Private and Confidential

WORKFORCE ADVISORY LAWYERS

Our Ref: DC:240471

24 July 2026

CFMEU Inquiry
GPO Box 3102,
Brisbane QLD 4001

Via E: legal@cfmeuinquiry.qld.gov.au

Dear Mr Woods,

RE: Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry

We are writing in support of a Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry.

The Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry (2025 Queensland Code) was updated in March 2025 following the Queensland Government's suspension of the Best Practice Industry Conditions (BPICs) in November 2024 and is currently under review ahead of the commencement of the Procurement Policy.

The previous Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry was published in 2000 (2000 Code). The 2000 Code was supported with Implementation Guidelines to the Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry (July 2013) (2013 Implementation Guidelines).

However, Commonwealth has also created building codes from time to time and is currently reviewing codes.

We support the reintroduction of and extension of the Implementation Guidelines to the Queensland Code of Practice for the Building and Construction Industry 2013.

What We Do:

We have experience assisting employers across Australia with a focus on Brisbane, Queensland and New South Wales. We specialise in the building and construction industry.

We have extensive experience in Australian workplace laws, particularly those relevant to the building and construction industry, Government, manufacturing, education, and engineering, including all aspects of managing unlawful industrial action, right of entry, unfair dismissals, and general protections.

Based in Brisbane, Queensland, we work with local and national clients as a specialist law firm representing employers and employer associations in all areas of employment law. We pride ourselves on adopting a practical approach to legal issues aimed at reducing complexity and focusing on relationships.

The former Code addressed a number of arrangements or agreements, however described or implemented regarding employment conditions.

1. The desirability of Queensland having a building and construction code.

I have extensive experience with the operation of Building Codes to achieve workplace relations management objectives on Queensland government projects expanding 29 years in Queensland.

A Code will provide the required guidance to achieve a structured approach on State projects. I have been advocating for the return of the 2013 or 2016 Codes for years. As detailed later, we suggest a number of additions should be considered.

2. The key elements that should be included / excluded from such a code.

The Codes normally address a wide number of issues.

- Legal obligations in relation to employment
- Written agreements (registered or unregistered)
- How independent contractors operate on construction sites
- Rights on construction sites, such as the right of entry and freedom of association.
- Disputes settlement
- Workplace health and safety
- Site security
- Drug and alcohol testing
- Sham contracting.
- Collusive tendering.
- Security of payments
- Sanctions for non-compliance include being excluded from public building and construction
- work.

A Code could introduce a **Code of Practice** for the on-site workforce on all Government Projects. If a worker breaches the Code of Practice which includes unlawful behaviours, freedom of association, harassment, unsafe behaviours, site rules and psychosocial issues a worker can be excluded from all government projects for a fixed period.

A Code may require "**tap-on and tap-off**" or facial recognition security turnstiles for the workforce and visitors including back to government cloud providing regulators with live reporting from sites. This will allow the correct monitoring, reporting and management of industry compliance issues and restore the community confidence required on projects.

A Code could provide for **site working calendars**, site shutdown days (Monday to Friday) or systems that limit productivity on a five to six-day work cycle, Monday to Saturday.

A Code may restrict a site productivity allowance or stop the payment of site or productivity allowances when the project is more than three or six months behind schedule.

A Code can provide a reasonable safety-driven approach to the on-site management of Heat and Inclement Weather issues. This will only impact work areas if no measures can be taken, including considering all options to continue the work of operators in air-conditioned machines.

A Code can ensure that Delegates/HSRs should be working HSRs representing an individual work teams with no super HSR or site HSRs.

A Code can exclude the payment of expense related or disability related allowances when no expense or disability is incurred. For example it remains common for Fares and Travel allowance to be paid on RDOs when no expense is incurred.

A Code can identify and achieve consent on complex issues including the psychosocial risks of working under or subjected to flags, logos, and other activities that may be adverse behaviour.

3. The benefits of using a code relative to other mechanisms such as legislation or regulation.

Within the construction industry a procurement Code is more effective in providing guidance, reform and engagement with the entire workforce on government sites. A procurement code compliance issues is not negotiable for contractors and workers. The same cannot be said for other compliance issues, enforcement arrangements or regulatory interactions.

The inability to tender or be excluded from tendering is universally understood and appreciated by all industry participants.

4. The costs and/or benefits of specific parts of existing or previous construction codes.

In our opinion, the benefits are significant in direct cost savings and indirect cost savings associated with productivity on-site. The direct costs likely in the current hot workforce market are !0% however the indirect costs associated with productivity range from an additional 12% to 20%. The current contractor allocations for non-productive behaviour has been reported to us at 4 weeks per year over and above known costs including leave, RDOs, weather etc.

As a minimum we would anticipate 12% savings in the bank.

5. The timing of implementation of such a code.

A significant body of work exists given the proceeding Codes, making it reasonable process to achieve within six to ten months allowing time for communication, training, assessments and amendments as needed. The industry can react quickly to procurement changes within months and the concepts or issues associated with a Code are well understood within the industry.

The workforce are also committed to achieve compliance to secure works for their employer. We have not experienced any significant level of resistance from a workforce asked to make changes to workplace arrangements or agreements directly associated to Code compliance.

The ABCC past assessment of over 1600 Enterprise Agreement clauses under the past Building Code 2016 provides a significant body of work to assist in the assessment of Enterprise Agreements.

6. The mechanisms and costs of implementation and enforcement of such a code.

The Code could be introduced within six months, if a minor or close mirror of the proceeding documents. That is the industry is extremely reactive to change that impacts tendering processes and motivated to achieve such compliance. Associated changes can be identified, assessed and implemented within that timeframe for tender process. Extensive workplace relations management plans can manage the practical on-site application of any requirements. Again the industry has extensive experience in implementing such documents within the workplace relations and workplace safety compliance issues.

The cost of implementation per significant project including administrative or professional costs would likely not exceed $60,000.00 to $80,000.00 plus GST, but excluding additional security costs, subcontractor costs and moderate administration time on-site. The above estimated costs include, assessment of documents or agreement, variation process for agreements or new agreements, negotiations, training and the development of a workplace relations management plans.

The costs for a subcontractors will vary from a single assessment meeting to redrafing or amendment process from $10,000 to $25,000.00 plus GST.

The ongoing management of Code issues, documentation and communication would be consistent with current obligations.

7. What is needed to make a Code work effectively if it were introduced into Queensland?

We ask the Inquiry to consider the following suggestions:

a) Amending the WHS Right of Entry legislation to provide WHSQ and QPS the ability to give a move-on order to Entry Permit holders from a particular construction site.
b) Introduce a Code of Practice for the WHS Right of Entry Permit Holders and HSRs.
c) Introduce a additional reporting of WHS Right of Entry to WHSQ and minimum standards to exclude the abuse of generic allegations.
d) Intoduce a Construction Commissioner or Industry Judicial Officer, considered below following this weeks announcement of the Commonwealth Fair Work Court.

NEW FAIR WORK COURT

A step in the right direction but likely not far enough for construction.

The new Fair Work Court is a major 2026 reform announced by the Albanese Government this week to overhaul how workplace disputes are resolved in Australia.

A specialist federal court that sits alongside the Fair Work Commission and delivers faster, cheaper, simpler justice for workers and employers. At first look this appears to a return of the Industrial Magistrates Court to deal with underpayment of wages, breaches of the Act or contracts. In practice, it's in response to a significant increase in hundreds of Adverse Action claims arising from the FWC to the Federal Court system.

What the Fair Work Court is

A new federal industrial relations court will:

- Hear workplace relations disputes (e.g., underpayments, entitlements, employment issues).
- Be staffed by specialist judges with deep workplace relations expertise.
- Operate in parallel with the Fair Work Commission, creating a streamlined pathway from conciliation to adjudication.

Why it's being created

The government acknowledges the FWC is not working, the current system is:

- Too slow, many workers and small businesses wait over two years for simple matters to be resolved.
- Too costly, legal costs often exceed the value of the claim.
- Too complex, navigating multiple jurisdictions is difficult for ordinary people.

The new court aims to deliver:

- Faster dispute resolution
- Lower costs
- Simpler access to justice
- More consistent decisions from specialist judges

The intention appears to be to move simple FWA matters out of the Federal Court system to a new likely Magistrate Level Court under the Fair Work System.

The aim of the new system is to have a seamless interaction with the Fair Work Commission likely a pipeline from FWC conciliation to court determination. For example, Adverse Actions matters after FWC conciliation are currently directed to the Federal Court injecting a six month plus delay in matters. The volume of these matters alone would justify a magistrate level court to streamline the processes and to enable judicial officers with experience.

Most of the work by the Federal Court is migration matters.

The Fair Work Court is set to become Australia's new specialist workplace justice system, intended to deliver faster, cheaper, expert resolution of employment disputes.

Industrial expertise is diluted in the Federal Court with likely lower than 20% of judges who have actual IR backgrounds. Industrial matters are only about10% of the Court's workload so a Fair Work Court solves this structural problem. However, the complex construction sector is a further and significantly different subset of workplace law and behaviours.

The proposed Fair Work Court could deal with CFMEU related conduct when that conduct amounts to a breach of the Fair Work Act, an Award, an enterprise agreement, or other workplace laws.

It would not replace the Federal Court or any ABCC-style (State BCCB) enforcement functions, but it would create a faster, specialist pathway for many types of CFMEU behaviour that currently take years to litigate. This may reduce timeline to six or eight months which may be an improvement but not sufficient to correct the productivity issues within the construction industry.

The construction industry requires a practical solution within six to ten days which is not within the capacity of the current system or the proposed new system. Yes, specialist judicial officers with industrial law experience is a significant improvement however even within this cohort specialist experience in the complexity of construction disputes is a further specialist knowledge.

What CFMEU/Union behaviour falls within Fair Work Court jurisdiction?

The Court is expected to hear matters involving:

- **Right-of-entry breaches**
  – entering without notice
  – refusing induction
  – entering exclusion zones
  – obstructing work
  – failing to comply with WHS directions
- **Coercion, undue pressure, or threats** under ss. 343–348 FWA
  – verbal abuse
  – intimidation
  – attempts to provoke confrontation
- **Adverse action**
  – targeting site leaders
  – threatening workers for not joining the union
- **Misrepresentation or improper conduct**
  – false statements about rights
  – misleading workers or employers
- **Industrial action outside the protected framework**
  – blockades
  – coordinated stoppages
  – interference with access

These are all Fair Work Act contraventions, meaning the new Court could hear them.

What remains outside the Court's scope?

Some CFMEU/Union conduct will still sit with other bodies:

- Criminal conduct
- Competition and Consumer Act matters (e.g., secondary boycotts)
- Major civil penalty proceedings (especially high-value or precedent-setting cases)
- WHS prosecutions as state WHS regulators

The Fair Work Court is not designed to replace these.

Would the proposed Court have handled on-site construction disputes differently?

Under the proposed Commonwealth system, the Fair Work Court could have:

- heard the matter faster
- dealt with the right-of-entry breaches directly
- issued injunctions to stop ongoing conduct
- imposed civil penalties
- referred serious elements to the Federal Court if needed

Like the Federal Court a new Fair Work Court would be able to address a large portion of CFMEU behaviour, especially right-of-entry breaches, intimidation, obstruction, and industrial coercion.

Nothing, particularly new with regards to powers which currently exist in the FWC or the current Federal Court. Prompting the question will the new Court deliver improved productivity for the commission.

History has informed us that the Federal Court and the Fair Work Commission have been unable to effectively manage the CFMEU to address productivity issues on construction sites. Upon review of the proposed Fair Work Court the benefits are minimal for the construction industry.

a) The Court still relies on a complaint-based system in an industry reluctant to engage with protracted court processes and deflect costs to clients or subcontractors.
b) Reducing a Court process from two years to one year will have no impact.
c) The use of judicial officers with some industrial experience (eg retail, mining or airline) remains significantly different to the complexity of construction as detailed in repeated inquiries.

What the FWC can't do

The Fair Work Commission **cannot**:

- impose civil penalties
- issue injunctions

- make binding orders about unlawful conduct
- enforce right-of-entry breaches
- punish intimidation, obstruction, or abuse

It is a conciliation and arbitration body, not an enforcement court.

What the Fair Work Court could do remains the same as the Federal Court.

The new Court just like the current Federal Court could directly hear contraventions of the Fair Work Act and:

- impose civil penalties on CFMEU officials and the union
- issue injunctions stopping ongoing behaviour
- order compensation
- make binding findings of fact
- deal with repeat offenders quickly

In on-site construction dispute cases, the Federal Court could have directly penalised:

- refusal of inductions
- entering exclusion zones
- physical interference
- verbal abuse
- coordinated blockade
- obstruction of WHS directions

The FWC has no power to do any of this.

This is critical because the CFMEU routinely uses procedural delay as an industrial tactic.

The FWC has no ability to stop that behaviour.

The Fair Work Court like the current Federal Court can:

- hear right-of-entry contraventions directly
- issue injunctions preventing repeat breaches
- impose penalties on officials
- make binding orders about site access
- protect site leaders from intimidation
- industrial behaviour orders
- site-specific conduct restrictions
- permit-related conditions
- industrial compliance programs
- special monitoring orders for repeat union officials

However, this does not currently occur. The Federal Court only received an extremely low number of applications by construction contractors due to the nature of the industry, their limited capacity to practically assist and significantly the time for any meaningful outcome.

We continue to propose an inquisitorial system 'Construction Commissioner or Industry Judicial Officer' to take action across the jurisdictional construction divide to protect productivity on-site without applications, without adversarial formal procedures, excessive time frames beyond six days to six weeks and industry specific knowledge.

Having a new likely Magistrate Level Court system will not achieve this.

AN INQUISITORIAL SYSTEM NEEDED

An inquisitorial system in construction dispute resolution would dramatically improve speed, fairness, and productivity by replacing adversarial, lawyer-driven conflict with fact-finding, early intervention, and practical problem-solving. It protects clients, builders, and subcontractors by keeping projects moving and resolving issues before they escalate into cost blowouts, delays, or industrial conflict.

History has repeatedly informed the Government that Developers, Builders, Contractors and Subcontractors will not make applications for assistance.

What an inquisitorial system is

Instead of two sides fighting (adversarial), an inquisitorial model uses a neutral decision-maker who:

- investigates facts directly
- asks questions
- gathers evidence
- identifies root causes
- proposes solutions
- issues binding directions early

This mirrors how building inspectors, engineers, and project managers already solve technical problems but applied to disputes.

Why construction benefits more than any other industry

Construction disputes are uniquely:

- fast-moving
- high-stakes
- technical
- interdependent (one subcontractor delays 20 others)
- productivity-sensitive

An adversarial system is slow, expensive, and reactive.

An inquisitorial system is **proactive, technical, and project-focused**.

Key benefits for clients, builders, and subcontractors

- Faster resolution = fewer delays and cost blowouts
- Productivity protection through early intervention
- Reduced legal costs and complexity
- Better technical accuracy
  Adversarial courts rely on:
  - competing experts
  - cross-examination
  - strategic evidence presentation

  Inquisitorial systems allow the decision-maker to:
  - appoint independent experts
  - inspect the site
  - test technical claims directly
  - cut through contradictory expert reports

  This produces more accurate, engineering-aligned outcomes.

- Reduced industrial conflict (CFMEU-type behaviour)
  An inquisitorial system can:
  - intervene early
  - enforce right-of-entry rules
  - issue behavioural orders
  - protect site leaders
  - prevent escalation

  This is exactly where adversarial courts fail — they intervene **too late**, after damage is done.

- Fairer outcomes for subcontractors
  Subcontractors often:
  - lack bargaining power
  - cannot afford litigation
  - are pressured to accept unfair variations
  - are blamed for design or sequencing issues outside their control

  An inquisitorial model:
  - investigates root causes
  - identifies responsibility accurately
  - protects subcontractors from unfair risk transfer
  - ensures payment disputes are resolved quickly

- Better client outcomes
  Clients benefit from:
  - fewer delays
  - fewer disputes
  - better quality
  - more predictable delivery
  - reduced reputational risk
  - lower project administration costs

Clients ultimately pay for adversarial conflict through:

- variations
- extensions of time
- claims
- legal fees
- productivity loss

An inquisitorial system reduces all of these.

Why the Federal Court, proposed Fair Work Court, FWC or QIRC have struggled to manage construction disputes, threats, corruption and safety disputes.

The Queensland Industrial Relations Commission (QIRC) and the Fair Work Commission (FWC) or Courts have not "failed" the construction industry in a legal sense but they are structurally incapable of managing the real disputes that occur on Queensland construction sites, especially safety disputes, which are routinely weaponised for industrial leverage rather than genuine WHS concerns.

The problem is the system design, the limits of jurisdiction, and the misuse of safety laws by actors who operate outside the industrial framework.

1. Safety disputes in construction are not always genuine WHS issues they can be industrial weapons

In Queensland construction, "safety disputes" have a history of frequently used as:

- a pretext for site shutdowns
- a mechanism to exert control over contractors
- a tool for coercion or intimidation
- a way to force commercial concessions
- a method to punish non-compliant subcontractors
- a tactic to disrupt projects for leverage

These disputes are not about safety they are about power.

Why this matters:

- QIRC has limited jurisdiction over WHS disputes.
- FWC has no jurisdiction over WHS disputes.
- WHS regulators (WorkSafe Queensland) have no power to resolve industrial coercion disguised as safety.
- Police rarely intervene because the conduct is framed as "safety concern" rather than threat or extortion.
- Courts (Federal or State) are not designed to address disputed issues in days or weeks.

Safety disputes become a loophole a legally protected shield for other behaviours.

2. The Commissions cannot intervene in disputes that are framed as "safety"

Both Commissions are bound by statute and are also reliant upon an application.

3. Safety regulators cannot manage industrial misuse of safety powers

WorkSafe is a technical regulator, not an industrial or criminal enforcement body.
So when safety is used as a weapon, no regulator has jurisdiction.

4. Construction safety disputes move too fast for the Commissions or Courts

Commission and Court processes are:

- slow
- evidence-based
- dependent on cooperation
- dependent on formal applications
- dependent on good faith
- dependent on parties attending hearings

Construction disputes are:

- immediate
- tactical
- based on site control
- based on fear
- based on commercial pressure
- resolved through leverage, not law

By the time a matter could reach conciliation or arbitration or court:

- the site has already been shut down
- the contractor has already capitulated
- the project has already lost time
- the damage is already done

No single body has:

- full jurisdiction
- investigative powers
- enforcement capability
- industry expertise
- operational presence
- political backing

This fragmentation guarantees failure.

5. Corruption and coercion hide behind "safety"

Corruption allegations in construction often involves:

- procurement manipulation
- union influence
- payments for industrial peace

- threats disguised as WHS concerns
- shutdowns used to force commercial outcomes
- selective enforcement of safety to punish non-compliant contractors

The Commissions have:

- no investigative powers
- no corruption jurisdiction
- no ability to compel evidence
- no ability to intervene in WHS matters

So corruption continues unchecked.

6. The result: a system that cannot protect workers, employers, or the public

From an industry perspective, the failure is obvious:

- safety disputes are misused
- threats continue
- coercion continues
- corruption continues
- productivity collapses
- projects are delayed
- costs increase
- regulators blame each other
- Commissions say "not our jurisdiction"
- WorkSafe says "not an industrial matter"
- Police say "not a criminal matter"
- Employers are left alone

But legally, the Authorities, Regulators, Commissions have not "failed" they were simply **never designed** to manage the real problems of Queensland construction.

QUEENSLAND CONSTRUCTION COMMISSIONER, INDUSTRY JUDICAL OFFICER

We propose the establishment of a Queensland Construction Commissioner. It reflects the structural failures identified across safety, industrial conduct, coercion, corruption, and dispute resolution.

Establishment of a Queensland Construction Commissioner

1. Purpose of the Proposal

This proposal recommends the creation of a **Queensland Construction Commissioner** as an independent statutory authority with powers to address the unique and persistent challenges in the construction industry, including:

- misuse of safety disputes
- unlawful industrial pressure
- coercion and intimidation
- corruption risks in procurement and site operations

- fragmented regulatory oversight
- productivity loss caused by unresolved disputes

The Commissioner would provide a single point of authority capable of intervening quickly, decisively, and lawfully.

2. Background and Problem Definition

2.1 Fragmented Regulatory Landscape

Queensland construction is regulated by multiple bodies WorkSafe Queensland, QBCC, QIRC, FWC, CCC, Police, and various departmental units.

No single regulator has:

- full jurisdiction
- investigative powers
- enforcement capability
- operational presence on sites
- authority to manage industrial misuse of safety

This fragmentation results in regulatory gaps, slow responses, and unresolved disputes.

2.2 Misuse of Safety Disputes

Safety disputes are frequently used as industrial leverage rather than genuine WHS concerns. Current regulators cannot distinguish:

- genuine safety issues
- fabricated safety claims
- industrial coercion disguised as WHS

This creates a loophole enabling shutdowns, threats, and extortion.

2.3 Industrial Coercion and Threats

QIRC and FWC lack jurisdiction over:

- threats
- intimidation
- unlawful right-of-entry
- extortion
- shutdowns used for leverage

These behaviours fall outside traditional industrial frameworks, leaving employers and workers unprotected.

2.4 Corruption and Integrity Risks

Procurement manipulation, collusive behaviour, and undue influence remain significant risks. No regulator has a mandate to investigate corruption within construction operations.

2.5 Productivity Impacts

The Queensland Productivity Commission has identified:

- chronic delays
- cost escalation
- regulatory inconsistency
- industrial disruption
- safety-related stoppages

These issues reduce productivity and undermine public confidence.

3. Establish a Queensland Construction Commissioner

3.1 Role Overview

The Construction Commissioner would be an **independent statutory officer** responsible for:

- resolving construction disputes
- investigating coercion, threats, and corruption
- overseeing safety-related industrial conduct
- coordinating regulatory agencies
- improving productivity and compliance
- protecting workers, subcontractors, and employers

4. Powers and Jurisdiction

4.1 Jurisdiction Across Safety, Industrial Conduct, and Integrity

The Commissioner would have authority to act where disputes involve:

- misuse of safety powers
- unlawful industrial pressure
- coercion or intimidation
- site shutdowns
- corruption or collusion
- subcontractor exploitation
- procurement irregularities a formal proposal for a Construction Commissioner

4.2 Immediate Intervention Powers

The Commissioner must be empowered to:

- enter construction sites
- issue binding directions

- suspend unsafe or unlawful conduct
- override fabricated safety disputes
- compel evidence and attendance
- require cooperation from unions, employers, and contractors
- refer criminal matters directly to Police or CCC

4.3 Investigative Powers

The Commissioner would have:

- power to compel documents
- power to compel testimony
- power to conduct audits
- power to investigate procurement and governance
- power to publish findings

4.4 Enforcement Powers

The Commissioner could:

- issue compliance orders
- impose penalties
- suspend site operations
- mandate corrective action
- enforce dispute resolution outcomes

5. Organisational Structure

5.1 Independent Statutory Authority

The Commissioner would be appointed by the Governor-in-Council and report to Parliament, ensuring independence from:

- ministerial direction
- union influence
- industry capture

5.2 Specialist Divisions

The authority would include:

- Safety & Industrial Conduct Division
- Coercion & Integrity Investigations Division
- Rapid Dispute Resolution Unit
- Construction Productivity & Reform Unit
- Legal & Enforcement Division

6. Benefits to Queensland

6.1 Improved Safety Outcomes

The Commissioner would:

- distinguish genuine safety issues from industrial misuse
- reduce shutdowns
- improve WHS culture
- protect workers from intimidation

6.2 Reduced Industrial Coercion

The Commissioner would:

- intervene in real time
- prevent unlawful pressure
- stabilise project operations
- protect subcontractors

6.3 Stronger Integrity and Anti-Corruption Measures

The Commissioner would:

- investigate procurement irregularities
- expose collusive behaviour
- refer matters to CCC
- strengthen public confidence

6.4 Increased Productivity

The Commissioner would:

- reduce delays
- resolve disputes quickly
- improve regulatory coordination
- support major project delivery

6.5 Clear Accountability

For the first time, Queensland would have one regulator responsible for:

- safety-related industrial conduct
- coercion
- corruption
- construction dispute resolution

7. Legislative Requirements

A new Construction Commissioner Act would be required to establish:

- the office
- powers
- jurisdiction
- independence
- enforcement mechanisms
- reporting obligations

Amendments may also be required to:

- Work Health and Safety Act
- Industrial Relations Act
- Building Industry Fairness Act
- QBCC Act
- Crime and Corruption Act

Conclusion

A Queensland Construction Commissioner would provide the **missing regulatory authority** needed to address the real disputes occurring on construction sites disputes that current regulators cannot manage due to jurisdictional limits, structural fragmentation, and the misuse of safety powers.

This reform would:

- improve safety
- reduce coercion
- strengthen integrity
- enhance productivity
- protect workers and employers
- support major project delivery
- restore confidence in the sector

It is a necessary and overdue step for Queensland's construction industry.

Extended Legislative Reforms

The CFMEU Inquiry must now consider changes beyond procurement, construction productivity, and WHS disputes or behaviours on-site. The State Government should be open to wider reforms likely justified by the ongoing revelations:

- new criminal offences targeting coercion, extortion, corruption and intimidation in industrial context.
- a Queensland-adapted RICO-style compensation and forfeiture regime enhanced governance, transparency and accountability requirements in Queensland.

The reforms aim to strengthen public confidence, protect workers and subcontractors, and ensure safe, lawful conduct on Queensland worksites.

Regards



Dean Cameron
Legal Practice Director

Phone: 1300 WAL LAW
Mobile: [redacted]
Email: [redacted]
Newsletter: www.workforceadvisory.com.au/subscribe