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

## Wednesday, 25 June 2025

Subject Page



PT WEIR
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

JM MATHERS
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

# WEDNESDAY, 25 JUNE 2025

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 23 May 2025 the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and member for Woodridge wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training deliberately misled the House. I consider the matter is trivial in nature and the minister was using puffery to express dissatisfaction with the former government's trade policies. 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 Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training and member for Mudgeeraba [792].

I have circulated a detailed statement about this matter and seek leave to incorporate it into the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Honourable members, on 23 May 2025, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and member for Woodridge (member) wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training (minister) deliberately misled the House.

The matter relates to statements made by the minister on 20 May 2025 during Matters of Public Interest and 21 May 2025 during Ministerial Statements.

Specifically, the minister stated on 20 May 2025:

> 'There was no strategy, no leadership and no outcomes. While the world was opening and opportunities were emerging, Labor sat idle. They did not grow trade; they watched it drift.
>
> Frankly, Queensland's exporters deserve better than a government whose idea of trade promotion was a press release, a pat on the back and subsidising investments with Queensland taxpayers' dollars without their knowledge.'

And on 21 May 2025:

> 'Unlike Labor, who flailed about on the international trade landscape and failed to produce real, tangible outcomes for Queensland.'

The member argued that these statements were false deliberately misleading and provided evidence of the former government's strategies and outcomes related to trade.

I sought further information from the minister about the allegation made against her, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

In her submission, the minister said that her statements were a generalised reflection on the actions of the member and the former government in failing to grow trade in Queensland. She provided a list of projects that she considered evidence of a failure to produce outcomes for Queensland.

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.

It appears that this matter is akin to the ruling by Speaker Pitt on 11 September 2024 where he stated:

> 'It is my view that the member was making general statements of his opinion rather than specific allegations of misconduct, and the matter is akin to puffery, hyperbole or political exaggeration. It is not a matter that can be objectively determined, as it is a subjective opinion.'

In this current matter, the minister is using political puffery to express her belief that the former government did not progress trade policy in Queensland. The former government obviously had trade policies, and the current government will have different trade policies. It is unlikely they will agree on which policies are superior. The minister is using exaggerated political expression that occurs regularly in parliamentary debate.

Accordingly, I consider the matter is trivial in nature.

Therefore, 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.

## Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 21 May 2025 the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 29 April 2025. I consider this to be a dispute on policy where the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition have differing political opinions on the interpretation and application of the protocol for judicial appointments in Queensland. The matter is in the realm of technical. Therefore, 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 Leader of the Opposition and member for Murrumba [793].

I have circulated a detailed statement about this matter and seek leave to incorporate it into the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Honourable members, on 21 May 2025, the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 29 April 2025. The matter relates to a statement made during Matters of Public Interest.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition stated:

> 'Director-General John Sosso has quietly been appointed to the Judicial Appointments Advisory Panel, a body that decides the future judicial appointments of this state. The LNP literally had to change the guidelines of the panel to allow them to appoint him.'

The Attorney-General argued that this statement was deliberately misleading because Mr Sosso was appropriately qualified and she could have appointed him under the former Judicial Appointments Protocol before it was refreshed in February this year. She notes it was refreshed because it had not been revised since 2016.

I sought further information from the Leader of the Opposition about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Leader of the Opposition argued that the amendments to the protocol assisted and aided in the appointment of Mr Sosso and that it is his belief that Mr Sosso would not have been eligible under the former protocol.

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.

This appears to be a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 4 April 2022 when he stated: 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, it is an objective fact that the protocol was amended.

However, the Attorney-General and the Leader of the Opposition differ in opinions on the impacts that the amendments have had and how both the former and current protocols should be interpreted.

These are political differences of opinions. As such, I consider this matter is within the realm of being technical.

Therefore, 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.

## Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 21 May 2025 the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging that the member for Gaven deliberately misled the House on 29 April 2025. I consider this to be a dispute on policy where the Attorney-General and the member have differing political opinions on the interpretation and application of the protocol for judicial appointments in Queensland. The matter is in the realm of technical. Therefore, 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 Gaven [794].

I have circulated a detailed statement about this matter and seek leave to incorporate it into the parliamentary record.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

Honourable members, on 21 May 2025, the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging that the member for Gaven deliberately misled the House on 29 April 2025. The matter relates to a statement made during Matters of Public Interest. Specifically, the Member stated:

> '…the Attorney-General kicked off the Women Lawyers Association and has literally changed the rules to allow her to appoint John Sosso to the Judicial Appointments Advisory Panel. This means John Sosso will have influence over who creates the laws and who enforces those laws. It means John Sosso can influence the judiciary, the parliament and the executive, making a complete mockery of the Westminster system.'

The Attorney-General argued that this statement was deliberately misleading because Mr Sosso was appropriately qualified, and she could have appointed him under the former Protocol for Judicial Appointments in Queensland (the protocol) before it was refreshed in February this year.

She notes it was refreshed because it had not been revised since 2016. She also noted that the Women Lawyers Association was used an example in the former protocol and was not prescriptive.

The Attorney-General submitted that the role of the panel members was to assess the merit of potential judicial officers and recommend them for consideration to the Attorney-General, and that they do not, in any way, influence the judiciary. I sought further information from the member for Gaven about the allegation made against her, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The member for Gaven argued that the amendments to the protocol assisted and aided in the appointment of Mr Sosso and that it is her belief that Mr Sosso would not have been eligible under the former protocol.

The member also noted that the example of a 'representative from the Women Lawyers Association of Queensland' was replaced with 'a current or former Executive of the Justice portfolio'.

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.

This appears to be a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 4 April 2022 when he stated: 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, it is an objective fact that the protocol was amended. However, the Attorney-General and the member differ in opinions on the impacts that the amendments have had and how both the former and current protocols should be interpreted. These are political differences of opinions. As such, I consider this matter is within the realm of being technical.

Therefore, 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.

## Speaker's Ruling, Comments by the Member for Ferny Grove

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, at the end of question time on Wednesday, 11 June 2025 the Leader of the House rose under standing order 248 to complain about an unparliamentary interjection by the member for Ferny Grove directed towards the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. I have reviewed the chamber overwatch visual and audio recordings of the relevant time. The recording has revealed an interjection by the member that certainly brought a number of other members to silence. However, the noise in the chamber at the time was such that I cannot distinguish exactly what was said. Therefore, I am taking no further action in respect of the matter. Although the language used could not be verified, the actions of the member were clearly disruptive. I will note for the benefit of members that there are precedents where, after review of the record or video, members have been required to withdraw for their language and/or conduct that is unparliamentary, on a subsequent day.

## Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Contempt of Parliament

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on Thursday, 12 June at the end of question time, the Manager of Opposition Business rose on a matter of privilege advising that at 10.43 am that day the government issued a media statement appearing to indicate the parliament had established a new parliamentary inquiry. As the assembly had not in fact established such an inquiry, the member raised this matter to ensure that the proceedings and the dignity of the House had not been compromised. The member requested the matter be thoroughly investigated.

A thorough investigation has revealed that on 11 June 2025, the day before the matter of privilege, the Primary Industries and Resources Committee resolved to self-refer an inquiry into sugarcane bioenergy opportunities in Queensland. It was this inquiry that the government media release was referencing. There is no matter of privilege arising.

# SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

## Hanlon, Ms S

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I advise of the retirement of Sue Hanlon from the Parliamentary Service after 52 years of service. We believe that Sue is the longest serving officer of this parliament, eclipsing the record of the first clerk of the Legislative Assembly, Lewis Adolphus Bernays, who served for 48 years.

Sue Hanlon commenced employment with the Queensland parliament on 26 March 1973 as a stenographer with the Parliamentary Library. In February 1984, Sue was appointed as a Parliamentary Library research aide. In April 1990 Sue resigned from her position at Parliament House to commence working as an electorate secretary for the then member for Redlands, Mr Darryl Briskey. In January 1991, Sue returned to the Parliamentary Library, having been appointed as an information systems support officer. In November 1992 Sue again resigned from her position at Parliament House to return to work for Mr Briskey in his electorate office.

In October 2006, Sue commenced working for Mr Phil Weightman in the Cleveland electorate office. In April 2009, Sue commenced working for Dr Mark Robinson who had been elected as the member for Cleveland, now Oodgeroo. Finally, until her retirement Sue continued to work for the current member, the Hon. Amanda Stoker. Not only has Sue worked at the precinct in various roles; she has also worked as an electorate officer for four different members, from both sides of the House.

After completing over 52 years of service, Sue's final day of employment was 16 May 2025. Sue, ever humble, did not want a celebration for her retirement and refused any talk of a major celebration. Sue eventually agreed to a lunch with a small group of long-serving colleagues, hosted by the Clerk in the Strangers' Dining Room last month. We cannot let Sue go without the House recognising her service. I am sure all honourable members will join me in thanking Sue for her contribution to the Parliamentary Service and the Queensland Parliament and in wishing her the very best in retirement.

**Honourable members**: Hear, hear!

## 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 Brightwater State School in the electorate of Buderim and Yeronga State High School in the electorate of Miller.

# PETITIONS

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

**Collingwood Drive, Traffic Lights**

136 petitioners, requesting the House to install traffic lights at the intersection of Collingwood Drive and Woodlinks Way, Collingwood Park [790].

**Ipswich, Cycling Infrastructure**

272 petitioners, requesting the House to connect existing bike paths and bike lanes in Ipswich [791].

Petitions received.

# MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

## Budget

**Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.39 am): We promised to turn up and deliver a fresh start for Queensland, and that is exactly what the 2025 budget delivers. Structural reforms and long-term measures are at the heart of our budget approach. Queensland families have been doing it tough. This budget provides responsible cost-of-living relief to

help take the pressure off the household budget. We believe that cost-of-living relief must be long term, targeted and fully funded across the forwards. That is exactly what this budget delivers.

We have already made 50-cent fares permanent. This budget also restores indexation to the electricity rebate scheme for vulnerable households. That will provide greater support to more than 600,000 Queensland families. Our new Back to School Boost will help cover the cost of school essentials for primary school students, with $100 delivered each and every year for every Queensland primary schoolkid. It is funded in the budget every year, delivering certainty for families. We have funded $200 Play On! sports vouchers to help keep kids active.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I will note the laughter from the other side. Under our government, the program covers both summer and winter sports.

**Mr Dick** interjected.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I will take the interjection from the member for Woodridge. It is fully funded in the forwards to provide certainty to families. We also promised easier access to healthcare services, no matter where you live.

**Mrs Nightingale** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Inala, we will start the warning list very early if this continues.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** This budget fully funds our Hospital Rescue Plan—credible, deliverable and fully funded. We axed the patients tax to make sure more costs were not passed on to Queenslanders.

**Ms Grace:** There was no patients tax.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I will take the interjection from the member for McConnel, who said, 'There was no patients tax.' There would have been from 1 July, if Queenslanders had not voted for change.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I take the interjection. They are always overreaching, making up stories and scaremongering. Our record investment in health services—$33.1 billion—will provide more free health care than ever before. We have also funded free health checks at kindy, and 60,000 kids, along with their families, will benefit from the program.

Queensland's population is growing. With that comes the need for more housing. We want Queenslanders to have a place to call home. That is why we axed a Labor tax and removed stamp duty for first home buyers. We extended the First Home Owner Grant, and this budget invests in a new Boost to Buy program to help more Queenslanders get into the property market. This is nation-leading support for homebuyers to reduce the deposit gap, help them enter the market and help them cope with rising costs.

This budget delivers what we promised when we were elected. It delivers structural reform to deal with the underlying issues Queenslanders are facing today. By boosting productivity and reducing wasteful spending, we are restoring respect for taxpayers' money. That is why we have been able to deliver long-term, targeted cost-of-living support to Queenslanders when they need it most.

## Budget

**Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.42 am): Yesterday we laid the foundation for a fresh start for Queensland. It is the fresh start the people of Queensland voted for. Handing down the 2025-26 budget, the Crisafulli government did exactly what we said we would do, and it showed we are delivering for Queensland. Yesterday we laid the foundation for budget repair to clean up a decade of Labor's fiscal vandalism, while saving the jobs and services they did not budget for. We also invested in the future of our state—in the education, health and transport infrastructure Queenslanders need. We locked in the funding needed to fix the youth crime, housing, health and cost-of-living crises left behind by Labor.

Do not just take our word for it. Listen to what some of the state's industry leaders had to say about the Crisafulli government's first budget. P&Cs Queensland praised the Crisafulli government's commitment to education and cost-of-living measures, particularly the $100 Back to School Boost, which they said would 'provide immediate relief for our struggling families'. The Queensland Council of Social Services noted our sensible cost-of-living measures and our commitment to deliver 'significant investment into specialist homelessness services and to build more social and affordable housing'. REIQ CEO Antonia Mercorella said our Boost to Buy home owner scheme was—

... a smart, timely step to match market conditions and help more Queenslanders achieve home ownership.

BDO welcomed the extension of the payroll tax rebate on wages paid to apprentices and trainees, which they said 'encourages job growth and investment in the apprentice and trainee workforce'. The Queensland Council of Unions welcomed the goal to grow the Public Service. The LGAQ welcomed our fulfilment of key election commitments and had particular praise for the $2 billion Residential Activation Fund, which will help councils lay the pipes, footpaths and roads needed for housing construction. The Property Council praised our housing initiatives and added—

It is encouraging to see that, unlike in previous budgets, the property industry has not been burdened by new taxes or increases, and we applaud the Treasurer and government for this.

AMAQ CEO Nick Yim said it was welcome to see the Queensland government 'recognises the urgent need to invest in our health system' over the next year. Even great Australian actor David Wenham had praise for the budget, saying he was pleased and happy with the support for the state's film industry and arts sector. These reflections make us ever more determined to continue laying the foundation of this fresh start that we promised.

## Budget, Infrastructure Funding

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.45 am): The Crisafulli government is delivering the largest infrastructure investment ever in the history of Queensland. In the budget yesterday the Treasurer outlined the foundations for the fresh start that we promised Queenslanders at the October state election. It is a budget focused on delivering critical cost-of-living measures for Queenslanders, like the $100 Back to School Boost, the $200 Play On! vouchers and making the LNP's 50-cent fares permanent.

The LNP's $200 Play On! vouchers will be for winter or summer sports. They are locked in—signed, sealed and delivered by the sports minister. The $100 Back to School Boost has been signed, sealed and delivered by the LNP education minister, and that $100 per primary school student across the state from the first term of next year will help in a cost-of-living crisis.

The Treasurer also confirmed the LNP will invest $116.8 billion over the next four years in generational infrastructure to strengthen communities across the state. These investments include a record $18.5 billion capital investment in Queensland Health to heal Labor's health crisis as well as a $41.7 billion investment in road and transport infrastructure to get the state moving. The LNP's record investment stands in stark contrast to Labor's frankly inadequate $107 billion capital program, which has since been exposed as a big hoax, not the big build that Labor promised Queenslanders. It was a big hoax riddled with budget blowouts and black holes because those opposite only had their eyes on retaining their grip on power at the October election, not on the future of the state or its people.

Following a decade of significant mismanagement from Labor, we are delivering on our promises to tackle the youth crime, health, housing and cost-of-living crises. Our infrastructure pipeline will deliver to Queenslanders what they need where they need it and, importantly, will be on time and on budget. Do not take my word for it. Let's look at what the stakeholders said yesterday.

Infrastructure Partnerships Australia stated our infrastructure investment not only delivers 'the necessary clean-up of Queensland's hospital expansion mess'; it also reflects the non-negotiables we must deliver and the timeframe in which they must be completed. Importantly, the government's record capital pipeline will be backed by good planning decisions so every Queenslander can be confident their communities will be ready for growth. In welcoming the budget's commitment to deliver new regional plans right across the state, the Planning Institute of Australia rightly stated—

Regional plans, when prepared together with infrastructure plans—and backed by implementation funding—provide greater certainty to councils, industry, and communities on where and how responsible growth will occur.

The Crisafulli government's first budget sends a strong message to workers and industry that Queensland is now well and truly open for business. As Queensland Major Contractors Association CEO Andrew Chapman stated, Queensland's 'record $116.8 billion infrastructure commitment over four years represents a strong signal of confidence in Queensland's ability to deliver nation-leading projects'.

Not only is the Crisafulli government investing significantly more in critical and generational infrastructure than Labor; the LNP will deliver more infrastructure for every taxpayer dollar spent by restoring productivity and ending the thuggery on construction sites by the CFMEU, who were defended every step of the way by the Labor Party and the former minister, the member for McConnel.

Queenslanders know that Labor would have seen them pay more for the essential infrastructure they need and deserve through their sweetheart deal with the CFMEU—BPIC. Bringing an end to the CFMEU tax is a significant cost-of-living measure for Queenslanders—a tax which would have forced rents up by seven per cent and meant 22,000 homes would not be built in Queensland.

We are already hearing loud and clear from industry that competitiveness is finally returning to Queensland with the suspension of the CFMEU tax. It is a big win for fairer procurement and improved productivity. Quoting directly from their media release, our decision to suspend the CFMEU tax 'restores competitiveness, fosters innovation, and will enable more tier 2 and regional contractors to bid for public infrastructure'.

We promised a fresh start for Queensland, and that is exactly what this LNP Crisafulli government's first budget delivers in spades.

## Back to School Boost

**Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (9.50 am): It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak on the Back to School Boost initiative that the Crisafulli government announced as part of our fresh start for Queensland budget. Before I speak more to it, let's revisit the context of the situation that we inherited.

Labor left us with a budget black hole and with a legacy of a cost-of-living crisis—a crisis that goes beyond the walls of this parliament, a crisis that impacts the lives of everyday Queenslanders, a crisis that left parents in the situation where they had to decide whether to buy Christmas presents or school supplies. When I became education minister, I committed to listening to constituents. I have received plenty of correspondence to my office from parents struggling with affording school supplies and paying for extracurricular activities such as sport and the arts. We have listened and we have responded.

The new $100 Back to School Boost will help cover the cost of school essentials for primary school students. The multimillion dollar investment over four years will deliver support and certainty to assist with the cost of books, stationery, devices, camps, excursions and uniforms. We value our stakeholders and thank P&C Queensland for their advocacy, statement of support and feedback. Thanks to CEO Scott Wiseman, who said, 'We're very pleased with the $100 back to school boost, which provides immediate relief for our struggling families out there.'

The Crisafulli government has done what Labor could not do: deliver a fully funded public education system with the largest ever federal funding agreement. We are also balancing out the cost of education expenses for parents. This multipronged approach to funding the education system empowers parents as well. We trust them to buy what they need for their children's learning. We respect them. We respect taxpayers' money. We are delivering for Queensland.

## Play On! Vouchers

**Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.53 am): The Queensland budget is delivering a fresh start for Queensland and cost-of-living relief for Queensland families. I know firsthand the power of sport and how it can shape the lives of young people, from learning how to win graciously and how to lose with dignity—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr MANDER:** How to lose with dignity is something a few members of the opposition could learn—to learning how to set and achieve goals, how to work as part of a team and also how to develop resilience.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members to my right, I cannot hear the minister.

**Mr MANDER:** I can start again.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No, you do not need to start again. Please continue.

**Mr MANDER:** They are skills that will shape the lives of our young people for decades to come. The Crisafulli government is now helping more children to play on and to live healthy and active lives.

Our $200 Play On! sports vouchers are funded every year and will provide opportunities for children who play both summer and winter sport. Since I stood here yesterday, more than 1,000

additional families have preregistered for the program, with almost 19,000 families registered and ready to Play On!.

Importantly, we will ensure regional and country kids get their fair share. Over the past two months I have been travelling across the state from Cairns and Mackay to Roma and Emerald as part of our recent sports strategy consultation, and I have heard firsthand the struggles of families who live in country towns who have to travel long distances to participate in sport. We will have a specific allocation for children living in different regions across the state to ensure no child is sidelined. We will also have an allocation for children living with a disability and we will be working to attract accessible sport opportunities to this program to make sure activity providers are there when parents and carers sign up.

Yesterday we hosted some of Queensland's leaders in sport here at Parliament House. They were incredibly supportive of this initiative from the Crisafulli government. Cricket Queensland CEO Terry Svenson said—

This program means that more Queensland kids will have an opportunity to play cricket this summer, we thank the Crisafulli government for their investment in grassroots sport and welcome any programs which reduce the costs and barriers for families to participate in sport.

Netball Queensland CEO Kate Davies said—

The Queensland Government's Play On vouchers are making sport more accessible across our netball communities—supporting participation, promoting active lifestyles, and helping clubs thrive right across the state.

I am also pleased to say that 217 new providers have taken this opportunity to jump onboard for our program. That is a whopping 35 per cent increase from the previous programs—another ringing endorsement of our new program. Also, 434 of our providers have told us that they are interested in, or already offer, inclusive activities for children with a disability.

Parents and carers will be able to receive one voucher per financial year per child, with the first round opening up on 4 August. Play On! is a win for families and a clear signal that the Crisafulli government is easing the burden on Queenslanders in this budget. We know budgets are tight for Queenslanders at the moment, but we also know how important it is that our children are active and healthy. That is why, unlike the Labor Party who only provided a one-year sugar hit and did not fund their vouchers beyond 30 June this year, Play On! will be funded every year. We are providing the certainty parents and carers need, and we are delivering for Queenslanders.

## Public Transport, Fares

**Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.57 am): The Crisafulli government is delivering real, timely, measured and meaningful cost-of-living relief to Queenslanders. Yesterday the Treasurer outlined a number of real cost-of-living measures that will help Queenslanders now and into the future deal with cost-of-living pressures—measures that are funded into the future, not hollow election sugar hits with no ongoing funding, which was the approach taken by those opposite. Naturally, the one that I am most proud of is the implementation of the LNP's permanent 50-cent fares, a tremendous LNP initiative championed by none other than the now Premier himself.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Let's have some silence.

**Mr MICKELBERG:** They had 10 years to do it, but they could not. The LNP did it in our first budget. We said we would make it permanent, and that is what we delivered and funded in this budget. There is money in the budget for this coming financial year to support it. Then there is money in the budget for the next financial year and the one after that and the one after that.

It was in our first 100 days of coming to government that I directed my department to make 50-cent fares permanent, and that is when I found out that those opposite had left no ongoing funding to make it happen, despite all the rhetoric that we heard throughout the election and the large advertising campaign to back it up. It turns out that the former Labor government and the opposition leader's priorities were—surprise, surprise!—more about advertising how good he was than about locking in 50-cent fares permanently.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Yesterday you ruled and issued a statement in relation to the intent of ministerial statements. I submit to you that the minister just then has strayed away from your ruling. I ask you to bring him back to the intent of ministerial statements for the dignity of the House.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I made the ruling that they were to be specifically around policy and not personal attacks. They were to address policy. Member, you are on policy but you might just be straying a little. If you would stick to policy, that would be great.

**Mr MICKELBERG:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I want to talk about why this LNP initiative is so important for Queenslanders and why we acted so quickly to make 50-cent fares permanent. Based on our budget, we expect that in the coming financial year Queenslanders will save around $322 million when compared to Labor's exorbitant previous fare structure. That is a real change that makes a real difference to the lives of Queenslanders. It is what now allows a lady in my community on the Sunshine Coast to do volunteer work when she could not previously because now it only costs her a dollar to get to and from the place where she volunteers. It allows young people in retail and hospitality to pick up an extra shift, and it allows many Queenslanders to not have to worry about getting to and from work or education using our public transport system. This is also incredibly important because it helps take vehicles off our roads, reducing congestion and pressure on our road network during morning and afternoon peaks.

This is what a fresh start looks like. I am looking forward to working with the Premier, the Treasurer and our entire government to ensure that as many Queenslanders as possible continue to make use of this cost-of-living initiative long into the future.

## Women

**Hon. FS SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (10.00 am): When we support women, we strengthen Queensland. I echo the Treasurer's sentiments from yesterday's budget speech when he said—

... women's economic security is not just about gender equality; it is about a stronger, more productive economy that delivers for every Queenslander.

Yesterday I met with leaders of organisations that champion women in the workforce and life, and I can report that they were really excited about the Crisafulli government's first budget. I want to share quotes from two different women particularly for the benefit of those Labor MPs opposite. One person said—

I'm really encouraged to see a proactive government looking outside the traditional bounds to problem-solving, leveraging resources, maximising impact and prioritising women. I'm looking forward to what's next!

Another said—

Childcare has been a huge issue for some of our women, just not being eligible because they aren't working ... things that will assist them to get into work and stay in work are really important. We look for that **ripple effect**, it changes their lives and the next generation's.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No quarrelling across the chamber, please!

**Ms SIMPSON:** We are all for the ripple effect. That is why the Crisafulli government is making strategic investments into the economic security of all Queenslanders through intentional investments in women, including: a $20 million Returning to Work package over four years to fund practical assistance for women re-entering the workforce—

**Ms Pease** interjected.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Lytton and Attorney-General, stop the cross-chamber chatter.

**Ms SIMPSON:**—and grants of up to $5,000 to help meet costs of child care, recertification and training, work wear, the preparation of CVs or job hunting, and technology or work relocation costs.

We are not stopping there. There will be further support for the Future Women Jobs Academy program to support women returning to work, a $400,000 Female Founders Investment Readiness program to break down barriers for female entrepreneurs, a $540,000 empowering women grants for community groups and funding for superannuation payments for the 52-week period of parental leave for Queensland public sector employees.

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Waterford, I am trying to hear the minister.

**Ms SIMPSON:** At a recent women's forum, local business owners and professional women highlighted the key role that women play in managing home budgets. This is where the rubber meets the road, because home budgets affect all Queenslanders. For this reason, the Crisafulli LNP government is making sure there are: free health checks for kindy kids to relieve the home budget; $200 Play On! sports vouchers to relieve the home budget; $100 Back to School Boost for primary schoolchildren for school essentials from 2026 to relieve the home budget; and the $386 Queensland Electricity Rebate Scheme for seniors, pensioners and concession card holders, which is increasing by $14—which Labor refused to increase.

It is not just us recognising how good our budget is for all Queensland women. In the ABC's budget coverage yesterday, women and the cost of living were listed among the winners. I could not agree more, because when women win, Queensland businesses, families and communities win. The Crisafulli government is delivering the foundations for a fresh start to help with the cost of living.

## Health System

**Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (10.04 am): This budget is delivering the single greatest investment in health care in this state's history. In fact, it is so big that we had to get a bigger placement printed so we could let people know. I table a copy of that placement for the information of members of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Document, undated, titled 'Queensland Health: Health services when you need them' [795].

This budget is the fresh start for Queensland we promised to help Queenslanders access world-class care when they need it. The LNP Crisafulli government is delivering a record $33.1 billion to deliver easier access to healthcare services in 2025-26 and beyond. Our budget shows the government is stepping up to fix Labor's woeful mismanagement of health services and health infrastructure. Importantly, in a cost-of-living crisis we are providing more free public health services for Queenslanders than ever before—more than Labor was ever able to do. We are starting by axing Labor's patient tax. It is gone, gone, gone.

More than that: we are investing. We are delivering on our commitment to stabilise elective surgery waitlists within 12 months. Our $1.75 billion commitment over four years is the largest investment in surgery in Queensland Health's history. This funding will provide more than 30,000 surgeries in 2025-26, leveraging the public and private hospital sectors, and will include an expansion of the Surgery Connect program. Ramsay Health Care has welcomed 'Queensland's nation-leading commitment' to boost elective surgery delivery. St Vincent's has also welcomed the investment. They said—

St Vincent's looks forward to ensuring many Queenslanders get their elective surgery sooner over the next four years.

The former government's record stands in stark contrast. They allowed the elective surgery waitlist to almost double from nearly 35,500 to more than 66,000. In fact, Labor was set to cut over 20,000 elective surgeries next year because they failed to fund them in their budget. This will not happen under our watch.

We are delivering on our commitment to drive ambulance ramping down to 30 per cent by 2028 through a $1.7 billion investment. That includes more than a billion dollars for the Queensland Ambulance Service to deliver 900 more ambulance personnel over the next four years, more ambulance stations and more vehicles on the road. The former government allowed ambulance ramping to go from 15 per cent to the nation's worst record of over 45.5 per cent during their term in government, risking the lives of consumers and patients. The good news just does not stop there: it continues, as we deliver on our commitment to grow the health workforce by 46,000 more workers by 2032. In 2025-26 we will make a down payment on that workforce by increasing it by 4,500, including 3,350 clinicians, improving access to essential health services.

Labor did not have a plan to grow the health workforce. In fact, they had set it up for cuts. Under Labor's last budget the health workforce was actually set to decrease by 1,794 FTEs. They did not fund it in the future years. That is Labor for you: 20,000 fewer surgeries and 1,700 fewer staff.

As Dr Nick Yim, the President of the AMAQ, has said, the $33.1 billion expenditure shows the government recognises the urgent need to invest in our health system. He said, 'It is a relief to see that health remains a high priority.'

We are delivering on our commitment to build hospitals on time and on budget—on time and on budget. A centrepiece of the budget is the $18½ billion Hospital Rescue Plan to deliver the biggest

infrastructure investment in Queensland Health's history. From Currumbin to the cape, it is the largest ever investment in health infrastructure in Queensland and it will deliver 2,600 new beds.

We are also delivering a $3.16 billion Timely Investment Infrastructure Maintenance program, including $2.6 billion in new money—not like Labor did, not by pulling it from some other account, but actual new funding. This critical investment will address unfunded commitments and blowouts made by the former Labor government, as highlighted in the Auditor-General's report.

It has been a long speech, I know, but there is so much good news to get out about our investment, about saving Queenslanders money and about delivering health services. Our record health budget goes a long way to addressing the dire mismanagement and unfunded announcements of the former government. There is more work to be done, but we are delivering our commitment to establish a world-class health system for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

## Housing Supply

**Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (10.10 am): The Crisafulli government's first budget lays the foundation for our plan to tackle the Queensland housing crisis and ease cost-of-living pressures across our entire housing system by investing in more social and community housing. That is because the best way to put downward pressure on rents is to build more homes sooner. Our budget delivers Queensland's biggest ever investment in social and community housing, with $5.6 billion allocated over the next four years to build more homes.

Our comprehensive housing plan will deliver a place to call home for more Queenslanders by increasing housing supply across the board, helping ease pressure for renters and first home buyers and especially our most vulnerable. We have inherited an unprecedented housing crisis and we are delivering an unprecedented response. Renters are particularly feeling the impacts worse than most. Under Labor, rents soared 60 per cent because supply did not keep pace with demand. Labor's former housing minister created chaos across the housing market through knee-jerk legislative changes riddled with unintended consequences that had to be embarrassingly corrected. It shattered investor confidence in our state. We are taking a very different approach—one that is built on certainty and stability, not stunts.

Our government is driving productivity in our construction sector. Our Building Reg Reno will help tradies spend less time on paperwork and more time on the tools by updating outdated building regulations. We are increasing housing supply as our No. 1 priority because more supply creates more options, and that is particularly important for Queenslanders on the social housing wait list, which grew 81 per cent on Labor's watch. Over the last decade, social housing construction grew at just a third of the rate of Queensland's population and community housing grew at around half of that, adding more pressure to an already stretched system.

The message has been loud and clear from our hardworking housing delivery teams—the stop-start grant programs of the past were too limited, too uncertain and too slow. That is why we are proud to be the first Queensland government to lock in permanent baseline funding for social and community housing construction. On top of that record uplift that we are delivering over the forward estimates, we have committed $500 million per year beyond the forwards in perpetuity. That certainty allows us to run an always-on procurement process so community housing providers can bring forward proposals year-round—not just when funding windows open. It creates consistency, it speeds up delivery and it means more homes will get built faster. That puts real downward pressure on rents which particularly helps our most vulnerable households. This is how the LNP will secure Queensland's housing foundations and provide a place to call home for more people across our state.

## Seniors

**Hon. AJ CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.13 am): The Crisafulli government is proud to be laying the foundation to support those most vulnerable in our community, including our aging and our seniors. I want to acknowledge and thank the Council on the Ageing Queensland for the incredible work they do across our state. I note the feedback we received since handing down the budget, including their endorsement of permanently maintaining 50-cent fares which is keeping older people connected and engaged across our communities. We are keeping GP visits affordable by ensuring that the patients tax did not proceed. There will be multiple hospital upgrades

and we are addressing ambulance ramping, which has impacted our most vulnerable, particularly seniors.

The new Supercharged Solar for Renters program will help reduce ongoing energy costs. We are investing in community facilities, such as Men's Sheds, University of the Third Age and community halls right across our state. We are also proud to ensure that seniors and other vulnerable households will benefit from the increased Electricity Rebate Scheme. This will help more than 600,000 households reduce their power bills by $386 in 2025-26.

## ABSENCE OF MINISTER

**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.15 am): I advise that the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training will be absent for today's sitting due to illness. I advise that the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership will answer questions for the minister in question time.

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### Energy Industry

**Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (10.15 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

1. acknowledges that the aspiration to achieve net zero emissions is costing Queenslanders' household budgets;
2. revokes all net zero targets; and
3. immediately reinvest in coal and gas baseload generation to take advantage of our abundance of coal and gas in Queensland.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr SPEAKER:** Question time will conclude today at 11.16 am.

### Infrastructure

**Mr MILES** (10.16 am): My question is to the Treasurer. The state's forward pipeline of infrastructure has fallen by $13.1 billion compared to the midyear update over the four-year capital program. Can the Treasurer specifically explain which projects have been delayed?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I thank the honourable member for the question. Yesterday it was a privilege to lay the foundation for a fresh start for Queensland. It was a real privilege to be able to do that because an awful lot of work had gone into the budget process and an awful lot of consideration had been given to the fiscal mess that was left behind by those opposite. If there was any measure of the fiscal mess that had been left behind by those opposite, it was the unfunded capital projects and infrastructure projects that were on the books here in Queensland.

We have spent the last eight months talking about those projects. I am going to list them again for the honourable member because it appears like they have not been listening, they have not been doing the hard work and they have not been going back to the drawing board. I am hopefully getting a lot of questions today because I have a lot of things I need to raise—I really do. Those opposite have not gone back to the drawing board and they have not thought it through.

Where do we start? We know that CopperString has gone from $1.8 billion to $5 billion to $6 billion to $9 billion to $13.9 billion. We know that Borumba has gone from $14 billion to $18 billion. We know that Pioneer-Burdekin under them went from $7 billion to $12 billion to $36.8 billion. We know it. I was talking this morning to Steve Austin and he was asking me about the cost of Cross River Rail. Steve was saying, 'When did this start and how much is it going to cost?' I think the honourable member for Murrumba was in fact in cabinet when it started. It was $5.4 billion when they started, and now it is $17 billion. It is years late and it is going to be completed in 2029.

The honourable member asked me the question in relation to the capex. This year's capital investment in the budget is a record. It is $116.8 billion.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The specificity of the question was around delays, not costs.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Your point of order is on relevance. I find the Treasurer is being relevant to the infrastructure budget that he has handed down.

**Mr JANETZKI:** In respect of the questions, if they had gone and done the work overnight and looked at the budget papers, they would have known the answer to this question. Look at Borumba—$8 billion to $3 billion, a productivity dividend built into the capex program. We will be delivering more capital projects more efficiently and more productively than what those opposite ever could have delivered. More than anything, what this question shows is that they have not learnt yet that their scare campaign is over. It is over! We have shown we are investing in the capital, the jobs and the services exactly as we promised.

*(Time expired)*

## Public Sector, Employee Expenses

**Ms FENTIMAN:** My question is to the Treasurer. Employee expenses between 2026 and 2028 have been cut in comparison to the LNP government's midyear update. Can the Treasurer explain why $2.5 billion in total will be cut from employee expenses in 2026-27 and 2027-28?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I thank the honourable member for the question. The Leader of the Opposition went to capex. Now the shadow treasurer wants to talk about opex, and I welcome that opportunity. I welcome the opportunity because I have never heard a more confused response to a budget than what those opposite provided last night. I have never heard a more confused response—never!

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I did hear it, as the shadow treasurer knows. I heard it. There are a few points of confusion that those opposite clearly have. We only have 24 hours until the Leader of the Opposition comes into this parliament and answers a whole range of questions. I am looking forward to hearing about his secret tax plan tomorrow. There is no other way. There is no way through for them, except for the Leader of the Opposition to come in and tell us his secret tax plan. I will have more to say about that a little later, too.

In respect of the shadow treasurer's question, I talk about the confused response. At one stage yesterday I thought that the opposition's response to the budget was to talk about the colour of the budget papers. I actually thought the Leader of the Opposition was going to come in for an hour tomorrow and talk maybe about colour or maybe the design work of the budget papers. Maybe that is the best he can do when analysing the budget. But it became even more confusing. It is exemplified by the question asked by the shadow treasurer right now.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Treasurer has gone nowhere near answering the question. The point of order is on relevance.

**Mr SPEAKER:** He has a point. The question was about employee expenses. You have one minute.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I have plenty of points, too, Mr Speaker. They want to talk about operational expenditure. We have had the confusion. Are they just going to talk about the colours of the budget paper or—hang on, is it MYFER? They want to talk about operational expenditure. I think the member for Waterford has to work a bit harder. They have to go to the numbers. Even that little scare campaign—

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Member for Waterford, you need to look at the papers because the spending in MYFER in 2025-26 is $96 billion. The spending in the budget yesterday, the investments into Queensland, is $99 billion, so you cannot even get your argument right. We are investing more—

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you upheld my point of order just a moment ago. This point of order is exactly the same—the question related to employee expenses.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you for the point of order. I believe the Treasurer was speaking directly to that issue as you rose on your point of order.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Member for Waterford, you are going to have to work harder. Look at the MYFER numbers in 2025-26. We are investing $3.7 billion more in this budget than what was even forecast in MYFER, and that is because you left everything unfunded.

## Budget

**Mr HEAD:** My question is of the Premier and Minister for Veterans. Can the Premier explain how the LNP Crisafulli government's first budget is delivering for Queensland, and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I want to start by thanking the honourable member for Callide for his question. I enjoyed spending time in his electorate in the last fortnight, and I have to say I enjoyed going to the Calliope Football Club with him where we spoke about all things—from Games On! to Play On! and the impact that that will have on that beautiful little club. I want to thank the member for the work he is doing with that club.

This budget is a foundation for a fresh start for this state. Today we have again seen from the opposition the same old play about trying to run the same old scare campaign. They are like a one-trick pony and they just cannot pivot. They cannot pivot away from what they thought their attack point would be. The budget has been universally well regarded by people from a vast array of sectors. My colleagues did an excellent job in ministerial statements of explaining some of those. We thank those stakeholders for the way they worked with us. It is a diligent budget. It makes sure that it does deliver the repair to services that this state needs. It invests in the infrastructure a growing state needs and it lays the foundation for fiscal repair.

I want to talk briefly about the impact on cost of living and the need for that long-term structural cost of living. I mentioned that the member and I went to the Calliope Football Club. We do have the Play On! vouchers which is something that is excellent, long-term and set in stone. We have the $100 Back to School Boost which is a great way of making sure that students have a connection with their school. We speak about free health checks for kindy kids. There are indexed electricity rebates for vulnerable families. We have axed the patients tax that the member for McConnel says does not exist—it was about to come in next week. We speak about the nation-leading first home buyer's package. There is everything from axing a tax to a program to make sure we can help reduce that deposit gap. Of course, there are also the permanent 50-cent fares locked in that were not funded.

I must comment about our need to fix the mess we have inherited. Labor never turned up to deal with youth crime, they never turned up to deal with the health crisis, they never turned up to deal with the youth crime crisis, but we are turning up to fix their mess. I look at the Leader of the Opposition today and I see a lot of vacant seats surrounding the Leader of the Opposition. I suggest to the Leader of the Opposition that this place here is a place where you want to turn up and do some work.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** This is a place where Queenslanders expect their parliamentarians to do some work.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for McConnel, I was on my feet.

**Ms Grace:** I am sorry, I did not see you.

**Mr SPEAKER:** You are now warned.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** While the opposition will not turn up to work, this budget is a turning point for the fresh start that this state needs. We are determined to make sure, after a decade of missed opportunities, of service delivery failures, of infrastructure blowouts in time and cost that this budget does deliver the foundation for a fresh start that this state needs.

*(Time expired)*

## Transport Infrastructure

**Mr MELLISH:** My question is to the Treasurer. It has been 15 years since the first ever QTRIP was delivered. Can the Treasurer explain how the $41.7 billion figure in this year's budget was established when Queenslanders remain in the dark about funding allocations for congestion-busting transport projects?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I look forward to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads getting out and selling our vision for the transport infrastructure that we will be delivering across Queensland. The work in QTRIP is there for all to see. The honourable member has had plenty to say about that already with respect to QTRIP and I—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** One person has the call and I cannot hear him.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Mr Speaker, thank you. That work in QTRIP has been done and it is very clear there are more projects.

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, you are warned.

**Mr JANETZKI:** More projects that will be delivered than under those opposite and work is being done. I look right across Queensland and those opposite cannot deny that there is a record Transport and Main Roads spend in this budget. There is a record $41.7 billion investment into transport infrastructure in this state. We know why it is so important—

**Mr Mellish** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Aspley, you know the rules around waving props around. You will cease your interjections.

**Mr JANETZKI:** It is so important because of the gaps that they left in our transport system. I have already talked about Cross River Rail—$5.4 billion to $17 billion. They want to talk about the visibility in projects and details—

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Waterford, you are now warned.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Seriously—they are without credibility. The budget papers—again, they need to go and dig a bit deeper. They need to work a bit harder. They did to look at BP two, three and four. Go and do some work. If they had done the work, they would have seen that not only do we have a record $41 billion investment into transport infrastructure in Queensland but it comprises 42 per cent of the capex program across the government. That is an extraordinary investment in capital expenditure on the projects we need to ease congestion and to build the legacy infrastructure that the Deputy Premier constantly talks about to prepare for the Olympics and the population growth that we see right across our state and across the regions. We have got projects up and down the Eastern Seaboard. We have the Bruce Highway investment. No matter where you look, this government and the transport minister—

**Mr Mellish** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Aspley, you have joined the warning list. You are warned.

**Mr JANETZKI:**—are building the roads, the rail and the supporting infrastructure that we need to deliver that fresh start for Queensland.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will have some silence.

## Budget

**Mr STEVENS:** My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. Will the Treasurer update the House on how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget lays the foundation for a fresh start, and is the Treasurer aware of any contrasting views?

**Mr JANETZKI:** I thank the honourable member for the question. He knows, like we all know on this side of the House, that we had to do a serious job on the budget. There was a lot of work to do. There was a decade of an inherited legacy that we had to work through to deliver yesterday's budget but we got the balance that was necessary: a targeted, responsible cost-of-living support for those who need it most; front-loading those investments into jobs and services as we promised so that Queenslanders can reap the benefits earlier; and we laid the foundation of budget repair. That is what we did yesterday.

The contrast with the approach of those opposite could not be more stark. Some of my ministerial colleagues have already laid that out today in ministerial statements but it is worth saying again because when we picked up this budget to look at it, the 50-cent fares were unfunded—zero dollars—we have made it permanent. You pick up the budget from 2024-25 and FairPlay vouchers under them—they ended next week. We had to step in.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Yes, they ran another fake scare campaign on that. That was disappearing.

**Mr Crisafulli** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Remember that? They spent more on the advertising hoardings of their documents in the last budget than what they actually put into the budget for it. They are utterly without credibility. They should never take the Treasury benches again. Seriously. We unfroze the indexation for vulnerable households, and we will not freeze it again, it will continue to rise during the course of this government. They promised precisely zero dollars in the budget for energy rebates—nothing. They have no credibility. They have none. Now I am intrigued to see—it appears that energy rebates and all these other things—

**Mr Bleijie:** Loser.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I am going to ask you to withdraw that comment.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The cross-chamber chatter will cease. Is anybody listening?

**Mr JANETZKI:** They talk about the 20 per cent discount on rego but it was ending in September. They never had it in their budget. They had never embedded it in their budget. I am looking forward to hearing the opposition leader's budget reply speech tomorrow because they have an awful lot of explaining to do to the Queensland people. That last budget in 2024-25, the funding black holes and the cliffs that we had to fund—I am looking forward to hearing from the opposition tomorrow.

## Rail Infrastructure

**Mr DICK:** My question is to the Treasurer. The Treasurer's media release claims that $40 million is provided for the Wave, the bus service substitute for direct Sunshine Coast rail to Maroochydore. Can the Treasurer explain why this funding does not appear in any budget paper or QTRIP?

**Mr JANETZKI:** There is funding for the Wave in the budget. We have made this commitment abundantly clear. In fact, the transport minister has said a great deal already about the funding of the Wave. There is money to build it, to bring it from Brisbane and to get that fast line from Brisbane to the Sunshine Coast Airport. We are delivering the Wave. There is money in the budget for it.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Order!

**Mr JANETZKI:** Again, I will draw the contrast between the investments that we have made in capital expenditure in this budget to those opposite. How can we ever forget their hoax project of Pioneer-Burdekin? It was $36.8 billion. They built their entire Energy and Jobs Plan—wait—around Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro. No-one could deny that, right? They built their entire Energy and Jobs Plan around Borumba pumped hydro. What did we find when we took government? The Energy and Jobs Plan was a hoax; Pioneer-Burdekin did not have a single dollar for a capital investment. There was under $1 billion. Do they really expect the Queensland people to believe that they were going to build that project, that capex investment—a two-gig project—by 2035 with zero dollars in the budget? Do they really think the Queensland people would trust them when we know that the Borumba pumped hydro had a less than one per cent chance of delivering any energy by 2030?

Their credibility on capital expenditure in budgets is at zero. In contrast, as we have progressed through this budget process, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads has a record capital infrastructure budget of $41.7 billion to build the projects that those opposite never built, never scoped appropriately and could never have delivered productively. We will be delivering those projects and they are funded in the budget—whether it is the Wave or whether it is cleaning up the mess on Cross River Rail. Across Queensland, up and down the Eastern Seaboard with the Bruce Highway, we are delivering the road infrastructure for the fresh start for Queensland.

## Housing Supply

**Miss DOOLAN:** My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the Deputy Premier advise the House how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget is delivering a place to call home for more Queenslanders, and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I want to thank the member for Pumicestone for the question. More importantly, I want to thank the member for Pumicestone for turning up to work today unlike the shadow cabinet, who will not even turn up and support the Leader of the Opposition in his first question time since the new government handed down its first budget. I have counted that six members have not even been

bothered to turn up to support the Leader of the Opposition. They do not back him. They do not back the Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Miles** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** He can gesticulate and interject all he wants, but the fact is his mob is not even backing him. His mob is not even backing him so much so they just say, 'We don't need to go to parliament because we don't want to back the opposition leader.'

In contrast, in answer to the honourable member's question, we have the Residential Activation Fund. It is a $2 billion fund that is about supply, supply, supply—getting land to market so Queenslanders, including young first home owners, can build their home without paying Labor's stamp duty tax. Guess what? This program has been so successful that in the budget we brought down yesterday we are bringing forward $500 million and doubling the first round to $1 billion. We have had over 178 applications, and the best thing for regional and rural members is that at least 50 per cent will be spent in regional and rural Queensland because we want Queenslanders to have a roof over their head no matter where they live in this great state. That is why we are investing in the Residential Activation Fund. That is why we are bringing it forward. That is why we are doubling the first round to $1 billion. To see the support and the excitement from councils across Queensland and landowners is so exciting. That is why I am so proud to be the Minister for State Development and Planning who has released the Residential Activation Fund.

In contrast, let's see what the opposition leader brings tomorrow. I wonder if his shadow cabinet will show up for his speech—probably not. They do not show up for his first performance after the budget is handed down. Let's see if they show up. He is a rudderless leader. He is the Judas goat of Queensland. He is leading a rabble. The boat is rudderless. It is sinking. He shows no leadership. In terms of his members, in order to stab someone in the back, they have to be behind him. I look behind him and his team is not even there.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** I just remind members that it has been a tradition in the House for a while that you do not talk about absences from the House. I remind members of that. I will wait for silence before we go to the next question.

## Bribie Island Bridge

**Mr RYAN:** My question is to the Treasurer. During the election the LNP committed $700 million for a new Bribie Island bridge. Given the LNP's election commitments were costed 'down to the dollar', why is the Bribie Island bridge now expected to cost up to $1 billion?

**Mr JANETZKI:** Yes, there is money in the budget for the Bribie Island bridge, so the honourable member can rest assured. How long do I have left? I have two minutes and 49 seconds. Let's reflect on the 10 budgets those opposite had to do something about it. They had 10 budgets to do something—

**Mr Mellish** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before we go any further, member for Aspley, you were on a warning. You can leave the chamber for a period of one hour.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Aspley withdrew from the chamber at 10.44 am.*

**Mr Crisafulli:** They won't have a quorum soon.

**Mr JANETZKI:** They are dropping like flies. Those opposite had the opportunity to do something in 10 budgets. More than that, they had local representation on the ground. They had the member for Morayfield, the member for Pumicestone—

**Mr Bleijie:** They delivered zero.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I take the interjection; they delivered zero. They had 10 budgets and they delivered nothing. I remember that the previous member for Pumicestone would get herself tied up in knots about this particular issue, and don't we have a great member for Pumicestone these days and didn't she go through plenty to get here? We know all about those opposite and what they put our member for Pumicestone through. We know that. We know what the former member for Pumicestone put our member for Pumicestone through. Isn't it great to have a local member for Pumicestone fighting hard and delivering?

We held cabinet the other day in Moreton Bay and it was great to see the connections that our member for Pumicestone has with the community—deep ties and a deep bond with that community.

She is working hard to deliver what that community needs, and there is no greater need for that community than the Bribie Island bridge. I will contrast the action we are taking, the funding we are putting into it and the delivery we have through the transport and main roads minister with what those opposite did over that 10-year period, which was zip, nada, nothing. Yet they have the audacity to come in here and ask a question about the funding of the Bribie Island bridge. They have the audacity to come in here and ask a question about the funding after 10 years and 10 budgets. They were clearly never going to do it. They were never, ever going to do it. Do honourable members know what? We will. We will be making announcements. We will be making decisions. We will be getting shovels in the ground. We will be delivering on this project in this term of government and there is funding in the budget for it. We will not stop until we have undone the 10 years of damage of those opposite.

## Health System

**Ms DOOLEY:** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget will deliver a record health spend and address critical health services that were underfunded and unfunded? Will the minister expand on the approaches that led to the funding shortfall?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I want to thank the member for Redcliffe for her question. The member for Redcliffe, of course, is a former nurse and her family have worked and continue to work at the Redcliffe Hospital. She knows from direct sources on the ground what is going on in our hospital and health service. She appreciates the need for people to turn up to work to do the job they need to do, like our hardworking nurses and midwives do every day. They get paid for it, unlike those opposite who do not turn up and seem to be getting paid for not being in the House today. That is the Labor Party way. No wonder they support the CFMEU: turn up, go to the pub and get paid for a day of work. That is the Labor Party effort. That is what they are doing over there. First it was nine and then someone self-ejected and it is now 10 who are gone from the other side of the House.

The Crisafulli government, as I said—

**Mr Power** interjected.

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

**Mr NICHOLLS:** The move is on; Logan is moving up the list. He is hot. He could be there before too much longer. The member for Nudgee better look out; I see there is a vacancy in that part of the world.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, I will look after the House. There is a lot of disruption.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the member for Logan. He is interjecting but not from his seat and he is on a warning as well.

**Mr SPEAKER:** As I said, I will control the House. I did not see it.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members! Minister, you are down to one minute and 20 seconds, so you had better start on the question.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members on my right, you are not helping.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am painfully aware of the time: I am on my second paragraph. The government is delivering a record $33.1 billion to support the state's health system. What did Nick Yim, the President of the AMAQ, say?

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order on my right!

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you. Dr Yim said—

Patients are waiting far too long for life-saving healthcare and this funding is essential to turn that around.

Not to mention Labor's failed capacity expansion program and in the member for Redcliffe's electorate notwithstanding a $1 billion blowout and budget delays, we are getting on with the job and

rescuing that hospital with more beds—and, member for Redcliffe, it is being redesigned and the car park is now out for a procurement. We will be getting on with the job that Labor could not do.

I was asked about funding approaches and the shortfall. What we know is this: what would the opposition leader have done? What will he say he will cut in order to deliver these services? What was he planning on cutting? Was he going to cut the $48 million needed for the midwife-to-patient ratios, the $192 million for staff entitlements or the $157 million for the Women and Girls' Strategy, including nurse-led, walk-in clinics? Those opposite have no answers. The LNP is delivering the foundations for helping Queensland.

*(Time expired)*

## Ipswich, Second River Crossing

**Ms BOURNE:** My question is to the Treasurer. The Deputy Premier committed $4 million towards a second river crossing for the Ipswich West region. Given the LNP's election commitments were costed 'down to the dollar', why is this $4 million in funding missing from QTRIP?

**Mr JANETZKI:** We will be honouring our election commitments. That is the answer.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Ipswich West asked a question. I am sure she would like to hear the answer. I could not hear anything that the Treasurer has said thus far.

**Mr JANETZKI:** We will be honouring our election commitments. It is in the budget. We are delivering it. That leaves me two minutes and 40 seconds, so I am going to take the two minutes and 40 seconds, Mr Speaker. Those opposite are so confused as to their strategy. They have 24 hours to try and work out their strategy. I hear the question and we are honouring our election commitments, but it all just comes back to one thing—the scare campaign is over. It is over. We found the balance in this budget. We have found the balance.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Cross-chamber chatter will finish.

**Mr JANETZKI:** It is over. I am sorry, everybody, but it is over—it really is—because we are honouring our election commitments. We are front loading the funding into jobs and services that would have been lost under those opposite. We are saving the Mater Springfield hospital. Those opposite did not even put in $638 million for it. The member for Waterford comes in and asks questions, yet she was the health minister and sat around the CBRC table for years. We are funding what those opposite never did and they come in here and ask these questions in a desperate attempt for this scare campaign, but it is over. It is over. We are going to honour our election commitments, as we promised.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was not about any of those matters to which the Treasurer has talked; it was about a second river crossing for Ipswich West.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Treasurer, you are aware of the question. It was very clear.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. We said we were honouring our election commitments. It is in the budget, so the scare campaign of those opposite is over, yet we are concerned that they simply are not doing the work that is necessary. They are not doing the work because they still do not think that they have done anything wrong. They still think that they should be in government. In terms of the arrogance of them, they still think that they should be in government and this budget has proven that we have found the balance—targeted and responsible cost of living. We have done what is necessary to save the jobs and services and we have laid the foundation to budget repair. I can confirm that we are not just going to fund it and we are not just going to honour our election commitments, but if those opposite had done their job they would have seen that it is on page 39 of QTRIP.

## Education

**Mr BENNETT:** My question is to the Minister for Education and the Arts. Can the minister outline how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget is helping Queensland kids and delivering a fresh start for our education sector, and is the minister aware of any contrasting approaches?

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I will have silence before I go to the minister.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the honourable member for the question because, as we have heard from those opposite who have no idea about what is in this budget, including the page numbers of commitments that have been made—

**Ms Leahy:** They can't read. They need to go back to school.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** They cannot read the actual budget papers, but we have made a very clear statement about our fresh start for Queensland after 10 years of those opposite—10 years of declining education standards, 10 years of behaviour issues, 10 years of NAPLAN results sliding, 10 years of a cost-of-living crisis, 10 years of teachers being embroiled in red tape and their morale going down and backwards and out the door. What we announced yesterday, apart from 15 schools—10 of them state schools—is this boost for Queenslanders for primary school students, and I note that there were some in the public gallery earlier.

**Mr Mickelberg:** From Buderim—from Brightwater State School, which you opened.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** They were from Brightwater State School, which I was proud to open last time we were in government, in the electorate of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, the member for Buderim. That is why the boost for Queensland students that we have announced is going to help them with issues from 1 January, but after day 8 of school next year it is going to help them with issues such as books and excursions—anything that happens in schools where parents may have had trouble balancing the cost needs. Whether it be for sporting or arts facilities, we have made sure—

**Mrs Nightingale** interjected.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** Mr Speaker—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Inala.

**Ms Leahy:** You're on a warning.

**A government member:** You should be now.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** This cost-of-living relief is going to be given to Queensland students attending—

**Mrs Nightingale** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Inala, you are now on a warning.

**Mr LANGBROEK:**—school from prep to year 6. As I said, it is going to sit as a credit in each student's account and be spent on essential items including books, stationery, sports equipment, technology, uniforms, excursions, camps and more. It applies to primary schools because the transition into full-time schooling can be tough, particularly on single-income families, often the case with young students who need more care and supervision.

The budget funding—for those opposite who may not know because they may not have been able to find the global figure—is $21.9 billion in education, a 5.1 per cent increase on last year. I want to acknowledge the coverage from the *Brisbane Times*, which acknowledged that it is the biggest funding boost in Queensland's education history—an extra $9.4 billion allocated by our government over 10 years as part of our federal funding agreement, which members have heard me speak about many times. We have achieved that funding increase when those opposite did not increase the state contribution for six years. We have made sure that we are getting to 75 per cent by 2028, four years before those opposite could.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** Just before I go to the member for Noosa, Minister for Health, I might just ask you to remove that material from display.

## Estimates Committees

**Ms BOLTON:** My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. With the budget released and estimates in four weeks time, can the Attorney-General report on what reforms are being introduced to both the estimates process and the committee system to address the failings of the past?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I would like to thank the honourable member for Noosa for a question in this House about the estimates process. I thank her for that. I also would like to thank the member for Noosa for always showing up and for representing her community in this place where we are paid to be during a parliamentary sitting week. Thank you, member for Noosa. I know it is a beautiful winter's

day and I am sure the waves at Noosa would be calling you, but, no, you are here in this chamber to help scrutinise the budget. So, thank you, member for Noosa. I do not know where the others are. Maybe there is a beach somewhere calling them.

**A government member:** Or a bar.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Or a bar! I take that interjection.

**Ms Pease:** Talking to your constituents!

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I am going to take that interjection from the member over there. I do hope they are out there talking to my constituents because my constituents have a lot to say to the former Labor government. The member for Noosa asks a very good question around the estimates process. As the Treasurer announced yesterday with the amendments to the Parliament of Queensland Act, the changes to the estimates process, to bring transparency, accountability and integrity back to the estimates process, is to put you, Mr Speaker, and the honourable Deputy Speaker in as chairs for each and every committee. Why would we do that? Because it is important that we stop—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr Crisafulli:** No more member for Logan running a protection racket!

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** There are so many interjections I want to take, but I am going to take the honourable the Premier's interjection, obviously. I have notes here that talk about the member for Logan, the king of the protection racket. As the member for Logan used to sit there I can remember thinking, as I was watching it, 'Is this bloke simple or something?' Every question he would ask—

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order, firstly, on a question in relation to standing order 113 in terms of whether this is, in fact, the Attorney-General's portfolio.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I am hearing a point of order.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Secondly, in relation to the unparliamentary slur levelled at a member of the House, I would ask the member to withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Integrity does come under the Attorney-General so that is valid. I would remind the Attorney-General to keep your language parliamentary and use correct titles.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I would ask that you withdraw.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I withdraw. It was the member for Logan, the king of the protection racket, who used to sit there and when the then opposition members would try to continue a line of questioning to a certain executive or minister, the then chair would go, 'Who is it to again?' It was just unbelievable. I remember reading that during the Premier's performance there was constant interference by the then Labor committee members. The Crisafulli government is restoring integrity to the estimates process.

*(Time expired)*

## Social and Affordable Housing

**Mr VORSTER:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth**.** Can the minister advise the House how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget is delivering more social and community housing and support for vulnerable Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to build the homes that Queenslanders need?

**Mr O'CONNOR:** I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. I thank him for his constant advocacy for more social and community housing in his community. Earlier today he was sending me messages from his Facebook post where people have been asking questions about this. He is a very hands-on member, the member for Burleigh.

**Mrs Frecklington:** He turns up.

**Mr O'CONNOR:** He turns up as well. I take that interjection. One would have thought that is the bare minimum, Attorney-General, but he is here. Thank you, member for Burleigh, for that. Thank you to everyone who comments on the member for Burleigh's Facebook page as well. The member for Burleigh will know that our city has been neglected for far too long, that we have not had the investment that we have needed to see, but I am pleased to advise the member for Burleigh that we have 564 social and affordable homes under construction or contract across the Gold Coast. That is particularly

important for our most vulnerable, for the people at that end of the market where we know this will make a huge difference because they are really struggling at the moment.

Our budget yesterday outlined our new approach to deliver even more homes for not only the Gold Coast, but also all parts of Queensland. We have lifted our capital spend over this four-year period to $5.6 billion—that is nearly a $2 billion uplift—but more importantly for the first time in our state's history we have locked in perpetual baseline funding for social housing and community housing delivery. That is transformational and it has been well supported by stakeholders. Julie Saunders from CHIA has said—

Thank you, Queensland Government, for prioritising long term sustainable solutions to our states housing crisis.

QShelter have said that they have been calling for increased investment in social and affordable housing and the allocation of an additional $2 billion in the budget over the next four years is a welcome development—as is the long-term funding commitment extending beyond the budget cycle.

Paul Bidwell from the Master Builders said—

This Budget has delivered a housing hat trick we are hopeful will meaningfully shift the dial on approvals and empower our industry to boost supply.

In my remaining time, I will touch on the other part of the member's question, which is alternative approaches. Labor's legacy is clear: we have 52,031 Queenslanders on the social housing waitlist—an 81 per cent increase since they came to office over a decade ago. That is their legacy: the lowest rate of home ownership in the nation, rents that soared 60 per cent, a social housing portfolio that grew nowhere near the population growth our state was experiencing and only, on average, 509 new social and community homes delivered each year. We are turning things around. We are changing how social and community housing is delivered across our state. I look forward to sharing more updates in the future as we grow that pipeline to where it should be.

## Princess Alexandra Hospital, Spinal Injuries Unit

**Mr BAILEY:** My question is to the Treasurer. Former shadow health minister Bates said in relation to the PA Hospital's Spinal Injuries Unit that it is 'the job of the minister to make sure that any part of the department is properly resourced and that patients are properly cared for'. Why then did the Treasurer not fund the much needed Spinal Injuries Unit upgrade at the PA Hospital in the budget, and can he actually attempt to answer this question?

**Mr SPEAKER:** There is an imputation at the end of that question. I will ask you to withdraw that.

**Mr BAILEY:** I withdraw.

**Mr JANETZKI:** Those opposite never funded it in the first place. We know that. They never put a dollar into it when they were in government. The health minister is doing the work that is necessary to work on that particular problem. Again, those opposite have walked in here and forgotten their 10 years in government. We are calmly and methodically cleaning up the former government's mess. There is no better example of where that is necessary than in health. That is why the health minister has Labor's health failures folder. I am surprised it is not larger.

**Mr Nicholls:** I have a second volume.

**Mr JANETZKI:** There is second volume and there will probably be a supplementary as well in due course.

They left behind a $12 billion opex black hole, as I recall. There were significant operational expenditure black holes. In contrast to those opposite, yesterday we announced a record health spend. There is more than $18 billion in the Hospital Rescue Plan, including to the PA Hospital. We have said that we are building new hospitals. We are doing the upgrades necessary after those opposite allowed the infrastructure to deteriorate for a decade. We are putting that record capital investment—$18½ billion—into the budget. It goes beyond that kind of investment. Our operational investment in the health system is more than $29 billion in this budget. The $33 billion total spend in the budget this year for health is cleaning up Labor's mess. We are saving the jobs and saving the services. We are fixing the deteriorating health infrastructure across Queensland. That is what we are doing, day by day. Those opposite never had any funding in the budget for it, and the health minister—

**Mr BAILEY:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was about funding for the PA Spinal Injuries Unit which was in last year's budget and is not in this year's budget. He has 34 seconds—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Your point of order is on relevance?

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being relevant to the question as asked. There was a broad nature to the question—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will hear the point of order in silence.

**Dr ROWAN:** The Treasurer is outlining the government's response and also the historical legacy of the now Labor opposition in relation to this matter with respect to the spinal unit at the PA Hospital.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Miller, the question was very close to being ruled out of order but I allowed it. I am allowing the Treasurer to answer it. In terms of the specifics, the question probably should have gone to the Minister for Health, but the Treasurer is the one who handed down the budget so I will allow the Treasurer to continue his answer. Treasurer, you have 34 seconds to round out your answer.

**Mr JANETZKI:** The health minister has an enormous challenge because those opposite left us with an enormous challenge. He is addressing it calmly and methodically. We are funding those services and those jobs. I stood with the health minister at Mater Springfield, where there was a $638 million operational black hole. What were those opposite doing? The then health minister was on CBRC. Those opposite have zero credibility when it comes to capital and operational expenditure. Yesterday we invested a record amount to deliver health services where and when Queenslanders need them.

*(Time expired)*

## Transport and Roads Infrastructure

**Mr HUNT:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Will the minister outline how the Crisafulli LNP government's first budget will deliver a record spend on generational infrastructure, and is the minister aware of any contrasting approaches?

**Mr MICKELBERG:** I thank the member for Nicklin for his question. He is a strong advocate for not just his community but also the entire Sunshine Coast. I am very proud, as a minister within the Crisafulli government, to deliver for the Sunshine Coast—something those opposite could not do in their 10 years in power. This budget delivers a $41.7 billion investment in road and rail infrastructure in Queensland. Let's compare that with last year. This is a $4.3 billion increase on Labor's last QTRIP. I mention projects like the Mooloolah River Interchange, the Wave and Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail, in the former treasurer's own electorate. He could not deliver it; we are delivering it. We are getting on with the job of delivering the road and rail infrastructure Queenslanders need and Queenslanders deserve. There is a $9 billion package to upgrade the Bruce Highway. Something those opposite said could not be done we delivered within the first 90 days of coming to government.

The member for Nicklin asked me about alternative approaches. One of the things I have been tasked with is ending the blowouts presided by the overrun overlord and his apprentice, the member for Aspley. My job is to deliver projects on time and on budget. In doing so, we will have more funding available to deliver those smaller projects that might be below the radar but are important to communities like those in Nicklin. One of those is safety upgrades at the Jubilee Drive, Chevallum Road and Palmwoods Road intersection at the rail overpass in Palmwoods. Sunshine Coast residents know how dangerous that intersection is, and we will fix it. There are also safety upgrades at intersections linking Elm Street with Myall and Diamond streets in Cooroy. The member for Nicklin has been a strong advocate to deliver those upgrades—not just talk about them but deliver them. We will deliver them as a part of our budget. There are also safety upgrades at the Nambour Connection Road and Diddillibah Road intersection. Diddillibah is a hard word to say, but I got it out! My job is to end the blowouts presided over under 10 years of Labor governments.

In the gallery we have year 6 students from Brightwater State School in my electorate. Shout-out to you guys; I will see you in a few weeks time. Our budget will mean that we can deliver upgrades for students in Brightwater and right across the Sunshine Coast. The Mooloolah River Interchange will mean they get home sooner at the end of the school day. The Wave will mean they will be able to move up and down the Sunshine Coast with better public transport than ever before. We will deliver that because of our budget discipline and our investment in critical road and rail infrastructure that people on the Sunshine Coast and right across Queensland deserve. I thank the member for Nicklin for his advocacy for his community. I look forward to being part of a Crisafulli LNP government that delivers for every single Queenslander.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think there was an interjection from a member opposite which was not taken but may have been unparliamentary.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I am sorry, I missed it.

### Transport and Roads Infrastructure

**Mr MILES:** My question is to the Premier. Is the real reason the Premier was so confident he could deliver transport projects on time and on budget that QTRIP now delivers no clear times and budgets for most projects?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, you have one minute to respond.

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. Unfortunately, I have only one minute to answer the question because the Leader of the Opposition does not know how to run time and does not know how to run his team. He does not know how to run his team because they do not turn up to work for him.

I say to the Leader of the Opposition: we have a plan to deliver infrastructure that those opposite did not have. We have QTRIP; they had 'cheap trick'. We have seen the mistakes, the blowouts in time, the blowouts in cost and the generational missed opportunities. In less than a year we have signed an 80-20 deal that those opposite said was not possible. We have delivered a generational plan for infrastructure. After 10 years of missed opportunities, this state is on the cusp of something very special.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The period for question time has expired.

## MOTIONS

### Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in Standing and Sessional Orders, I be allowed to immediately move a motion without notice with the following time limits to apply to the debate of the motion—

- 6 members, 5 minutes for each member; and
- Total debate time before question put—30 minutes.

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

**AYES, 51:**

**LNP, 49—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**KAP, 2—**Dametto, Knuth.

**NOES, 27:**

**ALP, 26—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, King, Martin, McMillan, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Whiting.

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

### Censure of Opposition

**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.22 am): I move—

That this parliament censures the Queensland Labor opposition for their failure to meet their duties in this parliament this morning, including the failure by some shadow ministers to attend question time.

This is a serious and important motion. Every four years, members are elected to this parliament to fulfil their duties, whether that be advocating on behalf of their communities or fighting for additional services and infrastructure for their areas. Some members of parliament are afforded additional pay to carry out the duties and the responsibilities that they fulfil not only to this House but also to all of Queensland. To be a member of parliament, you need to represent your community and your constituents.

Very importantly, each year we have a budget. It is an extraordinary situation that, the day after the 2025-26 state budget was handed down, in an unprecedented way members of the Labor opposition, including senior shadow ministers, have failed to attend important parts of the democratic and parliamentary processes in parliament, particularly when it comes to question time. Today in the parliament we see a Labor opposition that is lazy. They are not up to the great responsibilities that are bestowed upon them as an opposition in Queensland. They were not fit to be in government and clearly they are not even fit to be in opposition. Our democratic institution needs to be treated with the dignity and the respect that it deserves. Today, the Labor opposition has failed to do that.

This opposition would have to be the laziest in Queensland's history. They have significant resources to represent their areas and their communities. Their shadow ministers have significant resources. Failing to come into this place today is basically disrespectful to all of Queensland. It is terrible. It is disgraceful when we think about what is happening here.

This reminds me of the Tree of Knowledge at Barcaldine. People have told me that the Tree of Knowledge was poisoned, but I think it died of shame. I think it died of shame because in Queensland the Labor opposition and the union movement have failed to stand up for their interests and for ordinary Queenslanders. The tree was not poisoned by some scoundrel in the middle of the night. It died of shame and we know exactly why that is the case.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Dr ROWAN:** I hear members opposite interjecting. They will whinge and whine because that is all they do in this place. As a Labor opposition all they do is whinge and whine about particular things. However, we are just about to debate important legislation. This is not just about not being here for ministerial statements. It is not just about not being here for question time. It is also about not being here to debate important legislation, which is what we are elected to do in Queensland.

On this side of the House, we take our responsibilities seriously. Members of the government turn up to work. Members of the government represent their electorates. Members of the government fulfil their responsibilities. However, members of the Labor opposition recklessly abandon their responsibilities to their constituents and their responsibilities to this House. It is disgraceful.

This is an important motion. The government has not taken this step lightly. We have given due consideration to the appropriateness of a censure motion. A censure motion is appropriate given the unprecedented circumstances when we look at what has happened in this term of the parliament and the unprecedented circumstances over many years. The Labor opposition should be fulfilling their responsibilities to all of Queensland. They are paid to do that. The shadow ministers are provided with additional financial support and additional resources to do that, but they are not here in the parliament today. It is very clear: members on that side of the House are very quiet because they are embarrassed and ashamed.

**Mrs Gerber:** Because there's not enough of them.

**Dr ROWAN:** I take the interjection from the minister; there is not enough of them to interject and they are embarrassed and ashamed. I say to all members of this parliament that this censure motion needs to be supported. The government has not taken this step lightly. Shame on Labor.

**Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.27 am): I move—

All words after 'parliament' be omitted and following inserted:

'(a) acknowledges that members of parliament have multiple roles to discharge, including talking with Queenslanders about the budget.

(b) notes that the Labor opposition respects the institution of the Queensland parliament.

(c) notes that there are times that members of parliament, including the LNP, are absent from parliament for a number of reasons.

(d) condemns the Crisafulli LNP government for treating this parliament as their plaything.'

Queensland is a big state. On this side of the House, we will never shy away from representing Queenslanders and spending time in every single part of this state. The LNP might think that governing is all about Brisbane and the parliament, but on this side of the House we will continue to travel around the state and spend time in regional Queensland and, in fact, we will never apologise for that. Today we made a deliberate choice to make sure that regional Queenslanders knew how this LNP government had let them down in the budget delivered yesterday and what a bad budget it is for regional Queensland.

I note the curiosity of those opposite about where our members are and I am happy to inform the House about where our members are. First, I note that a number of members from both sides of the House are absent from parliament due to illness. I assume that this motion does not refer to them. I also note that the LNP have previously provided leave to their members to go on a cruise during parliament, which speaks a little to the hypocrisy of the Leader of the House.

The Leader of the House raised a concern that those members might not be here to deal with important legislation later today. I can assure the Leader of the House that those members will be back here to participate in the debate on that legislation. For the benefit of members, let me outline to the House where some of our Labor members are. The member for Cairns is in Cairns talking about how this budget fails to deliver an economic vision for Cairns and fails to properly invest in the Common User Facility at the Cairns port, which we all know is so important. The member for Greenslopes is in Townsville. He is the only MP in Townsville today and he is talking about how this budget fails to properly fund—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Members of the House, that was completely disorderly. I remind the members for McConnel, Logan, Waterford, Aspley and Inala that they are on warnings.

**Mr MILES:** The member for Greenslopes is in Townsville talking about CopperString, the state's renewable energy future, how this budget lets down North Queenslanders and how the four Townsville members have failed to stand up for the region. The member for Bundamba is in Mackay doing the very same thing. The member for Gladstone is in Central Queensland talking about how this LNP budget lets down regional Queensland, in particular the towns of Gladstone and Rockhampton.

The member for Bundaberg is in Bundaberg talking about how this government have failed to properly invest in the Bundaberg Hospital and how they have let the Wide Bay region down. The member for Nudgee is in Toowoomba talking about how this budget lets down the people of Toowoomba by not properly funding the new Toowoomba Hospital. The LNP should expect us to continue spending time in each and every one of these regions, fighting for them and highlighting how those opposite have failed to represent them.

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.33 am): The objective of an opposition is to hold a government to account. It is hard to do that when you do not show up to work. The honourable opposition leader said that some of his shadow ministers are sick, but the six shadow ministers he just mentioned are not sick; they are out of town and they are not doing their job in parliament.

Our job is to go from our electorates to parliament. That is what we are paid for. He has all but admitted today that two of his shadow ministers are in their local electorate doing local things. I would love to be in Kawana spruiking the budget, but I am here because parliament is sitting. It is the day after a budget was handed down and those lazy MPs thought they had to go back to their constituencies. It actually is a reflection on the honourable opposition leader and his lack of leadership. For the opposition leader—

**Mr Miles:** I sent them.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I will take the interjection. He sent them—that is why he is a bad leader. A true leader would not have sent them. A true leader would have said, 'You're required in parliament.' A good leader would have said, 'No.' A good leader would have kept them here. A good leader would have said to a shadow minister, 'You're getting paid $120,000 more than a backbench MP and your responsibility is to question the minister whom you shadow.' It is hard for them to question the minister they are shadowing when they are in Townsville, Bundaberg, Mackay, Toowoomba and Central Queensland.

**Mr Miles** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable opposition leader. It is his failure of leadership. If he were a proper and good leader, he would have looked the shadow minister in the eye and said, 'No, you have to be here to back the team.' If the opposition leader really wanted to get rid of a few members—I would not do this because a good leader would not do this—he should have sent the member for Pine Rivers out. I would have said—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Members, I appreciate the nature of the debate. That was just too noisy. I could not even hear the member for Kawana, which is difficult to believe.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** If as a leader I had the choice, I would have sent the member for Pine Rivers packing because her contribution to this House is limited at best. I would have sent the member for Woodridge. His gutters need cleaning.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjections. He probably applied to go because he wants to be in the media tonight, but it was probably rejected. I have served in this place for 16 years and this is the biggest farce of an opposition I have seen. I know there are a few members who have served longer than me. This would be the biggest farce of an opposition leader.

For the opposition leader to now try to convince us and the fourth estate that this was his grand plan—and that it was such a good plan—is an absolute joke. It was a bad plan. The day after a new government handed down—

**A government member:** Mr Giggles.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Giggles is back. It is his modus operandi. He has to giggle when he is nervous. It is like the song 'clowns to the left of me, jokers to the right'. That is what we have: clowns to the left, jokers to the right and no-one behind.

This censure motion is important. This censure motion is showing that the opposition have failed to turn up and do their job. Ministers should have been interrogated today by shadow ministers, but he let them off the hook. The Premier and I, as the leadership team, are happy for the shadow ministers to ask our ministers questions. I would give anything to get a question from the opposition. I have had one question in eight months! I have been sitting here saying, 'Please, please ask me a question.' I will pay them. I do not care. I will pay them to ask me a question.

I turned up to work and we expect the shadow ministry to turn up to work. There is a lack of leadership, and it is a reflection on the bad opposition leader who will not make Christmas. He did the last Christmas coup and the Christmas coup is coming for him this Christmas.

**Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.38 am): Didn't the member for Moggill get out the wet lettuce and give us an absolute thrashing! I have not heard such a stinging attack on an opposition since the bumbling B-grade Treasurer was given an extension of time to talk in the House. Boy, we were folded in two that day by that incredible effort. I am very happy to rise today to speak against the government motion and to support the amendment moved by the Leader of the Opposition.

I want to go back to some of the words of the member for Moggill. The member for Moggill said MPs should be out advocating for their communities, and that is exactly what the Labor opposition is doing today after the absolutely base, pathetic performance we heard in the House last night, with the Premier directing the police minister to put more police officers in one of his police stations and the Deputy Premier talking about how he had got money for his electorate, and his electorate alone, to put air conditioning in school halls when kids in Longreach, in the Far North and in Logan in hot halls get nothing. Then the Deputy Premier had to lecture everyone about how good it was to run the campaign to become school captain! They are the sort of people who sit on the other side and waste the parliament's time with stunts like this. They are not out in the community speaking to the—

**Mr Bleijie:** Says the former AG from Tuvalu! You got your law degree from Tuvalu!

**Mr DICK:** I take the interjection from the member for Kawana. I was more than a conveyancing clerk, I can tell you that. I ran more than a conveyancing business.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Order, member for Kawana!

**Mr DICK:** I also say to the member for Kawana that I never had the police investigate me for fraudulently issuing a document, but that is for another day. Remember when that was in the newspaper—when the Deputy Premier was investigated by the police?

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members, that is the third time I have had to rise because I cannot hear the speaker on their feet. It is not one side; all sides are offending. Member for Woodridge, you have the call.

**Mr DICK:** Then we had the member for Moggill saying, 'Members of the opposition should be in the House to listen to ministerial statements.' There has not been one sitting day since the election when minister after minister has not come in and serially abused the standing orders and absolutely

abused the right and entitlement to deliver a ministerial statement. The worst offenders have been the Premier and the Deputy Premier.

We are not going to sit in this House and listen to the nonsense of those members opposite when a bumbling B-grade Treasurer delivered B-day yesterday—a bad budget by a bad government. That is why we are out talking to the community about why the Common User Facility in Cairns—the most transformative piece of infrastructure for the Far North since the airport—is not being delivered by this government. It is why we are in Townsville talking to the community about why this government, including the three LNP nonentities who represent Townsville in this parliament, are not doing anything to protect that community from crime that is out of control in Townsville.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Mr DICK:** They are doing nothing for cost-of-living relief. Not only is it out of control; it is getting worse. The three bumblers from Townsville are doing nothing. It is why we are in Mackay talking about real cost-of-living relief while the member for Mackay sits in this House mute and absurd, listening to the nonsense of the Deputy Premier. All of those backbenchers had to sit there and listen to the nonsense of the Premier and the Deputy Premier last night—the self-indulgence, the self-reference. They cannot spend enough time talking about themselves. As a matter of fact, that is why they have moved this motion. Then we had the occasion during one of the Labor budgets when the former member for Burleigh was given leave to go on a cruise and then the Rocky Mountaineer—the train system through the Rocky Mountains. At least the people of Canada have a rail line, unlike the people of Maroochydore who are getting a bus!

This is just a waste of time. Then we hear the confected outrage by the member for Kawana about the importance of parliament and why we should all be in here talking about why we should be school captain! This is a nonsense and a mess by the government. It is a bad budget delivered by a bumbling B-grade Treasurer. It does not deliver cost-of-living relief. It delays infrastructure. It delays the congestion-busting infrastructure that every Queenslander needs. It is not boring; it is bad, and we are going to speak about it across Queensland.

*(Time expired)*

## Deputy Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Members, in relation to the amendment moved by the member for Murrumba, I have taken advice from the Clerk about the amendment and the fact that in usual parliamentary practice there cannot be direct negatives moved to a motion except for the exception set out in our sessional orders in relation to private members' motions on a Wednesday night. The advice received from the Clerk is that the member for Murrumba's amendment is to be ruled out of order.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members!

**Hon. FS SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (11.44 am): That is what happens when you send the brains trust on a road trip around Queensland! Is that the best the Leader of the Opposition can do? What a shambolic amendment he has tried to move today.

Let's talk about the importance of this parliament. People put their lives on the line and seek the trust of Queenslanders to get elected to this parliament and they expect them to turn up for work. In regard to the shadow cabinet, nearly a third of them are absent from the parliament during a parliamentary sitting week. That is unprecedented. We are moving a censure motion because this has never happened before. I have been in this parliament a number of years and I have never ever seen it. I am sure the Clerk and other senior members who serve at the table in this House have never seen a situation where a shadow cabinet—or, in fact, a government—take a third of their team off the benches and intentionally not turn up to parliament. That is their job. It is their main job. In regard to the shadow cabinet, who are supposed to be the opposite numbers to the government, their primary responsibility is to turn up to do your job: hold the government to account, respect the people of Queensland who have elected you to this parliament, and do your job.

What a weak excuse we have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. When you think about it, maybe this is the only way the Leader of the Opposition can hold the numbers in the caucus—send them on a road trip and get them out of here!

**Mrs Gerber:** Maybe the coup was on! The coup was on today!

**Ms SIMPSON:** Maybe the coup was on. This is so disrespectful to parliament. We have never seen this before. This is an unprecedented strategy from the Labor opposition, sending nearly a third of the shadow cabinet on the road during a parliamentary sitting week.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**(Mr Krause): Order, member for Pine Rivers and member for Algester!

**Ms SIMPSON:** If they have not noticed, when you get elected to parliament, the people expect you to turn up. There is an even greater expectation on shadow ministers that, as a team, you will be here. We understand when people are unwell. We understand that. There is not only an understanding but a respect for that. We are talking about shadow ministers who have put out media alerts. They are not on sick leave; they have put out media alerts. Shock horror! We found out about it because they have deliberately and intentionally sent them away from the parliament. They have sent them away from the very forum, the very place, where they are supposed to turn up.

This is Labor, with their black hole and their red ink—their black hole of unfunded promises and their red ink of fiscal mismanagement. They have shown disrespect for the people of Queensland and their hard-earned dollars—the people who put them in this place and where they expect them to do their job. They continue to have a black hole of leadership, a black hole of disrespect and a contempt for the people of Queensland. They are acting in a way that we have never seen before, sending nearly a third of their shadow cabinet away.

This is contempt for the people of Queensland. It is contempt for the parliament of Queensland, which is here to represent the people. This is a place of diverse voices. It is a place to bring ideas. It is a place where there will be agreements and disagreements, but it is a place where the people of Queensland expect us to come, to turn up and to do our job. I know some Labor members opposite are laughing. They think this is funny. Well, we think it is strange. Most of us all, we think it is contemptuous, to show the people of Queensland such a level of disrespect.

**Ms Enoch** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Algester, those comments are not directed through the chair. Cease them.

**Ms SIMPSON:** This is a serious matter. We have seen some strange strategies from the shambolic Labor opposition since they took over the opposition benches. It shows why Queenslanders have been treated like mugs while Labor were in government with the way they abused their hard-earned dollars and why they failed to make timely decisions in regard to law and order, health services and so many other frontline services. They were simply inept and incapable. The shadow ministry is now being exposed for just how shallow they are. They are not just a shadow ministry; they are a ghost shadow ministry—people who do not turn up to do their job and get on with the business of representing Queensland.

**Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (11.49 am): There is one person who set the opposition leader up for this motion which would then obviously be ruled out of order. Not only did the member for Waterford set the opposition leader up and say, 'Send your shadows out. It's a good idea', but she would have gone on, 'Leader, this is a good idea.' Well played, member for Waterford. It has blown up in his face. Then the poor deputy opposition leader had to come in and support his lowly leader. He has the motion texted to him and it gets ruled out of order. He cannot even get that right.

The Leader of the Opposition has one job, and that is to ensure his team turns up for work. He has also set up the poor member for Morayfield, who is now going to be known as the worst whip in parliamentary history. Honestly, you have to get your members to turn up. Now we know this is the laziest opposition Queenslanders have ever seen. I want to take the interjection from the Premier—which he has not made, but I am sure he would—because every question time the Premier says, 'Guys, you've got to get up early and work harder.' That is exactly what an opposition has to do. I have news for you: I was in opposition for 10 hard, long years—

**Ms Boyd:** We hear about it every day.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I will take that interjection from the member for Pine Rivers because guess what, member for Pine Rivers: you have to get up earlier. You have to work harder. You have to open your budget papers yourself. You have to work out what you have. You cannot make other people do the work for you. You have to actually show up and do the work. That is what your constituents expect.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Order, members. Direct your comments through the chair, please.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. That is what our constituents expect. They expect us to turn up and work hard on their behalf. Shadow ministers have one job, and that is to question the ministers. We all know they are scared of us. We all know that those opposite, those shadow ministers, cannot even ask a decent question. How many questions have they had ruled out, Premier? Seriously!

Member for Waterford, I say well done to you for setting up the opposition leader. The opposition leader fell for it. Imagine the strategy over there. 'Yes, member for Waterford, I'm going to do that. I don't know what else I'm going to do today.' Then it gets ruled out! Well done. Well played, member for Waterford. Seriously, next time send out some more.

*(Time expired)*

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Waterford, if you could resume your seat, please. In accordance with the motion moved by the Leader of the House, the time for the debate on this motion has expired. The question is that the motion of censure moved by the Leader of the House be agreed to.

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

In division—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Order, members! Cease your quarrelling across the chamber. I remind everyone that the standing orders apply in divisions.

**AYES, 48:**

**LNP, 48—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**NOES, 25:**

**ALP, 25—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, King, Martin, McMillan, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Whiting.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon

Resolved in the affirmative.

## PLANNING (SOCIAL IMPACT AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 1 May (see p. 1131).

### Second Reading

**Mr DICK:** Deputy Speaker—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): I call the Deputy Premier.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The minister speaks first. You are the shadow minister and I have an hour.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, you have the call to move the second reading.

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.58 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

**Mr Miles** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Are you okay, 'Giggles'? Are you happy?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**(Mr Krause): Order! Deputy Premier, continuing your second reading address.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee for its consideration of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The committee made one recommendation about the bill, which is that it be passed. I thank the committee for their recommendation. I thank all honourable committee members for that recommendation and the work they did over the last six weeks. I also thank members of the public and the many and varied organisations and industry groups who made written submissions and appeared before the committee at the public hearings. I note the overtly political nature of Labor's statement of reservation and the lack of genuine intent by Labor to put regional communities first.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, it is time for the House to break for lunch, but before we do I ask that you withdraw the reference to the Leader of the Opposition you previously made.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I remind you to use correct titles in the future. Members, it is time for the House to break for lunch. We will—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, members! Quarrelling across the chamber will cease. I am running the House. If you want to comment, please rise and make a point of order. Do not argue with each other across the House. It is time for the House to adjourn for lunch. The House will resume at 2 pm.

Sitting suspended from 12.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Let me begin where I finished. I note the overtly political nature of Labor's statement of reservation and lack of genuine attempt by Labor to put regional communities first. Let me deal with the renewable energy aspect first. The Crisafulli government is backing regional Queensland by making it crystal clear that regional communities are back at the decision-making table when it comes to large-scale renewable energy projects developed in their backyard and also that our changes ensure regions which host these large-scale developments are empowered and have forced benefits.

These are nation-leading laws to deliver on our commitment to empower regional communities on renewable energy developments and ensure long-lasting legacy benefits are locked in from any new project, at the time of approval, if the community wants it. For too long, Labor's reckless rush to renewables meant local communities and councils were shut out of the approvals process. We know Labor's approach was driven by ideology, not community interests.

We have had a lot of mess to clean up since coming to office. I had to make quick and important decisions to pause the assessment of three wind farm applications to make sure they did not sail through Labor's weak wind farm code. It was only after proponents demonstrated that they could meet the government's new expectations—including showing there was local community support for these projects—that we unpaused them. I can advise the chamber that all three applications have since been approved by SARA with strict conditions.

I also made the decision to call in the Moonlight Range Wind Farm. The response from regional Queensland to this project was overwhelming. It was unlike any application to date, with over 550 submissions received. I have to give credit to the member for Mirani, Glen Kelly, for the enormous amount of work he did in his community on this issue. After I called in the application and considered all the new material presented, it became apparent that this project did not stack up. It was a perfect example of the types of projects that were dividing regional communities and not treating them with the respect they deserve. It did not meet the Crisafulli government's expectations, so I refused it.

I have also recently called in two more wind farm proposals in the Western Downs region in Marmadua and Middle Creek. These applications were lodged just before wind farms became impact assessable in Queensland. This would have meant that the community would not be consulted as part of the DA process and appeal rights would not be afforded. This was in direct conflict with the new government's agenda, so they were called in for a more fulsome assessment and not against Labor's weak wind farm code.

On another matter, I have also received correspondence relating to the Lotus Creek Wind Farm currently under construction in Central Queensland. The correspondence raises allegations of illegal

clearing that may have breached the EPBC approval, and I will be writing to the new federal minister asking him to investigate these serious allegations.

The Crisafulli government is focused on delivering affordable, reliable and sustainable energy for Queenslanders. Our five-year Energy Roadmap led by the Treasurer is underway, bringing common sense back to the energy policy in Queensland. It is an approach based on economics and engineering, not ideology, and includes supporting smaller-scale pumped hydro projects. We are not focusing on projects like the $37 billion Pioneer-Burdekin hydro hoax—an absolute farce of a project that would have increased power prices and slugged every Queensland household $15,600 for the privilege. The Crisafulli government's Energy Roadmap will be delivered by the end of the year.

The Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring that every community, council and stakeholder is given the opportunity to have their say on renewable energy projects across Queensland. While the statement of reservation wrongly infers a lack of consultation, this bill aligns with the government's election commitment and was informed by engagement with local government and industry. We took this policy to the election, Queenslanders voted on it, and we had a full six-week committee consultation process. It is not surprising that the Labor opposition were not paying attention as part of this process, continually ignoring the concerns of regional communities regarding their rush to renewables. That is why Labor was so badly punished by regional Queenslanders at the last election.

The committee process ran over six weeks and held four public hearings—two in regional Queensland and two in Brisbane. This consultation process was fulsome, complemented by the release of all the statutory instruments that will be required to implement the community benefit system. The government provided these to be completely transparent and provide certainty to the energy sector about how the new framework will operate. We could have done what Labor always did and consult on behalf of the policy after we decided what the policy was, but we took a different approach and put everything on the table at the same time for discussion, review and finalisation, including the draft regulation.

Having made the election commitment for renewable energy projects to be subject to impact assessment and the same rigorous assessment processes as other resource projects, it has been the government's utmost priority to move at lightning speed. We owe it to regional Queensland, who have been waiting for these changes for years and to be finally heard by a state government. These actions bring certainty and clarity to the renewable energy sector on Queensland's expectations for wind farm and solar farm projects, with the requirement to build social licence with communities and provide industry with the expectations of the government when it comes to doing business in Queensland. Renewable energy projects have lacked a consistent assessment of their impacts on communities and a clear framework to ensure local benefits are delivered. While some proponents engage well, others do not, and Labor's weak planning laws have not required them to do so.

Within our first 100 days in office, the Crisafulli government delivered on our election commitment to give regional Queenslanders a voice. Wind farm proposals are now impact assessable. This means mandatory public consultation and third-party appeal rights—something that Labor failed to do in nearly 10 years. If a 280-metre tall wind farm was proposed for a neighbourhood in South-East Queensland—the equivalent of a 90-storey tower—local residents would rightly expect that they be notified of and consulted with on a project of that scale proposed in their backyard. Why should rules for regional Queensland be any different? Imagine if a proposal was brought forward to put over one hundred 280-metre high wind turbines on the top of Mount Coot-tha. Brisbane would be rightly outraged. Imagine then if the residents of Brisbane did not have a say or had no appeal rights. Well, that is what was happening in regional Queensland to our residents and farmers.

We have also updated the wind farm code to level the playing field on these developments. We will now see any proposal and its potential impacts thoroughly considered and mitigated from inception through to decommissioning and site rehabilitation. The onus will be on the proponents and the operators to consider impacts to the local economy, the housing market and infrastructure capacity and ensure protection of agricultural land and the environment.

Labor's statement of reservation raised concerns about the level of consistent assessment for impacts and what the bill means for project delays, costs, investment certainty, energy prices or emissions targets. Let me make it clear for them. Currently, a development application for a solar farm is assessed against 77 different sets of rules in Queensland—different fees, different levels of assessment, different assessment benchmarks. There is currently no certainty about building social licence or ensuring that development delivers a positive legacy for local regional communities. For too long, this has resulted in a lack of consistency across the state for solar developments—well, no more.

The bill will also mean that solar farms will be impact assessable. The state, through SARA, will assess large-scale solar farm developments—one fee, one level of assessment mandating public consultation, clear state assessment benchmarks by one assessment manager—providing certainty for the community, local governments and industry. Can you put a price on social licence? Can you put a price on the livelihood or the character of a regional community that will be hosting these large projects for decades to come? We are simply asking renewable energy developers to engage with the local community and local government in which they propose to build major developments over many hectares to discuss at the start of a project how they can be a good neighbour and contributor to the society in which their project will reside.

We have seen what happens when this work is not done. You get 88 per cent of local residents opposing a project in the case of the Moonlight Range Wind Farm. We are not imposing an unreasonable delay or cost to these renewable energy proponents. We are simply asking them to do what is right and what the local host communities deserve.

Labor's statement of reservation also raises concern with introducing regulatory hurdles. However, many renewable energy proponents are already engaging with local governments and know the importance of building social licence while those who have lost their social licence continue to negatively impact local communities, irrespective of any road map. As a result, we have charted a clear, transparent and accountable process to complete a social impact assessment and secure benefits for the community which will engage with community and local government about the social impacts and community benefit early and then provide a statewide consistent development assessment process.

If the message is not clear yet, let me say: Queensland is open for business and we are listening to our regional brothers and sisters. Providing an opportunity to be informed, engaged and heard is fundamental to building a social licence. The social impact assessment guideline to be a statutory instrument will ensure an evidence-based consistent engagement process is followed to help inform the needs of local communities to support a large-scale renewable energy project and inform a useful and responsive community benefit agreement.

We have listened to what stakeholders have had to say and the guideline has been tailored to ensure it is suitable for all relevant major projects, including renewable energy projects. As part of these agreements, local government is empowered to drive discussions about what and how the benefits may be delivered to their local community. The system will provide Queenslanders, particularly in regional and remote locations, the ability to make themselves heard on renewable energy projects proposed in their area.

Community benefit agreements will be public documents, holding proponents accountable. In some instances, we have seen what these benefits can look like. It includes the construction of new homes for the township. It includes the upgrade of local roads, both pre and post construction, and it can be education and skills programs.

This is now the new process and how it will work. Before a DA can be lodged with the SARA for assessment, a renewable energy proponent wanting to build a wind or solar farm now has to do the following: they will have to develop a social impact assessment—an SIA—and the full suite of impacts by the project has to be agreed to by the local council. Once the impacts of the project are agreed to, both the developer and the council will then enter into a community benefit agreement—a CBA. This agreement is designed to offset all of the impacts that the project will have on the regional community and how the proponent will be mitigating these impacts throughout the life of the project.

We are not putting minimum requirements on what a SIA or a CBA looks like. This part of the process will be run entirely by the local government and proponent. Local councils know their region better than we do, so we will not be dictating to either the proponent or the council on minimum standards within a CBA. Once the CBA is agreed to, a DA can be lodged with SARA for assessment.

The whole framework is designed to frontload the consultation process, including making it clear from the outset how a regional community can benefit from these massively impactful projects. This is something that is not happening after the fact in many cases, and leaves communities disenfranchised about the whole process and has been rigged against regional Queensland.

Introducing the community benefit systems puts the responsibility on the proponent to prove that the project has broad community support and clear benefits before spending time and money on the development assessment and other decision-making processes. If we are asking regional Queensland to do the heavy lifting on renewable energy, then they should rightly know what their community will gain from such large and impactful projects. These reforms are about establishing reciprocal

advantages for host communities who are on the ground, living with these developments and bringing this to the forefront of a robust decision-making process.

**Ms McMillan** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The member for Mansfield may laugh. If she is happy for one hundred 280-metre wind turbines to be put in the middle of Mansfield without community consultation, let us know and we will let the proponents know, but I bet she would lead the charge against it. They would lead the charge against it in the city.

The social impact assessment process will examine community concerns, outline the project's social impacts, and recommend plans to address them. This provides certainty to local government, industry and the community on what the minimum requirements are to advance a social impact assessment. Local government will remain the key conduit for advocating on behalf of the community and ensuring there is broad legacy from renewable developments which is shared with the community. After all, they are the ones who know their region best and where the pinch points lie.

It is also about delivery transparency and consistency in decision-making for renewable energy projects. Setting these parameters at the front and before the development process provides confidence to all—proponents, local government and the community—on what is expected for the development to occur.

For the implementation of this process, contrary to Labor's statement of reservation, local government will be financially supported with the ability to recover costs related to the community benefit system and will be well-informed by robust statutory instruments and strong guidance material, shaped by stakeholder feedback. Contrary to Labor's statement of reservation to ensure effective implementation, complementary changes to the planning regulation and affiliated legislation for the community benefit system are already well underway. My department will continue to work with local governments to consider what additional support is required.

Recognising the vastness of our state and being able to tailor tangible outcomes to each area, while providing a consistent state development assessment process is vital for the operation of these changes. These amendments will mark a shift towards a more community-centred and environmentally conscious planning framework for the renewable energy sector.

I now turn to the amendments for the Economic Development Act 2012. The amendments for the Economic Development Act 2012 enhance flexibility in governance and streamline decision-making processes. This will allow EDQ to better achieve the government's goals and facilitate progress, including the priority of providing more places for Queenslanders to call home. It is part of our plan to ensure that EDQ is refocussing its efforts on achieving its key objective—more housing and more jobs. As such, the bill amends specific provisions in the act relating the appointment and removal of the chief executive and board members, as well as the member representation and attendance at EDQ board meetings. These amendments align the act with the other legislation such as the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2023.

I will now talk to the amendments to the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021. For 1,200 days, the former Labor government failed to deliver meaningful progress on the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, leaving Queenslanders embarrassed and major projects without any certainty. Now with the games back on track after the release of our 2032 Delivery Plan, amending the act is essential to ensure we seize this historic moment for Queensland's future. Queenslanders expect a world-class games they can be proud of, and the Crisafulli government is focused on delivering that generational infrastructure through our once-in-a-generation opportunity.

The government commissioned the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority—GIICA—to undertake a 100-day review of the game's infrastructure which led to the 2032 Delivery Plan, forming a pathway forward and providing a vision for the games. I would like to thank GIICA and all its board for the amazing work they did on the 100-day review.

The bill represents the next stage in implementing the 2032 Delivery Plan. I want to make it clear to Queenslanders that the Crisafulli government does not take the introduction of these laws lightly, but they are necessary to ensure legislation is fit for purpose and we reach our 2032 deadline.

As outlined in the 2032 Delivery Plan, the private sector will help transform the Gabba precinct with a new arena and more housing for Queenslanders, ensuring Queensland maximises the tourism legacy opportunities. This entertainment precinct will open the door to bigger and better sports and entertainment beyond 2032.

I table *Gabba entertainment precinct: Be part of Brisbane's next iconic destination*. We are selling this to the world for the private sector to engage and build a 17,000 seat arena over at the old Goprint site.

*Tabled paper:* Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning: Gabba Entertainment Precinct: Be part of Brisbane's next iconic destination' [796].

**Mr Mander** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I will be opening it—as Elvis Presley. Firstly, the bill removes references to the 100 Day Review, which is now complete as we move forward to the important delivery phase. As we work through progressing the projects and implementing the plan, it is necessary to ensure appropriate governance, oversight and decision-making is in place to deliver legacy infrastructure throughout our once-in-a-generation opportunity. The bill aligns the focus of GIICA toward the delivery of the major and minor venues to be referred to as authority venues in time for the games. The proposed changes will ensure the ongoing role of GIICA is appropriate for successful delivery of its responsibilities. The bill will also do this through amendments to the purpose of the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021 and through amendments to clarify the identified functions and requirements for the performance of functions of the authority.

The role of the authority will be to deliver the authority venues in accordance with the conditions of funding provided to it. That includes leading the design and construction, obtaining an allocation of funding for each authority venue, and delivering in time for the games and within budget. The authority will also monitor the delivery of other venues such as those being delivered by the City of the Gold Coast, including the Gold Coast Arena and hockey venue. In delivering its functions, the authority will be responsible for ensuring that it complies with relevant games agreements as they relate to authority venues. The authority will also be required to have regard to the financial resources of identified parties, including the state and local governments involved in the delivery of the games.

To ensure the authority focuses on delivering venues, the Queensland government will prepare the Games Coordination Plan and Transport Mobility Plan. Delivering the games involves many stakeholders, and it is important we share the same objective to land a successful delivery. As such, the bill includes a mechanism for greater collaboration and communication between the government and the authority, with information, reports and records provided to the state representative on an ongoing basis.

We are also ensuring there is flexibility on who can be on the authority board, maximising the ongoing best mix of skills, knowledge and experience as we move into delivery phase. The appointment of the authority's chief executive officer is to be made by myself as the minister, following consultation with the authority board and a recruitment process led by the authority board.

Consistent with the changes to the focus of the authority, the bill removes the land acquisition powers that are currently in the act. Another change is the authority now represents the state and can access existing powers including the powers in the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 if required. The authority will be responsible for developing proposals and designs for authority venues which will be submitted to cabinet for funding. It is no secret that we are on a shorter runway to get these games back on track after Labor's mismanagement. The bill will ensure the venues and villages that are critical to Queensland's long-term future can be built on time and on budget. We have time to deliver this plan, as long as we get started now. The streamlining of planning processes for authority venues, other venues and villages listed in the act which are deemed lawful must ensure compliance with the relevant building and safety requirements. As villages are being delivered in partnership with the private sector, they will also have legacy use for housing and villages will continue to require building approval under the Planning Act 2016. This was another key output from the 2032 Delivery Plan, ensuring the planning and housing legacy of the athletes' villages across the state, unlike the former Labor government who forgot to even fund the villages.

The bill also establishes a framework to enable the collection of contributions towards infrastructure costs in relation to development for the villages. To ensure all the infrastructure entities share responsibility for supporting the timely delivery of critical infrastructure for the games, the bill provides authorisation to access, connect to or use necessary games infrastructure. The bill modifies a process for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage matters, setting out processes that incorporate engagement and consultation with relevant parties for the preparation of a cultural heritage management plan. Commonwealth legislation such as the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act still apply where relevant.

Finally and importantly, the list of authority venues is updated to reflect those identified in the 2032 Delivery Plan. In moving the list of authority venues to the act, the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Regulation is not required, so the bill will repeal that regulation. By streamlining the approvals pathway, the bill empowers delivery entities such as the authority to do what is needed and on time without having to go through the rigorous approval process. Again, the government recognises that amendments are not to be taken likely but they are the result of more than three years of inaction and backflips by the former Labor government and they are necessary.

As I said in my introductory speech, this act will change as venues and transport connections are added to the act. In contrast to what the opposition claims, civil proceedings may not be started to the extent sought as this would have the direct effect of prohibiting, restricting or limiting carrying out the development. The necessary provision is specific and circumstantial to ensure games infrastructure delivery entities are not delayed by proceedings brought to court with the intent of delaying or frustrating delivery of games projects. Despite assertions from the Labor Party, this provision for limiting civil proceedings does not affect Commonwealth constitutional jurisdictional matters. However, I note how divided the Labor Party is.

On one hand, they voted for the motion supporting our delivery plan but the member for McConnel has been standing shoulder to shoulder with people opposing Victoria Park stadium and the member for Mansfield is on record supporting the failed QSAC plan. How will they vote on this bill, we wonder? Will they support the 2032 Delivery Plan, will they support the games in 2032 or will they continue to whinge and whine and back their failed leader's plan to waste $2.25 billion on a temporary stand at QSAC with no legacy and no benefit to Queensland? Are they going to vote against rowing in Rocky? Will they vote against sailing in Townsville and the Whitsundays, archery in Maryborough or equestrian in Toowoomba? We will find out shortly. Will they vote against sports and facility upgrades from Barlow Park in Cairns, Whitewater in Redlands or the major developments right across Brisbane such as the National Aquatic Centre, the transformed RNA Showgrounds or upgrades to the Queensland Tennis Centre and the Chandler sporting precinct? It is time for the Leader of the Opposition to explain his position.

This bill is about getting on with the job and delivering the 2032 plan. A new Games Leadership Group will be established providing high-level strategic direction, coordination and oversight. The new group will bring together at least one representative from Brisbane City Council, the Queensland government, the Commonwealth government, the authority and the corporation. This will ensure delivery is coordinated. I would like to thank my federal counterpart, Catherine King, for continuing to work with me on the intergovernmental agreement. The size of the corporation's board will be reduced from 24 to 15, while retaining representation from all levels of government.

I foreshadow amendments that I plan to move to the bill during consideration in detail. With respect to the community benefit system under the Planning Act 2016, amendments are required to clarify that local government cost recovery fees will apply for their full role in the community benefit system. This will support community benefit agreements to deliver a positive legacy for communities. In relation to the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021, following the introduction of the bill we also considered the thoughtful and constructive feedback from stakeholders, including from the corporation itself, and are supporting a series of sensible, technical amendments to further strengthen the legislation. This is a first in relation to representation of the Australian Olympic Committee on the corporation's board. The bill, as introduced, provides two representatives from the AOC. We are adopting an amendment that if the AOC honorary life president position becomes available, then the AOC CEO will step into the board. This will ensure continuity of representation for the AOC and it is consistent with the Olympic Host Contract.

Secondly, on the matter of the board's vice-president, the bill originally proposed that the Queensland government nominated director be the sole vice-president. We are also including an amendment to include the Commonwealth government's representative to also be a vice-president of the board. We propose to extend the same exemption to public servants who may be appointed to the boards of both the corporation and the authority. This ensures highly sensitive information such as cabinet material is appropriately protected and that public servants are not placed in a conflicted position if appointed to one of the boards. The bill also includes a provision for a Queensland government officer to attend the board meetings of the corporation. When collaborating with the authority, the chief executive of the department may delegate a function or power of the chief executive to an appropriately qualified person. Consistent with the intent of the bill to streamline and progress delivery, amendments are to be made in relation to necessary games infrastructure to clarify that the minister may issue directions to government-owned corporations and prescribed authorities.

In response to the issues raised in the parliamentary committee process, amendments are made to the provisions about civil proceedings. The bill also supports improved opportunities for awareness of when information notices in response to cultural heritage provisions flagged during the parliamentary committee. In response to a request from the City of the Gold Coast, a further amendment is proposed to better reflect the detail of the venue to be known as the Gold Coast arena which aligns with the delivery plan.

These amendments are sensible, proportionate and ensure the bill delivers on its key objective: to support the efficient delivery of the 2032 Delivery Plan. Queenslanders have put trust in the Crisafulli government and we will get on with the job.

I intend to move amendments during consideration in detail to the Planning Act 2016 and the South East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 to urgently respond to calls from the local government regarding a recent and unexpected Planning and Environment Court judgement that was delivered on 30 April 2025. I also propose to move amendments to the Planning Act during consideration in detail to regularise ministerial and local government infrastructure designations for community infrastructure—schools, hospitals, social housing and the like—to allow development under an infrastructure designation to proceed without the need to also comply with the plans under a DCP, development control plan, applying to defined areas in Mango Hill, Springfield and Kawana Waters.

I propose to move amendments to the Planning Act to change the minimum statutory timeframe for consultation on a draft regional plan to get on with the job, refresh and deliver 13 new regional plans across Queensland in this term of government. This will reset the planning partnership with councils. Lastly, I will be moving technical amendments to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991 to ensure the continued effectiveness of the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme, QHWS, to provide adequate protection for consumers undertaking building work on their homes. A recent QCAT decision said that QHWS only applies if the building contract is written, signed, and dated. If not, consumers may lose protection. This would impact the financial sustainability of the QHWS and it does not align with the underlying policy intent of the QHWS, particularly in relation to consumer protection and we are dealing with that issue.

In summary, this bill delivers on multiple election commitments the Crisafulli government took to the last election. We are doing what we said we would do and keeping faith with the Queenslanders who elected us. During the committee process, we heard from the mayor of Isaac Regional Council who said—

> We currently have no formal power to enforce social or community benefit commitments and many developments continue without clear or consistent expectations around how they will contribute to the regions and where their projects are being built, and that is to the detriment of the communities, and it is also to the detriment of the industry.

The LGAQ said—

> We are really grateful that the bill recognises those impacts and will actually work to give power back to Queensland councils and their communities.

How refreshing. The Crisafulli government are levelling the playing field when it comes to renewable energy projects, bringing council and community back to the decision-making table. We are ending the inertia plaguing the Olympic and Paralympic Games and getting the games back on track after 1,200 days of chaos and crisis from those opposite. As recognised by the Infrastructure Association of Queensland, this bill 'is critical to ensure that appropriate frameworks are in place so that venues, villages and games related transport infrastructure are delivered by that deadline'.

We are also streamlining decision-making processes with EDQ. It is a fresh start we promised, it is a fresh start we are delivering and we are moving at speed to deliver it because after 10 years of one-way traffic, we have so much work to do. I want to thank all of the officers from my Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning who have worked tirelessly with us on developing this bill. It represents an important milestone in delivering the Crisafulli government's agenda over the next four years and beyond. Mr Deputy Speaker, in a nutshell, for renewable energy projects, it puts people in the bush first. It puts councils first. It rights the wrongs of the Labor Party who rushed to renewables without listening to local communities and it sorts out the Olympic and Paralympic Games debacle and chaos we saw under the Labor government. I commend the bill to the House.



**Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.29 pm): I rise to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, a bill that reveals more clearly than ever that the Crisafulli L-plate LNP government is out of its depth. This bill is not reform; this is regression. It is a mess of rushed ideas, opaque decision-making and

legislative overreach, a bill that was drafted in haste without proper consultation, without proper coordination and without the competence that Queenslanders deserve. The additional amendments rushed into the House today by the Deputy Premier to further amend this bill reinforce these very points.

This is exactly what you get from an arrogant, self-opinionated Deputy Premier and planning minister with a born-to-rule mentality and an L-plate LNP government, a government still learning how the steering wheel of government actually works while swerving across both sides of the policy road. Let me be clear: if this bill is passed in its current form it will delay investment, damage confidence, stall Queensland's clean energy transition and rip away the transparency and safeguards that underpin good planning in this state.

I begin with the so-called social impact and community benefit amendments. Labor supports genuine social impact assessment and we support mechanisms for delivering fair and just community benefits. However, this bill mandates that proponents of renewable energy projects must complete a full social impact assessment and negotiate a community benefit agreement before a development application is lodged. As the evidence before the parliamentary committee made clear, it is an unworkable, front loaded process that will delay critical clean energy infrastructure, drive up electricity costs and deter private investment.

This bill exposes what we have long known: that the LNP does not believe in renewables, does not understand the energy market and does not care about climate change. Wasn't it positively Orwellian listening to the Deputy Premier go on and on about Labor's ideology? This from the party that is the home of Matt 'King of Coal' Canavan and Colin 'Climate change? What climate change?' Boyce. These people in their heart of hearts do not support the clean energy transition and they are absolutely obsessed with opposing appropriate mechanisms to develop and expand our clean energy generation, transmission and storage base in Queensland. That is the truth. Instead, this bill imposes new obligations on already stretched councils with no clear guidance, no additional resources and no practical framework to make this work. The clean energy transition relies on certainty, speed and sensible, understandable regulation, and this bill provides none of those things. The result will be regulatory uncertainty, delayed projects, lost investment and emissions targets at risk.

In regional Queensland, where renewables are already driving new jobs and new industries, the bill will hit hardest. Projects will stall, opportunities will vanish and communities will suffer—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): Can we not have squabbling across the floor?

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Excuse me, member. Can we not squabble across the floor? I am trying to listen to somebody from your side address this bill. Can we do it in quiet please?

**Mr DICK:** Projects will stall, opportunities will vanish and communities will suffer because the Deputy Premier would not listen to anyone but himself and because the L-platers in the LNP could not get the policy right. This bill sends a clear message to anyone wishing to invest in our state that Queensland is closed for business.

Let me now turn to the amendments affecting Economic Development Queensland. EDQ plays a critical role in planning, land development, and economic growth and housing. This bill gives the minister greater power to hire and fire the CEO and EDQ board members without justification. It weakens governance, it undermines independence and it discourages frank and fearless advice—the kind of advice every good government depends on, the kind of advice the Premier pays lip-service to ad nauseam.

This is classic arrogant LNP behaviour: sideline the experts, consolidate the power and hope nobody notices. What would we expect from an LNP government that just could not wait to appoint one of its LNP mates, long-term LNP operative Julian Simmonds, as the CEO of EDQ as soon as it took power. He is the same LNP mate who helped secure the LNP's election win by funnelling coal company donations through spurious third-party organisations to attack the Labor government. I am just surprised the Deputy Premier did not personally hand over the 30 pieces of silver to Mr Simmonds out of the window of his brand new black Lexus. I might be misleading the parliament; he probably did.

What the LNP seems to forget is that Queenslanders do notice when independence is eroded. Exhibit A is John Sosso's appointment to the Queensland Redistribution Commission.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, is this relevant to this debate?

**Mr DICK:** The bill, the committee's report on it and the statement of reservations go to integrity.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will hear this in silence, please.

**Mr DICK:** It goes to integrity and how this government operates.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The bill references the Economic Development Queensland legislation, not the Redistribution Commission of Queensland, which the member is talking about. It is not relevant to the bill.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, I would ask you to keep your discussion to the bill.

**Mr DICK:** I see that they take offence to the most obvious statements.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, if you could proceed without comment I would be very appreciative, thank you.

**Mr DICK:** Queenslanders know that a planning system manipulated for political convenience cannot deliver public confidence or good public outcomes. We have seen before what happens when governments play politics with development decisions: we end up with projects that serve LNP donors, not the people. That is exactly what this government is laying the groundwork for in this bill.

**Mr de Brenni:** And they've got form.

**Mr DICK:** I take the interjection from the Manager of Opposition Business; this government and the LNP have form. Some of the most serious failings in this bill lie in the Olympic infrastructure amendments and here the Crisafulli LNP government's inexperience and lack of competence are on full display. In the name of urgency, the LNP is proposing to wipe away, to abolish, the protections of 15 acts of parliament including the Planning Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the Nature Conservation Act, the Heritage Act and the Coastal Protection and Management Act—gone. Olympic developments under this bill would be exempt from nearly every safeguard that protects the environment, heritage, traditional owners and the amenity of local communities. What do Queenslanders get in return? No assessment transparency, no guarantee of environmental protections, no proper voice for traditional owners or local communities. When it comes to First Nations people, they are silencing their voice; and we know that the LNP has form on that, too.

When you remove scrutiny, silence stakeholders and exempt billions of dollars in public expenditure on infrastructure from normal safeguards, you invite exactly the kind of waste and mismanagement that Queenslanders fear. The absence of checks and balances is not a quirk of this legislation; it is the LNP's entire basis for this legislation. The Bar Association of Queensland has rightly sounded the alarm, warning that the blanket ban on civil proceedings in this bill may be unconstitutional. Stripping Queenslanders of their right to seek judicial review, even in cases of jurisdictional error, offends fundamental legal principles and could see the government in court before a shovel even hits the ground.

This L-plate government does not want the public involved. It does not want councils involved. It does not want independent experts raising red flags, but secrecy is not strategy. Stripping away laws and silencing communities will not build an Olympic legacy; it will just tarnish it on the world stage. This bill is everything Queenslanders feared when the LNP secured power. It is rushed, it is reactive, it is riddled with contradictions, unintended consequences and practical implementation issues. The government somehow claims it wants a clean energy future and then ties the industry in red tape. The government says it wants to listen to the voice of communities then removes every planning safeguard without offering a credible alternative. The government says it wants accountability but will not even publish the reasons for its decisions.

Let me be clear about what Labor would do differently: we support social impact assessments, but they should be integrated into the planning process, not act as a barrier to it; we support community benefit agreements, but they must be clear, consistent and achievable, not vague obligations thrown on under-resourced councils; we support the efficient and timely delivery of Olympic infrastructure but believe this can be done with transparency and accountability; and we support EDQ as an independent, professional, evidence-led body, not a political puppet for whichever minister wants to wield the scissors at a ribbon cutting.

This bill jams together unrelated reforms on renewables and Olympics infrastructure—two complex issues that deserve their own scrutiny. The need to split this bill was obvious during the committee process. It was apparent that LNP committee members consistently redirected stakeholders concerned about Olympic infrastructure towards the renewable energy provisions. It was also clear that First Nations stakeholders were also steered by LNP committee members to comment on renewable

amendments instead of being alerted to the sweeping exemptions that removed their rights to protect sacred sites where Olympic venues are proposed. This approach shows exactly why these components should be dealt with in separate bills. Bundling them up silences proper debate and short-changes Queenslanders on both fronts.

During consideration in detail the opposition will move a series of amendments to fix some of the most serious flaws in this bill—amendments the Crisafulli L-plate LNP government should have included in the first place. These amendments strike a necessary balance between efficient project delivery and transparency, accountability and good governance. Each one improves the bill's workability, protects community and democratic rights and ensures responsible use of public resources, all without compromising the bill's core policy intent. We will move that social impact assessments and community benefit agreements for renewable energy projects be submitted after lodgement and resolved during the assessment process. This simple but powerful change removes a front-loaded barrier that would otherwise prevent clean energy projects from even entering the planning system.

**Mr VORSTER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member speaking is talking to proposed amendments that have not yet been moved and therefore fall well outside the long title of the bill and should be ruled out of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): That is not a point of order.

**Mr DICK:** We will move that social impact assessments and community benefit agreements for renewable projects be submitted after lodgement and resolved during the assessment process. This simple but powerful change removes a front-loaded barrier that would otherwise prevent clean energy projects from even entering the planning system. It ensures social impacts are assessed and benefits negotiated but in a way that is practical, flexible and investment friendly which is essential for meeting emissions targets and attracting renewable investment which creates regional jobs. We will also move to mandate timely publication of all Olympic related assessment documents, create a public register of Olympic related developments and require statements of reasons for Olympic related decisions. These basic transparency tools will allow Queenslanders to know what is being built, why, what advice or consultation was considered and how decisions are being made—something any government should support. Further, Labor will move to require that any additional Olympic funding must be subject to a parliamentary motion. With over $7 billion in public funds already committed, Queenslanders deserve to know when the goalposts are being moved and why. This amendment strengthens fiscal accountability and protects taxpayers from backroom budget blowouts.

Finally, we will move to replace the unlawful blanket ban on civil proceedings with a more targeted, constitutionally sound provision. The LNP's original clause is not just excessive; legal experts, including the Bar Association of Queensland, have warned it may be unconstitutional. Our amendment preserves the right to challenge decisions affected by jurisdictional error—a fundamental safeguard in our democracy—while still allowing Olympic infrastructure to proceed on time. These amendments ensure that renewable projects will still require social impact assessments and community benefit agreements and Olympic infrastructure can continue on schedule, but decisions will be more transparent, the government more accountable and the process constitutionally sound.

I also want to address the amendments to be moved by the Deputy Premier in the House today. These last-minute amendments are a direct consequence of the Crisafulli government's failure to consult properly when reintroducing the bill in the first place. Instead of delivering a clear and coordinated reform package, the Deputy Premier is now scrambling to fix major holes identified by stakeholders through a patchwork of reactive, piecemeal amendments. This kind of backdoor law making undermines legislative certainty, good governance and public trust. The Deputy Premier had months to get this right, yet it is only now during the final stages of the legislative process that he is being forced to respond to predictable issues that would have been picked up through proper and effective consultation.

One of the key amendments quietly shifts the cost burden of the new community benefit framework on to local councils, authorising them to recover costs for their role in social impact assessments, community benefit agreement negotiations and mediations. I will be clear: this comes with no detail, no funding support and no implementation guidance. Local governments are already stretched and this will create an administrative nightmare, especially for smaller councils with limited capacity. The Deputy Premier has introduced new responsibilities without a delivery model and now wants councils to foot the bill. That is not partnership; that is cost shifting.

Among the amendments is a completely unrelated change to the regional planning framework, cutting statutory consultation periods on regional plans from 60 business days to 30. This has nothing

to do with the bill's core purpose and everything to do with quietly silencing community voices. Reducing consultation on regional plans undermines long-term land planning use across Queensland. These plans set the vision for growth, infrastructure and environment over decades, yet the government is now rushing them through in half the time. This again is not reform. These amendments will take away the community's voice in a range of communities across Queensland. It is also a clear sign that the LNP government sees public consultation as a box-ticking exercise, not a fundamental principle of planning.

One of the most concerning amendments gives ministers new powers to direct government owned corporations to build or maintain games related infrastructure at their own cost. That means state owned water, energy and infrastructure providers can be forced to deliver Olympic projects without compensation. This raises serious concerns. It is a blatant cost shift from the state budget on to the balance sheets of GOCs which will ultimately be funded by hardworking Queenslanders through utility bills and service charges. The GOCs are meant to operate commercially and forcing them to absorb unbudgeted Olympic costs destabilises their finances and jeopardises their core operations, particularly in regional areas. The amendments reduce transparency and oversight because these directions do not have to be published or tabled in the parliament. That is a transparency black hole Queenslanders will not know who is paying or how much until the costs show up on the water bill and the power bill of people living in Woodridge, Logan and the rest of Queensland. Those opposite also want to hide through these amendments, I believe, the real price tag of the Olympics and the Paralympics. It is a political trick. The government is keeping Olympic spending off the books by shifting it to GOCs, allowing it to pretend the games are on budget when the real cost is hidden from view.

On all the evidence, including the evidence of the submitters who made submissions and spoke before the parliamentary committee, if this bill is passed in its current form it will have perverse and unintended consequences. It is anti renewables, it is anti transparency and it is anti accountability. It is exactly what happens when an arrogant and conceited minister—the Deputy Premier—and a government of amateurs try to legislate complexity without listening to the people who know how things actually work. The Crisafulli L-plate government might have inherited the keys to government, but Queenslanders are already worried about where they are driving us. On planning, on energy, on transparency and on Olympic infrastructure delivery, the new government is failing the test. Queenslanders deserve better. Our state deserves a government that understands the difference between urgency and recklessness and we need a parliament that stands up for transparency and accountability, especially when billions in taxpayer dollars are on the line. Queensland deserves nothing less. Accordingly, I move—

That the words 'now read a second time' be deleted and the following words inserted:

'withdrawn, redrafted and reintroduced as two separate bills:

1. the first dealing with chapter 2 and chapter 3 and any associated amendments from chapter 1, chapter 5 and schedule 1; and

2. the second dealing with chapter 4 and any associated amendments from chapter 1, chapter 5 and schedule 1 as needed.'

**Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (2.49 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. This reasoned amendment is an appropriate and very rational amendment to be moved and considered by this chamber.

**Mr KRAUSE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am seeking your clarification as to whether the call was given by you to the Manager of Opposition business or not while you were taking advice.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): Yes, it was. Could I clarify that all members speaking from now will be speaking to the amendment to the second reading.

**Mr de BRENNI:** To be clear, I rise to support the motion just moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, which is the reasoned amendment. We say that it is an appropriate and rational amendment to be moved and considered by this chamber, the people's chamber. I will outline why. The bill introduced by the member for Kawana is over 140 pages in length and it covers three distinct and very significant areas of public policy: social impact and community benefit amendments, Economic Development Queensland amendments and Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games amendments. At least two of these, the social impact and community benefit amendments and the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games amendments, are very large and, as the deputy leader said, complex and significant pieces of public policy which we say should be considered separately.

The Queensland Labor opposition strongly believes, after the evidence provided through the committee process and via evidence provided by stakeholders—those stakeholders who did not have

an opportunity to engage in the committee process—that these public policy elements should be dealt with and considered separately by the House. To deal with them together we say conflates two or three issues of great significance to Queensland. To deal with them together, in fact, ensures that proper debate and proper scrutiny of each of the discrete elements of those public policy areas does not, in fact, occur clearly in its own right. The Queensland opposition believes in the state's opportunity it has—or, more correctly, had before the LNP took office—through a deliverable job-creating transition to a low emissions economy—

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The honourable member is debating policy intent not the reasoned amendment as to why there should be separate bills. He is debating historical facts and the fact they lost the election and they cannot get over it. I ask you to bring him back to the reasoned amendment that he has moved.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will just take some advice. I remind you that we are debating the amendment, not the bill.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Yes, indeed, and what I am seeking to articulate for the benefit of the House is how significant each of the elements that are in the bill that we are saying should be separated are. I am providing that context to you and to the House about why we say that each of these pieces should be dealt with separately. We believe in the incredible opportunity presented by those various elements. I will not go into the policy areas, but I will describe them for the benefit of this debate on this amendment which is around the process for regulated renewable projects and the incredible opportunity the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games presents for athletes, the tourism industry, the economy of Queensland and future generations. However, legislation that deals with these two very significant items should be considered in a more careful and methodical manner and not pushed through this parliament as one single piece of legislation. That is the point that we are making. They should be considered separately so that the arguments cannot be misinterpreted and so that votes on this legislation, if they are required, are not compromised by the guillotine that has been consented to by the House.

Because those opposite are so keen to move on from their disaster budget of yesterday is not an adequate rationale for this bill to proceed without splitting. The member for Kawana has a record of putting forward legislation to this chamber which is not workable and sometimes not constitutional. Further to that, the member for Kawana has just dumped 45 pages of amendments on his bill. That constitutes 30 per cent of the size of the bill itself.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Deputy Speaker, I am not taking the interjections from those opposite.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Let us finish this in silence, please.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The people's chamber needs to be treated with respect, it needs to be given the opportunity to review the two distinct pieces of legislation, consider their very significant impact on the future of Queensland, and be considered separately via two legislative vehicles or, in short, two bills. To push through in one bill these profoundly significant policy reforms and their powers and limitations into law through what is effectively a cognate bill in its current form is an affront to Queenslanders. It is an insult to their intelligence.

Reasoned amendments have not been used often in this House, but when they are they are for serious matters. Unfortunately, the Queensland opposition has had to move them on a few occasions during this parliamentary session because those opposite, the LNP, have already developed form for trying to run roughshod over this parliament. We have, as well, observed those opposite drag out debate needlessly and then today seek to debate vastly incongruent legislation together.

Before the member for Kawana jumps to conclusions, I know that we have objected to his previous attempts at reasoned amendments. I am advised that the member for Kawana himself moved a reasoned amendment in 2020. It was to refer a bill back to a committee to, amongst other things, 'ensure compliance with and adherence to the spirit of section 26B of the Constitution Act'. It is interesting that the member for Kawana was so concerned in 2020 with the Constitution Act, because I understand—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, is this relevant to the amendment?

**Mr de BRENNI:** Absolutely.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** How so?

**Mr de BRENNI:** It is relevant because it goes to the record of reasoned amendments before the House. What I am debating at the moment is a reasoned amendment.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** You can proceed.

**Mr de BRENNI:** It is interesting that the member for Kawana was so concerned in 2020 with the Constitution Act, because I understand that elements of the current bill that the member for Kawana has introduced may also not be constitutional. The point is if he was serious about that amendment to the second reading question then, he would be serious about this amendment now and support it.

This amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is sensible: it is about ensuring that this House considers legislation appropriately. In conclusion, I want to make it clear that this is not about slowing down the consideration of this bill. This is not about opposing the key elements—for example, the renewable transition—nor is it about opposing the responsibility of developers to deliver genuine benefits in general partnership with local communities. It is not about opposing the Olympics—far from it. Queensland Labor supports renewables, regional communities and the Olympics, but this legislation and therefore the question before the House to consider this legislation as one piece is flawed. We say that it should be considered separately. It is on that basis that I commend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's amendment to the House.

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.59 pm): We will not be supporting the political reasoned amendment. The member is right: there is a record set for reasoned amendments and it has been set by the Labor Party. They are doing it for political purposes in the chamber. I love how the member for Springwood is now lecturing everyone about democracy and the importance of parliament when half of the shadow cabinet does not even show up to parliament during question time. Now they lecture everybody about the importance of parliament and the ability of everyone to have a say.

I say to the honourable member: no, I did not anticipate four years ago, when I moved one reasoned amendment in 16 years in this place, that I would be foreshadowing the member for Springwood would be moving a reasoned amendment four years later. This is not his first reasoned amendment. I think they have moved three or four reasoned amendments.

I will tell members what this is really about. First, it is about disruption of the place. Secondly, it is because those opposite are so divided on these issues. They are wedged on this issue in terms of backing the renewable energy component but not wanting to vote for the override powers for the planning provisions for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. They want it separated so they can vote against one and for the other. Do members know why? It is because the left wing of the Labor Party controls it. They are saying, 'We don't want to vote against the renewable aspects of the bill, but we do want to vote against the planning provisions in the bill relating to the Olympic and Paralympic Games.' That is what is happening here—not this road to Damascus conversion to loving freedom and believing parliament is supreme. It is purely because the Labor Party are wedged on the two issues.

For goodness sake, it is actually not a complicated bill. It puts regional communities at the forefront of renewable energy projects in this state. It overrides powers so we can fix Labor's mess of the Olympic and Paralympic Games and get on with the job of building things, creating jobs and opportunity. That is why those opposite want the bill separated—for no reason other than that they are wedged on this issue.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. You asked that I confine my comments to the amendment moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): Member for Kawana, could you keep your discussion relevant to the amendment.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Indeed. The proposition I am putting to the House is that the real reason the opposition have moved this reasoned amendment is that they are wedged on these two issues and the left wing of the Labor Party do not want to vote on one aspect of the combined bill. They have between now and 11.30 tonight to get together and work out what to do. When have we had this before? Adult Crime, Adult Time. It is the same issue: they were divided and they could not work out if they were backing it or not.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member, please keep it relevant.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** We will not be supporting the reasoned amendment, because reasoned amendments are there for use in extraordinary circumstances. This bill has been with the parliamentary committee for over six weeks. The bill and what is contained in the bill was an election commitment of the Crisafulli government. We took to the election in October these aspects of this bill. It then was

introduced. It has gone to a parliamentary committee for six weeks. There was no rushing. We did not curtail the parliamentary committee process.

I take the gesticular interjection. Two of the three amendments result from a recent Planning and Environment Court matter, on 30 April 2025. The other is a Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal decision that the House has to deal with. I did not foresee at the time that the Planning and Environment Court and QCAT would make a decision in the time between the introduction of the bill and its debate in the House, so now the House has to deal with it. That has happened since the dawn of time in parliament when courts and QCAT make decisions. It is important we get on with it. Those opposite have had the amendments for seven hours. They were tabled first thing this morning. Pursuant to standing orders, I move—

That the question be now put.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): The question is that the motion, as amended, be put. Those in favour say 'aye'.

**Honourable members:** Aye.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Those against say 'no'.

**Honourable members:** No.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The noes have it.

**Mr de Brenni:** Divide.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A division has been called. Ring the bells.

*In division—*

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion I moved was 'That the question be now put'. I think some members on the opposite side voted differently and some members on this side voted differently. I suggest to the House that you put the question again and retake the vote; otherwise, some of the opposition members will have to leave the room because they are voting contrary to what they said.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am going to put the question again. I think there was confusion on both sides and I think I was probably confused as well. The question is: 'That the question be now put.'

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

**AYES, 48:**

**LNP, 48—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**NOES, 34:**

**ALP, 31—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Whiting.

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**KAP, 1—**Dametto.

**Ind, 1—**Sullivan.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

**Mr SPEAKER:** A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

**AYES, 34:**

**ALP, 31—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Whiting.

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**KAP, 1—**Dametto.

**Ind, 1—**Sullivan.

**NOES, 48:**

**LNP, 48—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

**Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (3.15 pm): Yesterday, following the delivery of the budget by the Treasurer, if we learned one thing it is that the member for Woodridge has absolutely zero credibility when it comes to anything to do with finances. For that matter, he has zero credibility when it comes to anything to do with ministerial responsibility. He proved that again in the contribution that he just made. The member for Woodridge described the process that the Deputy Premier has gone through as 'rushed' and 'with haste'. I use the words 'decisive', 'definitive', 'positive' and 'certain'. The reason that this government has acted with such character traits is because of the 1,300 wasted days of disorganised and chaotic decision-making which led the people of Queensland, at the last state election, to say in a very clear way: just get on with it. That is what we are doing.

I rise to speak about the aspects of this bill that refer to the Olympic and Paralympic Games, which will be an unbelievable opportunity for this state. I support this bill as it will put us firmly back on track to deliver an Olympic and Paralympic Games that Queenslanders can be proud of. It will live up to the hopes and expectations of communities across our great state. This bill will ensure that we deliver a games for all of Queensland and the games that Queenslanders deserve.

After 1,300 days of chaos and indecision, our government has wasted no time in getting on with it. Within just 30 days of taking government, we tasked the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority with delivering a comprehensive 100-day review. We then delivered the 2032 Delivery Plan based on the outcomes of that review. Today, only a few short months after the release of our plan, we are debating legislation to implement that plan and to just get on with it.

This is what delivery looks like—not delay. The lasting impact of Brisbane 2032 will be felt across every community, every schoolyard and every local club across our great state. Our 2032 Delivery Plan lays out a clear path forward: a $7.1 billion venue capital works program will deliver a new Brisbane stadium, a national aquatics centre, enhanced tennis facilities and a dedicated para-sport facility at Chandler, just to name a few, all with fiscal discipline. However, it is the plan's reach into regional Queensland that I am personally excited about, as is the Crisafulli government.

While the games will be a global event, its success will undoubtedly be measured by the local impact it leaves behind across our regions. In Rockhampton, the Fitzroy River rowing infrastructure and athletes village will not only host games events; they will unlock community assets and new sporting tourism opportunities. In Cairns, the upgrade to Barlow Park will position the city to host more Rugby League and football events and inspire the next generation of athletes. Townsville will co-host sailing with the Whitsundays and stage Olympic football games, infusing new vibrancy into North Queensland's sporting scene. On the Sunshine Coast, upgrades to the Kawana stadium and mountain bike trails, plus the Wave transport link, will support multi-sport events and boost everyday community access. The reforms in this bill will mean that work on those local projects can get moving. They will be projects with real impact for our regions—no more delays.

**Mr Watts:** Don't leave out the equestrian centre.

**Mr MANDER:** I take the interjection from the member for Toowoomba North. Who could forget the equestrian centre or the archery facilities in Maryborough—no more delays. This bill does not stop there. It will streamline games related governance and allow games related decisions to be made more quickly, with greater clarity and direction. In particular, streamlining the organising committee board will make it more agile and better placed to guide the organising committee to deliver an incredible games. Crucially, the new Games Leadership Group enshrined in the bill will ensure the games is delivered with a cohesive strategic direction across the three levels of government, the infrastructure authority and the organising committee to ensure consideration is given to the legacy of Olympic infrastructure and its positive interaction with the Queensland communities they service.

These governance changes will enable the focus to shift to where it belongs: getting on with delivering one of the most spectacular Olympic and Paralympic Games the world has seen and

maximising the benefits to our communities before, during and long after the games. All these amendments and changes have come from the recommendations of the 100-day review. We made a promise with regards to the process and now we are delivering on it.

I want to acknowledge the amendments proposed to be moved by the Deputy Premier, particularly to allow the Australian government to nominate a vice-president to the board in the same way as the Queensland government to ensure that the Australian Olympic Committee has appropriate representation on the board and to give any public servant appointed to the board the same safeguards that others on the board have. They are practical, commonsense enhancements that reflect this government's commitment to consultation and integrity. These will ensure we have a coordinated, aligned and accountable approach for delivering world-class sporting and tourism infrastructure with tangible outcomes that are tailored to each locality's unique needs.

The Olympic and Paralympic Games are not just sporting events; they are a once-in-a-generation opportunity for Queensland to showcase our state on the world stage, to inspire future generations, to build lasting infrastructure and to deliver real economic and social benefits for decades to come. This government is determined to make the most of that opportunity. Today's bill is proof of that determination.

After today the delays will stop. It is time to get on with building the infrastructure that we so desperately need to stage a games that Queensland deserves. I commend the bill to the House.

**Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (3.22 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. There is a lot to say about this bill but not enough time. On behalf of the opposition members of the committee, I want to thank the secretariat for the incredible work they did on this. We received over 1,100 submissions to this bill. It was a hefty bill for us to work through. I thank them and my fellow opposition committee members—the members for Kurwongbah and Aspley—for their work on this. Regrettably, that is where the platitudes stop.

I will again make the point that the committee report goes nowhere near a balanced view that we would expect from a parliamentary committee. Committees are, in effect, the upper house in Queensland. I appreciate that it is the government's bill and it is the chair's report. Not only does the committee report not balance the views of both the opposition and the government members; it in no way represents the many concerns that we heard throughout the committee hearings.

There were over 1,100 submissions received and none of them, as far as I can recall, supported the bill as drafted. They, like us, supported the policy intent of the bill but most, if not all, submitters called out a range of grave concerns for Queensland if this bill were to proceed in this format. None of those views is contained in this report, and that is a direct reflection of a government that wants to control the narrative and not be transparent with Queenslanders about policy flaws.

The Deputy Premier might secretly gloat about having that level of control over the chair and over the report, but I remind the Deputy Premier that those 1,100 stakeholders are watching and they have seen the sham consultation process around this bill. They have also seen the integrity issues attached to the committee process where taxpayer funds were used to fly a member of parliament with a potential conflict of interest in relation to the bill near a property that they own which might be impacted by this bill. This is an extremely dangerous precedent for the government to set less than one year into their leadership.

I will now address the planning bill itself, which is so glaring in its hypocrisy and recklessness that stakeholders, including the Bar Association, have labelled it extraordinary. There are two principal aspects of the bill that sit in complete contradiction to one another. One aspect raises the approval obligations on renewable energy projects to a threshold not seen in Queensland's planning framework before. It is a threshold that not even coal and gas projects have to meet on the basis that consultation is important, which it is. The other aspect of this bill removes the consultation from Olympic projects as well as all environmental, heritage and most cultural protections. Let me start there.

Queenslanders may not have the right to stop a major development proceeding in their area, but they do have the right to have their say. This bill does away with that. The Deputy Premier has inferred that the opposition is trying to block the Olympics in speaking against this bill, which is an absurd argument. It was a Labor government that bid for the Olympics. It was a Labor government that won the right for Brisbane to be a host city. The Crisafulli government does not get to rewrite history on that.

Labor governments also believe in transparency. We believe in good planning. We believe that people have the right to have a say and to know why governments make the decisions that they make. We also believe that small businesses procured to undertake work on a project have the right to take a

proponent to court if that proponent does not pay up. This bill will do away with all of those rights for Queenslanders.

The Deputy Premier justifies his reckless behaviour by saying that this bill is necessary to get Olympic infrastructure built, but we know that that is not the case. Multiple witnesses fronted the committee and confirmed that Olympic infrastructure can still be built on time without the need to cut communities out of consultation or to entirely bypass Queensland's environment and heritage laws. The 100-day review recommends using existing mechanisms to ensure planning and approval requirements are obtained efficiently. Absurdly, this is recognised in the explanatory notes of the bill, but the Deputy Premier instead wants to pursue a planning pathway that is currently illegal in Queensland. Rather than simply go back to the 100-day review and utilise existing planning pathways, he has introduced a bill that sanctions his preferred approach and, in doing so, tramples the rule of law, including denying individuals access to the courts.

KC Cate Heyworth from the Bar Association of Queensland warned the committee about the risks, including the risk that the stadiums will be delayed through High Court challenges. She said—

Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation ... there is High Court authority which may be called in aid of having that legislation struck down.

One would think at this point that we have reached rock bottom on this bill, but one thing Queenslanders can rely on the Deputy Premier for is his ability to find new lows. This bill also introduces a planning framework for renewable energy that will suppress the investment and approvals for wind and solar farms in this state, taking Queensland from being the No. 1 state and leading our nation's energy transformation to lagging behind the rest of the country. It is working-class Queenslanders and our small businesses which will suffer the most.

Numerous submitters to this inquiry warned us that the bill will add fewer energy projects to the grid and will dry up investment in projects in the regions and that our household energy bills will continue to rise. Media reports have identified 110 projects across Queensland, representing $4 billion of direct investment into Queensland's regions and into Queensland's energy grid, which will potentially be caught up in the retrospective nature of the bill. Those projects will likely need to go back to the drawing board and essentially start their applications again. Alex Godina, the head of development for Cubico's sustainable investments, told the committee—

Retrospectivity in legislation has the ability to undermine industry and investor confidence, adding uncertainty and hesitancy with the fundamentals of the development process.

Tracey Stinson from the Clean Energy Council told the committee—

Retrospective legislation, burdensome red tape and absently defined and ambiguous processes will put Queensland's energy security at risk ...

Add to that revelations that Treasury were not asked to and have not completed any modelling on how the bill will impact the cost of electricity and that this government has scrapped household energy rebates, Queensland will end up with the highest power prices in the country because of the actions of the Deputy Premier, the member for Kawana.

The final note I will make on the bill is the disgraceful way that they have snuck amendments into the bill that will remove diversity on the organising committee for the Olympic Games board. While governments around the world are working on increasing diversity on boards, the Crisafulli LNP government are dedicating their time to removing those voices. There was no mention of this amendment in their explanatory notes or explanatory speech. They are quietly repealing the requirements for the organising committee board to have 50 per cent of nominated directors women and that at least one of the independent directors is Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander. Stakeholders have labelled this move as an appalling decision—which it is.

While the opposition support many of the intentions of this bill—to strengthen relationships between project proponents and communities, and to ensure that Olympic infrastructure is delivered on time—this bill is an egregious attempt to deliver on those outcomes. It will have unintended consequences.

In their ideological pursuit against renewables, this government has introduced a bill that will have devastating impacts on Queensland, with regional Queensland hit the hardest. This bill will see investment in our regions go backwards. Energy prices are guaranteed now to rise, and who will feel that most? It will be working-class Queenslanders, families and our sporting groups who have massive energy overheads and those in manufacturing and agriculture. We will see farmers who want to diversify

their income through hosting renewable projects miss out and local councils will be left to foot the bill for community infrastructure projects. It will create a planning scheme that discourages the support for the Olympics at a time when we should be leveraging the opportunities that this major event will bring.

We all agree with the policy intent, and that in fact was the reason for putting our amendment forward. Appropriate and workable planning legislation matters, and public confidence matters. As the Deputy Premier's idol, Elvis himself, says, 'We can't go on together with suspicious minds,' and public confidence is really important. I can tell the House that, after receiving 1,100 submissions, there is no confidence in Queensland when it comes to this bill. The Crisafulli government's ideological and clumsy bill is an absolute train wreck for Queensland. They need to go back to the drawing board and start again.

**Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (3.31 pm): It is an honour for me to rise to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, addressing social impact and community benefit as well as economic development across this state, and the Olympics and Paralympic Games. I listened with interest to what the member for Cooper just said about controlling the narrative in the House. She was a member of the Labor government that wanted to stop the media reporting in youth courts and control the narrative when we were talking about victims of crime in the last government. I do not think those opposite should talk about controlling the narrative.

It is an honour for me to be the chair of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee. When the Premier asked me to do that, he said, 'I want to make sure that the machinery-of-government arrangements are set up in such a way that Queenslanders will understand that the legacy from the Olympics and Paralympic Games is all about infrastructure and transport.' I am very pleased and honoured to be the chair of the committee delivering that legacy. There are other legacies around tourism but that is a conversation for another day. I recognise the Minister for the Environment and Tourism in the House this afternoon—a very astute member of this parliament.

The Olympic and Paralympic Games are a highlight for Queenslanders. They were not under the former government. They let politics get in the way. We saw a 1,200-plus-day delay under those opposite when they were in power. We told Queenslanders before the election what we would do. We said we would set up an independent delivery authority, and we did. We said we would deliver a games development plan in 100 days, and we did. I congratulate GIICA and the wonderful work that Stephen Conry and his team did—very experienced eyes on a complex problem. That development plan is something that the world over will look at as a best practice solution for these complex problems and the excitement that is the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

We have the development plan. This bill is enabling changes in governance structures to allow the fast-tracking and implementation of that development plan with some sensible amendments to legislation. It makes sure that our pathway forward is not hampered by any unintended consequences. It is an exciting thing for us to be able to establish the venues right across the state. As my colleague the member for Toowoomba North just said, having the equestrian centre in Toowoomba is a wonderful thing. There will be archery in Maryborough and rowing in Rockhampton. There will be some wonderful sporting events in Townsville and Cairns. There is even going to be sailing in Mackay, the Whitsundays and Townsville. It is an exciting time for us.

The changes also include establishing the games leadership group, which brings together leaders from a couple of different aspects to resolve any conflict they may have and to make sure that the games continue to operate in an efficient way. It also reduces the board numbers from 24 to 15. I was pleased to be on hand when Mr Andrew Liveris and members of the Olympic organising committee were here for a function at parliament a couple of weeks ago. He said he was so excited to have his colleagues here in Brissie. He said, 'We're going to have some fun.' Importantly, he said it is the first time that he had been invited to the people's house for a reception regarding the Olympics. That is a change in the culture that the new LNP government brings. We want to recognise that this is the people's house. We want to recognise the Olympics as the people's journey. This is the fresh start that we need for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

I want to associate myself with the comments of the minister before that this is about getting the games back on track. In fact, this bill could actually be called 'getting back on track and setting the framework for our way forward'. I am excited about the opportunities with the Olympics but I also have to touch on a couple of other important aspects of the bill.

In terms of the renewables issues right across the state, I was a part of local government before coming into this House, so I recognise that at the LGAQ conference they have had many motions from local governments across the state trying to come to grips with the renewables surge across

Queensland. You could say that the renewables policy under the former government was 'renewables at any cost'. That should not be the case. There need to be sensible controls put in place. That is what we said to Queenslanders we would do—and, again, we have done that. We have put in place impact assessable development applications to make sure that all of those renewable projects can face that scrutiny. We have also said to the community that we will put in place social impact agreements and community benefit agreements in consultation with the councils. Under the former government there were no requirements for these things. This legislation now mandates those requirements.

Some non-government members on the committee talked about the issues of timing around the social impact agreements and the community benefit agreements. When you are dealing with complex renewable issues, there are a number of things you must do in terms of working out the feasibility of that project—whether it sits within a grid, whether there need to be transmission lines and all aspects of the topography and geography of the area to see if it stacks up. I have had three renewable projects—two solar farms and a wind farm—over the last couple of years where confidential non-disclosure agreements have been put in place by the proponents of the projects. This is the practical outcome of the policies from the past where there have been no controls. Proponents go out and find rural land and put confidential non-disclosures agreements on the landholders. They promise them very large sums of money, which is very speculative at best, and then get their agreement to have further consultation. That is what happens. People in the community then hear about it and it divides the community. That is exactly what happens. There are some winners and there are some losers.

The intended consequences of this bill are to see social impact agreements and community benefit agreements put together with councils so that proponents of renewable energy projects cannot, in a clandestine fashion, get confidential non-binding agreements and then go forward. They must consult with local governments and stakeholders. We heard from 1,100-odd submitters. The deputy opposition leader commented that this bill is not fit for purpose or not something that communities aspire to, but when there are 1,100 submissions, many of which were very positive about this bill, then you have to say we are doing the right thing and listening to the local governments and communities that are impacted. You will not find anyone more experienced with renewable impacts and mining than Mayor Kelly Vea Vea and the Isaac council. They welcomed these changes to ensure renewable energy projects have a requirement to mandate, to be part of it—as did Mayor Andrew Smith from the Western Downs. Those two councils have a great deal of experience with renewable energy projects and it is something they have welcomed.

The LGAQ appeared before us and welcomed the bill. I am sure they are working hard to come up with opportunities for those councils that do not have as much experience with this issue as some of their other cousins to develop social impact agreements and community benefit agreements that are fit for purpose and that can possibly change over time. Some of these agreements are 25 or 30 years old, so it would be rational to think there may need to be some changes over that period of time. The proposal to put social impact and community benefit agreements up-front is very sensible. It does not mean that all of the other work on due diligence and assessments stops. In fact, you have to do that in parallel. As many of those who came before the inquiry said, there are good actors and bad actors in this space. There have been some very successful renewable energy projects where those companies have social licence because they worked with the councils. This bill ensures that all of them will do it. It makes sure that those bad actors in this space are held to account, have sensible controls, have impact assessable development and meet the standards for consultation that all of our communities deserve.

**Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (3.41 pm): I rise today to express deep concern over a change to the organising committee for the Olympic Games board that is contained in an obscure clause in this broad-ranging legislation.

The government has decided to repeal the requirement that half of the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee board directors be women and that at least one director be Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander. It is 2025. We are here in Queensland. This is a deliberate step backwards. The government is scrapping the requirement that half the board be women and at least one member be Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander—why? Because apparently diversity is too inconvenient for David Crisafulli and his government. They claim it is about efficiency and flexibility, but let's be honest: that is just a complete smokescreen. Will this be another opportunity for the LNP to appoint more of their mates to government boards? Is this about making space for the same old powerbrokers, the same old insiders and shutting the door on Queenslanders who just do not look like them?

This kind of decision is getting eerily similar to Trump issuing orders to cut diversity, equity and inclusion programs in the public and private sectors. This is the kind of backwards, divisive politics we expect from Trump's America, not a modern, forward-looking Queensland preparing to host the world.

Critics, including Renee Carr of Fair Agenda and Professor Watego of QUT's Carumba Institute, have rightly pointed out that this move reverses important strides in recognising women's contributions to sport and leadership. Moreover, Professor Watego has pointed out that the Sydney Olympics successfully operated with a board that included Indigenous representation, demonstrating that diversity and efficiency are not mutually exclusive. Repealing these quotas is not just a quiet bureaucratic change to streamline anything; it is a loud, shameful signal to every woman in Queensland and every Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander that this government does not believe you belong at the table. How do you host a world-class Olympics in a state as proudly diverse as Queensland while gutting the very commitments that would help make this event reflect who we are?

The Premier has said that the Olympics should 'inspire a generation'. What inspiration are we offering when we tell that generation, 'You will only be welcome here if you already have power'? Diversity is not a handbrake; it is a strength. A diverse board is not a burden; it is a necessity if we want decisions that reflect our full community and not just the interests of a privileged few for convenience. This decision is not just wrong; it is cowardly. It is a betrayal of the very values we should be lifting up on the road to Brisbane 2032: fairness, equality and unity.

If you think stripping women and Indigenous Queenslanders off the Olympic stage is going to go unnoticed, then think again. We will not let this go quietly because it is not just bad policy; it is a national embarrassment.

**Mr JAMES** (Mulgrave—LNP) (3.45 pm): Today I stand before you to discuss the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill embodies the promise of a fairer, stronger Queensland grounded in consultation, community benefit and an enduring Olympic legacy.

Let me begin with a simple truth. For more than a decade our regional communities have hosted large-scale wind and solar farms yet the planning framework has lagged. Community consultation was optional. Appeal rights were rarely granted. Many felt overlooked in the very places changed by new infrastructure. For too long renewable energy projects could begin with little input from those most impacted. Imagine wind turbines rising taller than skyscrapers—some over 280 metres—transforming country landscapes, yet leaving locals powerless to shape the future of their own neighbourhoods. That is why at the last election the LNP promised to restore fairness. We pledged to make renewable energy projects impact assessable and subject to rigorous approval just like other major resource projects. What Labor did not achieve in 10 years, we have delivered in 100 days.

The bill is not just about the process; it is about restoring trust in Queensland's planning system. Now renewable energy proponents must consult with communities before projects begin. The days of handshake agreements and vague promises are over. Meaningful community benefits must be formalised and agreed to up-front, not after approval. The bill empowers local governments, giving them a real say on how their regions evolve and ensuring they share in the benefits of hosting major developments.

This bill also encourages First Nations consultation. It includes provisions for a First Nations specific assessment pathway and guidance for proponents engaging with traditional owners and First Nations communities, including cultural heritage assessments and incorporating First Nations defined priorities.

Let me turn to another key commitment: our Olympic and Paralympic legacy. Queenslanders voted for a fresh start, and we are delivering. The Crisafulli government's 2032 Delivery Plan sets us on a clear path to host a world-class games. We are building generational infrastructure, shaping a 20-year tourism vision and creating an Olympic legacy for all. We are also correcting the record. Under Labor, Queensland endured over 1,200 days of games uncertainty: backflips on stadiums, funding gaps for athletes villages, delays and missed opportunities. Our government is focused on delivery. The 2032 Delivery Plan is final. Our people want to see action, not more political wrangling.

So what does the bill do? It introduces a community benefit system into the Planning Act. This means that social impacts of major renewable projects—like wind and solar farms—must be identified and addressed through binding, transparent agreements. Local governments and their communities are now key decision-makers, not bystanders. In a nutshell, the primary goal of this legislation is to ensure that development projects are planned and executed in a way that benefits both the proponent and the community.

The benefits of this would be to: minimise negative social impacts on development; maximise positive community outcomes and legacy; promote social equity and wellbeing; enhance community engagement and participation in the planning process; and create a more sustainable and socially

responsible development landscape. In essence, this bill represents a shift towards a more holistic approach to development, where the social consequences of projects are carefully considered and integrated into the planning and approval process.

The bill also brings amendments to the Economic Development Act, focusing Economic Development Queensland on delivering homes in priority development areas—directly addressing our state's housing needs. With the amended provisions, the bill will promote increased administrative efficiency and flexibility and allow Economic Development Queensland to work effectively towards government objectives.

For the Olympic and Paralympic Games, the bill amends the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act to clarify roles, streamline approvals and ensure strong leadership through the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority. The authority will oversee venue delivery, monitor progress and ensure Queensland is games ready. The bill also removes outdated provisions—like the completed 100-day review—and streamlines board appointments and CEO selection, keeping governance efficient and accountable. It clarifies the process for venue oversight, cuts red tape and accelerates infrastructure delivery so Queenslanders can see legacy benefits before and after the games.

Why is this necessary? It is because regulation of renewable energy across Queensland has been inconsistent. Some local governments are equipped to assess impacts; others are not. Communities bore the brunt of change without always seeing fair returns. This bill mandates that all renewable energy proponents must earn social licence—consult, agree and deliver real benefits before a project gets off the ground. It is fully backed by Queenslanders. When the bill went before the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, more than 1,100 submissions poured in. Four public hearings were held—in Brisbane, Rockhampton and Biloela. The committee recommended that the bill be passed.

The bill also introduces targeted amendments to other legislation, such as the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act to ensure the Home Warranty Scheme continues to protect home owners even for informal or verbal contracts. The bill validates past actions and restores consumer confidence. It also improves processes for infrastructure charges and fast-tracks consultations on regional plans, reducing statutory frameworks and enabling more timely delivery of Queensland's 13 regional plans. The aim is simple—less red tape, more results.

Allow me to share some voices from across our state. The Local Government Association of Queensland calls the bill 'a significant step forward', recognising that it returns power to local councils and their communities. The Mayor of Isaac Regional Council welcomes renewable investment but stresses the need for tools to manage impacts and maximise community benefits—a gap this bill fills. The Infrastructure Association of Queensland and the Council of Mayors (SEQ) support the bill's objective of streamlining games governance, with a focus on lasting legacy. The Planning Institute of Australia calls the bill an opportunity to recalibrate planning for both renewable energy and the Olympics, recognising the urgency and the need for lasting outcomes.

In closing, the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 is a blueprint for fairness, legacy and progress. It empowers communities, guarantees that promises made are promises kept and ensures the Olympic dream delivers for all generations. Let us seize this moment to shape Queensland's future—one that is inclusive, transparent and built to last.

**Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (3.54 pm): I rise today to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Sadly, it is a bill filled with blatant double standards and is another example of the LNP rushing through legislation with the barest of scrutiny. It is interesting that the LNP pretends to champion local governments. 'We're listening,' they say; 'They don't want wind farms,' they say. However, when it comes to the Olympics, the LNP cannot trust councils to stay on schedule and cannot trust councils to get it right on planning—the very thing councils are designed to do. We should not be surprised, though, with a planning minister who is calling in developments left, right and centre because he does not agree with the assessments of council—the same councils he is listening to. This is a minister, however, who said, 'Resetting the relationship with local government starts with listening.' It is clear the LNP only 'listens' to things they want to hear, just like the anti renewable energy sentiment from the member for Mirani, who I understand—I was not there but I read it in the media—commandeered a committee flight to complain about wind farms in his area.

We knew when the LNP cancelled pumped hydro last year that they were not on the renewable energy bandwagon. As an electrician from the power supply industry and a proud member of the mighty Electrical Trades Union, I have a lot of conversations about energy and I have always found people to be pretty positive about renewable energy. Of course, I have heard some good old conspiracy theories about wind turbines, and I am sure we will hear some more during this debate: birds fly into them, they explode all the time, the parts cost the earth, they are too noisy. Let me read some information about wind turbines from a page that was last updated in February this year, under the term of this government. It states—

A 3.5MW wind turbine can power around 2,100 homes and reduce greenhouse gas emissions by about 7,100t annually. That's the equivalent of taking about 2,300 petrol cars off the road.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr KING:** If you listened, you would learn something. The quote continues—

Modern wind turbines are designed to be as quiet as possible. The average noise level of a wind turbine is 40-50 decibels at around 500m. That's quieter than a lawnmower and even a dishwasher.

...

When the wind stops, turbines can rotate for hours, and continue to produce energy.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr KING:** Here are some more facts from the same webpage, and I will take that interjection because old mate beside me will get some information in a minute about that. The same webpage which was last updated on 22 May 2025—not that long ago—stated—

Wind turbines are responsible for less than 0.01% of human-related bird deaths—much less than traditional energy production, high-rise buildings, or cats.

And—

... studies have found that nuclear and fossil fuel power plants cause over 2,000 times more bird deaths than wind farms.

Guess where I found this information. It was on Queensland Treasury's webpage, updated under this government. Anyone who gets up and bleats about bird-killing wind turbines will have the Treasurer to deal with. I cannot understand why members in this place would want more nuclear and fossil fuels that kill 2,000 times more birds. It leads me to ask: why do they hate birds? What did the birds ever do to you guys?

I am also on the committee that examined this legislation, and what stakeholders told us was alarming. To start with, not meeting the standards for fundamental legislative principles is a bad look. I need to speak here as an ex-chair of a committee. FLPs should be addressed and, as our statement of reservation states, we were not happy with the lack of regard for FLPs. Being a chair—from my perspective, at least, from when I was—was about producing a report that best reflected the views of stakeholders, not just making a minister have an easy read that pumps up his tyres. The number of stakeholders who will read this report about this rushed legislation and wonder why their views were not listened to will be staggering.

Cate Heyworth-Smith KC, the President of the Bar Association of Queensland—someone who should have a pretty good view—summed up stakeholders' views of this bill very well in my opinion when she said—

Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation. It would be unsurprising to this committee, with respect, that there is High Court authority which may be called in aid of having that legislation struck down.

They are pretty strong words. Not only will this legislation undermine the state's renewable energy targets—possibly national targets too—it enshrines a double standard, a two-tiered system where different rules apply to proponents of renewable energy and non-renewable energy projects. Katie Mulder, the CEO of the Queensland Renewable Energy Council, said—

There is also inconsistency with other land use frameworks. We align with the mining industry in noting that the proposed social impact assessment and community benefit agreement requirements are not consistent with how social impacts are managed in the resources sector.

Making life and business harder for renewable energy proponents sends a message from this government that, 'We do not want your business in Queensland,' as was noted in the Clean Energy Council submission when they said—

The lack of transitional provisions, indicative timeframes, or a clear pathway for progressing applications where good-faith engagement has occurred on existing proposals is unwarranted. Uncertainty around how and when the new Social Impact Assessment (SIA) and Community Benefit Agreement (CBA) requirements apply is already affecting investor confidence and project delivery timelines.

This is especially critical for proponents who have made substantial commitments under the current framework, including grid connection agreements, council engagement, and land access negotiations, and are now facing the possibility of being required to restart the process under the new rules. Without a clear and fair transition, this effectively introduces retrospective regulation, undermining the confidence of investors and developers who have acted in good faith.

They have done this without having modelled the impact of this new regulation on investment in our state, or on our local economies. They have not even predicted the impact of this red tape on energy prices. So much for caring about the cost of living!

Labor had a plan for energy prices. We had a plan for jobs and energy. This government makes incoherent, non-transparent energy policy on the run to appease the same local governments they are happy to override in other areas, and pursue their anti renewables, pro-coal agenda.

In conclusion, we love the Olympics. That is why our former Labor government bid for them. I am so proud to say I was part of the government who secured the 2032 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games. None of those opposite can say that. But I will conclude by putting on the record my disappointment to think that the LNP is deliberately setting back the renewable energy industry simultaneously with this legislation.

**Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (4.01 pm): As a member of the State Development Infrastructure and Works Committee, I rise today to speak in favour of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I would like to try to bring the debate back into the real world. At the outset, I wish to thank and acknowledge the committee's support team who make everything happen and assist to reduce the mountain of information into a comprehensible document. I acknowledge the chair, Jim McDonald, for his experience and leadership and the rest of our committee for their contribution.

I also wish to commend Deputy Premier Jarrod Bleijie for his foresight in responding to the need for this important legislation, his insight into the complexity and, of course, his eye for detail. Further I mention the efforts of the member for Mirani, Glen Kelly, who took on board this issue that was having a massive impact on his community and worked with his parliamentary leadership and colleagues, local councils, landholders and community groups to bring about change.

I shall limit my comments to that part of the bill relating to major wind and solar farms and leave the Olympic and Paralympic Games enabling provisions to my colleagues.

I must declare at the outset that during my last term in government, I was a supporter of the Mount Emerald Wind Farm near Walkamin in the Far North. I was not a party to the decision-making process, nor was I financially or otherwise involved. To my mind, the project was the best and highest use of an otherwise rough and rocky mountain, and provided much needed power, jobs and community benefit to my community. When completed in 2018, the Mount Emerald Wind Farm was Queensland's largest with 53 turbines and a total capacity of 180.5 megawatts. What was unique about this project was that the proponents owned the land. There was, however, considerable community resistance to the project, some of which was based on fear, not facts.

Whilst my view of renewable energy facilities, including wind and solar farms, is better informed than it was a decade ago, I accept that each are an integral part of, but not the only solution to, our responsibility to supply reliable base power to the entire state.

Fast forward just a few short years and the wind and solar industry in Queensland has burgeoned, making Mount Emerald look like a prototype. With the federal government's obsessive policy on renewable energy and the Capacity Investment Scheme guaranteeing large companies' return on investment, wind and solar projects are popping up all over the countryside. Whilst there might be a financial gain for those landholders where these projects are located, the impact on the wider community has largely gone on unchecked. What has evolved has been a David and Goliath battle of gargantuan proportion. The large, and often overseas, corporations behind these projects are well-resourced and funded to overcome the concerns of small landholders, councils and communities that might be impacted by these projects. This bill will tip the balance considerably as all large wind and solar projects will be required to provide social impact statements and community benefit agreements as a prerequisite to approvals.

The committee heard from numerous witnesses in Brisbane, Rockhampton and Biloela, and received hundreds of submissions. We heard from representatives of proponent companies who, in the main, were very forthcoming; councils, large and small, with varying degrees of interaction and experience with wind and solar projects; and landholders and community members who either benefited from or were impacted by these projects. There were a variety of other groups that had interest in the outcome. In Biloela, we experienced firsthand the anguish and suffering of a tight-knit community who

have suffered unsupported for years at the hands of large wind and solar farms populating the region. I would be comfortable with the statement that, by and large, the bill found favour with the vast majority of submitters and witnesses, albeit some in principle, as it will deliver certainty and equity to all parties involved and impacted by large-scale wind and solar farms.

When to undertake the social impact statements and community benefit agreements was topical throughout the committee hearings and in submissions. There was a lot of discussion about whether these processes should be a prerequisite to, or a condition of, approvals. The argument by the proponents is that if both were to be undertaken prior to approval, it would cause unnecessary delays and expense to projects which could be avoided if approval were given, and then the social impact and resulting community benefit agreement was determined. Further, it was submitted that both the project, the impact and the benefit were all fluid and likely to vary during the construction and over the life of the project. This position was supported by some councils and other submitters. Conversely, landholder and community groups held the view that they would prefer that the social impact and benefit agreements should be in place prior to any approval or commencement of work.

My thought is that the social impact statement and the community benefit agreement should, as provided for in the bill, be in place before an application for approval is made. To undertake either after approval could result in community groups opposed to the project dragging out the process and creating greater uncertainty. Similarly, the proponent might, through its own processes, create uncertainty over the delivery of its obligations and responsibilities.

There is no magic in the nature and content of both impact statements and benefit agreements which, after the first few are established, will create useful examples for subsequent iterations. I have no doubt that with all the legal and professional expertise at the hands of the proponents, both the impact statement and the benefit agreements can provide for, and cater to, any variations that might arise during the approval, construction or operation of any project.

In all the years I was a lawyer servicing rural and regional Far North Queensland, I was asked to provide advice to landholders in respect of agreements relating to both large-scale wind farms and solar farms that were intended to be installed on their properties. There was rarely anything contained in those agreements that was innovative or surprising and, on the face of them, they provided substantial financial benefit to the landholder and facilitated the construction of the project. Without exception, when I inquired of the landholder who was responsible for the decommissioning of the infrastructure at the end of the life of the panels and turbines, the response was, 'The proponent.' Without exception, the agreements were silent on this point. The fallback position was that it was a condition of approval by the local authority. Once they were appraised of this information, very few landholders were willing to proceed to sign the documents on that basis.

This brings me to a critical consideration when developing social impact statements in community benefit agreements. Notwithstanding what might be contained within the conditions of these agreements relating to impacts and benefits, rights and responsibilities, the proof is in the proverbial pudding. Without an obligation on all parties to fulfil their responsibilities to the commitments contained within the agreements, there is a risk that ultimately the power balance may be reinstated to haunt communities, landholders and councils. I requested a comment be included in the committee report identifying the value of performance guarantees being an intrinsic component of social impact statements and community benefit agreements. The need for performance guarantees was discussed at the hearing and the need was recognised by all including proponents, some of whom suggested they were 'working on a proposal' in this regard. Without performance guarantees, large corporations with all their resources, lawyers and experts are at a considerable advantage if the only recourse to landholders, councils and communities have in relation to the enforcement of their rights is by legal proceedings.

The components used in wind and solar farms have a finite life and at this stage are not easily repurposed or disposed of. To ensure, once again, that obligations and responsibilities of proponents are fulfilled upon decommissioning, conditions of approval should contain performance guarantees. I make no reflection upon the integrity of proponents nor their intention or internal operations; however, all agreements are open to interpretation and disputation and the 25-to-30-year expected life of these projects can see a lot of change.

Finally, I turn to the statement of reservation. The statement of reservation by the opposition members of the committee does not appear to reflect upon, expand or develop concepts arising from the evidence taken by the committee but it appears to be cloaked in Labor ideology. The position taken is hard to reconcile with the collegiate and collaborative approach fostered by the chair, Jim McDonald.

It is as if the opposition were not even there or did not write the statement. I do hope the opposition members will reflect upon their role in the committee process as we have much to do in the future.

Turning to the statement itself, as previously stated, the committee held hearings in Rockhampton and Biloela. As an integral and central part of the committee inquiry into the bill—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Whiting): Thank you. Member, your time has expired.

**Mr KEMPTON:** I am out of time, sorry. We have missed the best bit!

**Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (4.11 pm): Today I rise to speak to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This is a bill that claims to improve social accountability in planning but, in its current form, does the opposite. This legislation amends the Planning Act 2016 to require social impact assessment and community benefit agreements for certain types of development before a development application can be properly made. The stated intent is to frontload community engagement and to empower local governments to negotiate better legacy outcomes.

At face value, this seems to be a positive step but we must look deeper because this bill is riddled with contradictions. There are two core aspects of this bill, and they sit in stark contradiction. The bill imposes unprecedented planning obligations on renewable energy projects—requirements that not even coal or gas projects must meet. At the same time, it removes nearly all planning environmental, cultural and community protections for 2032 Olympic infrastructure projects. On the one hand, the government insists on raising the bar for clean energy; on the other, it bulldozes community consultation and legal rights in the name of Olympic deadlines.

Let's start with the clear lack of balance and the erosion of community voice. More than 1,100 submissions were received during the public inquiry. None supported the bill in its current form, though many agreed with its intent. Despite overwhelming public input, the committee report glossed over key stakeholder concerns, giving disproportionate weight to the LNP government's position.

Community consultation and court access rights for Olympic projects are stripped, effectively silencing the very people this bill claims to empower. This is not participatory planning; this is exclusion by design. Olympic projects have no safeguards, no security. The bill exempts Olympic infrastructure from nearly all of the safeguards. There are no environmental protections, no cultural or heritage protections, no requirement for public consultation and no avenue for court challenge. Take, for instance, the proposed 60,000-seat stadium planned on heritage-listed land under this bill. It can proceed without any of the checks and balances that typically apply. First Nations voices have raised urgent concern. Kristen Hodge, the co-chair of the First Nations Legal Policy Committee highlighted that simply posting cultural heritage notices online will exclude remote and regional communities. Under the current system, notices appear in newspapers. That change alone may silence vital community voices and compromise the integrity of cultural heritage management plans.

At the same time, the bill creates a new regulatory burden for renewable energy projects, including mandatory social impact assessments and mandatory community benefit agreements. These requirements must be met before a development application can be even lodged. The consequences are real. The $1 billion Moonlight Range Wind Farm near Rocky has already been delayed; investors are pulling back; industry confidence is plummeting. Queensland risks falling behind in the clean energy transition.

Despite the Premier's direction for consistency across sectors, the bill imposes a far stricter regime on renewables, as I said earlier, than on mining or agriculture. The Queensland Renewable Energy Council has been clear: this new framework 'goes significantly beyond' what the resource sector is required to do. What is more concerning is the lack of a coherent policy framework. The promised Queensland Energy Roadmap has been delayed until the end of 2025. There is no economic modelling on how this bill might affect electricity prices. Household rebates have been scrapped, yet no explanation has been offered on how this legislation will impact power bills. The Queensland Law Society warns these reforms are likely to adversely impact the renewable energy sector. The Queensland Bar Association cautions that the bill may challenge the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court, raising the risk of a High Court action.

Let us be clear about what is at stake here. Community consultation rights, especially for Olympic developments, may be permanently weakened; renewable energy may face unjustified barriers, risking project delays, cancellations and lost jobs. Power prices may rise with no transparency or modelling provided to explain why. Judicial oversight may be undermined, raising serious constitutional concerns.

The bill is not what it appears to be. While it claims to enhance social accountability, it, in fact, disregards stakeholder and community feedback. It creates a two-tiered system: tough for renewables; lenient for Olympic projects. It undermines our environmental, legal and democratic institutions. It is important to highlight the comments made by some submitters. Mitchel Batty, Queensland Environmental Law Association President advised—

QELA is not supportive of effectively the extra layer of regulation that would see other requirements being introduced in order for a properly made development application to be lodged. Effectively, if there is an intent to further regulate particular types of development then there is an ability to do that in the current system through the already in place assessment processes.

Cate Heyworth-Smith KC, the President of the Bar Association in Queensland advised—

Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation. It would be unsurprising to this committee, with respect, that there is High Court authority which may be called in aid of having that legislation struck down.

I further quote—

Who decides prior to the commencement of the proceeding if there is a reasonable prospect that the proceeding will prevent the timely delivery of a venue? What plaintiff will simply accept that they cannot commence the proceeding on the basis that those hazily drafted criteria might be found to exist? Those criteria can only realistically be pleaded as a defence after the claim has been regularly instituted. The best the courts could do would be to see whether early summary determination might be appropriate. The position becomes hopelessly circular.

Kirsten Hodge, the First Nations Legal Policy Committee co-chair said—

The cultural heritage legislation in Queensland is already at the bare minimum. It already provides mechanisms where, if there is no Aboriginal party, the proponent or the land user can proceed if they do not reach agreement. By taking those stop-work orders and injunctions away from First Nations people, you are taking away their ability to identify what is culturally significant to them. We have a Commonwealth piece of legislation with native title that has a stringent procedure that the court goes through, but this is the only legislation in Queensland that gives First Nations people the ability to say, 'This is culturally important to me.'

The Bar Association submission further stated—

The Association observes, with respect, that deeming something that is *prima facie* unlawful to be lawful if vaguely expressed criteria are said to apply will likely create more legal disputation rather than less.

The bill is performative, not genuine. It is more about optics than outcomes, more about appearing consultative than being inclusive. Above all, it lacks authenticity. The disconnect between what is being presented and the actual intent of the bill could not be more glaring. We must ask ourselves: is this the planning legacy we want to leave behind, one that fast-tracks stadiums and silences communities while placing unnecessary roadblocks in front of the clean energy transition? Queensland deserves better. Let's not settle for performative politics; let's demand genuine planning reform, one that is fair.

**Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (4.22 pm): I rise to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill does multiple things. It will help ensure we deliver our Olympic Games plan by clarifying the role of the Olympic and Paralympic Games authority, focus on the oversight and delivery of our 2032 Delivery Plan and identify the venues and locations in the legislation. While that is certainly important to the state in helping deliver the rowing to Rockhampton, with part of one of the banks of the course being in my electorate, it is not the part of the bill that matters most to my electorate of Mirani. The bill changes the wind and solar approvals, which has been the hot button issue in my electorate of Mirani, one that has been bubbling away for nearly 10 years. Because of that, I want to focus the rest of my speech on these aspects of the bill.

I want to give this chamber an idea of what the communities that surround wind and solar projects were forced to cop under the previous government and why these changes are necessary. For too long these communities were not being listened to and were ignored when they voiced their concerns around quality of life, the environment and their livelihoods. I saw that firsthand as a neighbouring landholder to a wind factory that is currently held up in the EPBC approval process. I have seen the anxiety, the stress and the toll that takes on the mental health of those who have had these projects sprung on them. These developers would often go quietly to an area, find willing landholders and secure the land for their projects. They would then develop the site plan with the only consideration being given to the host; they would not give the neighbours a look-in to see what was going on.

Most of the developments in my electorate are wind farm developments that were approved under the old state code 23 where wind farm developers were effectively given free reign. What we saw under the old system was similar to the early coal seam gas industry when gas companies ignored the landholders and steamrolled their way into communities until political pressure forced a solution. The very same thing happened with renewables—an industry that became polluted with companies chasing an easy buck, not providing for Queensland, for Australia or for the communities in which they operate.

This is a shame because had renewable development been done correctly from the start, we might not be at the point where communities that have been burnt by the reckless rollout of renewables want no more projects in their area.

As elected officials, it is our job to listen to the people in our electorates and the people of Queensland. Too many people feel like they have been sacrificed at the altar of renewables, whether it is the people of the Pioneer Valley, who found out that they might be losing their homes from the media, or graziers like the Smoky Creek 'Tenacious 10', who have been fighting the Smoky Creek solar farm for nearly eight years, or the countless other landholders who will have to deal with the shadow flicker, the constant swirling from the spinning blades and the risk of contamination run-off from damaged turbines and panels.

Too often those impacted by these projects were told their concerns did not matter because we had to rush this to stop climate change, to save the earth or to move towards net zero. The mental anguish, the stress and the impact on the quality of life of those who have to live near these projects have been dismissed. I have watched happy, healthy people turn into skin and bones because of the stress that neighbouring projects have had on them. These developers expect neighbours to eventually get sick of fighting and give up. All too often this is the case because when the stress starts to kill them, slowly start to wear on their soul and make it harder to continue every day, it becomes easier to walk away and give up. We are putting an end to this. We are giving communities a say, giving them an opportunity to have their voices heard, ensuring these projects provide a legacy, do not destroy our natural environment and actually provide a benefit to the community in which they reside.

For too long developers have given lip-service to community consultation. Anybody who has been to these consultations knows there is not much consultation going on. These sessions are more like lectures with communities being told what is going to happen rather than working with them to get something they can live with. By making these projects impact assessable, we can ensure the community gets some benefit. We can ensure these projects are built in the right location where the environment is not going to be unnecessarily impacted and where the surrounding community gets a benefit instead of a burden.

In my electorate I now have six wind projects being built or almost completed. It was going to be seven until our government did what we promised: give communities a say on all new wind farm developments. We did that for the Moonlight Range Wind Farm when the Deputy Premier called it in, listened to the community and cancelled the project. That was a wonderful result for the community in Morinish, many of whom had no idea that a wind farm was going to be there until the call-in process started.

I was recently in Lotus Creek with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. In Lotus Creek we met with local communities including the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council, Kelly Vea Vea, to hear their concerns about roads in the area. With two wind farms along the Marlborough-Sarina Road it is no surprise that the impacts on the roads and how each development was managed were key topics. Clarke Creek Wind Farm went through a full impact assessment prior to the implementation of state code 23, and the difference between those requirements and that of the Lotus Creek Wind Farm is stark. The Clarke Creek Wind Farm invested in pull over bays to ensure the safety of cattle trucks that consistently travel along that road to ensure the impacts of construction were mitigated as much as possible. They had numerous environmental restrictions placed on the project to help manage things like run-off and reduce the amount of land clearing. While there is a lot of issues with this wind farm, the surrounding community is less opposed to the development because they were consulted; they were brought along on the journey. While they might not support the wind farm, most of the landholders can at least live with it.

Lotus Creek Wind Farm—over 50 kilometres further up the highway—however, was approved under state code 23. This is an area that should be a koala sanctuary, but we are putting a large-scale industrial project there. When it comes to koalas, Brisbane stops; when it comes to renewable energy, koalas are nothing. When it comes to the Great Barrier Reef, the world stops; when it comes to renewable energy and these developers that run up and down the coast of Queensland, the Great Barrier Reef is a nothing. The community does not seem to have been considered in this development. There are no pull-over bays and no consideration for other road users, including the school bus, which has already had to be repaired with a new windscreen because of trucks kicking up rocks into it. There are no additional pull-over bays, no thought was put into what happens when a truck pulling a wind turbine comes across a cattle truck on the other side of the road, no community input and, from what I have been told, locals who do get jobs up there are made to feel like outsiders. This is not good enough.

The former Labor government opened up the floodgates to the cowboys in the industry and left the impacted communities out in the cold. Under the Crisafulli government, this is changing. We are giving communities their voice back and making sure that people get their say, making sure that our endangered flora and fauna is properly considered, making sure that neighbours are properly consulted and making sure that people who are impacted by these industrial developments can have their voices heard.

**Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (4.30 pm): I rise to contribute to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The Queensland Labor opposition is and always has been a strong supporter of renewable energy, environmental protections and community-driven development. We believe in building a cleaner, more sustainable future while ensuring Queenslanders are brought along on the journey with genuine consultation and the opportunity to shape the future of their communities. This is evident in the former Labor government's commitment to the Energy and Jobs Plan and pumped hydro creating jobs in Central and Western Queensland whilst ensuring real action on climate change.

The bill introduces three significant changes to Queensland's planning and development framework: firstly, it creates a new system requiring proponents to undertake social impact assessments and negotiate community benefit agreements before lodging certain development applications; secondly, the bill proposes governance changes to Economic Development Queensland; and, lastly, the bill establishes a new framework for the delivery and oversight of infrastructure associated with the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Labor is proud to have won the games for Queensland. We believe in their power to generate long-lasting economic, social and community legacies. While we support the vision, we cannot ignore the flaws in how this bill is being executed. Once again we are seeing a government rushing through legislation without adequate modelling, proper consultation or even basic regulatory due diligence. This bill was introduced without a regulatory impact statement. The government has not properly explored alternative approaches or anticipated the consequences of these proposals. That failure has real implications for communities, councils, proponents and Queensland's future energy and infrastructure landscape.

At the heart of this bill is a new dual system that requires developers to complete a social impact assessment and enter into a community benefit agreement before they are allowed to lodge a development application. This is a complex new layer of process imposed at the front end of project planning. Initially this applies to solar and wind projects, but the scope can be expanded at any time through regulation. This reform introduces significant regulatory uncertainty at a time when the renewable energy sector needs clarity and direction. We are in the midst of a critical energy transition, yet instead of providing certainty the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering confusion. There is no strategy to guide implementation, no modelling to assess delays or price impacts and no road map to ensure Queensland remains on track to meet its climate commitments. Further, Australia cannot reach its energy targets without real action in Queensland. The LNP is abdicating its responsibility by walking away from a commitment to renewables.

Councils are being asked to take on highly technical responsibilities in assessing social impact assessments and negotiating community benefit agreements—tasks that most do not have the staff, the expertise or the resources to manage. This will lead to inconsistent application across jurisdictions and longer timeframes for approvals, putting current and future projects at risk. Furthermore, the bill disincentivises renewable investment in Queensland. It undermines the coordinated draft renewables regulatory framework developed under Labor, introducing disconnected processes and bypassing existing reforms that are still under consultation. Stakeholders have highlighted how the bill creates unnecessary inconsistency between the treatment of renewable energy and other sectors like mining or agriculture. The Queensland Law Society stated—

> ... these reforms are likely to adversely impact the renewable energy industry in Queensland in a way that is inconsistent with other types of development under the planning system, or resources projects under other legislation.

The result is a system that is not fair or balanced but clearly biased against clean energy. Despite the Premier's claim, this bill does not align approvals with renewables and other sectors. It makes renewable developments harder, not easier. It sends the wrong messages to investors and to regional communities that have backed Queensland's clean energy vision. I can only assume that this serves to feed the Crisafulli LNP government's ideological objection to new and emerging forms of energy generation. This bill sends a clear message to Queenslanders: the LNP has no plans to tackle climate impacts knocking at our door.

The bill also introduces sweeping changes to the governance of Economic Development Queensland. It grants the Governor in Council the power to remove the CEO or members of the EDQ board at any time without the need to provide cause. This is a deeply concerning change. The level of discretionary power granted to the minister in the new provisions is not just excessive; it risks politicising what should be impartial decision-making. It undermines the trust and the integrity that are vital to good governance and public confidence. Just like the appointment of John Sosso to the Redistribution Commission, the appointment of a former LNP federal member to lead EDQ only reinforces these concerns. These changes send a message that frank and fearless advice is no longer welcome, planning decisions are no longer made on merit and the Public Service is no longer independent. That is not how responsible planning systems work and Queenslanders deserve better.

As for the games infrastructure component of the bill, we support the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Of course we do: we won the bid to host them. We fought to bring them here and we support their delivery, but the amendments in this bill raise significant concerns among legal experts, environmental and heritage advocates, community groups and First Nations communities. This bill removes established environmental, planning and heritage protections for Olympic infrastructure, bypassing critical safeguards without clear criteria or transparency. The amendments effectively allow certain developments to be deemed lawful solely because they are linked to the games, removing key oversight mechanisms. This approach has been condemned by the Bar Association of Queensland and flagged by the Queensland Law Society as potentially unconstitutional. Accordingly, the Bar Association of Queensland stated in its submission—

> In short, the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games can be delivered without the need to remove the application of the assessment and approval processes of the relevant Acts, nor to remove the offence provisions for conduct that is, by any metric, unlawful and should be prosecuted.

The opposition is also deeply concerned that First Nations communities were not properly consulted on these amendments, particularly changes that affect cultural heritage protections. As the Environmental Defenders Office has recommended—

> To ensure that the reforms are progressed with the free, prior and informed consent of First Nations people, the parts of the Bill which impact the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples should be withdrawn, and appropriate consultation should occur with and as guided by affected First Nations communities.

In conclusion, while we support the principles of renewable energy investment and the delivery of the Brisbane 2032 games, this bill does not deliver those goals in a way that is responsible, balanced nor transparent. The Crisafulli LNP government has brought forward a bill that centralises power, offloads responsibilities onto councils without resources, weakens statutory safeguards, politicises key institutions like EDQ and introduces legal ambiguity into Olympic infrastructure delivery. Queenslanders deserve legislation that is transparent, consultative and consistent. Queenslanders deserve better.

**Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (4.40 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to provide members with more information regarding the technical amendments to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act, which the Deputy Premier circulated this morning, that will clarify the operation of the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. The Home Warranty Scheme is a statutory safety net for Queenslanders building or renovating their homes, with an average of 150,000 policies taken out each year. It makes sure that when things go wrong or when work is left incomplete or is defective consumers are protected and are not left to carry the burden alone.

Our amendments make it clear that eligibility for cover under the Home Warranty Scheme is not restricted to only formal, written and signed building contracts. These amendments confirm that other forms of agreements, including informal arrangements like email exchanges or verbally accepted quotes, are also recognised under the scheme. This reflects how many Queenslanders engage with tradespeople, especially for lower financial value renovations and repair work. Not every contract is or necessarily should be a 20-page legal document. For thousands of Queenslanders it is a clear quote, an email confirming acceptance, a mutual understanding of the work to be done. That has always been common practice within the industry and these amendments give that practice legal certainty. It is not reasonable to deny someone protection under the scheme simply because their contract was not in the right format, especially when they received a notice of cover from the QBCC and proceeded in good faith.

These amendments result from a QCAT decision which interprets certain provisions under QBCC legislation in a manner inconsistent with the longstanding intent of the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. A sample review of Queensland Home Warranty Scheme policies issued by the QBCC found that between 60 to 90 per cent of lower value renovation contracts would not meet the formality

requirements set out by QCAT. While the rate of defects and claims for lower value work is low, when defects do occur the cost of rectification is often up to three times greater than the cost of the original building work. Given the prevalence of informal contracts, the QBCC has historically assessed Queensland Home Warranty Scheme claims using a common law principles approach which accepts these informal contracts. Recognising common law contracts, as these amendments do, is consistent with the overall policy intent of the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme to provide consumer protection in the worst of circumstances. The amendments have resulted from advice that the government received. We formed a view that it was important to move these as quickly as possible to resolve the matter.

As the Deputy Premier stated earlier, the amendments will provide legislative certainty and clarity about the intent of the Home Warranty Scheme by confirming coverage for the range of agreements between a homeowner and a builder. These amendments will ensure informal contracts that meet the substance of a contractual agreement under common law are covered and that consumers who have done everything reasonably expected of them are protected.

In addition, these amendments will validate past decisions made by the QBCC in line with this approach, ensuring that past actions, premium collections and claim payments remain secure and free from legal uncertainty. They also provide clear pathways for consumers, whose claims may have been rejected solely because their agreement was not in formal written form, to now seek review within a defined six-month period.

To conclude, these changes uphold the purpose of the scheme to protect Queenslanders and give them confidence in our construction sector. They do not change the fundamental responsibilities of builders or alter statutory warranty rights under formal contracts, but they do clarify what types of agreements the scheme will honour and, in doing so, reinforce trust in the system. I commend the bill and the associated amendments to the House.

**Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (4.44 pm): I rise to speak on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in its current form. This bill is yet another example of the Crisafulli government's pattern of broken promises and policy chaos. Broken promise, after broken promise, after broken promise; they promised Queenslanders transparency and accountability, yet here we are debating legislation that centralises power, removes safeguards and hands the government unfettered power to remove the CEO or board members of Economic Development Queensland at any time without cause. It has taken just eight months for this government to return to the dark old days of Campbell Newman, the same Campbell Newman that Premier Crisafulli called special in his biography.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr BAILEY:** That is a matter of fact. Those opposite can object as much as they want, but it is a fact that the member for Broadwater, the Premier, called Campbell Newman special. That is who he idolises. Labor supports the principle of putting people at the heart of planning. We welcome mandatory social impact assessments and community benefit agreements. Requiring large projects to demonstrate their social value and negotiate genuine community benefits is commonsense reform and that is why we support the intent behind part 6B of this bill. This omnibus approach is fundamentally flawed. This legislation bundles together three separate, distinct policy areas—renewable energy provisions, Olympic infrastructure arrangements and Economic Development Queensland governance changes—that deserve separate consideration and proper scrutiny. That is why Labor moved a motion to split this bill into its component parts.

Beyond this structural flaw and training-wheel exercise by those opposite, the bill contains troubling conditions that undermine basic principles. While the government promises meaningful community consultation, it slips a ministerial blank cheque through the back door. Director-general Sosso, as the planning chief executive, will be granted broad reserve powers to waive social impact assessment and community benefit agreement requirements—a backdoor exemption that undermines accountability. Our concerns about these excessive powers are well founded because we have already seen how this duplicitous government exercises its planning powers when it suits their political and ideological interests.

Just last month we witnessed the extraordinary spectacle of the Deputy Premier's department intervening in a Planning and Environment Court case to support a luxury eco retreat development at Maleny Manor—a project the local council had voted to refuse on environmental grounds. This was a 38-unit luxury resort proposed by a company whose director has donated tens of thousands of dollars to the LNP. That is a fact. The hypocrisy from the government is breathtaking. This is the same Deputy

Premier who cancelled the $1 billion renewable energy wind farm approval at Moonlight Range; the same minister who blocked affordable housing project after affordable housing project. Yet when it comes to a luxury resort opposed by the local council and community, suddenly the minister found a state tourism interest worth fighting for in court in support of LNP mates. It says a lot about a government that blocks affordable housing for Queensland families who are struggling while championing luxury developments for LNP donors. It says a lot about their priorities when they find excuses to stop social and affordable homes for working families but bend over backwards for wealthy mates.

We are seeing a return to the dark old days when large-scale renewable energy projects were blocked for the entire time of the Newman government. Not one of them was allowed to proceed at a time when they were common in other states. The cancellation has sent a chill down the spine of the clean energy industry in Australia. This is exactly the kind of preferential treatment that undermines investment in clean energy in regional areas, which is likely the purpose of the government. While this bill talks about community benefit and social impact, the reality is this is a planning minister who blocks renewable energy and affordable housing when it suits, but backs luxury developments for political mates. It is 'here we Joh again'. Schedule 4 is a return to the LNP's DNA: jobs for mates and power concentrated at the top. The bill tears up longstanding 'for cause' safeguards around the board of Economic Development Queensland. Under these changes nominated directors may be shown the door at a ministerial whim. This is straight out of the Newman playbook that Queenslanders rejected when they threw Newman out after less than three years.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr BAILEY:** I hear an interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach—one of those rejected at the time. Chapter 3A is perhaps the most concerning part of this entire bill. It declares that every concrete pour and traffic detour for the 2032 Games is taken to be lawful, overriding 15 separate acts, including the Environmental Protection Act and the state's own Planning Act. Sections 53DD(3) and 53DU strip Queenslanders of their normal right to seek an injunction if works go off the rails. This is unprecedented overreach.

Deputy Premier Bleijie cannot claim to be the custodian of Queensland's natural and cultural heritage in one breath and in the next ram through clauses that let bulldozers roll before traditional owners have even finished negotiations. A 60-day deadline and a fallback default plan is not free, prior and informed consent; it is take-it-or-leave-it coercion dressed up as efficiency. This shameful treatment of First Nations people shows the true character of the 'here we Joh again' Crisafulli government.

The failure of proper consultation on this bill is breathtaking, even by the government's low standards. First Nations organisations saw draft cultural heritage clauses only after the ink was dry. The committee was given a scant few weeks to examine a rewrite of half a dozen principal acts. This is not good governance; this is government by ambush. It mirrors the same rushed, botched approach we saw earlier this year with the youth crime legislation. The government had to come back to fix fundamental errors with the bill whereby they left out various crimes such as rape and attempted murder. A sharp premier or minister would have picked that up.

Just eight months in, we have a secretive Crisafulli government smothering scrutiny at every opportunity. This is the Premier who promised no health cuts and then immediately halted hospital expansions across Queensland last November—the same Premier who promised our clinicians nation-leading pay but then sent out his hapless health minister to deliver an insulting pay offer that would leave Queensland nurses and midwives earning less than their Victorian colleagues.

When Premier Crisafulli says something, it means absolutely nothing. That is very clear. This planning bill, which will be used to roadblock new clean energy infrastructure in Queensland, is further evidence of that sad reality. The renewable energy sector has raised serious concerns about this bill, and rightly so. The Clean Energy Council warns that without clear transitional provisions the reforms may delay critical clean energy infrastructure and deter investment in Queensland. That has already happened. The proposed one-megawatt trigger for solar projects would capture many small community installations that have minimal social impacts.

The former Labor government had Queensland on the path to becoming a renewable energy superpower, but since October we have seen the LNP cancel project after project—pumped hydro cancelled, wind farms blocked, solar developments delayed. They have no plan to achieve their own stated but—let us be frank—confected commitment to net zero. Instead we see red tape driving up project costs that struggling Queensland families will be forced to pay for through higher power bills while coal plants break down more often due to their advanced age.

Despite these fundamental flaws, Labor recognises that there are some necessary elements to the bill. We support the 2032 games and we support meaningful social impact assessment, but we will not stand by while this government tramples fundamental rights and rushes through flawed legislation without highlighting it. Given the government rejected our motion to split the bill, Labor will not be supporting it at the second reading. We cannot support legislation that bundles together disparate policy areas without proper scrutiny and that contains major flaws that will slow Queensland's energy transition.

Labor was committed to making this legislation work for Queenslanders. That is why we proposed comprehensive amendments to fix this bill which the government, to their shame, rejected. These include allowing social impact assessments for renewable energy projects to be submitted post lodgement, mandating timely publication of all Olympic assessment documents within five days, requiring parliamentary approval for additional Olympic funding—we look forward to seeing them try to stick to their envelope—replacing the current ban on civil proceedings with more targeted provisions that maintain judicial review, inserting transitional provisions for in-flight projects and lifting the solar trigger threshold to include community-scale projects.

Once again, this is a government that had a plan to get elected but no plan to govern Queensland. That is very clear in this bill. I think that is increasingly clear to Queenslanders.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr LEE** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (4.54 pm): I rise to speak to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill contains a number of amendments, but I shall speak substantively to the planning and then the Olympic and Paralympic Games aspects of the bill. This bill is primarily about amending the Planning Act 2016 to introduce a community benefit system into the Queensland planning framework. When it comes to renewable energy projects, Labor is always, as Don Quixote would say, tilting at windmills. That is why Labor is so recklessly indifferent to the social and environmental impacts of wind and large-scale solar farms in rural regional communities. Labor is ideologically obsessed with wind farms and large solar farms.

During the 2024 election, we clearly articulated to Queenslanders that we would make renewable energy projects subject to the same rigorous planning assessments and approvals as other major resource developments such as mining, gas and agriculture. We listened to Queenslanders and we are doing what we said we would do. On 3 February 2025 we made wind farms impact assessable and subject to state development assessment provisions. This means developers must initiate public notification and community consultation, and it potentially provides an opportunity for third-party appeals. This is great news for the Fraser Coast and regional Queensland.

We are calmly and methodically rectifying Labor's reckless renewables approach to plundering our prime agricultural land and compromising our food security. Our rural and regional communities have had enough. They deserve the same respect as suburban communities when it comes to our planning laws. My community have had enough of Labor's NIMBY approach to wind and large-scale solar farms.

The bill's community benefit system consists of a social impact assessment, subject to community consultation, which will then inform a community benefit agreement between a proponent and a local government. This will be a requirement before lodging a development application for certain uses which are to be prescribed by regulation. The social impact assessment will include a comprehensive assessment of the social impact of a project, in consultation with that community. The bill requires a proponent to consider the cumulative impacts—both negative and positive—of the wind or large-scale solar project. Thus, the whole-of-life impact of the renewable energy project must be considered.

It is critical that communities have a voice very early in these wind farm or large-scale solar projects. The social impact assessment forms the basis of an enforceable community benefit agreement between the proponent and the local council. To be enforceable, the agreement requires sufficient certainty and completeness in relation to performance guarantees and decommissioning requirements. Other provisions in the agreement may include support for local charities or local infrastructure investment such as road and/or rail or energy cost reductions to landowners in proximity to wind or solar farms. The local council, on behalf of the host community, will be able to negotiate the community benefit agreement in circumstances where they are not also the assessment manager. The social impact statement and community benefit agreement documents must be submitted to the assessment manager as part of a properly made development application.

When it comes to renewable energy projects, Labor's ideological embracement of wind and solar farms knows no bounds. We heard earlier from the Chicken Littles on the other side of the House. I wonder how the Brisbane-based Labor members would feel about wind or solar farms in their city electorates. I forgot: 'not in my backyard'. Clearly, Labor's mindset is that it is okay to ride roughshod over rural and regional communities.

This bill will provide for the Planning Regulation 2017 to prescribe the uses which require a social impact assessment and community benefit agreement prior to lodging a development application; a reserve power for the chief executive officer of the department administering the Planning Act to allow a development application to be lodged with an assessment manager without a Social Impact Assessment or a community benefit agreement, as well as the authority to impose conditions for social impacts; and transitional provisions to clarify how the Planning Act and subsequent Planning Regulation amendments apply to a development application that has been made or lodged but not decided.

This bill also amends the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021. Congratulations go to those regional Queensland locations that will be hosting the 2032 games. It will truly be a Queensland games. My electorate of Hervey Bay is the whale watching capital of Australia. The 2032 games will coincide with whale watching season and we are looking forward to capitalising on the significant domestic and international ecotourism opportunities in my beautiful city.

In 211 days the Crisafulli government has done more to get the Olympic and Paralympic Games on track than Labor did in over 1,200 days. Labor's panic-stricken and muddled renovation proposals for QSAC, Lang Park and the Gabba were an absolute dud—just ask Olympian gold medallists Sally Pearson, Grant Hackett and Leisel Jones or other Olympians such as Melanie Wright, Brooke Hanson, Geoff Huegill, Jon Sieben, Andrew Baildon, Chris Wright and Brenton Richard as well as Paralympians Curtis McGrath, Karni Liddell and Monique Murphy.

We do not have a minute to waste. We are heeding Kipling's advice to—

... fill the unforgiving minute

With sixty seconds' worth of distance run ...

This bill provides for sound governance, project delivery, thorough planning and timely implementation of the 2032 Delivery Plan for the games. The objectives of the bill include promoting effective decisions and governance of the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee for the Olympic and Paralympic Games Corporation board; ensuring effective government oversight of the corporation and the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority; ensuring that the powers and functions of the GIICA are fit for their intended purpose; identifying endorsed villages and venues in line with the 2032 Games Delivery Plan; and streamlining planning approval processes for the development of or related to venues or villages and games related transport infrastructure identified in the act.

Brisbane was selected by the International Olympic Committee on 21 July 2021 and, under the Olympic Host Contract, the IOC entrusts the corporation, the state of Queensland, the Brisbane City Council and the Australian Olympic Committee with the planning, organising, financing and staging of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. In his introductory speech, the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, the Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, said—

Games governance arrangements need to be reflective of who bears the most risk in the delivery of the games.

Therefore, the Queensland government holds a significant responsibility under the Olympic Host Contract for underwriting the costs of the 2032 games.

GIICA will be responsible for the oversight and delivery of venues, including the design and construction of venues in accordance with the games delivery plan. GIICA will be required to develop funding submissions and venue designs for consideration by the cabinet or the Cabinet Budget Review Committee. This will ensure that the government has robust governance oversight of the 2032 Delivery Plan.

The bill also proposes amendments to the Economic Development Act 2012 to improve administrative efficiency and flexibility of board operations in Economic Development Queensland. These amendments are calculated to bring EDQ back to its core business of residential development in priority development areas. This is a fresh change for Queensland after a decade of Labor's sacking and stacking of boards and rallying against fearless and frank Public Service advice. I commend the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to the House.

**Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.03 pm): I rise to speak on the government's so-called planning bill. Queensland is staring down a critical moment for our clean energy

future and the Crisafulli LNP government has chosen fear over vision and politics over planning. This bill is a disaster. It is a smokescreen. It is ideological zealotry from a party that has always hated renewables. Worst of all, it is a signal flare to investors that Queensland is closed when it comes to cheaper, cleaner energy. Let us be clear: the LNP does not believe in renewables. They never have. With this legislation they are turning that ideology into law. This bill does not just stall renewable energy projects; it sabotages them. Under the Premier's leadership, the LNP has no energy road map, no modelling and no plan—just roadblocks, confusion and chaos. Let us be real: it is really the Deputy Premier driving this train with no map, no breaks and no clue. He has taken a sophisticated policy challenge and turned it into a bureaucratic nightmare.

Let me be clear: I will always support strong and meaningful community benefit agreements. On this side of the House we support rigorous social impact assessments that ensure local people share in the benefits of the clean energy transition. However, they must be practical, integrated and fair, not weaponised to stall projects and drive investment away from Queensland. The Premier says this is about creating a level playing field but that is a fiction. What this bill really does is build new barriers—barriers that do not apply to fossil fuels, do not apply to gas or mining and certainly do not apply to the LNP's coal donors. It is a two-tier system: fast tracks for big coal and roadblocks for renewables. Queenslanders are getting an LNP ideology masquerading as policy. We are watching projects stall, investments vanish, communities left in limbo and energy bills increasing all because this government would rather blow up a process than build consensus.

Let us take the Moonlight Range Wind Farm, for example. I read the story of Tracey Richards and her family who are fifth generation cattle farmers impacted by the wind farm. With the project scrapped, they now face the very real threat of losing their farm. The Richards family described the government's decision on Moonlight Range as 'unnecessarily cruel and without logic and reason'. I think that about sums up the Deputy Premier's approach to renewable energy and this bill as a whole.

I turn to the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Every Queenslander wants the games to succeed but success does not come from silencing First Nations' voices, gutting legal protections or rewriting the rule book for the LNP's political convenience. The Bar Association of Queensland says that this bill is 'contrary to the rule of law'. The Queensland Law Society calls its legal restrictions 'unprecedented and likely unconstitutional'. This is not planning; it is panic. This bill says the Crisafulli government cannot deliver Olympic infrastructure unless they strip away every safeguard that exists to protect Queenslanders: environmental law, cultural heritage protections, legal rights, community consultation and transparency.

This is a government so lacking in capability and so devoid of skills that their only solution is to tear up the rule book. If they are willing to do this for the Olympics, what is next? What else will they declare too hard, too slow or too inconvenient for democracy? What other promises will they break because they cannot deliver without gutting Queensland's laws? Is that what 'on time and on budget' means to them? Does it mean that anything in the way, be it a community, a court or a cultural site, just gets bulldozed?

Under the Deputy Premier, Economic Development Queensland has become a revolving door for LNP mates with independence tossed out, expertise sidelined and decisions politicised. Does that sound familiar? It should because it is straight out of the LNP playbook. This bill centralises control in Brisbane while dumping complex tasks on local councils with no support. We could have a framework that provides clean energy, community benefit, environmental protections and investor confidence, but instead we have this mess of a bill and an LNP ideological rejection of anything that smells like renewables.

This is more than a planning failure; this is a values failure and Queenslanders deserve better. They deserve better than a government that sees accountability as an inconvenience. The LNP wants Queensland to look backwards to secrecy and unchecked ministerial power, but we know the future is in renewables, it is in transparency and it is in inclusivity. We will fight for that future because this bill is not a plan; it is a warning and the warning is this: if you care about clean energy, community voices, the rule of law or the games being a legacy we can all be proud of then this LNP government is not on your side.

**Hon. FS SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (5.09 pm): Labor wasted more than 1,000 days that should have been used to plan for Queensland's 2032 Olympics. They have ripped up a chunk of the runway and they are the reason it is necessary now to bring in legislation to get the job done so Queensland keeps its commitment to

Queenslanders, to Australians and to the world to hold the 2032 Olympics and to make sure it is done well. We are proud to have the experience and to create a legacy of infrastructure that will serve all of Queensland, no thanks to the obstinate, obstructive and absolute incompetent former Labor government.

They are the reason it is necessary now to bring in legislation that contains different processes to achieve outcomes that both respects the stakeholders and gets the job done. We will have no more mucking around, no more obfuscation and no more excuses from Labor. It has to be done. It can be done with respect for stakeholders, but there was no respect for stakeholders when they mucked it up and failed to get on with the job.

The job that we have been left with is to ensure that we have a successful 2032 Olympics. The 2032 Olympics is an exciting opportunity to showcase Australian culture and, more specifically, Queensland culture to the world. The spotlight will be on us. It will be a chance for all Queenslanders to shine. We will have international visitors on our doorstep experiencing Queensland culture and the rich diversity of our First Australians. Their stories, their heritage, their art and their businesses will also be at the forefront. They are important partners in this process.

This project has to land in time for the Olympics. We do not have another 1,000 days to waste. This has to be done and we have to get on with it. We need to come together as Queenslanders if we are going to be ready in time. To be honest, we are playing catch-up due to the time that was wasted by the former Labor government. We are on a shortened timeframe because of their lack of progress. We need to come together and make it happen so we can open our doors to the world. We want to bring all Queenslanders with us so they can be proud of the legacy that will serve not just today's generation but many to come.

I want to assure all Queenslanders that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander partnerships are undeniably important to us. In fact, a key point of our cabinet's charter is our commitment to Queenslanders and our First Australians being able to thrive and have opportunities in the lead-up to the Olympics and beyond. For this reason, I want to clarify that, due to that shortened timeframe caused by Labor, this bill provides an alternative pathway for planning approval specifically for Olympic based projects, but I do stress that there will be careful consideration as to how we do that and take on board any concerns so that we can land a good outcome together.

The Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 includes a modified process for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage approvals by way of a cultural heritage management plan. There is still a plan and there is still stakeholder agreement, but this bill intersects with the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act and the Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Act 2003. It is important to note that the bill sets requirements to ensure building work is subject to appropriate controls and that cultural heritage is respected.

The feedback from and perspectives of our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders have been heard and will be heard and valued. They are reflected in the two proposed amendments to the bill that will be moved by the Deputy Premier. Specifically, one of the amendments will introduce an additional requirement for better notifications. During the committee process, there was feedback with regard to ensuring there is better notification of information through more widely circulated means so people are aware of what is happening. In addition, it is also proposed that the chief executive of the Department of Women, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Multiculturalism be notified when a default plan takes effect under the alternative cultural heritage provisions to ensure a duty of care is upheld by the department. Both of these amendments to the bill uplift requirements for community communication and consultation and ensure the close involvement of my department and my director-general in matters of cultural heritage.

In addition to the consultation that is specific to this bill, I have engaged with over 90 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander stakeholders throughout the state, including through events on country and meetings, and heard their stories. I understand the importance of language and the importance of culture, which we need to respect and incorporate into other opportunities for the wider community so they can also embrace and understand their journey and their culture. They are proud of that culture, and we need to find ways to bring those stories and that culture to an Olympic world stage. As Queenslanders, we need a process to land a good outcome together.

**Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.16 pm): Here we Joh again. This bill is dragging us back to an era of unaccountable, undemocratic and regressive governance that is the hallmark of conservative politics in this state. This bill is all about trashing process and represents some of the most extraordinary overreach we have seen in generations. This is the 2025 equivalent of the Deen brothers rolling up in

the middle of the night to avoid public scrutiny or challenge so that a bloody-minded, pig-headed government can simply ignore the very real community concerns that exist and will continue to emerge as the government rushes in to the Olympics vanity projects.

Every Queenslander should know that for the sake of the Olympics this government is willing to shred the Environmental Protection Act, the Environmental Offsets Act, the Vegetation Management Act, the Nature Conservation Act, the Coastal Protection and Management Act, the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act and the Planning Act—and that is not even the entire list. It is also proposing a new watered-down process to effectively bypass cultural heritage protections.

For the sake of the Olympics, and so this government can please the fat cats and vested interests in the Olympics committee, this government is willing to shred the usual requirements for community consultation, override processes to protect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage and simply erase vital environmental protections. It is, as far as I am aware, completely unprecedented to override 15 separate planning and environmental controls for the development of Olympics and Paralympics infrastructure. This tells us that this government does not give a toss about its constituents or their concerns, our communities and the future of our cities and regions.

This government is so eager to grovel at the feet of Olympics fat cats that it is willing to sacrifice green space, sacrifice Aboriginal cultural heritage and silence any community concerns or opposition. Despite all the grandstanding we have seen from Labor on this bill, Queenslanders have not forgotten that Labor treated them with the same level of contempt around the Gabba stadium redevelopment—a project that the former government forged ahead with despite enormous opposition and on the back of next to no community consultation.

Rethink the Gabba are the alliance of community members around East Brisbane State School and Raymond Park who successfully fought to quash the ludicrous Gabba stadium plans. Rethink the Gabba write that this bill, framed around 'efficiency' is in essence—

> ... a fairly thinly veiled attempt to limit not only the ability of any dissenting voices to have their say, but to have any meaningful consultation ... It may seem like this is a good way to "get things done" more quickly, but we would like to remind you what happened when the previous State government tried to impose massive changes on the community of East Brisbane and Woolloongabba in 2023.

They continue—

> If the current State government tries to override planning laws in the mistaken belief that communities are willing to prioritise the Olympics over everything else, they risk suffering the same consequences. In short, when you exclude communities from essential decisions impacting their future, they will push back, sometimes with devastating political consequences.

Let's not forget who really benefits from the Olympics. It is not everyday people. It is not small local businesses. It is the out-of-touch elites on the IOC and it is the already wealthy—the big property developers, the media and broadcast corporations, the corporate sponsors and the massive hotel chains. It is certainly not the everyday people who will instead see the costs of rent and housing skyrocket. Even those residents who are super keen on the Olympics need to remember that the tickets to any events, particularly any tickets to finals, will almost certainly be at costs that are out of reach for the everyday person.

There were over 780 submissions to this bill—the vast majority of which were in strong opposition. Two hundred and thirteen of those were form submissions but there were even bigger numbers of unique submissions. This is members' constituents taking the time to register their opposition. They can see what is coming.

In changes that the Environmental Defenders Office described as 'unorthodox' and 'dangerous', the bill provides that the development of any infrastructure designated under it will be lawful and not subject to compliance or approval under the Planning Act or any of the other 14 pieces of relevant legislation. The EDO writes—

> The complete suspension of significant planning and environment legislation is not justified and is a disproportionate response to the need to roll out Olympics infrastructure. These laws exist to ensure that developments are safe, environmentally sustainable, and conducted in accordance with the public interest (informed by public consultation). A lack of preparation for the Olympic and Paralympic Games should not be used as a pretext to erode public participation and regulatory safeguards which are designed to protect the integrity and safety of development and to minimise impacts.

The South East Queensland Community Alliance write that the operational requirements, which form part of the host city contract require that the host city assess impacts on 'climate, biodiversity/natural sites, sourcing and resource management/circular economy, infrastructure and mobility' and to focus on 'public engagement and communication'. In excluding the games infrastructure from 14 separate pieces of legislation, the SEQ Community Alliance argues that this bill contravenes

contractual obligations within the host city contract and represent an 'unjustified level of overreach and community exclusion'.

The apparent safeguard is that the parliament will need to pass further amendments to the act to designate each piece of relevant infrastructure. I do not need to tell anyone here and we do not need to pretend that that is any kind of safeguard in this unicameral parliament. It is in fact just a licence for the LNP to designate whatever they want whenever they want without any genuine community consultation. The community will be left with no ability to appeal these decisions or even commence civil proceedings against a development if it would cause delay, and there is no legislative requirement for detailed environmental assessments, despite the apparent commitment to doing them.

As the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties said in its submission, 'If Queenslanders cannot enforce their legal rights, they have no rights at all.' The whole thing again calls to mind the Joh era of Queensland when around 60 buildings were demolished and the community saw its important gathering spaces just destroyed, often in the middle of the night.

Projects designated under these new laws will evade existing requirements under cultural heritage legislation. They will get an alternate framework that significantly curtails the time for consultation, with just a 60-day timeframe for negotiating a cultural heritage management plan. I have to say it was a little galling to hear the minister talking just before me about her consultation with First Nation leaders.

There is no requirement for free, prior and informed consent to projects—no ability for them to say no. Instead, if negotiations are unsuccessful within the timeframe, a default plan will be imposed and the project goes ahead without any regard for place-specific First Nations management of land and culture. This is in direct contravention of cultural rights under the Human Rights Act and the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People, but we know what this government thinks of human rights, don't we?

We have at least one concrete example of how the LNP would like this to play out in Victoria Park—Barrambin. This government has broken its pre-election promise that it would not build an expensive, wasteful new stadium for the Olympics and is putting it on top of this much needed inner-city greenspace. It is a breach of the Olympic Host Contract, which mandates avoiding permanent structures in protected areas and prioritising previously developed sites.

Of course, the LNP is no stranger to bulldozing and selling off greenspace in Brisbane, but this is particularly egregious given the loss of cultural history and the destruction of sacred sites that this bill is designed to facilitate at Barrambin. Barrambin holds deep cultural and spiritual significance to the First Nations Yagara and Turrbal peoples. It is a campground and meeting place for corroborees, dancing, hunting and gathering, and a place for First Nations people from neighbouring regions to visit and stay. The LNP are ready to destroy all of that heritage for a new Olympic stadium that they promised they would not build.

There is one promise that the LNP is clearly determined to keep, and that is taking us backwards on renewable energy. I have long advocated for community involvement in planning decisions, including decisions about renewables. For years now I have been pushing the government to review the Planning Act so it adequately accounts for this, but consultation and assessment should apply equally to all large developments with potential for significant social impacts. Instead, these laws are specifically designed to hamper Queensland's transition to renewable energy. In fact, as QCC pointed out, this bill will result in stricter regulatory requirements for a two-hectare solar farm than for a coalmine that extracts any less than two million tonnes per annum of coal. The latter will continue to enjoy exemptions from environmental impact assessments, actively discouraging investment in renewable energy.

I have a further quote from the EDO that I have run out of time for. Honestly, it is no wonder they want to defund them. This is a dog of a bill and it needs to be voted down.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (5.26 pm): I rise this evening to speak on behalf of the people of Keppel in support of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. While this bill deals with multiple items, I would like to focus my contribution on the item which has been the most pressing concern for my residents in Keppel. Central Queenslanders, including my communities of Keppel, are part of the front line of struggles between a not fit-for-purpose planning framework, an ideologically driven agenda that silenced the voice of our communities and a policy that has left a legacy of disconnect which has tied up our councils in knots and needs to be fixed.

In urban cities and in urban centres, town plans have scenic amenity performance outcomes which help manage the impact on visual amenity of new developments. As an example, the Livingstone Shire Council town plan speaks to minimising the impacts on the visual or scenic amenity caused by development—that is, it provides for performance outcomes that state that development—

(a) is not visually prominent against the natural skyline when viewed from a public coastal viewer place;

(b) is not visually prominent against the surrounding vegetation or other natural landscape …

It goes on and ends with it—

(e) does not result in:

(i) scarring by exposed earthwork; or

(ii) canopy removal on hilltops, prominent headlands, ridges and hillslopes; or

(iii) modification of the natural environment which dominates the landscape;

For the communities of Keppel and for Central Queenslanders, these are important values—how we manage the livability of our communities as we grow, how we protect our region that we love and how we protect the natural wonder which is important. Yet, for current proposals in the renewable energy field, no such considerations apply. Scar the land, dominate the landscape, remove the canopy and forever change the skyline. It would not be considered automatically approved in Brisbane. In fact, I imagine there would be campaigns and petitions. Yet in Central Queensland this would be the case. I suggest these projects should not be automatically approved in regional Queensland.

It is important that MPs note the scale and size of renewable projects proposed in Central Queensland. They dwarf the surrounding communities. Wind farm structures are as tall as 1 William Street. Yet no consultation and no rigorous approval process are undertaken. These projects are deemed approved. It is only fair that, to give communities a say, such projects are impact assessable. Under this legislation, they would be subject to rigorous approval processes, as are other sector projects. Let's take another example. Last week Minister Perrett and I met with farmers.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hutton, adjourned.

## MOTION

### Energy Industry

**Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. acknowledges that the aspiration to achieve net zero emissions is costing Queenslanders' household budgets;

2. revokes all net zero targets; and

3. immediately reinvest in coal and gas baseload generation to take advantage of our abundance of coal and gas in Queensland.

We are here tonight to talk about household budgets. Much has been said about the state budget and it will continue to be spoken about this week, but this motion relates to a particular focus on the household budget. I know that when my wife and I talk about our household budget, the No. 1 or No. 2 ranked item is power bills. It has come as a great surprise and shock to me over recent years when I reflect on what I used to pay for power for my house across the road. It was a house of a similar nature with a pressure pump and a pool pump. We used to pay about $4,000 year and now we are nudging over $9,000 a year. We have gone to quarterly bills because we could not afford it. I thought that maybe we were doing something wrong, so we got an electrician to put on a wi-fi monitor to monitor where all of the energy usage was in our house. Nothing was out of place. I thought, 'What the hell's going on here?'

As a politician I certainly know what is going on out there, but I am speaking figuratively. Then a flood of complaints started to come in from constituents. People who do not follow the energy market or what is going on much politically were saying, 'I'll tell you what it is, Robbie. It's those smart meters. Since they put those on my electricity has gone up.' I say to them that it is a lot bigger than smart meters. I pondered that the number of Ergon workers has not doubled in the Traeger electorate, nor has it in Queensland, and their wages have not doubled. What has happened in the electricity market over recent years? What significant thing has happened?

We have tried to pre-emptively replace—or you might say replicate—the generation network with renewables. Everyone says they are cheaper. We never really get to the bottom of that. It is a really difficult argument to have here because with subsidies, carbon credits and the distortion of the markets,

it is very difficult to say what the true cost of these things are. It is hard to be convinced that, when you see all of the infrastructure and works that go into installing wind farms and some of these things, we are fully capturing the cost of these things. You are replicating that network and it is not centralised. It is not like one big coal-fired power station at Biloela. You are putting all of these generators everywhere—mostly privately owned, I might add—so now we have to build a separate network and substations and everything to accommodate that. That gets pretty expensive and it has to land somewhere. Curiously, my power bill has gone up at the same time as that network has been rolled out.

We are 35 per cent of the way to these targets. Where does this end? How do we afford this? The money has to come from somewhere. I know you are going to keep knocking on us on our power bills. We have reached the threshold now where people are saying they cannot afford it, so someone has to ask the question: where does this stop? Are we being honest with people about how much this is costing us? This debate tonight is not all about accepting or debating climate change; it is about what is the cost we are willing to pay to meet the targets you are setting.

When we talk about targets, under scrutiny in the federal parliament CSIRO said there are 40 different models for net zero. Not one—40 different models. We have one for Australia, but it is not the same as overseas, so in five years let's swap with someone else that has a more convenient model for us where we do not have to take the same measures. You might say, 'At least we're doing something.' Maybe that is true, but be honest about the cost of it. Be honest about the cost of this stuff for Queenslanders. A lot of poor people are sitting there at home and of course they are saying, 'Yes, I really want to fix the environment.' When you put that proposition out people are going to say, 'Well, hang on, Australia and Queensland voted for this. They want to fix the environment.' Of course we all do. Everyone loves the environment. But you tell them what it is costing them, because they are sitting at home—probably like me and my wife—saying this stuff is starting to hurt, and we are only at 35 per cent. We still have a long way to go. Those are big numbers to stretch to.

If you want to solve global climate problems here, are you going to make Queensland do that? Are you going to make Australia do that? We contribute one per cent of global emissions. Until you convince places like India and China to get onboard with this, we are wasting our time. They are not really interested in this at the moment. We still have some 34 billion tonnes of coal. We are still willing to sell it to them and they can burn it, but we are going to deny ourselves that opportunity of an energy advantage. We have done the same thing with gas, but that is another story. There is so much hypocrisy in this. Be honest about the costs of net zero and let's walk away from them.

**Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (5.35 pm): I move the following amendment—

That all words after 'That this House' be omitted and the following paragraphs inserted:

'1. acknowledges the government's commitment to make energy affordable, reliable and sustainable;

2. notes the investment into our power stations through the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee;

3. notes the decision of the government to extend the life of our coal-fired power stations to ensure supply; and

4. notes the government's investment in Queensland's gas industry in this year's budget, including funding for power stations and new exploration areas.'

Queenslanders expect affordable power, they expect reliable power and they expect sustainable power. That is exactly what this government is delivering. Our approach to energy is based on economics and engineering: not ideology, like those opposite. Take our coal-fired power stations as an example—the youngest fleet in the country. Under the Crisafulli government they are not being neglected or written off like under those opposite. They are being properly maintained and positioned to play a central role in our energy mix. We are not afraid of saying 'coal' this side of the chamber.

We have introduced the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee, a $1.6 billion commitment over five years to ensure our publicly owned power stations are maintained properly, kept operational and able to put downward pressure on power prices. Why? Because we know that you cannot keep the lights on without base load power. Let's not forget what happened under those opposite. The former government ran our power assets into the ground, and Queenslanders paid the price in May 2021 when the explosion at the Callide Power Station plunged much of the state into darkness. It was a symbol of Labor's failed ideological approach that left Queenslanders paying more for their power bills. It is one of the many reasons Queenslanders rejected Labor's ideological energy experiment and their so-called Energy and Jobs Plan.

Queenslanders saw right through Labor's $36 billion hydro hoax, which would have slugged every household in this state over $15,000 and not have delivered a single watt in time. The Crisafulli government is delivering what Labor never could. We are delivering a real energy strategy based on real economics. Our approach is grounded in the practical needs of the energy grid and the economic needs of Queensland families. It includes unlocking new gas supply, because we understand that the best way to put downward pressure on energy prices is to have more energy in the market.

Just last month I announced that nine new parcels of land comprising 16,000 square kilometres will be open for tender across the Cooper and Surat basins. To give members a sense of the scale of this exploration area, it is 6½ times the size of the ACT. This is about boosting gas supply, creating more competition and putting downward pressure on energy prices. We are sending a strong message to resource investors that Queensland is open for business. After a decade of antigas and antimining policies from Labor, we are restoring investor confidence and re-establishing Queensland as a place where energy and resources projects can succeed and resource companies are welcomed. They are so welcome, in fact, that the first question I asked resource companies when they walk through my door is do they have an application for a new project in their pocket?

We are ensuring the success of resource projects continues through the Resources Cabinet Committee. Through the RCC we are cutting red tape, reducing approval timelines and giving proponents the certainty they need to get on with the job, because we understand that time is money. Labor locked up resources, drove investment off a cliff and left Queenslanders paying higher bills. The Crisafulli government is taking a commonsense approach to energy that backs the industries that power our economy—because the best way to bring down energy prices is to bring more energy onto the market.

Queenslanders did not vote for chaos and crisis. They voted for a government that delivers, and that is what this amendment reflects. It reflects the need for a clear-headed, commonsense approach to energy, and it reflects what Queenslanders voted for—a fresh start, a clear direction and a government that is committed to addressing the underlying issues driving up the cost of living. When it comes to addressing cost-of-living pressures, we will make the big decisions and the investment and stand by our word right across Queensland.

**Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (5.40 pm): We know Queensland Labor is 100 per cent backing net zero emissions targets by writing those targets into law. Incredibly, the Queensland Liberal Party have supported Labor's net zero emissions targets. This motion is about bringing some common sense into the fantasy net zero commitment. China contributes over 31 per cent of global emissions, while Australia contributes just over one per cent of the world's carbon emissions. Here in Australia and Queensland we are never going to save the planet, but what we can save—with the support of the House for this motion—is the cost of electricity bills for Queenslanders.

In our state we have an abundance of coal and gases but we export it overseas for countries like China and India to burn and enjoy reliable base load power and cheaper electricity. It does not make sense that we have net zero emissions targets but then export as much coal as possible for other nations to burn. China is killing themselves laughing at our stupidity by using our own resources to make more wind turbines and towers to sell back to us to destroy our own economy and energy stability. The mockery of this is we then destroy local environments by clearing vast tracts of natural bushland to build wind farms.

In the case of the Chalumbin Wind Farm, the Ravenshoe community, Bob Katter and I were successful in stopping this project. It was proposed to be one of the largest wind farms in the Southern Hemisphere, with initially 200 turbines at 250 metres high with 90-metre blades located right next door to a World Heritage listed Wet Tropics area containing endangered flora and fauna. Where were the protesters? This project required significant land clearing just to allow road access for these massive wind farms. Going back 30 years ago in the same area, the green movement protested and put a stop to the Tully-Millstream hydro-electric project. Where are the protesters now who were there 30 years ago? This was an approved project with a tunnel already constructed which would have powered 150,000 homes and saved $300 million a year in transmission losses. This same green movement that protested against the Tully-Millstream hydro-electric scheme were nowhere to be seen to protest the thousands of hectares of sclerophyll forest right beside the rainforest to be knocked down. None of them were in sight.

**Mr Dametto:** They couldn't care less.

**Mr KNUTH:** They could not care less. The Collinsville coal power station was a 200-megawatt base load power station that was closed to reduce emissions and redevelop the site for renewable

energy projects. Then the federal government assisted by paying overseas companies through the Renewable Energy Target scheme to set up a 42-megawatt solar farm that was put together by backpackers. Collinsville had an abundance of coal onsite and a thriving community, but the power generation profits from that Collinsville coal power station went to hospitals, schools and roads whereas solar farm profits go overseas. How stupid are we.

We understand now why net zero emissions targets are being questioned more and more in this country. The New South Wales Nationals have abandoned their net zero emissions policy. The South Australian Liberal state branch have abandoned a net zero emissions policy. Only days ago the Northern Territory government backflipped on its 2030 emissions reduction target. In fact, the Northern Territory government's own rank and file members passed a motion to abandon net zero emissions targets altogether. Our close neighbours New Zealand have woken up and reversed their nation-destroying ban on oil and gas exploration. The ban contributed to energy shortages and increased reliance on imported coal, with a greater focus on energy security and a willingness to explore new gas fields. Other nations are backtracking on climate goals. I commend the motion to the House.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (5.45 pm): I am more than happy to rise in this House to speak in support of the amendment moved by the honourable member for Burdekin, Dale Last. For those who might have missed a bit of history that I talk about in this House, I am a geologist.

**Mr McDonald:** A geologist?

**Mr HEAD:** I am a geologist. As a geologist—

**Mr Last:** I knew it.

**Mr HEAD:** I will take that interjection from the member for Burdekin. I was a rock licker, as some say. I worked in coalmines across the eastern seaboard of this country.

**Mr McDonald:** Is that a rock detective?

**Mr HEAD:** I do not know if you would call it a rock detective, but maybe we should take on that title. As a geologist working in coalmines in Queensland and other parts of the nation, I could see firsthand how much that industry contributed to our nation, how much wealth it provided. You could not work in that industry without knowing how fortunate we are to have that industry to provide cheap and reliable electricity to our nation. Energy security is something that underpins national security and national prosperity.

**Mr McDonald** interjected.

**Mr HEAD:** Thank you, member for Lockyer; I hope the rest of it is good too. Energy security relates directly to national prosperity. It is important that we continue to improve the mess that we have inherited from the previous government, which did not factor in the need for base load reliable and affordable power. We saw that with the significant price rises we had on our electricity bills.

As the member for Callide, I do not get to spend much time at home. When I paid my electricity bill last week, I once again could not believe how expensive it had got. That is something on the minds of a lot of people across this nation and across Queensland because of the power price rises we have seen. Instead of the previous government fixing the fundamentals and ensuring we had coal-fired generators that were properly maintained and would operate into the future providing that base load affordable and reliable power, they turned around and gave us one-off sugar hits of handouts on our energy bill and they front-loaded it right before the election so that most Queenslanders did not have to pay a power bill between 1 July last year—or whenever that rebate kicked in—and the election. That rebate has now expired and they never funded it into the future. They are saying that we cut rebates, but you cannot cut something that did not exist. I put that on the record.

This is the mess that we are trying to fix. To fix this mess we need to look at those [coal-fired generators and other forms of generation like gas peakers. I commend the Treasurer for investing significant money—I think it is nearly $500 million in the next financial year—for the Brigalow gas peaking plant which is around the corner from where I live near the Kogan Creek Power Station. It is generation like that which is incredibly important to get into the grid to help restabilise it and drive down electricity prices. Our electricity grid operates in a supply and demand market. That means the more supply that is available to bid into the market at any point in time, the lower the wholesale price will be, and in turn the retail price for consumers will be lower.

The other point, as the member for Callide, I would like to make is we currently produce about one quarter of Queensland's electricity. We are a powerhouse electorate, through the works of the

Callide Power Station and the Kogan Creek Power Station, and of course we have the Condamine gas peaker there as well which provides a bit of important generation to our grid. I want to make sure that we can continue being the powerhouse electorate. I back the workers who live in those communities, and who want to live and work in those communities, and that is why I back the moves of our government to fix the mess of the former government and invest in our base load supply. That ensures the future of those jobs for the communities I represent. Those people move there because they want to live there. They are great communities. Chinchilla and Biloela is where the workers of those power stations live and work. As their local member, I am happy to stand up here and support all programs that ensure their future and, of course for every Queenslander, programs that ensure we have cheap, reliable and affordable electricity for all of Queensland.

**Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (5.50 pm): Many of the contributors to this debate have begun their contributions by talking about power prices, the impact that they would argue of net zero, the cost of different forms of energy from renewables to coal, to gas et cetera. Let's get one thing clear and on the record as part of this debate: Queenslanders' bills are going up because of one thing and that is—

**Mr Head:** The former Labor government.

**Mr McCALLUM:**—the LNP government. On 1 July, after—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr McCALLUM:** They can sit there and laugh about it, but whether it is the Katter party members or any member from the other side of the House who get up and cry about the fact that their constituents are coming to see them, worried about their power bills, which all of our constituents are, just remember it was the LNP that went to the election and promised to lower power bills in Queensland. Yet, from 1 July we are going to see power prices in Queensland going up by at least 3.7 per cent on the regulated price, and I have seen bills in my own community in Bundamba that are going up by over 11 per cent—broken promise No. 1 from the LNP.

When it comes to power prices, the member for Traeger did say that he was yet to be convinced, to be honest, about the cost. I want to thank the honourable member for Traeger for his contribution. When it comes to things like net zero targets which do facilitate and encourage net zero generation, as in solar, there are many Queenslanders—we are the leading state in the nation—who have put solar panels on their homes or their businesses. Why? Because it brings down their emissions and it also brings down their bills. Probably every member in this House will have constituents who have solar panels on their homes and they will be reducing their energy bill or indeed they will be a net exporter into the grid. I think that really does need to be put onto the record in this debate.

When it comes to net zero targets, outside of residential bills, net zero also encourages and supports jobs and investments in many sectors right across our state. It helps keep Queensland industries competitive and it helps protect Queensland jobs, like in the member for Traeger's electorate.

When it comes to the North West Minerals Province, whether it is traditional resources that are being mined there, whether it is copper or zinc, or you look at the new economy minerals that exist there, they are being supported by net zero targets. Net zero targets are driving an enormous amount of investment in our regions, whether it is in the north-west or in other parts of Queensland. It is worth remembering that when you look at industry associations for fossil fuels, whether it is gas, whether it is coal, most of them have committed to net zero targets. Why do they do that? Because they operate in a global market and they want to protect their ongoing sustainability and viability against the competition they have overseas.

Net zero is protecting jobs here in Queensland, and net zero is building our industries—our existing industries, our industries that have been the backbone of our state and are still so important, but also our new industries, our growing industries and our future industries.

I will finish on the member for Callide's contribution where he said you cannot cost something that does not exist—

*(Time expired)*

**Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (5.55 pm): I rise to speak to the amended motion moved by my good friend, the member for Burdekin. In doing so, I do want to commend the member for Traeger because he has given us a great opportunity to remind the people of Queensland about the Crisafulli government's relentless commitment to ensure the lights stay on in this great state and that they pay less for power.

Make no mistake, under Labor the state's energy grid was in disarray. I suspect even the members for Traeger, Hinchinbrook and Hill would agree with those of us in the Crisafulli government that the people of Queensland have only one party to blame for their increasing and continuing to increase electricity bills and that is the Labor Party in this state who oversaw a decade of disarray. Maintenance breaches were commonplace and that led to irregular supply. It led to cost blowouts which, of course, were passed on to long-suffering Queensland taxpayers. Then there was a real blowout—a blowout at the Callide Power Station when it exploded back in 2021, plunging Queensland into darkness and sending our power prices sky-high. That is the price of Labor.

Unlike those opposite, we are committed to ensuring energy is affordable, reliable and sustainable, and we are methodically and sensibly addressing the issues confronting our state, just as we said we would. We are delivering for Queensland. We have introduced, as others have said, our electricity maintenance guarantee and it has been backed through this recent budget. We know our electricity generators are ageing, they need regular maintenance to ensure their reliability and we are providing that. We need that to ensure affordability in a cost-of-living crisis in Queensland—again, a result of that decade of Labor disinterest, disdain and debacle.

Over the next five years, we are going to invest $1.6 billion into those publicly owned power plants, ensuring they operate as they should. That puts downward pressure on the power prices and that benefits both residents and businesses alike, regardless of where they are in this state. It also means the lights stay on. For families and businesses, electricity is an essential ingredient.

I have been very clear: I believe in climate change. As the environment minister, as well as being a father of five, I understand the need for renewable energy and I support it. As tourism minister, I understand the need to protect and preserve the pristine environment that attracts millions of visitors from around the world each year. However, our transition must be sensible and it also must be deliverable. Our power must be affordable, must be sustainable and must be reliable. Renewable energy projects must stack up.

Queenslanders saw Labor's harebrained Pioneer Burdekin debacle blow out from $12 billion to nearly $37 billion, and if the member for Woodridge had had his way, Queenslanders would have been forced to have paid for that harebrained scheme on their power bills for generations to come. That does not even mention how much of an act of environmental vandalism it was, let alone the devastating impact it would have had on those communities that were impacted by the proposal.

Unlike Labor, we will ensure that proposals for green energy are supported by their local communities and that they have been respectfully and thoroughly consulted. We believe in proper representation for Queensland, not just a South-East corner imposed agenda, as too many have suffered under in the past decade.

The proposals must be sound. They have to have adequate storage and transmission capabilities so the state is not burdened with assets that do not deliver. We know that gas is a part of that response. After Labor's decade of dithering—you heard from the member for Burdekin—it is time to get cracking with new exploration. Queensland is a rich resource state and we must utilise the bounty that nature has given us. By unlocking supply and driving new gas investment there will be more downward pressure on gas prices and, yes, as the Minister for the Environment, I will ensure these projects meet our high environmental standards and they pass our appropriately rigorous processes. Where they do, they will be approved in a timely fashion. No longer will you see a supply-boosting power bill-slashing project languishing on a Labor minister's desk for fear of losing a few Green preferences down in Brisbane. Instead, the Crisafulli government is getting on with getting the job done. We are addressing the factors that have led Queenslanders into this cost-of-living crisis. Our energy future will involve coal. It will involve gas. It will involve solar, wind and hydro, but it will be done in a responsible and sensible way because we are delivering the fresh start we said we would.



**Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (6.00 pm): I rise to give my contribution to the motion moved by the member for Traeger. The reality is that there are a number of things driving up our electricity bills across Queensland and the pursuit of net zero has been the No. 1 driver of those increases over the last 10 years. There has been an aggressive approach by the Labor Party to go down the rabbit hole of renewables to the point where they have complete sacrificed the ability for the grid to provide dispatchable, base load power that can be produced all through the day and at times of peak load.

At this point in time, we have a problem in Queensland where there is actually too much solar on the National Electricity Market. People do not understand this. I do not know if anyone here follows the NEM, but you can go in and check it. Please ask if you do not. If you are a member of parliament, understand how the National Electricity Market works. Believe it or not, during the middle of the day we

are actually operating in a negative market because we have solar and wind generators that cannot ramp up and down and have to export their power, whether we like it or not, as they producing too much power on the national electricity grid.

The reality is that we need to balance the grid constantly. Too much power being generated—blackouts. Not enough power—blackouts. During the day we operate in pretty much a negative market when there is too much wind and solar. The fact of the matter is that there are not enough generators—coal-fired or gas—right now that can chase those peaks and troughs and that are able to export at peak load times. In the mornings when people are cooking breakfast and at night when people are coming home, turning on their air-conditioners, turning the electricity on for the stove and oven—those peak times—wind and solar is not working. Solar is definitely not working, especially after six o'clock in wintertime, I can tell you that.

What are working are the gas-fired power stations. What are working are the coal-fired power stations. Remember, the grid is actually connected throughout the nation. What happens is, Western Australia is doing their thing but South Australia, for example, has no power stations left so they start reverse bidding for the power. The gas-fired power stations in Queensland or New South Wales start ramping up and guess what ramps up as well? The price of electricity at those peak load times. When you take the average price of electricity between the middle of the day when we are in a negative market right through to peak load times that is why the cost of electricity goes up.

What do we need to do to bring power prices down? I tell you what: because of the problems that have been caused by chasing net zero, we will not fix this problem in five minutes. The government side of the House will understand this. The only way to create a lower price during those peak load times is to have more generators. Guess what that means? It means not just maintaining our gas-fired power stations, not just maintaining the coal-fired power stations in Australia but building more. We need to build more reliable base load power from a rotating generator in this state, in this country, if we are have any chance of bringing down net zero.

If members want to chase net zero, that is fine—do it without nuclear. It is an absolute farce trying to do it without nuclear. People keep saying that nuclear will cost us money. It will but so will building a gas-fired power station and so will building a new coal-fired power station. Renewables will not fix our problem in Australia. They are definitely not going to bring down our power prices in Queensland. The proof is in this year's budget. For everyone with residential solar on their roof who was offered 44 cents per kilowatt hour, or whatever it was back in the day—a high price to get people excited about solar, to get them in and exporting back into the grid—that is now down to around eight cents a kilowatt hour. People are asking: why has it been slashed? There is no market for solar any more. If I see one more solar farm approved during this term, I will be laughing. I will be pushing against it in the Hinchinbrook electorate that is for sure.

For the first time, I am thinking about putting solar on my roof, not because I want to chase the ideology of solar—I could not care less about it—but I am making a financial decision for my family because it is too expensive to buy solar from Energy Queensland or Ergon right now in North Queensland.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (6.05 pm): The mental gymnastics at the end there are still confusing me a little. 'Solar is too expensive but I will put it on my roof now.' Jesus—I withdraw. Excuse me. Blasphemy.

**Mr Dametto** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Hinchinbrook, you have made your contribution; it is now time for the member for Maiwar.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I find it absurd that in a debate on the topics that the Katter's have put up tonight we are hearing this kind of muted, but occasionally explicit, suggestion that this is not a debate about climate change. They want to pretend that they can talk about all things renewables and all things net zero but it somehow does not have to do with climate change because they do not want to come out—nor do the government—and say that climate change is absolute bollocks, which we know is their view. We know that is the view of the Katter's and of the government because it is writ large across—

**Mr Katter:** I will say it.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Oh, he will say it! Well, let's take the interjection from the member for Traeger. He tries to pretend that it is not. We will get to the member for Traeger's selective reference to CSIRO. He calls on CSIRO in his contribution and wants to pretend somehow that they support his position.

Has the man spent half a minute looking at the GenCost report put out by CSIRO last year which showed—without any question—that renewables and storage is far and away the cheapest option for power generation in Queensland?

**Mr KATTER:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence to the comment that was made earlier.

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

**Mr BERKMAN:** I withdraw. I will avoid whatever thin skin I can in future. He talks about CSIRO and now, he wants to pretend that he is not relying on CSIRO—

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Like I cannot watch it on the TV. Jesus, these people are idiots. The member for Hill sits here and asks the question rhetorically: how stupid are we? How stupid do they think we are?

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order related to unparliamentary language.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I caution you to be a bit more careful in your language.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Indeed. I will make it clear, from this point on, that I have no interest in further interjections from the Katter's Australian Party so if they choose to interject, we will leave it right where it sits.

**Mr Dametto** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Hinchinbrook, if you want to be here for the vote, I caution you to cease your interjections.

**Mr BERKMAN:** It is absurd that these members come in here and they want to talk about the cost of power generation, firstly, flagrantly ignoring the actual facts that CSIRO have put out about the costs of renewables and storage and, secondly, flagrantly ignoring the very real human and economic costs that climate change is wreaking on their very communities, year in year out. How many cattle does the member for Traeger reckon have been lost in his electorate with the floods that have rolled through the electorate? Is he going to pretend that has nothing to do with climate change? Is he really going to pretend that the loss of human life across this state—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Maiwar has the call.

**Mr BERKMAN:** How stupid are we? How stupid do they think we are?

**Mr SPEAKER:** I would caution you on your language once again, member for Maiwar. This is the Queensland parliament.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Mr Speaker, I am simply quoting the member for Hill in his contribution, but I will move on. We had at least a brief—

**Mr Katter:** Reference it.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I take the interjection; those were his very words. The member for Traeger should look at the record. He asked, 'How stupid are we?', and I ask the member for Traeger again: how stupid does he think we are?

I will turn for a moment to the contribution of the member for Glass House, our climate change minister, who again puts this absurd position that he believes in climate change as though climate science is an article of faith. I know that he himself is a man of faith, but you do not get to believe or disbelieve in science. You either understand it and you act appropriately, or you just do not get it. That man sitting on the ministerial benches and supposedly representing Queensland's interest on the environment does not get it. He is the same man who came into power under Newman in 2012 and gutted the office of climate change. He set back decades—

**Ms Leahy:** Through the chair.

**Mr BERKMAN:** I am speaking through the chair.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will look after the House.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Yes, they can allow you to look after the House. It is absolutely gobsmacking to hear this man talking about how he believes in climate change.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr BERKMAN:** Of course there is an argumentative tone to this because just about every member left in this House wants to deny the realities of climate change. They want to treat Queenslanders like we are fools and as though we do not see the cataclysmic climate impacts that are coming our way. I cannot find myself voting for either the motion or the amended motion. I will not be staying here to vote for either of them, but I want it on the record that both of these parties are full of deniers; they are full of climate deniers who are going to trash our state's future.

*(Time expired)*

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

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106 (10).

Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

1. acknowledges the government's commitment to make energy affordable, reliable and sustainable;
2. notes the investment into our power stations through the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee;
3. notes the decision of the government to extend the life of our coal-fired power stations to ensure supply; and
4. notes the government's investment in Queensland's gas industry in this year's budget, including funding for power stations and new exploration areas.

## PLANNING (SOCIAL IMPACT AND COMMUNITY BENEFIT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1994, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

**Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (6.17 pm), continuing: As I was saying, last week Minister Perrett and I had the opportunity to meet with some farmers who put into stark contrast the difference between the obligations put against them versus someone looking to use the land for renewable energy projects. Did honourable members know that farmers need to apply for an MCU to allow them to convert a paddock that is being used for cattle to an orchard? However, if they were to put in renewable energy, no MCU is required. We can and we should do better.

The legacy of the current process here in Queensland means that there are 77 schemes and 77 processes and councils are being overwhelmed and challenged by large corporations. Solar farms have been assessed differently to wind farms, which are treated differently to other energy projects. Once we start looking at how different local governments and different local government planning schemes are applied, it is obvious: the capacity to manage these processes is affecting outcomes and having impacts to the detriment of our communities. Our communities live with the impact of these developments from the start to the end, be it the haulage damage, the temporary workforces or the market changes which affect the pricing on everyday goods, housing, infrastructure and local services. Yet until this legislation, there has been no formal requirement for a proponent to commit to delivering community benefits, unlike other resource related projects.

This bill is about restoring fairness and trust to Queensland's planning framework because regional Queenslanders deserve a framework that works for them. The current one is not working. Imagine if wind turbines were deemed approved on Mount Tamborine or Mount Coot-tha. I can only hypothesise that the communities of South-East Queensland would be lining up to support these changed laws.

I thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee for their work in progressing all of the submissions and for the time the committee invested in visiting communities including Rockhampton for their public hearings. I note the committee recommended that the bill be passed. I am proud to be part of a Crisafulli LNP government that is stepping up. We will ensure that communities are given voice and that every energy project is treated fairly. We will restore accountability for projects and provide improved transparency for our communities.

**Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (6.20 pm): I rise to make a contribution on this bill. I was very lucky to serve on the committee as a replacement for the member for Kurwongbah for much of this.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr WHITING:** Yes, it is true; I was on the magical mystery tour up in the air copiloted by the member for Mirani. We did joke that he should not touch the controls, but when he sat in the copilot seat I really did think we could have some issues. I am not quite sure what the objective was. Was it to convince us that maybe renewables are bad and there should not be wind farms? I am sorry if that was the case. It was informative, but he did not change our minds, but thanks very much anyway.

One of the things I want to talk about—and this goes to some of the amendments that we are dealing with that I have just seen. I do not know if I am going to get the chance to talk about these in detail before we hit the guillotine at about 11.30 pm. I point out that under the planning changes there will be an amendment to allow development under an infrastructure designation to proceed without the need to also comply with the plans under a development control plan in Kawana, Springfield and also Mango Hill. This is a huge issue in the North Lakes area. There have been two or maybe three elections when the issue of what happens on the North Lakes golf course, which is protected by a development control plan, has been relevant. My question is: does this amendment open up the way for the approval of a development on the North Lakes golf course that contravenes the existing development control plan? I think that is a legitimate question. If it does, that is a big change in the LNP position.

When I said that this issue was a part of the last couple of elections, the LNP relied on the Save North Lakes Golf Course people to support it and man its booths. It received a lot of support for its candidate from the Save North Lakes Golf Course group because it made it very clear that it would keep the development control plan as sacrosanct and that no development would be approved if it contravened the development control plan. That was the clear message from the LNP, and I am wondering if that has changed. If it has, that will be a big issue for the LNP to deal with in the North Lakes area because it was so strongly against any development approval that contravened this development control plan. Luke Howarth, the former member for Petrie, was very strong in supporting this particular group by saying that no development would be approved with that development control plan and would be knocked out if any approval came for that site. We may touch on this issue later, but I wanted to make sure that I got the chance to talk about this because that is a huge difference in the LNP position if that is in fact the outcome that we see in North Lakes—that is, that there will be a route open for a developer to get approval for a proposal that contravenes the development control plan.

It was very clear from the hearings on this bill that it does impose those complex, regulatory hurdles on renewable projects. That has been talked about today and I absolutely believe that that is what we are seeing. This bill imposes red tape on the renewables industry and it creates uncertainty for investors.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr WHITING:** I heard a 'Hear, hear' from the other side. I thought that the member for Lockyer's side was campaigning on getting rid of red tape, but I am happy to be corrected if those opposite like red tape now. That is fine and we can tell people that. It is very clear that this would delay those clean energy projects or make them financially unviable, and that is something we heard from the Clean Energy Council and a group like the Queensland Farmers' Federation as well. That is a point that it made. One thing I learnt during this inquiry is that there are many members of the LNP who really do not like renewable energy. They really do not like it. I would not say that they hate it—that is maybe too strong—but they strongly dislike it and, if some of these members could have their way, they would have the Deputy Premier call in every single renewable project that is happening in that area. I suggest that that would be their dream and I think that the sector needs to think about this as a possible outcome.

Parts of this legislation deal with the Olympics and Olympics infrastructure. In this regard, this bill offers no scrutiny and no rights, and that is a shocking part of the bill that is in front of us. It will override almost every key law that protects Queensland's environment and heritage; it will strip away protections to habitats, wetlands and all kinds of natural areas; and there will be no legal right as the bill stands now to object to or even be consulted on what is happening in these areas—no legal right to object. This is shocking. This bill goes some way to undermining the rule of law or the impact of law in our state. Do not take my word for it, but as has been said tonight and said by the President of the Queensland Bar Association—and I want to say this again—

... deny access to the courts for civil proceedings in relation to development use or activity if there is a reasonable prospect that the proceeding will prevent the timely delivery of an authority venue ...

The president went on to say—

Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation.

That is quite a strong statement. As we have heard, there are 15 laws that would be overridden by this bill—15 laws including, for example, the City of Brisbane Act and the Environmental Protection Act. These projects could destroy fish habitats protected by the Fisheries Act 1994 and local councils could be stripped of their general powers to make or enforce development related decisions. That is an astounding outcome when today we have heard that one of the principles behind this bill is to make sure that councils and local communities can have their say, but part of this bill strips those very same rights or obligations away. The bill also means that there is going to be no scrutiny over Victoria Park. I would invite people to read the evidence of Dr Peach on the issues surrounding putting that infrastructure into Victoria Park. I will not say too much, but I do believe that that is a choice and that that development really does need to come under scrutiny. I believe that the issues that potentially face that venue could be more challenging or as challenging as the Gabba or QSAC.

Earlier today the Deputy Premier said that in consultation for this bill the government put everything on the table. However, I make the point that you could only get to that table if you signed a non-disclosure agreement. That is one of the things we heard from the evidence. It was quite interesting and quite shocking to hear that. One of the witnesses said that they—

> ... had an opportunity of a one-hour briefing once we had signed non-disclosure agreements that we were not going to discuss the contents of our briefing with our members or anyone who was not in the meeting. I think to characterise that as consultation would be an overreach.

This is an incredible development. There is an obligation on governments to consult. What kind of system do we have where some of our main stakeholders are asked to sign non-disclosure agreements, and bear in mind that this was about a week before the actual bill was presented to the parliament? The other thing we found out was that very few people, if any, saw the bill in any shape before it was presented. Some people were consulted about what was going on, but nobody saw this bill. There was no proper analysis or consultation and no regulatory impact statement. There was not any modelling to understand the consequences of the bill and neither the energy division of the Queensland Treasury nor the planning division of the DSDIP assessed the impact of this bill on project delays. There are many things in this bill that deserve our full attention, but we really must be aware of unintended consequences, and we have talked about this endlessly in this place. I believe that a bill of this size really needs that complete scrutiny to find what I know will be the unintended consequences that will be quite massive that flow from this bill when it does pass.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

**Hon. A LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (7.31 pm): I rise to support the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Like everything with the Crisafulli government, this bill delivers on important commitments to Queenslanders, especially those in rural and regional Queensland. Renewable energy projects, such as wind and solar farms, can have a real impact on regional communities and private landowners. My electorate knows this all too well, as do local governments across Queensland.

The bill introduces a community benefit system that establishes requirements for the social impact assessments and community benefit agreements for prescribed development applications. These changes ensure social impact and community benefit are appropriately considered and assessed before the development application is lodged. Renewable energy proponents will need to build a social licence with a host community in their local government, conduct a social impact assessment and enter into community benefit agreements with councils before starting the development assessment process. I cannot stress how welcome this legislation is, particularly in my electorate. We have listened to rural and regional Queenslanders and we are delivering meaningful consultation and benefits to the locals who actually live in those areas that are impacted by the wind and solar projects and also to the local governments.

Addressing the amendments to the South-East Queensland (Water Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 mentioned by the Deputy Premier, they provide certainty to the distributor-retailer industry and the South-East Queensland community by confirming that infrastructure charges notices already issued remain valid. Consequential amendments also provide that the distributor-retailer boards cannot adopt a charge for trunk infrastructure related to public housing or trunk infrastructure prescribed by regulation for another development. I will go into some more detail about the proposed amendments. The amendments ensure charges can continue to be levied by the South-East Queensland distributor-retailers, Urban Utilities and Unitywater, when the connection generates additional demand on water or wastewater trunk infrastructure. Further, they ensure a

consistent infrastructure charging framework for all water and wastewater service providers, whether they are distributor-retailers or local councils.

My department has partnered with the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning to ensure these amendments are consistent with those proposed in the Planning Act 2016. Planning Act amendments relate to the local government infrastructure charges framework. The existing charging framework that applies to public housing is also being clarified with consequential amendments. These amendments make it clear that the distributor-retailer boards can adopt a charge for trunk infrastructure related to public housing. It maintains the status quo arrangements for this type of development. Combined, Urban Utilities and Unitywater service over 2.3 million customers and approximately 62 per cent of the South-East Queensland region. These distributor-retailers are council owned, with Urban Utilities servicing the Brisbane, Ipswich, Lockyer Valley, Scenic Rim and Somerset local council areas and Unitywater servicing the Moreton Bay, Sunshine Coast and Noosa local council areas. The remaining south-east local councils, Logan, Redland and the Gold Coast, provide water and wastewater services in their respective council areas and issue their infrastructure charges under the Planning Act 2016. Likewise, local councils outside South-East Queensland issue infrastructure charges under the Planning Act framework.

Infrastructure charges are vital in delivering essential infrastructure for new development and are beneficial to the development industry and community alike. To provide consistency in the framework that applies to the trunk infrastructure that local councils and distributor-retailers are responsible for, the amendments being made to the South-East Queensland (Water Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 follow the amendments mentioned by the Deputy Premier in relation to the Planning Act 2016. These amendments put beyond doubt the established arrangements that support our infrastructure networks. They will ensure that the developments placing burden on our trunk infrastructure networks continue to pay their fair share. I understand these amendments to clarify the levying of infrastructure charges for the additional demand placed on trunk infrastructure are supported by both Urban Utilities and Unitywater. I commend the bill to the House.

**Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (7.36 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. In doing so I would firstly like to acknowledge the significant work of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee. All our committees work extraordinarily hard, but it is clear that a lot of work was undertaken by this committee in physically producing a report. In addition to the public hearings and briefings, there were over 1,000 submissions to their inquiry that needed to be read, let alone processed and discussed, including several hundred form submissions. We do not often see feedback that is that extensive. Their work also included an aerial inspection of wind farm and large-scale solar farm sites. I cannot mention this without referring to the statement of reservation from the opposition that questioned not only the actions of some MPs who did not actively disclose their active or perceived interest during public hearings, but also the use of taxpayer funds to fly the committee and a member of parliament with a potential conflict of interest in relation to the bill over or near a property that they own which might be impacted by this bill. The opposition referred to this as extremely concerning and setting a dangerous precedent. We all know who we are talking about, but I digress.

This bill is more of the same that we have come to expect from the LNP. Firstly because of the fundamental incoherence of fusing two significant yet entirely distinct policy issues into a single legislative instrument—Olympic infrastructure planning and renewable energy project regulation—and, secondly, because the bill, in bringing these two entirely different policy positions together, advocates for positions that are diametrically opposed to each other, which is quite breathtaking in its hypocrisy. Of course, those opposite do not care about that.

This bill proposes to cut Queenslanders out of decisions that directly affect their communities, their environment and their heritage, removing consultation for Olympic projects under the guise of efficiency. There have been a few comments from the opposite side saying that we are concerned about this bill because we are not supporters of the Olympics, which is absolutely ludicrous. We are the ones who brought the Olympics to Queensland. This bill bypasses cultural protections, heritage concerns and environmental scrutiny in an attempt to bulldoze through projects. It is not about building Olympic stadiums faster. Witnesses to the inquiry confirm that these facilities can still be delivered on time using existing legal planning pathways. In fact, the government's own 100-day review makes this clear.

On the other hand, this very same bill imposes burdensome new obligations on renewable energy projects, lifting the bar for consultation and social impact assessments to heights not even seen in coal or gas projects. In the one bill you are talking about both taking away consultation and process and

adding it. You are saying that it is okay to have the two things in one bill. It is inconsistent, it is unfair and it is ideologically driven.

During the inquiry the committee heard from industry after industry—Acciona Energy, Equis Australia, Cubico and the Clean Energy Council—warning that this bill will stall projects, drive up costs, undermine investor confidence and set Queensland's renewable transformation back years. It heard that no new wind farm applications have been submitted since this bill was introduced. That alone should set off alarm bells.

The hypocrisy of this bill is best illustrated by the very understandable responses of the gas sector—and I do not mean that the gas sector people were hypocritical. When they were asked if they would support applying these new consultation thresholds to their own projects to create a so-called level playing field, they baulked—as you would. They said it would need serious consideration. Well, of course it would.

The committee process that examined this bill was itself deeply compromised. Over 11,000 submissions were received. Virtually none supported the bill in its current form, yet the committee's report ignored them. It failed to reflect the overwhelming concern from stakeholders and undermined the very integrity of Queensland's parliamentary processes. We also learned that Treasury was not asked to model how this bill would affect electricity prices, project costs or emissions targets. The department of state development denied responsibility for consultation and modelling and then pointed at Treasury, who said the same in return. It is a merry-go-round from the bureaucracy while energy bills climb and investment dries up. The government has the audacity to do this when it has removed the $1,300 energy rebate. Before the election we had the Premier promising—there is a video of him saying it—that he would keep that rebate because it will help people keep their heads above water. Quick as a flash, he got rid of that.

The committee heard about secret stakeholder meetings where only a few were invited, bound by confidentiality agreements. Entire sectors were excluded, including the government's own energy corporations. This is just no way to legislate. We have it on record that investors who have just refined their renewables framework will likely return to New South Wales. I know that the government wants this and is already turning us all blue. It is obviously very New South Wales focused. Now it is ensuring our investment heads over the border as well.

This bill is so flawed that it even manages to sneak in amendments that remove diversity requirements from the Olympic organising committee's board, eliminating a mandate for gender parity and Indigenous representation. On the news tonight the new federal leader, Sussan Ley, was talking about the importance of setting quotas and having more women. Clearly, the two parties do not talk. We are in a time when the world is pushing for inclusiveness and transparency, and this government is going backwards. When we came to government after the LNP in 2015, there were 32 per cent women on government boards. We set a target of 50 per cent women on government boards and we achieved that. By the time the election came at the end of last year, we had just over 50 per cent. We were not asking for more women but not fewer women either—gender parity. Even if you do not support gender parity, there is irrefutable evidence that by having diversity on a board you are more likely to make better decisions and even be more economically successful. Let's not even go there about them eliminating Indigenous representation on the board. It is very clear that this government places no value on the First Nations people of Queensland and is not interested in any way in them being represented at any level or in any form of our society.

This bill challenges the rule of law and threatens judicial independence. As KC Cate Heyworth-Smith of the Bar Association warned, its clauses represent a 'breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals' and a 'challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court'. She cautioned of likely High Court challenges, cost blowouts and project delays—exactly what the Deputy Premier claims this bill is meant to avoid.

Let us not forget, first and foremost: Queenslanders still have the right to be heard. They may not always stop a development, but they deserve the right to have their say. This bill robs them of that right. Shame on them.

**Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (7.44 pm): I will briefly respond to the final comment from the member for Bulimba. Public consultation is the vast majority of what this bill brings into legislation. This bill and what it delivers to Queensland highlights the most important issue for the people of Callide. I have had many thousands of conversations with constituents and there have been phone calls and correspondence to my office. From this, it is clear that the status quo is not working for Queensland. It is not working for rural and regional Queensland—the communities that are the backbone of this state

and that generate significant wealth and prosperity for our country. These many conversations have influenced how I go about advocating for the people of Callide.

I have had lengthy conversations with the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer and energy minister about what is needed for the pathway in Queensland. It is fantastic to be part of a government that is making the changes needed to align with community expectations. The reality is: I would need hours to properly articulate in this House the varying and conflicting views of the constituents of Callide and the experiences people have had. Having heard of their experiences, I very much feel for those constituents who have been in various fights. I also appreciate that some landholders are seeking the economic opportunities that might come with solar and wind projects. Realistically, I could probably write a book about it. There are numerous challenges, concerns and opportunities. I will just touch on them, because in the time I have that is all I will be able to do.

Firstly, why did I come to this parliament? One of my key principles is my belief in the property rights that underpin what this nation was built upon. I am incredibly passionate about rural and regional Queensland. I have been fortunate to live in another country. Canada is a fantastic place, but in my time living there I could not help but remind myself how great Australia is and the communities I grew up in on the Darling Downs. I support the industries that underpin our national sovereignty and prosperity. I spend a lot of time fighting greenie activists. They call themselves greenies but sometimes you question how green they really are. I am a believer in the free market. That is my background and they are the principles that bring me to this place. That does underpin what I am trying to do in helping the electorate of Callide navigate the future when it comes to all energy sources, including solar and wind developments.

What tears a community apart is when someone takes away its future. We saw that with the previous government saying that they backed in the workers at our coal-fired power stations. They said that they had a job security guarantee, within which were relocation packages. The people who work at those power stations and in those communities want to live there. They do not want to pack their bags and move somewhere else. That is why we need a future in those communities.

Changes with due process that significantly change the landscapes of those communities also tear them apart, as do unanswered questions. Many community members have a lot of questions that have never been answered, and they deserve those answers. I work with developers for solar and wind projects. I sit down with them and relay a lot of those questions. Some companies are very good and have the facts and information and are working to address the concerns. Others are not. I say to those that are not: you had better get working if you want a future in Callide.

Of course, there has been a lack of consultation. Callide has been at the forefront of previous industry developments by companies that nearly lost their social licence because they came in to steamroll communities and they thought they could get away with it. That is not something that I will stand by and watch. My focus for the people of Callide is very outcome driven. It about a future for our communities. It is about cohesive communities. It is about neighbours that want to get on with one another. I have spent a lot of time working with potential developers and I tell them that if they want me to support their project then they need to make sure their neighbours and the community are on board with that project. I acknowledge that some companies have gone to lengths to work with their neighbours and the community, but some have not.

Farming is tough. Farmers have to deal with a lot of red tape. I appreciate that some landholders want to seek other economic opportunities for their land. In some instances, some farmers have land that is not very good for farming and they want to use it for other things. Where appropriate, we should support them in that. Agricultural land is precious and we need to look after it. We need to make sure that we have a good approach to do that. We have cities built on prime farmland, we have coalmines built on farmland and now we have renewable projects also built on farmland, but there is only so much of it so we have to consider all industries and the impacts of human development when progressing.

Importantly, we have to listen. I spent a lot of time, with my office staff, phone canvassing and contacting many people across the electorate. Over a period last year, we had over 1,500 conversations with constituents where we had their contact details. It was interesting to hear that the electorate is relatively supportive of solar power but very much against wind power. When it comes to those projects being constructed in their backyard or in their community, they are generally opposed but there are also mixed views and some do support it. I did that to try to inform my decision-making.

I want to read out some of the comments that people made. Some said that they like that more energy options are being explored. Others said that there has been no consultation with their communities and that things happen without anyone’s knowledge and then there is no comeback.

Others said there does not seem to be consultation with the local community and companies seem to do whatever they want. Another said that they are not keen to neighbour it. Someone else said renewable energy is good and it provides different options. Those comments came from constituents of Callide and it shows that there is a broad range of views across the electorate.

I wanted to quote some of the things said at the Biloela hearing but I will not have time to do that. I thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee and the chair for coming to Biloela. Importantly, I thank every individual who turned up at the Biloela public hearing for this important legislation. Their attendance shows how important this change is and will be for that community. I thank everyone who gave evidence there. I appreciate their passion. To the tenacious 10, I am sure I will hear from you into the future. As I said recently, we cannot call in Smoky Creek and I know that that is not what they want. However, I do not support making retrospective changes to this and setting that precedent. I know that is not what they want to hear, but I have told them that in writing and I am happy to put it on the parliamentary record, to be upfront and honest with them. Communities deserve their local representatives to be upfront with them, and that is the reality there.

I know that across my communities the councillors and mayors have been working hard to try to ensure that, whatever happens in the future, future mayors and future elected representatives can carry those communities forward. They all want to see a future for their communities. At the end of the day, we need pragmatism, we need a reasoned approach and we need to ensure we use logic in our decision-making. We need to level the playing field and listen to communities. Importantly, we need to talk facts, figures and tangible outcomes. At the end of the day, I am not ideological in how I approach this. I refer to the values that I mentioned at the start, but we need projects that have the right process and are in the right place.

**Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (7.54 pm): The Labor opposition supports renewables, we support communities having their say and we support delivering the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games—games that we proudly secured for Queensland as a lasting legacy for our state. However, Queenslanders deserve better than what this bill puts forward. This is not about supporting clean energy or delivering the games efficiently or sustainably. It is about rushed lawmaking, political pointscoring and undermining Queensland's environment, our communities and the state's global reputation.

The Crisafulli LNP government has brought forward legislation that, in its current form, stakeholders have variously labelled as legally dangerous, environmentally reckless and economically short-sighted. It damages investor confidence in our state, sidelines local communities, strips away hard-won environmental protections and hands ministers extraordinary powers without proper checks or balances. Queenslanders deserve legislation that strengthens our future, not weakens it.

In respect to the Olympics, as I said earlier Labor backs the Brisbane 2032 games. Of course we do. These are games that our former Labor government secured for Queensland. We believe in their potential to bring lasting benefits to Queensland: jobs, investment, tourism, a platform to celebrate our state on the global stage and a platform to showcase our stunning natural environment. We live in a stunning country but Queensland is most definitely the jewel. It is the most biodiverse state in the country. It is no coincidence that we have the most World Heritage properties in the country.

However, this bill gives Olympic projects unprecedented legal exemptions, stripping away protections under Queensland's key environmental planning and cultural heritage laws. As rightly raised by key environmental stakeholders, the Queensland Conservation Council and the Environmental Defenders Office, which represent thousands of Queenslanders who are deeply committed to preserving our unique natural and cultural heritage, all infrastructure, even for the Olympics, must consider its environmental impact. No Queenslander voted for koala habitat to be bulldozed or for cultural heritage to be ignored. As rightly pointed out by the Queensland Law Society and the Queensland Bar Association, the courts may be silenced in the name of Olympic deadlines. No Queenslander voted for that either.

However, this bill gives Olympic projects unprecedented legal exemptions, stripping away protections under Queensland's key environmental planning and cultural heritage laws. This bill overrides cornerstone laws: the Planning Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the Nature Conservation Act, the Vegetation Management Act, the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act and more. Those are laws that protect our natural environment, our cultural heritage and our communities.

The bill removes established assessment and approval processes, allowing developments associated with Olympic infrastructure to bypass safeguards without clear or transparent criteria, bypassing the rules that every other project must follow. This bill imposes a sweeping ban on civil

proceedings that might delay Olympic infrastructure. That means no legal action to challenge unlawful approvals. Of course that would be of concern to communities. Of course that would be of concern to the conservation sector, to the legal fraternity and to traditional owners.

Regardless of the protestations of the government that it is only for a limited purpose and it would not be misused, we are talking about a government that this week did not fund the independent community environmental legal service, the EDO, which could help to hold them to account on such matters. It is another example of saying one thing when in opposition and doing another when in government. Why would anyone have confidence in the government not to abuse these provisions and not to set a precedent from which they decide to conveniently build?

We all know that the LNP have no credibility on the environment and environmental protection, particularly given such notable quotes given in this place by the architect of this legislation, 'Dredge, baby, dredge!' or a personal favourite from the member for Burdekin, 'I'll sign. You drill.' We need all the robust environmental protections we can get with the LNP in government. The Bar Association of Queensland has warned that the rule of law must not be a casualty in the battle for the efficient development of Olympic infrastructure. That is what is at risk here.

Then there is the erosion of First Nations cultural heritage. The bill replaces genuine negotiated cultural heritage management plans with a rushed developer-led process. Traditional owners are given tight and inflexible timeframes, and if they cannot reach agreement the developer's plan is imposed by default. It strips away the right to seek injunctions to protect cultural heritage. It reduces access to the Land Court. It risks violating the Human Rights Act and the fundamental rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples. The Environmental Defenders Office, the Queensland Conservation Council, legal experts and First Nations voices have all sounded the alarm. Queensland can deliver the games in a way that respects our laws, our environment and our First Nations communities, but this bill fails that test.

In respect of renewable energy, Queensland should be leading the global race for clean energy investment. We have the resources and the workforce, which positions us with ample opportunity to power our future with renewables. Make no mistake: it is only a strong renewable pathway that will allow Queensland to effectively reduce its emissions and to meet its emissions reduction targets—something this government claims it is committed to, but we know that it is not really.

This bill sends that message clearly. It imposes unprecedented red tape on renewable energy projects, forcing them to complete mandatory social impact assessments and community benefit agreements before they can even apply for development approval. Of course, social impact and community benefit are important factors—critical factors—but no other industry faces this barrier before a development application can be lodged—not coal, not gas, not mining and not large agribusiness. If the government is really genuine about community consultation and it believes this is the right and best way, it should provide the same opportunity to all industries to build equally strong social licence and level the playing field, as the member before me said.

The Queensland Renewable Energy Council, the Law Society and even regional councils have warned these provisions will delay projects, increase costs and drive investment interstate. Some 66,000 megawatts of renewable projects are in the pipeline. These projects are vital to meeting Queensland's emissions targets, creating regional jobs and securing cheaper, cleaner and more reliable energy. Queensland families and businesses need cheaper, cleaner and more reliable energy now that so many families have no energy rebate to call on.

Labor believes in community benefits, but these assessments must be made fairly, consistently and at the right time through proper planning processes. Requiring these before the project can even go through a development approval has the potential to cut a good project off at the knees before it can prove its worth. Look at the evidence: MacIntyre Wind Farm underestimated its workforce by hundreds of jobs; and the Aldoga Solar Farm created Australia's first solar supply chain using Queensland steel. These benefits emerged as the projects evolved, not before the sod was turned.

Locking in rigid agreements too early risks missing those benefits altogether and councils will be left to pick up the pieces. Smaller regional councils say they lack the resources and expertise to manage complex community agreements. They are being set up to fail—without funding, without training and without support. Queensland should be making it easier to build solar and wind projects to benefit our communities and the environment, not making it harder than digging a coalmine.

We back proper planning for renewables through renewable energy zones, coordinated state assessments and genuine community consultation. This bill delivers none of that. It is designed that way because this LNP government could not do much more to make it clear that they do not support a

renewable pathway. They are ideologically opposed to it. Many on that side of the House are probably still denying the science. I have stood in this House time and again calling on the government to tell Queenslanders what their plan is for energy transition, but we know they do not have one. They only have a plan for a plan.

Labor supports the games. We support communities. We support renewable energy. We support the rule of law. We certainly do not support stripping away protections under Queensland's key environmental planning and cultural heritage laws or the right of Queenslanders to have a say. Queenslanders deserve better.

**Mrs KIRKLAND** (Rockhampton—LNP) (8.03 pm): I rise today to speak in strong support of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is a landmark step in reshaping Queensland's planning framework to better reflect the values of fairness, transparency and community empowerment. This bill is not just a technical amendment; it is a statement of intent. It says that development in Queensland must be not only economically viable but also socially responsible. It says that communities like mine in Rockhampton deserve a seat at the table when decisions are being made that affect their future.

At the heart of this bill is the introduction of a community benefit system into the Planning Act 2016. This system requires proponents of certain large-scale developments, such as wind farms and solar farms, to undertake a social impact assessment and enter into a community benefit agreement with the local government before lodging a development application. As a former councillor for Rockhampton Regional Council with the portfolios of water and environment, the recklessness of existing legislation became increasingly obvious. I was not alone in questioning the impacts to our communities that I was observing within my role.

A prime example of the shortcomings that this bill addresses is state code 23, which governs wind farm development in Queensland. While well-intentioned, the code has been widely criticised for its lack of enforceable community consultation requirements and limited transparency. It allowed wind farms to proceed with minimal local input, often leaving communities feeling sidelined. This bill begins the correction of rushed cart-before-the-horse legislation and building codes, flipping the script. It front loads community engagement, requiring developers to build social licence and demonstrate how their projects will deliver lasting, positive outcomes for host communities.

In Rockhampton, where renewable energy projects are increasingly part of our economic landscape, this reform is especially relevant. Our region has the land, the sun and the wind, but we also have people who care deeply about their environment, about their livelihoods and about their future. This bill ensures that their voices are heard and that their needs are met. Beyond planning, the bill also amends the Economic Development Act 2012 to enhance the governance of Economic Development Queensland. These changes will help drive housing supply in priority development areas, which is another issue of great importance to Rockhampton where housing affordability and availability continue to remain as pressing concerns.

Let us not overlook the amendments to the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021. These changes streamline governance and ensure that the legacy of the 2032 games is one of inclusion, efficiency and long-term benefit not just for Brisbane but for all of Queensland. For Rockhampton, this legacy includes vital Olympic infrastructure projects, such as a world-class venue for rowing and canoeing. These investments not only put our regions—plural—on the global sporting stage but also serve as enduring legacy assets for local recreation, tourism, housing and economic development.

The bill helps facilitate these developments by strengthening planning pathways and aligning them with the community's expectations. Importantly, the Local Government Association of Queensland—LGAQ—which represents councils across the state, has thrown its support behind this bill, recognising its potential to empower local governments and deliver better outcomes for communities. The State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee noted in its report that the bill enhances transparency, empowers local governments and provides certainty to industry. These are not just bureaucratic improvements; they are tangible steps toward a more inclusive and accountable planning system.

For Rockhampton, this bill means more than legislative reform; it means that when a wind farm is proposed near Gracemere or a solar project is proposed near Stanwell our community will have a formal role in shaping the outcome. It means that benefits, whether in the form of local jobs, infrastructure or environmental offsets, will be negotiated up-front and not as an afterthought. It also

means that our local council will be better equipped to advocate for our interests, and that developers will have a clear framework for earning the community's trust.

This is planning done right. It is planning that respects people. It protects places and it promotes prosperity. I commend this bill to the House.

**Ms MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (8.09 pm): I value good planning. I see its worth and I recognise the impact it can make in our communities and our state. In my previous life, I spent over a decade working in planning—both in the public and private sectors—and I saw the positive outcomes that can be achieved with strong planning guided by community buy-in.

Planning certainty is also important. One of the key issues that any housing or infrastructure investor will tell you is critical to their developments or projects is planning certainty. Planning certainty matters: it impacts investment decisions, it supports community expectations and it provides clear transparency around decision-making. Unfortunately, the bill before us is less about planning certainty and more about ideology—and that is a dangerous thing because it would seem that the Crisafulli LNP government is only interested in undermining the clean energy transition in our state by imposing a unique frontloaded framework onto renewable projects that require mandatory assessments and agreements before development applications can even be lodged.

The bill amends a number of Queensland acts to introduce a 'community benefit system' into the state's planning approval framework for specific developments. This includes two components—a social impact assessment and a community benefit agreement. The bill provides that developments that require a social impact assessment, or SIA, will be prescribed by regulation. If an SIA is required, the development application must be accompanied by an SIA report and a community benefit agreement made with the local governments in affected local government areas. A consultation version of the draft Planning Regulation was tabled during the explanatory speech and indicates that developers of wind farms and large-scale solar farms will be subject to the community benefit system proposed in the bill.

Despite the Premier directing his planning minister to ensure that renewable energy projects face consistent approval processes with mining and agriculture, the bill does the opposite. The Queensland Law Society summed it up when they said—

... these reforms are likely to adversely impact the renewable energy industry in Queensland in a way that is inconsistent with other types of development under the planning system, or resources projects under other legislation.

Singling out renewables with heavier, pre-lodgement obligations does seem to create an unfair, anticompetitive framework and you cannot help but wonder whether this is really about slowing Queensland's clean energy transition. It is so hard to understand why the LNP does not want renewable energy projects or investment to succeed in our state. They are sending a terrible message to renewable energy investors that Queensland is simply not open for business—that and appointing the member for Mudgeeraba as the trade minister.

A recent member survey by the Queensland Renewable Energy Council found low levels of confidence in current state government policies regarding investment certainty. About 26 per cent of respondents 'strongly disagreed' with the statement that the Queensland government's policy settings effectively promoted investment certainty in renewables; 33 per cent 'disagreed'; and 35 per cent were 'neutral' in response to the statement. So a staggering 94 per cent either disagreed or were neutral about the LNP government's policies—94 per cent!

Given the lack of any meaningful consultation on this bill, there are of course practical considerations that have not been considered. The Queensland Renewable Energy Council submitted that often the parameters of a project are not fully understood until later in the development process and that this could lead to the SIA and CBA having to be revised multiple times before an application is ready for approval. As they advised—

We are particularly concerned by the requirements to complete an SIA and a CBA before lodging a development application. This approach is unprecedented. We recommend that these be embedded within the DA [Development Application] assessment process, in line with other jurisdictions and the resources sector. This would avoid prematurely binding landholders, reserve local government resources for credible projects, enable a more integrated, staged process aligning CBAs, impact assessment and conditioning.

As referenced in the committee report, the Central Highlands Regional Council expressed a similar concern, submitting that the SIA and CBA will occur before the detailed reports and plans have become available at the development assessment stage and that this information is key to appropriately understanding impacts and potential solutions. Again, without early consultation, no implementation plan or any clear strategy on how local governments will be expected to take on these new complex

responsibilities, local governments are rightly concerned. Local governments submitted to the committee that they lack the specialist expertise, staffing and funding needed to assess SIAs and negotiate community benefit agreements. They want more support from the state government including state funded training, model contract templates and support by the state when their capacity is exceeded.

It is important that we support local governments through this significant transition to renewables. This is work that the former Labor government was progressing through the release of a Draft Renewables Regulatory Framework. The framework proposed reforms to strengthen environmental considerations, improve community engagement whilst supporting regional economic development and project delivery. We recognise the issues of concern for our local governments and community. As the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council submitted—

> In Isaac, we do welcome renewable investment but the speed, scale and complexity of the transition is running well ahead of the rules meant to manage it. Currently, our regions have no tools or framework to guide development, minimise impacts or maximise benefit for the people and communities that are at the forefront of the renewables boom.

The Local Government Association of Queensland recommended that the government ensure a coordinated approach to the development of renewable energy initiatives across state government agencies, including the development of a renewable energy roadmap—that would be good—a mandatory code of conduct for renewable energy proponents, a social licence toolkit, as well as changes to statutory and non-statutory planning instruments. As the committee report found, similar sentiments on the need for a coordinated approach were also expressed by other stakeholders from the local government and energy sectors.

We have a bill before us that has been rushed, with inadequate consultation and of course through the prism of a policy vacuum when it comes to energy policy—no assessments done on the impact of project delays and cost, investment confidence, energy prices or emissions targets; no modelling; and no discussion with the Australia government on what this means for national climate commitments. How embarrassing for Queensland.

I also welcome the shadow minister's amendments to mandate the timely publication, within five business days, of all assessment and approval documents for games venues, villages and related transport infrastructure, to create a public register of Olympic related venues and to require statements of reasons for any legislative overrides. Queenslanders deserve to know what the government is doing when it comes to Olympic infrastructure approvals, especially given the bill will be removing established assessment and approval processes, bypassing numerous environmental, planning and heritage laws. Queenslanders deserve transparency, good governance and good planning. Sadly, they will not find it in this bill.

**Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (8.16 pm): I rise to speak in support of one of Queensland's important pieces of planning reform for our state—the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is not just about process; it is about people. It is about ensuring our fast growing community like the Redlands are not simply places on a map for developers but thriving, well-planned places where people live, work and raise families—communities that are heard, respected and left better off.

This week the Queensland parliament aims to pass legislation that does exactly that. It delivers a stronger voice for communities in major developments. It improves transparency and local input. It ensures that projects, especially major or state significant ones, deliver long-term social benefits. Critically, for the Redlands it clears the way for Olympic legacy projects like the Birkdale Community Precinct and the Redland Whitewater Centre to progress with certainty and momentum.

This bill introduces a new community benefit system into the Queensland planning framework—a real step forward for public engagement. Under these reforms, project proponents will be required to engage early, build social licence and work with local governments and the communities affected. That means no more tick-a-box consultation at the end of the process. Instead, it is frontloaded, with meaningful community involvement before development applications are even lodged. That is a win for Redlands residents who have, for too long, felt that local voices have been drowned out by bureaucratic noise or development timelines.

The planning bill makes amendments to several key pieces of legislation including the Planning Act 2016, the City of Brisbane 2010, the Local Government Act 2009 and the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016. At its heart it is about delivering better outcomes, not just more paperwork.

As the member for Redlands, I have advocated strongly for these reforms because I know how passionate our community is about protecting what makes Redlands special: our natural environment,

our neighbourhood character and the lifestyle we all value. That is why I am proud this bill gives local councils a greater role in shaping what community benefit looks like, because it is not just about whether a project fits within zoning rules; it is whether it leaves a positive legacy, whether it builds better transport links, delivers park and green space, supports housing where it is needed or creates new local jobs. That is what residents expect and that is what they deserve.

This bill also strengthens planning governance and streamlines approval for our state's Olympic infrastructure, ensuring Queensland is games ready in 2032 and that local communities like the Redlands see real, lasting benefits from this once-in-a-generation opportunity. The Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act has also been updated through this bill to enable the more effective delivery of games venues, villages and transport infrastructure. That includes projects identified in the 2032 Delivery Plan such as the Redlands Whitewater Centre, a facility that will not only host Olympic competition but continue as a high-performance training centre, recreational facility and tourism drawcard for decades to come. The Birkdale Community Precinct, which includes the whitewater venue, is being designed as a lasting community asset—a hub of green space, recreation, culture and heritage. Thanks to this bill, planning pathways for this Olympic legacy project are now clearer, more efficient and more responsive to community needs. Importantly, these projects are backed by both state and Commonwealth funding, helping ensure they are delivered without placing the burden on local ratepayers. That is a smart, responsible approach to growth that Redlands will welcome.

The bill also amends the Economic Development Act 2012 to ensure Economic Development Queensland can better focus on its core task: increasing housing supply and delivering homes in priority development areas. That means more housing where it is needed with appropriate infrastructure and planning to support it. In our region, as we plan for population growth across areas like Southern Thornlands and the Redlands coast, these reforms are timely. They will help ensure developments include up-front consideration of transport, schools, health care and community infrastructure. No more reactive planning; no more last-minute scrambling. This is about anticipating the needs of a growing region and meeting them in partnership with the people who live there.

The bill also strengthens governance arrangements for Olympic delivery, including streamlining the work of the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority, GIICA. GIICA's role has been clarified and focused to deliver games venues on time, within budget and in line with community expectations. The bill ensures these venues are built to last, with primary legacy uses such as housing, sport and recreation in mind. There are also safeguards to ensure that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander cultural heritage is respected through a clear alternative process for engagement and consultation.

This legislation is a milestone for Redlands. It delivers on what our community has asked for: transparency, early engagement and a genuine say in shaping our future. It ensures that projects we are proud of like the Birkdale precinct and the Redlands Whitewater Centre can move ahead with confidence, supported by streamlined processes, clear governance and a strong community oversight. It reinforces our commitment to making the Olympic and Paralympic Games a legacy that reaches well beyond the 17 days of competition into the homes, parks and neighbourhoods of the Redlands coast and beyond.

In closing, I thank the planning minister and all those involved in developing this bill. It is smart reform, it is people-first reform, and it is legacy-building reform, because growth is inevitable, but positive legacy is a choice. Through this legislation, today we have chosen to give communities like Redlands the stronger voice they deserve.

**Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (8.23 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I do so as a proud member of the Queensland Labor opposition, a party that supports smart planning, clean energy and a games legacy that delivers for all Queenslanders. What we have before us today is a bill that does none of those things well. It is a bill borne not of thoughtful consultation or strategic reform but of political convenience, rushed drafting and a complete disregard for transparency and good governance.

The opposition supports better community engagement and benefit sharing in planning, especially for large-scale projects. We also support renewable energy jobs and we strongly support the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, but this bill is not reform; it is regulation by ambush. That is why I support a move to split the bills to deal with renewables in one bill and the Olympics element in another, with the remaining Economic Development Queensland amendments going into one of those two split bills.

Let me start with the so-called social impact assessment and the community benefit agreement framework. In principle it is a worthy idea, but in practice the Crisafulli LNP government has created an unworkable mess. This bill forces renewable energy proponents to complete extensive social assessments and negotiate binding community agreements before even lodging a development application, before a single drawing is submitted, before stakeholders even know what is being built. I do not know about anyone else here, but I do not think that is sensible policy. It will result in delays, uncertainty, potential cost blowouts and a threat to Queensland's clean energy future.

The LNP has a weird obsession with renewables. There is an antirenewable sentiment running through their veins—like the antirenewable member for Mirani, who I understand from media reports commandeered a committee flight just to complain about his personal circumstances. Many local councils, particularly in our region, have made it clear that they are not resourced for what this bill is proposing. They do not have the staff, the skills or the budget. Councils like Banana shire and Townsville have told the committee in no uncertain terms that they simply cannot shoulder the burden the LNP is dumping on them.

Developers like Acciona, Arc Energy and the Queensland Renewable Energy Council are equally alarmed. They have warned that the bill's pre-lodgement requirements are unworkable. It is unprecedented and it risks killing projects already years in the making. One developer explained it best. When they first scoped a wind project they expected 12 full-time jobs, and in reality it turned out to be 40. You cannot capture that benefit before the details are known. This government talks a big game about reducing red tape—

**Mr Stevens:** How many wind farms in Lytton?

**Ms PEASE:** I will take that interjection. If those opposite bothered to take note, the Port of Brisbane is in my electorate, and the Port of Brisbane has been the host of many wind turbines that have come through, so thank you for letting me highlight that. I am so thrilled to highlight that. Thank you very much—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr McDonald): Member for Lytton, direct your comments through the chair, thank you.

**Ms PEASE:** This government talks a big game about reducing red tape—I remember they are also very good at doing the chicken dance—yet here they are smothering renewables with it while letting fossil fuel projects off the hook entirely. There is no requirement for a coalmine to go through a community benefit agreement, but a tiny solar farm? You bet! Despite the LNP Premier, the member for Broadwater, directing his planning minister, the member for Kawana, to ensure that renewable energy projects face consistent approval processes with mining and agriculture, this bill does the opposite. It imposes a unique front-loaded framework onto renewable projects that require mandatory assessments and agreements before developments can even be lodged. As QREC explained—

> This new pre-application requirement is completely different to the resources industry process in Queensland. Several other key aspects of the proposal go significantly beyond what would typically be considered equivalent to resources, clearly exceeding their requirements.

When the committee asked if these requirements should apply to non-renewable projects, proponents of fossil fuel developments firmly said no. Rather than aligning approval processes, the bill entrenches a more onerous system on renewables, creating a two-tiered framework that undermines Queensland's energy future.

Given this, it is clear that the bill as proposed serves only to disincentivise renewable energy investment in Queensland. The opposition can only assume that this serves to feed the Crisafulli LNP government's ideological objection to new and emerging forms of energy creation, apart from nuclear. That is not levelling the playing field; that is tipping it straight back into the 20th century. All roads lead back to their fear and their contempt for renewables. Like I said, it runs through their veins.

The more we address in this bill, the more problems we find. The changes to Economic Development Queensland strip away the independence of one of the state's key development agencies. Ministers will now have unchecked power to sack the CEO and board members at will—no reasons, no safeguards, just raw political control. I pose the questions again. Is this good policy? Does it serve the interests of Queenslanders, or does it serve the interests of executive government?

Let us turn to the Brisbane Olympics. Labor brought the games to Queensland. We fought for them and we back them, but this bill risks turning a once-in-a-generation opportunity into a textbook case of executive overreach. It overrides every major environmental, heritage and planning law in this state. It wipes away protections for koala habitats. The member for Redlands was talking about how

good it is for them. What about your koala habitats down there? Member for Redlands, have you been standing up for the koalas in your electorate? Sorry, you do not get a vote from them. It silences communities, erodes the rights of traditional owners and excludes local councils from decision-making. This bill creates a special process—

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms PEASE:** Excuse me, I think the member for Redlands just said there are no koalas in the Redlands. I think that is interesting to hear. Thanks for alerting the parliament to that, member for Redlands. This bill creates a special process—

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

**Ms PEASE:** I withdraw. I grew up in the Redlands and I know for sure that there are koalas in the Redlands, so thank you very much. This bill creates a special process for cultural heritage that does not require consent—

**Mrs STOKER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Redlands took personal offence. She was being verballed by the member for Lytton. It was withdrawn. She cannot then double-down and do it yet again.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will look after the behaviour in the House, member for Oodgeroo.

**Ms PEASE:** Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. This bill overrides every major environmental, heritage and planning law in this state. It wipes away protections for koala habitats, coastal dunes, wetlands and even drinking water systems. It silences communities, erodes the rights of traditional owners and excludes local councils from decision-making. This bill creates a special process for cultural heritage that does not require consent, allows default plans to be imposed and removes the right to seek a stop-work order. I do not know about anyone else in this House, but I do not want to live in a Queensland that does this. It sounds like I am going back to my childhood under the days of Joh Bjelke-Petersen.

Let me be very clear. This is not consultation; this is coercion. This is effectively saying to the local government community of Queensland, 'We don't trust you. We need you but we don't trust you. We don't think you're up to the job.'

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Director your comments through the chair, member for Lytton.

**Ms PEASE:** The Bar Association of Queensland has warned that the bill's sweeping ban on civil proceedings could be unconstitutional. Legal experts agree: it breaches the rule of law and, ironically, it may delay Olympic projects even more by triggering litigation about the legislation itself.

The bill fails basic transparency tests. It allows Olympic infrastructure to proceed without public notice, without planning processes, without even an established reason for overriding Queensland laws. The public deserves better than secretive, unaccountable development with billions of taxpayers' dollars at stake. That is why the opposition is seeking amendments in consideration in detail: to allow social impact assessments and community benefit agreements to be submitted during, not before, the assessment process; to mandate publication of all Olympic infrastructure approvals and reasons for legislative overrides; to require a parliamentary vote for any additional funding, even if it is one cent over; and to replace the unconstitutional civil litigation ban with a lawful, limited safeguard that preserves the Supreme Court's authority to review government decisions.

These are reasonable, practical amendments. They protect communities without compromising project delivery. They restore transparency without delaying the games. They offer legal certainty where the government has offered only confusion. This bill is a blueprint for confusion, overreach and political interference. Queenslanders deserve better.

**Hon. AJ CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (8.34 pm): I was going to comment on the opposition's contributions later in my speech but I cannot help but react immediately. What we have seen on show in the chamber this evening by the four previous Labor speakers—the members for Nudgee, Bulimba, Jordan and Lytton—is ideology. The reason we secured more regional seats than ever in this House is the ideology of those opposite. What we heard was hypocrisy at its best. I have never heard such hypocrisy from a former environment minister like I did in the House tonight. The former Labor ministers were all proud to tout the Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro project when there was a complete disregard for environmental assessment or approval, cultural heritage, the Yuwi people and engagement with local government.

The reason we are debating the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is those opposite demonstrated blatant disregard for local government for 10 years. They showed no respect for regional and rural communities and for impact assessable developments. We have heard the member for Mirani be almost berated in this House—in fact, it was an attempt to bring him into disrepute. The member for Mirani entered this House with a mandate. He won that seat from a minor party member who sat in this House for many years after Labor lost the seat, and he won that seat because he stood up for his community. He has been accused tonight in this House of abusing taxpayers' money when what he has done is represented those communities that did not have a voice and were ignored by those opposite.

The former Labor government was happy to bring in legislation and code assessable requirements. I experienced that as the deputy mayor of Mackay, as many of my colleagues did. On this side of the House, we actually value local government. This side of the House has more members who have served in local government than the opposite side, but they get up here and speak as if they have some, I do not know—

**Mr Field:** Magic pudding.

**Ms CAMM:** Magic pudding—I will take the interjection. They know nothing about local government. They know nothing about respecting local communities. They know nothing about sitting in a council chamber having to make a decision that is then sent to the planning court because they were not given the tools under the Planning Act. I want to commend the Deputy Premier on his leadership and the way he has engaged with our local communities in regional Queensland—

**A government member:** Labor hates them.

**Ms CAMM:** I will take that interjection. Labor hates regional communities—apart from today when they flew into our regional communities. The member for Bundamba cannot even pronounce 'Bucasia Road' in my local community. He is now the laughing stock and is not welcome back in the Mackay-Whitsunday area; it is quite hilarious.

I want to speak to what is a very important bill. We are proud on this side of the House to finally see the Olympic and Paralympic Games being able to move forward with a Delivery Plan. Queenslanders spoke at the 2024 election. We do not need to hear those opposite. They think we have not engaged, but we engaged for four years and that is why we are on this side of the House. Queenslanders spoke about streamlining governance for the Olympics, a games leadership group and the Brisbane 2032 organising committee board. We will see an opportunity for government to facilitate and deliver. I heard the member for Lytton talk about the 'Brisbane games'. It is not the Brisbane games; it is the Queensland games. It is the Queensland games because the Deputy Premier engaged regional Queensland and delivered a plan that is going to encompass regional Queensland—Maryborough, Rockhampton, Whitsunday and Townsville—and we are proud of that.

I also want to speak to the amendments to EDQ, having been the former chair of planning and economic development in my time in local government at Mackay Regional Council. What I would say is EDQ left us waiting. These reforms will allow and facilitate EDQ to be agile, to be responsive and to be able to deliver where we need them to deliver, and that is bring forward development that is going to deliver not just economic outcomes but housing supply across our state.

I also want to touch on and commend the planning changes that we will see when it comes to the community benefit for solar and wind developments. I think the difference between the Clarke Creek and Lotus Creek projects was highlighted quite clearly by the member for Mirani—one was impact assessable versus one was code. My guess is those opposite would not even know where Clarke Creek or Lotus Creek are because all we have heard from Brisbane-based MPs and shadow ministers tonight is all about Brisbane. I would welcome a wind farm proponent to maybe put something up in the member for Bulimba's seat or a solar farm perhaps in the member for Lytton's seat. That would be well received, I am sure, by our communities in regional Queensland.

What this will deliver in community benefit is consistency. It will give assurance to investors that they know what the rules are in our state. We welcome renewable investment, as we have welcomed coal investment.

In my time in local government in economic development, there are good proponents and there are bad proponents, and that is the truth across the entire spectrum of investment. What we are doing is actually front-loading with a policy and then followed by legislation which sets out the rules of engagement when you want to invest in Queensland. The expectation that our community has is there be investment where you will have an impact in rural and regional communities. So they should,

because these projects may be high in capital, but they do not deliver jobs on the ground. You cannot compare a wind and solar farm with a coalmine. I get on a plane each and every week, back to my home town, with many members here on this side of the House. Most of those opposite just drive 20 minutes home, but on this side of the House many of us have to fly and then we have to drive several hours. When I do that, I am surrounded by coalminers—coalminers who have done the hard yards in ensuring the revenue that those opposite wasted is here and is invested in our state's services.

It is not too much to ask that wind, solar and renewable proponents have to invest in social capital and social impact and have to demonstrate their investment not just in Queensland so that they take the returns but demonstrate their investment in local communities where they are having an impact.

With that, this is about delivering approvals in the right location, ensuring energy transition at the right time for the right projects is received in the right parts of our state where communities want to embrace that and where proponents want to work with communities. Those opposite came into this House and accused a member who stood on a platform with a mandate from his community to stand up for his community. That is why people stand up for government. That is why people nominate to be members of parliament. People in this House should respect the integrity and the conviction that people have because those opposite—

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I am not taking the interjections from the member because I do not actually care what he has to say tonight. What we all should respect in this House is that we all sit in these chairs representing our community with conviction and we stand on issues that matter to our community. Brisbane-based MPs over there on the opposition benches gave no regard to the community in the Pioneer Valley, no regard to my community where I grew up in Mirani, in Pinnacle, in Finch Hatton, in Eungella, in Netherdale, with the Pioneer-Burdekin Pumped Hydro Project where they were prepared to destroy a community. We are now facilitating those landowners to buy back their properties. Those opposite had no regard for the natural environment, no regard for the biodiversity of the Eungella National Park and no regard when it came to the impact on our community.

They can stand up and contribute all they want tonight, but the fact is they have no credibility when it comes to managing the environment, no credibility when it comes to major projects or renewable projects, and it is only an LNP Crisafulli government that will respect communities, respect local government and ensure we get the settings right to drive investment in our state for the next generation.

**Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (8.44 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I stand in support of the statement of reservation signed by the members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee—the members for Cooper, Aspley and Kurwongbah.

I have spoken in this chamber before about the critical importance of heritage protection and genuine community consultation and planning and development. These values are not optional extras; they are essential pillars of responsible governance and public trust.

Let me be clear: I support the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Like many in the community, I am excited about the opportunity it represents. I heard the member for Whitsunday say they are the Queensland games. Well, what a pity they forgot Ipswich. I have to express my deep disappointment at the lack of investment in Olympic infrastructure for Ipswich West, just a stone's throw from Brisbane, despite our proximity and our potential.

Support for the games, however, cannot come at a cost of bypassing long established assessment and approval processes. This bill, which amends the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021, proposes significant changes to governance, project delivery and planning pathways to enable the games delivery plan to proceed on time. However, it also opens the door to Olympic related developments that bypass vital environmental, planning and heritage safeguards, with no explicit or transparent criteria provided.

The committee received over 1,100 submissions during its inquiry—a clear sign of public interest and concern. I want to highlight just a few of those voices. The Australian Institute of Architects, Queensland Chapter stated they are—

> … deeply concerned that heritage and environmental values and safeguards are at risk if Olympic-related infrastructure is allowed to bypass standard heritage and planning laws.

They argue, rightly, that Olympic developments should be subject to the same law as all other developments. Their warning is stark: the proposed amendments pose a higher risk to the state's reputation and the overall success of the 2032 games.

Another submission from the Southeast Queensland Community Alliance, a coalition of planning and environmental advocacy groups, makes it plain that the changes proposed in this bill should have been the subject of extensive community consultation before being introduced to the parliament.

Queenslanders expect and deserve transparency, accountability and meaningful community input, especially when once-in-a-generation developments are being considered. The 100 Day Review itself recommends using existing mechanisms to ensure planning and approval requirements are obtained efficiently.

Section 10.4 of the *100 day review* states—

> Queensland's existing legislative framework makes various streamlining mechanisms available to the Queensland Government.

But rather than use those mechanisms, the government has introduced this bill which will ensure communities are shut out of planning decisions in their own backyards—an incredible departure from Queensland's existing planning framework.

President of the Bar Association, Cate Heyworth-Smith KC told the committee—

> While the proposed provision has practical difficulties, which I will come to, they must not be allowed to distract from the fundamental proposition that the rule of law must not be a casualty in the battle for efficient development of Olympics infrastructure.

Let's deliver a world-class Olympic and Paralympic Games, but let's not do that at the expense of the heritage, environment and democratic processes that define us. I urge the House to listen carefully to the voices of concern and to ensure that the rush to deliver infrastructure for 2032 does not leave behind the very communities and values that make Queensland proud. As previously stated by a former member of this House, 'We do not build a better future by demolishing the past.'

**Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (8.49 pm): I rise to support the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. In one word, this bill is about delivering. We are delivering on our promise to build more homes for Queenslanders. We are delivering on our promise to listen to regional communities. We are delivering on our promise to sort out Labor's debacle and create a 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games Queenslanders can be proud of. It is this very spirit of delivery that has caused those opposite to have such a deep opposition to this bill. That is because debating it here today has awakened in them a deeply uncomfortable truth. After 10 years of chaos and crisis under those opposite—under Labor—they have absolutely nothing to show for it. Instead they are forced to sit here this evening and watch as the Crisafulli government gets on with fixing their mess and delivering the fresh start that we promised.

As the Minister for the Environment, I want to firstly touch on how important it is to modernise our planning framework to ensure all communities are treated equally because we all want an energy grid that delivers affordable, sustainable and reliable power to Queenslanders. Whilst those opposite may refuse to believe it, our energy transition is ground-up, not top-down. Every single time the former Labor government allowed large-scale renewable generation projects to be built in the backyards of regional Queenslanders, without bothering to listen to what the communities wanted, they undermined the very energy transition they claim to support. Bit by bit, community goodwill and the social licence of our energy future crumbled away. Communities were told to sit down, shut up and cop whatever Jackie Trad thought was best. That is not how you bring people with you. That is not how you create a strong social licence for energy transition, and that is not how a government should treat its citizens.

Whilst the former Labor government may have spent 10 years looking down their noses at regional Queensland, the Crisafulli LNP government is standing shoulder to shoulder with those communities. This nation-leading legislation is about ensuring regional people have their voices heard on what is happening in their own backyards—exactly like suburban communities do when there is development in their neighbourhoods. We did not stop there. Instead, we have gone one step further to create a generational legacy in countless regional communities by front-loading the requirements for renewable energy proponents to engage with the community they intend to operate in and negotiate the benefits that will flow to the region. Under the current framework, impacts are not always being identified, properly considered or mitigated to the satisfaction of the local government or the host community. Wind farms and solar farms are vast scale developments that necessitate large workforces and oversized haulage to construct. Host communities have been overwhelmed by those workforces, by the transport and the other impacts.

The Crisafulli government committed to amend laws to ensure renewable energy projects are impact assessable with approval processes consistent with other land uses like mining and agriculture.

Mining projects are subject to multiple assessment gateways and have a long-established social licence with host communities. Primary producers have experienced having to seek an impact assessment development simply to put a farm store or a farmstay on their property, while a solar farm can establish under code assessment with no public consultation or submitter appeal rights. These changes restore balance, ensuring large-scale renewable energy projects are subject to impact assessment and required to fully consider the impact they have on host communities, especially during construction. Importantly, assessing benefit will not be a matter for the distant future—a can that can be forever kicked down the road, or an obscure handshake agreement that is never really formalised. Instead it must be done up-front. No longer will the agreements based on a handshake and no longer will they engage on local benefits after they get a development approval. Wind farms are popping up in regional Queensland that are taller than 1 William Street—bear that in mind—over 280 metres to the tip of the blade. That is why regional communities feel disenfranchised—because skyscraper-type developments have been occurring in their neighbourhood and they have been powerless to have a say. Those days are gone.

I note earlier today, the member for Woodridge marched out with a few cringe-worthy one-liners and an embarrassing attempt at a scare campaign. Whilst I respect that he was one of the few shadow ministers to actually show up to work today, I suspect he wishes the opposition leader had allowed him to take the day off too. Thankfully, having heard his contribution, I do not think the House would have been poorer for his absence. For all of his scaremongering on renewable energy, I would like to remind the member for Woodridge of this: the Crisafulli government is cleaning up the mess he made. This bill will end a decade of Labor recklessly trashing support for renewable energy projects and jeopardising the industry's future in Queensland and instead, give our regional communities the voice they deserve.

When it comes to cleaning up Labor's messes, how could I not talk about the Olympic and Paralympic Games? As the Minister for Tourism, I cannot tell you how excited I am for Queensland to finally be on the front foot, making the most of the green and gold runway in the lead-up to the 2032 games. Thanks to the Crisafulli government doing the work those opposite did not, Queenslanders are finally excited about the games too. Because of the member for Murrumba our state was faced with embarrassment on the global stage—a games without correction because of a Labor government without a plan. Instead, exactly as we promised we would do, we have held our 100-day review, handed down our 2032 Delivery Plan and started getting our state ready to shine on the world stage.

This bill seeks to ensure appropriate governance, project delivery and planning pathways to enable the implementation of the 2032 Delivery Plan in time for the games. I note the comments made by my colleague, the member for Maroochydore earlier in the day: we would not be in those situation if those opposite had not wasted over 1,000 days. Part of this, too, is Destination 2045: our 20-year tourism plan. Whilst the failed former minister for tourism, the member for Cairns, decided not to show up for work today, our plan for Queensland's tourism future leverages the games to create a generational legacy for tourism following a decade of Labor neglect. That is why this bill—which provides strategic oversight and direction and allows for us to streamline processes to deliver the essential transport infrastructure and games infrastructure we need—is so important to building a post-games legacy.

Finally, I want to talk briefly about how this bill will help us build more homes for Queenslanders. The changes made by the bill support the Crisafulli government's commitment to refocus Economic Development Queensland on delivering homes in priority development areas in order to increase housing supply. That is because the LNP will always be the party of home ownership. Our shared equity scheme will help deliver homes for first homebuyers, with a government equity contribution of up to 30 per cent on new homes for a minimum of two per cent deposit. Our abolition of stamp duty for first homebuyers on new homes will drive demand and remove one of the largest barriers for young people. With this bill, we will boost supply by tasking EDQ with delivering more homes in priority development areas. The bill will promote increased administrative efficiency and flexibility and allow Economic Development Queensland to help more Queenslanders own a place that they can call home. The Crisafulli government is getting on with delivering the fresh start we promised. I commend the bill to the House.

**Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (8.58 pm): It is hard to reconcile the completely contradictory components of this bill. In some cases, it provides for better community consultation and improved approval processes which is welcomed and in others it completely removes them.

First, the bill amends the Planning Act to introduce what is called a community benefit system to the planning framework for specific development uses. The specific uses are to be set out in regulations. However, as the Deputy Premier said in his introductory speech, they will be for renewable energy

projects and no other form of development applications, or DAs. For these uses, the proponent must conduct a social impact assessment, or an SIA, and a community benefit agreement, CBA, before lodging a DA. This will require the applicant to engage and work with the community earlier in the process, not just at the DA lodgement point and later. This is really good news as our communities should be engaged early and often on large-scale developments.

We actually have good engagement examples of this in my community, such as the Lake Macdonald Dam upgrade by Seqwater. However, this example is not the norm and this legislative change is limited to renewable energy sites. The question is: what about other large-scale developments including where expansions occur, decimating safety, health and infrastructure in our peaceful communities? Should they not have the same legislated input?

Concerns were raised by RACQ that these changes would have unintended negative consequences as the present threshold fails to distinguish between utility-scale solar farms and commercial-scale installations intended primarily for self-consumption by businesses and local governments. Another issue raised was that it would only apply to wind and solar renewable projects and not large-scale battery energy storage systems. Not everyone is a good corporate citizen. Even though we have been fortunate in our community for feed-in on a storage facility, other companies may not do so.

Second, the bill makes some changes to the arrangements to the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority, GIICA, streamlining the board by reducing state government appointees from four to one, federal government appointees from four to one and vice presidents of the board from six to one, and also removing the requirement that 50 per cent of nominated directors be women and that at least one of the independent directors is Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

Third is what the government calls streamlining the approvals process for Olympic venues and villages. These changes were supported by Brisbane 2032 and the Property Council of Australia, who stated they have long championed streamlined and efficient planning. However, this could also be called abolishing approvals required under the Planning Act and a range of other acts including the Coastal Protection and Management Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the Fisheries Act, the Local Government Act, the Nature Conservation Act and the Queensland Heritage Act. As one submitter said, while the bill introduces stricter social impact scrutiny for renewable energy, it reduces oversight for state sanctioned infrastructure. This contradiction sends a clear message: environmental laws will be enforced selectively, not uniformly, which undermines public confidence in planning integrity. Over half of the submissions addressed this issue, raising risks of impacts on wildlife, including koalas, and heritage values; bypassing scrutiny; reducing transparency; and removing the oversight of courts.

A law professor from the Gilbert + Tobin Centre of Public Law submitted that they were deeply concerned as excluding the operation of certain laws is an affront to the requirements of equal and general applicability of the law to government that is fundamental to the rule of law. The department noted these issues and concerns, responding that the purpose of these amendments is to enable the timely delivery of games venues and villages. These do not allow for unchecked development with appropriate standards, and development impacts can be addressed during the design and construction, which is true, as all venues will be required to comply with necessary building and safety requirements. However, again, environmental and heritage concerns could be ignored.

Many submitters were concerned also with the impact of building a stadium in the green space of Victoria Park. One highlighted its history, which I found really interesting. The park was gazetted in 1875 as part of a global park movement which also saw the creation of New York Central Park and London's Hampstead Heath and represents the last remaining substantive inner-city Brisbane green space. Brisbane already has the lowest area of green space of any Australian capital city and a 63,000-seat stadium is going to massively impact the park. In response, the department simply reiterated that the stadium is in line with the 2032 Delivery Plan. Ex-Brisbane lord mayor Graham Quirk said earlier this year that Brisbane City Council has a policy of no net loss of green space in the city, suggesting you could potentially turn the Gabba into green space—an area much in need of it—to offset the loss. Hence, there would be a loss in one location and a gain in another.

Overall, this bill seems to be one step forward and two steps back. Without amendments, it is difficult to support it in its current form. That includes incorporating a community benefit system into all major developments, not just a selected sector. In addition, we need to see whether bypassing various acts for the Olympics passes the pub test, given it is not done for Queenslanders who have been desperately trying to provide critical accommodation for their families. This has included for our most vulnerable on private properties with examples of refusals coming constantly to my office including not

being in keeping with the streetscape. I could go on. Ultimately, I think honourable members would see why it would not pass the pub test.

My thanks go to the committee and the secretariat for the report and to the many Queenslanders who made submissions. Their input is always valued.

**Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (9.05 pm): I rise today to speak in strong support of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. A key objective of the bill is to amend the Planning Act 2016 to introduce a community benefit system into Queensland's planning framework. This bill is about making sure Far North Queenslanders have a real say in how major large-scale wind and solar projects affect their communities and ensuring they benefit, not just bear the burden of these visual monstrosities in their region.

I live and represent one of the most biodiverse regions in the world. The Chalumbin wind farm was a major wind farm development project which was proposed on the border of the Wet Tropics World Heritage area close to Ravenshoe on the Atherton Tablelands. Clearing forests to build wind turbines is an oxymoron. The Chalumbin wind farm would have cleared more than 500 hectares of forest next to the Wet Tropics World Heritage area. It would have murdered birds, bats and many other species of animals that accidentally flew into the turbines, let alone the ones that lost their habitat from the clearing. Thankfully, the community rallied, advocated and won but they should not have had to go through this fight and the stress of this. Thankfully, they did stand up for it and they won.

The community should have been consulted, and this is what this bill does. It makes it law that all new renewable projects are subject to the same rigorous approval processes that other resource projects have to go through. My community are not anti renewables; they are just anti rolling them out without consultation. This bill recognises that regions like Far North Queensland are no longer willing to be the silent host of large-scale projects while the benefits go south and the impacts stay local.

Wind farms are popping up in regional Queensland that are taller than a 40-floor building. That is higher than any building in Cairns—over 200 metres to the top of the blade. They are massive. No-one in Brisbane or South-East Queensland would want these forced on them in their backyard. The city Greens voters think these projects are great for the environment and that they are being good citizens, but they have no idea of the impact of these projects and what they do to regional Queensland. I have had many Greens voters in Far North Queensland tell me that they have switched parties as they realise how detrimental these projects are. This new legislation is for them.

This system will involve conducting social impact assessments and establishing community benefit agreements. Under this bill, developers will be required to engage with local communities before a single application hits a planning desk. They will be required to conduct a social impact assessment and they must enter into a community benefit agreement with local council. This gives councils across Far North Queensland, from Cairns to Cooktown, from the Tablelands to the Torres Strait, a real seat at the table. It means that the voices of our regional towns, our remote communities and our traditional owners will no longer be an afterthought. Far North Queensland has always done its part. We host industries that drive the economy, tourism, agriculture, resources and, for a long time, clean energy like the Barron River hydro. We are leading the state in renewable energy investment and we welcome it, but we want it done with us not to us.

This bill ensures that energy developers will no longer be able to drop massive projects into our communities without first building social licence. Developers will need to engage the Far North Queensland community up-front and negotiate community benefit agreements before projects can proceed. Local councils will have a greater leverage in negotiating outcomes for their communities. This is about working together as a community to achieve positive solutions for our region. Regional Queensland, including Far North Queensland, has hosted wind and solar farms for over a decade without a say in how these developments affect our communities. Labor had a decade to right these wrongs, and we have done it in our first 100 days. Communities like these across the Tablelands, Mareeba and the Cassowary Coast have been denied the basic rights of consultation and appeal. If the residents in Ravenshoe, Tolga and Dimbulah express opposition, the government must take notice, underpinned by the legislation.

This bill gives our rural communities a voice, a say and the power to stand up for what they want in conjunction with the government. This speaks volumes about our government. We do not just act; we plan, we consult, we listen and we act accordingly, and we deliver. We have seen too many communities wear the costs of developments with strained services, housing pressure and social disruption with little to show for it, and this bill gives us the tools to change that. It ensures renewable

energy projects and developments contribute to infrastructure, community wellbeing and long-term legacy, not just short-term profit.

This bill is not just about wind and solar farms though; it is about planning and delivering our infrastructure in the lead-up to the games. It is about removing red, green and gaffer tape holding back progress so that we can get games infrastructure underway. Although the games venues will be concentrated in the south-east, the Crisafulli government's 2032 Delivery Plan guarantees infrastructure and tourism legacy across all of Queensland, including in Cairns. We have soccer and basketball Olympic Games proposed to happen in Cairns and upgrades committed to Barlow Park. Far North Queensland is also the prime humidity training location for pre-Olympics opportunities and additional competitions. Far North Queensland stands to benefit from the 20-year tourism strategy that will flow from the games and, under the amendments, planning laws are being streamlined to ensure that the entire state is part of the Olympic opportunity. Under the amendments, there will be transparency in planning decisions, enhanced administrative flexibility for Economic Development Queensland and they replace outdated groups with new games leadership and executive groups for unified decision-making.

After years of dysfunction and delays under Labor, we are delivering, not just planning. We are planning not just for an epic Olympic Games—the best the world has ever seen—but also for legacy that will serve Queenslanders for generations. The venues, the villages and the infrastructure we build will not be temporary showpieces; they will be lasting assets for communities, including Far North Queensland. In closing, this bill is about restoring fairness and trust in Queensland's planning framework because, as it is right now, it is not working. This bill serves everyone—local governments, the construction industry and the taxpayer. This bill ensures that our communities are not hosts to development but partners in shaping it. I fully support this bill and commend the tireless work of the Deputy Premier and his team.

**Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (9.12 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill before the House. There are two key areas in terms of change in this bill. It is essentially two bills in one which stand diametrically opposite to one another—full of double standards with the front loading of red tape in one sector yet an 'anything goes approach' in another area, and that is the concern. We heard that those opposite went to the election and promised that they would instigate some of the changes that they made here. Mind you, I do not recall on a small target strategy any of this said in a very loud way out there in the community, but apparently those opposite made it very clear exactly what they were going to do. They were horse whispering in the regions about what they were going to do, but let me tell you that no-one in my electorate heard anything about it. Those opposite are saying that they promised to listen, that they promised to consult. However, the only time though that they promise to listen is when it suits them. When it does not suit them, they are not going to listen, they are not going to consult and they are going to do whatever they want.

When it comes to renewables, the changes to the planning framework applying to large-scale projects such as wind and solar farms by way of social impact and community benefits are premised on one thing—making sure that they do not go ahead. That is what it is about. These changes provide for additional consultation rights, but this is a deception. Those opposite do not believe in renewables but do not have the political courage to say it. That is the reality with regard to what is in this bill. These changes will have a chilling effect on renewable projects and will have a long-term impact on our environment and for the future of generations to come. Do not be mistaken: these changes are all about the LNP walking away from renewables. These changes expose those opposite. We need renewables, yet they are walking away from them. They are making it difficult by front loading these requirements. I have absolutely no problems—none whatsoever—with social impact assessments and community benefit agreements. However, if it is good enough for renewable energy projects, then it is good enough for projects in my electorate too.

Those opposite talk about solar farms, but let me tell members where the biggest solar farm is—on the roofs of the houses in my electorate. That is the biggest solar farm in Queensland—the roofs on the houses in all of our electorates. That is the biggest solar farm in this state, yet those opposite want to have all of these barriers to solar farms and wind farms in terms of ensuring that they meet social impact assessments and community benefit agreements, but they are quite happy to build a stadium after they went to the election, I might say, promising no new stadiums, and then they wonder why my community is upset and concerned about the impact on my electorate of a broken promise of no new stadiums. Isn't it interesting that speaker after speaker has got up in this place and talked about respecting the community, listening to the community, consulting with the community and keeping your

promises, but none of that—not one element of it—has happened to my community in McConnel, and then they wonder why we are calling out the double standards and the hypocrisy that is in this bill before the House?

**Mr Dick:** That's why the bill should've been split.

**Ms GRACE:** This is why the bill should have been split. I take that interjection from the deputy premier, who moved that amendment but which was voted down.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr McDonald): I think you meant the Deputy Leader of the Opposition there.

**Ms GRACE:** I beg your pardon?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am just correcting you: the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Ms GRACE:** Did I say 'deputy premier'?

**Mr Dick:** Those were the days.

**Ms GRACE:** Sorry: Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I join the ranks of the transport minister, who has made a similar error multiple times, but we all get things wrong sometimes.

When it comes to the Olympic and Paralympic Games, those opposite ask how we would feel and what we would say if a solar farm or a wind farm were to be dumped in my electorate or in the inner city, but those opposite are going to dump a stadium they said that they were not going to build and there has been absolutely no consultation with our community at all.

We 100 per cent won the Olympic Games. We won Brisbane 2032. We are strong advocates for the Olympic Games and I cannot wait for them to be here in 2032, but my community has concerns with a promise given. I was told that I was scaremongering at the time because the then opposition leader and now Premier, David Crisafulli, promised on more than 12 occasions that there would be no new stadium. Members of my community were saying to me, 'Grace, are you sure?' When I was campaigning—I got a swing towards me in the last election—that was the worst kept secret. Everyone around town was telling me as the then minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games that those opposite were going to build a stadium in Victoria Park.

I was accused of scaremongering. My community was saying they were concerned. There had been no consultation, there had been no discussion. They were saying, 'He is saying that there is no new stadium. Grace, are you sure?' My community are concerned about the impact. We are getting a stadium on parkland with heritage value, with Indigenous cultural value, with environmental value in very scarce parkland. They talk about a wind farm and a solar farm out west.

**Mr Krause:** You were not worried about that with the Pioneer-Burdekin, were you?

**Ms GRACE:** I will take that interjection. They worry about it out in the Burdekin, but there is no worry about it in my electorate. Somehow there is disrespect for the residents who are concerned about what is happening in their backyard with no consultation whatsoever. In fact, when those opposite talk about double standards and were their voices listened to, Rosemary O'Hagan said—

> We have actually said that it increases community rights for the people who are affected by renewable projects but it strips us of our rights, so we do not get to have the same level of consultation as we would under the normal planning acts.

No wonder they are concerned. Recently when the Premier was asked what percentage of the park he was going to take for the stadium, he said it was whatever the stadium needs. But what percentage is that? It was such a flippant response. One wonders why my community is concerned. It is alright for those opposite to stand up for their communities, to say, 'I am advocating for my community. I am listening to my community,' but I get disrespected and my community gets ridiculed because we are raising concerns—following a promise of no new stadiums—about how it is going to impact them.

What is the traffic going to be like? We are now going to get the Olympic village at the RNA and upgrades to the RNA. Where is a warm-up track going to go? We are now getting an aquatic centre in Spring Hill in very limited green space in that beautiful suburb where I grew up. There has been no consultation, there is no information, and then we get ridiculed because my community has the audacity to raise concerns about lack of consultation.

As a local member and shadow minister, I have not even been given the decency to be consulted or to be briefed about exactly what is happening in my electorate. There has been no offer—nothing. It is absolutely shameful. Andrea Lunt said—

> To us that seems illogical and it creates, as Rosemary said, a sense of inequality because it is valuing the rights of the community members who are involved or affected by renewable energy projects over the rights of those who might be impacted by Olympic authority venues.

We are not anti the Olympic Games. We are not anti the plan that is put forward if that is the plan of the government. They are the government of the day. My community are not second-class citizens and they should be treated the same way as other communities. They should be consulted, they should be informed and they should be respected.

**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (9.22 pm): I rise to address the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This legislation is yet another example of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's commitment to delivering for Queenslanders in a way that is responsible, community focused and forward looking. Whether it is restoring trust in the planning process, delivering more homes for Queenslanders or ensuring we deliver a games legacy that we can all be proud of, this legislation represents the meaningful reform that Queenslanders voted for and deserve.

I want to begin by focusing on the reforms associated with the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. As we all know, the former Labor government presided over more than three years of delay, backflips and dysfunction when it came to games planning and delivery. By doing that they jeopardised having a successful games. The former Labor state government failed to see a single shovel in the ground after 1,200 days. They failed to appoint a board to the delivery authority and failed to fund core infrastructure like the athletes villages. That is why Queenslanders voted for change—and they voted for decisive change in October last year. They voted for a state government that would restore competence, credibility and confidence in our state's ability to deliver a games that showcases the very best of Queensland to the world.

The 2032 Delivery Plan released by the Crisafulli LNP state government sets out a clear and practical vision. We are focused on not only delivering venues and transport infrastructure but also maximising the legacy—a legacy that has the potential to span decades and generations. Importantly, this legislation gives the delivery authority the clarity and structure it needs to carry out its role. It outlines the authority's responsibilities for venue delivery and formalises the oversight mechanisms necessary to keep projects on track. This legislation also ensures planning pathways are streamlined so that we can deliver critical infrastructure on time whilst retaining appropriate oversight and transparency.

As the state member for Moggill, many local residents have shared with me their relief to finally see a competent state government that is delivering a games vision that is achievable, inspiring and grounded in legacy outcomes. I have spoken with many local sporting clubs and community groups and what is clear is that people are energised by the opportunities that are ahead, including opportunities for new infrastructure, better sporting facilities and real investment for our communities. For our young Queenslanders in particular, the 2032 games will be a defining moment, not only as spectators or fans but even as participants, volunteers, athletes or leaders of tomorrow.

In fact, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the 50 young leaders from schools across our state who came to the Queensland parliament yesterday for the state budget. In particular, it was terrific to welcome local Kenmore State High School captains, Yuna Kim and Liezel-Marie Roux, to our parliament as they took part in a number of events throughout the day. I know that the Minister for Education certainly enjoyed having them here at the parliament. I also want to give a special acknowledgement to Liezel-Marie who will later this year travel to Winnipeg in Canada to represent Australia at the 2025 World Archery Youth Championships and shortly thereafter travel to Christchurch in New Zealand where she will be competing on behalf of our country in the Trans-Tasman Challenge. Liezel-Marie's remarkable dedication and sporting success truly embodies the spirit of our next generation of athletes. Her journey to represent Australia on the world stage, in both Winnipeg and Christchurch, is not only a source of immense local pride but also a powerful reminder of what is possible when young Queenslanders are given the right opportunities and support.

With the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games on the horizon we are entering a golden era for sport and participation in our state. These games are not just about international competition, they are about inspiring young Queenslanders like Liezel-Marie to dream big, train hard and know that the world stage is within their reach. Through the generational infrastructure the Crisafulli LNP state

government is delivering and the legacy we are building, local sporting clubs, schools and communities right across Queensland will be better placed to nurture the next generation of champions.

Turning to other measures within this legislation, this bill also ensures that our planning system is fairer and more responsive to the needs of regional communities. For too long large-scale wind and solar projects have been approved without sufficient consultation or regard for local impacts. Labor left regional Queensland exposed to a planning scheme that treated these communities as an afterthought, with optional consultation, limited rights of appeal and no guarantee of community benefit. The reforms to the Planning Act 2016 finally correct this imbalance. Through a structured mandatory community benefit system we are placing social licence at the forefront of this planning process. Proponents will be required to engage meaningfully with host communities and deliver benefits that match the scale of their developments. Local governments will now have greater influence and be supported by clear statutory guidelines that enhance transparency and accountability. We are seeing renewable energy proponents that already go above and beyond, but this bill will ensure that level of commitment becomes the norm and not the exception. By formalising these agreements we build trust, provide certainty and, most importantly, ensure that local and regional Queenslanders see lasting, positive legacies from hosting such major infrastructure.

This is about restoring fairness and bringing Queensland's planning system into line with community expectations. It is not right that suburban communities have rigorous planning protections whilst regional communities are left without. What Labor failed to do over a decade, the Crisafulli LNP government has delivered within its first 100 days.

Finally, I briefly acknowledge the amendments to the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991. These amendments are critical for maintaining home owner protections under the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. A recent QCAT ruling created significant uncertainty about whether protections apply in cases where contracts are verbal or informal. This has understandably caused concern in the community. As the state member for Moggill, over many years I have heard from residents about their concerns with the QBCC. Queenslanders need to know they are protected, that the QBCC has their back and that their homes and financial security are not vulnerable because of a technicality. These amendments will restore the original intent of the scheme, confirm the validity of past QBCC actions and ensure consumers are protected moving forward, regardless of the formality of their contract. This is a sensible, measured response and one that will help maintain public trust in the building industry.

In closing, I congratulate the Deputy Premier and his team on this important legislation. It enshrines fairness in planning processes, protects home owners and provides the legal and structural foundations needed to make the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games a defining success story. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (9.30 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker—

**A government member:** You're back!

**Mr J KELLY:** I am back. They have missed me, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is good to be back. All those people who said that I did not show up to work today have misled parliament. I say that categorically. They have a chance to correct the record before I write to the Speaker because they have all misled parliament. I am back. I can understand why they are so upset. It is because I have been out doing what they would have loved to have done, which is to tell people how bad their budget is. I will—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hunt): Member, you will speak on the bill, please.

**Mr J KELLY:** I state categorically that people in my community support transitioning to a clean energy future. They loved Labor's Energy and Jobs Plan. If they had any criticism of it, it was that we were not moving fast enough. Imagine being the next LNP candidate in my community who has to walk around explaining to the good voters of Greenslopes that the LNP government has made it harder for renewable energy projects to get off the ground. That will be a pretty quick and short conversation: 'Hello. I'm the candidate from the LNP, I hate renewable energy and I've just made it harder for you to get projects up.' Slam! That is what is going to happen.

When I am doorknocking, I meet loads of people who work in the mining industry—loads of them. A huge number of people who work in the mining industry live in my electorate. When I meet those people at community events or when doorknocking, they tell me that they want to see a transition to a clean energy future and that they also know mining is a key part of that. What they do not support is what the LNP is doing when it comes to renewable energy, which is playing tricks like those being

played in this bill. They do not want people to bury their heads in an ideological sandpit. They want action on climate change and they want it now. This bill makes that so much harder.

Supposedly, this is all about listening to councils, which is something that Labor supports. We will do that whether we are in government or opposition and we will do it consistently, unlike the LNP. A couple of months ago in the *Courier-Mail* I read a story about the Deputy Premier and the environment minister taking steps to override a council to help an LNP donor get his eco-tourism business up and running. I seem to recall that, in the exact same paper on that very day, an LNP 'spinbot' was running a line about this legislation giving councils a greater say in whether wind farms or renewable energy projects proceed. One of their little LNP 'spinbots' is probably being forced to watch my speech right now and no doubt is already writing a letter to the Speaker, accusing me of misleading parliament. Seriously, I could not make this up. I am not that good at fiction. It is a pretty simple plot: when an LNP donor is involved, do not listen to council but override them; when a wind farm and action on climate change is involved, listening to council is important and it is an excuse to frustrate and shut down a project. That is really what is going on here.

I read with interest the statement of reservation about the lack of regulatory impact statements. Those opposite really want to give councils a greater say because apparently they are committed to openness, transparency and good governance, yet they cannot even use a standard government tool like a RIS to check if these laws are workable. I can tell members who else they did not listen to: the Queensland Bar Association. Cate Heyworth-Smith KC certainly did not mince her words. It is a long quote, but I have enough time. She said—

> Aside from the breathtaking dismantling of the rights of individuals, this appears very much to be a challenge to the institutional integrity of the Supreme Court by state legislation. It would be unsurprising to this committee, with respect, that there is High Court authority which may be called in aid of having that legislation struck down.

I am no legal eagle but I get the gist of what the good KC was saying there. Given that the Deputy Premier has form for having his laws overturned by a higher court, one would think that he would listen to that good KC and perhaps attempt to avoid that.

A few years ago when I did my Really Big Walk for Parkinson's Queensland from Taroom to Brisbane, I spent two entire days walking through the Coopers Gap Wind Farm. I fully understand why local residents would want to be consulted about those types of projects, but we already have the tools to do that. In fact, the member for Barron River told us a wonderful story about a project in her area that did not go ahead following the use of existing laws. What we are really doing here is setting up projects to fail because the anti-renewable anti-science LNP want to stop those projects.

I am proud of being part of a government that won the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games and I will always be proud of that achievement. Our party supports the 2032 Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games and we want them to be successful for Queensland and for Australia. However, what we do not support is a weakening of oversight. We do not support replacing clear safeguards with vague promises. I certainly do not support riding roughshod over First Nations communities. I am sure First Nations communities will not be surprised that they are being sidelined from genuine consultation about culturally significant sites by a party whose leader voted in favour of the Path to Treaty in this sacred chamber and then turned his back on them and shut down the Path to Treaty. That approach to First Nations communities will be rightly condemned in my electorate and it is a really poor approach to take to any aspect of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Of course, pushing this legislation with the flaws pointed out by the hardworking Labor committee members and multiple submitters and without a RIS might mean that we delay the games as we end up mired in community campaigns, legal challenges and further damage to community support as a result of ignoring the very genuine concerns of the community. This bill really does not help the Olympic and Paralympic Games; it actually jeopardises them. It certainly jeopardises renewable energy projects and that should be of deep concern because, without a clean energy transition, we are failing to take any serious action on climate change and that is disgraceful.

**Ms DOOLEY** (Redcliffe—LNP) (9.36 pm): Tonight I rise in strong support of the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill delivers fairness, opportunity and a voice for communities like mine in Redcliffe and others right across regional Queensland. As someone who works hard every day for Redcliffe, listening, delivering and standing up for my community, I know firsthand how vital it is for local residents to feel heard and respected in decisions that affect their neighbourhoods, their livelihoods and their futures.

This bill is a clear reflection of our Crisafulli government's commitment to restoring fairness in Queensland's planning framework, which is something that the previous Labor government failed to

deliver for over a decade. For too long, regional and rural Queenslanders have hosted large-scale renewable energy projects like wind and solar farms without adequate consultation, transparency or community benefit. I listen to the many regional members on this side of the House—members such as Glen Kelly from Mirani where wind farms have been fast tracked with limited or zero consultation or regard for the local impacts; and Sean Dillon from Gregory where that has also happened. Under this bill, renewable energy projects will finally be impact assessable, subject to the same scrutiny as mining and other major developments. Communities will now have a seat at the table and, most importantly, community benefit agreements will become a required part of the process, ensuring that locals are not just impacted but also rewarded for playing a role in our energy future.

It puts an end to the handshake deals and opaque promises. It front loads responsibility and requires developers to engage early, consult meaningfully and deliver real, lasting benefits. It also empowers local governments to negotiate and make decisions based on structured social impact assessments—something that is long overdue.

This bill also takes critical steps to deliver on our Olympic and Paralympic legacy—a legacy that was left in chaos by Labor. After 1,200 wasted days, Queenslanders voted for a fresh start in October last year, and this bill unveils our plan for the 2032 Olympics, which has transparency, accountability and delivery at its core. The amendments clarify the role of the Games Independent Infrastructure and Coordination Authority, streamline venue approvals and embed governance to meet the tight timelines to make sure that we deliver the stadiums and all the infrastructure that has been outlined in time to welcome the world to Brisbane and to Queensland.

Let's be clear: these games are not just a two-week event; they are a generational opportunity to deliver housing, transport, tourism and community infrastructure that will benefit Queenslanders long after the torch has gone out. We are focused on that legacy, especially for regions like mine in Moreton Bay and the Redcliffe Peninsula. We are excited there will be a brand new stadium at the Petrie campus of the University of the Sunshine Coast. This will be a game changer for our region for years and decades to come.

I have met many young Redcliffe sporting awardees recently at various sporting presentation nights—people like Wroxton King, who dreams of being in the Paralympics in 2032. He literally needed a wheelbarrow to take home all of his awards from the Redcliffe Leagues Swimming Club. I look forward to seeing him compete. Remember the name: Wroxton King from Redcliffe.

Another key reform in this bill is around housing. With cost-of-living pressures and population growth, we must build more homes faster and smarter. The No. 1 issue in my electorate of Redcliffe is housing—affordable housing, social housing, community housing and private housing. We need to unlock all the barriers so we can get more houses built to ensure that everyone has a place to call home.

This bill refocuses Economic Development Queensland on delivering homes in PDAs, increasing housing supply and reducing barriers to fast-tracked developments. This is needed in Redcliffe and right across Moreton Bay. We need this kind of planning for certainty, and we need pathways that empower us to grow sustainably.

This bill also includes sensible amendments to protect home owners under the Queensland Home Warranty Scheme. Whether a building contract is signed or verbally agreed to, Queenslanders deserve peace of mind that their homes are protected. These amendments restore that certainty. We are also cutting red tape to allow essential community infrastructure, like schools and hospitals, to proceed more efficiently under existing development frameworks without duplicating bureaucracy. We are also modernising regional planning consultation timeframes to better reflect how our communities engage with planning in the digital age, reducing delays while maintaining robust public input.

This bill has been the subject of widespread consultation, receiving over 1,100 public submissions. Groups like AgForce, the Local Government Association of Queensland and the Planning Institute of Australia have endorsed the need for these reforms. The LGAQ's CEO, Alison Smith, stated—

> We are really grateful that the bill recognises those impacts and will ... give power back to Queensland councils and their communities ... to secure community benefits ... which we hope will last for generations ...

In conclusion, this bill is bold, balanced and fair. It restores trust in planning. It gives locals a say. It demands transparency. It delivers real benefit. It keeps us on track to host a world-class Olympic and Paralympic Games that all Queenslanders can be proud of. I commend the bill to the House.

**Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.44 pm): A great sporting event can leave a legacy that lasts for generations. While this may not be the time of year to acknowledge our neighbours south of the Tweed, there is no doubt that the success of the 2000 Games put Sydney firmly on the world map, encouraging many thousands of young people to get into sport and resulting in improved infrastructure from sporting facilities to transport and housing. It is that legacy infrastructure that this government is focused on as we plan for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and it is why I rise tonight to speak on the proposed amendments to the Brisbane Olympic and Paralympic Games Arrangements Act 2021. These amendments are not just administrative adjustments; they are critical enablers for the successful delivery of the Brisbane 2032 games, identifying the games related transport infrastructure needed and providing for an expedited pathway for delivery.

In March the Crisafulli government released the 2032 Delivery Plan—our plan to deliver a successful games following the directionless approach of those opposite. In addition to providing the much needed direction on games venues and villages, the 2032 Delivery Plan also sets out the transport infrastructure priorities to deliver reliable, efficient, safe and inclusive transport services to the Olympic and Paralympic stakeholders and spectators while meeting the needs of our growing communities before, during and after the games.

The 2032 Delivery Plan accelerates the delivery of major transport projects to expand the reach and capacity of our transport networks, including: the Wave, a seamless transport solution linking heavy rail from Beerwah to Birtinya to a state-of-the-art metro hub that connects to the Sunshine Coast Airport through Mountain Creek and Maroochydore; the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail, which will provide additional tracks, station upgrades and signalling infrastructure to support higher-frequency passenger rail services between Brisbane, Logan and the Gold Coast—more trains for Gold Coast commuters to and from Brisbane; bus priority corridors in Brisbane, the Redlands and on the Gold Coast; delivering the Coomera Connector stage 1 and committing to deliver subsequent work ahead of 2032, providing an alternative connection between Brisbane and the Gold Coast; and upgrades to the Gateway Motorway and the Bruce Highway to increase capacity, safety and reliability for traffic moving from the New South Wales border all the way to Cairns.

**A government member:** Are we doing budget replies?

**Mr MICKELBERG:** No, not yet. The amendments provide the mechanism to ensure these transport initiatives are delivered in time for the games, when the eyes of the world will be on not only the south-east corner of Queensland but also the Fraser Coast, Central Queensland and North Queensland. Come 2032, our transport networks and services will face unprecedented demand, as we provide priority movement for athletes and officials across the network to get to competition venues and move vast numbers of ticketed spectators to the many competition venues across the south-east, all while keeping the network moving for normal business and personal travel.

With Olympic competition being held across South-East Queensland and regional centres, we know that many games spectators will be travelling long distances to attend games events and will also want to explore the places they are visiting. The transport projects that support regional connections, such as the Wave and the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project, need to be delivered and operational before 2032. It is not just about having certainty that construction will be completed; time is also required to ensure that the services are fully operational and integrated with the rest of the transport network.

While these legislative provisions are attached to the Olympic Games arrangements act, the transport priorities identified in the 2032 Delivery Plan are not just for the games; they are transport priorities that support our growing cities and regions. These projects are providing more travel options and capacity in our network for residents and businesses. More capacity in our network means reduced travel times so people can get home from work more quickly at the end of a long work day.

Streamlining approval processes for critical transport infrastructure will allow my department, working with the private sector, to deliver these projects on time and on budget, while also restoring fiscal discipline and respecting taxpayers' money. We know from engagement with industry that multiple steps for project approval add to cost and time pressures on these major projects. Cost escalations in particular can see projects stall and in some cases be shelved indefinitely.

Meanwhile, the pipeline of infrastructure work forecast in Queensland has grown by 13 per cent since 2023 according to the QMCA. Increasing demand for skills and resources from new projects while existing projects stall compounds the problem, but this government is determined to better manage the pipeline of work and these amendments will help us do just that.

The legislative amendments also task the Department of Transport and Main Roads to prepare the games transport and mobility strategy. As the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, I welcome this change. My department is the lead of the games transport program, working with the Brisbane 2032 Organising Committee and local governments to develop the operational plans to meet the unique games travel demands. The strategy will build upon the direction and priorities established through the 2032 Delivery Plan and identify the transport outcomes required to underpin a successful games, not just infrastructure upgrades but also improved services and systems and customer information to enable us to get the most out of our networks, to provide more travel options, to better cater for all members of the community and to encourage more sustainable travel behaviour.

It will be important that the games transport and mobility strategy informs the more detailed operational planning that is to occur, through the games transport program and in partnership with local governments. The government's 2032 Delivery Plan includes other initiatives that will further enhance the transport network and expand the reach and convenience of services including expanded bus and train fleets, bus priority corridors, accessibility and active travel upgrades, and inclusive wayfinding. Planning activity is underway on many of these initiatives and will accelerate as planning for venues and broader games operations mature.

This planning may identify further transport projects that would support the games and provide ongoing legacy to our communities. These legislative amendments give Queensland the opportunity to ensure that we are able to leverage the games to drive a lasting legacy for the transport network and for the people of Queensland, providing the ability to streamline approval and delivery of critical transport infrastructure.

Ongoing improvements to transport infrastructure and services to meet the needs of our growing state and support games operations will require a commitment from and engagement with all three levels of government—and I will continue to advocate for funding from the Commonwealth. Local governments also have a role to play, with local connections to new games venues an important consideration.

The Brisbane 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games are a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for Queensland. They are an opportunity to showcase our state to the world, to inspire future generations, and to create a legacy of infrastructure, connectivity and community pride. I support these amendments, which will ensure that the Brisbane 2032 games are remembered not just for their sporting excellence but perhaps, more importantly, for the enduring benefits they will bring to Queensland.

**Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (9.52 pm): I rise to speak on the bill before the House. I will start with the issue of community consultation or, more accurately, the complete inconsistency and political convenience that now defines the LNP's approach to it. The LNP have more positions, frankly, on community consultation than a gymnastics final and none of them stick the landing. For the past few years, the LNP have fallen over themselves criticising me and Labor for progressing housing developments in places like Toowoomba, Arundel, Noosa, Tewantin, Wakerley, Redlands—

**Mr Stevens:** And rightly so.

**Ms SCANLON:** I hear the interjections: there are probably more that they have objections to—for projects that they deemed as not having sufficient community consultation, but now those so-called community champions have a very different view to stadiums and Olympic infrastructure. They are proposing to completely remove community consultation for Olympic stadiums, arenas, athlete villages and major associated public infrastructure. This is the epitome of hypocrisy, just like the hypocrisy in this bill on renewable energy which will no doubt result in delayed approvals and deter investment.

On the one hand, they want proponents to undertake a process before lodging an application that does not apply to coal and does not apply to gas. It does not even apply to large-scale tourism developments. On the other hand, for solar and wind projects—the very infrastructure that we need to reduce emissions in this state—the bar is suddenly higher. It is a double standard plain and simple. Worse still, it seemingly directly contradicts the Deputy Premier's own ministerial charter letter, which says—

> Amend laws to ensure renewable energy projects are impact assessable with approval processes consistent with other land uses like mining and agriculture.

So which is it? The contradictions do not stop there though. This government proposed amendments to this bill which will reduce the minimum consultation period for regional plans. Cutting the time communities have to engage with these complex, long-term frameworks is a step backwards especially when, through the committee process, we heard clear calls for more time, not less.

When it comes to what this bill does for Olympics related developments, the bill overrides nearly every key law designed to protect Queenslanders and the places we love. We have exemptions from the Planning Act, the Environmental Protection Act, the Nature Conservation Act, the Queensland Heritage Act and the Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act.

The government's new stadium—the one they said they were not going to build before the election until they changed their mind afterwards—will not need to consider koalas or anything else. Basically, the government is saying, 'Just trust us,' just like we were supposed to trust the member for Bonney, who said before the election that the LNP were going to continue funding the Environmental Defenders Office if successful and then they got in and cut their funding within the first six months.

There are a litany of other concerns experts have raised about this bill, notably by the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association—and they did not mince their words, did they? I am not surprised that the Deputy Premier did not listen to them because he did listen to them when he was the attorney-general—the worst attorney-general this state ever saw.

Finally, I want to turn to some of the last-minute amendments the LNP are trying to ram through this House once again. One of these changes is to allow development under an infrastructure designation to proceed without the need to comply with a development control plan, including validating development already carried out that did or does not comply. It is very interesting. I am pleased the Deputy Premier is in the House while I am asking some of these questions. The member for Kawana tore up an approval that I gave to the Brisbane Housing Company for an affordable housing project in Birtinya in his electorate claiming it was in contravention with the DCP. Now he is retrospectively approving every other development that might have been allegedly in contravention of the DCP.

**Mr Bleijie:** Yes, because you unlawfully approved them.

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjection. 'Yes,' he says. Call me cynical but how does the member for Kawana expect us to believe that after the department considered this affordable housing project and the DCP and recommended that I approve it but then suddenly with a change of government and no interference from the Deputy Premier, who had been publicly railing against this project up until the election, the same public servants—

**Mr Bleijie:** It was an election commitment.

**Mr Dick** interjected.

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjection: it was an election commitment, but he tried to tell us that it was based on the DCP—so which one is it? How does he expect us to believe that the same public servants miraculously found a loophole to help justify the member for Kawana axing this project? No other infrastructure designations were revoked in DCP areas—just this one in the Deputy Premier's electorate. Convenient.

**Mr Bleijie:** I'm not going to tear down the Sunshine Coast University Hospital, am I?

**Ms SCANLON:** I take the interjections from the Deputy Premier. Very clearly he has quite a significant interest in this project, so one would ask whether he should have made the decision on this project and what Integrity Commissioner advice he sought on it. Let's be clear: this project was in line with the council plan for the area, yet the Deputy Premier still killed it. However, for every other development, possibly LNP donors—who would know based on their track record—he is fine and today we are passing laws to retrospectively authorise them even if they are contrary to the DCP. They have one rule for luxury developers and another rule for affordable housing.

**Mr BAROUNIS** (Maryborough—LNP) (9.58 pm): It is an honour to stand before you today to speak on a bill that represents not just a legislative change but a change in values, in direction and in how government treats its people of Queensland. Today I speak to the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025—a bill that restores fairness, re-establishes community voice and recognises that regional Queensland deserves the same respect and consultation as any other part of our state.

For more than a decade regional Queensland has played host to large-scale renewal energy developments—wind farms, solar farms and major infrastructure—that fundamentally changed the landscape of our communities, but here is the truth: our communities have been treated like an afterthought in this process. Under the former Labor government, the planning framework for these projects was not fit for purpose. Community consultation was optional and, even worse, appeal rights were non-existent. Let me ask you this: why should a family living in a regional town have fewer rights than someone living in a city suburb when it comes to major developments in their own backyard? They

should not, and that is what this bill addresses. Let me bring this home. My own electorate of Maryborough has faced its own battle. There is a proposed site for a large-scale wind farm—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hunt): Member for Maryborough, can I get to you take your seat, please. Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House, I call the Deputy Premier to reply to the second reading debate.

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (10.00 pm), in reply: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thank the member for Maryborough for his advocacy for his constituency not only in the planning space on wind, solar and renewable energy but also the Olympic and Paralympic Games. I recognise that he is a big advocate for archery. We wanted to ensure that the Olympic and Paralympic Games were spread right across Queensland and not just Brisbane, which Labor was so focused and determined to make it all about. The LNP government wanted to make sure that everybody in Queensland benefited from the Olympic and Paralympic Games, including farmers and the agricultural sector, who will benefit from the produce they will supply. Fruit and veggie growers, cleaners, everybody involved in the Olympic and Paralympic Games and the thousands of volunteers we are going to need from right across Queensland—everybody will benefit.

This bill will also create a legacy, particularly in rural and regional Queensland. In Far North Queensland there will be upgrades to Barlow Park in Cairns. Sailing is coming to North Queensland. In Central Queensland we have invested over $20 million into the Harrup Park upgrade. There will be sailing in the Whitsundays. We will have archery in Maryborough. Who could forget rowing in Rocky on the mighty Fitzroy River in Central Queensland. There are upgrades for the brand new Sunshine Coast outdoor stadium. The equestrian events will be in Toowoomba. Whitewater rafting will be in the member for Capalaba's electorate in the Redlands area. There is so much for all of Queensland.

For Brisbane there is a new Victoria Park stadium with 63,000 seats in legacy mode. The new national aquatic centre will be the best aquatic centre in the world. People from around the world will look to Queensland and say, 'That is where I want to train the next Olympians and Paralympians,' and it is right here in Brisbane. We love the RNA. It is the Royal Queensland Show, the Ekka, where the country meets the city. They are getting a 20,000-seat outdoor arena. For 10 years the RNA advocated for the Labor Party to upgrade the RNA's Machinery Hill site where the new 20,000-seat outdoor arena is going to be, but for 10 years they did nothing with the RNA. We are proud to be part of a government that is going to be investing not only in an athletes village at the RNA showgrounds but also Exhibition station, which has just opened. How fantastic will it be for our farmers in the bush to come to the city to share their knowledge and love of the land right here in the heart of the city with a new, upgraded RNA.

I thank honourable members for their contributions. I am still not familiar where the Labor Party sits on this bill because no-one actually said they are going to vote for it or vote against it. I think we have about an hour and a half before we vote on the bill, so I would suggest to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he get his caucus together and work out what the plan is. Are you going to back the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032 or are you going to vote against it? If you vote against it, then nothing has changed since the 1,300 days of wasted opportunities, chaos and crisis that the Labor Party oversaw with the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

Are you then also going to back our farmers in regional Queensland and back the social impact assessments and community benefit agreements that put regional Queensland at the forefront and give them a say as to whether they want these renewable energy projects? Are they going to vote for or against that? We do not know. Are they going to vote for all of the other amendments? We will see. If they do not vote for it they are basically doing two things: one, they are thumbing their nose at regional Queensland like they did when they were in government because regional Queensland does not matter to the Labor Party; and, two, they are voting not to support the games in 2032. They are not voting to support the young kids who are going to learn archery in Maryborough. They are not voting to support the future Olympians and Paralympians who will be learning rowing on the mighty Fitzroy River. They are not voting for the young kids who will be learning horseriding and competing in equestrian events in Toowoomba, sailing in the Whitsundays and Townsville, or playing basketball on the Sunshine Coast. They will be voting against all of those young kids who will be the future Olympians, Paralympians and athletes in this great state.

They will also be voting against legacy. They will also be voting against billions of dollars of infrastructure in the next seven years to be spent in Queensland. That will be Labor's legacy if they vote against this bill tonight. They will be voting against infrastructure and the future of our young Olympians

and Paralympians in this state. They will not only be voting against regional Queensland; it will be a slap in the face to regional Queensland members and renewable energy proponents.

As I said earlier today, they are wedged on this and it is why they wanted the bill split. The greenies and the lefties in the Labor Party wanted to ensure they can say to their renewable energy friends, 'We're backing your laws', but then they did not want to vote for Victoria Park because Grace Grace, the member for McConnel, does not support the new 63,000-seat stadium. That is why they wanted the bill split this morning, because they are wedged on it and they want to vote for the greenies but they are not for the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032. Cry me a river when they come in here all day and say, 'We're the biggest supporters of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.' I have heard it all day. 'We are the biggest supporters.' Well, vote for the bill. Prove tonight that the Labor Party backs the 2032 games. Prove tonight that they back the 2032 Delivery Plan and vote with the government tonight on the 2032 Delivery Plan and the amendments we are putting in the bill tonight.

I will go through a couple of the issues and complaints from the Labor Party. Let me start by thanking the Liberal National Party members and crossbench members who talked about the renewable energy laws. The Labor Party whinged that this was thrust upon people; no-one knew about it. I spoke about this nearly every day during the election campaign. We had a pretty strong position that we would make wind farms and solars farms impact assessable. It was an election commitment. Guess what? Queensland voted for change. They voted for a fresh start. They voted to support the LNP's plan to make renewable energy projects impact assessable. Queenslanders voted for these laws because they saw the destruction that a lot of these renewable energy projects were causing in regional and rural Queensland without communities having a say.

This does not stop renewable energy projects: this gives communities a say in renewable energy projects. There are mayors and residents across the state who support these renewable energy projects in the right place. They will go through because they will go through a social impact assessment. The social impact assessment will say, 'The social impact on the community is limited. There is good community support for it.' Then the proponents will go to the councils. They will enter into a community benefit agreement. It can be done as soon as possible, and then it will go through the DA, it will be approved and the councils will be happy, the proponents will be happy and the community will be happy. What it does offer is an opportunity if the community is not happy with the social impact assessments and the community benefit agreements. If the community is not happy, they will finally have a say.

As I said earlier in the debate today, you cannot have one rule for South-East Queensland and one rule for the rest of Queensland, particularly with respect to residents in South-East Queensland having a say on a development approval. I do ministerial infrastructure designations all the time and sign them off. Part of that is consultation. We write to the council. We write to the proponents. We write to the local members. It is consultation, but a lot of the renewable energy projects in regional Queensland did not have to do any of that. There are some providers who loved the laws under the Labor Party because they have not had to do any of that. There are some providers who have done better than others with respect to taking communities on a journey, and that is why I made some of the decisions that I have.

The member for McConnel made the claim that the government apparently has a double standard when it comes to community consultation because we are not consulting on Victoria Park. Well, the 2032 Delivery Plan was a 100-day review which everyone had a say on. The member for McConnel was afforded the opportunity, like every Queenslander, to have a say on where stadiums across Queensland should go and ought not go.

That is surprising because I am reminded of a media statement that Dr Christian Rowan sent out when he was the shadow minister for education. Members will recall that, on the very same day that Annastacia Palaszczuk announced the Gabba knockdown, the then minister Grace Grace announced there would be community consultation but she did not realise that the then premier had just announced it was getting knocked down and when it was getting knocked down. That community consultation was fraud, it was fake, it was never happening. Grace Grace was saying, 'We're going to be consulting with the community,' but she was not told that the then premier was doing a press conference down the other end of town saying, 'I'm announcing today the Gabba's getting knocked down.' That was affecting East Brisbane State School and nobody was getting consulted on that. I table a copy of the press release.

*Tabled paper:* Media release, dated 17 February 2023, from the former shadow minister for education and shadow minister for the arts, Dr Christian Rowan MP, titled 'Labor doesn't listen: Premier's gaffe reveals sham school consultation' [797].

I am not going to accept the double standards that the member for McConnel talks about. We know that she voted on the motion in this place for the 2032 Delivery Plan, but we also note that behind the scenes she has been supporting heritage listing of Victoria Park, joining the likes of Campbell Newman and other groups in opposition to Victoria Park. They are using all these environmental and cultural sensitivity reasons, but I remind honourable members that Victoria Park was a golf course. I am surprised they think there were all these people picnicking there, because if you were picnicking at Victoria Park just a few months ago it would have been a pretty dangerous situation with a high chance of getting hit in the head with a few golf balls.

**Mr Stevens:** You've seen me play.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** We have seen the member for Mermaid Beach play; that is right. Cut me a break—it was not this culturally sensitive park where thousands of community members went every day; it was a blooming golf course that was designed into parkland only recently. They are saying mistruths out there that it was this spectacular park. I heard it all tonight when the member for Gaven was mentioning koalas. Now we have koalas roaming this golf course apparently.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection: Arundel Hills, which she was going to bulldoze, possibly had more koalas than Victoria Park.

Let's deal with the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and his amendments to remove the SIAs and CBAs to be submitted prior to the development application lodgement. The Labor Party do not want community to have a say at the start. They want the development applications to be made by the developer and then go to community. No: on this side of the House, the LNP are saying that the proponents of renewable energy projects go to the community first. There was this rubbish from the member for Gaven who said that coal companies and resource companies do not have to do that. It takes 15 years on average to get a coalmine approved in Queensland, while under the Labor Party it was taking less than six months to get a wind farm or solar farm approved. I do not think coal companies have had it too easy, as the member for Gaven would say, when it takes nearly 15 years to get a coalmine and other resource projects approved in Queensland. They do go to the community, because under the Coordinator-General they have a far more rigorous process than renewable energy projects ever did.

The member for Woodridge raved on about community consultation again, but it went to a parliamentary committee for over six weeks. How many bills did they move in the last 10 years where they cut short the parliamentary committee processes? Now it is different when they are on that side of the House.

For some reason, the member for Woodridge has an unhealthy obsession with the car that I drive. Every day in this House he mentions my car. We do not usually talk about the entitlements of members, but maybe it is a good time to point out that the Labor Party ordered five or six Mercedes-Benz for ministerial cars. He is whingeing about a Toyota Lexus that I am driving around in, yet they ordered those five or six Mercedes-Benz. He was getting driven around in a Hyundai IONIQ, which I think is valued more than the blooming Lexus anyway. I do not know why he has this unhealthy obsession. Maybe the unhealthy obsession is because he does not have the car anymore and he has lost his driver. I think that is what he is more mad about. It is not the fact that we are building $7.1 billion of Olympic and Paralympic infrastructure; it is just that he has to drive himself and I think that is really driving him mad. I think that is the real issue.

He also talks about mandating the venues and so forth. It is in the bill; it is in the Delivery Plan. Everybody knows what is in the Delivery Plan: sailing in Townsville, the Whitsunday region, Victoria Park, the National Aquatic Centre, RNA upgrades, archery, rowing on the Fitzroy River. How much more public does he want? It is all there; it is all public. We had a consultation period through the 100-day review, so I am not sure why he is wanting to mandate where the venues are going to be because it is contained in the bill. We actually have a list in the bill. As I said, when the bill becomes an act it will be changed from time to time because more venues will be added to the act and it will actually come to parliament. Every authority venue that changes or gets added or taken out will actually be in the act and it will come to parliament. It cannot get more transparent than that.

Let's not forget that the member for Woodridge was the Treasurer of this state with the Olympic and Paralympic Games debacle that he could not sort out. What they could not sort out in 1,300 days we sorted out in 100 days. As I travel the state, I now see confidence and excitement from people about the 2032 games because it applies across all of Queensland. It is real and people can now see the vision and they just want to get it done. They do not want politicians whingeing about what cars MPs

are driving; they want people to get behind this and support this type of legislation. This is important legislation because we need to get on and construct. As soon as this bill goes through, GIICA will start the process and start procurement for the minor venues, in particular, and then they will get to work on Victoria Park and all the other venues and work with the local governments.

Let's talk about the planning aspects of the bill, the regional plans. The former planning minister was attacking us and saying that we are reducing the regional plan consultation from 60 days to 30 days. Let me tell honourable members how it happened under the Labor Party. When I became the planning minister, I was given a large document which was a consultative draft of the new Far North Queensland Regional Plan. I said to all the mayors in Far North Queensland, 'Let's have a Zoom meeting and talk about the Far North Queensland Regional Plan.' To my surprise and shock, when I got them on the Zoom meeting they said that they had not even seen it. I said, 'What do you mean you haven't seen it?'

The mayors said that the state government wrote to them about what they would like in a regional plan but that the state government went and drafted it and did not consult with them. The mayors were expecting me to just drop the new Far North Queensland Regional Plan in draft, but I said, 'I'm not doing that.' I sent it to every mayor in Far North Queensland and said, 'Here's the document. You go through it and tell me what you want changed.' They did that, and we had over 300 submissions and we are going to accept I think over 90 per cent of them. I am now going to release a Far North Queensland Regional Plan which all the mayors have been involved in and they will be with us on a journey. That is how you reset the planning partnership with local government. You do not tell local government what to do.

It was the same with the Fraser Coast Regional Council. I met with the Fraser Coast Regional Council. They did not support the Wide Bay regional plan because of the black sky provisions. For 18 months the state government forced these provisions on this council so I said to the mayor and the council, 'You tell me what you don't want in it and I'll take it out.' They wrote to me saying they wanted a provision taken out and I have taken it out. That is what consultation with local government looks like. It is actually not hard. We will be able to do these 13 regional plans in the next 3½ years.

When the member for Gaven was the planning minister, she was overriding the council to force in a community at Arundel Hills—incidentally, on a golf course—with thousands of homes that the community did not want. She was overriding it. Guess what. I stopped it, and I am proud to have stopped it because of the advocacy of our local members down there. She talks about the development control plan in Kawana Waters that I stopped with the 90 units of affordable housing. I did stop it because I got advice from the department that said that if the development were to proceed it would be an unlawful development. It took this government to find an unlawful provision that the Labor Party had been using for years, and we are fixing Labor's mistake. I can say to the honourable member that the same company has now submitted an application to council for 60 affordable units, pursuant to the DCP, pursuant to the town plan, and it will be lawful development and it will go through the normal council process. We fixed that issue and we are fixing Labor's bad legislation now.

We saw the EDQ amendments. I want to congratulate Julian Simmonds on the work he has been doing as Acting CEO of EDQ. Again, the member for Woodridge—look at him now—with the smear and gutter politics that he has against individuals in this place, if he were to say everything he says every day outside of this coward's castle, he would be locked up in court forever and he would be bankrupt because he would lose every defamation action. He is a grub. The member for Woodridge is an absolute grub, and how he treats people—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Hunt): Deputy Premier, I ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language, thank you.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw. He has no respect for individuals in the Public Service—

**Mr DICK:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at that as well and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdrew.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He has already withdrawn.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** You just wanted to get on the record, did you?

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, stay quiet while I take advice, thank you. Deputy Premier, the member has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw. Even in this contribution, he mentioned Director-General John Sosso again. He cannot help himself—his attacks on public servants; his attacks on the Acting CEO of EDQ. He cannot help himself.

This legislation puts communities in regional Queensland first. This legislation sorts out the Olympic and Paralympic mess created by the Labor Party. This legislation is a fresh start that Queensland voted for.

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

**AYES, 50:**

**LNP, 47—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Dooley, Field, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**KAP, 3—**Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**NOES, 36:**

**ALP, 33—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**Ind, 2—**Bolton, Sullivan.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

## Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

Clause 4—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.27 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

**1 Clause 4 (Amendment of s 99 (Cost-recovery fees))**

Page 11, line 5, 'section 106ZM(2)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 106ZM(1)

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [798].

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments [799].

The purpose of amendment No. 1 is to ensure the City of Brisbane Act 2010 provides the ability for local governments to set and charge a cost recovery fee for all aspects of their involvement in the community benefit system under the Planning Act. This will include council involvement in social impact assessment processes, negotiating and entering into community benefit agreements as well as any associated mediation processes. Amendment No. 1 amends the bill to reference amended section 106ZM(1), fees for particular purposes.

I heard during the debate on the second reading speech the Labor members talk about local governments will be out of pocket with the social impact assessments and so forth. No, they will not because they can levy and they can charge the proponents. It is not extra work for the local governments; it is the local governments that will work it out because again we are resetting the planning partnerships of local government, and then the local governments will be able to work out their fees, charges and levies for these particular renewable energy proponents. Then they will go into good-faith negotiations—one, for a social impact assessment, and then, secondly, after a social impact assessment has taken place, they will do a community benefit agreement.

It is putting community at the heart and soul of the decision-making process. It is putting local government at the heart and soul of decision-making process. The Liberal National Party government

believes local governments know their communities well, they know what the issues are in their local communities and they know their residents well. That is why we put in this provision.

We believe that the legislation was sufficiently clear that it allowed the local governments to do this, but during the committee process local governments wanted further clarification, hence this further clarification today.

**Ms Bush** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper.

**Ms Bush** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member is not taking your interjections.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** So this, as I said, is letting councils set the charge and cost recovery fee for all aspects of their involvement in the community benefit system under the Planning Act 2016.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 4, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.29 pm): I move amendment No. 2 circulated in my name—

**2 Clause 5 (Amendment of s 100 (Register of cost-recovery fees))**

Page 11, line 17, 'section 106ZM(2)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 106ZM(1)

The purpose of amendment No. 2 is to ensure the City of Brisbane Act 2010 establishes the requirement for council to keep a register of cost recovery fees associated with their involvement in the community benefit system under the Planning Act 2016. This will include any cost recovery fees council set for their involvement in social impact assessment processes and negotiating into entering into community benefit agreements, as well as associated mediation negotiation processes, as I said before. Amendment No. 2 amends the bill to reference amended section 106ZM(1), fees for particular purposes. I commend amendment No. 2 to the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 5, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.30 pm): I move amendment No. 3 circulated in my name—

**3 Clause 7 (Amendment of s 97 (Cost-recovery fees))**

Page 12, line 5, 'section 106ZM(2)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 106ZM(1)

The purpose of amendment No. 3 is to ensure the Local Government Act 2009 provides the ability for local governments to set and charge cost recovery for all aspects they are involved in with the community benefits system under the Planning Act 2016. Members may think that I am repeating myself but it is important that we place on record the various pieces of legislation that this particular amendment changes. This will include local government involvement in social impact assessment processes, negotiating and entering into community benefit agreements, as well as any associated mediation processes. Amendment No. 3 amends the bill to reference amended section 1O6ZM(1) fees for particular purposes. I commend amendment No. 3 to the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (10.32 pm): I move amendment No. 4 circulated in my name—

**4 Clause 8 (Amendment of s 98 (Register of cost-recovery fees))**

Page 12, line 17, 'section 106ZM(2)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 106ZM(1)

The purpose of amendment 4 is to amend clause 8 and ensure the Local Government Act 2009 establishes the requirement for local governments to keep a register of cost recovery fees associated with their involvement with the community benefit system under the Planning Act 2016. This will include any cost recovery fees local governments set for their involvement in social impact assessment processes, negotiating and entering into community benefit agreements, as well as any associate mediation process. Amendment 4 amends the bill with reference to section 106ZM(1) fees for particular matters. I commend amendment 4 to the House.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clause 10—

**Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.33 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

**1 Clause 10 (Amendment of s 51 (Making development applications))**

Page 13, line 3 to page 14, line 5—

*omit.*

I table the explanatory notes and the statement of compatibility with human rights.

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, explanatory notes to Hon. Cameron Dick's amendments [800].

*Tabled paper:* Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Cameron Dick's amendments [801].

As honourable members of the House are aware, under this bill renewable energy proponents are required to prepare a full social impact assessment and negotiate a community benefit agreement before even lodging a development application. That is a very rigid process and it presents the very real risk of investment that our state needs to deliver Queensland's energy transition being halted, chilled or stopped. This amendment omits the requirement that those social impact assessments and community benefit agreements must accompany development applications at the time of lodgement. This change enables applicants to submit these materials during the assessment process which the state opposition says increases flexibility and alignment with standard development assessment procedures.

These changes remove unnecessary delays that may discourage clean energy investment; support jobs and economic activity, particularly in regional parts of Queensland; keep Queensland competitive in the global race for renewable energy and renewable energy capital; and also maintain clear safeguards to ensure communities receive full and just benefit from development.

I think everyone in this House wants strong community protections but they must be practical, coordinated and fair and they must work. The state opposition says these amendments will deliver those balances so we think these are simple but powerful changes that will have an important impact. They will allow renewable energy investment to continue to flow to Queensland as we transition our energy system but, at the same time, they will ensure communities that are receiving the benefit of that investment, receive that benefit at a community level as well. We move this amendment now so those communities will not be left behind by this transition. For the sake of time and because of the hour, these comments will apply to the second amendment that will be moved in my name shortly. I do not intend to address this again.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The Deputy Leader of the Opposition may say in his quite dulcet tones that they are 'simple amendments'. If they were so simple, why didn't they do them for 10 years? It is so simple—put community first—but they did not it for 10 years because they rode roughshod over local regional communities, particularly our farmers in the state and in the bush. It is so simple—they just forgot to do it for 10 years.

**Mr Mander:** Softer.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Sorry, softer. It is so simple—they just forgot to do it for 10 years. Our amendments are also simple but they put community first and that is the whole goal of this bill. We want to make sure community is put first. Now, let me get to the heart of it. Here is the reality: they could have done it for 10 years—they didn't. We are doing it within seven to eight months of state government because we are putting regional communities first. Incidentally, I am not sure why he is moving amendments to a bill when he has just voted against the entirety of the bill. He is trying to amend a bill he has just voted

against which is bizarre, but coming from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the leadership team—the strategic duo over there—I am not surprised, Premier, that this is where we are getting to. Usually, as a strategy, if you are going to move amendments you vote for the bill on the second reading to allow it to go to a second reading, then you have the debate of committee reports in consideration in detail and then, if you are not satisfied with the result of consideration in detail, you vote against the bill on the third reading.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** But the left will not allow it—I take the interjection. The left did not want to vote for putting communities first in renewable energy projects but they wanted to vote for the Olympic and Paralympic Games because there was a wedge. The reality is: what the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is proposing will see no change in regional Queensland because it, again, allows the renewable energy companies to do all the groundwork, all the investigative work—no community consultation, nothing at the start. They just go into regional communities and do all the investigative and preparatory work—the community will know nothing about it—and lodge the development application and then, 'Now let's look at the social impact development' after the DA is already lodged. No, no—consult the community at the start. We are bringing it forward. We are front ending all of the consultation so it does not take place in the middle but it takes place at the start.

Renewable energy developers will be required to complete a social impact assessment when they want to put a proposal in a community in regional Queensland. If then through the social impact assessment it talks about roads, rail, housing issues—I could not tell you the amount of times, particularly in TMR, where renewable energy projects have gone in, the trucks are damaging state-owned roads and there is no obligation for the developer to pay for the roads or contribute to the roads. The environmental vandalism, no obligation—

**Ms Bush:** Your bill doesn't address that. Your bill doesn't address that scenario.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper, the Deputy Premier has the call.

**Mr Mander:** You need to speak slower, I think.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. It does—

**Ms Bush:** No, you didn't! We all heard that.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper.

**Ms Bush:** You are sexist. You are sexist to the core.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper, you are now warned under the standing orders.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable member. It does do that because when you do a social impact assessment the renewable energy developer is required to work out what the social impact is on the community. Once they work out what the social impact is on housing, trades, roads, swimming pools, schools and houses, then—

**Ms Bush:** It doesn't do that.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection—no, actually I do not take the interjection because I believe the member for Cooper is deliberately trying to get kicked out so she does not have to vote on this bill at the third reading. That is what she is doing. I have just worked it out.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, would you speak to the actual clause, please?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Once you have the social impact assessment, you have the community benefit agreements. The community benefit agreement is an agreement between the proponent and the local government.

**Mr Crisafulli** interjected.

**Mr King:** The Premier is speaking as much as you. Who's speaking out of the two of you?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kurwongbah.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** He is backing me up.

**Mr King:** I am struggling to hear.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kurwongbah.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** God forbid a Premier helps a Deputy Premier.

**Mr SPEAKER:** One person has the call.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It does not happen on the Labor Party side. It does not happen on that side. Chirp, chirp, chirp, chirp!

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier! Could you bring your contribution back to the amendment?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Once the social impact assessment is completed you have a community benefit agreement and the community benefit agreement will say whatever the council want it to say. That is why we have left it sufficiently broad enough, because the Labor Party would have it restricted. We have left it sufficiently broad enough so because the assessment that has been done says, 'The road impacts on this. We're going to need X amount of houses for the workers or maybe temporary workers' camps,' the agreement will say they have to provide that and it is a signed deal done with the proponent, community and local government.

We are going to do it at the start because that has been the problem in regional Queensland. The Labor Party have ridden roughshod over them; they just come in with many of these proposed renewable energy projects and community do not have a say. I have sat in the room and in the town halls. I went to the member for Callide's electorate when we were in opposition and I saw grown men crying because of the impact of some of these renewable energy projects in his community. I have heard the stories from the member for Mirani. I have heard today from the member for Southern Downs, James Lister, who is unfortunately ill and is away. He would have loved to have been here to talk on this bill.

**Ms McMillan** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** He is quite ill and he has been in hospital. I take the interjection from the member for Mansfield. He has been ill and Mr Speaker has advised that the member for Southern Downs has complied with the standing orders with respect to notifying the Speaker of his illness, but again that is just the Labor Party who—

**A government member:** He had a reason not to turn up.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I would not lecture people from the Labor Party about not turning up to work because we saw it all over the news tonight.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Come back to the clause, please.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Once the community benefit agreements are entered into with the council, then it is a good obligation for the renewable energy proponents to deliver housing, temporary workers' accommodation, upgrade roads, upgrade sewerage and stormwater systems for local government. It is whatever the community and council want. That is why we will not be supporting the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's amendment, because again it rides roughshod over local communities.

I do not know what is so hard for the Labor Party to understand. Regional Queensland have not had a say in these projects. We are giving them a say. As I said this morning during the second reading debate, if I was to have a proponent come to me as planning minister and say, 'I want you to override the rules so I can put two hundred 80-metre towers on the top of Mount Coot-tha,' I wonder what the members opposite would think about that. Would they have the same fake outrage that they are displaying now? Guess what? If that happened, the communities would be consulted.

When you go to regional Queensland, under the Labor Party laws and their old codes, the communities and local governments were not consulted. This is returning the balance. It is putting the balance back into regional communities to have a say, and it is part of our plan to not only support regional Queensland—when we say support regional Queensland, we mean it because we were elected in regional Queensland and we have so many fantastic new members from regional Queensland. The Labor Party lost seats in regional Queensland. Their contribution in this debate today and these amendments just show they have learnt nothing from their election loss. They have learnt nothing about regional Queensland. I saw—I did not watch it because I do not follow him on social media—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** No, I do not.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I hope this is relevant to the clause.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It is absolutely relevant. I can assure the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that for every bizarre post, tweet and video he does, they send me copies. I do not go looking for them, but my gosh, I get sent copies. He did this bizarre video. He was touring regional Queensland and yet he stood

in the heart of regional Queensland and then attacked our laws on renewable energy proposals in regional Queensland. It is like, 'Listen, mate. Listen to regional Queensland.'

**Mr Mander:** He's got his finger on the pulse.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. I think he was carrying the Binna Burra bell around with him as well. He holds that close to his heart. Remember he was a firefighter; he was a fake rural firefighter. That was the best polished bell to ever come out of a bushfire. We oppose the amendment proposed by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr DAMETTO:** I did not get an opportunity to speak to the second reading debate, but I will speak to the clause raised by the member. I live in the Hinchinbrook electorate and we have had a number of wind farm proposals in our electorate. They were code assessed to the point where some proponents did a very good job at community consultation. We saw that done where they were trying to build a social licence. Unfortunately, there were other proponents who, under the Labor Party's previous regime, actually flew under the radar. This proposal put forward flies in the face of what we have been trying to achieve here tonight, knowing the community at Mount Fox was not consulted previously under the Labor Party when it came to code assessable wind farms.

The community did not even know what was going on up there at Mount Fox. The local government did not even know what was going on at Mount Fox until the battery facility was proposed and needed council approval. It was at the point where no-one in council knew what was going on up there because it was being code assessed by the state government. The fact is the council had absolutely no idea what impact that was going to have on the roads or the residents there. Shame!

This amendment we are debating seeks to reverse what the state government is trying to achieve, and that is to give back a voice to regional Queensland. Those residents at Mount Fox were absolutely livid to hear there was a second wind farm going in there. When we got to the point of trying to oppose that wind farm, what were we told? 'Sorry, it has been code assessed.' Not even the local member was consulted about the second wind farm being approved. That is an absolute shame and a travesty. I can tell honourable members that they will not find a more connected local member than me with my community. When my community calls me up and says, 'What's going on? There's a wind farm going up there, Mr Dametto,' I can tell them one thing right now—

**Ms Boyd** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Pine Rivers, the member for Hinchinbrook has the call.

**Mr DAMETTO:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. It is absolutely disgusting that a project of that size with that capability of changing the landscape of Mount Fox can completely fly under the radar while there is another proponent doing the right thing in terms of community consultation—

**Ms Bush** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Hinchinbrook—

**Ms Bush** interjected.

**Mr DAMETTO:** I am not taking the interjection, so she can stop that right now.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Hinchinbrook, I am taking the interjection. Member for Cooper, you can leave the chamber for a period of one hour.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Cooper withdrew from the chamber at 10.49 pm.*

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Now we will have some order. We will have some silence. Show some respect for the speaker. Member for Hinchinbrook, you have 41 seconds remaining.

**Mr DAMETTO:** The fact that the proposed legislation tonight gives an opportunity for social impact assessments will ensure that councils are kept at the forefront of any debates, any discussions, any public consultation to ensure that the community is brought along for the journey when it comes to these sorts of things and will have a proper opportunity to ensure that the infrastructure will be put in place, the social licence is being built and ensuring that the community is happy with what is going on in their backyard. That is what Queenslanders deserve, that is what regional Queensland deserves and that is why we will be supporting this legislation as it passes through the House tonight.

*(Time expired)*

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

**AYES, 34:**

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

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**Ind, 1—**Sullivan.

**NOES, 51:**

**LNP, 47—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Dooley, Field, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**KAP, 3—**Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**Ind, 1—**Bolton.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 11 to 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—

**Mr DICK** (10.56 pm): I move amendment No. 2 circulated in my name—

**2 Clause 15 (Insertion of new s 65AA)**

Page 17, after line 18—

*insert—*

(aa) state that development must not start until a social impact assessment report for the application for the approval, that complies with section 106W(1), has been given to the assessment manager; or

(ab) state that development must not start until a community benefit agreement for the application for the approval, required under section 106Z(1)(a) or (b), has been given to the assessment manager; or

These issues have been well and truly canvassed tonight and during the course of the second reading debate.

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

**AYES, 34:**

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

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**Ind, 1—**Sullivan.

**NOES, 51:**

**LNP, 47—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Dooley, Field, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**KAP, 3—**Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**Ind, 1—**Bolton.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 16 to 18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19—

**Mr DICK** (11.03 pm): I move amendment No. 3 circulated in my name—

**3 Clause 19 (Amendment of s 79 (Requirements for change applications))**

Page 20, lines 1 to 30—

*omit.*

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

Clause 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20, as read, agreed to.

Clause 21—

**Mr DICK** (11.03 pm): I move amendments Nos 4 to 8 circulated in my name—

**4 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 23, lines 18 to 30—

*omit.*

**5 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 25, after line 5—

*insert—*

**106VA Requirement to provide social impact assessment reports**

(1) This section applies in relation to—

(a) a development application for development requiring social impact assessment; or

(b) a change application, other than a change application for a minor change to a development approval, that relates to development requiring social impact assessment.

(2) The applicant must give the assessment manager or responsible entity for the application a social impact assessment report for the application that complies with section 106W(1)—

(a) if the assessment manager or responsible entity gives the applicant a notice under subsection (3)—within the period stated in the notice; or

(b) otherwise—before the application is decided.

*Note—*

For a change to a development application, or a change application, that relates to development requiring social impact assessment, see also section 52A.

(3) The assessment manager or responsible entity for the application may, by notice given to the applicant, ask the applicant to give the assessment manager or responsible entity a social impact assessment report for the application within a stated reasonable period after the application is made.

(4) This section does not apply if the chief executive gives the applicant a notice under section 106ZE(1)(a) stating that a social impact assessment report is not required for the application.

**6 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 25, line 8, from '51(4)(a)' to '79(3)(a)'—

*omit, insert—*

52A(3)(a) and 106VA(2)

**7 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 27, after line 11—

*insert—*

**106YA Requirement to provide community benefit agreements**

(1) This section applies in relation to—

(a) a development application for development requiring social impact assessment; or

(b) a change application, other than a change application for a minor change to a development approval, that relates to development requiring social impact assessment.

(2) The applicant must give the assessment manager or responsible entity for the application each community benefit agreement for the application required under section 106Z(1) or entered into under section 106Z(2)—

(a) if the assessment manager or responsible entity gives the applicant a notice under subsection (3)—within the period stated in the notice; or

(b) otherwise—before the application is decided.

*Note—*

For a change to a development application, or a change application, that relates to development requiring social impact assessment, see also section 52A.

(3) The assessment manager or responsible entity for the application may, by notice given to the applicant, ask the applicant to give the assessment manager or responsible entity each

community benefit agreement for the application required under section 106Z(1), or entered into under section 106Z(2), within a stated reasonable period after the application is made.

(4) This section does not apply if the chief executive gives the applicant a notice under section 106ZE(1)(b) stating that a community benefit agreement is not required for the application.

**8 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 27, line 13, from '51(4)(b)' to '79(3)(b)'—

*omit, insert—*

52A(5)(a) and 106YA

Non-government amendments (Mr Dick) negatived.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move amendment No. 5 circulated in my name—

**5 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 31, after line 18—

*insert—*

(5A) A regulation may prescribe matters for this section, including processes and procedures for the mediation.

Amendment agreed to.

**Mr DICK:** I move amendments Nos 9 to 11 circulated in my name—

**9 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 34, line 27, '65AA(2)(b) or'—

*omit, insert—*

65AA(2)(aa) to

**10 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 37, lines 22 to 25—

*omit, insert—*

with section 106VA.

**11 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 37, line 28, '51(4)(a), 79(3)(a)'—

*omit, insert—*

106VA

Non-government amendments (Mr Dick) negatived.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move amendment No. 6 circulated in my name—

**6 Clause 21 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 6B)**

Page 39, line 19 to page 40, line 7—

*omit, insert—*

(1) A local government may charge an entity a fee in relation to each of the following—

(a) carrying out an activity, in relation to the preparation of a social impact assessment report by the entity, in accordance with a guideline made by the chief executive under section 106W(2);

*Examples of activities for paragraph (a)—*

- consulting with the entity about the process for assessing the social impact of development and the terms of reference for the assessment
- consulting with the entity, community members and other stakeholders as part of the process for assessing the social impact of development
- reviewing a draft social impact assessment report prepared by the entity and consulting with the entity about the social impacts and mitigation measures identified in the draft report

(b) considering a social impact assessment report given to the local government by the entity for the purpose of negotiating a community benefit agreement;

(c) negotiating a community benefit agreement with the entity, including participating in a mediation process in relation to the agreement.

*Note—*

See also the *City of Brisbane Act 2010*, section 99 and the *Local Government Act 2009*, section 97.

(2) If an entity is charged a fee under subsection (1), the fee is payable whether or not the entity prepares a social impact assessment report or enters into a community benefit agreement with the local government.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 21, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 22 to 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26—

**Mr DICK** (11.05 pm): I move amendment No. 12 circulated in my name—

**12 Clause 26 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))**

Page 44, lines 18 to 21—

*omit.*

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

Clause 26, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 27 to 48, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.06 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move amendment No. 7 circulated in my name—

**7 After clause 48**

Page 54, after line 8—

*insert—*

**48A Amendment of s 21 (Conditions of appointment)**

Section 21(3)—

*omit.*

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 49, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.06 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I move amendment No. 8 circulated in my name—

**8 After clause 49**

Page 55, after line 3—

*insert—*

**49A Amendment of s 43 (No duty to disclose particular information acquired in particular capacities)**

Section 43(1)(a)(i), after 'holder'—

*insert—*

or public servant

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 52, as read, agreed to.

Clause 53—

**Mr DICK** (11.07 pm): I move amendments Nos 13 and 14 circulated in my name—

**13 Clause 53 (Amendment of s 53AD (Functions))**

Page 56, line 4, before 'Section'—

*insert—*

(1)

**14 Clause 53 (Amendment of s 53AD (Functions))**

Page 56, after line 17—

*insert—*

(2) Section 53AD—

*insert—*

(3) However, subsection (4) applies if the authority has obtained 1 or more allocations of funding for an authority venue under subsection (1)(a).

(4) The authority may seek a further allocation of funding for the authority venue under subsection (1)(a) only if the Legislative Assembly has, on a motion of which at least 28 days notice has been given, passed a resolution approving the seeking of the further allocation.

I want to talk in particular to amendment No. 14. That amendment inserts a new requirement that further funding allocations for Olympic venues may only be sought if approved by resolution of this Assembly, the Legislative Assembly of Queensland, passed with 28 days notice. After years of commentary on the cost of the Olympics and, of course, claims, promises and commitments made time and again that the entire Olympic venues program could be delivered on time and on budget, the LNP has the opportunity tonight to enshrine that in legislation. I think anyone who has observed the history of the Olympics knows that regrettably there is a long history of Olympic infrastructure projects running well and truly beyond the budget.

The problem that Queensland now faces is that the so-called delivery plan has locked the current LNP government into selected sites that have not been scoped at all. In fact, they are not shovel-ready projects. There is no completed design work. There are no detailed costings. There are no confirmed delivery schedules. We do have a brochure.

**Mr de Brenni** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** It is important. I will take the interjection from the Manager of Opposition Business.

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** I take both interjections. The brochure is completely coloured in the new state colour: blue. Have we not seen that all this week: the new state colour appearing on everything? It was also good to hear yesterday that the budget would not be used for advertising purposes—except it was all blue and it had the slogan on it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Woodridge, are you talking to the clause?

**Mr DICK:** Yes, thank you, Speaker. We have a glossy brochure and a photo but that is it. This is important and these amendments matter. They make sure that if additional taxpayer funds are required—and they will be required—then it has to come to the parliament. The costs need to be laid out and justified to the last cent with no secret LNP cabinet decisions and no budget trickery, just accountability. That is what we are seeking to achieve through this amendment that I have moved in the House tonight.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** If only the former treasurer had introduced a similar provision when he was the treasurer funding the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

**Mr Mander** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable sports minister. It would have been novel because his new-found interest in financial accountability and delivering projects on time and on budget is laughable. I do agree with him on one thing: he said there have been years of commentary. That is it! That is all they did. All they did was commentate. We deliver, they commentate. That is all they did even though 1,300 days passed. A whole Olympiad had passed and they had no concrete plans for the 2032 games.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** If I was the former minister for state development who was responsible for Olympic and Paralympic infrastructure, I would not be interjecting because she too was part of the problem in the Labor team. Now the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has moved an amendment because he wants parliament to have a look at financial accountability. We had the Gabba that was $1 billion. Then it was going to be knocked down. Then it was a paint job. Then it went to $2.7 billion. Then it was meant to be over $3 billion. Then the Christmas coup happened and they got rid of Palaszczuk and put in Steven Miles. He said, 'I have a great idea!' He said, 'I'm not going to do permanent venues, I'm going to do temporary venues.' He put forward the $2.25 billion QSAC temporary stadium. Imagine if parliament did have the authority to look at what they did during those four years. It is funny when we repeat a bit of history because he is trying to forget history, although it was not that long ago. He was the treasurer. I would have loved to have been in the CBRC meetings that he was involved in. Did he question then premier Miles about QSAC and the $2.25 billion? Did he question all the blowouts?

Honourable members will recall that when we won office the first thing I did was to ask for the costings of the minor venues. We had already seen the huge blowouts. We suspended BPIC, the CFMEU tax. The Sunshine Coast Council mayor told me that they did the procurement on the original outdoor stadium and because of BPIC the cost had increased by 20 to 30 per cent. I am looking forward

to the new procurement process that GIICA will undertake to see what the costs will be without the CFMEU Labor BPIC tax.

I remind members, the Labor Party and the community about the history of the Olympic and Paralympic Games because the member for Woodridge is right: there was a lot of commentary. However, there was not much action from the Labor Party. We have had to fix it. With the honourable minister for sport, we developed the 100-day review and then put out the 2032 Delivery Plan. As I said earlier, no matter where you go in the state now, across Queensland people are excited that they have a government that is competent, that got on with the job, that did the review and that delivered the delivery plan. The time for debate is over and the time to deliver is now.

I am proud of the sports minister because I have seen him talking to young kids throughout the state about the Games On! program and the PlayOn! vouchers. That level of excitement from young kids who want to be Olympians and Paralympians in the 2032 games would not have happened if the Labor Party were re-elected. Their aspiration was for a temporary venue at QSAC. Every time I drive through the electorate of the honourable member for Gympie and I see the big Matilda kangaroo out the front of the service station, I think that the only thing missing from Steven Miles's QSAC plan was to grab Matilda and take it back to QSAC because that is where it was in the 1982 Commonwealth Games. The only thing missing was a big blow-up kangaroo sitting on top of QSAC.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The Trojan kangaroo! The Labor Party cannot lecture anybody about financial accountability. They blew the budget for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

I want to thank the federal minister, Catherine King. We met last week. We have been speaking regularly because we are both determined to deliver the best games in 2032. We are both determined, as is the Prime Minister and the Premier, to deliver the 2032 games on time and on budget. We are working with our federal government colleagues to renegotiate the intergovernmental agreement. From the conversations I have had with Minister King, that our sports minister has had with Minister Anika Wells and that the Prime Minister has had with the Premier, I am very confident that we are all on the same journey. We will have the best games in 2032 and they will have the best legacy. I am looking forward to continuing discussions with Minister King, as we had last week.

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

**AYES, 35:**

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

**Grn, 1—**Berkman.

**Ind, 2—**Bolton, Sullivan.

**NOES, 50:**

**LNP, 47—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Dooley, Field, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

**KAP, 3—**Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Dick) negatived.

Clause 53, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 54 and 55, as read, agreed to.

Clause 56—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.22 pm): I move amendments Nos 9 and 10 circulated in my name—

**9 Clause 56 (Replacement of ch 3, pt 3 (Games governance and planning documents))**

Page 58, line 27, 'This section'—

*omit, insert—*

Subsection (3)

**10 Clause 56 (Replacement of ch 3, pt 3 (Games governance and planning documents))**

Page 58, line 33 and page 59, line 1, from 'public' to 'department'—

*omit, insert—*

person

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 56, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 57 and 58, as read, agreed to.

Clause 59—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.23 pm): I move amendment No. 11 circulated in my name—

**11 Clause 59 (Replacement of s 53BJ (Conditions of appointment))**

Page 60, lines 6 to 10—

*omit.*

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 59, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 60, as read, agreed to.

Clause 61—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.23 pm): I move amendment No. 12 circulated in my name—

**12 Clause 61 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 5, div 4, sdiv 3)**

Page 60, line 22, after 'holder'—

*insert—*

or public servant

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 61, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 62 to 64, as read, agreed to.

Clause 65—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.24 pm): I move amendment No. 13 circulated in my name—

**13 Clause 65 (Amendment of s 53CL (Particular entities to give information, documents or assistance to authority))**

Page 63, lines 12 to 16—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section 53CL(1)(e)—

*omit, insert—*

(e) a distributor-retailer;

(f) any other government entity within the meaning of section 53EB.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 65, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 66—

**Mr BLEIJIE** (11.24 pm): I move amendment No. 14 circulated in my name—

**14 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 68, line 33 to page 69, line 6—

*omit, insert—*

(3) Also, a civil proceeding arising out of the development, use or activity may not be started to the extent the relief sought would have the direct effect of prohibiting, restricting or limiting the carrying out of the development, use or activity.

(3A) Subsection (3) does not limit, and is not limited by, section 53EG.

Amendment agreed to.

## Speaker's Ruling, Amendment Out of Order

**Mr SPEAKER:** I note the member for Woodridge's amendment No. 15 is inconsistent with the government's amendment No. 14, which has just been agreed to by the House. This is contrary to standing order 150, which provides that an amendment cannot be moved which is inconsistent with

one already agreed to by the House. I, therefore, rule the member for Woodridge's amendment No. 15 out of order.

**Mr DICK:** I move amendment No. 16 circulated in my name—

**16 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 69, after line 8—

*insert—*

(5) In this section—

***relevant decision*** means a decision, or purported decision, in relation to the development, use or activity that is made under a relevant Act.

*Note—*

See also section 53EG in relation to other decisions related to authority venues, other venues, villages and games-related transport infrastructure.

Non-government amendment (Mr Dick) negatived.

**Mr DICK:** I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

**AYES, 37:**

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

**KAP, 3—**Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

**Ind, 2—**Bolton, Sullivan.

**NOES, 47:**

**LNP, 47—**Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Dooley, Field, Gerber, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Pairs: Bates, Howard; Lister, McMahon.

Resolved in the negative.

**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 note that the Deputy Premier's amendments Nos 25, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42 and 43 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendments Nos 15 to 43, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

**15 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 77, line 18, 'administered.'—

*omit, insert—*

administered; and

**16 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 77, after line 18—

*insert—*

(c) in 1 or more newspapers circulating generally in the project area and in which notices affecting Aboriginal persons and Torres Strait Islander persons are regularly published.

*Example of a newspaper for paragraph (c)—*

the Koori Mail

**17 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 83, after line 19—

*insert—*

(3A) Also, the proponent must give a copy of the notice mentioned in subsection (3) to—

(a) the chief executive of the department; and

(b) the chief executive (cultural heritage).

**18 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, line 10, before 'bear'—

*insert—*

unless the direction states otherwise,

**19 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, after line 13—

*insert—*

(8A) If the infrastructure entity is a government owned corporation or a prescribed authority—

(a) a direction may be given to the entity under subsection (4) only by the Minister acting jointly with the entity's relevant Ministers; and

(b) before the direction is given, the Minister and the relevant Ministers must consult with the entity's board about the proposed direction.

(8B) For subsection (8A), subsections (4) and (5) apply as if a reference in the subsections to the Minister were a reference to the Minister acting jointly with the entity's relevant Ministers.

**20 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, lines 14 and 15—

*omit, insert—*

(9) If a direction is given under this section to an infrastructure entity that is a government owned corporation—

**21 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, lines 27 to 29—

*omit, insert—*

***government entity*** means—

(a) a government entity within the meaning of the *Public Sector Act 2022*, section 276; or

(b) a government owned corporation.

**22 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, after line 29—

*insert—*

***prescribed authority*** means—

(a) the Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority; or

(b) the Queensland Rail Transit Authority.

***Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority*** means the Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority established under the *South East Queensland Water (Restructuring) Act 2007*, section 6.

***Queensland Rail Transit Authority*** means the Queensland Rail Transit Authority established under the *Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013*, section 6.

**23 Clause 66 (Insertion of new ch 3A)**

Page 88, after line 30—

*insert—*

***relevant Ministers***, in relation to a government owned corporation or prescribed authority, means—

(a) for a government owned corporation—the shareholding Ministers of the entity under the *Government Owned Corporations Act 1993*, section 78; or

(b) for the Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority—the responsible Ministers under the *South East Queensland Water (Restructuring) Act 2007*; or

(c) for the Queensland Rail Transit Authority—the responsible Ministers under the *Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013*.

**24 Clause 67 (Amendment, relocation and renumbering of s 54A (Funding agreements))**

Page 94, after line 5—

*insert—*

(1A) Section 54A(1), 'each'—

*omit*.

**25 After clause 68**

Page 95, after line 16—

*insert—*

**68A Amendment of s 57 (Use or disclosure of confidential information)**

(1) Section 57(1)(a)—

*insert—*

(iiia) the chief executive of the department;

(2) Section 57(1)(a)(iiia) and (iv)—

*renumber* as section 57(1)(a)(iv) and (v).

**26 Clause 71 (Amendment and renumbering of sch 1 (Dictionary))**

Page 99, after line 12—

*insert—*

***public servant*** means—

(a) a public service employee; or

(b) an APS employee under the *Public Service Act 1999* (Cwlth).

**27 Clause 72 (Insertion of new schs 1—5)**

Page 105, table before line 1, first entry, columns 2 and 3, 'arena with seating for up to 18,000 people'—

*omit, insert—*

indoor entertainment and sport venue with seating for 12,000 to 15,000 people

**28 Clause 73 (Amendment of s 17 (Composition))**

Page 131, line 2, 'president'—

*omit, insert—*

presidents

**29 Clause 73 (Amendment of s 17 (Composition))**

Page 131, after line 5—

*insert—*

*Note—*

See also section 26 in relation to the vice presidents of the board.

**30 Clause 73 (Amendment of s 17 (Composition))**

Page 132, lines 5 and 6—

*omit, insert—*

(j) either—

(i) if a person holds office as an honorary life president of the Australian Olympic Committee—the honorary life president; or

(ii) otherwise—the chief executive officer of the Australian Olympic Committee;

**31 Clause 78 (Replacement of s 26 (Vice presidents))**

Page 136, lines 10 to 14—

*omit, insert—*

**26 Vice presidents**

(1) The nominated directors holding office under section 17(1)(b) and (c) are the vice presidents of the board.

(2) Each vice president's role is decided by the president.

**32 Clause 80 (Amendment of s 33 (Presiding))**

Page 137, lines 2 to 10—

*omit, insert—*

(1) Section 33(2), 'appointed under section 26(2)'—

*omit.*

(2) Section 33(3)(a), 'appointed under section 26(2)(b)'—

*omit, insert—*

who is the nominated director holding office under section 17(1)(b)

(3) Section 33(3)(b), 'appointed under section 26(2)'—

*omit.*

(4) Section 33(4)—

*omit*.

**33 Clause 81 (Amendment of s 34 (Quorum))**

Page 137, lines 11 to 14—

*omit*.

**34 Clause 82 (Amendment of s 35 (Voting))**

Page 137, lines 15 to 18—

*omit.*

**35 Clause 85 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))**

Page 138, after line 14—

*insert—*

(1) Schedule 6—

*insert—*

***vice president*** means a vice president of the board of the corporation holding office under section 26(1).

**36 Clause 85 (Amendment of sch 6 (Dictionary))**

Page 138, line 15, before 'Schedule'—

*insert—*

(2)

**37 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert—*

**Chapter 4A Regional planning amendments**

**85A Act amended**

This chapter amends the *Planning Act 2016*.

**85B Amendment of s 10 (Making or amending State planning instruments)**

(1) Section 10(3)(c), '60 business days'—

*omit, insert—*

30 business days

(2) Section 10(3)(d), '30 business days'—

*omit, insert—*

20 business days

**38 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert—*

**Chapter 4B Development control plan amendments**

**85C Act amended**

This chapter amends the *Planning Act 2016*.

**85D Amendment of s 275ZB (Restrictions on starting development in structure plan area)**

Section 275ZB(5)(b)—

*insert—*

(iv) the development relates to infrastructure under a designation.

**85E Amendment of s 316 (Development control plans)**

Section 316, note—

*omit, insert—*

*Note—*

See also part 9, division 2 and part 11, division 1.

**85F Insertion of new ch 8, pt 11**

Chapter 8—

*insert—*

**Part 11 Transitional and validation provisions for Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025**

**Division 1 Provisions relating to development control plans**

**366 Definition for division**

In this division—

***development control plan*** see section 358.

**367 Validation of particular development and uses**

(1) This section applies if—

(a) before the commencement, development in relation to infrastructure under a designation was carried out on premises; and

(b) when the development was carried out, a development control plan applied to the premises.

(2) It is declared that the carrying out of the development, and any use of the premises that is a natural and ordinary consequence of the development, is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been if—

(a) a process in the development control plan for making and approving plans, however called, with which development must comply had been complied with in relation to the development; and

(b) the development had complied with the plans in the way stated in the development control plan.

(3) Subsection (2) applies despite—

(a) section 316(2); and

(b) the old Act, section 857(5); and

(c) the repealed *Integrated Planning Act 1997*, section 6.1.45A(2); and

(d) the development control plan.

(4) Subsection (5) applies if the development was carried out under a development approval on premises in—

(a) a community residential designation or an open space designation; or

(b) a town centre designation; or

(c) a conservation designation or a regional transport corridor designation.

(5) Despite section 275ZB, it is declared that the carrying out of the development, and any use of the premises that is a natural and ordinary consequence of the development, is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had the development complied with—

(a) for development on premises in a community residential designation or an open space designation—section 275ZB(1); or

(b) for development on premises in a town centre designation—section 275ZB(2); or

(c) for development on premises in a conservation designation or a regional transport corridor designation—section 275ZB(3).

(6) In this section—

***community residential designation*** see section 275T.

***conservation designation*** see section 275T.

***designation*** includes a designation of land for community infrastructure under the old Act or the repealed *Integrated Planning Act 1997*.

***open space designation*** see section 275T.

***regional transport corridor designation*** see section 275T.

***town centre designation*** see section 275T.

**368 Development in development control plan areas**

(1) This section applies if—

(a) on or after the commencement, development in relation to infrastructure under a designation is carried out on premises; and

(b) a development control plan applies to the premises.

(2) Despite section 316(2), the old Act, section 857(5) and the development control plan—

(a) a process in the development control plan for making and approving plans, however called, with which development must comply does not apply in relation to the development; and

(b) the development is not required to comply with the plans in the way stated in the development control plan.

**39 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert*—

**Chapter 4C Infrastructure charging amendments**

**40 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert—*

**Part 1 Amendment of Planning Act 2016**

**85G Act amended**

This part amends the *Planning Act 2016*.

**85H Amendment of s 113 (Adopting charges by resolution)**

(1) Section 113(3), after 'be for'—

*insert—*

trunk infrastructure that relates to

(2) Section 113(3)(a), 'use'—

*omit, insert—*

a use

(3) Section 113(3)—

*insert—*

(e) development prescribed by regulation.

**85I Replacement of s 120 (Limitation of levied charge)**

Section 120—

*omit, insert—*

**120 Levied charge**

(1) A levied charge under an infrastructure charges notice for a development approval may be for extra demand placed on trunk infrastructure that will be generated by the development the subject of the approval (the ***approved development***).

(2) In working out extra demand, the demand on trunk infrastructure generated by a prescribed development or use may also be included if—

(a) an infrastructure requirement given or imposed in relation to the prescribed development or use has not been complied with; or

(b) the prescribed development or use has not been carried out on the premises and either of the following apply—

(i) the approved development is for or relates to the prescribed development or use and the demand on trunk infrastructure generated by the prescribed development or use has not been included in working out extra demand for another infrastructure requirement;

*Example of approved development that is for or relates to a prescribed development or use—*

The approved development is building work for a multiple dwelling. A material change of use of the premises for the multiple dwelling is accepted development. The building work is for the material change of use, and the use of the premises for the multiple dwelling.

(ii) an infrastructure requirement applying to the premises on which the prescribed development or use will be carried out was given or imposed on the basis of development or a use of a lower scale or intensity being carried out on the premises.

(3) In this section—

***infrastructure requirement*** means an infrastructure charges notice, or a condition of a development approval, that requires infrastructure or a payment in relation to demand on infrastructure.

***prescribed development or use***, in relation to the development approval mentioned in subsection (1), means—

(a) development that may be carried out on the premises without a development permit; or

*Example of development that may be carried out without a development permit—*

accepted development

(b) development that is the subject of another development approval for the premises; or

(c) an existing use of the premises that is lawful and is already being carried out on the premises; or

(d) a previous use of the premises that is no longer being carried out on the premises if the use was lawful when it was carried out; or

(e) another use of the premises that—

(i) is a natural and ordinary consequence of the approved development or of development mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); or

(ii) is or is taken to be a lawful use of the premises under this Act or another Act.

**85J Amendment of s 307 (Infrastructure conditions—change or extension approval)**

(1) Section 307(2), 'section 120(3)(a) and (b)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 120(2)(a) and (b)(ii)

(2) Section 307(4), 'sections 99BRCJ(3) and (3A)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 99BRCJ(2)(b) and (3)(a) and (b)(ii) of that Act

**85K Insertion of new ch 8, pt 11, div 2**

Chapter 8, part 11, as inserted by this Act—

*insert—*

**Division 2 Provisions relating to infrastructure charges notices**

**369 Definitions for division**

In this division—

***given*** includes purportedly given.

***infrastructure charges notice*** includes an infrastructure charges notice under the old Act.

***levied charge*** includes a levied charge under the old Act.

***new***, in relation to a provision of this Act, means the provision as in force from the commencement.

**370 Infrastructure charges notices—former s 120**

(1) This section applies in relation to an infrastructure charges notice given for a development approval before the commencement if—

(a) former section 120 applied in relation to the levied charge under the notice; and

(b) the levied charge did not comply with former section 120 when the notice was given.

(2) It is declared that the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120 been in force when the notice was given.

(3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120 been in force when the notice was given.

(4) However, if the infrastructure charges notice has, before the commencement, been found by a court or tribunal to be invalid or has been set aside by a court or tribunal—

(a) the decision of the court or tribunal, and any orders, declarations or directions made by the court or tribunal in relation to the decision, stand; but

(b) new section 120 applies in relation to the giving, after the commencement, of a new infrastructure charges notice for the development approval.

(5) In this section—

***former section 120*** means section 120 as in force from time to time before the commencement.

**371 Infrastructure charges notices—old Act, s 636 as in force from 7 November 2014**

(1) This section applies in relation to an infrastructure charges notice given for a development approval before the commencement if—

(a) the old Act, section 636 as in force from 7 November 2014 (the ***relevant provision***) applied in relation to the levied charge under the notice; and

(b) the levied charge did not comply with the relevant provision when the notice was given.

(2) It is declared that the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120 been in force when the notice was given.

(3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120 been in force when the notice was given.

(4) However, if the infrastructure charges notice has, before the commencement, been found by a court or tribunal to be invalid or has been set aside by a court or tribunal—

(a) the decision of the court or tribunal, and any orders, declarations or directions made by the court or tribunal in relation to the decision, stand; but

(b) new section 120 applies in relation to the giving, after the commencement, of a new infrastructure charges notice for the development approval.

(5) For subsections (2) to (4), new section 120 applies as if a reference in the section to a term that is defined under this Act and the old Act includes a reference to the term as defined under the old Act.

**372 Infrastructure charges notices—old Act, s 636 as in force between 4 July 2014 and 6 November 2014**

(1) This section applies in relation to an infrastructure charges notice given for a development approval before the commencement if—

(a) the old Act, section 636 as in force between 4 July 2014 and 6 November 2014 (the ***relevant provision***) applied in relation to the levied charge under the notice; and

(b) the levied charge did not comply with the relevant provision when the notice was given.

(2) It is declared that the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120, other than new section 120(2)(b)(ii), been in force when the notice was given.

(3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 120, other than new section 120(2)(b)(ii), been in force when the notice was given.

(4) However, if the infrastructure charges notice has, before the commencement, been found by a court or tribunal to be invalid or has been set aside by a court or tribunal—

(a) the decision of the court or tribunal, and any orders, declarations or directions made by the court or tribunal in relation to the decision, stand; but

(b) new section 120 applies in relation to the giving, after the commencement, of a new infrastructure charges notice for the development approval.

(5) For subsections (2) to (4), new section 120 applies as if a reference in the section to a term that is defined under this Act and the old Act includes a reference to the term as defined under the old Act.

**41 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert—*

**Part 2 Amendment of South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009**

**85L Act amended**

This part amends the *South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009*.

**85M Amendment of s 99BRCF (Power to adopt charges by board decision)**

(1) Section 99BRCF(2)(c), after 'be for'—

*insert—*

trunk infrastructure that relates to

(2) Section 99BRCF(2)(c)(i), from 'trunk infrastructure' to 'use'—

*omit, insert—*

work or a use

(3) Section 99BRCF(2)(c)(ii), (iii) and (iv), 'trunk infrastructure related to'—

*omit.*

(4) Section 99BRCF(2)(c)—

*insert—*

(v) public housing; or

(vi) development prescribed by regulation.

(5) Section 99BRCF(4)—

*insert—*

***public housing***—

(a) means housing—

(i) provided by, or for, the State or a statutory body representing the State; and

(ii) for short or long term residential use; and

(iii) that is totally or partly subsidised by the State or a statutory body representing the State; and

(b) includes services provided mainly for residents of the housing.

**85N Replacement of s 99BRCJ (Limitation of levied charge)**

Section 99BRCJ—

*omit, insert—*

**99BRCJ Levied charge**

(1) A levied charge under an infrastructure charges notice for a water approval for premises may be for additional demand placed on trunk infrastructure that will be generated by the connection the subject of the approval (the ***approved connection***).

(2) In working out additional demand, any existing demand for a water service or wastewater service may be included if—

(a) the existing demand is not the subject of another water approval for the premises; or

(b) the existing demand is the subject of another water approval for the premises and an infrastructure requirement given or imposed in relation to the other water approval has not been complied with.

(3) Also, the demand on trunk infrastructure generated by a prescribed development or use may be included if—

(a) an infrastructure requirement given or imposed in relation to the prescribed development or use has not been complied with; or

(b) the prescribed development or use has not been carried out on the premises and either of the following apply—

(i) the approved connection is for or relates to the prescribed development or use and the demand on trunk infrastructure generated by the prescribed development or use has not been included in working out additional demand for another infrastructure requirement;

*Example of an approved connection that is for or relates to a prescribed development or use—*

The approved connection is for a multiple dwelling. A material change of use of the premises for the multiple dwelling is accepted development under the Planning Act. The approved connection is for the material change of use, and the use of the premises for the multiple dwelling.

(ii) an infrastructure requirement applying to the premises on which the prescribed development or use will be carried out was given or imposed on the basis of development or a use of a lower scale or intensity being carried out on the premises.

(4) In this section—

***charges notice*** means—

(a) an infrastructure charges notice under this Act or the Planning Act; or

(b) a notice mentioned in the repealed SPA, section 977(1).

***development*** see the Planning Act, schedule 2.

***infrastructure requirement*** means a charges notice, a water approval condition or a condition of a development approval if the notice or condition requires infrastructure or a payment in relation to demand on infrastructure.

***prescribed development or use***, in relation to the water approval mentioned in subsection (1), means—

(a) development that may be carried out on the premises to which the water approval relates without a development permit under the Planning Act; or

*Example of development that may be carried out without a development permit under the Planning Act—*

accepted development under the Planning Act

(b) development that is the subject of a development approval for the premises; or

(c) an existing use of the premises that is lawful and is already being carried out on the premises; or

(d) a previous use of the premises that is no longer being carried out on the premises if the use was lawful when it was carried out; or

(e) another use of the premises that—

(i) is a natural and ordinary consequence of development mentioned in paragraph (a) or (b); or

(ii) is or is taken to be a lawful use of the premises under the Planning Act or another Act.

**85O Insertion of new ch 6, pt 16**

Chapter 6—

*insert—*

**Part 16 Validation provisions for Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025**

**159 Definitions for part**

In this part—

***given*** includes purportedly given.

***new***, in relation to a provision of this Act, means the provision as in force from the commencement.

**160 Infrastructure charges notices—s 99BRCJ as in force from 5 December 2014**

(1) This section applies in relation to an infrastructure charges notice given for a water approval before the commencement if—

(a) section 99BRCJ as in force from 5 December 2014 until the commencement of this section (the ***relevant provision***) applied in relation to the levied charge under the notice; and

(b) the levied charge did not comply with the relevant provision when the notice was given.

(2) It is declared that the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 99BRCJ been in force when the notice was given.

(3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 99BRCJ been in force when the notice was given.

(4) However, if the infrastructure charges notice has, before the commencement, been found by a court or tribunal to be invalid or has been set aside by a court or tribunal—

(a) the decision of the court or tribunal, and any orders, declarations or directions made by the court or tribunal in relation to the decision, stand; but

(b) new section 99BRCJ applies in relation to the giving, after the commencement, of a new infrastructure charges notice for the water approval.

(5) For subsections (2) to (4), new section 99BRCJ applies as if—

(a) a reference in the section to the Planning Act includes a reference to the repealed SPA; and

(b) a reference in the section to a term that is defined under the Planning Act and the repealed SPA includes a reference to the term as defined under the repealed SPA.

**161 Infrastructure charges notices—s 99BRCJ as in force before 5 December 2014**

(1) This section applies in relation to an infrastructure charges notice given for a water approval before the commencement if—

(a) section 99BRCJ as in force before 5 December 2014 (the ***relevant provision***) applied in relation to the levied charge under the notice; and

(b) the levied charge did not comply with the relevant provision when the notice was given.

(2) It is declared that the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 99BRCJ, other than new section 99BRCJ(3)(b)(ii), been in force when the notice was given.

(3) Anything done, or omitted to be done, in relation to the infrastructure charges notice is taken to be, and to have always been, as valid and lawful as it would be or would have been had new section 99BRCJ, other than new section 99BRCJ(3)(b)(ii), been in force when the notice was given.

(4) However, if the infrastructure charges notice has, before the commencement, been found by a court or tribunal to be invalid or has been set aside by a court or tribunal—

(a) the decision of the court or tribunal, and any orders, declarations or directions made by the court or tribunal in relation to the decision, stand; but

(b) new section 99BRCJ applies in relation to the giving, after the commencement, of a new infrastructure charges notice for the water approval.

(5) For subsections (2) to (4), new section 99BRCJ applies as if—

(a) a reference in the section to the Planning Act includes a reference to the repealed SPA; and

(b) a reference in the section to a term that is defined under the Planning Act and the repealed SPA includes a reference to the term as defined under the repealed SPA.

**42 After clause 85**

Page 138, after line 17—

*insert—*

**Chapter 4D Queensland home warranty scheme eligibility amendments**

**85P Act amended**

This chapter amends the *Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991*.

**85Q Amendment of s 67WA (Definitions for pt 5)**

Section 67WA—

*insert—*

***contract***, for the carrying out of residential work, see section 67WBA.

**85R Insertion of new s 67WBA**

After section 67WB—

*insert—*

**67WBA References to *contract* for carrying out of residential construction work**

A reference in this part to a ***contract*** that is a contract for the carrying out of residential construction work includes a reference to an arrangement that but for the operation of schedule 1B, section 13(5) or 14(10) would have effect as a contract for the carrying out of residential construction work.

*Example of an arrangement for this section—*

an arrangement between a licensed contractor and a person, reached through an exchange of emails, under which the contractor will carry out residential construction work for the person

**85S Insertion of new sch 1, pt 19**

Schedule 1—

*insert—*

**Part 19 Declaratory and validation provisions for Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025**

**89 Definitions for part**

In this part—

***affirmative decision***, in relation to residential construction work, see section 91 of this schedule.

***binding declaration—***

(a) means a declaration made by the tribunal under the QCAT Act, section 60(1); and

(b) includes an order made by the tribunal under the QCAT Act, section 60(2) to give effect to the declaration.

***consumer—***

(a) has the meaning given under section 67WA of the Act; and

(b) includes the following persons—

(i) a defrauded person under section 68H(1)(c) of the Act;

(ii) a person declared to be, or to have been, a consumer under section 93 of this schedule.

***essential requirements***, for a contract for the carrying out of residential construction work, see section 90 of this schedule.

***non-compliant arrangement*** see section 92(1) of this schedule.

***rectification decision***, in relation to residential construction work, means a decision about the scope of works to be undertaken under the statutory insurance scheme to rectify or complete the work.

***review decision*** means a decision made by the tribunal under the QCAT Act, section 24(1)(a) or (b).

***termination decision***, in relation to residential construction work carried out under a non-compliant arrangement, means a decision—

(a) that the arrangement was terminated in circumstances that, had the arrangement been a contract, would have constituted a valid termination of the contract; and

(b) that had the consequence of allowing a claim for non-completion of the work under the statutory insurance scheme.

**90 Meaning of *essential requirements* for a contract for residential construction work**

The ***essential requirements*** for a contract for the carrying out of residential construction work are that the contract must be in writing and dated and signed by or for each party to the contract.

**91 Meaning of *affirmative decision* in relation to residential construction work**

Each of the following decisions of the commission is an ***affirmative decision*** in relation to residential construction work—

(a) a rectification decision relating to the work;

(b) a termination decision relating to the work;

(c) a decision to allow a claim for the work under the statutory insurance scheme;

(d) a decision to pay an amount for a claim for the work under the statutory insurance scheme;

(e) a decision under section 71 of the Act to recover an amount for the work.

**92 Effect of non-compliant arrangement**

(1) This section applies in relation to an arrangement, entered into before the commencement, for the carrying out of residential construction work (a ***non-compliant arrangement***) that—

(a) did not comply with the essential requirements for a contract for the carrying out of the work; but

(b) would have had effect as a contract for the carrying out of the work if the arrangement had complied with the essential requirements for a contract for the carrying out of the work.

(2) This section applies whether or not the non-compliant arrangement remains in effect on the commencement.

(3) Despite schedule 1B, sections 13(5) and 14(10), the non-compliant arrangement is taken to be, and always to have been, a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work under part 5 of the Act.

**93 Declaration about consumer for residential construction work under non-compliant arrangement**

(1) This section applies to a person who, but for schedule 1B, section 13(5) or 14(10), would be, or would have been, a consumer for residential construction work that is, or was, the subject of a non-compliant arrangement.

(2) It is declared that the person is, or was, a consumer for the residential construction work as if the non-compliant arrangement were, and had always been, a contract for the carrying out of the work under part 5 of the Act.

**94 Validation of particular decisions of commission**

(1) This section applies if, before the commencement, the commission made an affirmative decision in relation to residential construction work that was the subject of a non-compliant arrangement.

(2) However, this section does not apply in relation to a rectification decision or termination decision relating to the residential construction work if, before the commencement, the tribunal made a review decision or binding declaration affecting the rectification decision or termination decision.

(3) The affirmative decision is taken to be, and to always have been, as valid as it would have been if the non-compliant arrangement had been a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work under part 5 of the Act.

(4) Any action, or purported action, taken in reliance on the affirmative decision is taken to be as lawful and valid as it would have been if the non-compliant arrangement had been a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work under part 5 of the Act.

**95 Validation of particular actions of commission**

(1) This section applies if, before the commencement—

(a) the commission did any of the following things (each a ***supportive action***) in relation to residential construction work—

(i) accepted an insurance premium for the work;

(ii) issued a notice of cover for the work;

(iii) recovered or attempted to recover the amount of an unpaid insurance premium under section 68H(4) of the Act for cover under the statutory insurance scheme for the work;

(iv) recovered or attempted to recover, under section 71 of the Act, an amount paid by the commission for a claim for cover under the statutory insurance scheme for the work;

(v) sought or accepted a tender for building work to rectify or complete the work;

(vi) authorised the carrying out of building work to rectify or complete the work;

(vii) paid a claim for the work under the statutory insurance scheme; and

(b) the work was the subject of a non-compliant arrangement.

(2) However, this section does not apply if the supportive action related to a rectification decision or termination decision mentioned in section 94(2) of this schedule.

(3) The supportive action is taken to be, and to always have been, as valid as the action would have been if the non-compliant arrangement had been a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work under part 5 of the Act.

**96 Review of particular decisions of commission**

(1) This section applies if, before the commencement—

(a) a person entered into an arrangement for the carrying out of residential construction work; and

(b) the commission made either of the following decisions (each a ***rejection decision***), whether in the first instance or as an internal review decision, in relation to the work—

(i) a decision to disallow a claim for the work under the statutory insurance scheme wholly or in part (a ***disallowance decision***);

(ii) a decision to the effect that the arrangement could not be validly terminated under the statutory insurance scheme (a ***non-termination decision***); and

(c) the rejection decision was made wholly or partly because the commission considered the arrangement did not comply with the essential requirements for a contract for the carrying out of the work.

(2) However, this section does not apply in relation to a disallowance decision if, before the commencement, the tribunal made a review decision or binding declaration affecting the disallowance decision.

(3) A consumer for the residential construction work affected by the rejection decision may, within 6 months after the commencement, apply to the commission for review of the decision.

(4) For an application for review of the rejection decision under subsection (3), each of the following decisions is taken to be a reviewable decision under part 7, division 3, subdivision 1 of the Act—

(a) a disallowance decision made as an internal review decision;

(b) a non-termination decision.

(5) Section 86C(1) of the Act applies in relation to an application for review of the rejection decision under subsection (3) as if the application were an internal review application made under section 86B of the Act.

(6) Subject to subsections (3) to (5), part 7, division 3, subdivision 1 of the Act, other than sections 86A and 86B(b), applies in relation to an application for review under subsection (3).

**97 Preservation of effect of particular tribunal decisions**

(1) This section applies if, before the commencement—

(a) a person entered into a non-compliant arrangement for the carrying out of residential construction work; and

(b) the tribunal made any of the following decisions, declarations or orders (each an ***affirmative tribunal decision***)—

(i) a review decision or binding declaration that—

(A) was consistent with a rectification decision relating to the work; or

(B) confirmed a termination decision relating to the work;

(ii) an order under section 93(2) of the Act for the payment of an amount under section 71 of the Act relating to the work;

(iii) another decision, declaration or order made on the basis that the non-compliant arrangement was a contract for the carrying out of the work.

(2) The rights, interests and liabilities of all persons affected by the affirmative tribunal decision or related action for the decision are the same, and are taken to have always been the same, as they would be or would have been if the non-compliant arrangement had been a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work under part 5 of the Act.

(3) In this section—

***related action***, for an affirmative tribunal decision, means action, or purported action, taken in reliance on the decision.

**98 Reopening of particular proceedings of tribunal**

(1) This section applies if, before the commencement—

(a) a person entered into an arrangement for the carrying out of residential construction work; and

(b) the tribunal made either of the following decisions—

(i) a decision to disallow a claim for the work under the statutory insurance scheme wholly or in part;

(ii) a decision to the effect that the arrangement could not be validly terminated under the statutory insurance scheme; and

(c) the decision was made wholly or partly because the tribunal considered the arrangement did not comply with the essential requirements for a contract for the carrying out of the work.

(2) A consumer for the residential construction work affected by the decision may, within 6 months after the commencement, apply to the tribunal, under the QCAT Act, section 138, to reopen the proceeding for which the decision was made (the ***reopening application***).

(3) The QCAT Act, section 138(2) does not apply to the reopening application.

(4) Despite the QCAT Act, section 139(4), the tribunal may grant the reopening application if the tribunal considers—

(a) subsection (1)(c) applies to the decision; and

(b) the decision may not have been made if the arrangement had complied with the essential requirements for a contract for the carrying out of the residential construction work.

(5) The QCAT Act, section 140, applies in relation to hearing and deciding the issues in the reopened proceeding as if the tribunal had decided the proceeding should be reopened under section 139 of that Act.

(6) Subject to subsections (2) to (5), the QCAT Act, chapter 2, part 7, division 7 applies in relation to reopening the proceeding and hearing and deciding the issues in the proceeding.

**99 No compensation payable**

(1) No compensation is payable by the State or the commission to any person for or in connection with the enactment or operation of a relevant amendment or anything done to carry out or give effect to a relevant amendment.

(2) This section applies despite any other Act or law.

(3) In this section—

***relevant amendment*** means an amendment of the Act by the *Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025*, chapter 4D.

**85T Amendment of sch 1B, s 1 (Definitions for sch 1B)**

Schedule 1B, section 1, definition *written form*—

*omit.*

**85U Amendment of sch 1B, s 13 (Requirements for contract—level 1 regulated contract)**

Schedule 1B, section 13(2), 'in a written form,'—

*omit, insert*—

in writing and

**85V Amendment of sch 1B, s 14 (Requirements for contract—level 2 regulated contract)**

Schedule 1B, section 14(2), 'in a written form,'—

*omit, insert*—

in writing and

**85W Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary)**

(1) Schedule 2, definitions *contract* and *written form*—

*omit.*

(2) Schedule 2—

*insert—*

***contract*—**

(a) for the carrying out of residential construction work, for part 5, see section 67WBA; or

(b) for part 7, means a contract for carrying out tribunal work.

**43 Schedule 1 (Other amendments)**

Page 139, after line 14—

*insert—*

**Environmental Offsets Act 2014**

**1 Schedule 2, definition *administering agency*, paragraph (a)(i)(B), 'the Planning Act, schedule 2, definition *enforcement authority*, paragraph (a)(iii)'—**

*omit, insert—*

section 160A(2) of that Act

**2 Schedule 2, definition *administering agency,* paragraph (a)(ii)(A), 'schedule 2 of that Act, definition *enforcement authority*, paragraph (b)'—**

*omit, insert—*

section 160A(2) of that Act

Question put—That clauses 66 to 86 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 66 to 86 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 Deputy Premier's amendment No. 44, as circulated, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to,

Amendment, as circulated—

**44 Long title**

Long title, after 'the *Planning and Environment Court Act 2016*'—

*insert—*

**, the *Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991*, the *South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009***

Question put—That the long title of the bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

# ADJOURNMENT

**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.33 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

## Ipswich West Electorate, Road Infrastructure

**Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (11.33 pm): I rise today genuinely bewildered by the approach that this government continues to take—an approach more focused on short-term political pointscoring than on delivering for the people of Ipswich West. Specifically, I am concerned by the lack of briefings, communication and progress on critical infrastructure projects in my electorate of Ipswich West: the Mount Crosby interchange, the Bremer River Bridge, the Warrego Highway, Haigslea-Amberley Road and Schultz Road intersection, the second river crossing and the Amberley

interchange. These are not pet projects; they are essential upgrades for the safety, connectivity and growth of one of the fastest growing regions in Queensland.

The minister and this government are well aware of the importance of each of these projects to the people of Ipswich West, yet despite my requests for briefings I am met with radio silence. In some cases, I learn of updates only through the media or by attending public meetings, where departmental representatives answer questions that should have already been shared with my office. No, a phone call telling my office about the incident on the Mount Crosby overpass when it happened—albeit I was grateful for that—and a further call weeks later telling me to check TMR's Facebook page for the latest update does not constitute a ministerial briefing or being kept up to date as the local state member.

My office fielded hundreds of emails and phone calls and had people calling into the office seeking information around the Mount Crosby overpass incident. It is they who deserved to get answers on what was happening on this critical piece of infrastructure. This incident created havoc throughout the whole electorate, not just within the immediate area but across the electorate, on many local roads not built to withstand the traffic volumes. It highlighted the need for an alternative route. I want to say that I also appreciate that TMR acted after the incident and have worked very hard to find a solution.

I was elected by the people of Ipswich West—democratically, fairly and with a mandate to represent them. No matter which side of politics I sit on, I am here to be their voice. Whether it suits the government or not, I will continue to be their voice. I did not come here to revise the past; I came here to focus on the future—on how we deliver what our communities need rather than on who possibly failed to do so in the past. This endless blame game is not just tiresome; it is a disservice to every resident in Ipswich West.

I want solutions. I want a briefing. I want a seat at the table. Most of all, I want to see shovels in the ground. I urge the minister to take his foot off the brake, stop staring in the rear-view mirror and start driving these projects forward. Let me be clear: I am not going anywhere. Until we get the answers and the action we deserve, I will continue to tailgate this government every step of the way.

002

## Redland Bay Men's Shed

**Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (11.36 pm): I would like to take this opportunity to give a heartfelt shout-out to one of Redlands' truly special community groups, the Redland Bay Men's Shed. Last week I had the absolute pleasure of visiting the shed and meeting with president Martyn Rogers and more than 50 of their members—part of the group that is now over 100 strong. What an incredible bunch they are. There was an unmistakable energy in the room—the sound of tools at work, laughter in the air and the kind of camaraderie that reminds you how powerful connection really is. That is what makes the Men's Shed movement so vital. It is not just about woodworking or projects; it is about purpose and friendship and providing a safe, welcoming space for men to support one another and talk openly about life.

We know that mental health does not always look the same for everyone, and for many blokes the chance to connect over a shared activity can be life-changing. The Redland Bay Men's Shed is living proof of that—fostering community, encouraging wellness and offering something as simple and profound as belonging.

If there is one thing I heard loud and clear during my visit it is that they are bursting at the seams. This group has grown so much that space has become a real issue. I want to assure the members that I will be working closely with Redland council to explore ways we can support them into the future, because when you see a group delivering so much good you want to help them grow.

I have to mention the beautiful gifts I received: a handmade golf club pen for my husband, Justin, and for me a cheeky little monkey trinket, which now has pride of place in my office—small tokens but incredibly meaningful and a perfect reflection of the care and craftsmanship these men put into everything they do.

To everyone at the Redland Bay Men's Shed, thank you. Thank you for your warmth, your humour and the vital role you play in our community. You are more than just a shed; you are a sanctuary, and our Redlands is better for it.

003

## Wynnum Fringe

**Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (11.39 pm): The Wynnum Fringe festival is here. It is running from 2 to 20 July. Our bayside is set to explode with colour, culture and connection as Wynnum Fringe returns with its biggest celebration ever. A blockbuster program of music, comedy, cabaret, kids shows and

circus will light up the Augathella Spiegeltent. That is right: the spiegeltent from Augathella has been purchased by Wynnum Fringe and brought to Wynnum.

Every year the festival has gone from strength to strength. Ticket sales are through the roof. It brings colour and vibrancy to my local bayside community in the electorate of Lytton. In terms of driving economic growth, everyone is a winner—small businesses, accommodation providers and creatives.

We know that, sadly, those opposite hate the arts. It is in their DNA. I am not really sure why. Perhaps it is because, deep down, they are still recovering from that time they did not get cast in the high school musical. Ever since then they have had a vendetta against the arts. Maybe it is not that they hate the arts; maybe they are just confused by them. Perhaps they think fringe festivals are about haircuts. Maybe the LNP just do not like a bit of colour in life. Maybe the world should just be painted in 'LNP blue'. Even maroon is way too far out there for the LNP. They had to change the colour of our state's logos, for goodness sake!

The local hardcore group of cookers that run the Lytton LNP spit out their usual online bile every time they hear the words 'Wynnum Fringe'—threatening sponsors, supporters and creatives. Yes, that does really happen. The Wynnum Fringe festival proudly sponsors the Bay Pride march, which kicks off at 11.30 this Sunday at the Wynnum Wading Pool. Wouldn't it be nice if government members showed their support? Tickets are now on sale.

Our government funded the Wynnum Fringe festival through Arts Queensland because we recognised the value and benefit. It is not clear exactly what festivals will be supported by this government. Perhaps it is based on who the local member is or just on picking winners. So much for the Queensland Creative Futures arts uplift; it depends on your postcode.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PEASE:** I look forward to clarity regarding funding for festivals and I encourage everyone—even members opposite who are having a go at me—

**A government member:** What about the country muster?

**Ms PEASE:** If the member had listened to what I was talking about, he would know that the spiegeltent actually came from Augathella. The festival is actually called 'Wynnum to the West'. I encourage those opposite who are going to town on me for talking about the arts to come down and have a look. We are having a B & S ball and everything!

## Motherhood Village; Baby Give Back

**Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (11.41 pm): I rise to speak on two exceptional local charities on the Gold Coast. Motherhood Village Ltd, based on the Gold Coast, is passionate about supporting local mothers, fathers and families who feel isolated or alone with their struggles as they navigate parenting. A local mum, Tracey Tyley, came to see me last year about her particular charity. Last weekend I saw her and her husband, Adam, and their son Spencer, whose birthday it was—and I will tell members more about that event soon.

Motherhood Village is the Gold Coast's first and only peer-led perinatal mental health support service, built on lived experience and aimed at supporting mothers and fathers who are falling through the cracks in our mental health system. With research showing that one in five mothers and one in 10 fathers in Australia will experience perinatal mental illness and with more than 7,000 babies born each year on the Gold Coast, Motherhood Village is performing a mammoth job. In 2025 alone, Motherhood Village has already directly supported almost 300 families on the Gold Coast, with feedback from 99 per cent of participants reporting they are feeling more connected, more empowered and less alone.

Motherhood Village programs are wideranging and diverse and include mental health support, antenatal and bereavement groups, and targeted support for families recovering from acute illness or early pregnancy loss or navigating fertility journeys. It works closely with Gold Coast Health, local hospitals and the Gidget Foundation to provide wraparound care that eases pressure on clinical services.

As I mentioned before, I recently attended the Motherhood Village Ltd Family Fun Day event on the Isle of Capri, right opposite my electorate office. There were lots of families there, shedding the perception that the Surfers Paradise electorate is full of people who are not necessarily having children. There are a lot of young families there. It was an outstanding initiative at which there were hundreds of people and a great number of volunteers to help out. It reached over 28,000 people in our community and is a powerful reminder that when services are built from lived experience they are trusted and effective.

Also on the Gold Coast is Baby Give Back. Members here may well be acquainted with it and its founder, Carly Fradgley. It is a charity that provides donated basics, such as clothing and nappies, to vulnerable babies and children through social service agencies and caseworkers. I commend the good work of Motherhood Village and Baby Give Back, because no parent should suffer in silence—and of course there are many who also need support—and on the Gold Coast, thanks to Motherhood Village and Baby Give Back, they do not have to suffer and are being supported by other members of our community.

004

## Bastion, Mr RW

**Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (11.44 pm): People from all over Australia recently gathered in Cairns to celebrate the life of a true tourism legend. Robert William Bastion's contribution to the tourism industry, not just in Far North Queensland but also across Queensland and Australia, remains unique and unprecedented. He was the consummate road warrior when it came to selling the Great Barrier Reef and a range of products from the Far North to the world.

Robbie gave up a milk and bread run and started working at the Queensland government travel bureau in Sydney, where his tourism journey began. He established many lifelong relationships in those early days, particularly with Todd Parker. In the late 1980s he moved to Cairns and started working in sales with the reef company Quiksilver in what would be described by many of us as the golden age of tourism in the Far North, with Max Shepherd and Mike Burgess. This marked the beginning of his world travels and the creation of an amazing network of lifelong friends and business contacts, not to mention amazing life stories.

Robbie was part of a small team that travelled extensively through the late 1980s and early 1990s, establishing the economic foundation stones for our region's success and building in the international market. He built genuine relationships, attending travel and roadshows and conducting trips himself. His establishment of the Paradise Found roadshow after the September 11 attacks in New York reflected not only his understanding of the industry but also his passion for it—unlike any other in Australia's international tourism marketing strategies.

He was an outrageous character at times and, like all of us, was not without fault; however, his acknowledgement of his own faults only appeared to endear him to his countless friends and colleagues. His wit and humour were powerful and opened many doors—and possibly closed a few. He loved a drink and a laugh and was a great lover of all sports. He was generous with his vast knowledge of the industry and helped many in the tourism industry over generations.

A skilled writer, an avid reader and an acknowledged author, he spent many years feeding his quest for knowledge, visiting museums and libraries around the world. His writing skills were reflected in his annual email to the world summarising international and domestic politics, sporting events and social happenings. They were not just humorous but often studded with pearls of wisdom.

With his recent passing he leaves behind countless friends, and the tourism industry in not just Queensland but Australia has lost a true legend. Our thoughts and prayers go to Gail, Jesse and James, Robbie’s five exquisite grandkids, and Vicki. Vale, Robert William Bastion. He was a good man.

## Wide Bay Promo Night

**Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (11.47 pm): Whether from the Coral Coast, the Fraser Coast, Maryborough or Callide, our Wide Bay icons are coming to Parliament House tomorrow night. David Lee, John Barounis and I are bringing the Wide Bay to parliament for a special roadshow celebrating the region's excellence. I take this opportunity to remind all MPs to come along. I will be shamelessly boasting to everyone here tonight just how awesome our region is.

Our promo night will showcase the region's finest produce, attractions and award-winning businesses. Our region will be well represented with the likes of Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers, Bundaberg Rum, Lady Elliot Island Eco Resort, Downer, Hyne, Maryborough Military and Colonial Museum, Ocean King Prawns, Artificial Turf Qld, and Kingfisher Bay Resort and Village. Our local chambers of commerce, our councillors and many more will make a special appearance.

We first launched this event in 2012. I am very proud to once again bring the region's unbeatable produce, unique tourism opportunities and thriving organisations to Brisbane. It is no secret that I am incredibly proud of this region and what we have to offer, and I look forward to being able to shine a spotlight on our icons tomorrow.

Having these amazing products and services all under the one roof at Parliament House is great exposure for our region. It is a valuable opportunity to highlight the strength, diversity and community spirit of our electorates—from small family owned business to large businesses, from charitable organisations to industry groups. I give a shout-out to Regional Development Australia and our collective staff for the huge effort they have put into making tomorrow night what it will be. Their hard work and dedication are what make our region such a dynamic and welcoming place. We thank them for it.

I know that the member for Maryborough, John Barounis, is very proud and eager to highlight local businesses and Maryborough's rich heritage and growing tourism appeal. Maryborough is home to many beautiful heritage listed buildings that attract visitors from near and far. David Lee is also a very proud local member who cannot wait to show off the tourism mecca of Hervey Bay with great food, hospitality and accommodation.

**A government member:** They've got nice scallops.

**Mr BENNETT:** And nice scallops; I take the interjection. The Wide Bay promo night aims to foster greater awareness and collaboration across electorates while celebrating the achievements and character of our regional communities. I look forward to inviting the likes of Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers CEO Bree Watson back to the House. She has been with us from the start. I thank them very much for their effort. It provides a valuable platform to showcase the exceptional variety of produce grown in our region and an opportunity for our stakeholders to engage directly with ministers and shadow ministers.

Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers also partners with Foodbank Queensland for this event, with all showcased produce donated to support their vital food relief efforts. I cannot wait to show off the Wide Bay to all of our MPs tomorrow and I look forward to seeing you there. If you have not already RSVPed, it is not too late. Let's welcome Bundaberg Tourism, Kalki Moon, Mon Repos, Tinaberries, PCCC, Lychee Divine, Fraser charters, Economic Development Queensland, Downer and, of course, all things archery as we celebrate the Olympic Games and archery in Maryborough. See you tomorrow night!

## Queensland Teachers' Union, Enterprise Bargaining

**Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (11.50 pm): Yesterday members of the Labor opposition stood shoulder to shoulder with Queensland teachers and members of the QTU in their fight for the future of education in Queensland—a fight that is not just about teachers but also about students, because every student deserves a great education and every educator deserves respect. A quality education for every child needs teachers who can depend on fair pay and safe, fair working conditions. That is what our teachers are fighting for in the current round of EB negotiations.

QTU members are stronger, more united and more determined than ever to be valued and respected for their profession: educating Queensland students. What they are asking for is crystal clear: nation-leading wages. While the government made lots of promises to our teachers and school leaders before the election, they are not so interested in fulfilling those promises now. Labor understands that schools do not run on false promises. They run on the dedication and hard work of our teachers, teacher aides, admin staff and school leaders. That is why Labor will always stand shoulder to shoulder with teachers in their fight for decent conditions.

Our educators work tirelessly each and every day to nurture the hearts and minds of our young people. I sat down recently with three local delegates from the Queensland Teachers' Union, Mickey, Kate and Michael, Nudgee locals and incredibly inspiring examples of the teaching profession. These three educators have dedicated their professional lives to the service of young people in this state. They wanted me to know what they are fighting for and why they are fighting for it. I want Mickey, Kate and Michael to know that I am fighting for them. I want every teacher in my local schools across the Nudgee electorate to know that I am fighting for them. I want every teacher who has made a difference in the lives of my two children to know that, as a mother, I am so thankful for what they do each and every day and that I am fighting for them. I know my husband knows that I am proud to be married to a state school teacher.

The QTU's priorities are not unreasonable. They are fighting for what every teacher in this state deserves: fair pay, manageable workloads and the basic resources to ensure every student receives a quality education. Thank you to all of the educators and union members who showed up and made their voices heard outside parliament last night. Thank you to the QNMU, which came out in solidarity with teachers, because strong public services rely on properly valuing the people who deliver them.

After last week's shameful offer presented to union members—as stated by QTU members themselves, the worst EB offer in living memory—the pressure is now on the LNP government to come to the table and deliver for Queensland teachers like they promised.

## Andersen, Mr J

**Mr LEE** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (11.53 pm): I rise to pay tribute to a fifth-generation Hervey Bay stalwart, Mr John Andersen. John has lived a full and adventurous life as a former schoolteacher, small business and Fun Parlour owner, tour guide, magician, justice of the peace and local historian. John Andersen has given a lifetime of service to our Hervey Bay community.

John is a magician and was awarded the 60-year Order of Merlin Excelsior from the International Brotherhood of Magicians, one of 50 in the world. He has mixed in circles with the likes of American magicians David Copperfield and Penn & Teller. John's favourite trick is with the linking rings. John and Lynette Andersen owned and operated the iconic Fun Parlour in Scarness, Hervey Bay for over 45
006 years. The Fun Parlour included minigolf, slot cars, pool tables, pinball and a jukebox.

In 2007 John joined the Hervey Bay Historical Village and Museum and later served seven years as president. John is now a life member of the Hervey Bay Historical Village and Museum. John is passionate about saving our history. He collaborated with other local historians and the Hervey Bay Historical Village and Museum Management Committee and wrote four major books: *Hervey Bay: The First 150 Years*, *The Urangan Pier: Hervey Bay Celebrating 100 Years* and *Moments in Time: A Pictorial History of the Fraser Coast*, volumes 1 and 2. John also spent countless hours painstakingly restoring old glass negatives and photos of the Fraser Coast region.

In 2013 John was instrumental in bringing the then Governor of Queensland, Her Excellency Ms Penelope Wensley AC, as the guest of honour to Hervey Bay's 150-year celebrations. In September 2023 John was pivotal in organising the 80th anniversary of Operation Pilgrimage, led by Lieutenant General Ken Gillespie, a former chief of the Australian Army. The anniversary marked the occasion of Operation Jaywick, a special operation in World War II in which Z Force commandos and sailors trained on K'gari Fraser Island. On 26 September 1943 Z Force used the MV *Krait*, disguised as an Indonesian fishing boat, to infiltrate the Japanese occupied Singapore harbour and sink three ships and damage a further three ships. John also served on the Fraser Coast Regional Council's Arts, Culture and Heritage Advisory Committee.

There is a saying that behind every good man there stands a woman. Thank you, Lynette, for so ably supporting John in his community work over many years. On behalf of the Hervey Bay community, thank you, John Andersen. You are leaving an enduring historical legacy to our community. You are, indeed, saving our history.

## Flinders River, Water Allocation

**Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (11.56 pm): I would like to talk tonight about the flawed allocation process of Flinders River through a parody. It could be the best way to describe the government approvals processes for water allocations in the Flinders. It was written by an ex-farmer who worked hard for many years to try to get an allocation for a project at Hughenden. It is called 'The Flinders River Hotel'. It reads—

Great pub with plenty of cold beer on tap. Run by the State Government water department, managed by the Minister.

For the last ten years they have sold less than 5% of their beer. Why? The rules of drinking in their pub were just too hard.

A lot of the beer was reserved [for] years by people who don't show up. We call them sleepers.

Why don't they have a sale? They tried that a couple of years ago but cancelled it. Everyone downstream had to ask permission to be able to buy the beer at the auction, so of course everyone except the best downstream dude, who didn't have to ask anyone, was sitting pretty. This upset a lot of people.

Have they got plenty of staff? Yeah, heaps. They are busy setting the drinking rates.

Plenty of tables? Yeah, but most are reserved for the sleepers who don't show, and you upset them by sitting near them.

Is management trying to fix the problem? Oh yeah, they're doing this big review run by themselves under the same rules from last time, with lots of stakeholder meetings.

Are they listening? No.

Will anything change? Probably not. What will happen to the pub? It will have not many customers and beer sales, and the locals will still miss out on what could be a great pub with plenty of action.

That's a shame. Why aren't the locals doing something about it? They have formed a "beer alliance" and are trying to have a meeting with management.

Do you think management will take any notice? I hope so, because after this next round of beer sales, the brewery won't be able to supply any more.

We have the Flinders River system—there is the Etheridge as well. The Flinders is 1,000 kilometres long, and 3.8 million megalitres a year flow down it. Half of it is dry most of the year. It is a monsoonal system, so everything flows once a year. We do not capture anything in it. For goodness sake, should we not at least let people take something out of it? We are talking about less than five per cent being used at the moment. Even the environmentalists let you take 20 to 30 per cent without question, yet here we are squabbling over giving out five per cent of a system. We are not trying to cost-recover on any infrastructure. There is no dam in there. They have to carry all the risk of supply but we cannot issue anything.

Please do not follow what Labor did in the last 10 years. We were excited when there was a change of government in the Newman years and we thought there would be a 600,000-megalitre allocation, but only an extra 100,000 was allocated, which is where we are now. Apart from Etta Plains, nothing new has gone out. The large-scale cotton farms are not great deliverers to the small towns. The smaller units are the good deliverers to the towns. That is why we aim at schemes. The larger aggregation of those waters are akin to FIFO mining operations. These allocations need to go out. It
007 will cost you nothing to activate that economic development.

## Gold Coast, Housing

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (11.59 pm): Housing on the Gold Coast is a hot issue, particularly for residents of my Mermaid Beach electorate taking in Mermaid Beach, Nobby Beach, Miami north and Burleigh east of the Gold Coast Highway. They are very concerned about the Gold Coast City council's focus on putting wall-to-wall high-rise apartments right across local residential streets. We understand that there is a huge migration to the Gold Coast and there must be planning to accommodate this influx of people; however, turning the east side of the highway into sardine city, with multimillion dollar apartments that only the very rich can afford, is not the answer to providing affordable housing, which the city desperately needs.

Colliers advise that the average cost of new units on the Gold Coast is $2 million. While it is easy for developers to sell multimillion dollar apartments with views of the fantastic beachfront, the city council should focus on providing affordable units in high-rise developments around train stations known as transport oriented development. Nerang, Helensvale and Coomera stations are the perfect locations for affordable unit development, and the development industry should focus their high-rise aspirations on those areas for the betterment of the city to avoid clogged up roads and street parking fiascos.

My community understands that some medium density high-rise along the Gold Coast Highway and light rail stage 3 is an acceptable outcome; however, the area between the highway and the beachfront is an area they bought into because of the low-rise amenity and current peaceful tranquillity, and they do not want that changed. I support them wholeheartedly. I will do everything I can to reach a sustainable and acceptable outcome for the area that is prime Gold Coast real estate.

With international migration being the catalyst for interstate migration to the Gold Coast from down south, it is incumbent upon us as decision-makers to think of the long-term outcomes of our planning decisions today. With population projections forecasting over a million people on the Gold Coast by 2042, we do not want to see highway gridlock and street parking chaos as the outcomes of our short-term, sugar hit development solutions. As demographer Bernard Salt once said to me in answer to my questions on the above outcomes, Gold Coasters will have to 'learn to compartmentalise', which means in layman's terms that if you live west or north of the city it will be a very long day to get to the beach.

I have already espoused the opportunity of developing 10,000 hectares of farmland in the north of the city. Couple that with several nodes of transport oriented development of affordable housing around train stations and we will have a viable development program for the many thousands of people who want to make the Gold Coast home. 'Affordability' is the keyword for future development, and there is no cheap housing being proposed for my electorate on the Gold Coast.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

008 The House adjourned at 12.03 am (Thursday).

## ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Head, Healy, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Sullivan, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young