



Speech By
Dr Christian Rowan

MEMBER FOR MOGGILL

Record of Proceedings, 14 May 2026

MOTION

Leader of the Opposition, Finding of Contempt



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

That this House—

1. notes Ethics Committee report No. 244, tabled in the House on 14 May 2026;
2. finds the Leader of the Opposition and member for Murrumba in contempt, under standing order 266(2), for deliberately misleading the House;
3. determines that an unequivocal apology to the House is an appropriate penalty;
4. notes the apology on the floor of the House from the Leader of the Opposition on 14 May 2026; and
5. resolves to take no further action.

The motion before the House to give effect to the recommendations of the Ethics Committee report No. 244, specifically that the House makes a finding of contempt against the Leader of the Opposition for deliberately misleading the House, is a serious matter. For this House to make a finding of contempt against any member is an exceptionally serious matter. For such a finding to be made against the Leader of the Opposition elevates the seriousness of that conduct even further.

This motion goes directly to the integrity of this institution, the standards expected of members of parliament and the trust placed in all of us by the people of Queensland. The standing orders, practices and procedures of this parliament are not optional guidelines; they are fundamental protections that underpin the integrity, dignity and proper functioning of the Queensland parliament, an institution that has stood for almost 166 years.

The Ethics Committee has now carefully examined this matter, considered the evidence before it and reached a clear and unequivocal conclusion. The committee found that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House. The findings contained within the Ethics Committee's report are detailed, considered and significant. Importantly, the Ethics Committee found that the central claim repeatedly advanced by the Leader of the Opposition—namely, that the impact on the Deputy Premier's property was never disclosed at any point in time—was incorrect. The Ethics Committee carefully examined the evidence put before it and found that disclosures regarding the Deputy Premier's property interests had, in fact, been made through multiple mechanisms and on multiple occasions.

Firstly, the Ethics Committee noted that the Deputy Premier had made declarations through the Register of Members' Interests in accordance with the requirements imposed upon members of parliament. Secondly, the Ethics Committee identified that the Deputy Premier had also made disclosures publicly within parliamentary proceedings. Thirdly, the Ethics Committee examined the chronology of events and the material available to the Leader of the Opposition at the time the statements were made. The report by the Ethics Committee makes clear that the relevant information

was available, that it had been disclosed and that it was capable of being identified by the Leader of the Opposition prior to his statements being made in the Queensland parliament, and that is critically important.

This was not a situation where information had somehow been concealed from the parliament or had been withheld from public scrutiny. The Ethics Committee found precisely the opposite. The committee found that the Deputy Premier had complied with the relevant disclosure requirements and had appropriately declared the interests in question including through the Register of Members' Interests, the very mechanism established by this parliament to ensure transparency and accountability.

The committee carefully considered the Leader of the Opposition's submissions and explanations and came to the unequivocal conclusion that the requirements for a finding of contempt had been established. The Ethics Committee found that the statements made by the Leader of the Opposition were misleading. The Ethics Committee found further that the Leader of the Opposition knew, or ought reasonably to have known, that his statements were incorrect having regard to the publicly available disclosures and declarations that had already been made. Finally, the committee concluded that the conduct of the Leader of the Opposition satisfied the necessary threshold for a deliberate misleading of the House.

These are grave findings. These are serious findings. Every member of this House carries a profound responsibility to ensure statements made in this parliament are accurate and truthful. The integrity of the Queensland parliament depends upon members conducting themselves with honesty, accountability and respect for the standards and processes of this institution. That is why findings of contempt are rare, and they should be rare. The threshold for such a finding is deliberately high because the consequences for both the member involved and the integrity of the parliament itself are serious and significant.

What is deeply concerning is that this matter does not exist in isolation. This is now the latest, the most serious and the most egregious example of a continuing pattern of conduct from the Labor opposition, which has repeatedly failed to respect the standing orders, processes and conventions of this parliament. In fact, less than six months ago the member for Cooper was herself found in contempt of the Queensland parliament following a recommendation of the Ethics Committee. The committee report made deeply concerning observations regarding the conduct of the member for Cooper and her engagement with the committee process itself. The committee noted that the member for Cooper missed multiple deadlines to provide a submission to the committee.

The findings and comments made by the Ethics Committee then with respect to the member for Cooper reflect broader concerns regarding a failure of Labor members to properly respect the institutions, standards and processes of this parliament. Today we see the Leader of the Opposition become only the second Labor leader to have a finding of contempt recommended by the Ethics Committee of the Queensland parliament. Of course, members will recall that the former Labor premier of Queensland was also found in contempt following findings concerning improper attempts to influence Katter's Australian Party members of the parliament. That history matters because this motion goes to leadership and a pattern of contempt exhibited by the Labor Party.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Only one person has the call.

Dr ROWAN: Ultimately, it goes to integrity. It goes to whether those who seek to hold the highest offices in this state are prepared to uphold and respect the standing orders, traditions and parliamentary processes that safeguard this institution.

As I conclude my contribution, I want to again stress how, importantly, the Ethics Committee did not arrive at this recommendation lightly. Parliamentary committees are entrusted with significant responsibilities. Ethics Committee proceedings are not political exercises. They are a serious parliamentary body charged with protecting the integrity of this institution. The Ethics Committee considered documentary evidence, parliamentary records, submissions and the relevant factual chronology before arriving at its findings. The House should recognise that the recommendation now before us follows that careful examination.

The Leader of the Opposition should reflect very carefully upon the gravity of this finding and upon the office he currently holds. This House could not simply dismiss or minimise a finding of contempt against the Leader of the Opposition. To do so would diminish the authority of the parliament itself.

The Queensland parliament is bigger than any individual member. It is bigger than any political party. It is an institution built upon trust, accountability and adherence to long-established parliamentary standards. Where those standards are deliberately breached, this House must act accordingly.