




Speech By  
**Hon. Meaghan Scanlon**

**MEMBER FOR GAVEN**

---

Record of Proceedings, 11 June 2025

**POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES (MAKING JACK'S LAW PERMANENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL; CORRECTIVE SERVICES (PAROLE BOARD) AMENDMENT BILL**

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (8.09 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate, but to start I want to acknowledge the Beasley family and the amendments that have been put forward in the House today. As many others have remarked, the Beasley family has certainly turned an unimaginable tragedy into advocating for law reform, for education, for preventive measures that make our community safer. I, too, would like to join the member for Woodridge and others in recognising the member for Morayfield, who was the minister at the time and who in good faith worked with the Beasley family and, frankly, worked with members of the opposition at that time to enact law reform that the Beasley family advocated for, many people in the community on the Gold Coast advocated for and police officers advocated for in a bipartisan approach in this House. I want to recognise all of those people who have been involved in pushing for this law reform that we are voting on here today. It is a shame, though, that we now have last-minute amendments that take away from some of the good work that has happened to recognise families like the Beasleys. These last-minute amendments have been put forward by the transport minister, effectively to make it easier for the LNP to increase toll roads.

**Mr Mickelberg** interjected.

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjection. I do not know if those members of the backbench of the LNP have actually read the law reform, but it does make it easier for the government to increase toll roads. Whatever the member for Buderim says I do not believe, because the LNP also said that it was not going to build a stadium and we now have a stadium, don't we? When those opposite say something, it means absolutely nothing. That is very clear about this government. What I think is really telling—

**Mr Crandon** interjected.

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjection from the member for Coomera. He is more focused on stadiums than hospitals. Those opposite are going to axe hospital beds in Robina, but he is advocating for stadiums. I think these amendments are pretty reflective of where the LNP's priorities are. When we put forward amendments to remove good character evidence for perpetrators of rape and sexual assault, those opposite said that that was not urgent, that we could not pass those amendments urgently. In fact, when we said that we would even vote on the government's amendments those opposite said, 'No, you can't do that. That's got to go through the committee process. It has to be thoroughly examined,' but tonight they want to ram through changes that allow the LNP to increase toll roads. I think that is pretty reflective of the LNP's priorities. It said the Trusts Bill was urgent and increasing toll roads is urgent, but apparently rape victims and sexual assault victims are not as important to the LNP. These amendments, I suspect, are a cover for some of the LNP aligned mayors who want to increase toll roads. I agree with the mayor on the Gold Coast on some things—

**Mr Vorster:** Oh, you're attacking Tom now?

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjection from the member for Burleigh, because he certainly does not agree with him on the light rail even though I agree with the mayor on the light rail. I will tell members what I do not agree with Tom Tate on, and that is increasing toll roads.

**Mr Vorster** interjected.

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the member for Burleigh's interjection that he is now suddenly a big advocate for Mayor Tom Tate increasing toll roads, just not for the light rail, it appears. That is a very interesting position that I am sure Gold Coast business leaders would be really interested to know about. In the middle of so many cost-of-living pressures, why on earth would the LNP think it is sensible to increase tolls? If it was not going to do that, why would it have these last-minute amendments? Those opposite wonder why we are critical of these last-minute amendments—

**Mr Smith:** Two weeks before a budget.

**Ms SCANLON:**—two weeks before a budget; I take the interjection. These last-minute amendments will be rushed through. If those opposite did not want us to make these accusations, then maybe allow it to go through a thorough committee process so we could actually understand the intent behind these reforms, but what this looks like is a dodgy cover-up to try and do the bidding of mayors who want to increase toll roads. No-one on this side of the House thinks it is acceptable to slug families who are already struggling with more cost-of-living pressures. We have already seen those opposite come out and admit that they are going to be increasing rego for hardworking families, and now they want to slug Gold Coast motorists with toll roads as well. I campaigned against a toll road in 2017 and I will continue to advocate against it because it is the wrong thing to do, particularly when people are struggling. As I said, I think it is pretty disappointing that a government that came in and said that it was going to be about integrity and transparency continues to just rush and ram through laws without any proper scrutiny on things like trusts and tolls but will not take the same principle to other areas of law reform where there is bipartisan support. I think this is pretty shameful and I would ask the minister to explain more about why he is rushing through these amendments.