse to meet with families of Queenslanders who have died, he and his office have simply ignored them. The family of a Bribie Island man who died after waiting two hours for an ambulance has been ignored. *9News* reported that the family contacted the health minister's office nine times, and the only response they received was an automated email reply. I respect and remember that man and his family tonight.

I was not afraid to meet the families of Will Fowell, Talieha Nebauer and Caitlin Wilkinson Whiticker. I embraced that opportunity as the health minister. The only thing any member of the LNP ever said about the commission of inquiry into Barrett was when the member for Surfers Paradise said it was a witch-hunt: no apology then, no apology now, no apology tonight by the health minister. That is everything that is wrong with this corrupt and broken LNP government.

(Time expired)

Coomera River, Erosion

Mr BOOTHMAN (Theodore—LNP) (9.30 pm): I rise to talk about an issue which has been going on in the Theodore electorate for some time—that is, the erosion along council land on the Coomera River. Over the last decade, land alongside the Coomera River has suffered significant damage and erosion from major weather events. The Gold Coast City has acted, or is acting, in certain sections of the river to tackle this problem. However, at the Oxenford Pony club, the location where the continued erosion is threatening one of the busiest roads in the area, council refuses to do anything.

Only a short distance downstream, though, council sought state funds to fix the riverbank at Regatta Waters parkland. Why is it unwilling to stabilise the riverbank at the Oxenford Pony Club? The pony club is pleading for council to use the $4 million that the Crisafulli government has put forward for rock armouring of this riverbank. Similar protection has been done upstream of this area to great effect and it has stopped that erosion. To date, council has been unwilling to attempt any prevention measures to protect its asset and the community club. Council says the originally planned restoration works are

no longer viable because of worsening erosion and that future works may not meet its value-for-money thresholds. Council also says it has no positive obligation to protect its land from a natural erosion event.

This is not just a piece of grass. The Oxenford Pony Club is a valued place for riders, and families come from the wider community to run their pony club competitions there. Geoff Thomson has been working and looking after that club for decades. Capturing the value of this land on a spreadsheet is not good enough for council. I strongly urge council to listen to the residents and reconsider their current unwillingness to protect the riverbank at the Oxenford Pony Club. If rock armouring is working elsewhere upstream, why can't it work here? Doing nothing will affect residents far beyond my electorate. It will affect the Scenic Rim and Gaven electorates as well as other electorates throughout the Gold Coast because the Tamborine Oxenford Road is a major thoroughfare. The pony club would be left without viable grounds. At the moment, the pony club are seeing their land shrink every single time we have a weather event. They are pleading with council to reconsider and take the $4 million from the state government to implement an action plan.

(Time expired)

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.33 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