



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Tuesday, 9 December 2025

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3859
Absence of Clerk of the Parliament	3859
ASSENT TO BILLS	3859
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 24 November 2025, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 24 November 2025	3859
ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF HINCHINBROOK	3859
By-Election, Return of Writ	3859
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Endorsed Writ for the election of the Electoral District of Hinchinbrook	3860
Member Sworn	3860
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3860
Absence of Members	3860
PRIVILEGE	3860
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	3860
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Premier and Minister for Veterans and member for Broadwater	3861
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	3861
Parliament House, Artwork	3861
Visitors to Public Gallery	3861
PETITIONS	3861
TABLED PAPERS	3862
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3865
Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report	3865
Cordingley, Ms T	3866
Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report	3866
Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report	3867
Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report	3868

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 9 December 2025

Resources Industries	3869
WorkCover, Fraud	3869
Resources Industries	3869
Resources Industries	3870
Agriculture and Forestry Industries, Environmental Regulations.....	3871
Cricket.....	3872
Parliament, Sitting Days.....	3872
<i>Tabled paper: Memo, dated 9 December 2025, from the Assistant Minister to the Premier on</i>	
<i>Matters of State and New Citizens and Leader of the House, Dr Christian Rowan MP, to members</i>	
<i>of the Parliament, advising of the 2026 parliamentary sitting calendar.</i>	
MOTION	3872
Portfolio Committees, Membership.....	3872
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	3873
Visitor to Public Gallery	3873
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3873
Public Service, Consultancies.....	3873
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Proactive Claims Management Project'</i>	
Public Service, Consultancies.....	3874
Child Protection.....	3875
Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety, Information Technology.....	3875
Child Protection.....	3876
Energy Assets	3877
Child Protection.....	3877
Energy Assets	3878
Child Protection.....	3878
Energy Assets	3879
Child Protection.....	3880
<i>Tabled paper: Media release, dated 20 February 2025, by the Minister for Education and the Arts,</i>	
<i>Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, titled 'Every interaction Counts'.</i>	
National Parks, Pest Management.....	3881
CFMEU	3881
<i>Tabled paper: Photograph depicting Labor Forum.</i>	
Road Infrastructure	3882
Health System, Workforce	3883
<i>Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding health professionals.</i>	
MOTIONS	3884
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	3884
CFMEU, Administration.....	3884
Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3890
Non-government amendment (Ms Scanlon) negatived	3890
Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	3890
Motion agreed to.....	3890
Suspension of Sessional Orders.....	3890
ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF HINCHINBROOK	3890
First Speech.....	3890
HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3).....	3893
Second Reading	3893
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3903
Cost of Living	3903
Hinchinbrook Electorate, By-Election	3904
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance.....	3905
Reportable Conduct Scheme.....	3906
Cost of Living	3907
Reportable Conduct Scheme; Member for Hinchinbrook.....	3908
Homelessness	3909
Social Housing	3910
Cost of Living	3911
Pioneer-Burdekin Pumped Hydro Project.....	3912
Queensland Museum, Educational Materials	3913
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Introduction to ocean acidification'</i>	
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Changing climates, changing waters'.</i>	
<i>Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'States of matter—our warming world'</i>	
<i>Tabled paper: Document, dated December 2025, titled 'Report: Queensland Museum Learning</i>	
<i>Resources: Climate Accuracy and Sponsorship Concerns'.</i>	
<i>Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 September 2025, from the Environmental Defenders Office to the</i>	
<i>Chief Executive Officer of the Queensland Museum, Dr Jim Thompson PSM, regarding the</i>	
<i>museum's Future Makers program.</i>	
ENERGY ROADMAP AMENDMENT BILL; GREENHOUSE GAS STORAGE AMENDMENT BILL; HEALTH LEGISLATION	
AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3); DEFAMATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3914
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	3918
Resolved in the negative.....	3918
Division: Question put—That the question be now put	3923
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3923
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	3924

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 9 December 2025

Resolved in the affirmative.....	3924
PRIVILEGE	3924
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Use of Unparliamentary Language	3924
HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)	3924
Second Reading	3924
CROCODILE CONTROL AND CONSERVATION BILL	3933
Second Reading	3933
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photographs depicting people on rafts at the Innisfail Sugar Festival titled 'Home Made Raft Race'.....	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—	
Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission No. 96.....	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting a crocodile in a hotel pool.....	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting a crocodile caught in a net on a beach.....	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—	
Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission No. 78.....	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Government: Report titled 'Queensland Crocodile Management Plan', 2025.....	3935
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—	
Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, government response.....	3935
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—	
Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission from Dr Tim Coyle.....	3945
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.....	3946
Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).....	3946
HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)	3946
Second Reading	3946
Consideration in Detail	3949
Clauses 1 to 57, as read, agreed to.....	3949
Clause 58, as read, agreed to.....	3951
Clauses 59 to 71, as read, agreed to.....	3953
Clauses 72 to 89, as read, agreed to.....	3953
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.....	3953
Third Reading.....	3953
Long Title.....	3953
ENERGY ROADMAP AMENDMENT BILL.....	3953
ENERGY ROADMAP AMENDMENT BILL; GREENHOUSE GAS STORAGE AMENDMENT BILL	3953
Second Reading (Cognate Debate).....	3953
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated 10 September 2025, titled 'Revealed: Qld's new energy plan to set coal power end dates'.....	3959
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated March 2024, titled 'Cost of living Qld: Leaders outline approach at head-to-head showdown'.....	3962
ADJOURNMENT	3963
Natural Disasters, Recovery.....	3963
Joyce Newton OAM Memorial Bursary	3964
Coopers Plains, Level Crossing Removal; Public Service, Wages and Conditions	3965
Cordingley, Ms T.....	3965
Hauritz, Mr B; Kurwongbah Electorate, Storms	3966
Howatson, Mr KL.....	3967
Gambling	3967
Currumbin Electorate, Community Champion Awards.....	3968
Far North Queensland, Tourism Industry.....	3968
King, Mr J.....	3969
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of social media posts and media articles regarding Jack King.....	3970
ATTENDANCE	3970

TUESDAY, 9 DECEMBER 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Clerk of the Parliament



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to inform the House of the unavoidable absence of the Clerk today.

ASSENT TO BILLS



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from Her Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letter will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable P. Weir MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of His Majesty The King on the date shown:

Date of assent: 24 November 2025

A bill for an Act to amend the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014 and the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the Building Act 1975, the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2018 and the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991 for particular purposes

These Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

24 November 2025

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 24 November 2025, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 24 November 2025 [\[1949\]](#).

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF HINCHINBROOK

By-Election, Return of Writ



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that the writ issued by me on 3 November 2025 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Hinchinbrook has been returned to me with a certificate endorsed thereon by the Electoral Commission


of Queensland of the election, on 29 November 2025, of Wayde Leonard Chiesa to serve as such member. I table the endorsed writ for the information of the House. I now call the honourable member forward to take the oath of allegiance and of office.

Tabled paper: Endorsed Writ for the election of the Electoral District of Hinchinbrook [1950].

Member Sworn

Mr Wayde Chiesa, having waited at the bar of the House, was invited by Mr Speaker to enter the chamber.


Mr Speaker administered the oath of allegiance and of office to Mr Chiesa, who then signed the Roll of Members.

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on behalf of the parliament, I welcome to the Queensland Legislative Assembly the new member for Hinchinbrook.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT


Absence of Members

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Traeger that he will be absent from the House from 9 to 11 December, inclusive of those dates. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

Honourable members I have received advice from the member for Gladstone that he will be absent from the House from 9 to 11 December, inclusive of those dates. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 13 November 2025, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Premier deliberately misled the House on 16 October 2025. The matter involved an answer to a question on notice. I consider the question was answered consistently with answers to this and former governments to similar questions. There is no matter of privilege. 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. I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 13 November 2025, the Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that the Premier deliberately misled the House on 16 October 2025.

The matter relates to an answer by the Premier to a Question on Notice. The question asked by the Leader of the Opposition on 16 September 2025 was:

'With reference to page 9 of the Department of Premier and Cabinet Service Delivery Statement and 'Ministerial Offices'—Will the Premier provide (a) a breakdown in table format of the number of each classification employed (ie 10x A03, 30 x AO5) and (b) the breakdown of FTEs by role, i.e Media, Policy, Chief of Staff, Administration, Chauffeur?'

The Premier answered:

'Data about positions allocated to each Ministerial Office is publicly available and is published each quarter under the Right to Information Publication Scheme on the Department of Premier and Cabinet website at <https://www.premiers.qld.gov.au/right-to-info/published-info/our-lists.aspx>.

The Leader of the Opposition argued that the answer was misleading in two ways. First, because the website that the Premier references in his answer does not provide the information that was requested in the answer. And second, because the privacy concerns that the Premier notes do not align with the ruling *Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and The Premier; Mulherin, MP (Third Party)* [2014] QLCmr of 23 October 2014 from the Information Commissioner.

I sought further information from the Premier about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Premier submitted that the question could be read as seeking information at the ministerial office level and his answer was premised on that reading. He claimed that he had made an attempt to provide directly relevant information in answer to the question, in quarterly data on positions within each ministerial office.

The Premier also submitted that under any interpretation of the question it was undoubtedly about ministerial staff and ministerial offices, and it is his view that providing detail about staff per office is inappropriate as it would risk the privacy of staff.

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

I concur with Speaker Pitt who observed in his 2022 ruling about questions on notice and answers, that responsive answers begin with proper questions.

I have reviewed answers to similar questions from former governments and am of the belief that the level of detail that was provided by the Premier is similar. For reference, those answers can be found here:

<https://documents.parliament.qld.gov.au/tableoffice/questionsanswers/2024/85-2024.pdf>
<https://documents.parliament.qld.gov.au/tableoffice/questionsanswers/2018/1157-2018.pdf>
<https://documents.parliament.qld.gov.au/tableoffice/questionsanswers/2015/113-2015.pdf>

Further, the ruling from the Information Commissioner relates to an RTI application, not to a Question on Notice. Presumably, the Leader of the Opposition can apply through the RTI process for the information he requests if he wishes to do so.

The answer to the Question on Notice is not misleading and there is no matter of privilege.

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

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Premier and Minister for Veterans and member for Broadwater [1951].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Parliament House, Artwork



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, this sitting week we are showcasing two more artworks from Queensland parliament's Regional Council Collection assembled in 1979 to celebrate the completion of the Parliamentary Annexe. The first piece is *Resting* by Rex Backhaus-Smith, an artist well known for his unique portrayals of the Australian outback. The work was donated by the Cambooya shire council, which in 2008 was amalgamated with seven other councils to form the Toowoomba Regional Council.

The second piece is *Wheat* by Winifred Ash. Largely self-taught, Winifred began painting in oils in 1963, before studying with the Australian Flying Art School, and her works are represented as far away as California. This artwork was donated by the Waggamba shire council, which at the time was Queensland's largest producer of wheat. In 2007, the shire of Waggamba merged with the shire of Inglewood and the town of Goondiwindi to form the Goondiwindi Regional Council. Next sitting week, we will feature two more artworks, continuing to highlight regional communities represented in this chamber.

Visitors to Public Gallery



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by visitors from Down Syndrome & Intellectual Disability Queensland.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petitions, sponsored by the Clerk—

Barron River Bridge

152 petitioners, requesting the House to design and build the new Barron River Bridge to accommodate microbats [1935].

Body Corporate Costs

69 petitioners, requesting the House to amend legislation permitting all costs for the administration of the Body Corporate Certificate (Form 33) to be borne by the seller rather than all owners under the body corporate [1936].

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petitions, lodged and sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

Hooker Boulevard, Noise Mitigation Barriers

Mr Stevens, from 156 petitioners, requesting the House to install noise mitigation barriers along the northern and southern sides of Hooker Boulevard, Mermaid Waters [1937] [1938].

Hooker Boulevard, Speed Limit

Mr Stevens, from 211 petitioners, requesting the House to permanently reduce the speed limit on Hooker Boulevard from 70kph to 60kph [\[1939\]](#) [\[1940\]](#).

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

Renewable Energy

Ms Boyd, from 982 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to transition to a sustainable, low emission, renewable energy system [\[1941\]](#).

Highfields State Secondary College, Outdoor Hardcourt Facilities

Mr Watts, from 604 petitioners, requesting the House to deliver fit for purpose outdoor hardcourt facilities at Highfields State Secondary College [\[1942\]](#).

Housing

Hon. Furner, from 6,670 petitioners, requesting the House to include the right to adequate housing including rental and social housing in line with international human rights obligations [\[1943\]](#).

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

Circumcision

652 petitioners, requesting the House to advise all religious bodies that still conduct circumcisions on boys that they should be done by a competent medical practitioner [\[1944\]](#).

South East Queensland Regional Plan, State Forests

2,766 petitioners, requesting the House to permanently protect publicly owned State Forests in the South East Queensland Regional Plan [\[1945\]](#).

Wood Heaters and Fire Pits, Ban

469 petitioners, requesting the House to ban the use of wood heaters and fire pits in residential areas [\[1946\]](#).

Colosseum, Development Proposal

1,472 petitioners, requesting the House to reject development proposal (DA57/2024) by Private Energy partners for the purpose of a Renewable Energy Battery Energy Storage facility located at 292 Cawthrays Road, Colosseum [\[1947\]](#).

Vehicles, Noise Pollution

1,069 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure vehicles are inspected and tested for compliance with noise pollution maximums [\[1948\]](#).

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

21 November 2025—

- [1855](#) Ministerial Gifts Register—Reportable Gifts 1 July 2024–30 June 2025
- [1856](#) Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 10, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 27 August 2025 and 16 September 2025
- [1857](#) Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency (Ahpra) & National Boards—Annual Report 2024–25
- [1858](#) Report on administration of the Nature Conservation Act 1992—1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025
- [1859](#) Report on administration of the Marine Parks Act 2004—1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025
- [1860](#) Report on administration of the Environmental Protection Act 1994—1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025
- [1861](#) Wet Tropics Management Authority—Annual Report 2024–25
- [1862](#) Wet Tropics Management Authority—State of Wet Tropics 2024–25: Extreme rainfall events: impacts and recovery

24 November 2025—

- [1863](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on Trade and Investment Mission to Indonesia by the Minister for Primary Industries, Hon. Tony Perrett, 21–25 October 2025
- [1864](#) National Health Practitioner Ombudsman—Annual Report 2024–25

26 November 2025—

- [1865](#) Queensland Ombudsman—Preventing harm to children with disability in Queensland—Report 2: Department of Housing and Public Works, November 2025

27 November 2025—

- [1866](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 18, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 27 August 2025 and 16 September 2025
- [1867](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an ePetition (4261-25), sponsored by the member for Coomera, Mr Crandon, from 1,758 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct a review of the legislation governing sunset clauses in off-the-plan contracts for houses, townhouses and units in Queensland and implement reforms that prevent developers from exploiting these provisions to the detriment of purchasers
- [1868](#) Crime and Corruption Commission: Investigation Murray—An investigation into allegations of corrupt conduct by the Mayor of Townsville, November 2025
- [1869](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an ePetition (4305-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,817 petitioners, requesting the House to create a statewide philosophy of water fluoridation for everyone

28 November 2025—

- [1870](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 23, 58th Parliament—Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025
- [1871](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners' (Version 6)
- [1872](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health workers' (Version 4)
- [1873](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Indigenous health workers' (Version 5)
- [1874](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Queensland Ambulance Service' (Version 5)
- [1875](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Pharmacists' (Version 9)
- [1876](#) Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Physiotherapists' (Version 3)
- [1877](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to a paper petition (4320-25), presented by the member for Mirani, Mr Kelly, from 299 petitioners, requesting the House to withdraw all state investment from the Moah Creek Wind Farm
- [1878](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 19, 58th Parliament—Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025
- [1879](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an ePetition (4256-25), sponsored by the member for Bundamba, Mr McCallum, from 696 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure TransLink is held accountable when their delivery partner and/or bus companies refuse to ensure bus driver safety

1 December 2025—

- [1880](#) Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 15, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 16 September 2025 and 14 October 2025
- [1881](#) Response from the Premier and Minister for Veterans (Hon. Crisafulli), to an ePetition (4243-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 898 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the current standing orders regarding e-petitions that prevent petitions on similar subject matter from being raised simultaneously
- [1882](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to a paper petition (4321-25), presented by a member, Mr Dametto, and an ePetition (4267-25), sponsored by a member, Mr Dametto, from 804 and 113,380 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to do all in its power to legislate Castle Law in Queensland

3 December 2025—

- [1883](#) Queensland Racing Appeals Panel—Annual Performance Report 2024-25
- [1884](#) Auditor-General Report 6: 2025-26—Information systems 2025

4 December 2025—

- [1885](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 24, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 27 August 2025 and 16 September 2025

5 December 2025—

- [1886](#) National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2024-25
- [1887](#) Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 16, 58th Parliament—Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill 2025

8 December 2025—

- [1888](#) Child Death Review Board—In Plain Sight: Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, 2025
- [1889](#) First Nations Treaty Institute—Final Report: 26 April 2024—29 November 2024

[1890](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on Trade Mission to Vietnam and China by the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, Hon. Ros Bates, 2-8 November 2025

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 1992:

[1891](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 141

[1892](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 141, explanatory notes

[1893](#) Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 141, human rights certificate

Queensland Institute of Medical Research Act 2025:

[1894](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 142

[1895](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 142, explanatory notes

Gaming Machine Act 1991, Keno Act 1996, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999:

[1896](#) Gaming Machine and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 143

[1897](#) Gaming Machine and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 143, explanatory notes

[1898](#) Gaming Machine and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 143, human rights certificate

Environmental Protection Act 1994, Forestry Act 1959, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Recreation Areas Management Act 2006:

[1899](#) Forestry and Other Legislation (Revocation of Forest Reserves) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 144

[1900](#) Forestry and Other Legislation (Revocation of Forest Reserves) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 144, explanatory notes

[1901](#) Forestry and Other Legislation (Revocation of Forest Reserves) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 144, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992:

[1902](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 145

[1903](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 145, explanatory notes

[1904](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 145, human rights certificate

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) Act 2003:

[1905](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2025, No. 146

[1906](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2025, No. 146, explanatory notes

[1907](#) Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (Queensland) (Victorian Container Deposit Scheme) Notice 2025, No. 146, human rights

Water Act 2000:

[1908](#) Water Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 147

[1909](#) Water Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 147, explanatory notes

[1910](#) Water Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 147, human rights certificate

Medicines and Poisons Act 2019:

[1911](#) Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2025, No. 148

[1912](#) Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2025, No. 148, explanatory notes

[1913](#) Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2025, No. 148, human rights certificate

Planning Act 2016:

[1914](#) Planning Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 149

[1915](#) Planning Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 149, explanatory notes

[1916](#) Planning Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 149, human rights certificate

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971:

[1917](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (Barlil Weir and Cooranga Weir Projects—Investigation Works) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 150

[1918](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (Barlil Weir and Cooranga Weir Projects—Investigation Works) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 150, explanatory notes

[1919](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (Barlil Weir and Cooranga Weir Projects—Investigation Works) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 150, human rights certificate

Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, Medicines and Poisons Act 2019, Public Health Act 2005:

[1920](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 151

[1921](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 151, explanatory notes

[1922](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 151, human rights certificate

Animal Care and Protection Act 2001:

[1923](#) Animal Care and Protection Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 152

[1924](#) Animal Care and Protection Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 152, explanatory notes

[1925](#) Animal Care and Protection Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 152, human rights certificate

Biosecurity Act 2014:

[1926](#) Biosecurity (Varroa Mite) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 153

[1927](#) Biosecurity (Varroa Mite) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 153, explanatory notes

[1928](#) Biosecurity (Varroa Mite) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2025, No. 153, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992, Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011:

[1929](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 154

[1930](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 154, explanatory notes

[1931](#) Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 154, human rights certificate

Major Sports Facilities Act 2001:

[1932](#) Major Sports Facilities (Major Concerts at Brisbane Stadium (Lang Park)) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 155

[1933](#) Major Sports Facilities (Major Concerts at Brisbane Stadium (Lang Park)) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 155, explanatory notes

[1934](#) Major Sports Facilities (Major Concerts at Brisbane Stadium (Lang Park)) Amendment Regulation 2025, No. 155, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report



Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.40 am): Our government places the utmost importance on keeping children safe. We promised Queenslanders we would restore safety in our communities. We are delivering stronger laws and better oversight and we are putting Queensland children first. We promised to shine a light on this state's broken child protection system. That is why our government tasked the Child Death Review Board with conducting a review into system responses to child sexual abuse. That work has been ongoing for the last 12 months and yesterday the Attorney-General and I released the final report.

The findings are damning and it makes for harrowing reading. The review identified catastrophic failures in responses to child sex abuse under the former government. It uncovered up to five missed opportunities to identify or stop one of Australia's worst paedophiles, Ashley Paul Griffith. Every child deserves to be safe. Every parent deserves to trust that the system works and will do all it can to protect their children. Under Labor that trust was broken.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take the interjection from the member for McConnell. The 2017 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse recommended the establishment of a reportable conduct scheme. Those opposite sat on their hands and broke multiple promises to deliver it. As a result, Ashley Paul Griffith was able to remain undetected until 2023. Labor's failure to act left Queensland children unprotected and left Queensland behind other jurisdictions as one of the few states without a reportable conduct scheme eight years after it was recommended by the royal commission—eight years! Our government has already fast-tracked commencement of the scheme. It will now start from 1 July next year, requiring certain organisations to report, investigate and respond to allegations of child abuse. It is just one of the actions—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take the interjection and the head shake from the member for McConnell. This is important.

Mr Bleijie: You can take a gesticulated interjection.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I took the shake of the head.

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There was no interjection. I take offence. I ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence.


Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw, Mr Speaker. I would shake my head too with a record like that. Our government has already fast-tracked—

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and I ask that he withdraw.


Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw. It is just one of the actions we have already taken to make the system safer for every family. Earlier this year we established a commission of inquiry into the child safety system. The inquiry has already heard from foster carers, kinship carers and stakeholders about the challenges they face protecting our most vulnerable.

We have passed Daniel's Law through this House. Daniel's Law will create Queensland's first public child sex offender register, empowering parents to better protect their kids, but there is more to do and we must deliver stronger safeguards to keep children safe. The final report released yesterday makes 28 recommendations to better protect Queensland children. It highlighted gaps in the blue card system and weaknesses across that system such as fragmented responses and poor information sharing. We are carefully considering the recommendations. I acknowledge the board, in particular chair Luke Twyford, for their work on the review. No system will be bulletproof, there will always be monsters, but we must all commit to doing everything we can to deliver the best system possible.

Cordingley, Ms T

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.43 am): Yesterday the jury returned a guilty verdict in the murder of Toyah Cordingley. It brings justice for Toyah's loved ones years after her tragic loss in Far North Queensland. This is a case about a tragedy that rocked our state, a relentless pursuit of justice and vindication for a tight-knit Far North Queensland community. Our thoughts are with her family and friends. I know that they will not forget Toyah. Queenslanders will not forget Toyah either. I would like to acknowledge the work of the Queensland Police Service which for years did not give up. They launched investigations spanning this state, this nation and overseas. They brought and delivered justice for Toyah's family.

Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.44 am): Every child deserves to be safe and every parent deserves confidence and trust that the child protection system works. The Crisafulli government's message is clear: protecting children is a non-negotiable. Within the first 10 days of coming to government we commissioned a review into the failures that allowed repeated child sex abuse by Ashley Paul Griffith. Yesterday we released *In plain sight: review into system responses to child sexual abuse* and it makes for sobering reading. The report identifies 18 missed opportunities to detect and disrupt Griffith's offending.

To be clear, this vile human being Griffith could have, and should have, been caught earlier. The report notes five missed opportunities that can be directly attributed to the former Labor government failing to implement a reportable conduct scheme during its decade of decline. This is despite a 2017 royal commission into institutional abuse recommending a reportable conduct scheme be implemented. Back in 2017 the then Premier, and so many of those former ministers sitting opposite us, branded it, supposedly, a priority.

The report serves as a reminder of what happens when governments fail to act. If Labor implemented a reportable conduct scheme in 2017, when it was first recommended, like most other states in this country did, this offender could have been stopped up to five times. That is five chances to protect so many children; five chances missed because that government failed to act. In fact, it was not until the dying days of their administration that a bill passed in this House—nearly seven years after it was recommended. While the former Labor government stalled and sat on their hands children were preyed on by this monster. What we saw was a procession of negligent ministers, each incapable of

bothering to deliver a scheme that has proven in other states to keep our children safe. From the member for Waterford to the member for Bulimba, the member for Nudgee and the member for Murrumba, one after another they failed to act.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw attention to your ruling in relation to the framework for ministerial statements and submit to you that they are not an opportunity for personal attacks on other members. I would seek your guidance to the Attorney in respect of your ruling.


Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order with reference to your ruling as well. You have also given rulings that ministerial statements do have a broad nature in relation to public policy areas and the minister is providing a contextual background to the matters that she is raising in her ministerial statement.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, you are speaking to a report that comes under your jurisdiction. You are quite entitled to speak to that report. The thing that I have made comment on is personal attacks. I do not encourage personal attacks in ministerial statements, but you are quite free to speak to that report.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I take your guidance. *In plain sight*, the report by Luke Twyford, clearly outlines the timeline of the former government. I am simply naming the former ministers who were responsible and whose job it was—as they promised Queenslanders they were going to do back in 2017 in statements made by those former ministers—and what has led to this. However, I am happy to move on.

The Crisafulli government is building the country's best child safety system because nothing is more important to our government than protecting our kids. As the Premier has outlined, we are fast-tracking the commencement of the reportable conduct scheme to 1 July 2026, which is the earliest date it can commence. The government will now carefully consider the 28 recommendations in the *In plain sight* report. I want to sincerely thank the victim-survivors, the families, the kids and the carers who have bravely shared their experiences and I acknowledge the tireless efforts of those who contributed to delivering this groundbreaking report. Finally, I extend my gratitude to the board and its chairperson, Mr Luke Twyford, for their dedication to this important work.

Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report

 **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) (9.50 am): The first time you hold your child is the first time you feel love like no other: unconditional, bursting love. In that moment, your life is changed forever as you feel overwhelming joy, relief, fear, strength and the raw instinct to protect this little human who has just entered your world. Who would have thought you could feel all those things at once? Some will get to spend time off work to raise their children but more often the financial need to return to work simply catches up and this is amplified for single parents who have to earn money to continue to help that little person thrive. I know this, along with mother's guilt, all too well.

The first time you take your child to day care you go in with an overwhelming sense of anxiety mixed with optimism. Kids can sense your apprehension so for their sake you put on a brave face; they are going to have a great time. There is a knot in your stomach. You know the world is not always kind. Will they make friends? Will they adjust? From time to time, the horror thought of a predator coming in contact with her child is in the back of every mother's mind. Having seen what the Morcombes went through with the loss of Daniel, it is the worst nightmare that too many Queensland parents have considered.

As parents, we have to trust that the system will take care of and protect our little ones. In most cases, your child is so little that they cannot tell you how their day was so you rely on the centre, the system and the safeguards to work as they should. Every day when you collect them you ask: how are they getting on? Are they making friends? Are they eating? Are they toilet training well? Are they sleeping too long because you know they may not go to bed that night, which creates a vicious cycle? Are there photos of the day to reassure you that they had a great day? For the majority of parents, children have many years of learning and playing, with a little graduation celebration at the end of their time in child care before going on to kindy or prep.

However, as we have come to learn over the past few years and through this damning report, predators seek out these places where our most vulnerable children are—predators such as Ashley Paul Griffith. Along with many mums, dads and Queenslanders, I struggle with the reality of the acts of

abhorrent violation of innocence that are too horrific to turn our minds to. My thoughts are with the parents, the carers and the children who will grow up to learn what happened to them. This is every parent's worst nightmare: when you drop your child off to day care you expect them to be safe and taken care of, but instead they are preyed upon by a monster who steals their childhood and destroys any trust you have in the people and the system that was supposed to nurture our most precious little ones. Worst of all, as we have learned this week from the QFCC's *In plain sight* report, it was an entirely preventable attack on our state's most vulnerable children because of a failure to implement a reportable conduct scheme.

We are all leaders in our communities. We are legislators. Everyone sitting in this House has an obligation to do everything in their power to protect children. As ministers, we take oaths. We are sworn in to bring forward legislation, to set policy, to direct our departments and to be accountable to Queenslanders. For seven years those opposite failed in their ministerial responsibilities and duties. The report speaks to the timeframe in which both Child Safety and attorneys-general had opportunities to introduce a reportable conduct scheme as in other states. The Crisafulli government is committed to safety across our communities and to the protection of children and young people. We will be held accountable by Queenslanders for doing so and those opposite need to be held accountable for their failure to do so.

Through this damning report, we know what happens when those in power do not act. Our children have paid the ultimate price and it is shameful and disgraceful. These are real consequences and horrendous outcomes. For every parent who wants justice, those who had the power to do something to prevent it should be held accountable. We will act. We will do everything to protect our children, just as we have by introducing Daniel's Law, just as we have by instigating the commission of inquiry into child safety and just as we will continue to do in reforming every system that we can to protect our state's children.

Review into System Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, Report




Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (9.56 am): The safety and protection of all children in Queensland's early childhood education and care services is our No. 1 priority. Like all parents, I have been horrified by the allegations of child sexual abuse that have emerged this year across multiple states, including Queensland. In July this year, I called two urgent roundtable meetings with key stakeholders from the early childhood education and care sector, including the Queensland Family and Child Commission and the Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority, ACECQA. The Crisafulli government has taken swift action to ensure safety measures are strengthened throughout Queensland. Queensland is leading a nation-first commitment to formally train every early childcare worker in the state on child safety. This will make sure all workers and educators understand the child safety legislative reforms and implement them so that educators are clear about their role in recognising and responding to any safety concerns. We are doing everything we can to stop predators from getting through the door and having access to Queensland's children.

The Crisafulli government has also delivered an additional \$12.7 million for the regulatory authority to ensure that we continue to have officers on the ground, visiting services and monitoring safety. The former Labor government had no funding for those roles past July 2025. As Queensland education minister, I was pleased to lead the discussion with other ministers at education ministers' meetings and with the federal government to introduce a national register for early childhood education teachers, which has been accepted by states and territories. As of 27 February 2026, it will be a legal requirement nationally for all early childhood education teachers to be on the national register.

The Crisafulli government has also fast-tracked the reportable conduct scheme, as mentioned by the Attorney-General, which will now come into effect from 1 July 2026. This was a recommendation of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse back in 2017 and we are fast-tracking these requirements to deliver stronger protections for Queensland children. Reporting requirements have been reduced from seven days to 24 hours and our changes will ensure key agencies and departments are notified at the same time. Under the former Labor government, a reportable conduct scheme was not prioritised and the scheme would not have applied to the early childhood sector until mid-2027. New South Wales has had a reportable conduct scheme since 1999 and the ACT and Victoria introduced a reportable conduct scheme in 2017, Western Australia in 2023 and Tasmania in 2024. This is another example of the former Labor government not prioritising child safety whereas under the Crisafulli government there is nothing more important than the safety and protection of Queensland's children.

Resources Industries

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.59 am): I begin by acknowledging the most important issue for Queensland today—my wife's birthday. I invited Sally to spend the day with me to watch the proceedings and she declined. She chose the Sunshine Coast rather than being here with us in the chamber. I want to wish my wife, Sally, a very happy birthday.


The Crisafulli government is priming Queensland's resources sector. We are doing that by partnering with the private sector. Queensland is open for business. There is a big spotlight on Queensland at the moment. We are looking at the Sunshine State and saying, 'Come to Queensland. If you are in the resources sector and already here, expand!' That is why I was pleased to recently attend, with the resources minister in his own electorate, the expansion of Peabody's Centurion north development project which we have declared a coordinated project. There is a \$660 million drive in that program. The expansion of that program in the north will secure 525 mining jobs into the future.

I was disappointed that the official opposition in Queensland voted against our Energy Roadmap two sittings ago, because that Energy Roadmap locked in coal jobs in the future. It locked in jobs in the resources sector. There is a c-word that we are prepared to say in this parliament—coal! Queenslanders know the real political party looking after blue-collar workers in the great state of Queensland is the LNP and its members, not the Labor Party. The expansion of this Centurion Mine will extend the mining area and the extraction of premium quality Queensland coal which will be exported to our trading partners throughout the world. The Premier has made it abundantly clear that this government understands the once-in-a-generation opportunity that exists with respect to the supply of critical minerals to our trading partners and allies around the world.

AUKUS pillar 2 will play a major role in fostering trilateral economic collaboration on critical minerals amongst Australia, the United States and the United Kingdom, and we welcomed the announcement in October by the Prime Minister and President Trump on an agreed framework to secure the supply of rare earths and critical minerals for both our defence and technology sectors. We are saying, 'Look at Queensland. We want to do deals and we are open for business with our resources and critical minerals sector.'

We are a government that backs regional Queensland, and we are not embarrassed like the former Labor government to back our resources sector and secure jobs in the regions into the future.


WorkCover, Fraud

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (10.01 am): While this government is ensuring that Queenslanders are able to secure and keep well-paying jobs where they are safe, we are also cracking down on those who try to take advantage of Queensland taxpayers through fraudulent WorkCover claims.

I am pleased to advise the House that WorkCover has invested in new strategies to not only disincentivise false claims in our system but also uncover fraudulent claims. WorkCover will establish a fraud taskforce as part of a joint effort with the regulator to coordinate prevention, investigation and prosecution of fraudsters, and there are many. We have recovered over \$250,000 under this government alone. We will not allow fraudsters to continue with WorkCover claims in this state. This is complemented by a new internal WorkCover fraud hub on the WorkCover intranet.

Queenslanders should have faith in the integrity of our WorkCover system, and they will under this government. After a decade of decline under Labor, the Crisafulli government is securing Queensland's future.

Resources Industries

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (10.02 am): Our great state is open for business—open for investment, open for innovation and open for the jobs that will secure our economic future. The resources sector has long been the backbone of Queensland's economic security and prosperity. It is the industry that has built our regional towns, funded our essential services and sustained hundreds of thousands of Queensland families. That is why this government is creating certainty and stability in our resources sector to restore investor confidence and drive security for its future. When our resources sector is strong, Queensland is strong.

In the last week of November, three major projects were unlocked, thanks to partnerships between the Crisafulli government and the resources sector. As mentioned by the Deputy Premier, in Central Queensland, the Deputy Premier, alongside the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, declared Peabody's Centurion Mine extension a coordinated project. In another boost for Central Queensland, the Crisafulli government helped secure major international investment into Broadlea, Carborough Downs and Ironbark coalmines, working alongside a consortium to deliver global long-term investment.

In the north-west, the resources minister and I welcomed a \$2.3 billion investment into Queensland's largest new copper mine. The Eva Copper Mine, to be delivered by Harmony Gold, will create up to 1,000 jobs during construction and 450 jobs once the mine is operational. The mine is expected to produce 60,000 tonnes of copper every year in a major win for workers and the north-west community, which further backs in our \$200 million investment in the North West Energy Fund.

All these investments underline the Crisafulli government's support for the north-west. These investments are being made into Queensland by our international partners—investors from Japan, Europe, the United States and South Africa. The world's leading resources companies want what Queensland has to offer, from a wealth of critical minerals to steelmaking coking coal. Queensland is open for business and investors are walking through the door, ready to partner with us to deliver for our state.

Resources Industries



Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (10.05 am): Over the past year, the Crisafulli government has delivered what Queensland's resources sector has been crying out for—certainty, clarity and confidence. We have taken the handbrake off and we are backing the hardworking Queenslanders who work in our mines and our regional economies and provide our export earnings. Let's look at the fruits of that over the last month alone, with three big decisions on consecutive days, backing Queensland mining jobs.

One: as mentioned by the Treasurer, Harmony Gold confirmed its final investment decision for the Eva Copper Mine, set to be Queensland's largest copper operation. It did not happen by chance. It happened because the Crisafulli government, through the Resources Cabinet Committee, worked relentlessly to facilitate approvals and fast-track progress. The project will deliver around 1,000 construction jobs and 450 ongoing positions and produce 60,000 tonnes of copper each year over its 15-year life. It is a massive boost for North-West Queensland and Townsville.

Two: we have locked in long-term certainty for Central Queensland coal jobs with a major new investment in Fitzroy Australia resources by a consortium led by Argo Queensland, securing the future of the Broadlea, Carborough Downs and Ironbark mines, and protecting 1,000 jobs.

Three: as the Deputy Premier just mentioned, the Crisafulli government has also declared Centurion Mine in my electorate a coordinated project.

This is what it looks like when a government says yes and backs it with action. These decisions mean jobs for boilermakers in Rockhampton, for the leckies in Mackay and for the tradies in Townsville. It means confidence for local communities that rely on a strong and stable resources sector.

Contrast our approach with those opposite. In the previous sitting week, Labor attacked coal jobs in this chamber. During their decade of decline, Labor created confusion instead of clarity with any mining policies that sent confidence over a cliff. The opposition leader stood on the sidelines while global investors looked elsewhere, and his federal mates have taken it even further, joining forces with their long-term partners, the Greens, to ram through anti-Queensland amendments to the EPBC Act.

Queensland's resources companies operate under world-class environmental standards, but the Greens' amendments, which Labor supports, ignore all that, imposing more red tape, stripping away streamlining for coal and gas approvals and handing Canberra bureaucrats the power to override Queensland's only rigorous processes.

It is blatant federal overreach. No other state has been singled out like Queensland, and that tells you everything you need to know about where Labor stands when it comes to Queensland jobs. Let me tell you that we will be reminding Queenslanders every single day that Labor traded away Queensland jobs for Greens' votes.

Queenslanders know where the Crisafulli government stands on mining jobs. They know we are on the side of those hardworking Queenslanders who get on a plane at five o'clock and go out there to do their seven-on, seven-off roster. They know that we will never trade Queensland jobs away for Greens' votes. We will keep restoring Queensland's reputation as a place where projects get approved, investments get moving and jobs get created, because regional Queenslanders know who is in their corner, and it is not Labor.

Agriculture and Forestry Industries, Environmental Regulations



Hon. AJ PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (10.08 am): Eleven days ago, the Australian government directly attacked Queensland jobs in the agriculture and forestry industries. The Labor-Greens coalition made changes to the Australian government's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. The change will have significant implications for our highly productive and valuable agriculture and forestry sectors.

The changes were made at the last minute without consulting industry, without their input. The changes were almost immediate. Submissions to the Senate inquiry into the legislation closed last Friday, a week after the government rushed it through the Senate. As soon as I became aware, I immediately wrote to the federal minister, Murray Watt—a Queensland senator—to discuss the implications. I have not received a response.

The minister has strung people along. Queensland primary producers acted in good faith thinking they could make a submission. They were deliberately misled by the minister. It is a disgracefully calculated political decision which has sold out our farmers and regional communities. During Senate estimates last week, we learned the federal government did not even seek formal advice from its own department of agriculture about the massive implications this would have for agriculture and forestry.

Queensland's primary producers already operate under world-leading environmental regulations. Approximately 80 per cent of Queensland is already mapped as remnant vegetation, which cannot be cleared. Queensland's Vegetation Management Act provided certainty to landholders about which areas were regulated and which areas were exempt. The changes will impose tighter restrictions on landholders and introduce new Commonwealth powers to override Queensland's already stringent approvals. The rush to complete the deal undermines years of work by our farmers, our scientists, our foresters, industry bodies and other levels of government to adopt and operate under world-leading environmental standards. It will place onerous conditions on landholders managing regrowth on their property, including removing the 'continuing use' exemptions for vegetation more than 15 years old. This will mean that landholders with category X vegetation on their property will now have to apply for reassessment and approval under the EPBC Act. Preserving the existing rights and certainty of primary producers to manage vegetation through property maps of assessable vegetation—PMAVs—for example, is critical to maintaining productivity.


Increased assessment of agricultural actions will increase the burden on farmers seeking to maintain farmland that has already been lawfully cleared and is being managed as part of a productive landscape. The uncertainty will reduce farm productivity, reduce long-term investment and impact land values. It would be a backward step and would work against efforts to reward land stewardship that delivers positive outcomes for production and the environment.

The changes ignore the reality of family farms. It imposes red tape on mum-and-dad farmers who do the right thing by forcing them to go through the same bureaucratic processes as trillion dollar international mining companies. My office has already received reports of farmers halting work because they do not know what it means. AgForce President Shane McCarthy described the situation as 'a dog's breakfast' and 'a hill that agriculture could die on'.

The Queensland Future Timber Plan, released in October, provided a pathway for transformation, growth and renewed investment certainty in the forestry and timber industry in Queensland. There is now a high level of uncertainty about the potential impacts of the act's reforms on forestry operations and investment confidence in Queensland.

This legislation will impact every Australian who chooses to eat Australian grown food or use Australian fibre. It is an attack on our food security and the communities that grow it. The Australian government has ridden roughshod over Queensland's farmers, landholders, forestry sector and regional communities.

Cricket

 **Hon. TL MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (10.12 am): It is another year and another great test victory at the Gabba. The Aussies delivered an emphatic eight-wicket victory over our oldest rivals in the second Ashes test, proving once again why the first test of the summer must be at the Gabba. Unlike in Perth, test cricket in Queensland lasted four days. Why? We like to do them slowly! Unsurprisingly, Queenslanders rose to the occasion to help deliver Australia's 2-0 series lead. Michael Nesar's five-fer was a match-winning contribution, with Marnus Labuschagne making an impact with the bat. The result maintains the phenomenal record that England has not won a test in Brisbane at the famous 'Gabbatoir' since 1986.

There is sad news: next year, for the first time in nearly 50 years, we will not have a test cricket match at the Gabba. Why is that the case? It is because of the games chaos and crisis of those opposite. It reminds me a lot of the Bazball panic. First, we had former premier Palaszczuk committing to upgrade the Gabba for a made-up figure of \$1 million.


Mr O'Connor: A billion dollars.

Mr MANDER: A billion dollars—I take that interjection. When asked about that figure and the business case in an estimates hearing, the then auditor-general said, 'All I could find was a media release.' Two years later the figure had ballooned out to \$2.7 billion. Under this farcical plan, the Brisbane Lions and the Queensland Bulls would have been displaced to the RNA, and that process would have put the future of test cricket in doubt. What is worse is that under Labor's plan cricket and AFL had to pay for the upgrade themselves.

What was the opposition's plan? It was to have a temporary stadium at QSAC—one of the most ridiculous ideas I have ever heard, and I think it is still their policy. No legacy for Queensland existed under the former Labor government. After 1,200 days of chaos, we put the games and the future of test cricket back on track. We took the advice of the independent experts and committed to build a brand new stadium at Victoria Park. What happened the very next day? Cricket Australia committed to the return of the Ashes test to Brisbane after the games.

Unlike those opposite, the Crisafulli government want the first test back in Queensland, and we will fight to bring it back. It was Labor's neglect that secured first test hosting rights for Perth until the 2027-28 series. The first test in Brisbane is more than a sporting event; it is a pilgrimage. It is the spiritual home of the first test in Australia, and that is why it should be in Brisbane. We know that the summer needs the first test to be back at the Gabba, and we are fighting hard for it. Only the Crisafulli government will deliver for the future of test cricket in Brisbane and will deliver an Olympic and Paralympic Games that Queenslanders deserve.

Parliament, Sitting Days

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.16 am): I know that all members of the 58th Queensland Parliament, as well as those in the press gallery and the public gallery and all Queenslanders, will be delighted to be provided the following information. I formally advise the House of the Queensland parliament's sitting dates for 2026. I table a copy of the 2026 Queensland parliamentary sitting calendar for all members.

Tabled paper: Memo, dated 9 December 2025, from the Assistant Minister to the Premier on Matters of State and New Citizens and Leader of the House, Dr Christian Rowan MP, to members of the Parliament, advising of the 2026 parliamentary sitting calendar [1952].

MOTION

Portfolio Committees, Membership

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.17 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That—

1. the member for Scenic Rim be discharged from, and the member for Caloundra be appointed to, the Education, Arts and Communities Committee; and
2. the member for Caloundra be discharged from, and the member for Hinchinbrook be appointed to, the Governance, Energy and Finance Committee.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitor to Public Gallery



Mr SPEAKER: Before we start question time, I would like to advise members that we are being visited in the gallery by the Hon. Terry Stephens MLC, President of the Legislative Assembly of South Australia. Welcome.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time today will conclude at 11.17 am.

Public Service, Consultancies



Mr MILES (10.17 am): My question is to the Treasurer. Premier Crisafulli said—

... taxpayers' money being handed over to the big four consulting firms to complete the work of the public service will end.

I table a document which shows KPMG have joined WorkCover's business solutions team and sit alongside public servants in a government office.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Proactive Claims Management Project' [1953].

Is KPMG being paid to complete the work of public servants?

Mr SPEAKER: That was quite a lengthy question.

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. There are a couple of things. First of all, WorkCover is an independent statutory body, so it makes its own decisions. What I want to make clear for the honourable member—

Mr Bleijie: We go after fraudsters; you're worried about a consultant.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, the Treasurer has the call.

Mr JANETZKI: I want to address partly the subtext of the honourable member's question when it comes to consultants and contractors. It is a legitimate question particularly given that those opposite oversaw exponential trajectory growth in consultants and contractors in their decade in office. They saw exponential growth in contractors and consultants.

Mr Crisafulli: Tell us about it.

Mr JANETZKI: I am going to come back to that, Premier, because the numbers are worth repeating. What was even worse was what we saw in the Coaldrake review. When it came to the usage of consultants and contractors in the decade those opposite were in government, the Coaldrake review belled it very loudly. The Coaldrake review made it clear that there was an over-reliance on consultants and contractors. That is what the Coaldrake review said about those opposite and their use of consultants and contractors.

We know all the stories that came out of the Coaldrake review—the yelling at public servants, the disregard for public servant advice, the compromising of the Public Service in their delivery of free and frank advice to the government of the day. That is what the Coaldrake review said—there was an over-reliance, a hollowing out of the Public Service. That is what they left Queensland with. We have made our support for the Coaldrake review very clear with our approach and dedication to empowering the Public Service to give full, free and frank advice that Queenslanders need to deliver more and better services to Queensland.

I am going to finish this response with some of the numbers. Those opposite had overseen a culture of exponential growth in consultants and contractors in Queensland—20 per cent plus. That is what we have seen—exponential growth in consultants and contractors. Time and again the former treasurer said there would be savings: in the 2020 budget he was going to save \$3 billion and then in the 2024 budget he was going to save another few billion dollars. They said it would cut. It did not just cut; it expanded. They did not even flatline the trajectory. It grew exponentially—20 per cent plus! Those on this side of the House are dedicated to flattening the trajectory of growth in consultants and contractors and empowering our Public Service to deliver more and better services to Queensland.

(Time expired)

Public Service, Consultancies

Mr DICK: My question is to the Treasurer. Given the Premier's promise and the Treasurer's promise that Queensland Government Consulting Services would deliver \$7 billion in budget savings, why isn't Queensland Government Consulting Services assisting WorkCover's business solutions team?

Mr JANETZKI: That really does show that the member for Woodridge has dropped the ball. You need to pay more attention, member for Woodridge, at budget and estimates time. You should be paying more attention. It has all been answered there. Do better! Sharpen up! You have to pay attention.

The member for Woodridge did not fail just in 2020 when he said he was going to save \$3 billion and then again in 2024 when he said he was going to save another few billion dollars. Pay attention! Pay attention, member for Woodridge. It has all been answered in questions on notice. Savings have been found. We know that we did not just save \$681 million on consultants and contractors in the budget by reducing the consultants and contractors spend on Borumba and other associated projects. It has been answered. The savings have been delivered. They need to go and check answers to questions on notice. They need to be paying attention in estimates.

More than anything, the member for Woodridge has a serious set of questions to answer himself. In 2020, when the member for Woodridge said he was going to save \$3 billion, did he save anything? Did he save a single cent? In the 2024 budget, when they came back again and said they were going to save billions, did they save anything? They did not save a cent—not a cent. That is the record of the member for Woodridge—all the while they oversaw the culture that the Coaldrake review revealed.

We have made it clear that Queensland Government Consulting Services has been set up. It is a division of the Queensland Treasury Corporation. The flattening of the trajectory is underway. The savings are being made. They need to go and check answers to questions on notice. They are not paying attention. Let me tell you, Mr Speaker, we are just getting started. We are determined that Queensland Government Consulting Services supports the bureaucracy, supports the Public Service.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I will be very careful to make my point of order consistent with your ruling that I should not restate the question. Clearly the question—

Government members interjected.

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

Mr de BRENNI: I appreciate all the context the Treasurer is trying to apply. Clearly the question was about the role of Queensland Government Consulting Services and why it is not—

Mr SPEAKER: So your point of order is?

Mr de BRENNI: It is on relevance. None of the context that has been provided has been relevant to that question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order in relation to the Manager of Opposition Business and standing order 118(b) is that the Treasurer is being relevant to the question as asked and to all the elements of that. The opposition might not like the response, but the Treasurer is being responsive to the question as asked. They might not like it, but he is being relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer, you heard the question. Keep it in mind and talk about consultants.

Mr JANETZKI: I will continue. For those opposite who are showing considerable interest in Queensland Government Consulting Services, the new managing director has been appointed. I wish Giselle all the very best in her efforts to help build more support services for the Public Service in Queensland.

I am sure the member for Woodridge would know all about the Queensland Treasury Corporation and the staff who make up the Queensland Treasury Corporation. I bet the member for Woodridge knows all about the staff members. Maybe some in the Queensland Treasury Corporation have come out of his office. He knows all about it. On this side of the House we are backing in the Queensland Treasury Corporation to support Queensland Government Consulting Services to deliver support for the bureaucracy and to deliver more and better services for Queensland, and they just do not like it.

(Time expired)

Child Protection

Mrs POOLE: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. The Crisafulli LNP government has taken swift action to examine the state of Queensland's child protection system. What has the government's recent landmark report exposed about any approaches that put Queensland children at risk?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the honourable member for Mundingburra for her question, for her dedication to keeping kids safe over a long and decorated policing career, for her involvement with the Daniel Morcombe Foundation and for her support for what we are doing on this side of the House. It is a good question. I would not have thought it would have taken until the third question today to get a question about this report because it is really, really important. The member asks about what we are doing to keep kids safe. I read that report. I reflect on that report. I think about the catastrophic failures in a system. I think about the harrowing details of families. I think about the pressure on people working in the system trying to provide good quality care. I think about all of those missed opportunities, those sliding doors moments, to do better for kids who were not taken because of dysfunctionality. I think to myself about what might have been if things had been embarked on.

I go back to that 2017 royal commission when the alarm bells rang and no-one listened. Other states did but no-one listened. Then I think about 2020 when ministers stood up and said, 'This is the year we're going to do it,' and nothing happened. Of all the questions that I was asked yesterday there was one that left me stumped, and it was: why? I still cannot unpack it. I think about it and I play it over and over again. Why would a government not do it? Why would they not embark on a reportable conduct scheme? I cannot even bring to mind what a possible reason would be.

I think to myself surely it was not the cost—surely. Surely for the sake of some money you would not prevent kids being safe. Then I think to myself surely it was not the dysfunctionality, the chaos and crisis, that they could not even see this was an issue to do something about—surely. I just keep asking why. I cannot answer it. No-one on this side can, but there are a few over there who can. There are several former child safety ministers. There are several former attorneys. There are former education ministers. There is one who had a few portfolios. There were cover-ups, moving things around, announcements a handful of days after the whistle was blown, and no-one has answered that question. Today is their opportunity to walk out onto the balcony and tell people why. That is all.

Ms Camm: They deserve to know.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will tell you why they deserve to know. You can answer the why, but parents are going to have to tell kids how, when, where and what happened. Imagine that conversation in the years to come. Only those opposite can answer why. Go out and face the music.

Department of Families, Seniors, Disability Services and Child Safety, Information Technology

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Treasurer. The review into Unify was carried out by big four consulting firm Deloitte and should have been completed by now. Why were Queensland Government Consulting Services not used to review the Unify system in Child Safety after it was turned on by the Crisafulli LNP government?

Mr JANETZKI: Seriously, of all days the member for Waterford could ask about systems! I am not sure whether the member for Waterford was listening to the events of the last 24 hours, but you would think a former child safety minister, former health minister and former attorney-general would have thought carefully about standing up and asking a question in relation to systems within Child Safety.

A government member: She was set up.

Mr JANETZKI: I will take the interjection. It does nearly feel like a set-up by those around her. You would think the member for Waterford would have thought more deeply about asking a question around systems on a day like today when it is clear, as the Attorney-General and Premier laid out yesterday with Luke Twyford's report, the failures in systems those opposite oversaw for a decade. They had a chance to act and they failed to do so for a decade. That is their legacy. What could they have done to better safeguard Queensland children sooner? They know, but they sat on their hands for a decade and failed to act. Then they decide to ask a question about systems, after everything the Attorney-General and Premier have said in the last 24 hours. It is shameful that those opposite would ask a question—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is only one person who has the call. The quarrelling across the chamber will cease.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer to standing order 118(b), the rules for answers to questions. It is clear that answers shall not debate the subject to which the question refers, nor has the Treasurer's response been in any way relevant to this question. On both grounds I ask that you rule on the Treasurer's response to this important question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the question as asked by the member for Waterford, there are a number of elements to the question. There was a reference to the Unify and IT systems in Child Safety as well as other elements. The Treasurer is being responsive to the question as asked. I would also submit that he has not been debating the question as asked. He has been providing broad contextual background and information which is relevant to the question as asked by the member for Waterford.

Mr SPEAKER: I will talk to the Clerk about this. I was listening to the Treasurer. There were a lot of aspects to that question: obviously Child Safety, the Unify system and consultants. Treasurer, I will be listening to your answer. At this stage I find you relevant. Continue.

Mr JANETZKI: For those opposite to ask questions about systems in Child Safety on a day like today is unbelievable. It is staggering that they would ask the question. What is also staggering about the shadow treasurer asking a single question about consultants and contractors is that the shadow treasurer was in 31 CBRC meetings that oversaw a 20 per cent growth in consultant and contractor spending. For 31 CBRC meetings, while the member for Waterford was in the room, they oversaw 20 per cent plus trajectory growth in consultants and contractors in Queensland.

Queensland Government Consulting Services will be working with all line agencies to determine what matters are appropriate for review. My concern is building a better Queensland Public Service. That is what Queensland Government Consulting Services will support the Public Service in achieving. Those opposite just cannot bear it.

Child Protection

Mr FIELD: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering stronger safeguards for children, and is the Attorney aware of any approaches that did not protect Queensland kids?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for Capalaba because it is a very important question. The last couple of days have been really tough for parents in Queensland. I have had many messages in relation to this report. I just received one which said, 'This is a rough few days for us parents with young children.' That really goes to the heart of what we are talking about here today.

We have a report that lays bare the failures of an administration that was meant to put the safety of Queenslanders first. So many members of the former government who sit opposite sat around the cabinet table in CBRC, including the member for Waterford, who was a former child safety minister and former attorney-general, and the member for Murrumba. All of them with their heads down know that they should have and could have protected these children. They could have listened. I have here a timeline that I think is important. It has been very well laid out in this report. In 2018 then premier Palaszczuk stood up and said—

The establishment of a reportable conduct scheme is a priority for Queensland.

In 2023, after over half a decade of failing to deliver any such scheme, Ashley Paul Griffith was arrested. Immediately after that arrest—go figure—Labor received an internal briefing which queried—

How would the Child Safe Standards and Reportable Conduct Scheme make a difference in this case?

Now we know that up to five times it would have made a difference in this case. Interestingly, a week after his arrest—nine days, to be exact—Labor released consultation papers on—you betcha—a reportable conduct scheme. Nine days after the arrest of Ashley Paul Griffith they decided to go into action after in 2018 promising Queenslanders they would bring in a scheme that could and should protect our children. It is curious timing, you might think. We know that the Family and Child Commission also thought this was odd. They talk about it in their report. What was in the cabinet document that those opposite refuse to release?

(Time expired)

Energy Assets

Mr McCALLUM: My question is of the Minister for Energy. Premier Crisafulli promised he would not privatise Queensland's energy assets. Why did the energy minister break that promise to Queenslanders by selling 80 per cent of the Brigalow gas peaking plant to APA?

Mr JANETZKI: I think again the shadow energy minister has been set up because that is probably pre-empting debate considering the bill on the Energy Roadmap is about to be debated in the next 24 hours. I am happy to take the Dixie from the member for Bundamba. I am really happy to take it. Thank you for the question, member for Bundamba. It has been a long time coming. I appreciate the question, even if it is pre-empting debate. I am thankful for the question because it does feel like a bit of a set-up.

It has been a great week or two for the Energy Roadmap in Queensland. We have not just had Eva Copper in North-West Queensland, unlocking half a trillion dollars worth of critical minerals west of Hughenden to Mount Isa, backed by our \$200 million North West Energy Fund. That is great news for the north-west; I will take that. Last week we also announced a billion dollar investment into Brigalow gas peaker at Kogan. Do I hear the member for Callide or do I not? It is a private sector partnership with the government, so CS Energy and APA are delivering that.

Do you know the really sad thing for the member for Bundamba and how he has been stitched up? You do realise that it was your idea to enter into a private sector investment on that very same gas peaker. It was their idea. They were going to do a 50 per cent partnership between Iberdrola and CS Energy. It is actually their idea, Mr Speaker, except we have delivered it—something they could never do.

I am going to remind the member for Bundamba of something in the lead-up to the debate on the Energy Roadmap bill. While desperately searching for relevance as the shadow energy minister, he wrote an op-ed for the *Courier-Mail*. We are about to debate this a lot in the next 24 or 36 hours. The good news is that this debate is coming and we are going to get a chance to talk about the Energy Roadmap. In that op-ed he was talking about private sector investments. We have said coal for longer, more gas and more private sector investment into renewables and storage. That is our position: that is the Energy Roadmap and we are delivering it. Those opposite would say, 'Private sector investment is a bad thing.' That op-ed from the member for Bundamba was 17 sentences, and he talked about private sector investment in three of them. He loves private sector investment in the energy system. That is the member for Bundamba's record. That is what they believe, except we are the only party that can possibly deliver it.

Child Protection

Mr MOLHOEK: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How is the Crisafulli LNP government showing leadership regarding the safety of Queensland children, and is the Attorney aware of any instances where leadership was not shown?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is such an important issue and I am so pleased to get another opportunity to discuss this important issue. I want to start where I finished in relation to what those opposite knew. It is clear in the report, because the report says that the board sought to understand the timing of that public release, nine days after the arrest, and that this was in part to address the potential cynicism that the consultation papers were released as a direct response to the offender's case. However, the document requested by the commissioner and by the Child Death Review Board of the opposition was refused on the basis that it was cabinet-in-confidence. What we want to know is why. What are those opposite covering up? Why will they not release it and give some certainty to some parents? What was contained in that secret cabinet document?

The people of Queensland deserve to know whether those opposite were in a state of panic. Was the member for Waterford trying to cover up the fact that as a former child safety minister and attorney-general she had been sitting on her hands? Was the member for Murrumba sitting there in stark panic because he had no clue what was going on? What about the member for Bulimba, as a failed child safety minister as well? What did they know, and why did they not release it to this vitally important report? Let's remember that the member for Nudgee should not get away with it either. There is so much in this.

We had the premier of the day, former premier Palaszczuk, in 2017 saying that it was a priority. She actually said that institutions need to be accountable for the way they protect children and investigate allegations of harm—what hollow words. Twelve months later, the then premier said that

work was progressing—that was in 2018. The following year we had even more updates after questioning, with the then government still considering the implementation. In 2020 the minister, the member for Nudgee, showed more incompetence and more delays.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am happy to take those interjections. There is not one former minister who should be interjecting in this. If you have so much to say, then say it to the commission and go and say it outside. Tell the people of Queensland what was happening in the cabinet. Tell the people of Queensland why you were part of a government that sat on your hands while children of Queensland were being molested. That is where you need to go out and explain to the people of Queensland, rather than interjecting on this very serious issue.

Energy Assets

Mr KING: My question is to the Minister for Energy. APA's shareholder callout labelled the Brigalow gas peaking plant a tolling agreement with minimal returns. How much will it cost Queensland taxpayers to insure an asset that would have been owned outright by Queenslanders to now provide guaranteed returns to a private company?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. The joint partnership is very clear. I am reminded again of how those opposite do not pay attention now that they are in opposition. They have really messed up here. I mentioned this in my last response in relation to the gas peaker at Kogan, which is an outstanding announcement for the member for Callide's electorate. We are supporting coal and gas in regional communities. We are protecting local jobs, local industry and local small businesses. That is what we are backing in.

I am going to talk a bit about the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan and those opposite. There was plenty of reporting on the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan and Pioneer-Burdekin on the weekend, and I will come to that a bit later. Those opposite have so little knowledge of what is in their Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. I do not think they even realise—clearly the member for Bundamba did not and now the member for Kurwongbah does not—that this gas peaker was in your Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. Keep up, folks. The private sector investment into a gas peaker was in the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, and I hear that 14 cabinet ministers might have been there when then premier Palaszczuk announced it in 2022—14 cabinet ministers—and one of them was pretty chatty to the *Australian* over the last few days. It is the cabinet minister who would not be named, as reported in the *Australian*.

Ms Camm: Who is it?

Mr JANETZKI: I do not know who it is over there, because clearly none of them have read the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. There were 37 pictures in there of fairy lights and campsites, but no real, actual proper delivery of projects. It was all fairy lights and campsites in their Energy and Jobs Plan. We are doing real modelling and making real progress for the people of Queensland. That was their Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan released by the then premier at CEDA with 37 pictures. Clearly, it was a fairytale, as we know from Pioneer-Burdekin and Borumba. They have not even bothered to read their own fairytale because they come in here and ask questions about a gas peaker that they proposed with the private sector. They come in here that clueless about their jobs. They disgrace themselves day after day in opposition.

Child Protection

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Can the minister outline how the Crisafulli LNP government is prioritising the safety of Queensland kids after a decade of decline?

Ms CAMM: I thank the member for Scenic Rim for the question. He writes to me often advocating for children, particularly, and families in the child safety system. I always appreciate receiving his correspondence.

We have gotten to work. In the last 12 months we have delivered the commencement of a commission of inquiry into the broken child safety system which we have inherited from those opposite, who had more than five failed child safety ministers. Each and every day I continue to uncover the mess that I have inherited from those opposite—like the hot potato that they just wanted to pass around. We commissioned the census into children missing from out-of-home care—something those opposite

never did. They could not have cared less about the almost 700 children who have been missing in this state year on year as the numbers continued to grow. We also introduced Daniel's Law because we do not protect child sex offenders—unlike those opposite, who continue to fail in their ministerial responsibilities after announcing a commitment to—

Ms Farmer interjected.

Ms CAMM: I will take the interjection from the former education minister and former child safety minister—the former minister who has failed. I sure hope that those opposite go and yell from the rooftops what they knew and when they knew it and why they will not release a document that was requested by the independent—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you are now warned under the standing orders.

Ms CAMM:—Family and Child Commission and the Child Death Review Board. On this side of the House we will be open and transparent. If we can do something to fix the system, we will. We hear silence from those opposite when it comes to the blame game around the failure to implement a system. It was in 2017 that we saw that report handed down and multiple ministers such as the former child safety minister, who was also the attorney-general—no-one over there took responsibility or accountability to bring in the reportable conduct scheme.

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms CAMM: I take the interjection from the member for McConnel because I will take ministerial responsibility every day of the week—

Ms Grace: Oh, come on.

Ms CAMM: I take this very seriously. For the sake of the 69 little girls who were allowed to be molested because of the failure of those opposite—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are now warned under the standing orders.

Ms CAMM: I hope the mothers and fathers of Queensland children are watching today so they know the standard of those opposite: 69 girls molested, 300 charges and Australia's worst paedophile lies at their feet.

(Time expired)

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you were warned. I will ask you to leave the chamber for a period of one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for McConnel withdrew from the chamber at 10.53 am.

Energy Assets

Ms HOWARD: My question is of the Minister for Energy. The 2025-26 budget had more than a billion dollars allocated for the construction of the Brigalow gas peaking plant. Why will Queenslanders pay guaranteed private shareholder profits when they are already struggling to pay their energy bills?

Mr JANETZKI: The 2025-26 budget talked about a \$479 million investment into the Brigalow gas peaker. That is a matter of public record. I remind the member for Ipswich—and I note the former member for Ipswich West is in the gallery. It is so good to see Darren Zanow. What a great member for Ipswich West he was.

I acknowledge the question from the member for Ipswich. We have been clear about that budget investment. We have been clear about our collaboration with the private sector into more gas generation. In fact—and this is all pre-empting debate, but they opened the door and I am going to walk right through it—we have our \$400 million energy investment fund. That is what that fund is all about: partnering with the private sector to deliver more gas generation. We are out with market sounding for another 400-gigawatt gas peaker in Central Queensland. I know that the member for Callide is very excited about that one, too. He talks to me about it regularly.

I note the general tone of the questions today from those opposite. They started off with consultants. They are the party whose consultant of choice was Anacta, camped in 1 William Street. Then they asked about private sector investment into renewables. Those opposite are the ones who gave tens of millions of dollars to Twiggy for a technology that does not even exist yet. That is their record. When will the member for Murrumba—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to relevance. The question was about private shareholder profits—

Mr Miles: Guaranteed.

Mr de BRENNI:—guaranteed private shareholder profits and why Queenslanders would pay that.

Mr SPEAKER: Treasurer, the question was about—

Mr JANETZKI: It is obvious; it is on the public record. It is a matter of partnership and collaboration. I just conferred with the Deputy Premier. How much taxpayer money did they give to Twiggy? How much money did they give? We think it is \$60 million and potentially counting—

Mr Bleijie: And we're claiming it back from the billionaire.

Mr JANETZKI:—and the Deputy Premier is talking about getting it back. That is their record: tens of millions of dollars on an unproven technology.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Quarrelling across the chamber can cease. Treasurer, you have 24 seconds remaining.

Mr JANETZKI: Those opposite were giving away tens of millions of dollars to Twiggy. Seriously! They are without credibility in asking these questions. Our Energy Roadmap is clear: coal for longer, more gas generation and private sector investment into renewables and storage. That is the Queensland way.

Child Protection

Ms JAMES: My question is to the Minister for Education and the Arts. What action is the Crisafulli LNP government taking to keep kids safe, especially in institutionalised settings, and is the minister aware of any alternatives that did not keep Queensland kids safe?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the Assistant Minister for Early Learning for the question, her most important portfolio in the context of this question. Of course, she is also the Assistant Minister for Far North Queensland, Tourism and Creative Industries. She is also a passionate parent, as I know many of us are.

One of the first things we did as a government in child safety was to launch a statement of shared commitment—we did this on 20 February 2025—titled 'Every interaction counts'. The statement was informed by stakeholders from across the early childhood sector. I want to thank my department and all of those people—the for-profits, the not-for-profits, the community sector and outside school hours care. I met all of those people early on in my tenure as Minister for Education. We launched 'Every interaction counts', a statement that acted as a prompt to the sector to review policies and procedures related to child protection, promoting continuous professional development and ensuring every child's right to a safe and nurturing environment continues to be upheld. I table a media statement from that day.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 20 February 2025, by the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, titled 'Every interaction Counts' [\[1954\]](#).

This highlights the importance of educators and children having safe and respectful relationships. We also developed resources to help educators to build capability in supporting children's social and emotional development—unlike the previous Labor government, who were all talk and no action.

Not only did we introduce a statement of commitment; we are taking tangible action. We are taking child safety seriously. We invested \$3.7 million to expand protective behaviours training and education programs, which are being delivered with the National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect and Autism Queensland. Some \$20 million more has been invested in Queensland's Early Childhood Workforce Strategy, prioritising the recruitment, development and retention of skilled professionals. We are leading the review of child safety arrangements under the National Quality Framework. We are working with other jurisdictions to deliver safety outcomes.

As part of major child safety reforms, a ban on the use of personal mobile phones in early childcare settings has been introduced. We are implementing this to ensure the safe, appropriate and secure use of digital devices. In conjunction with other education ministers, as I have already mentioned, we agreed to the trial of CCTV in childcare services.

There is no task more important for any government, childcare provider or educator than ensuring the safety of our youngest and most vulnerable people. I want to acknowledge the remarkable commitment that all educators demonstrate to early childhood education every day. It is the collective determination of the Crisafulli government to put the children—their voice, rights and dignity—at the centre of everything we do. The previous Labor government did not just fail to continue funding regulatory authority; it did not prioritise the reportable conduct scheme.

(Time expired)

National Parks, Pest Management

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for the Environment. The \$10 million announced by the government last week for feral pest management will barely scratch the surface. When will the government get serious, listen to regional Queenslanders and adopt the highly successful New South Wales licensing model that safely allows registered recreational shooters to hunt feral pigs in state forests and national parks?

Mr POWELL: I thank the member for Hill for his question, and it is fair to say that I actually agree with a significant part of the question that the member has put to me. Like many of my ministerial colleagues, I have been left a basket case after a decade of decline under those opposite. The reason we have an incredibly huge feral pig problem across our protected area estate and across our private landholdings is that those opposite literally locked up our national parks and threw away the key. They did not fund the rangers to do the work. They did not want anything to be done in those national parks. They did not want Queenslanders to enjoy them, that is for sure.

When we came to government we gave a resounding commitment to the people of Queensland to do two things: provide more rangers and be better neighbours. We have recruitment underway already on our 150 additional rangers—that is, 120 Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service rangers as well as an additional 30 Indigenous Land and Sea Rangers. Guess what the first action was: to save 40 fire rangers' jobs in our budget—40 jobs that those opposite crowed about but that they were going to cut from their budget if they were re-elected. So the member for Hill can go back to his community and say for the first time ever there is a proper fire management regime across protected area estates in Queensland. In fact, last year alone we burnt one million of the 13 million hectares that we are responsible for—a record.

Can the member for Hill guess what those rangers will also do? They will be out there addressing the pest and weed problem that we have inherited because we know that, as the manager of all of that land, we have a responsibility to ensure that we are better neighbours to those that surround our national parks. Not only will we be better neighbours; we will ensure we have better conservation outcomes, whether it be fire or pests or weeds.

When we get a better conservation outcome, I then pick up the other side of the portfolio and I ensure that we offer 45 new ecotourism offerings in our national parks and in our protected areas across the state, because when we start looking after them we want Queenslanders to get out there and enjoy them—to make a light footprint in our national parks to ensure they remain the beautiful and stunning natural landscapes that they should be—and that we market and sell that to the world.

When the world's eyes are on us in 2032 for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, we want them to come for the sport and then keep coming back to visit the rest of the state. We take our responsibility as landholders very seriously, and I agree with the member for Hill: we will be addressing feral pigs across our landscape in the coming years as we rectify a decade of decline under those opposite.

(Time expired)

CFMEU

Mr DILLON: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. My constituents have been shocked by the allegations of bullying, violence and intimidation perpetrated by the CFMEU revealed through the landmark commission of inquiry. Can the Deputy Premier advise how the Crisafulli LNP government is ending the CFMEU's business model, and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for the question—a very important question. I am glad I was asked the question because I recall when we announced the establishment of the Wood royal commission into CFMEU bullying, intimidation, misogyny and behaviour on worksites the opposition leader at the time reflected, 'This is just a thought bubble of Jarrod Bleijie.' That is what the

opposition leader's response was. If I am going to be accused of any thought bubbles in the 17 years of public office, I will take this one, because the testimony that I have heard from the royal commission after the first two weeks of hearings is shocking, appalling but not surprising—and it spilled out on to the floor of the Labor Party convention with the division in the Labor Party. I have seen a lot in this place. I did not think an opposition could be any more divided and against their leader than it already is, but it was on full display at the Labor Party convention.

We saw the ETU—the left wing of the Labor Party—move a motion enthusiastically backing and supporting the CFMEU. The right of the Labor Party moved out; they stood up and they walked out. Interestingly, when I was watching and observing the news that night and the photographs of the conference, I saw lots of those in the right of the Labor Party walking out of the motion debate.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will just wait. They are blocking the camera, Mr Speaker.

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, of course the protection racket of the CFMEU—

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: There he is—in black—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I think we are all settled again.

Mr BLEIJIE: Despite the evidence of the commission of inquiry, that member—de Brenni—still runs cover for the CFMEU in the chamber from opposition. As the right of the Labor Party was storming out because of the support of the left for the CFMEU, I did notice one member. Now, it is only half a face, but I do recognise half this face, and he was there sitting in his chair backing the ETU motion, and that is none other than the member for Miller, Mark Bailey. I table a copy of Mark Bailey supporting the ETU—supporting the CFMEU—while the right was marching out.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting Labor Forum [1955].

More incidentally, an observation: in the paper today there is a cabinet document that has been leaked about BPIC and the dodgy deal to set up the BPIC operation under the former Labor government. I did not leak those details and the housing minister did not leak it, but one of those sitting opposite did. It is a cabinet document of the former Labor government. This is the division that the Leader of the Opposition oversees. He is not fit for office, particularly when those opposite continue to back the CFMEU.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Callide for the next question.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Road Infrastructure

Mr HEAD: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering major road infrastructure on time and on budget while keeping workers safe, and is the minister aware of any approaches that saw budgets and timeframes blow out and worker safety abandoned during a decade of decline?

Mr MICKELBERG: I want to acknowledge the question from the member for Callide—a worthy question. At least he was able to get the jump, not like the Leader of the Opposition—'Mr Eight Per Cent' after the weekend. We are focused on getting on with the job of delivering infrastructure for every Queenslander, whether they are in Callide or the other 92 electorates right across the state. There is a \$9 billion investment in the Bruce Highway on an 80-20 funding split, only because the Crisafulli government did not roll over to the federal government and fought for our fair share. Not only did we not roll over for the federal government; we also do not roll over for the CFMEU. Unlike those Labor members opposite we will side with Queenslanders, not the CFMEU.

When I travel the state and talk to workers—for example at the Centenary Bridge site—they tell me about CFMEU thugs coming over the fence, intimidating them, abusing them and following them home after work—with the tacit support of the former Labor state government. The actions of weak former ministers like the member for Aspley and the overrun overlord, the member for Miller, contributed to a culture of bullying and misogyny.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Obviously, I take personal offence. I ask that I be addressed by my correct title by the minister.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I was pulled up during the last sitting for using the term the minister used. You ruled it unparliamentary. I am seeking a ruling on the word I was pulled up for in the last sitting as an unparliamentary term.

Mr SPEAKER: Firstly, the member for Miller has taken personal offence.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, I do not think that is an unparliamentary term. You can take offence but it is not unparliamentary.

Mr MELLISH: I am sorry, Speaker: you made a ruling that we could not use the term 'weak'. I was pulled up last sitting for using that exact term.

Mr SPEAKER: Could you write to me in respect of that please, member for Aspley? I did not hear it. I did not pick it up, I am sorry.

Mr MICKELBERG: Those opposite oversaw a culture, both within the building and construction sector and with the Public Service, of fear and intimidation. We saw public servants abused and subjected to behaviour that is, in anyone's book, unacceptable. Under those opposite, the CFMEU stormed a QTRIP industry briefing, and the public servants who work for me have told me of their fear on that day. Rather than tackle that front-on, those opposite chose to roll over. They cancelled the QTRIP industry briefings. We have brought them back, face-to-face. I acknowledge the work of my department in delivering that for the industry, to provide certainty and to recognise that we will side with Queenslanders over the CFMEU.

When the CFMEU call the shots, Queenslanders pay. Cross River Rail blew out from \$5.4 billion to \$17 billion under those opposite because of the actions of the CFMEU and a government which sided with the CFMEU. Thugs over Queenslanders—that is their record. We will not stand for it. The commission of inquiry will continue to tell the stories of the harrowing tales and the cost of the CFMEU, which owned the former Labor government. You have to ask why that might be the case. There is a long list, which I do not have time to read into *Hansard*, of members opposite who have strong links to the CFMEU. In their maiden speeches, frontbenchers opposite thanked the CFMEU for their support. Members of the backbench were members of the CFMEU until it became politically inconvenient recently. We will side with Queenslanders over the CFMEU every single day.

(Time expired)

Health System, Workforce

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Health. Hardworking radiation clinicians who care for Queenslanders with cancer join us in the gallery today. I table a petition on their behalf.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding health professionals [1956].

Will the health minister revoke the LNP government's decision to effectively cut the pay of cancer care clinicians by 25 per cent?

Mr NICHOLLS: It would be fair to say that I have been waiting for this question. First I want to acknowledge the hard work of all of the employees in Queensland Health who are helping us—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The minister has just risen to his feet.

Mr NICHOLLS:—to deliver on our election commitments—

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, you are now warned.

Mr NICHOLLS:—including reducing the elective surgery waiting list, which we have done. We have reduced it by 5,000. We remember the promises made by those opposite including the member for Waterford, who said that she would reduce it within 12 months but it went up. They are also helping us deal with ambulance ramping. In good news—

Ms Pease: Are you going to acknowledge them?

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection. In good news, I can report that the ramping rate for the month of October is down to 38.6 per cent. This is a four per cent drop over that period of time. This is only achievable because of the good work of our employees. I am also able to report that, in relation to two new certified agreements, we have reached agreement, with an 88 per cent vote in support, on our EB12 agreement—that is more than 20,000 staff who have agreed with our agreement. There is over 95 per cent support from our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander workforce in relation to it.

Mr MILES: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The radiation clinicians have waited very patiently for an answer to their question. My point of order goes to relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, the point of order was on relevance. The question was around radiation workers' pay and conditions.

Mr NICHOLLS: Absolutely. I want to say thank you to those radiation specialists who are here. The reason they have had to wait a little bit longer is that the Leader of the Opposition could not jump to get the call to ask the question when he wanted to. Let me start by saying that incompetency does not work.

We want to pay radiation therapists what they are worth. Radiation therapists, whose average base salary is \$138,000, receive an extra 25 per cent—around an extra \$35,000—under a 2022 agreement made by those opposite on the basis that a work value adjustment would be carried out so that the proper rates of pay could be established for them. That was in 2022. It has still not been done. Since being signed up in 2022, a work value arrangement has not been done. We are doing it, and that is the subject of conciliation that started at 9.30 this morning in the Industrial Relations Commission.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Macalister.

Ms McMAHON: My question is to the Premier—

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Miller, you are warned.

Mr WATTS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You have ruled in this House that members are not to turn on their microphone or stand before the time on the clock has expired. I pushed mine on exactly at the end of the time and stood for the call.

Mr SPEAKER: Actually, the period for question time has now 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, the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations be allowed to immediately move a motion without notice with the following time limits to apply to the debate of the motion—

- 3 minutes for each member;
- total time before question put—30 minutes.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

CFMEU, Administration



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.18 am): I move—

That this House:

1. supports the legislation that keeps the CFMEU in administration now and into the future.


As we have just outlined, the dysfunction and disunity in the Labor Party is real. It was on display at their convention on the weekend. Rather than campaigning in the Hinchinbrook by-election, the Leader of the Opposition was in Brisbane fuelling the disunity at the Labor Party convention. More importantly, the members of the right walked out of the conference when the ETU, the left wing of the Labor Party, were backing a motion to support it. I tabled a photo of the member for Miller sitting there, staying there, during the motion debate. The question for the Leader of the Opposition is: who in his team voted to support the ETU motion to get rid of the administration of the CFMEU? They should be named and they ought to be shamed.

What we have seen come out of the Wood commission of inquiry is terrible: public servants locked in cupboards and misogynistic comments made by other unions. For 10 years the Labor Party stood by and did nothing. More importantly, the royal commission is exposing that union members such as Stacey at the AWU had warned ministers. She said she warned Mick de Brenni and the member for Miller, Mark Bailey. What did they do? What Mark Bailey did was retrospectively apply BPIC to transport infrastructure projects despite being told the issues with it. What is coming out of the royal commission about what is happening on construction sites in Queensland is misogyny, bullying, intimidation and thuggery that is overseen, backed and supported by the Labor Party. We now have a real chance to change the culture of the construction industry in Queensland so women can feel valued and feel safe in the workplace. Do not get me started—

Ms Scanlon: Respect at work—you delayed that.

Mr BLEIJIE: Seriously, the member interjects when I was just about to talk about the CFMEU's front for CFMEU women; what a joke. I would encourage the member for Gaven to not back her Labor mates, not back her friendly Labor mates but back the workers who are giving testimony before the inquiry. I dare to say, back the right of the Labor Party who are backing us in getting rid of this bad culture in the CFMEU. We will change the culture of the CFMEU like poison is drawn from a wound. We will do everything we can to make sure that the culture changes and that productivity returns to worksites. The Leader of the Opposition has a lot of explaining to do. Did he back the ETU motion backing the CFMEU? I bet he did.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.21 am): The motion the Deputy Premier has moved is for the House to express its support for Labor's CFMEU administration legislation introduced by Labor, passed by Labor and continues to be supported by Labor. It is Labor's legislation.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Miller, you have been warned. You will leave the chamber for one hour under the standing orders.

Whereupon the honourable member for Miller withdrew from the chamber at 11.22 am.

Mr BLEIJIE: Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at what the member said—deliberately, obviously, to leave the chamber so he does not have to vote on this motion—and I ask him to come back to the chamber and withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you for your point of order. I will seek some advice on that point of order. Member for Kawana, your point of order is a relevant one. The advice I have received is that the member for Miller may be required to withdraw his comment when he returns to the chamber after his one hour withdrawal. We will make a note of that and ensure that he is so requested.


Mr MILES: Labor supported the decision of the Albanese government to include the Queensland branch of the CFMEU in administration. We passed the laws that supported that administration of the state registered union, the laws that are referred to in this motion, and we continue to support those laws. The Deputy Premier has referred to a motion from the Labor Party state conference, but he has mischaracterised that motion. That motion called for the laws to remain until the CFMEU is out of administration, at which point the laws would be no longer required. It was always envisaged by both the state and federal laws that they would be there for the period of time that the CFMEU remained in administration.

On this side of the House we have not and will not tolerate the kind of behaviour that has been reported at the commission of inquiry. We have never, and will never, defend bullying, intimidation and inappropriate behaviour in those workplaces. That is why Labor put the CFMEU into administration.

The purpose of that administration is to clean up the organisation so that it can eventually be handed back to its members. That is the purpose of the administration. If the Deputy Premier is suggesting that the CFMEU should never be returned to its members, that is an outrageous, extremist position which we do not support. We support these laws for as long as the CFMEU needs to remain in administration and then the administration is no longer required.


Mr Crisafulli: So why the barney the other day? So what was the other day about?

Mr MILES: If you were here you would have heard me answer that, Premier. For so long as the administration is required we will support Labor's laws that put the CFMEU into administration.

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (11.25 am): What the opposition leader, 'Mr Eight Per Cent', is saying is that the Labor Party will do one thing behind the closed doors of their conference, but another thing when Queenslanders are watching. If this motion is so simple, so administrative, like the opposition leader is saying, then why was there a walk out? Why did the AWU and their members walk out last weekend if it was just administrative as the opposition leader is claiming? Last weekend Labor delegates put their support for the CFMEU on the sticky paper. The ALP state conference formally called on the party to repeal the very legislation that keeps the CFMEU in administration in Queensland. Once again they called to hand back the keys to a militant, misogynistic union that is currently the subject of an inquiry into some horrific allegations about behaviour on Queensland worksites.


We heard from the Deputy Premier about at least one of the delegates who did not walk out of the room, but who else did not walk out of the room? Was the member for Springwood still in the room to vote on that motion? Was the member for Gaven still there? Was the shadow minister, the member for Jordan—I think a member of the AWU—in the room to vote on that motion? They are so desperate to get their CFMEU mates back in charge that the motion even called on their federal MPs and senators to go to Canberra and tear up the Commonwealth safeguards as soon as the CFMEU is out of administration nationally.

Today we have a choice. On this side of the House we have a government that is standing with workers, with Queensland taxpayers, with small businesses who just want safe job sites and who want projects delivered on time and on budget. Will Labor continue to stand with a militant union that has treated Queensland's construction industry like its own personal fiefdom? We know exactly how far Labor was prepared to go for the CFMEU when they were last in government. They were told directly, repeatedly, for many years that BPICs would jack up costs, but they put them in place anyway. They were warned that they would destabilise and delay major projects. They did it anyway. They knew that their mates in the CFMEU had created bullying, misogynistic and mob-like worksites, but they did it anyway. Reports from the inquiry and in the *Courier-Mail* today show again that the CFMEU ran procurement in Queensland. This parliament should send a very different message to that of the Labor Party conference: we will stand with Queensland workers and Queensland taxpayers, not with the militant, misogynistic CFMEU.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.28 am): Well, you know the LNP is in trouble when it has to go to the member for Bonney—one of the heavy hitters—to run the argument. No senior minister wants to back the Deputy Premier because everyone on that side of the House, everyone on this side of the House and everyone in the gallery and the media knows this is just another one of the Deputy Premier's pantomimes. When the member for Miller was suspended from the House for an hour, the Deputy Premier said, 'Call the Sergeant-at-Arms to arrest him!' It is just a pantomime. This is not a serious person running Queensland. We know what he thinks. The poor old member for Hinchinbrook. Imagine coming to the parliament for your first sitting day as a member of the Legislative Assembly, something you might have dreamed of, and you have to hear this pantomime by the Deputy Premier. Get used to it, member for Hinchinbrook, you are going to hear it for another 3½ years. Welcome, anyway.

I say to the Premier, the Deputy Premier and all those opposite: look at the enacting legislation that put the CFMEU into administration, both the federal act and the state act. What does it say at the bottom? It says: written and authorised by the Australian Labor Party. We are the government that put this mob into administration and we are proud to have put them into administration. Not one member of this opposition stood against that because we do not stand for bullying, intimidation, misogyny, threats of violence or actual violence. None of us in the Labor Party stand for any of that in the trade union movement, in our party or in the broader movement because it is against the very values that we believe in. We are proud to have put this mob into administration and we stand by that law.


We know what this is: it is just another stunt by the Deputy Premier. It is another opportunity to do his pantomime in the parliament, which he does every sitting day as he tries to show off to his backbench and to the media. I can tell you: the people of Queensland see through it. You only have to read today's *Brisbane Times* to see that none of this pantomime and schtick is working. The Premier's approval rating is down. His preferred premier status is down. You just have to look to see that none of this is working. Of course, we have had the Hinchinbrook by-election. I say to the Premier: we do not need a part-time premier standing at a polling booth for three days; we need a full-time premier who is going to look after Queensland. This is just another stunt by the LNP and it should be treated like that by this parliament and the people of Queensland.

 **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) (11.31 am): We just heard the Labor Party rewrite history. If we are to believe the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, they somehow muscled up to the CFMEU. They somehow stood up for all of the people who complained about being bullied and threatened and for the women who were locked in rooms by CFMEU thugs. However, they did nothing. In fact, what we have just heard is an excuse for the inaction of the Labor Party, which not only did nothing to protect women in the workforce who were threatened with the misogynistic bullying and threats of the CFMEU; they also did special deals that jacked up the price of construction throughout Queensland.

Under the LNP government, we now have a commission of inquiry into the CFMEU. We thought things were bad given the findings in the Watson report, but what is coming out of the inquiry that is putting the CFMEU under the spotlight is absolutely damning. Labor knew about this and did nothing. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition tried to claim that they stand up for the workers and respect women, but they did nothing. The former minister for women, the member for Waterford, who in fact congratulated and thanked the CFMEU for helping her get elected, did nothing to condemn the appalling behaviour of the CFMEU and their thugs.

We should never underestimate how serious this is. The CFMEU have been linked to criminal acts and they had the patronage of the former Labor administration, but it did nothing even when people's lives were literally threatened. Some of the things that have come out are completely damning, but once again the women in the Labor Party, including the shadow minister for women and former women's minister, Shannon Fentiman—who is in lock step with the CFMEU—failed to act. It is damning. A member of the AWU, Stacey Schinnerl, has spoken about threats and intimidation. She described what happened to her in front of her child. Even people who are not aligned with the CFMEU have felt threatened. Those who should have known better had their hands on the lever of government, including the member for Waterford. In fact, the silence of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition at that time speaks volumes. We had a situation where women were shouted at and threatened, where there was misogyny and bullying, and where death threats were made against women and others in the workforce.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (11.35 am): It is always great to follow the member for Maroochydore, the Minister for Women, in debate on a motion that we are furiously in agreement with because this was our legislation. I am not sure that the Deputy Premier cottoned on to the fact that it was the Labor government that supported the federal Labor government in putting the state registered union into administration. We are all in furious agreement. I would like to point out that the member for Maroochydore quite rightly talked about how important it is for women to feel safe at worksites. Again, we are all in furious agreement, except for the fact that her LNP government paused indefinitely respect at work laws that kept women in the workplace safe. Where is her outrage at her own Attorney-General for scrapping respect at work laws? As we can see, there is no real concern for women in the workplace; otherwise, she would be advocating very strongly for there to be better protections for women who face sexual harassment at work. However, that is not what this is about. Given the fact that this was our legislation, that is not what this is about. This is more shameless political pointscoreing but not done very well. It is not very effective, either. It is not very good.

Opposition members interjected.


Ms FENTIMAN: I take all of those wonderful interjections: try harder, get up earlier, do better. That is what we say as we all furiously support this great motion from the Deputy Premier. In his contribution the Deputy Premier waxed lyrical about the Labor Party state conference so I thought we should also look at the LNP's state conference, because they had some really choice debates. They are furiously against net zero despite the fact that some in their parliamentary caucus are supposedly very pro net zero, although most of them are not.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Waterford, I ask you to please enlighten the House as to how this is relevant to the motion.

Ms FENTIMAN: I would very happily like to enlighten you, Deputy Speaker. In moving this motion, the Deputy Premier talked at length about the Labor Party state conference. The motion does not talk about the state conference—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I bring you back to the motion, member for Waterford.


Ms FENTIMAN: Those opposite do not want us to talk about any of the things that happened at their state conference and the fights they had, including that paid DV leave is too generous. I have not heard the Minister for Women talk about that. Instead, they come in here and move a motion that we furiously support because it was our government that took action as we believe every worker deserves to be safe and respected at a worksite. That is why we took action to place the union into administration and that is why we passed respect at work laws that they should also pass.

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (11.38 am): To pick up on the point of the previous speaker, I understand that she said they furiously support the motion before the House today. Our point goes to the duplicitous nature of those opposite. The question is: how did they vote last week at the Labor conference? How did they vote behind closed doors as opposed to how they vote in the chamber today? You cannot do one thing and then say the other. History is not on their side. I have talked before about a decade of those opposite watering down youth justice laws—and they are now trying to rewrite history on that—which led to the youth crime crisis. They did the same thing when they ran a protection racket for their mates in the CFMEU and we saw violence and intimidation explode on construction sites right across Queensland. It was not just in MOUs that they signed with Workplace Health and Safety and others, which essentially disempowered police to take action, but they changed legislation.

I quickly want to tell a story that happened in Caloundra leading up to 2020—the construction of the federal-state government funded Caloundra interchange upgrade, a billion dollar project. The CFMEU were, night after night, closing that site down, costing taxpayers hundreds of thousands of dollars a night every time they shut it down. Police were called. Late-night calls from CFMEU officials were made to senior ministers, and maybe some of those phone records might come out in this commission of inquiry. Police charged them with trespass. What did those opposite do? In 2020, on the back of a corrective services bill, they changed the law to protect their mates. They changed the trespass laws, allowing for CFMEU officials not to be charged with trespass when they walk onto these sites.

They cannot come in here now and rewrite history. We know they are trying to do that on youth crime. They watered down the law and youth crime spiralled out of control. They watered down the law to protect their mates in the CFMEU. Now what is being exposed in the commission of inquiry is dire. What we are hearing day after day at the commission of inquiry is dire. For those opposite to come in here now and say, as the member for Waterford just did, that they furiously support our motion, they need to talk about how they voted behind closed doors. Are they in support of the motion moved at the Labor Party conference just the other week to basically reinstate the CFMEU, re-empower them and get them back to where they were?

In stark contrast, like we are with youth crime, like we are with crime on construction sites, we trust our police. We are giving them the resources they need to crack down on crime and safety, whether it is in communities or construction sites, and we will continue to do that. History shows those opposite watered down the law, they signed MOUs to disempower our police, and we are taking a vastly different approach.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (11.41 am): I move the following amendment—
That the motion be amended to remove the words 'supports the legislation' and insert 'supports Labor's legislation'.

I do not know what planet the member for Maroochydore is on because she was in this parliament when we, in fact, passed laws that support this very motion. I know she has been around for some time. I would have thought she would have figured out how parliament works by this stage but evidently not, based on that contribution, because, of course, these are Labor's laws.

I found the contribution in particular by the member for Bonney quite interesting. He was very interested in the ALP state conference. I thought it might be interesting to have a look at the LNP state conference and what some of those opposite might support as well. Of course, we have here that the

LNP support repealing or amending section 124A of the Anti-Discrimination Act to prevent the misuse and suppressing free argument on matters of public importance. Does he support that? Does he support amending the Anti-Discrimination Act so more people can say racist things?

Mr O'Connor: Did you walk out? That is the question. I reckon that means you stayed. There you go—you stayed!


Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney. The motion put at that conference is what the law is. Your motion supports it. Evidently, you have no idea what the motion is or what the laws are that we all voted on in this parliament. As every speaker has said, we are in furious agreement that these laws were the right laws to enact to ensure that we have safe workplaces and that unions act with respect and decency.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms SCANLON: What the member for Bonney does not want to talk about are the unhinged people in his political party who put forward motion after motion that drags this state backwards. Then, of course, we had the gender ideology motion. That one was: 'that this convention of the LNP calls upon the state conference to repeal a discredited and harmful gender ideology from all laws and institutions in Queensland'. I wonder if that is what influenced the health minister, or apparently the director-general, because there was apparently no intervention whatsoever on that decision.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney because I know he does not like us bringing it back to his track record. We also had the motion that called on the convention to essentially repeal merit-based selection processes and ensure we actually had women in positions of authority. The Deputy Premier can come in here and talk about respect for women in the workplace. Your own political party evidently does not support women. That was demonstrated by the fact that you have paused respect at work legislation that was designed to put a positive obligation on employers, so save me the fake outrage about women.

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.44 am): The question here today is: how did those opposite vote when faced with the opportunity to stand up against the CFMEU and the CFMEU's backers? Who stayed in the room and who walked out? Queenslanders know well the price of the CFMEU—a \$55 million blowout on the Centenary Bridge because of the actions of the CFMEU under those opposite. I think I said in question time that Cross River Rail had gone to \$17 billion—I should have said \$19 billion—as a consequence of the CFMEU and the mismanagement of those opposite. Queenslanders are paying the price because of the CFMEU and the cosy deal between the former Labor government and CFMEU thugs, and they want to continue it.

Speaker after speaker has come in here on this debate and spoken about anything other than the CFMEU and their support for the CFMEU. The member for Waterford says they 'furiously support' this motion, yet they are going to try to amend the motion because they furiously support it. Queenslanders know that Labor sides with the CFMEU over Queenslanders. The party of the workers supposedly sides with CFMEU thugs, with links to organised crime, over keeping workers safe and job sites productive.

It is interesting to see who has not spoken on this motion. Interestingly, one chose to get kicked out so they did not have to vote on it. I wonder what union that particular member might be part of. Would it be the ETU? Who moved this motion? Where is the member for Bancroft? The former member of the CFMEU, a member of the ETU, is absent and will not be speaking on this motion. What about the member for Bundamba? Hello, mate. Welcome to the party! Not speaking on this motion, are we, mate? The ETU—got to keep your mates on side.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on the longstanding convention and rules of the parliament in terms of reflecting on a member's absence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Thank you, member for Springwood. I hear your point order. Minister, that is a very important rule and convention. I would ask you to refrain from noting members' absence from the chamber and carry on.

Mr MICKELBERG: Indeed, thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will continue with my list of ETU members who have chosen not to speak on this motion. The member for Kurwongbah: where is he on this motion? Silent. Those opposite try to walk both sides of the fence. They do not want to offend their union masters, but they do not want to look like they side with the CFMEU. Queenslanders know full well where the Labor Party stands when it comes to the CFMEU.

The question is: who stayed in the room and who left? Did the member for Waterford walk out? Did the member for Miller walk out? We know he did not. We saw a picture of him in there. What did the opposition leader do; did he stay or go? Did he stand up for Queenslanders or side with the CFMEU? Queenslanders deserve a government that will work for them, not one that will side with their union mates—CFMEU thugs and bullies. This government, the Crisafulli government, will always choose Queenslanders over the CFMEU.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The time for debate on this motion has expired.

Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.

Non-government amendment (Ms Scanlon) negatived.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Suspension of Sessional Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.48 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of the sessional orders be suspended to immediately allow the member for Hinchinbrook to make a statement not exceeding 20 minutes, noting his election.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF HINCHINBROOK

First Speech

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Before calling the honourable member for Hinchinbrook, I remind members that this is the member's first speech and it should be listened to with the courtesies reserved for such occasions.



Mr CHIESA (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (11.49 am): I rise today with a deep sense of humility and gratitude to deliver my first speech in this House as the member for Hinchinbrook. I stand here today because of the hard work, sacrifice and love of my family and the communities that raised me. I grew up in Ingham. Like so many people from our part of the world, my story begins with my grandparents, who took a chance on this country and this region. They arrived with very little in their pockets but with a great deal of hope, and they chose North Queensland as the place to build a better life.

My dad's dad, my nonno, came from Italy to Ingham in the 1950s. Like many others, he cut cane, saved and worked. Together with my nonna, her sister and his brother-in-law, he eventually bought the family cane farm. My parents live on that farm to this day. My dad and his brothers still run it alongside my brother and a number of my cousins. On my mum's side, my granddad served in the Australian Army. When he was discharged, he was given an Australian Army land settlement block in Braemeadows near Ingham. He, along with my nanna, grew cane and worked the farm.

Between these two families there are 14 children—my aunties and uncles—and 44 cousins, of which I am one. That certainly helps the primary vote for an aspiring politician, let me tell you! More importantly, it means that family, farming and community are at the heart of who I am. Some of my earliest memories are of big family lunches and dinners, parties, running around the farm, playing backyard sports of any kind, surf lifesaving, being in the swimming club and playing junior rugby league.

First and foremost, I want to acknowledge my grandparents, my aunties and uncles, my cousins and my parents. I am one of five children, and my mum and dad have always backed us kids, whatever avenue we chose. Between my siblings and me there are now 13 grandchildren, and it is a real joy to see them building the same close relationships with their cousins that I did with mine growing up around the farm.

Throughout my career I have been privileged to work with some incredibly passionate people. I grew up in the ag industry. I worked helping to support small and family businesses and I worked in the mining industry. Most recently, over the last four years, I had the privilege of working across 14 communities in North and North-West Queensland as the CEO of Regional Development Australia Townsville and North West Queensland. In that role I saw very clearly that when governments genuinely listen to communities we get better outcomes and better lives. I saw councils, chambers of commerce, community groups and industry bringing ideas to the table, and I saw how powerful it is when government partners with rather than talks down to regional communities.

For the last 17 years I have been lucky enough to call rugby league for Triple M's Cowboys Call Team, broadcasting from Gladstone all the way to the cape. I learned very quickly how passionate North Queenslanders are about their patch of paradise. It was an absolute honour to broadcast the North Queensland Cowboys' first ever premiership back in 2015.

I also found myself behind the microphone during natural disasters. I heard the genuine fear and concern in people's voices when Cyclone Yasi hit in February 2011, and I saw firsthand the critical role that government plays in keeping people safe and in the subsequent recovery. 4TO FM's Steve 'Pricey' Price once told me that as a broadcaster you do not let people into your life; they let you into theirs, and you should always remain humble. That advice has always stuck with me. After 17 years of the good people of North Queensland listening to me, I now have the ultimate honour of listening to them. That is what the job is really about for me: using this place and this platform to make sure the voices of North Queensland and Hinchinbrook are heard loudly and clearly.

My family taught me three things: the value of serving one's community, the value of family and the value of hard work. I take those values into this role as the member for Hinchinbrook. I also want to acknowledge Mum and Dad. They are here today. Just over a week ago, Dad won the Queensland state sports award for service to sport after 55 continuous years of service to Forrest Beach Surf Lifesaving Club. I have lost count of the thousands of people he has trained and coached and the state and national medals they have won. My mum has been beside him for every one of those 55 years, always making sure those thousands were well fed and left with a smile on their faces. That is why ahead of Christmas I have only purchased one suit! Their example of quiet, consistent service to others is something that I will carry with me in this place.

My upbringing, my life on the farm and my career as both a chartered accountant and a sports broadcaster have taught me something very simple, and it is what we brought into this campaign: when you listen to community and when you work hard, you can deliver outcomes and results that genuinely improve people's quality of life. Becoming the member for Hinchinbrook was not on the bucket list at the start of 2025, but sometimes it is incredible how things unfold in life. When the opportunity arose—the opportunity to contribute to a part of the world that has given me so much and to leave it a better place—it was simply too important to turn down.

When I finished school in 1995, a large number of my cohort—nearly 80 per cent, in fact—had to move away from Ingham to go to university, to get further training, to take up a trade or to find work. I never want that to be the only option for the kids of today. Whether they are eight or 18, I want them to be able to live, learn and earn in a town or region of their choice. I want them to be able to work in a tourism business in Cardwell, on a banana farm in the Kennedy Valley or on a sugarcane farm just outside of Ingham or get the training, education or job they want without having to leave the northern suburbs of Townsville. They will only be able to do that when governments play their role—when the services are there, when communities are safe, when roads and infrastructure keep pace and when industries are supported and enabled, not held back.

Hinchinbrook is a region full of opportunity, and I intend to work hard to ensure this place reaches its potential. That means backing existing industry, attracting new investment, supporting local small and family businesses and, above all, removing the barriers that stop local people and local communities from getting ahead. The people of Hinchinbrook have one important thing in common: they are passionate about their patch—and why wouldn't they be? From the chimney stacks of the mighty Victoria Mill to Wallaman Falls, the Lucinda Bulk Sugar Terminal, the beaches, the rainforests, the fishing and the beautiful Hinchinbrook Island, this place has it all.

Over the last couple of months, listening to that passion has helped shape our plan for Hinchinbrook. The electorate begins at the Bohle River, to the north of Townsville. The northern part of Townsville includes the suburbs of Burdell, Mount Low, Bushland Beach, Deeragun, Alice River, Rupertswood and Bluewater and the beachside communities of Balgal Beach, Saunders Beach, Toolakea, Toomulla and beyond. This area is home to hardworking tradies, Defence Force personnel, nurses, teachers, fly-in fly-out workers and professionals.

In recent years, infrastructure has not kept up. In the mornings and afternoons, these hardworking people sit in traffic for 40 to 50 minutes. Mums and dads are leaving home at 7 am to miss the traffic. This is time they do not get to spend with their kids. As I said to the Premier recently, this is capital city traffic, but we choose not to live in a capital city. The detailed planning work for the North Shore Boulevard and Woolcock Street intersection is so important so we get that fixed right.

The Svensson Road upgrade, which will provide another connection point to the Bruce Highway, is equally important. Infrastructure is not concrete and bitumen; it is quality of life, it is time with family and it is safety. When we get these decisions right, parents make it home for dinner, kids spend less time in the backseat of the car and more time at sport—or maybe doing homework—and local businesses can plan with confidence.

As we move further north, we reach the agricultural heartland of Rollingstone, where pineapples are grown, and the Herbert River district—cane and cattle country. People there want to see a strong future for the ag industry. They want to see real diversification opportunities and have confidence in the regulatory settings so they can invest for their own future as well as for their kids.

They want improved flood resilience. This district experienced the worst flooding it has seen since 1967. Locals told me they saw water in places they have never seen it before. They are tough, but they are still doing it tough. Homes and businesses were inundated, including the Ergon Energy substation. That is why completing the stage 1 works of that substation was so important, and I was absolutely honoured to be there last Friday for that announcement. There is more work to be done, and I look forward to continuing to drive it.

The Bruce Highway is the lifeblood of our state, particularly of this region. The resilience of and the safety upgrades to the Gairloch and Ripple Creek section are critical. Everyone who lives in this region knows how often that section is closed due to flooding. As we saw when the Ollera Creek bridge collapsed in the floods earlier this year, more needs to be done for the Bruce through the Hinchinbrook electorate. I intend to fight to ensure we get our fair share.

Further north again is the Cardwell community—a community that not long ago was reeling from inaction on Port Hinchinbrook. I went to Cardwell a few days after I was announced as a candidate. I spoke with local businesses and there was a real sense of despair. One shop had turned over only \$75 for the entire day and they were about to close for the day. To return to Cardwell four weeks later with the Premier and Deputy Premier to announce our fix for Port Hinchinbrook—including dredging the marina and the establishment of the first ever provisional priority development area—and to see that community rediscover a sense of optimism is something that will stay with me forever. It showed me what you can do in this role and in this House when you listen and act.

The farming communities of the Kennedy Valley and the Lower Tully are just as important. Our banana and cattle producers there are world-class. I met the Dickinson family from Dicko's Bananas and toured their farm. It struck me again how vital it is that we keep producing our own food, that we do not burden our farmers and producers with over-the-top regulation and that we fight to ensure we are not undermined by imports that threaten the viability of our existing industries.

Above all, the people of Hinchinbrook deserve to feel safe. Throughout the campaign the community told me they wanted more action on crime. This region bore the brunt of a decade of weak laws. Townsville in particular became ground zero. We cannot go back to where we were 12 to 24 months ago. Take the North Townsville Community Hub, for example. It was broken into six times in two years. This hub runs, amongst other things, community programs, community food programs and free playgroups. When they are broken into these services cease while they clean up, repair and rebuild. Forty per cent of youth crime is being perpetrated by repeat youth offenders out on bail. Bail reform is vitally important to me and our community. The people of Hinchinbrook—and, indeed, the people of this state—deserve to feel safe in their homes, on their streets and in their businesses, and I intend to pursue this on behalf of our community.

Every part of the Hinchinbrook electorate is special to me and every community within it has played its part in the development of our plan. Our aim is simple: to make our community safer, stronger and a better place to live, work and raise a family. I would also like to acknowledge the former member for Hinchinbrook and now Mayor of Townsville, Nick Dametto. His passion for Hinchinbrook, Townsville and North Queensland is undeniable. I look forward to working with him in his new role and also the other mayors across the Hinchinbrook electorate—Cassowary Coast Mayor Teresa Millwood and Hinchinbrook Mayor Ramon Jayo—to deliver for our communities.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank some people. Firstly, to Tamara Shroy and Will Gati: thank you for your incredible effort and support over the last two months. I am not sure we would be here without your hard work. To the LNP organisation—to President Doug Hawkes, State Director Ben Riley, Hinchinbrook Chair Bryce McDonald, the Young LNP, members and volunteers: thank you for your support, advice and energy throughout the campaign. I could not have done it without you.

To my fellow LNP members of parliament—in particular, the members for Mundingburra, Thuringowa and Townsville: thank you for your check-ins, letterbox dropping, doorknocking and everything else in between. I sincerely appreciate it. To the ministers who came north during the campaign, thank you. Sometimes you have to be careful what you wish for. Hinchinbrook has a lot of catching up to do and I intend to keep the invitations coming.

To Senator Susan McDonald, thank you for your unwavering support. To Minister Last, thank you for your support, advice and training over a long period of time. To the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, thank you for your advice, guidance and support. It is much appreciated. To the Premier, David Crisafulli, who I have known for a very long time: his passion for all of Queensland comes as no surprise to me. His work ethic and his desire to leave this state in a better place are qualities I deeply admire.

Most importantly, I want to thank my children and my family. To my kids—Lucy and Tommy, who are 11 and eight—you are my why. You have not seen much of dad over the last eight weeks—not as much as I would like, that's for sure—but seeing your smiling faces on election night is a moment that will stay with me forever. I love you both dearly.

To Lucy and Tommy's mum, Cass, thank you for your support during the campaign. You did the heavy lifting at a very busy time of year—end-of-year dance concerts, grand finals, sports awards and award nights—and for that I am truly grateful.

To my partner, Samantha—Sam—you are my rock. As CEO of the WNBL side the Townsville Fire, I have seen how hard you have worked to get this club where it is today. I do not think I have seen anyone more passionate about women's sport than you, and where you have taken this club is a credit to your drive and leadership. Over the last two months you have also been somewhat of a psychologist for me, so I thank you for that. I could not have done it without you. I would encourage everyone in this House to attend a Townsville Fire match at some point. You will not be disappointed.

Mr Mander: Go the Fire!


Mr CHIESA: Hear, hear! To Sam's kids, Ollie and Mati, thank you for your support and for continuing to remind me of everything that is good in this world. To my brothers and sister—Damon, Melissa, Jared and Michael—and their families, and to my extended family and friends: thank you for your love, your patience and your belief in me. Politics is a tough business, and I do not take lightly the sacrifices that those closest to us are asked to make.

In closing, I want to reflect on someone who has had a profound impact on me and on our region—the late Frank Beveridge, the former mayor of the Charters Towers Regional Council and chair of Regional Development Australia Townsville and North West Queensland, whom I had the great privilege of working for for nearly four years. Frank taught me many things, but there are three lessons that I will carry into this place: first, he said always try to simplify the complex; to always value people and relationships above all; and, lastly, when faced with a difficult decision, to always do the right thing. Mr Speaker, I intend to take those lessons with me as I listen to the people of Hinchinbrook, work hard for them and deliver the results they so very much deserve.

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)

Resumed from 14 October (see p. 3000).

Second Reading

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (12.06 pm): Mr Speaker, I congratulate the member for Hinchinbrook on an outstanding first speech in this place. I say congratulations and you are a welcome addition to this House. I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring Queensland's health legislation is fit for purpose and can respond appropriately to the needs of our communities. The Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025 delivers on these objectives through amendments in five key areas: the regulatory framework for providers of assisted reproductive technology; the consent framework to support organ donation in cases of circulatory death; the accreditation standards for surgery procedures; the governance arrangements for important statutory office holders; and the reporting of occupational respiratory diseases. Together, these amendments will address practical challenges, advance important regulatory frameworks, strengthen accountability and improve patient outcomes.

I would like to thank the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee for its consideration and inquiry into the bill. The committee made one recommendation: that the bill be passed. I would also like to thank the individuals and organisations who provided submissions and participated in the committee's inquiry.

The opposition members of the committee published a statement of reservation about the bill. The statement of reservation supports the amendments in the bill about assisted reproductive technology, organ donation and cosmetic surgery. The statement notes faux concerns from opposition members about the amendments relating to statutory office holders, despite having established the same arrangements while they were in office. I will address those concerns in a moment. Firstly, I want to outline the key reforms in the bill.

Countless families across Queensland—indeed, across Australia—have benefited from assisted reproductive technology, otherwise called ART. For many, ART treatment provides a pathway to parenthood that would otherwise be out of reach. However, as we have seen in recent years—and very recently—errors and adverse events within clinics can result in lifelong consequences for patients and the people who are born as a result of ART treatment. The former government introduced the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2024 to regulate this sector which was previously self-regulated. This legislation is complex and critical, establishing a regulatory framework that plays a pivotal role in governing conduct that impacts so many families that its development demanded the utmost care.

Regrettably, and despite this requirement, those opposite rushed its introduction, against advice, with insufficient drafting time. Those opposite provided insufficient time for stakeholders to adequately engage with the process. Since its passage in September 2024, implementation of the ART Act has highlighted the consequences of Labor's rushed legislation. The framework imposed rigid rules that were impractical in some instances and disproportionately disadvantaged some families. The effect of some provisions was unclear, creating difficulties for providers and patients in navigating the requirements. I have heard the distressing real-world impacts of these drafting issues. Through no fault of their own, patients had their treatments interrupted or postponed—a very distressing outcome for many women and families at such a vulnerable time.

This bill addresses those identified issues through targeted and timely amendments which ensure the ART Act's regulatory framework operates effectively and as intended. Critically, these changes embed insights provided by stakeholders to ensure the regulatory framework aligns with community expectations, promotes equitable outcomes and does not result in unnecessary hardship.

I thank the stakeholders, including donor-conceived people, advocacy groups and ART providers, for their engagement through the development of this bill. The majority of submissions received by the committee on the ART Act amendments expressed support for the amendments. As noted by Donor Conceived Families Australia in their submission to the committee, the ART Act amendments represent a 'balanced, compassionate and evidence-based approach that serves the interests of all parties involved' in ART treatment.

Turning to other aspects of the bill, amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 will provide a clear legal framework to better support organ donation to occur in certain circumstances. Organ donation is the gift of life. I want to take this opportunity to encourage all Queenslanders to consider registering as organ donors and to share that decision with their families. These important steps can help give the 1,800 Australians waiting for an organ transplant a better chance at living fuller, healthier lives along with the more than 14,000 people on dialysis, many of whom would benefit from a kidney transplant. Organ donors give others the gift of a second chance at a longer, healthier life. The bill honours this gift by ensuring life-saving donations have the greatest chance of success.

Amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act establish a framework for a person's next of kin to consent to medical procedures to be carried out before a person has died in cases where a person meets the criteria for donation after what is known as circulatory death. Unlike cases of brain death, donation after circulatory death requires medications to be given and tests to be performed before life-sustaining measures are withdrawn. That is because tissue and organs deteriorate rapidly once a person's heart stops beating. These procedures improve the chances of a successful organ transplant. Appropriate safeguards have been included in the bill. Discussions about withdrawal of care and organ donation are kept separate. Consent for these procedures will only be sought after a decision has already been made to withdraw life-sustaining measures. There was strong stakeholder support for these amendments during the committee process. DonateLife Queensland noted that the amendments 'provide a safe and ethical framework for improving transplantation outcomes for the people of Queensland'.

I turn now to another important reform in the bill. Cosmetic surgery is a significant and growing industry which has experienced a wide range of reported patient safety issues. The term 'cosmetic surgery' potentially covers a broad range of procedures and can be used or interpreted differently by clinicians and the community. To be clear, the amendments in the bill will apply to elective and invasive cosmetic surgery that has the dominant purpose of achieving what the patient perceives to be a more desirable appearance. This can include face and neck lifts, calf implants and some types of liposuction.

Cosmetic surgery is not used to prevent, diagnose or treat medical diseases or conditions and does not include procedures such as reconstructive surgery, mole removal or cosmetic injectables. Across Australia we have heard of cosmetic surgery procedures being undertaken in facilities that had a lack of suitable sterilisation and infection control and where patients undertook procedures without being fully informed about the risks and potential complications. A comprehensive review of regulation of cosmetic surgery noted considerable variation to the regulation of facilities providing cosmetic surgery across states and territories which exposed patients to risk. As a result, all Australian health ministers tasked the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care to develop national standards for the safe delivery of high-quality cosmetic surgery. This process has occurred over many years and involved extensive consultation.

The amendments in the bill ensure the Private Health Facilities Act 1999 has a clear head of power to require licensed private health facilities that provide surgery in Queensland to comply with the national cosmetic surgery standards. I am proud to say that we already have private health facilities that are implementing those standards. We have been advised by the Australian Commission on Quality and Safety in Health Care that one private hospital and three day hospitals in Queensland have already been assessed against the national standards. Work has also been completed or is currently underway in other states and territories to require compliance with those national standards. The amendments in the bill will help to lift the standards of care in the cosmetic surgery sector and ensure all facilities that perform cosmetic surgery must take important steps to improve patient safety. The amendments to the Private Health Facilities Act also make improvements to the sharing of private hospital information with Queensland government entities.

I will turn to aspects of the bill that deal with governance of the health system. The public health system in Queensland has a budget of more than \$33 billion—a record high budget—with spending on health care being the single largest area of expenditure by government. This record budget reflects the government's commitment to addressing issues such as hospital capacity, elective surgery backlogs and workforce shortages inherited after Labor's decade of decline. Our record investment also highlights the critical importance of ensuring that oversight of the health system is functioning well and that our health system leaders are held to account for their performance. We need to ensure that every single one of our statutory appointees is committed and energised to take on the crucial oversight role.

That is why this bill amends four health portfolio acts to provide a broader range of circumstances when statutory office holders can be removed from their positions. These changes recognise that persons appointed to these important positions of public trust must be held to high standards. These office holders have critical governance roles in providing public health services across Queensland, improving health and wellbeing, regulating pharmacy ownership and supporting and improving public health services.


The statement of reservation from the opposition members of the committee raised concerns about these changes; however, that statement fails to acknowledge the committee's report that the same provisions and the same wording are used in at least 21 other pieces of legislation. What a surprise! In fact, the statement of reservation accuses the Crisafulli government of being hypocritical. Hypocritical? I would like to remind those opposite that the very same wording and the very same clause was included in the omnibus Debt Reduction and Savings Bill 2021 introduced by the then treasurer, the member for Woodridge. That bill was passed with—and that wording can be found today in—section 82 of the National Injury Insurance Scheme (Queensland) Act 2016. That is only one example among others I am more than happy to share if required. The approach in this bill is not novel or unique. It is used across the statute books and adopted on numerous occasions by those opposite. This approach recognises that there are rare circumstances where statutory officers are not fulfilling their intended functions or duties in providing effective oversight of critical public services.

Although the bill broadens the grounds for removing persons from those positions of trust should it become necessary to do so, it does include important safeguards to ensure these decisions are fair and transparent. Natural justice will continue to apply, such as being given notice of the proposed decision and an opportunity to be heard. Also, decisions about the removal of board members will need to be made by the Governor in Council, which provides oversight of decisions through a formal

government decision-making process. The vast majority of our statutory appointees do a tremendous job in providing valuable oversight of the public health system, and I thank them for their service to Queenslanders.

Finally, the bill includes a minor amendment to reflect that the federal parliament passed legislation to establish the Australian Centre for Disease Control on 6 November 2025. As part of the Commonwealth legislative changes, responsibility for the National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry will be transferred to the newly created Australian Centre for Disease Control. The bill ensures notifications of occupational respiratory diseases made under Queensland's Public Health Act 2005 will be made to the relevant Commonwealth officer in the Australian Centre for Disease Control.

This bill delivers a broad range of practical amendments to Queensland's health legislation. It clarifies and improves the regulatory framework for assisted reproductive technology, strengthens pathways to enable life-saving organ donations, improves standards for providing cosmetic surgery and promotes high standards of performance for those in leadership positions in Queensland's public health system. These changes ensure Queensland's health legislation is fit for purpose and positioned to better respond to the evolving needs of our communities. It is for those reasons that as the minister I commend the bill for the consideration of the House.

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (12.20 pm): The Labor opposition will be supporting most elements of this bill. This is the third health legislation amendment bill introduced and debated this year. I have previously called out the lack of substantive amendments put forward in previous bills considered by our committee, so I do want to commend the minister for actually putting a few more clauses into this bill. I just cannot help wondering why all three health legislation amendment bills were not simply combined and brought in en bloc. This approach wastes significant parliamentary and Public Service resources. It suggests to me that the minister and the government do not really have an agenda and are just improvising and making it up as they go—or maybe, like we saw in the last health legislation amendment bill, they do have an agenda but they just want to keep it secret for as long as possible and prevent this House from having any debate on their agenda.

This is exactly what we would expect from a government that claim they are committed to transparency, accountability and integrity. I hope the minister will put on the table any amendments he intends to bring with regard to this bill—unlike last time, where disgraceful parliamentary tactics were used to silence any debate on pill testing. I hope we actually get a chance to debate any amendments that might be brought to this bill. If there are amendments coming, I would have liked to have had the opportunity to speak on whatever those amendments might be about because I was denied that the last time a debate like this occurred. That is shameful. If the government that are so committed to accountability, transparency and integrity are actually going to use these parliamentary tactics to stop debate on issues they find ideologically uncomfortable, why don't they just shut down the parliament and run the state from the comfort of the executive chambers? If we are going to have amendments, let us have them now.

Assisted reproductive technology, in my opinion, is a modern wonder. It helps people enjoy the experience of parenthood where biology or circumstance has denied them this opportunity. Being a parent is without doubt the most demanding yet fulfilling thing that my wife and I have ever done. As with any clinical procedure there are risks, and there have been a number of serious concerns raised and high-profile investigations into issues with assisted reproductive technology providers nationwide. The *Courier-Mail* reported on a situation where the wrong embryo was transferred to a patient, resulting in the birth of a stranger's baby. This is clearly very distressing and potentially traumatic for all involved in this situation and it could have intergenerational impacts. It is imperative that we apply this technology and put safeguards in place to avoid this type of trauma.

Also, as was highlighted by a witness in the hearings, as the number of people using ART increases, it is important that we put in place measures to reduce the risk of unintended and unknown sibling interbreeding which dramatically increases the risk of genetic disorders. That is why the former Labor government was proud to introduce a state-based licensing and regulatory framework for assisted reproductive technology providers in Queensland to ensure that families have safe access and are appropriately supported to start or grow a family.

The amendments in this bill address issues that have come to light since the commencement of the ART Act. The ART Act introduced important changes, including a limit on the number of donor families and the sufficient collection of information from sperm or egg donors. While these changes are important to ensure safe practice, some issues have emerged. The strict application on the limit on the number of donor families and the use of donor material where the required contact information may not

be collected has proven to be harsh and created very unfair circumstances where families or individuals have been prohibited from using ART services to create a genetically related sibling to an existing offspring. This bill expands the case-by-case approvals that the director-general of Queensland Health can provide to create fairness and equity in accessing ART. There are a number of other changes that make assisted reproductive technology safer for those people who use it and safer for the people who are born as a result of this technology.

In addition to the changes relating to ART, this bill also introduces amendments to bring cosmetic surgery performed in private hospitals into line with the new national cosmetic surgery standards. As many high-profile cases have highlighted, cosmetic surgery has been poorly regulated in the past, and when things go wrong it can have devastating impacts. Body image and our perception of our bodies can have a massive impact on our mental health and wellbeing. I have cared for people who have had their body image or perception significantly changed by burns, cancer, infectious diseases, traumatic injury or aging. Sometimes the healing around acceptance of a changed body image is one of the hardest things for health professionals to assist patients with. Those people who for whatever reason choose to have cosmetic surgery need to be protected from unethical and unscrupulous people, whether they are delivering services as an individual or as part of an organisation, and this bill continues that process of regulating this aspect of health care. The amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act are supported by Labor. They ensure organ viability and provide more opportunities for safe organ donation in Queensland.

Finally, I want to talk about one aspect of the bill that really demonstrates that this is a government that is emulating their leader's capacity to say one thing and do the complete opposite. Remember, David Crisafulli and the LNP government are committed to transparency, accountability and integrity. This bill contains provisions which allow the removal of board members for any or no reason from hospital and health boards, the board of Health and Wellbeing Queensland, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Council and hospital foundation boards. The Queensland Law Society were not supportive of this provision, and they were joined by many other submitters. In response to statements by the minister about the number of bills that contain these provisions, their view is they should be removed from all of these bills.

If no reason for removal is given, then it is reasonable to assume that you cannot rule out that the person has been removed for political reasons. If the government believes in transparency, why not provide the reasons for removal? Of course, removing a board member could damage that person's reputation, and, in the absence of any public notification of the reasons, the individual who has been removed has no opportunity to defend themselves either publicly or privately.

There is also the possibility that a board member is removed for valid reasons relating to incompetence or worse. In this scenario, in the absence of any public reasons for removing a board member that person may go on to join other boards and continue a practice that is damaging to other organisations. This is truly poor governance, but the government know this. That is why they are removing these provisions from another bill before the House right now—the major sports facilities bill. In the first reading speech on that bill, the minister specifically notes that this type of provision is being removed because it represents poor governance practice. I am glad all members of the committee, including the LNP members, acknowledged this and noted it in the report.

Clearly, this is a government that does not know what it is doing. In one bill it takes away these provisions and in another bill it puts them in. It is another example of the glaring hypocrisy at the core of this government, or perhaps it shows the true agenda of David Crisafulli and the LNP government. Perhaps they are clearing the way so they have no impediments to get in the way of their jobs-for-mates fiasco or any scrutiny of their actions to stack government boards with LNP mates. After Labor's decade of introducing nurse and midwife patient ratios, rebuilding the health workforce, building new hospitals and getting through COVID, we have endured a year of broken promises, slick slogans and dodgy deals.

Government members interjected.


Mr JKELLY: Welcome; they have finally arisen. Clearly, the motivation for this amendment is to allow the LNP to do more dodgy deals by appointing their mates to boards. Queensland deserves better. While we support the majority of the positive changes introduced by this bill that ensure that health care is safe and equitable, it should be evidence based and expert led. It should not be ideological. We cannot support the amendment which is a clear example of the LNP choosing ideology over evidence so they can continue their dodgy deals.

Once again, I say to the minister that if he has amendments to this bill he should bring them to this House and bring them to the table. He should lay them before this House so that future speakers on this side have the opportunity to debate them. As we saw the last time we debated a similar bill, there were two amendments and there were multiple speakers for the first amendment, which was noncontroversial and supported by both sides, and that prevented any further debate or discussion in relation to the other amendment.

If the government intend to introduce amendments, they should bring them to the table. The purpose of this chamber is to debate difficult and tough issues and give all people in this chamber who represent their communities in good faith the opportunity to speak on these issues. Using shameful and disgraceful parliamentary tactics to shut down debate in this chamber is completely and utterly unparliamentary and should cease. If there are amendments, put them on the table and let's have a discussion about them.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Before I call the member for Southport, I would like to remind the following members that they are on a warning: the members for Logan, McConnel, Bulimba and Miller. I would also like to caution members not to interject other than from their own seat. That includes you, member for Theodore. Finally, member for Miller, immediately prior to your withdrawal from the chamber at 11.22 am the Deputy Premier took personal offence to your comments. They were unparliamentary and I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: I am happy to withdraw.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (12.30 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3). At the outset, I want to congratulate the health minister on the fact that he has brought so much reform to this House over the last 12 months. While, yes, there have been three amendment bills, that simply reflects the fact that there has been a lot needing to be fixed. What we have seen is the health minister coming in and having to deal with a decade of decline. That has required a lot of well-thought-out action, just like this legislation with important, well-thought-out amendments. Each and every one of these amendment bills has had a place in time and an important role to play in fixing many of the issues confronting Queenslanders with what was a failing and broken health system.

I also want to commend the minister for the last round of legislation we debated just a few weeks ago with regard to the tobacco and other legislation amendment bill and the rapid response by Queensland Health and other enforcement agencies in our state in dealing with what has been an absolutely appalling abuse of the law. I congratulate him on the, I think, 148 illegal tobacco shops that have been shut in the course of just the last fortnight. Well done, Minister.

This bill proposes amendments to eight pieces of health portfolio legislation to strengthen governance, improve regulatory frameworks and ensure legislation operates effectively across Queensland's health system. Key reforms include: amendments to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2024 to address issues identified during implementation; amendments to the Private Health Facilities Act 1999 to improve patient safety in cosmetic surgery; and amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 to establish a consent framework for ante-mortem interventions in cases of circulatory death. The bill also introduces governance changes to allow the removal of certain office holders without cause, reflecting the importance of public confidence in the health leadership.

The committee received 17 submissions from stakeholders and held a public briefing with Queensland Health, followed by a public hearing with a range of organisations and individuals. On behalf of the committee I want to thank those individuals and organisations who made written submissions on the bill and who appeared before the committee at the public hearing. I also want to thank my committee colleagues, our secretariat and Queensland Health, who assisted the committee during this inquiry.

The bill includes amendments to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2024. It also includes amendments to the Hospital and Health Boards Act and other acts to allow without-cause removal of certain office holders to maintain public confidence. I will return to that point in a moment. It also amends the Private Health Facilities Act to require private health facilities that provide cosmetic surgery to comply with the National Safety and Quality Cosmetic Surgery Standards and enable information-sharing agreements. It also makes amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 to establish a consent framework for ante-mortem interventions in cases of circulatory death, enhancing opportunities for organ donation.

Key themes and submissions that were considered by the committee included: the practical impacts of overly prescriptive requirements contained within the ART Act and the landscape of fertility legislation across Australia; the need for amendments to counselling requirements for couples who are separated; the risk of unregulated cosmetic surgery practices and the need for standardisation to protect patient safety; a duplication of regulatory regimes associated with cosmetic surgery facilities and potential impacts this may have on smaller facilities; the potential for divergent decision-making in end-of-life care and how conflicts might be resolved where two people disagree with a proposed course of action in advance of organ donation; and the potential governance risks of no-cause removals for certain office holders balanced against the public interest of maintaining trust in the leadership of health entities. The committee considered all of these issues and took into account fundamental legislative principles and human rights which are engaged by the operation of the bill. The committee made one recommendation: that the bill be passed.

I want to turn now to the comments of the deputy chair within his statement of reservation and again here today. I note that, while Labor have said they support these amendments, they also say they have reservations around the removal of office holders under the Hospital and Health Boards Act and other acts. Further on in the statement of reservation they acknowledge that removal powers are included within other acts and they also express concern about this new provision. It is an understatement to say that it is in some Queensland acts. It is, in fact, in 21 other pieces of legislation, and I want to draw the House's attention to those 21 pieces of legislation. We hear our Labor colleague in the House raising grave concerns about these 'special' powers that are being introduced, yet for more than two decades these provisions have existed within other pieces of legislation that Labor have happily presided over for this period of time.


We see these provisions in the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001, the Trade and Investment Queensland Act 2013, the Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013, the South East Queensland Water (Restructuring) Act 2007, the Queensland Museum Act 1970, Queensland Art Gallery Act 1987, the Queensland Performing Arts Trust Act 1977, the Queensland Theatre Company Act 1970, the Libraries Act 1988, the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003, the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011, the Tourism and Events Queensland Act 2012, the Legal Aid Queensland Act 1997, the Rural and Regional Adjustment Act 1994, the Coexistence Queensland Act 2013—should I go on?—the Racing Act 2002, the Food Production (Safety) Act 2000, the Gold Coast Waterways Authority Act 2012, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008 and the Corrective Services Act 2006.

Labor have form on this provision, and for them to come into this House and suggest it is an inappropriate provision is absolutely disingenuous. In fact, I want to draw the House's attention to the comments that were made by Queensland Health. Queensland Health made the comment in public hearings that this is a matter of policy for the government. The previous four or five Labor governments presided over many boards and bills and appointed all their Labor mates to those boards and union reps have used their powers inappropriately over many years, so for those opposite to come in here now and suggest that this is an inappropriate use of power is nothing short of breathtaking. The advice from the Queensland Department of Health is important and I think it is important to draw the House's attention to it. The committee report stated—

... the Bill requires the decision to remove a person from office to be made by Governor in Council. It was said that this provides a safeguard to ensure that all decisions will be subject to a considered Government process, with consultation between Ministers and a formal process. In response to concerns about procedural fairness and natural justice, Queensland Health noted that procedural fairness and natural justice processes are part of the common law and apply without needing an express provision in an Act. Procedural fairness and natural justice are expected to be followed if a person is to be removed from office under the amendments, which may include the giving of notice of the proposed removal from office and an opportunity to be heard.

This is not just a policy decision of the current Crisafulli government and it is not some new idea; this is standard practice and has been for decades within the state of Queensland.

I want to finish with one final comment, and that is that the Queensland Law Society raised concerns about this amendment. It is curious to me—and I think it should be curious to the House—that it never raised concerns about it when the other 21 acts embraced the same condition or provisions.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (12.40 pm): I rise to speak on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025. Finally we have found a way to engineer a short speech by the minister. This bill touches eight acts across the health portfolio and, unlike other relatively threadbare bills from this lethargic minister trying to pad out a thin legislative agenda from the Crisafulli government, it fixes some real-world problems—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence. The member knows he should use proper titles and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Thank you, Minister. Member for Miller, the minister has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. Unlike other bills from this minister trying to pad out a thin legislative agenda from the Crisafulli government, it fixes some real-world problems and—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again I take personal offence at the imputation and I ask that the member withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller, will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I just ask what the imputation is, because there was no adjective—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller, you are aware that the custom is that if you have said something to which another member takes offence you will withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: That is fine; I withdraw. This bill fixes some real world problems and cleans up gaps that have emerged as new frameworks have started to operate, but it also hands the government a blank cheque to itself to give it the option to sack health leaders on boards for any reason or none and hope that nobody notices. It is that sense of lack of accountability that we are seeing at the moment with the decision of the minister and the Premier not to release the Vine report, for instance, for public scrutiny, so this is consistent with that.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance and I take personal offence at the comment made by the member for Miller.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay. Firstly, member for Miller, will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will just take some advice. Member for Miller, would you be scrupulous to remain relevant to the bill that is before us. Thank you.

Mr BAILEY: Certainly. I am very happy to, Mr Deputy Speaker; thank you for your guidance. On balance, Labor will support the bill in the current form in which it has been introduced and appears here today. We do so because it contains some important and practical reforms that will help Queenslanders—families going through IVF, people seeking cosmetic surgery, patients and families faced with end-of-life decisions about organ donation and workers suffering from serious occupational respiratory disease. I also want to put very clearly on the record that the Labor opposition has serious concerns about the government's decision to include no-cause removal powers for health boards and CEOs. This goes to integrity, good governance and confidence in the system. We do not support things that make sackings easier for the government.

The Crisafulli government promised openness and transparency before the election, but it has broken that promise time and time again, and here we go again. We will also be watching this government very closely in how it uses those powers or misuses those powers. We know the record of the minister, of course—more than 4½ thousand sackings during his previous term as treasurer of this state and his implementation of Strong Choices. What we are concerned about is the potential to misuse that provision. We will also be watching this government very closely in future about its implementation of this provision.

I want to structure my remarks around three simple tests: does this bill improve patient care and safety; does it respect the rights and dignity of patients, of families and of health workers; and does it uphold integrity in good governance in our health system? Where it passes those tests, we will support it. Where it fails, we will say so plainly, particularly when it gives more power to this health minister, who we know has already botched an appointment of the Chief Health Officer, has banned pill testing, has denied health care to trans youth, has botched the flu season, has dumped his commitment to—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, Minister?

Mr NICHOLLS: My point of order will obviously be relevance, and again I take personal offence at the comments he has made in reflection on me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller, will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I also caution you on relevance. Raking over the activities of past governments is not relevant to the bill here. I would also remind you that you are currently under a warning so there is no latitude for failure to adhere to Speaker's directions.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The opposition very much supports best practice in the healthcare system. Let me just start by speaking about the assisted reproductive technology aspect of the bill. This parliament recently put in place a state-based regulatory framework for IVF and donor conception in Queensland after serious concerns about self-regulation in clinics. Since then, as can happen with major new pieces of legislation, practical problems have emerged—problems that are of real significance to couples and individuals going through IVF, issues affecting whether a family gets the chance to have a sibling for their child or whether a long-stored embryo is able to be used. The bill makes a series of changes to address those problems, and we welcome them.

Firstly, with regard to the issue of donor limits, Queensland's law sets a cap of 10 donor related Australian families per donor. That cap is there for good reasons—to protect donor-conceived people from being part of a very large unknown sibling group and to support their right to know their origins—but strict application of that cap in all circumstances can result in cruel outcomes, for example, where a family has already had a child with a particular donor and wants a sibling yet finds the donor has now effectively hit the cap. The current law in fact blocks assistance for families in this case, so the bill allows the chief executive of Queensland Health to approve case-by-case use of donor material beyond the 10-family limit in defined circumstances to prevent undue hardship. That is sensible. The cap remains the norm, but there can be exceptions for legitimate reasons. We support that because it is practical and it is humane.

Secondly, the bill untangles overly prescriptive information requirements which proved unworkable in the real world. As it stands, assisted reproductive technology providers effectively must collect specific types of contact details—a phone number, an address, an email—before donor material can be used. That sounds reasonable, but in practice it risks good donors and good families being frozen out because one piece of information is missing or outdated. Members can imagine the stress of a citizen or citizens facing that particular scenario, and fortunately the bill does address that. The bill moves towards a more practical requirement to collect contact information in whatever form is reliable and creates a case-by-case pathway for use where the full set of prescribed details cannot be obtained despite reasonable efforts. It responds to real-world difficulties that have been experienced that prevent positive outcomes from occurring. The principle remains that donor-conceived children should be able to find out about their genetic origins, but the law stops punishing families for paperwork technicalities, which I think everybody would agree is a very unreasonable and undesirable outcome. In terms of the bill, we think it is a fair balance and we support that.

Thirdly, the bill clarifies time limits on the storage and use of donor gametes and embryos. It allows storage and use beyond 15 years, where approved, and makes clear that materials should only be disposed of if the chief executive has not approved its use. This bill provides a humane case-by-case mechanism to avoid the unnecessary destruction of embryos where there is a clear expectation they would be used. The bill also tightens consent arrangements, including requiring written consent for egg retrieval, and clarifies how the definition of 'spouse' applies where couples have separated so that separated partners are not dragged through unnecessary joint counselling while still protecting their rights.

There are also technical amendments about data transfer between providers, powers for inspectors and support for the donor conception information register run by Births, Deaths and Marriages, bringing Queensland into line with national accreditation requirements. These issues matter deeply to the people going through IVF and to donor-conceived Queenslanders, who will grow up with inevitable questions about their identity. On these assisted reproductive technology changes, the bill meets the tests of better care, better rights and better governance, so Labor supports them.

In relation to cosmetic surgery, the bill amends the Private Health Facilities Act to deal with the cosmetic surgery industry. There have been rising concerns across Australia about unsafe cosmetic procedures, aggressive marketing to vulnerable people and the disproportionate exploitation of women and young people. Queensland already requires private health facilities to comply with the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards. This bill clarifies the head of power so that, by regulation, we can require facilities that provide cosmetic surgery to also comply with the new National Safety and Quality Cosmetic Surgery Standards that were agreed to by health ministers in 2023. These cosmetic surgery standards are specifically tailored to that industry and deal with issues like preoperative assessment, psychological screening, consent, credentialing and aftercare. They are not about telling

people what they can and cannot do with their own bodies; they are about making sure that, if you choose to, you are treated with the same basic level of safety and quality you would expect in any other surgery in our healthcare system.

The bill also allows for information-sharing agreements with other Queensland government entities about data collected under the act so that regulators can join the dots on risky providers rather than working in silos. This will maximise people's ability to avoid those providers. It is important to protect consumers, as dodgy providers can do so much damage to people. Some submitters raised concerns about potential duplication and the impact on smaller providers. Those concerns are worth keeping an eye on, but the core principle that cosmetic surgery should meet robust nationally consistent safety standards is sound. Labor supports those amendments.

In relation to organ donation, one of the most important parts of the bill is the amendment to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act. Most of us are familiar with organ donation after brain death, but this bill deals with a different scenario: donation after circulatory death, where a decision has been lawfully made to withdraw life-sustaining treatment and the person will die after their heart stops. In some of these cases, the patient and their family may want their organs to be used to save other lives. We obviously encourage people who are interested in organ donation to register, to maximise the number of opportunities that are out there. To make that possible, clinicians may need to carry out certain procedures before death—what the act calls ante-mortem interventions such as taking blood for tissue matching or interventions to preserve the viability of the organs. Right now, the law is unclear about who can consent to those procedures and when. That uncertainty can mean missed opportunities for life-saving transplants. That is a particularly tragic scenario when the person who passes away has made clear their intention to help others.

The bill puts in place a clear consent framework. It defines what an ante-mortem intervention is and what it is not. It allows competent adults to consent to such interventions for themselves. It also allows the senior available next of kin to consent in writing where a child or an adult lacks capacity once a lawful decision has been made to withhold or withdraw life-sustaining measures and organ donation is intended. It also requires a designated officer to authorise the intervention and to ensure consent is recorded and placed on the patient's hospital record.

The committee looked carefully at fundamental legislative principles and human rights, including the right to be free from medical treatment without consent. It concluded that any limits are justified, proportionate and accompanied by appropriate safeguards, including respect for any prior objection by the patient and oversight by a designated officer. This does not shorten anyone's life. It allows families who have already gone through the agony of accepting that their loved one cannot be saved to honour their wishes and potentially give others a second chance at life. On this part of the bill I think there will be strong support right across the chamber. Labor supports these amendments.

In relation to occupational respiratory disease, the bill makes a consequential amendment to the Public Health Act to keep Queensland's notification requirements aligned with the National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry, which is shifting to sit under the head of the Australian Centre for Disease Control. Given Queensland's experience with silicosis and coal worker's pneumoconiosis we all know too well the importance of accurate national data on occupational lung disease. This is a technical change but it supports a broader national effort, and we support that.

The most troubling part of the bill is in relation to governance and no-cause removals—the provision that allows the Crisafulli government via the Governor in Council to remove certain office holders 'for any reason or no reason'. Let's be clear about who they are: the members of numerous hospital and health boards; the Health and Wellbeing Queensland board and CEO; the Pharmacy Business Ownership Council and CEO; and hospital foundation boards. It is chilling that someone might be removed under this legislative reform for no reason. On what grounds is it considered reasonable to remove somebody from a paid role for no reason? That is what this government is bringing before the House here today—no reason: 'We are going to get rid of you and we are not going to give you any reason or justification for that.' I find it extraordinary that somebody could be removed and they would have no idea on what basis—what they did or did not do, what they said or did not say. How is it that somebody can lose something and yet have absolutely no information about why? Are they modern values? I do not think so.

This government were elected after saying they would be open and transparent. This provision goes right across that fundamental election promise by Premier Crisafulli to be open and transparent. We have people on boards serving the public, serving Queensland, and they want to be able to remove people for no reason. It is chilling. Incredibly, it is presented in the explanatory notes as improving

governance. Getting rid of people for no reason is apparently 'improving governance'—it really harks back to the Newman or Bjelke-Petersen days; of course, during the Newman years this minister was the treasurer—on the basis that these positions are important, budgets are large and ministers must be able to act if they lose confidence. No-one disputes that these are important positions or that there will be rare cases where office holders have to be removed.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bailey, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Cost of Living



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): I welcome the new member for Hinchinbrook to the chamber. Standing in this House and representing Queenslanders is one of the greatest privileges. The Labor opposition wishes him all the best. I would also like to express my sadness at the passing of Queensland great Bill Hauritz. Bill was a giant of the arts scene, most notably for founding and leading the Woodford Folk Festival. He was also a dear friend and I will miss his ideas and advice.

As we approach Christmas I want to acknowledge the frontline workers, volunteers and community organisations across the state who are facing one of their busiest periods. While many families will gather and celebrate, just as many are doing it tough. In recent months I have travelled across Queensland and in every region, in every community, people have spoken with striking honesty about what they are going through. They tell us that life is getting harder, prices are rising faster than pay packets, those daily expenses that used to be manageable now feel like a burden families cannot escape.

This is not abstract; these are real Queensland stories. Hannah recently wrote to me on Instagram. She is studying law, has had three rent increases that she cannot afford with a young child and is sitting on the social housing waiting list. Madeline messaged me too. She is a nurse and, with her partner, earning over \$240,000. Despite a perfect rental history, all of their applications have been rejected. Rylan told me that moving out seems like an impossible dream, despite earning over \$80,000 a year.

Their stories are hard to hear, but what should alarm every member in this House is that these situations are no longer rare; they are becoming normal. Reports released in the past fortnight confirm that nearly half a million Queensland households can no longer afford the basics—not luxuries and not extras but the basics—like rent, groceries, transport and medicine. QCOSS has warned that for many Queensland families this Christmas will not be a party but a struggle to simply get through. Families are turning to 'buy now, pay later' just to purchase groceries, while children's sports fees, school supplies and even medical appointments are being put off because families just cannot stretch any further.

Cost of living is not a slogan; it is the daily reality of millions of Queenslanders who feel like the ground is shifting beneath them. It is painfully clear that Queenslanders are worse off under this LNP government. The Premier made a commitment before the election that the test of a government is whether people are better off. By his own test, this government has failed. Since the LNP came to power rents have skyrocketed, groceries continue to get more expensive and unavoidable costs like rego have been hiked by the government. The number of Queenslanders falling behind is growing by the day. I have spoken to parents who are working two or three jobs and are still unable to cover their power bill and young people in full-time work who cannot afford a share house, let alone the dream of owning their own home.

While families are tightening their belts, this government is extending its hand instead to its mates and donors. Those opposite have tightened nothing except their grip on arrogance. They scrapped the \$1,000 energy rebate at precisely the moment electricity bills surged, in some cases by more than 400 per cent. Housing affordability is a foreign concept as the Deputy Premier scraps those targets. Under their new rules, social housing is harder to qualify for, even as homelessness rises across every part of Queensland. All of this has made life more expensive and more uncertain.

What has made Queenslanders angriest is not only what the government have done but also the attitude with which they have done it. They behave as though nothing is wrong, as though families are not struggling, as though the consequences of their decisions belong to someone else. Just this morning the Deputy Premier was gloating about changes to WorkCover from this government and the

alleged savings to be made, but when the LNP are questioned about KPMG, one of the big four consulting firms literally moving into the offices of WorkCover, they say, 'Well, they are a statutory body so they can make their own decisions.' Then when pressed on the private company that the LNP have sidled up with for the Brigalow gas peaking plant, promoting the profits they plan to make off Queenslanders' energy bills, we again got nothing but deflection and waffle. That is the reality of this LNP government.

The Premier does not know what it feels like to open a power bill and feel a knot of fear in your stomach. He does not know what it is like to look at your rent increase and wonder whether your family will still have a roof over their head next month. He does not understand the feeling of telling your children they cannot join their friends because the sports fees are simply too high this season. Queenslanders see it, though. They feel it and they know that this Premier is not living it. Recent reports show single parents spread so thin they are choosing between meals and medication, families falling behind on rent and half a million Queensland households unable to afford essentials, even with two incomes. That is the reality outside of this building, yet the response from this government has been denial, deflection and decisions that make things worse.

These are not unavoidable economic headwinds; these are policy choices. They have chosen to treat housing not as a right or a foundation for stability but as an asset class on a spreadsheet. While Queenslanders pay more, this government has appointed dozens of its mates and donors to senior government roles, all while preaching about fiscal restraint. This is not discipline and it is not reform; it is neglect dressed up as management. Queenslanders deserve better. They deserve a government that understands affordability is not just a matter of budgets but a matter of dignity—a government that understands stable housing is the first building block of a stable life and a government that recognises cost of living is not solved by lectures but by leadership.

Labor in government has always stood for fairness, opportunity and aspiration. My own story, like so many Queensland stories, exists because Labor governments invested in education, health care, housing and opportunity for working families. That intergenerational promise—the idea that every Queensland child can dream bigger than the last—is at risk under this LNP government, but it does not have to be this way. Labor will continue listening to Queenslanders in every community and we will continue building a plan that reflects their hopes and meets their needs. We will expose every broken promise and every cut that makes life harder.

I know where I stand, I know where Labor stands and I know where Queenslanders will stand when they have had enough. We will fight every single day to ensure this cost-of-living crisis is met with urgency, compassion and real solutions. Next week the Treasurer will hand down his midyear fiscal and economic review and we will see in black and white whether Queenslanders will get any universal cost-of-living relief. We will also see how much funding the new and expanded hospitals will receive or if there are any dates yet for when thousands of hospital beds will be built. It is another test for the LNP to show they stand with Queenslanders and not just their mates in big business. If it goes anything like their negotiations with Queensland teachers then it will be another test they will fail.

Hinchinbrook Electorate, By-Election



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.10 pm): I begin by congratulating Wayde Chiesa, the new member for Hinchinbrook, on his resounding victory. It is great to see him here and it was great to be on the campaign trail with him. It was a tough campaign because he was battling two Labor candidates. He beat one Labor candidate and he also beat the real Labor candidate who was running for the Katter party, Mr Molachino. Well done and congratulations. Never before have I seen so many Labor candidates running in one election as the member had to put up with. He fought vigorously, came through at the end of the day and is now sitting in this chamber, so well done. We have exposed all the mistruths that the opposition leader had about that campaign, with their double takes and double Labor candidates and one ought to look at the result.

For the education of the member for Hinchinbrook, what we just witnessed was the last MPI statement by the opposition leader for the year. Rather than set out an alternative government vision, his statement was just about him because he does not know whether his team will take him past Christmas, Easter or June-July next year. That is the problem. The opposition leader talked about tests. The only one being tested is the opposition leader and he has failed spectacularly just as, I might say, he failed spectacularly in the Hinchinbrook by-election. The Labor Party would have everyone believe that it is Katter country, but northern Townsville is battlers' country. It is blue-collar country. In the past those people would have voted for the Labor Party, but they did not. They voted for Wayde Chiesa and

the LNP. The Labor Party would tell everyone, 'Don't take our lowest result in Queensland's history as anything to go by because it was going to be like that.' No, it was not. It was because of the opposition leader's resounding defeat in October 2024, which was retested at the by-election when he also failed spectacularly.


Time and time again, we saw the Deputy Leader of the Opposition going up there. He left their convention. He probably did not want to vote for the CFMEU-ETU motion, so he left. I refer to the *Courier-Mail* in which the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said he left the Labor Party conference to fly north to lead the campaign in Hinchinbrook. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in his own words, was leading the campaign in Hinchinbrook. Who is going to accept responsibility for the 8.3 per cent? Is it 'Mr Eight Per Cent' from Woodridge, 'Mr Eight Per Cent' from Murrumba or do they collectively take ownership of the worst result in Labor's history?

Government members: Four each!

Mr BLEIJIE: We will divide it: four each. If we look to the members of the Labor Party, they would say the same thing. One has only to look at the lack of leadership in how they have dealt with the CFMEU over the years. At the Labor Party conference the Leader of the Opposition said they 'failed as a government'. He was the premier! It was his government but he wants to rewrite history. He wants people to think that the housing crisis, the cost-of-living crisis and the youth crime crisis were just made up. They were not. They were because of 10 years of decline under the former Labor government. They have responsibility for that. Queenslanders are not fooled. Queenslanders are not fooled when the opposition leader comes in here and puts on a fake soft accent like he is interviewing a Labor university student out the front of QUT: 'I've just spoken to a Queenslanders who talks about the housing crisis.' Luckily for the Queenslanders he spoke to, this government is unlocking 98,000 blocks of land under our Residential Activation Fund. We will have more blocks of land, more housing and more social and affordable housing than ever before following 10 years of decline under the Labor Party.

Let us look at what the AWU said in the Wood commission of inquiry. Stacey Schinnerl, the AWU state secretary, was asked if she told former ministers Bailey and de Brenni that she was concerned that the CFMEU were using BPIC to expand their industrial footprint. She said yes and she went further. In response, former minister Bailey said, 'I don't want to be involved in union turf wars.' That is all he thought it was. He put the misogyny, the bullying and the intimidation by the CFMEU down to union turf wars. No, it was not. It was disgraceful behaviour and only the LNP are going to stamp it out. Stacey Schinnerl also said that she told de Brenni and Bailey that they were going to apply BPIC respectively on stage 3 of the Gold Coast Light Rail. This will be confirmed in the royal commission. It is a lack of leadership from the opposition leader.

Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.15 pm): After that pathetic parliamentary pantomime we just saw and the one earlier this morning, I rise to speak on a very serious matter of public interest: the need for the Premier to stop prioritising politics and start prioritising the safety of Queenslanders. This is the awful reality: outside the LNP bubble, in the real world, in just one day in Queensland 13 people were injured on e-mobility devices—and those are just the injuries we know about. The Premier and his government continue to do absolutely nothing to address this serious problem—that is, unless you consider the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Sport making a joke about the situation to be doing something. The Premier has the wrong priorities for Queensland. The LNP were happy to bring forward by three months the reporting date for an inquiry in relation to biofuels but the LNP has done absolutely nothing to accelerate the parliamentary inquiry into e-mobility devices in Queensland. It is something that the Labor Party has consistently called for, but the LNP and the Premier's pride stand in the way. Meanwhile, across Queensland, children are being killed or catastrophically maimed while using e-scooters and e-bikes.


Speaking of the government's commitment to keeping people safe, last week in my community of Logan two people were shot dead in a matter of days. That follows shootings in North Lakes on 24 March, in Surfers Paradise on 31 March, in Beenleigh on 10 April, in Woodridge on 28 July and in Slacks Creek on 21 September. Where was our tough-on-crime LNP Premier then? I will tell members where the tough-on-crime LNP Premier was. He was standing at a polling booth in Hinchinbrook all day Thursday, 27 November; all day Friday, 28 November; and all day Saturday, 29 November—that is, until the media turned up. As soon as he saw the TV cameras, the Premier ran away and stayed in hiding until the media left. The Premier was standing at an early polling centre or at a polling booth, not governing, just politicking.

Queenslanders do not need a part-time premier. Queenslanders need someone who is serious about the job of premier and someone who will work day and night for the benefit of the people of our state, not the benefit of the LNP. Time and again, the Premier tells Queenslanders what he thinks they want to hear, but the reality is that this LNP Premier is just not fair dinkum. If the Premier were fair dinkum, he would be doing something about the gun-toting criminals in Logan who act like they are above the law. I will tell you this, Deputy Speaker: if two people had been shot dead in Ingham then there would have been a full-blown police response in 24 hours, yet Logan gets nothing.

If the Premier were fair dinkum about being tough on crime and tough on illegal guns, he would commit to implementing the recommendations of the Wieambilla coronial inquiry without delay. What about the farcical performance by our pathetic police minister on the weekend? He, too, would not commit to implementing the tough gun laws recommended by the Wieambilla coronial inquiry. The police minister could not commit to doing the right thing to honour the memories of fallen police officers Rachel McCrow and Matthew Arnold. I suggest the police minister and the Premier should have fewer meetings with the gun lobby and have more meetings with the families of police officers gunned down in the line of duty in Queensland. I would urge them to come down to Logan to speak to members of my community who are absolutely sick of it.

It is time for the Premier to stop acting like a shoddy used-car salesman and start acting like a Premier leading our state, given we have a completely ineffectual and clueless police minister who, by his own admission, uses victims of crime to win seats in parliament. I am calling on the Police Commissioner to come down to Logan tomorrow and set up a strike force to run gun-toting criminals out of town. I have had enough. My community has had enough. We do not want gun-toting criminals thinking they can shoot whoever they want, whenever they want, wherever they want. Two fatal shootings in suburbs in our community in a week is entirely unacceptable. It is wrong and we expect the LNP to act tomorrow.

Reportable Conduct Scheme

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.20 pm): I say to the member for Woodridge with respect to the outrage he has just displayed: Reportable Conduct Scheme. Where has he been since 2017? He sat around the cabinet table with all of the guilty party over there and did nothing with that report sitting there—all of them. The members for Miller, McConnel, Woodridge, Murrumba, Waterford and Bulimba all sat around the cabinet table—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Minister for Health, the member for McConnel has taken offence.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. Let me say that the report—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words that were used against me as well, and I ask the minister to withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. The report with respect to the—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I also take personal offence at the words used by the minister and ask that he withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw against all of them. Let me save them all the time; it is nice and easy to do. There is a lot more to come. When it comes to the faux outrage expressed by that team over there with respect to what has been delivered after one year of the Crisafulli government, after a decade of decline under Labor, everyone will recognise the sheer histrionics and theatrics being expressed by those opposite. There is a total lack of genuineness in their outrage, because they had a decade to do something about it—a decade in which they wound back the laws that actually were protecting communities. It started in 2016 and they did it for a decade. They failed to take action that saw, as the report showed, at least five instances where Ashley Paul Griffith may have been detected if there had been a reportable conduct scheme, which those on that side failed to deliver. They did it when they watered down our tough laws in 2016 and they started changing it. They did it when they failed to support the police and failed to meet the requirements for recruitment and saw attrition rates increase. They certainly did it in health, where they failed to deliver for over a decade—a decade of decline.

I heard the member for Murrumba say that he has been out listening to Queenslanders. Was the member for Murrumba out listening to the Queenslanders in Hinchinbrook who voted for him in the overwhelming number of eight per cent?

Mr O'Connor: It was 8.3 per cent—come on!

Mr NICHOLLS: Yes, 8.3 per cent. We saw a 17 per cent swing to the new member for Hinchinbrook, and what a welcome addition he makes. Was the member for Murrumba listening to the people of Hinchinbrook? I think not. He went backwards—backwards by half. That is the outcome.

How has the LNP proceeded? We have proceeded to listen to the people of not just Hinchinbrook but also Queensland. We got the result we saw in Hinchinbrook because we have been listening and we have been delivering. We will continue to deliver. I am reminded of Labor's decade of decline each week in parliament when I refer to volume 1 of my handy book here, 'Labor's—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left! I do not need your assistance in guiding what the Minister for Health is holding in his hand. Your comments are highly disorderly and I will ask for them to cease.

Mr NICHOLLS: The book I have in my hand is 'Labor's Hospital Failures', about which I have some glee in reminding those opposite. There is their failed capacity expansion program, mismanaged by two of Labor's health ministers. Despite not having a clue about what was going on, the member for Miller claims the project was—and I use his words—'planned as well as they possibly could be at the time'. Isn't that a damning indictment—'planned as well as they possibly could be at the time', despite costing millions more—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the comments by the minister and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: They are the member's own words.

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

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. Labor's best possible planning, according to the member for Miller, was an undeliverable, underfunded program described by industry as 'blind optimism and unbridled enthusiasm' never amounting to a proper delivery strategy. It was also described by Infrastructure Australia as 'a mirage of media releases', over budget and undeliverable every step of the way.

That is not the first time that the member for Miller has got things wrong, because we know the member for Miller was out when it came to Cross River Rail—the project was out billions of dollars and five years delayed—and his election commitment for a mental health hub in Yeronga—


Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister persists with his sledges against me. I find them personally offensive, and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Miller. It is not necessary for you to give any commentary other than to take personal offence. Minister, would you withdraw, please?

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. The member for Miller's 2020 election commitment for a youth mental health hub was never delivered, and he now takes exception to the fact that we are delivering a mental health hub and posts about it.

I heard the member for Murrumba talk about a constituent. Well, a constituent wrote to me—not one of mine but a constituent of the member for Miller—and said: 'His response was to block me and remove my comments from his post. I also noticed he deleted the post from another commentator who was further explaining it.' Labor had a decade to do it. They failed every time, and the member for Miller is a prime example.

Cost of Living

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (2.26 pm): Not long ago, Foodbank released its *Foodbank hunger report 2025*, a report it publishes annually, and there were some sobering statistics. In the last 12 months, one in three households faced the distressing question of what, if anything, they could put on the dinner table. Seven in 10 households of people with a disability are food insecure. Even households earning \$91,000 or more per annum are not immune, with one in five food insecure. More households now know where they can turn to if they cannot afford enough to eat, but almost half feel too embarrassed or ashamed to ask for help, while 35 per cent worry about others being in greater need. There is so much more in this report.

These statistics are bad enough in themselves, but they are actually about human beings. They are people like Liz in my electorate, an approved carer for her two disabled grandchildren, who is dreading Christmas because she does not have enough money to buy Christmas presents. There is

the couple, two public servants who live in my electorate, who alternate having dinner each night so that their kids can have three meals a day. There are the kids that the Wellspring Hub at Micah Projects are picking up to go to Hawthorne, kids whose families are staying an average of 18 months in motels because they are homeless, and Micah provides them with occasional care. There is family after family needing assistance. This government went to the election telling those people that they would be better off. How did these people know if they were going to be better off? Well, they would feel it.

We have seen what this government do when they make promises like that. They go the other way. They scrapped Labor's \$1,000 energy rebates; they scrapped Labor's 20 per cent discount on car rego; the Brisbane LNP council increased rates by \$1,000 a year; fuel, energy, water and groceries are all going up under the LNP; they have cancelled affordable housing projects and thousands more in the pipeline; they have changed the rules for homeless Queenslanders to get emergency care; and 11,000 calls for homelessness assistance have gone unanswered because this government simply does not support those services.

Let's talk about what they are doing to the real wages of public servants. Before I go to that, I want to say that it is not only the actions of this government but also the way they talk about it. If anything told us what this government thinks, it was the statement from the member for Mackay when he was talking about the homeless people on the river. He said that they should go somewhere else because otherwise there is nowhere for them to eat their fish and chips without having to be worried about homeless people. That is what this government thinks.

Let's talk about the real wages of public servants. These are the people who, increasingly, will not be able to afford the essentials of life. We have the \$25,000 allowance cut for radiation therapists and we have the teachers. Our teachers will go to arbitration because this government refuse to intervene and recognise the needs of our teachers. They made them an insulting offer. It was an insulting offer to the people whom we hand our kids over to every single day and say, 'Please make sure our kids grow up to live happy and safe lives.' That is what we ask teachers to do, and they do it every single day.

This government not only made them an insulting offer but also will not even guarantee three per cent in the interim so they can get through the next year, so they can get through arbitration. They are leaving teachers to suffer. It is time that this government showed that they care. This Premier and this minister are simply lying about what they are doing to support our teachers. They said they made a historic offer, but 70 per cent of the teachers said that it was an insulting offer.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Pause the clock, please.

Mr STEVENS: The member used unparliamentary language.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice about that.


Ms FARMER: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I accept the withdrawal from the member for Bulimba.

Ms FARMER: They said that teachers were being offered the same as nurses and police, but nurses secured extra financial benefits through negotiation and the police secured extra payments and incentives. We heard that the QTU cancelled a meeting with the minister. In fact, the meeting was cancelled because the brother of the acting president of the QTU needed emergency evacuation to Brisbane. That was the reason they cancelled the meeting, but the minister said that the meeting was cancelled because they just did not want to be there. They are lying. They want our teachers to go hungry. They want our teachers to not feel valued. They want them to suffer.

(Time expired)

Reportable Conduct Scheme; Member for Hinchinbrook

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.32 pm): When I saw the member for Bulimba rise on a matter of public interest, I thought, 'Good, here we go. We might get an explanation for why the previous Labor government failed to implement a reportable conduct scheme all the way back in 2017 when it was first recommended.' Do you know why I thought we might get that explanation from the member for Bulimba when she rose to her feet just now? She was the minister responsible for child safety when the royal commission recommended the Reportable Conduct Scheme back in 2017. She was directly responsible for implementing the recommendations that the royal commission handed down.

I thought at this point in time, as it is a matter of public interest for Queenslanders, we might get an explanation from the member for Bulimba as to why she, when she was the minister, did not implement a reportable conduct scheme to protect our children and why the most prolific and horrendous paedophile in Queensland's history was able to continue with his horrendous offending against children when he could have been stopped. He could have been picked up and stopped if the member for Bulimba, in her then portfolio of responsibilities, had implemented the Reportable Conduct Scheme, as recommended by the royal commission. What did we hear from the member for Bulimba? We did not hear a why and we did not hear an apology. Why have they not released the cabinet documents that explain the decision-making process around that table? Queenslanders deserve to know.

Does the House know what else the member for Bulimba was responsible for and for which we have not heard any apology? She was responsible for the youth crime crisis. That is right. When our youth justice laws were watered down, the member for Bulimba was the youth justice minister.

I congratulate our new member, Wayne Chiesa, on his victory in the by-election. What did he stand up for during that campaign? He stood up for stronger laws. He stood up for his community, which feels like it has been decimated by the weak laws the former Labor government presided over for the last 10 years—a decade of decline under Labor. Under Labor—and this is particularly relevant to the member's electorate—we saw a dire explosion in youth offending. The number of stolen vehicles increased 91 per cent, robbery increased 100 per cent and armed robbery increased 82.3 per cent.

Under Labor's weak laws and the leadership of the member for Murrumba and the member for Bulimba, we saw hardcore repeat offenders released back onto the streets to continue offending. In fact, the reoffending rate out of our detention centres was 94 per cent. What was the reoffending rate out of the Cleveland detention centre, which is relevant to the member for Hinchinbrook? It was 96 per cent. That is the member for Bulimba's record. Despite stakeholders telling the member for Bulimba that the 72-hour plan they had implemented was not enough and was not based on evidence, despite the Queensland children's commissioner—


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Members to my left, it just reached a level of volume in here where I could not hear what the minister was saying. That is unacceptable and disorderly. Please, cease your interjections if they are not being taken.

Mrs GERBER: Does the House know why our new member's community suffered a 96 per cent rate of reoffending out of Cleveland detention centre? The previous Labor government ignored the recommendations of the QFCC and ignored recommendations of stakeholders who said we cannot release kids back into communities from detention without any support. The previous Labor government released youth from detention centres back into communities with little to no support. Their measly 72-hour plan was only given to serious repeat offenders, and the Auditor-General found that not even every serious repeat offender got 72 hours. It was found that the 72-hour plan was not based in evidence.

The Crisafulli government has taken action. To restore safety to where we live, every single youth who goes into detention will be given 12 months of support when they are released back into our communities. We can restore safety to the people of Hinchinbrook, who suffered for too long under a weak Labor government. They now have a fierce local member who will stand up for his community on crime, who will ensure his community gets safety restored to where they live. I congratulate him on his election, and I thank him for the campaign that he ran. I condemn the previous Labor government for their weak laws, for their failure to protect Queenslanders and for their failure to protect children from the worst paedophile in Queensland's history.

(Time expired)

Homelessness

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.37 pm): I begin, with the indulgence of the House, by welcoming the new member. It is not always this friendly! We will see how the rest of the festive season goes.

I want to start with what are very real circumstances that occurred overnight in Bundaberg: the very sad passing of a man believed to be in his 30s and homeless. He passed away overnight in one of the public toilet blocks in Bundaberg. I have spoken with the police this morning with regard to the matter and they believe it is likely related to natural circumstances due to the poor health of the man.

We know that homelessness is a very serious issue—it has always been a very serious issue. We know that at no time should any of us in this House blame individual deaths on members of parliament in this place or on those who have responsibility. What we must reflect on is how this death highlights the very real circumstances that are facing individuals not just in Bundaberg but also across Queensland.

These are very real circumstances that impact families. There are families with infants who are currently living in cars, in garden sheds of their previous neighbours or in tents in caravan parks. I raise this because on 29 October I spoke about families in Bundaberg who are facing this vulnerability. I spoke about a father and his four-year-old and seven-year-old who are continuously sleeping in a car because they have not been able to be provided with any crisis accommodation. I spoke about two parents and their 18-month-old who are sleeping in a garage. I spoke about a mother with two infants—10 months old and 18 months old. However, the minister said that when I raised these matters I was attacking the community housing provider. He said that I was attacking the community housing provider when what I was doing was highlighting to the minister the very real circumstances of families being rejected in their time of need.

What we learned on Friday was that there are 11,000 pleas for help that have gone unanswered under this LNP government, under the watch of this minister. Some 82 per cent of those 11,000 are vulnerable Queenslanders. Somewhere near 40 per cent are escaping domestic, family and sexual violence. We are seeing this in Bundaberg, in the Wide Bay and right across Queensland where we have families, children and babies being rejected access to four walls and a roof because of the eligibility criteria set down by this minister.

The member for Bonney and the member for Burnett can attack me all they want, but why don't they come out with me and meet with Simone, who is a mother of a 10-year old and a 13-year-old, and her husband? The four of them have been living in a tent for three months. They went to the community housing provider but were told that under the rules of the LNP, because they signed an agreement to live in a tent in a caravan park for six months, they are not considered homeless. They were told that if you sign a six-month agreement to live in a single tent on a caravan park site the LNP do not consider you homeless. That is outrageous.

We have a 13-year-old boy being bullied at school for living in a tent. I know that the school will be taking the right steps and they will be educating the student who has made a bad decision to bully. How can a 10-year-old and a 13-year-old wake up after a week of storms that saw their tent collapse on them and traumatise them and think they can go to school and learn the next day? How can the mum and dad not be worried that if they go to the government Child Safety might get involved? They are terrified. Families are terrified that, due to no fault of their own, due to eligibility requirements of this minister shutting down their chance for crisis accommodation, they are failing their children. They think that Child Safety will come in because they cannot live up to the expectations of the LNP.

Minister, come to Bundaberg next week. Let's visit them together. Let's find a solution. Work with me and I will respect you.

Social Housing



Hon. ST O'CONNOR (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (2.42 pm): This is a perfect opportunity to provide some important context because there are far too many Queenslanders struggling with housing insecurity after a decade of decline under Labor. Because of the building and construction industry that those opposite oversaw, 77,000 fewer homes have been delivered across this state since 2018. Imagine, member for Bundaberg, if we had 77,000 additional homes right now? That is the finding of the independent Queensland Productivity Commission; that is not a political claim. The former government delivered on average 509 social homes a year over their decade of decline. They oversaw an 81 per cent increase in the social housing register. They oversaw the least productive job sites in the nation, as I just ran through. They oversaw rents increasing over 60 per cent. They also oversaw the lowest rate of home ownership of any state in the nation.

We are committed to turning things around. In our first year we have made some big progress. Earlier the Deputy Premier ran through some of the changes we have made to supply—98,000 lots unlocked through the Residential Activation Fund. In terms of our target to deliver 53,500 social and community homes by 2044—years sooner than the former government's target—in our first year we already have more than 5,700 social and affordable homes in construction or under contract across Queensland. We have delivered more than 1,640 social and community homes since January this year, with more than half in partnership with a community housing provider.

Even if you only want to count the homes that have been contracted under the Crisafulli government—if you only want to be a bit unkind and if you are a failed former minister and you want to try to protect your legacy and you only want to let our new government claim the homes that we have contracted ourselves—that is 3,343 homes since 1 November last year. Behind every one of those homes is a Queenslander whose life has changed. Earlier this year I met Alberto and his wife, Gina, who were living in a van behind our local Hungry Jack's in Labrador. They were able to move into a beautiful new social home in Biggera Waters that we delivered. I welcomed Tanyia and her dog Googy to their new home in Caboolture alongside the member for Pumicestone. Tanyia was rebuilding after 18 months of experiencing homelessness following a tragic storage facility fire. In Mackay I met Heather, who finally gained the security she needs to care for her grandchildren and to take part in her local pickleball club.

In Mackay, when we were turning the first sod for some new homes on a site that had sat empty for eight years, our QBuild workers told me, 'Minister, we felt like we had been doing more mowing than building over the last decade.' We are turning that around. These moments matter. They are the reason we are investing a record \$5.6 billion over this four-year period alone from our first budget. It is why we are now the only state in the nation to lock in perpetual funding for community housing delivery beyond the political cycle to give those providers the system they need to deliver, to plan, to get long-term housing out of the ground. It is all about actual delivery, not just making announcements.

We backed a streamlined master agreement—something the former government announced back in 2017—which takes over 2,000 outdated arrangements down to just 114. Earlier we heard an attempt at another scare campaign from the Leader of the Opposition, who claimed there have been changes to social housing eligibility. There have been no changes to social housing eligibility—no changes at all to the eligibility for social housing. They are the same eligibility criteria that had been there for many years under those opposite.

What has changed is that we are no longer letting property owners live in social housing. We are no longer letting high-income earners live in social housing. We have identified more than two dozen property owners who were able to live in social housing under the failed policies of the Labor Party and over 155 households who were high-income earners living in social housing while there were people on the waitlist. We have invested over \$600 million into more crisis accommodation. After a year of delivery there is a long way to go, but we are making progress to turn around the housing crisis we inherited after a decade of decline that has led to many tragic situations across Queensland.

Cost of Living



Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (2.47 pm): It is always great to follow the member for Bonney—probably the most tone-deaf, heartless and callous housing minister we have ever seen, especially after the contribution—

Mr O'CONNOR: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at those disgraceful comments and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Minister, there is no need to put that subjectivity into your point of order. Member, would you withdraw?

Ms FENTIMAN: I withdraw. I would urge the housing minister to meet with the constituents of the member for Bundaberg who are going through such a tough time. I think we were all moved, or most of us were moved, by those stories.

Today I rise to speak about the LNP's broken promises, particularly when it comes to cost of living. We have heard a number of stories today about Queenslanders doing it tough. A year into their term in government, Queenslanders have seen a growing list of broken promises and a failure to help Queenslanders in a cost-of-living crisis. The latest inflation data tells a very troubling story—a story that makes me a little bit nervous about what else the LNP are going to dump on Queenslanders in their budget update next week or what will be missing, that is, universal cost-of-living relief. In October, Brisbane's headline CPI rose again. Inflation was 5.2 per cent. The highest of any capital city was right here in Brisbane.

The broken promise of this Premier to scrap energy rebates has sent power prices through the roof. The ABS has reported that electricity prices have risen an astonishing 468 per cent in a year. Economists have been blunt about the consequences. Once the rebate fell out of the CPI calculation in the September quarter, inflation for Brisbane and regional Queensland jumped to 4.7 per cent, which

is well above the national average. Brisbane is now the most expensive capital city in the country, so what is this government going to do to support Queensland families doing it tough? Rents continue to climb. Families are still reeling from rising grocery prices, soaring insurance premiums and unpredictable fuel costs.

In my electorate of Waterford, 40 per cent of households are renters. Data has now shown that 86 per cent of renters in Logan are experiencing rental stress. Some suburbs in my community, Tanah Merah and Underwood, have 100 per cent of renters in rental stress. That means thousands of households in my electorate alone cannot afford their rent, cannot afford their bills. Families are doing the maths and they are cutting back wherever possible, but they are still coming up short. We have seen nothing from this government to help these families. QCOSS has warned that people on low incomes are making impossible choices between keeping a roof over their head, feeding their kids, or paying to get their kids their school uniforms or into school sport. Families are spending up to 48 per cent of their household incomes just on housing. The government has the tools to protect Queenslanders from this, but they have completely walked away from any support for families.

The Treasurer's budget update next week will show us exactly how little they intend to change course. I do not expect to see any change that will help Queenslanders doing it tough because their entire government has been completely tone deaf to the hardship and struggle of Queensland families. This time they have to take ownership of their policies and their budget. They have had six appropriation bills and 265 media releases mention their budget. You cannot blame Labor anymore for this mess. The budget update is a reflection of their economic management, and they will have to front up to Queenslanders next week and explain why there is no universal cost-of-living relief coming their way.

If their last budget update is their idea of good economic management, I think all Queenslanders are in trouble. Let's hope this time the Treasurer does not try and create another magic pudding with the debt figure or play the blame game. Let's not forget he added \$23 billion in operational expenses. We still do not know where that money has gone. In fact, the Under Treasurer confirmed it was just an estimate—a pretty big one—that then sent Queensland on an outlook downgrade. He not only shot the fiscal credibility of the government, lost the trust of the bond market and lost the trust of ratings agencies but also, more importantly, lost the trust of Queensland families when energy rebates were not continued. Maybe this time the Treasurer can get all of the under treasurers to sign off on the budget update.

Mr Miles: Maybe.

Ms FENTIMAN: Maybe. We will have to see. On this side we will keep fighting for Queenslanders and fighting for cost-of-living relief because they need it.

(Time expired)

Pioneer-Burdekin Pumped Hydro Project



Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (2.52 pm): I must reply in some respects to the member for Waterford's contribution, because households are doing it tough and this government is dedicated to helping them in every way possible. I need to reflect briefly on the budget's cost-of-living relief: \$8.5 billion in concessions—the largest ever contribution to cost-of-living relief; Back to School Boost; Play On! vouchers that were permanently funded; and the Crisafulli government's permanent 50-cent fares.

Before I move on, the member for Waterford wants to contrast. Our cost-of-living relief is permanent. Do you remember 50-cent fares, Mr Deputy Speaker? They spent more on advertising the budget papers in 2024 than they did on putting it in the budget. We have permanently funded it. They talk about 20 per cent off car rego. In 2024 they spent four times more in advertising the budget papers than they did on putting that discount in the budget. Our cost-of-living relief is targeted, timely, recurrent and responsible. Most of all, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is permanent. The Energy Roadmap clearly laid out modelling that showed avoided costs to Queensland households of \$1,035 every year for the next 10 years—a lower system cost to Queensland taxpayers.

One of the first actions of this government was the public release of the detailed analytical report into Labor's Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro energy storage project. The centrepiece of the former government's Energy and Jobs Plan was supposed to be the world's biggest pumped hydro program. Do you remember the battery of the north? We got that all the time from those opposite. The report, which was kept hidden by those opposite, was finally released and it revealed that Pioneer-Burdekin

was all a hoax. It went from \$7 billion to \$12 billion to \$36.8 billion. It was not financially or environmentally possible and the community was never consulted. All of those details were kept from the Queensland people.

On the weekend we saw an investigation by the *Australian* newspaper. It has uncovered more concerning details about the level of deception contained in the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan which was underpinned by the Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro project and Borumba. What did this report say? I started highlighting some of the key sections, but then it turned into a colouring-in exercise because there is so much in this report those opposite must answer. The article said that it raises questions about the plans and timelines and whether its release was driven more by politics than readiness. Let's look a little bit further.

Fourteen former cabinet ministers were at the CEDA lunch in 2022 when the former premier announced it. One of them—and most of them are still over there—as was reported, the minister 'who would not be named', called it out and said it was all about the announcement rather than the delivery of the project.


A government member: Who was it? I reckon it was the member for Woodridge.

Mr JANETZKI: I reckon it might have been the member for Woodridge; I reckon he was there. Maybe it was the member for Springwood. Maybe the member for Springwood has been talking to the *Australian*, 'the minister who would not be named'. They are all keen to throw former premier Palaszczuk under the bus and they are close political confidantes of the former premier. I know that the former deputy premier was a close political confidante of the former premier. As the former deputy premier I would expect that he would be very close to the then premier.

Let's look at the record. What was the former deputy premier saying in August last year? Then premier Miles said, 'Our commitment to the Pioneer-Burdekin project is rock solid.' What else did the member for Murrumbidgee say 18 months ago? This takes on a very disconcerting air when you consider the headlines and reports from the weekend. He said that every drill and borehole brought benefits to the community that would continue for decades to come. Look at the reports in the *Australian*: 'Toxic politics: did premier's "undercooked" fix contaminate valley?' The member for Murrumbidgee said that every drill and borehole brought benefits to the community. They have questions to answer.

(Time expired)

Queensland Museum, Educational Materials

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (2.57 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker Krause, you have young children of your own, so I think this an apt question for you and any other members in this House. Would you be okay with your kids' science lessons being sponsored and shaped by a fossil fuel company? Shell is funding educational materials for Queensland kids that include their corporate branding, outdated scientific data and misleading information on climate change. This is happening under the guise of a national sponsorship agreement with the Queensland Museum. Shockingly, some of these materials are being removed from the Queensland Museum's website, so I thought I would bring them to the attention of the House before they disappear altogether.

I will start with 'Introduction to Ocean Acidification' which, as we can see here, has the Shell QGC logo on the front. The unbelievable irony of them including not just their corporate materials but also, if we turn to page 9 of this document, they exclaim to everyone's shock and horror 'poor Nemo' when they discuss the effects of ocean acidification on the anemone that Nemo lives in—as though they care. 'Poor Nemo!' You can see the crocodile tears.

I move to page 13 of the document, where these guys are actually asking children to come up with their own carbon capture and storage solution. It is unbelievable. Maybe most unbelievable of all is that there is not a single mention of fossil fuels in this entire document which talks about carbon dioxide and ocean acidification. It is absolutely unbelievable. I table that for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Introduction to ocean acidification' [1957].

I go to the second document, titled 'Changing Climates, Changing Waters'. This one takes us through some potentially useful information about rising sea levels, more intense rainfall events, consequences for flooding, more droughts, more bushfire weather, warmer and more acidic oceans and more frequent sea level extremes, but there is still not a single mention of fossil fuels in this entire document. In fact, I could not help but gag a little bit getting to the end of this document and seeing they had interviews with two staff from the Queensland Museum. There is no mention of fossil fuels, yet they asked these two Museum staff what actions they take personally to reduce their carbon footprint. The

carbon footprint is the biggest sham that the fossil fuel industry has ever come up with. They are not just greenwashing in here but trying to ignore their own responsibility and foist responsibility on to young children in their learning. It is an absolute joke, with no mention of fossil fuels. I table that for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Changing climates, changing waters' [1958].

Page 7 of the final document I will refer to today tells us that the climate has warmed by 0.7 of a degree in the last century—never mind that it has actually risen by more like 1.2 degrees up until today. It asks students to focus on warming over the last 5,000-year period—never mind the immediate future that they will inherit and for which they will have responsibility for managing increasing natural disasters. In amongst all of the 10 pages of this document, I think one out of seven mentions of the word 'fossil' refers to fossil fuels but it is in this context where they guide teachers to 'conclude this activity with a discussion about how individuals, the local community, Australia and the international community are reducing their reliance on fossil fuels and combatting climate change'. It is disgraceful. You cannot make this up. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'States of matter—our warming world' [1959].

I have run out of time to go through all of the content they include in this nonsense, but I will also table this Comms Declare report generated this month.

Tabled paper: Document, dated December 2025, titled 'Report: Queensland Museum Learning Resources: Climate Accuracy and Sponsorship Concerns' [1960].

It goes into a lot more detail about the misinformation and greenwashing that we have seen from Shell in concert with the Queensland Museum. This is a disgraceful conflict of interest. Shell is one of the 10 largest polluting companies in Australia. The Climate Council has estimated that it has produced 19.1 million tonnes of CO₂ since 2016. Shell has a 17 per cent stake in the North West Shelf gas project in WA—thanks, Labor. This project is mooted to generate four billion tonnes of carbon dioxide before its end date in 2070. Fossil fuels are responsible for nearly 90 per cent of all global carbon emissions. The minister has this advice—which I will also table—that says that the partnership between Shell and the Queensland Museum is likely unlawful because Shell's operations are directly impacting on Queensland's natural and cultural heritage, which the Queensland Museum Act requires the Queensland Museum to preserve.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 September 2025, from the Environmental Defenders Office to the Chief Executive Officer of the Queensland Museum, Dr Jim Thompson PSM, regarding the museum's Future Makers program [1961].

Will the government act to preserve our kids' education and the independence of our state's institutions? Probably not. They are all in the pocket of big business. They would probably put a Shell or Adani logo on the front of this building if they could.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Maiwar, I refer to the opening of your speech. I will take the question you posed of me as a rhetorical question, but for your own guidance and the guidance of all members I will say that statements and questions should be through the chair, not to the chair in this chamber. I am not going to ask you to withdraw or anything like that; it is just guidance for all members.

ENERGY ROADMAP AMENDMENT BILL

GREENHOUSE GAS STORAGE AMENDMENT BILL

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)

DEFAMATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate; Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order; Order of Business



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (3.03 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill and the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, with—
 - (a) separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
 - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and

- (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles;
2. Under the provisions of standing order 137, the following bills be declared urgent bills:
- (a) Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3);
 - (b) Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill;
 - (c) Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill; and
 - (d) Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.
3. The following time limits for the bills listed in 2. apply:
- (a) The minister to be called to reply to the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) by 7.30 pm on Tuesday, 9 December 2025 with all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 8.00 pm on Tuesday, 9 December 2025;
 - (b) The minister to be called to reply to the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill and the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill (cognate debate) by 8.15 pm on Wednesday, 10 December 2025 with all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 9.00 pm on Wednesday, 10 December 2025;
 - (c) The minister to be called to reply to the Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 5.00 pm on Thursday, 11 December 2025 with all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 5.30 pm on Thursday, 11 December 2025.
4. If all stages have not been completed by the times specified in 3., Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bills, including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bills, without further amendment or debate.
5. The special adjournment motion (valedictory speeches) to be moved immediately after the passage of the Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill with the total time allowed for debate 30 minutes.
6. Adjournment to be moved following the special adjournment motion with no adjournment debate.

I will briefly address this motion. This is a procedural motion that sets out the order of business for the sitting week. It is entirely consistent with longstanding parliamentary practice and is one that the Labor opposition would be very familiar with, having moved similar motions when they were in government. This motion provides certainty, giving all members clarity about the program of business before the House this week, and it ensures that sufficient, structured and orderly time is provided for debate on the bills listed.

The special adjournment and valedictory speeches being held at the completion of the Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill on Thursday is also entirely consistent with long-established precedent. It is a practice that has occurred across multiple parliaments, including under the former Labor government, which routinely adopted the same arrangement with respect to timings and the commencement of valedictory and special adjournment proceedings during the final sitting week of a parliamentary calendar year.

The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government has been highly productive over the last 12 months, and that productivity has been underpinned by disciplined, methodical and orderly management of the House. This motion reflects that approach and ensures the Queensland government continues to operate in a calm, methodical, considered and effective manner on behalf of all Queenslanders.


Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the procedures of this House. A motion of this nature, with its level of complexity and detail, was read in a way that I am sure all members would agree was not intelligible. The member who is moving that motion is duty bound to table that motion so that members can consider the motion before debate ensues.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): What is your point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order is in relation to the procedures of this House. The standing orders require a motion of this nature to be tabled and circulated to members. It has not been circulated to members. Debate is about to ensue. It is clear that the Leader of the House has done this—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I understand your point of order and I am going to seek some advice about it. I have sought advice. The House granted leave to the Leader of the House to move the motion without notice. I understand the motion is being copied and is in the process of being circulated. There is no point of order.

Dr ROWAN: In continuing, I say to the Manager of Opposition Business that the motion has been provided to the clerks for circulation, as has been indicated. As Leader of the House and manager of government business, I commend the motion to the House.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (3.08 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, with your indulgence, I will take a moment to look at the motion moved by the Leader of the House, which is two pages. The Leader of the House could have treated this matter with some degree of respect. He could have given members of this House the opportunity to review this before this debate ensued. The motion sets time limits for a number of bills, including the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill and the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3).

It indicates that the minister be called to reply to the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) by 7.30 pm on Tuesday, 9 December. What this motion is seeking to do is to guillotine debate on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) by 7.30 tonight. It goes on to say that the minister be called on to reply to the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill by 8.15 tomorrow night.

Mr Stevens: That's Wednesday.

Mr de BRENNI: I am not taking interjections from members. What I am taking the opportunity to do is to provide information about what is in this motion. In the way he read this motion to the House, the Leader of the House deliberately denied the rights of members to understand what he was putting to this House. This is a deliberate tactic to undermine the processes and procedures of this House. The conduct of the Leader of the House is contemptuous.

The question has to be asked: why is this government so desperate to shut down debate on the legislation that they have brought into this House? I put this rhetorical question through you, Mr Deputy Speaker: why run from debate if their laws can actually stand up to scrutiny? Those opposite know that the laws they have introduced are a failure before they have even passed the House and they will run from them over the next 2½ days.

Why silence the members of this place? Why silence these members? Members of the government backbench and the government front bench are all silenced. This was a mob that once demanded transparency. Do honourable members remember that? I want to draw the House's attention to the Speaker's ruling on this matter of 14 March, and it was clear. This is why I say that this motion is contemptuous and should not be supported by this House. Mr Speaker said—

This is where they come to have their say ... I do not think it should be treated lightly.

That is what the Speaker has set for the rules of this place and the Leader of the House, with the clear support of the Premier and the Deputy Premier, has come in here and taken away the rights of members to have their say. Does that Premier, who has given this imprimatur, now reject the Speaker's own defence of democracy? I say that is exactly what this Premier has done. The Leader of the House said that members must be allowed to speak on behalf of their communities. I say to members that they will not be able to speak on behalf of their community when it comes to the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3). They will not be able to speak on behalf of their community when it comes to the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill. They will not be able to speak on behalf of their community on the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill. They will not be able to speak on behalf of their community on the Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This is a mob that lectured this House for years about transparency. Here are some other quotes from those opposite. They said Queenslanders have a right to know what the opposition has to say.

Mr McCALLUM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Everton is interjecting from a seat that is not his own.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Bundamba, thank you for your point of order. I will caution the member for Everton. You know the rules: interject from your own seat, please.

Mr de BRENNI: They said this parliament should have the time it needs to scrutinise legislation, so why the sudden amnesia? Why abandon every single principle they say they stand for, that they fight for? What are they trying to hide?

I will not anticipate debate on any of these bills while we debate this motion, but everybody knows that these bills are incredibly serious, so why the rush? Why choke debate on something of the scale of importance as the privatisation of Queensland's energy system? Consideration in detail and the right for all members to have their say is essential. We saw this government start off their term of parliament by gagging debate in this parliament. Then they realised they were wrong on the bills and they had to

fix their mess in later bills. Why repeat the same mistakes over and over? Do honourable members know what leads to them making the same mistakes over and over? It is arrogance and contempt and that is on full display here in this House this afternoon. This is just like they did with their Expert Legal Panel operating in secrecy; it gagged them, preventing them giving their advice. That advice is still secret. No committee of this place even scrutinised it. Stakeholders did not see it. Why silence the only forum left to scrutinise these bills, which is this House? That is what they are doing today.

Before the election the Premier said, 'When I say something it means something.' Why does nothing he says mean anything anymore? On day one of the 58th Parliament the Premier gagged debate and today here he is doing it all over again.

Mr Power: Four times over.

Mr de BRENNI: Four times over; I take the interjection from the member for Logan. Arrogant and contemptuous—that is the style of this government. If this government believes in the rights of Queenslanders—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers and member for Mermaid Beach, no quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr de BRENNI: If this government believes in the rights of Queenslanders, why will it not let the representatives of those Queenslanders speak on their behalf? This is not a motion about efficiency. I reject every pathetic reason the Leader of the House put forward.

Mr Dick: Embarrassing.

Mr de BRENNI: It was embarrassing. Mr Deputy Speaker, I put it to you that the Leader of the House probably did not want to do this. The Deputy Premier would have instructed him to do this because that is his modus operandi—gagging debate, shutting down the rights of members; he just wants it all his own way, contemptuous and arrogant. It is about control and it is about shutting down those with different ideas to that of the Deputy Premier and his extreme views. If someone has a different view to his extreme views, he does not want to hear it; he does not want the parliament to hear it. It is about denying Queenslanders a voice. That is what has happened here today. What kind of government is afraid of debate on its own laws?

Mr Power: The Crisafulli government.

Mr de BRENNI: The Crisafulli government.

Ms Boyd: A bad government.

Mr de BRENNI: A bad government. What kind of leader silences the voices of members elected to a house of democracy? Our democracy relies on the scrutiny that occurs during debate in this House and our communities rely on the representatives here in this place to express their views. This parliament relies on open and fulsome debate. If this is a government that believes in any of those principles, why is it trampling every single one of those here today?

This motion to guillotine debate treats Queenslanders with contempt. What it ultimately does is reject the voices of Queenslanders. That is what this Premier has done today: on four occasions throughout this week he proposes to reject the voices of Queenslanders.

Ms Grace: Shame.

Mr de BRENNI: It is shameful. It is incredibly shameful. I urge all members of the parliament, including the members of the government backbench, to think very carefully about what they will say to their communities when they return home only to tell them that the opportunity to speak on their behalf was taken from them by this arrogant and contemptuous Premier.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr STEVENS: Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I call the member for Mermaid Beach.

Opposition members interjected.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order, Manager of Opposition Business?

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, is in relation to the member seeking the call. The member for Mermaid Beach, in my opinion, did not rise to seek the call in advance of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and, on that basis, I move—

That the honourable member for Woodridge be heard.

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

AYES, 32:

ALP, 32—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, Pease, Power, Pugh, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.


NOES, 52:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, 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, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Mermaid Beach.

Government members: Hear, hear!

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (3.24 pm): Thank you, Mr Speaker. The irony of that little vote is that we wasted—

Mr Whiting interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bancroft, you are warned. I had just called the member for Mermaid Beach. He had not said more than a couple of words before interjections started. There will be more joining the member for Bancroft. The member for Mermaid Beach has the call.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Again, the irony is that those opposite are wasting more valuable time, something which the Manager of Opposition Business suggested was of urgent need to discuss matters ongoing. However, the Manager of Opposition Business might not realise that this is the last sitting week for the year. We will not be sitting again until February—those opposite got the calendar today—so it is a great thing that the current Leader of the House—and I support him as a former leader of the house—has done for the betterment of this Queensland parliament. There are four bills to clear and it is very important that we get them done this week as we move into a very long Christmas break.

The Manager of Opposition Business is the pot calling the kettle black because I was in this House, as was he, when with 18 minutes notice the voting system for Queenslanders was changed. That was a most urgent matter to happen in the middle of the night, yet now he comes out and says, with four hours to go—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Mermaid Beach, you have the call, but I will remind you of the motion that is being debated.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. It really goes back to the urgency of these bills to be done this week and the opposition's complaint that four hours tonight to discuss these matters is not enough time to put forward their views on the matter.

Mr Fumer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Ferny Grove, I will not caution you again.


Mr STEVENS: Under the Westminster system, as we know, it is the opposition's job to whinge and whine, and it does it very well. Unfortunately, the repetitiveness of this Labor Party's whingeing and whining leads to a great waste of time for this Queensland parliament. I am on the back bench over here and I will have plenty of time. I will put my speech in as succinct a manner as possible, in a shortened version, so that we all get our opportunity in a short time to say our piece. For the Manager of Opposition Business to get up here and whinge and whine, as is his job, about not having enough time is absolute hypocrisy in light of what those opposite did previously when they were on this side for 10 years and all the bills that were pushed through without a problem. I remember the bills that were argued about time and time again after notice of the week's work and the debates on bills that were all cut short by the government of the day.

For the Manager of Opposition Business to not realise the importance of getting these four bills done this year, before we have a long break heading into early February next year, belies any understanding of the importance of getting this legislation through for Queensland, and that is what it is all about—getting this legislation done and dusted this year for Queensland. If those opposite cannot manage to fit their speeches and their whingeing and whining into the appropriate time, that is a problem for the Manager of Opposition Business and the whips. They should be able to manage their speakers with different points of view and ensure that when they are opposing these bills or whatever they want to do—I am not sure which ones they are opposing or which ones they are agreeing to—the bottom line is that they have plenty of time to put their points across. Members opposite have an opportunity to put their different views, not repetitive views time and time again.

For the Manager of Opposition Business to be opposing this motion and then talking for 10 minutes and wasting more time calling for a division so that his deputy opposition leader can get a little speech in—and I am sure that he will follow me in speaking—shows the absolute hypocrisy of the Labor Party. I am taking my time here because these four bills are very important for Queensland and we will get them done. Everyone will get their opportunity to speak. Basically, what those opposite have to do is contain their speaking to points of relevance, not regurgitating their speeches written for them by the Labor Party's 23 staffers on level 9—writing speeches for them to waste the parliament's time. It is a very important—

Mr McDonald interjected.

Mr STEVENS: That is right. It is a very important motion that the Leader of the House has moved for Queensland's benefit. We want these bills done this week. We will not extend the time on Thursday and ruin the valedictories—like the former Labor government did time and time again, wasting time all the way through so that we did not have proper valedictories for the Parliamentary Service. The Leader of the House has done a great job and all members of this House should support this motion.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.31 pm): I want to commend the member for Mermaid Beach. That was a brilliant one-minute speech repeated for seven minutes—and the member for Mermaid Beach wants to lecture the Labor opposition on repetitiveness. Mr Deputy Speaker, with your indulgence, I want to acknowledge the member for Hinchinbrook who won the by-election in Hinchinbrook fair and square. I welcome him to the parliament. I wish it was a parliament, though, member for Hinchinbrook. What we are seeing here is a pantomime—that is what we are seeing. We are seeing a pantomime from this government. This motion represents what the LNP has turned this parliament into.

On a quick assessment of the times set out by the Leader of the House, there will be about one hour and 45 minutes for a second reading debate on the health bill—55 minutes for non-government members. The second bill deals with perhaps the most important matter this parliament will debate this parliamentary term: the future of energy in Queensland—an issue that is arguably more important to the future of Queensland, its people, its communities and its economy than the Olympics. This House will be debating it for 4½ hours in the second reading stage—two hours and 15 minutes for non-government members. Then, of course, we have to rush through the defamation bill. I cannot tell you how often I am down at Coles in Logan Central Plaza and they are rushing up to me in the aisles—the checkout operators—‘Cam, when are you going to pass the Defamation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill?’ I am telling them, ‘The LNP thinks this is the most important thing for Queensland.’ It is not. The reform process for a unified defamation system has been continuing in this country for about 25 years. This government wants to hide from its Energy Roadmap. They want it dead and buried without debate and discussion. Something they should all want to talk about they want debated in four hours and 30 minutes, leaving 2¼ hours for all non-government members.

I want to go back to what the Leader of the House said. He said this motion and the rush to finish the parliamentary year—as we heard from the member for Mermaid Beach—is so everyone can hear the valedictory speeches and socialise and is a matter of established convention and tradition. When it comes to the operation of this parliament we have seen convention and tradition trashed by the Crisafulli LNP government. We remember when they destroyed the Truth-telling and Healing Inquiry in the middle of the night with no parliamentary scrutiny and debate. We remember when they banned drug testing in this state in a shameful attempt to silence the voice of the people in the middle of the night and their filibustering on the debate on the rural fire amendment—not allowing the people of this state to have the legislation properly examined and their representatives properly heard. Of course we saw the

pantomime about the Trusts Bill. We remember that. It is important; it is not important. It is urgent; it is not urgent. This is wasting the parliament's time and showing that the members of the government cannot control the legislative program of the LNP government.

I want to associate myself with the words of the member for Springwood, who gave a terrific contribution on this appalling motion. He said the people of Queensland deserve open and fulsome debate in this chamber, the people's chamber, and all we see is an arrogant abuse of power. We saw the truth from the member for Mermaid Beach because we have 'four bills to clear'—not four bills to debate and not four bills to have a contest of ideas on. We have four bills to tick off so we can bring the parliament to an end—throw everything out. The parliamentary committee's work, the examination of the bill—it does not matter; we just have to clear the bills before we can all go on holidays.


I saw the member for Glass House trying to be normal on social media. Did you see that film that he put up on acronyms? Well here is an acronym for the member for Glass House and all members of the LNP: DSW—do some work. Do what you are paid to do—not run off to socialise at the end of a parliamentary week. We are happy to sit here all night tomorrow night. The LNP changed the standing orders so you could sit into the night. We are willing to sit into the night to debate legislation.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DICK: I do not know what the member for Nanango is babbling about, but it will be another inanity. All I want to say is this: this is another example—

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr DICK: Do not encourage the member for Nanango. All I want to say is this is another example of an arrogant abuse of power. Even the member for Moggill knows it is a farce. He was laughing and giggling because he is embarrassed. We know the strings are being pulled by the Premier and the Deputy Premier. We see the Premier coming in eyeballing everyone—the de facto whip counting who is in the chamber. They are obsessed by control; they are not obsessed by open, free and full debate. Every member of this House should have an opportunity to have their voice heard on these bills, but particularly the energy bill, which is critical to the future of Queensland. Every member of this House should oppose this motion. We should call this out for what it is—an arrogant abuse of power. This is the way the people of Queensland have seen the LNP conduct themselves time and time again throughout this parliament. It is entirely unacceptable, just as is this motion is entirely unacceptable.

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (3.39 pm): What a sad day for democracy under the LNP government, who waltz in here today and with this motion are trashing every single fundamental tenet of the democratic process that occurs here in this House. They come in here and treat this parliament as their plaything. This is a unicameral parliament, without any upper house. They come in here and crunch through the numbers to silence members in this House from properly debating important laws—not one, not two, not three but four laws. It is an absolute disgrace.

Members are elected to this place to speak on behalf of their constituents. There are 93 electorates. I acknowledge and welcome the new member for Hinchinbrook. I am full of sorrow for him that he comes here on his first day to see his own government remove his right to speak on four bills. Do not tell me that the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill is not an important bill for the people of Hinchinbrook or any of the other 92 electorates that are represented in this House. On his first day he is gagged by the boss, the member for Broadwater, and the member for Kawana. Every single member who has been elected to this place has a right to speak in relation to the matters that are before this House, whether it is legislation, a motion or a committee report. What we are seeing here today is one of the most egregious and ignorant fettering of the rights of every single member in this place.

The process for the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill has been truncated. The committee report was rushed. Only four of 41 submitters were given the opportunity to appear before the committee. This government—this mob—has form for shutting down debate, for shutting down proper, robust examination and accountability of the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill. Why do members think they are now compressing the entire consideration of the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill into less than 24 hours—around 4½ hours of debate? They want to truncate debate on it because the government is absolutely terrified of the divisions that exist within their caucus around energy. That is why they have come in here with a guillotine motion. We examined at the last sittings the enormous divisions that exist within the LNP caucus. The member for Maryborough does not believe in net zero. He is not going to get to speak on it today.

There are many stakeholders in the energy industry. There were many submitters who wanted to have their views heard during the committee process and were not able to. A lot of those stakeholders are relying on the debate of the legislation for an opportunity for their views to be put on the record of this House, to be properly taken into consideration by the minister and by executive government. All of this has been cut by this motion. There is hardly a more pressing issue than the future of the energy system here in Queensland. There is hardly a more pressing issue than the cost of energy in every single one of the 93 electorates. This is the government's signature energy plan and the bill that will enact that.

Mr HUNT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think the member is straying into pre-empting debate.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order, member for Logan! You are warned under the standing orders. I do not need your assistance or you interrogating the member for Nicklin on his feet as he is making a point of order. Member for Nicklin, was your point of order relevance?


Mr HUNT: No, it was pre-empting debate on the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Anticipation of debate. Thank you, member for Nicklin. I have been listening carefully. Member for Bundamba, please be cautious about anticipating debate. I think you have been going okay, but continue.

Mr McCALLUM: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I appreciate your guidance. I have been very careful to talk broadly about the cost of living and about power prices and how that is important for every single community that is represented in this House. It is absolutely disgraceful that members of this House will not have an opportunity to talk about the government's bill that will shape energy prices here in Queensland.

The bills that are the subject of this motion are important and the issues that are contained within them should be fully ventilated, whether it is the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3), which will be cut by eight o'clock tonight, or the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill, which is a cognate debate with the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill. It is not just one bill getting crunched through in 4½ hours tomorrow night; it is actually two. Then, of course, there is the defamation bill.

There is a very disturbing pattern of behaviour from this government. We have seen the secrecy; we have seen the lack of transparency. What we are now seeing time and time again is the government's willingness and propensity to come in here and gag proper, robust parliamentary debate on bills. This is an absolute disgrace. I urge every single member of the House to think carefully about whether or not they are prepared to support a motion that is going to take away their right to contribute to bills that are being debated on behalf of their community in relation to these matters. The record will show for every single member, when it comes to voting on this motion, whether or not they voted to silence their community. If they vote for this motion they are voting for their community to be silenced. I am very glad that that will be on the record.

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (3.47 pm): The member for Woodridge cannot lecture anyone on being normal. In his contribution the member for Woodridge wanted to engage in ad hominem attacks—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask for that to be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): The member has taken offence, Minister. Would you withdraw, please?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. The member for Woodridge came in here and engaged in ad hominem attacks. He likes to dish it out but he cannot take it.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: Cue camera 2!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. Member for Woodridge?

Mr DICK: I take personal offence and ask the minister to withdraw.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. I will stick to facts. At the booth that the member for Woodridge proudly stood on in the Hinchinbrook by-election, the vote was 8.39 per cent primary vote. Labor heartland—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. This is a—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand your point of order, member for McConnel. Minister, I ask you to remain relevant to the procedural motion. There is always some latitude to give context, but I would ask you to be relevant to the motion.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. I assure you I will come back to the substance of the motion. The member for Woodridge spoke about the government riding roughshod and communities not having their voice. Communities had an opportunity to have their say in Hinchinbrook just two weekends ago, when they resoundingly rejected Labor's view of the world.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order: procedural motion and relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for McConnel.

Mr POWELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister has indicated he is providing some context and he is coming to the substance of the motion as put. He was barely into his contribution before he was interrupted again, but he has indicated that he is coming to the substance of the motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, members to my left, for your points of order. Minister, I have been listening very carefully to you and you are stating that you are responding to concerns or issues raised by the member for Woodridge. I ask you to remain relevant to the motion before the House and those comments made by the member for Woodridge.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. Those opposite contend that there is insufficient time for them to voice the concerns of their communities through this motion yet in these debates all we hear from those opposite are prewritten speeches and hollow talking points. The hypocrisy of those opposite in their opposition to this motion does not go without notice. I sat on that side for seven years and listened to those opposite come in here and move motion after motion to gag debates at their whim. For example, they changed electoral laws with 17 minutes notice. That is what those opposite did. It was not considered by a committee. It was not remotely part of the bill. They decided to do it because it suited them.

Therefore, for those opposite to come in here with some hypocritical righteous position that the government are riding roughshod says more about their approach. This is the laziest opposition in Queensland's history, which is reflected in the results of the Hinchinbrook by-election where their primary vote was the lowest in history.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr MICKELBERG: The member for McConnel does not like it because she knows it is true.

Ms GRACE: My point of order is relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Transport and Main Roads, you have had a pretty good go in responding to the member for Woodridge. I again caution you to be relevant to the motion before the House.

Mr MICKELBERG: Perhaps they want some more time to ventilate the concerns that were ventilated by an unnamed former cabinet minister in the *Australian* on the weekend. That person told the *Australian* that the five gigawatt Pioneer hydro—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order: procedural motion and relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for McConnel. Minister for Transport and Main Roads, you have the call. Bring your comments to the motion before the House.

Mr MICKELBERG: Perhaps it is because they need additional time to articulate who it was and the content of the leaks that a former cabinet minister, in the *Australian*—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister has flagrantly not adhered to directions from the chair now on five separate occasions.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr BAILEY: He needs to speak to the motion and he is being absolutely outrageous in his behaviour.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is your point of order on relevance?

Mr BAILEY: It is, again—for the fifth time.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Miller. Minister for Transport and Main Roads, I have cautioned you a number of times. I urge you to remain relevant in your forthcoming comments to the motion before the House.

Mr MICKELBERG: As the House is aware, this motion deals with a procedural motion addressing the Energy Roadmap and the quotes that were leaked to the *Australian* directly relate to the Energy Roadmap and the Labor Party's alternative, in particular. In fact, the alternative might better be described as a thought bubble. One of the quotes was—

Pioneer-Burdekin was too big and undercooked, but she was all about the announcement, and she wanted a big announcement. Perhaps they want to articulate what that announcement was. Who was it?

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on two points of order: relevance and anticipating debate on the very bill that is the subject of this procedural motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Woodridge. Minister for Transport and Main Roads, I do think that your most recent—

Mr McCallum interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Bundamba and member for Nanango, stop quarrelling across the chamber. Minister for Transport and Main Roads, I think you may have been straying into anticipating debate on the bill with those comments. Do you have concluding comments in relation to the motion?

Mr MICKELBERG: They do not want the debate now and I note that. Given that this is a procedural motion, they were happy to run down the clock for their full 10 minutes. We know that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition likes the sound of his own voice. This is a procedural motion and, as such, I move—

That the question be now put.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will deal with that point of order. Minister, the member for Woodridge has taken personal offence at your comments. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw.

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

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, 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, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 32:

ALP, 32—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, Pease, Power, Pugh, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to a ruling that you made on 14 March 2025. In that ruling, where you were determining a query in relation to the entitlement of members of this House who had indicated that they wished to speak to a bill, you ruled—

The people on this list indicated they wish to speak to it. There are 93 elected representatives in this parliament. This is where they come to have their say. This bill, if passed, is law. I do not think it should be treated lightly. It is my view that the debate should continue.

Mr Speaker, I submit to you that the sessional orders outline that, from 5 pm today, time will be allowed for disallowance motions, private members' bills or government business and that the motion moved by the Leader of the House, which seeks to constrain debate on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3), which is to be concluded by 7.30 this evening, is in direct contravention of your ruling of 14 March 2025. I submit to you, for the reasons expressed in detail in your ruling, that the motion as put by the Leader of the House should be ruled out of order.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the point of order by the Manager of Opposition Business. The motion has already been put to the House and voted on. Under the sessional and standing orders of the House, the House is in charge of its own destiny. That matter has now been decided and I submit to you that the motion as put now stands, given that a vote has now been taken and recorded. As such it stands.

Mr SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Thank you very much, Manager of Opposition Business. There are a couple of things. We do have a motion before the House. In terms of your quoting me on that ruling, that was on a bill. This is a motion that has been put before the House. It is a procedural motion. The comments I made were with regard to the reading of a bill. There had only been one speaker on that bill, if you remember well. That was a bill and this is a motion, so there is no point of order. I will now go to the next order of business.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am seeking clarity. My understanding from the ruling was that it was in relation to questions before the House, but I am seeking clarity. Is it only in relation to bills that members are entitled to an expectation to have their say?

Mr SPEAKER: I have made my ruling. Please do not try to put words in my mouth. We have a procedural motion before the House. We will move to the vote on the motion.

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

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, 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, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 33:

ALP, 32—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, Pease, Power, Pugh, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Use of Unparliamentary Language



Mr SPEAKER: This morning in question time the member for Aspley took a point of order regarding alleged unparliamentary language used by the Minister for Transport. I have reviewed the transcript and I agree the use of the term in the context of being attributed to another member is unparliamentary. Accordingly, I ask the Minister for Transport to withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw.

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3903, on motion of Mr Nicholls—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (4.09 pm), continuing: Incredibly, despite the fact that the bill is moving to allow the government to remove people from a whole variety of health boards for any reason or no reason, the explanatory notes explain it as improving governance. It is quite amazing to see them

claiming that night is day and that black is white. On the basis that these positions are important, apparently, and budgets are large, ministers will be able to act if they lose confidence. That is the reason given. Anybody who has had a position taken from them deserves to be given a reason they have been removed. That is the current situation. This opposition supports that transparency and openness.

We are suspicious about the record of this minister in terms of the potential misuse of this new power that he is giving himself and the government in relation to people who are performing very important roles in public life in terms of all of the different health boards. No-one disputes that these are important positions or that there will be rare cases when office holders have to be removed, but the way you do that—the process, the transparency, the fairness—is not a technical side issue; it is at the heart of public trust in our health system, yet this government is reducing openness and reducing transparency—things that were promised at the last election by the Premier. Openness and transparency were part of the LNP platform. What we see here, by being able to remove people without any reason given at all, is less transparency and less openness from Premier Crisafulli and health minister Nicholls, whose record as Minister for Health over the last 12 months has been a very poor one.

Stakeholders at least backed openness very clearly. The Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union warned that these amendments risk compromising procedural fairness and undermining confidence in the governance of public health entities. The Queensland Law Society was even more direct. The Queensland Law Society said the bill creates opaque processes that are inherently unfair, lack transparency and could dissuade good candidates from taking up board roles in the first place. That is the Queensland Law Society—a group that the current minister has lauded in the past—criticising this aspect of the bill that takes away openness and transparency in terms of the removal of people from a whole range of health boards right across this state.

The committee acknowledged that there is inconsistency across legislation and pointed to the Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which is currently before the House, which, embarrassingly, is removing a no-cause removal provision from that act. The government do not know what different arms of the government are actually doing across different portfolios, and I put that down to a failure in the Premier's office. After a year in power they still do not know how to run the show and be consistent across different portfolios. It has been more than a year and these are the kinds of amateur-hour anomalies and inconsistencies that we are seeing manifested in this bill.

The committee expressly said that the government should take a consistent approach across all legislation that aligns with its stated position on accountability and transparency. We in the Labor opposition have made our views very clear in the statement of reservation. I acknowledge and thank the Labor members of that committee—the members for Greenslopes and South Brisbane—for their very strong contributions, and they are two people who themselves have a lot of direct professional experience in the health sector.

In the statement of reservation we have said that this is not the direction we should be heading in for the governance of the health system. The explanatory notes claim these powers improve governance, but in our view they actually undermine openness and transparency. These measures, which effectively allow the Crisafulli government to sack hospital board members without cause, are yet another broken promise from a government that has not even attempted to keep many of its promises. These powers will sit on the books for them to use or misuse at any time in the future.

This is a government that have already trashed this House in terms of process. We saw the pill testing move to truncate and prevent debate in this House. This is a government that blocked any future discussion on the issue of abortion. This government have a history of shutting down transparency and openness. We saw another example of it procedurally just now when they mashed together four different bills. They would rather go to Christmas drinks than work hard in this House and allow debate. The opposition is ready to debate long, hard and often, but the government would rather go to Christmas drinks than have democracy happening in this House. They would rather trash democracy than do their job as legislators.

We do not have to imagine too much how this power could be misused because the government has form. We can see the pattern. It was Minister Nicholls who presided over the Chief Health Officer debacle—an eight-month national and international recruitment process with an expert panel doing the work that the parliament expects of it only for the Premier and Minister Nicholls to junk the panel's merit-based recommendation to appoint Dr Hajkowicz to the position of Chief Health Officer. They have form.

Independent advice was treated as inconvenient and they brushed it aside. That is how Minister Nicholls handles his portfolio, and we can see the pattern of behaviour. This is the same government that have already stacked government boards with their LNP mates—Julian Simmonds at EDQ; Peter Matic, former LNP councillor; Viv Grayson; Jeff Seeney; Jane McNamara; Michael Hart, former member for Burleigh—

Mr LEE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I ask that you bring the member for Miller back to the long title of the bill.

Mr BAILEY: To the point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): One moment, please. The member is talking through those general principles. I am still listening to what he is saying. I am paying attention.

Mr BAILEY: A key part of this bill will allow the government to sack people from health boards without giving any reason. I am talking about boards, for the member for Hervey Bay's benefit. It is an important part of this bill. We see a whole lot of LNP mates have been appointed to boards, like Viv Grayson; Jeff Seeney, former deputy LNP premier; Jane McNamara; Michael Hart; Lachlan Millar; Chloe Kopilovic; and James Power. There is a long list of them, and we know that they can now remove people from health boards without any reason.

Mr BOOTHMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Listing off names is not relevant to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is not taken.

Mr BAILEY: This is the same government which still will not come clean with Queenslanders about the full findings of the transplant review at the Prince Charles Hospital. Families and clinicians have asked for transparency. Instead, they get heavily curated summaries and redactions. They have form. When things go wrong under the watch of Minister Nicholls, which has happened often over the last 12 months, his instinct is secrecy and spin, not fronting up with the truth. We see the Vine review has not been released for public scrutiny so parents of trans kids or health professionals can see it. It is being kept under the cloak of secrecy. Like the Bjelke-Petersen days, like the Newman days, that is what we are seeing under Premier Crisafulli—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to relevance and remaining within the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have the greens for this bill here. I am going through that and trying to make sure the member is keeping to the long title of the bill and the principles of the bill and is covering those issues that are covered in the report. I ask the member to stick to that. I still have to get a copy of the report.

Mr BAILEY: I am happy to move on. We should be encouraging the boards in our health system to be strong, expert and independently minded. We need people who are prepared to ask the hard questions about record ramping under this Crisafulli government, waiting lists, quality and safety. Instead, this Crisafulli government wants boards that know they can be terminated for any reason or no reason if they cause too much political discomfort. That is a fact in this bill. Minister Nicholls does not want health experts who speak truth to power; he wants boards that nod along with the spin doctors in his office. This so-called health minister wants 'yes boards', not health boards. Labor has significant reservations about this attack on openness and transparency in the health board section of this legislation by Premier Crisafulli and Minister Nicholls because they will be allowed to sack them without cause.

We recognise that some of the clauses also tidy up and strengthen disqualification provisions—for example, where a board member becomes insolvent, is disqualified from managing corporations or is convicted of serious offences. Those disqualification criteria are appropriate. The leap from clear, objective disqualification grounds to open-ended no-cause removal is not justified. It is a step back to the dark old days when a lack of integrity was a feature of this parliament under premiers Newman and Bjelke-Petersen. It is a step towards more politicisation of the health system. In the hands of this health minister, who has form, it is a step that Queenslanders should rightly be worried about.


Despite the opposition's strong objections, we will not oppose the bill in its current form as tabled on this ground alone, because we are not prepared to hold up the assisted reproductive technology reforms. People who need those reforms need them quickly. The organ donation framework, the cosmetic surgery standards and the occupational disease reporting changes that Queenslanders need

are also part of this bill, and we are mindful of those. However, we put the government on notice that we will scrutinise very closely how they exercise those powers and we will pursue answers if we see them being misused.

Labor is supporting the bill in its current form and we will consider any amendments that are directly related to the subject matter of the bill as tabled so far on their merits. However, we do not support and will not support efforts, if the government chooses, to bolt on highly contentious and unrelated measures to this bill as they did with pill testing previously, particularly anything arising from the Vine report or gender-affirming care when we do not even know what is in the Vine report. The government refuse to release it. There is a risk that they are going to do the same thing they did with pill testing, and if they did it would be another trashing of this House—a trashing of the democratic process, a prevention of debate and a prevention of democratic scrutiny of an important health document. This technical omnibus bill is too important for that to occur.

If the government wants to bring forward major changes in that space it should introduce a dedicated bill, publish draft legislation, consult properly with clinicians, patients and trans families and subject it to full committee scrutiny—not use this bill as a legislative Trojan Horse to ram them through, like the Newman or Bjelke-Petersen government did regularly. Our support is for the bill as introduced at this time. Given this government's track record—we know their track record has been appalling on health—we do not want to see such a major change smuggled through late at night in this House.

I have outlined our position on the bill. We know that there is form in terms of the government. I want to thank all of the committee members. We want to see the important parts of this bill put through. However, we have deep reservations about the provisions around boards.

 **Ms DOOLEY** (Redcliffe—LNP) (4.22 pm): I rise to speak in strong support of the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025. This bill represents a practical, thoughtful and community centred set of amendments across Queensland's health portfolio—changes that will make a real difference in the lives of Queenslanders including the people I proudly represent in Redcliffe.

The Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring our health legislation is fit for purpose, aligned with contemporary standards and responsive to the needs of Queensland families. This bill delivers exactly that. It modernises and clarifies our laws around assisted reproductive technology, strengthens pathways to enable life-saving organ donations, improves patient safety in cosmetic surgery and reinforces the integrity of health leadership and governance across the state.

Many families in Redcliffe have relied on assisted reproductive technology, ART, to build their families. For couples experiencing infertility, single parents by choice and those needing donor gametes, ART provides a pathway to parenthood that may otherwise be out of reach. As we have seen, this is an area where errors have had lifelong consequences. Our community expects safety, clarity and compassion, yet the rushed drafting and limited consultation under the previous government led to rigid, confusing provisions in the ART Act 2024.

Since the act commenced, patients, families and donor-conceived advocates have been calling for sensible changes—and this bill delivers them. First, it introduces greater flexibility for collecting donor contact information. A missing email address or outdated postal details should not deny someone the chance to use their chosen donor. This amendment ensures administrative technicalities do not become barriers to family building.

Second, the bill provides discretion for the director-general to approve the use of gametes or embryos on a case-by-case basis. This allows compassion and common sense to prevail where strict rules could cause hardship—for example, when a donor's family limit is reached or when certain contact information cannot reasonably be obtained. This is particularly important for families in Redcliffe who may already be navigating the emotional and financial strain of fertility treatment.

Third, the bill strengthens inspector powers so the regulator can properly investigate and enforce compliance. Our community expects clinics to operate safely and transparently, and these improvements ensure oversight is not only strong but also effective. Finally, the amendments futureproof Queensland's framework by removing outdated references to the former accreditation body and aligning with the new national approach commencing in 2027. For Redcliffe families dreaming of a child, these amendments mean a clearer, fairer, safer path to treatment with less red tape and more support.

This bill also makes important changes to organ donation procedures—changes that will save lives. Organ donation after circulatory death requires quick action. When life support is withdrawn and the heart stops, organs deteriorate rapidly. Under the current law, the process for consent to certain

pre-death interventions—simple scans or procedures needed to assess organ viability—has been unclear. This lack of clarity can mean lost opportunities for donation even when families are willing and supportive. In 2024 alone, 96 Queensland families consented to donation, giving 273 people the gift of life, yet more than 1,800 Australians remain on transplant waitlists. In Redcliffe I regularly hear from families affected by kidney disease and other chronic conditions who know just how transformative a transplant can be.

The amendments in this bill provide a clear, lawful and compassionate pathway for consent. Consent from the next of kin can only be sought after a lawful decision has been made to withdraw life-sustaining measures; a dedicated hospital officer, independent from the treating team, must authorise procedures; and decisions are to be made ethically, transparently and with the utmost respect for grieving families.


Cosmetic surgery is also reviewed in this bill. It is an expanding industry, yet sadly we have seen many patient safety issues emerge nationwide. This bill closes the legislative gap by clearly allowing the government to prescribe targeted accreditation standards for specific health services. This is especially important for cosmetic surgery when the National Safety and Quality Cosmetic Surgery Standards are soon to apply. For our Redcliffe community, this means that facilities offering cosmetic procedures must meet the highest national standards, proper infection control, qualified practitioners, strong patient consent processes and robust reporting systems.

This bill also modernises governance arrangements across several key health acts. Hospital and health boards, hospital foundations, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Council and Health and Wellbeing Queensland all play vital roles in delivering and supporting frontline services.

Finally, the bill includes minor but necessary amendments to align Queensland law with the Commonwealth's new National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry. This ensures that cases of occupational lung disease such as silicosis are reported accurately and consistently. For a community like mine in Redcliffe, where many work in trades, construction and manufacturing, strong protections for respiratory health are absolutely essential. This amendment supports early detection, better data and improved national coordination.

The impacts for my electorate include: families accessing fertility treatment will have clearer, more compassionate systems with less unnecessary red tape; residents awaiting lifesaving organ transplants will benefit from improved donation pathways; patients undergoing cosmetic procedures will be better protected by national safety standards; local health services and governance boards will operate under a stronger, more consistent accountability framework; and workers at risk of occupational lung disease will be covered by improved reporting and national oversight. In short, this bill strengthens safety, enhances clarity and supports Queenslanders through some of the most significant moments of their lives: starting a family, receiving a transplant, undergoing surgery or trusting the governance of their local health service.

In conclusion, the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025 is practical, well-considered and firmly in the best interests of Queensland. For the people of Redcliffe this bill means safer health care, clearer processes, stronger governance and better outcomes. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (4.31 pm): I rise to speak on the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3). I begin by stating that the Labor opposition supports the majority of the amendments introduced in this bill to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act, the Private Health Facilities Act, the Transplantation and Anatomy Act and the consequential amendment to the Public Health Act. We support these changes because Labor will always back safe, equitable access to health care for all Queenslanders. On this side of the House we believe that health care must be evidence-based; it must be backed by clinicians, not politicians; and it must empower people to make informed decisions about their health care, their bodies and their families.

The amendments before us today touch on several important areas of healthcare regulation. They address teething problems in the newly introduced regulatory framework for assisted reproductive technology; they strengthen safety and compliance for cosmetic surgery; and, importantly, they create more opportunity for organ donation in Queensland—opportunities that can save lives. They are sensible reforms and we support them, but we do have serious concerns about the amendments that allow the removal of members of health boards for any reason or for no reason at all. I will come to these shortly.

Firstly, I want to talk about assisted reproductive technology, ART. Across Australia there have been several high-profile investigations and deeply distressing incidents involving ART providers. We all remember the recent case reported in the *Courier-Mail* where the wrong embryo was transferred to

a patient, resulting in the birth of a stranger's baby. These are unthinkable mistakes. They cause immense trauma to families, and they are simply unacceptable with the systems and safeguards available through modern medicine.

That is why the former Labor government was proud to introduce a state-based licensing and regulatory framework for ART providers here in Queensland to ensure families can access ART safely and with confidence and that providers are held to consistent and appropriate standards. We recognise that modern families come in all shapes and sizes and we believe that all Queenslanders deserve fair and equitable access to assisted reproductive technology. I am proud of so many things in my life, but definitely my children are what I am most proud of and I want to see all Queenslanders able to do so in a safe way.

Since the commencement of the ART Act some issues have emerged in its operation. The strict application of limits on donor families and the inflexibility around donor contact information have created circumstances where families have been prevented from accessing ART simply to create a genetically related sibling. This is not fair and it is certainly not what the act intended. The bill expands the director-general's ability to grant case-by-case approvals, restoring fairness and equity. It also adjusts overly prescriptive contact information requirements, ensuring that the law continues to uphold safety without inadvertently excluding people from treatment. The bill also clarifies transitional arrangements for individuals and families who commenced treatment before the act began. This is particularly important for same-sex couples and families with diverse structures, ensuring they are not unfairly disadvantaged. We also welcome the strengthening of inspector powers, because if concerns arise the department must have tools to properly investigate and enforce compliance.

In addition, the bill makes a number of technical but important amendments to definitions, consent requirements, storage timeframes for eggs and embryos, and the transfer of genetic material between providers. All of these refinements ensure the act operates as intended and in alignment with national accreditation standards. For these reasons we support the ART amendments.

Cosmetic surgery continues to grow in popularity, and with that comes a significant responsibility to ensure safety, competence and transparency. The amendments to the Private Health Facilities Act bring Queensland into line with national cosmetic surgery standards across the nation. These reforms ensure that procedures are provided in a safe, regulated environment, that clinicians meet appropriate professional standards and that information can be shared with other government entities where required in the public interest. People are entitled to make choices about their own health care. It is our role to ensure the system around them is safe, evidence-based and expert-led, so we support those amendments.

To donate an organ is to donate life. In 2024 more than 1,300 people across Australia were given a second chance at life through organ donation, yet here in Queensland more than 1,800 people remain on transplant waiting lists. I know someone very well who went through this and it is heartbreaking. Last year, of those 1,800 people only 96 people met the criteria to donate. That gap is heartbreaking and it is urgent. The amendments in this bill provide legal clarity for interventions following circulatory death where next of kin have already consented. This ensures clinicians can undertake blood tests and other procedures necessary to assess viability and make a match, so they will maximise opportunities for organ donation and ultimately save more Queensland lives. The Labor opposition supports them.

The opposition hold serious concerns about one section of this bill, and that is amendments giving the government power to remove board members from hospital and health boards, Health and Wellbeing Queensland, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Council and hospital foundation boards for any or no reason. We are deeply concerned that this is simply a mechanism for the Crisafulli LNP government to sack hardworking, qualified board members so they can continue their jobs for mates hiring spree. In just one year the LNP has clocked up more than 60 jobs for mates, handing out cushy positions to friends, donors, associates and even former LNP MPs, and now they want unchecked power to extend that practice into Queensland's health governance structures. Stakeholders have already raised serious alarms about this. The Queensland Law Society stated in its submission—

These amendments do not properly provide the affected individuals with natural justice or procedural fairness. They are also inherently unfair as they apply to existing office holders ...


They went on to say—

... public trust must also be predicated on appointment and termination processes that are transparent and fair. The Bill creates opaque processes ...

This is not integrity, this is not accountability and this is certainly not what Queenslanders were promised. The government claims these changes simply bring health legislation into alignment with other acts, but that argument falls apart immediately. Right now another bill before this House, the Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, removes no-cause removal and sets clear, transparent criteria for dismissal. On one hand the LNP is saying that no-cause removal is appropriate in health; on the other they are removing it entirely in sport.

Even the government's own backbenchers through the committee process—and I want to give a shout-out to the committee that did so much work on this—flagged this inconsistency. The committee noted the government's approach was contradictory and called for consistency aligned with transparency and accountability. What we see instead is chaos, confusion and an LNP government still wearing its L-plates. This is a government making political appointments while cutting the pay of frontline cancer care workers by 25 per cent just before Christmas. Queenslanders deserve so much better.

In closing, health care must always be evidence-based, it must be expert-led and it must empower people to make informed decisions about their own health care. That is why the opposition supports the majority of the positive, sensible reforms in this bill, particularly those improving safety in ART, cosmetic surgery and organ donation. We support the bill in its current form and we hope that if the government circulates amendments in consideration in detail it does so with sufficient time for proper scrutiny. That is how democracy works; that is how a parliament should function. We hope any future amendments strengthen healthcare access and do not deny Queenslanders their right to make informed decisions about their bodies. As the Premier and Deputy Premier recently said, health care should be between patients and their doctors. We agree wholeheartedly. Health care should be safe and equitable, and it should be evidence-based and clinician-led. It should never be ideological. Queenslanders deserve nothing less.

 **Mr LEE** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (4.40 pm): I rise to speak to the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025. This is an omnibus bill to amend eight health portfolio acts. Hervey Bay welcomes the Crisafulli government's measured, calm and methodical approach to health legislative reform. These substantive changes come after a decade of decline in our healthcare system. This bill proposes to amend the Hospital and Health Boards Act, the Health and Wellbeing Queensland Act, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Act and the Hospital Foundations Act to provide for without-cause removal of certain office bearers for any reason or no reason. These amendments are necessary to ensure that the public, including my community in Hervey Bay, has confidence and trust that office holders appointed under the relevant legislation are held to the highest standards of performance, integrity and effectiveness.

This bill provides for the Governor in Council to remove office holders with or without grounds. Minor amendments will also allow for the appointment of acting members in the event of a vacancy and clarify the criteria for disqualification from becoming or remaining an office holder under the acts. These proposed amendments will have retrospective application to board members appointed before commencement of the legislation.

I note the breathtaking hypocrisy from the opposition as they sanctimoniously lecture us about these proposed changes. Indeed, it was Labor that passed 11 of the 21 pieces of legislation with no-cause provisions in appendix E to the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee's report—an inconvenient truth for Labor. The member for Miller had no problem supporting the Public Sector Act 2022 that gets rid of community representatives. Section 242(6) of the act provides for the termination of community representatives on the Public Sector Governance Council without specifying any grounds for termination.

I turn to the amendments to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act 2024. We are proposing targeted and methodical amendments to remedy Labor's botched and ultimately rushed drafting of the 2024 ART legislation. This bill amends the ART Act to assist in the implementation of the regulatory framework governing Queensland ART services. Firstly, the bill provides for less prescriptive requirements for collecting of contact information of gamete donors—eggs or sperm donors—for use in the ART procedure. This provides greater flexibility whilst also ensuring that relevant contact information is obtained on all gamete donors. The donor conception information register will be a staged implementation commencing in 2026.

Furthermore, this bill expands the discretion for the director-general to approve the use of gametes or embryos on a case-by-case basis where a strict application of legislative requirements would cause undue hardship. This includes circumstances like exceeding the 15-year time limit on

using gamete material or where the use of the donated gamete or embryo would mean the 10-family limit was exceeded. This bill also proposes to rectify issues with the previous industry-led self-regulation of providers under the Reproductive Technology Accreditation Committee. The bill will require from 2027 an independent accreditation of providers under the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care. The proposed amendment also provides for counselling services to be provided to a spouse of a person undergoing an ART procedure but not where the person is separated. This bill delegates wide legislative power to the executive to make transitional regulations pursuant to a Henry VIII clause. A Henry VIII clause is an act of parliament that enables the act to be amended by subordinate or delegated legislation.


I now turn to the amendments to the Private Health Facilities Act 1999. These amendments will ensure that private health facilities that provide cosmetic surgery are required to comply with the national standards of accreditation—being the National Safety and Quality Cosmetic Surgery Standards—and support the safe delivery of cosmetic surgery in private health facilities. To avoid any confusion, this bill does not relate to cosmetic injectables. The bill furthermore amends the Private Health Facilities Act to provide information to be shared with the Queensland government under prescribed information-sharing requirements.

I turn to the proposed amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979. In 2024, 527 organ donors throughout Australia saved or transformed the lives of 1,328 people. There are currently 1,800 people on the transplant waiting list, including a veteran friend of mine. Indeed, many in my community of Hervey Bay are the beneficiaries of organ transplants. There are two legal definitions of death for the purposes of the act: brain death and circulatory death. This bill will clarify opportunities for organ donation in relation to cases of circulatory death. It provides a framework for consent for certain ante-mortem procedures to be conducted to determine the suitability for donation because organ quality can deteriorate rapidly following circulatory death.

The act currently provides for a next-of-kin consent to organ removal following death but is unclear as to consent in relation to ante-mortem interventions in identified cases of circulatory death. This amendment bill proposes that, once a lawful decision is made to withdraw or withhold life-sustaining measures, a person's next of kin can consent to such interventions. The hospital's designated officer must then separately authorise the interventions following next-of-kin consent. The designated officer is independent of the treating team and not included in any discussions regarding withdrawal of life-sustaining measures or organ donation.

Finally, the Public Health Act 2005 requires minor and consequential amendments following the Commonwealth's National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry Act 2023, which now provides for notifications of occupational respiratory diseases to the national registry, and the Australian Centre for Disease Control Bill 2025, which establishes a new, independent disease control entity.

In closing, this omnibus bill is a well-considered and methodical approach to health legislative reform. After a decade of decline in our healthcare system, we desperately need a contemporary and fit-for-purpose healthcare system. I commend the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025 to the House.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (4.48 pm): I rise in support of the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025 amending the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act, the Private Health Facilities Act, the Transplantation and Anatomy Act and the consequential amendment to the Public Health Act, which addresses teething problems with the introduction of regulation on assisted reproductive technology providers in Queensland and ensures safety and compliance for cosmetic surgery and increased opportunities for organ donation. We support all of those amendments, as many of the speakers on this side of the House have already articulated.

However, those same speakers have also voiced our serious concerns with the amendments that allow for the removal of health board members for no reason, and I will speak on that a little bit later. I have to say it is refreshing that we actually get to debate a bill or any initiative from this government which is based on evidence and the advice of experts. I could count on the fingers of one hand the number of decisions of this government that actually meet that category. On the health issue alone, we could look at pill testing, gender-affirming care, flu vaccinations—the list goes on—but I say well done to them on this one.

Families come in all sorts of shapes and sizes and increasingly so, and assisted reproductive technology has enabled that to occur. As that has happened and as demand for that technology has increased so, too, has the need for a tighter regulatory environment. As we know, the previous Labor government introduced that amendment, a state-based licensing and regulatory framework for assisted

reproductive technology providers in Queensland, after some horrific and incredibly distressing stories were raised by people who had been treated poorly by fertility clinics including where often there were simply no safeguards. We all know of families who have relied on ART in order to start a family. The impact that process has on them and their relationships, the emotional toll when hopes are dashed and relationships break down as a result of the stress, but then the joy of conceiving and carrying a child and then the birth—what a gift ART provides to those families, but what a responsibility on providers and on government to make sure the framework under which it operates is compassionate and has integrity, accountability and responsibility.

It was a very important bill at the time, making sure families have safe access and are appropriately supported to start and grow their families. It gave solace to many Queenslanders. We understand there have been teething issues and I believe the changes in this bill will ensure safe practice. I can imagine it is an issue which will need to be revisited on a regular basis as technology progresses. I want to particularly comment on the clarification and changes to the transitional provisions for individuals and families who commenced ART prior to the act's commencement. This is important, especially to same-sex couples and those with diverse family structures, to ensure the transitional provisions operate as intended and do not unfairly impact certain individuals or families. I acknowledge the concern of some constituents who have raised this with me and have been following the progress of this bill very closely. I am very pleased to see resolution of their concerns.

Of all of the other amendments in this bill, I wish to speak now on the amendment that gives this government permission to remove hardworking members of hospital and health boards, the board of Health and Wellbeing Queensland, the Pharmacy Business Ownership Council and hospital foundations boards. We have grave concerns about these amendments, not the least of which is because in the 12 months that they have been in government, the LNP has been absolutely shameless about its appointment of mates and donors. I think I heard someone on a board is actually the next-door neighbour of someone opposite. I do not know whether that is true, but I would not put it past them.


I do not know how many times someone incredibly competent who is recognised for their capability nationally and internationally has rung me to say, 'I've just been sacked by the LNP. I have never been sacked in my entire life.' I say to them, 'Don't worry. It is not about you. It is just because one of their mates has been in the queue and they wanted to give them a job.' We can look at some examples of the people they have put in place who have no qualifications. There was James Power, who set up a right-wing lobby group and who was just put on the QCAA board; Michael Hart, chair of WorkSafe—and I remember all of us in this parliament talking about how he took a trip across the Rockies during a parliamentary sitting week—Julian Simmonds for EDQ; Viv Grayson, who is a big donor to the LNP, is chair of TAFE, and the TAFE board is now full of property developers. Aside from the dodgy decisions they make, we can see how inconsistent they are. Even the committee commented on the fact that we have a bill before the House now which actually seeks to do just the opposite. They are a bit of a shambles. I do not think there is anyone in charge of making sure their decisions are consistent.

The only other thing I want to say is that this government has form when it comes to introducing amendments at very late notice on incredibly important matters in order to allow no debate. I am talking about pill testing. I want to say very clearly that we will support this bill despite our concerns about the boards because it is an important bill and it needs to go through. However, if this government seeks, as many people are fearful they will do, to introduce a late amendment on gender-affirming care or anything to do with the Vine report, there will be outrage. They will forever seal themselves as being the most disreputable, most dishonest and most disgraceful government that ignores experts and ignores evidence in order to fulfil their own ideological values. If that happens, we are giving notice that we will absolutely not support it.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to relevance and remaining within the long title of the bill. Some of the content, I would submit to you, is not relevant to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Member, you are signalling intent there. You signalled that quite effectively there. I urge you to keep to the general principles and within the long title of the bill.

Ms FARMER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have finished my contribution.

 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (4.55 pm): Good health policy is built on evidence, ethics and empathy, and all three of these principles are reflected in the legislation before the House today. For my community of Keppel it is a refreshing change to the experience during the decade of decline. The Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) amends eight acts across the health portfolio. It strengthens

safety, improves clarity, upholds trust and ensures compassion sits at the heart of our health system. The amendments to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act strike the right balance between regulation and practical application. They uphold the rights of donor-conceived people while recognising the deeply personal and often complex journeys of families navigating fertility treatment.

The amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act 1979 are both sensitive and vital, remembering that few decisions are as profound for a family as those made at the end of life. As I learned from reading through the transcripts of the hearings of the inquiry, in cases of circulatory death, critical medical interventions must occur before death to preserve organ quality. To this day, the law has been unclear about who could consent to these interventions. This bill resolves the uncertainty, protects families, ensures transparency and strengthens the ethical confidence through its use of a dual consent safeguard. This is crucial to our donation system. It also improves the chances that more Queenslanders waiting for a transplant will receive the gift of life.

This bill strengthens the Private Health Facilities Act 1999 to clearly allow Queensland to mandate compliance with the new National Safety and Quality Cosmetic Surgery Standards. This strengthens oversight, reduces regulatory blind spots and aligns our laws with existing arrangements for Commonwealth and interstate cooperation. Further, this bill provides sensible reforms that reinforce integrity, provide flexibility and ensure public confidence in health governance.

The bill also makes minor but important amendments to the Public Health Act, reflecting the Commonwealth's establishment of the new Australian Centre for Disease Control. For my community of Keppel, this bill strengthens the protections at the beginning of life, it ensures dignity at the end of life and it supports families who are navigating fertility treatment. It honours our donors and our donor families who are going through one of the most complex times in their family's life. It improves the emerging field of cosmetic surgery, ensuring safety and provides reinforcement of governance integrity. It also strengthens disease monitoring for Queenslanders.

As I said at the beginning, these are practical, compassionate and responsible steps that make this responsible legislation. I want to take a moment to acknowledge and thank the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee for all of its work in this space. Reading through the hearing transcripts and reading the report was of great benefit to me as to how this would apply to my community of Keppel. I commend the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hutton, adjourned.

CROCODILE CONTROL AND CONSERVATION BILL

Resumed from 19 February (see p. 136).

Second Reading



Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (5.00 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am very proud of the KAP's continued work to bring this issue back before the Queensland parliament. I would love nothing more than to see this bill finally passed into law so we can claim back our waterways. Over eight years, my colleagues and I have travelled right across North Queensland—to Cairns, the Tablelands, the Daintree, Mareeba, Innisfail, the Cassowary Coast, Hinchinbrook and communities across the gulf. We have spoken directly with residents, Indigenous leaders, environmental representatives, local councils, surf-lifesavers, tourism operators and families who have been directly affected by the growing crocodile problem in the region. This bill, like the Safer Waterways Bill that I tabled years ago, was written and packaged from those conversations. It is built on the voices of the people who live with crocodiles every single day. It is disappointing that after all of these years the major parties have still failed to produce any meaningful reform to address this issue.

Too often the people making these decisions are those who have never lived in North Queensland, who have never swum in Stuart Creek or Saltwater Creek, who have never skied in the Johnstone River or somersaulted off the pontoons at Lake Placid, who have never camped on the sand of the Tully River or spearfished in Banyan Creek. I appreciate the support for this bill from the Cairns Regional Council, the Mareeba Shire Council, the Whitsunday Regional Council, the Local Government Association and the Carpentaria Land Council. Since the bill has been in the public arena I have also been contacted by a number of Indigenous councils in the cape and the gulf supporting the bill.

Sadly, there has been an explosion in croc numbers since my Safer Waterways Bill was rejected in the parliament more than five years ago. I have here a picture of what it was like swimming in the eighties, when no-one thought about crocs. I table that picture.

Tabled paper: Photographs depicting people on rafts at the Innisfail Sugar Festival titled 'Home Made Raft Race' [1962].

This picture was taken at the Innisfail Sugar Festival raft race event. It shows people swimming in the Johnstone River, which is now infested with crocodiles. If you try to swim across the Johnstone River, you will not make it out alive. Back-to-back governments have allowed the enjoyment of our waterways to disappear. Belinda Santarossa is a concerned mum who made a submission to the committee. It states—

The crocodile population in Far North Queensland is OUT of control. We have a whole generation of crocs that don't fear humans and that is a dangerous predicament. Crocodiles are in higher, colder fresh water streams where they have never been before. They are adapting to these conditions because of the over population. My teenage son LOVES to fish and I would prefer he was out fishing the creeks and drains than at home playing computer games but I fear for his safety when we have 3-4 m crocs living in drains and sleeping in cane paddocks. Something has to be done ... it is only a matter of time before more lives are lost around the Silkwood/Kurrimine Beach area.

I table the submission.

Tabled paper: Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission No. 96 [1963].

Canefarmers have told us many a time that when they are harvesting pigs used to run out; now they have crocodiles running out. Why? It is because of the failure of back-to-back governments to take action and do something positive about the croc problem. There was a croc in the hotel pool of a popular beach resort in North Queensland. I table a photograph.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a crocodile in a hotel pool [1964].

I also table a picture of a croc in a stinger net right near Castaways Resort at Mission Beach.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a crocodile caught in a net on a beach [1965].

Carla Grieve, who owns the popular Tinnie Shack, made a submission to the committee which states—

I am the owner of the Tinnie Shack in Mission Beach which is a Marine retail and repair store. I've owned this company for over 25 years and there has been a massive amount of public concerns raised over the crocodile population increase and threat to human and animal life, I am also the wife of Dean Grieve who was attacked by a crocodile in Port Hinchinbrook in 2024 where a four meter male crocodile launched onto the back of our houseboat and tried to take my Husband off the boat and that crocodile had one week earlier taken our dog ... it is imperative that this bill be passed to protect human lives and allow proper authorities to manage the situation

I table the submission.

Tabled paper: Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission No. 78 [1966].

We see panic when there are suspected croc sightings at Stradbroke Island and more recently at Noosa. It was front-page news everywhere and, quoting from 9News, it 'has sparked major concern for the residents and tourists staying at the popular destination'. This is a daily occurrence in North Queensland with, as I pointed out, the crocodile that was in the net in Mission Beach and the crocodile at Castaways Resort near Mission Beach.


Crocodiles are coming this way. North Queensland is overcrowded with them, but there is somebody who is trying to do something, and that is the member for Hill. For far too long, decisions about crocodile management have been made in Brisbane by people who do not see crocodiles in their bore drains, who do not have to worry about their kids swimming in local creeks and who do not have to check their water pumps for 18-foot reptiles. Statements such as 'Queensland doesn't have a crocodile problem; we have a people problem' are why people living in North Queensland have lost trust in successive governments. They have watched government after government ignore their voices while the problem gets worse.

Brisbane has South Bank, Lang Park, trains and buses running at frequent schedules, theme parks, footbridges and massive shopping centres. We have our waterways, our natural swimming holes, our creeks and our rivers, but our lifestyle has been stolen because, as I said, back-to-back governments have lacked the intestinal fortitude to take action.

The Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025 is about protecting lives. It is about restoring balance. It is about giving our communities back what they have lost. At Rollingstone Creek there was a two- or three-metre croc swimming amongst children and the authorities had the ridiculous notion that because it was not showing aggression they would leave it there. The Tully River has beautifully clean,

crystal clear water and now it has been infested and taken over by crocs. People used to ski there and used to camp on the side of the river. The crocodiles have taken over our waterways. We are over it. People are sick and tired of trying to launch a boat when there are 14-foot crocs launching at them.

At Hinchinbrook, a 14-foot croc tried to take a person out of his houseboat. We have kids who are luring down on the side of the river, doing what kids do. People have the audacity to say that someone is an idiot because he was down on the side of the boat trying to lure. We did not have to worry about this 20 years ago. The government needs to take action because we are very angry about how this has been allowed to happen. People can smirk, but these are man-eating beasts. They are out there while people are trying to paddle their canoes. A few years ago in Cairns, women were stalked by a 14-foot croc. They were petrified. Kids cannot even go out and paddle their canoes on Mission Beach because of the crocs that are there—not to say nice things but to maul them and kill them. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (5.10 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill introduced by the member for Hill earlier this year. Firstly, I would like to thank the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee for its work. I thank the Queenslanders who made submissions and shared their views throughout this process. The Crisafulli government is delivering a fresh start for the management of crocodiles in Queensland. In doing so, I table the government response to the committee report and the revised Queensland Crocodile Management Plan.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government: Report titled 'Queensland Crocodile Management Plan', 2025 [[1967](#)].

Tabled paper: Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, government response [[1968](#)].

This is the first major update to crocodile management in almost a decade. It matters because Queenslanders deserve a plan that keeps them safe and protects the environment. In my prior contribution to the House I incorrectly said the former government had not reviewed the plan. They reviewed it—they just did not update it—so I apologise and retract that statement. Here is the truth: we have done what Labor could not. We have finalised a crocodile management plan that delivers for Queensland. A plan built in consultation with Queenslanders, industry and experts as well as local governments. A plan that sets out a clear, strong framework for the future. A plan that strikes the right balance between public safety and conservation because both matter and both must work together.

I previously updated the House that the government was completing a review of the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan. Today that work is done. I want to acknowledge all members on this side of the House, and especially the members for Cook, Mulgrave and our newest member, the member for Hinchinbrook, for their advocacy on behalf of their communities. To the people of Hinchinbrook: this is what having a seat at the table looks like. The new modernised Queensland Government Crocodile Plan 2025 provides clear protocols for managing crocodiles based on designated zones, ensuring responses are tailored to the level of risk in each area. To ensure the voices of Queenslanders are heard we have also introduced an annual feedback process. The new plan streamlines the zones and introduces a reportable removal zone. If a crocodile turns up in a water body outside its typical habitat we will target it for removal. Far too often we hear reports of a croc turning up somewhere where it should not. This plan ensures community safety in those areas.

Following consultation, further refinements were made to several crocodile management zones to reflect community feedback and enhance public safety. In the Cairns Regional Council area three new targeted crocodile removal zones have been added in the Mulgrave River including Greenpatch, Peets Bridge and the Little Mulgrave River. In the Cassowary Coast Regional Council area we will be rezoning the Warrina Lakes Community Parklands to become a targeted crocodile removal zone. In the Hinchinbrook Shire Council area we are rezoning the two front ponds of the Tyto Wetlands to become an active removal zone. In the Mareeba Shire Council area we are rezoning Southedge Dam, or Lake Mitchell, to become a reportable removal zone.

These changes matter. They make communities safer. They show what happens when government listens and delivers, yet the plan is also grounded on science and it puts public safety above all. It will continue the Crocwise safety campaign, it will work with traditional owners and it will ensure conservation of this iconic species for future generations. It is a sensible plan that strikes the right balance between safety and conservation.


The government will not be supporting this bill. That is in line with the committee's key recommendation and here is why. The bill is fundamentally flawed. It proposes changes to Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service operations that will not improve efficiency. The proposal by the member for

Hill to establish a Queensland crocodile authority and mandate that all staff reside in Cairns would compromise response times to acting on reports of crocodiles in the areas that I have just mentioned. Contrary to the contribution made by the member for Hill, decisions on crocodile management are not made here in Brisbane; they are made by Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service staff who are strategically distributed across key crocodile habitats including in Cairns, Innisfail, Townsville, Mackay and Rockhampton. Notice I did not once mention Brisbane. Centralising staff solely in Cairns would hinder the ability to respond effectively to crocodile sightings in other regions, putting Queenslanders at greater risk.

Furthermore, the widespread culling that is proposed in the bill could create a false sense of security encouraging unsafe behaviour in areas inhabited by crocodiles and it ignores the Nature Conservation Act's requirement to protect threatened species and ensure sustainable use. It also fails to meet Commonwealth obligations under the EPBC Act. The committee agreed these actions could push crocodiles to endangered levels and no-one wants that.

The committee also made seven further recommendations to enhance the existing framework. Six of those recommendations are fully supported by the government and one is supported in principle. Those supported include: expanding what was previously called zone F for automatic removal in Mareeba shire—that will now be reportable removal and is implemented; installing permanent safety signage at boat ramps and tourist areas; developing a marketing campaign for populated crocodile habitats; producing educational materials in traditional and common tourist languages; and enhancing engagement with Indigenous communities. All of those are supported. In principle, we support real-time reporting of crocodile sightings on QWildlife; however, verification remains essential to prevent inaccurate reports and unnecessary alarm. In an increasing environment of artificial intelligence it allows us to ensure what we are looking at is actually a reported crocodile. These recommendations reaffirm the strength of Queensland's current framework—grounded in science and prioritising safety and conservation.

What sets our government apart is simple: we do what we said we would do. We promised to deliver an effective crocodile management plan that puts Queenslanders first. We have done that while striking a balance to conserve the species. We have delivered the most significant update to the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan in seven years and we did it by listening to Queenslanders. It is a commonsense approach that puts safety first while conserving a vulnerable species. The bill is the wrong approach; our plan is the right one. That is what good government looks like and that is what we will continue to deliver.

 **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (5.18 pm): I rise to speak to the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill. The bill before us largely resembles the private members' bills the member for Hill and the KAP have introduced on four other occasions in this House: the Safer Waterways Bill 2017, the Safer Waterways Bill 2018 and the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2024. Now we have the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025. I will give the member this: he has started including the word 'conservation' in later versions of the bill but only in word, not in substance. This bill, like the ones before it, is focused on the culling of crocodiles. Little else has changed in the member's wording or in the justification for the bill. I appreciate the point the member makes each time he introduces one of these bills—that it is about public safety. Of course I understand that. As a child of the Northern Territory, I appreciate what it is like to live with very large crocs.

I have no doubt that it is that core principle of public safety that motivates the member to keep bringing the bill back. Public safety has to guide the government of the day's management of crocodiles and, indeed, any wildlife that poses a risk to human life—it is certainly what drives the opposition's response—but culling is not an effective way to provide for that safety. The evidence does not support it and it does not stack up. While the member does not actually mention the words 'cull' or 'culling' once in the explanatory notes, that is what this is about. Sections 10 and 23 of the bill make that clear. The stated objectives of the bill are to place greater value on human life by responsibly reducing the risk of crocodile attacks as much as possible. The wording is—

... to eliminate from our waterways any crocodiles that pose a threat to human life, while continuing to protect crocodiles from becoming extinct as a species.

You cannot eliminate—which means to completely remove, not reduce—the threat to human life from saltwater crocodiles unless you eliminate all crocodiles—every single one. They are an ambush predator. That is a reality. Unless you cull to the point of extinction you cannot eliminate the risk, which is where we got to when they were hunted to the brink of extinction in Queensland until 1974, when they were protected as a threatened species under the Nature Conservation Act 1992. Even if we did

remove every crocodile from Queensland's waterways we would still need to deal with the risk of crocs migrating from neighbouring jurisdictions. They swim really well, which was a point well made by Simon Booth from the QPWS during the committee's inquiry. He is a person I have the utmost respect for as a true croc expert.

How you can reduce the risk to public safety is to have a robust management program that is scientifically led and proven, and that is what Queensland currently has. The Queensland Crocodile Management Plan, the overarching statewide plan that manages estuarine crocodiles, is world leading. The 2021 independent expert committee, led by the then chief scientist, found that the Queensland Crocodile Management Program was world class, fit for purpose and highly effective in reducing the risks to public safety while conserving crocodile populations in the wild. Our 2021 review of the plan was informed by evidence-based science, including the findings of key monitoring and research work undertaken by the then Queensland government and external experts. This is what has to guide our management of this species, not a bill that makes a lot of claims that are not contemporary or true—claims that were not supported during the committee process.

The prevailing public sentiment from public committee hearings was in opposition to the bill. The bill claims that it is needed because of increased reported sightings and increased crocodile attacks. I do not doubt that there are increased sightings. Our former Labor government invested heavily in increasing the community's awareness of the risks of living in or travelling within croc country, allocating an additional \$4.175 million in 2023 over three years and \$300,000 per year ongoing to promote crocwise behaviour and invest in detection and deterrence products to enhance public safety. I hope to see the government continue that increased funding in the interests of public safety. We also introduced the QWildlife app in 2020, improving the ease of reporting sightings, at the same time we were investing in public education and awareness campaigns for locals and tourists to North and Far North Queensland. We introduced new offences to discourage people discarding food sources that may attract crocodiles to public places such as boat ramps, and for people who deliberately remain within the vicinity of a crocodile or ignore move-on directions. All of these steps and many more were designed to raise the awareness and visibility of crocodiles in the environment to keep people safe, so an increase in sighting numbers, many of which are duplicated, is a fair and reasonable expectation.

The bill makes the claim that crocodile attacks have increased because the population has increased to an unsafe level and likens it to the Northern Territory. The estuarine crocodile population in Queensland is estimated to be between 20,000 and 30,000. That is approximately one-fifth of the Northern Territory population. The average rate of population growth for the species is about 2.2 per cent per year. The population growth has largely plateaued and their average size has decreased, likely due to ongoing removal of problem crocodiles and the fact that we have far less extensive ideal habitat for the species to breed.


The rate of fatalities from saltwater crocodiles currently sits at about 0.4 deaths per year. When you compare that to instances of other animal related deaths—from snakes, sharks or even dogs—it is significantly lower. That is certainly not to diminish how traumatic every death and every attack from a crocodile is for those affected, but no-one would propose a cull of dogs, which had a fatality rate in 2023 alone six times higher than that attributed to crocodiles. Instead, we rightly regulate dogs, as we do crocodiles under the Crocodile Management Plan.

That does not mean that the plan should not be constantly reviewed and changes made to respond to community concerns like those raised by the member for Hill. When in government we committed to a major review of the Crocodile Management Plan and we consulted widely. We released a draft plan in 2024 and included updates to crocodile management zones, a consolidation of the number of zones from six to four, changes to existing zone areas and the introduction of an annual feedback process for the plan, including the opportunity for members of the public to request changes to the crocodile management zones. We commenced trials to proactively change crocodile behaviour using conditioning techniques such as hazing to increase wariness and drive them away from high-use recreation areas and included changes to provide clearer information about the risks and management responses for each zone to help improve the community's understanding about crocodile management in their area, how problem crocodiles are identified and targeted for removal and what happens to those that have been removed.

None of the improvements that we have made over the past eight years since the QCMP was introduced are acknowledged in this bill, yet these changes came from consultation with the community. They reflect their requests for improvements to public safety and an evolution of the science, and that is how we should continue—not by a return to the days of culling to extinction which this bill proposes, if not in its actual words then certainly in the substance of the intent that underlies it. The government

has now had that draft plan for 12 months, and I note that the minister has only today tabled its new plan. I will be very interested to see what is included. I truly hope it is still led by science. I know that traditional owners and the environment sector are watching with equal interest.

The bill also calls for greater powers for Indigenous landowners to manage crocodiles on their land. This is something the member for Hill and I certainly do agree on. Their knowledge needs to be respected and listened to in the management of crocodiles on their traditional lands. They have coexisted for thousands of years and want greater opportunities to manage them on country. Recently elders and community leaders on the cape raised this with me again. They do not feel heard by this government in that regard. The government needs to do better. It certainly needs to start actually listening and responding to their aspirations for management of a totemic species on their lands. That should be realised and respected. There are calls for a crocodile reserve in the cape to realise conservation and potential tourism outcomes. It is something at the very least they should be supported to explore. They do not feel they have received that support. I will continue to support their calls to see that vision become a reality. For these reasons and many others that time does not allow me to expand on, the Labor opposition does not support the bill.

 **Mr JAMES** (Mulgrave—LNP) (5.28 pm): I rise today to speak on the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025 introduced by the member for Hill. This bill proposes significant changes to the way we manage crocodile populations in Queensland, including the establishment of a Queensland crocodile authority, the legalisation of untrained individuals killing crocodiles, trophy hunting and new restrictions on crocodile farming licences. Let me be clear: while the safety and wellbeing of our communities must always remain our top priority, this bill creates more problems than it solves. It introduces unnecessary red tape and fails to take a sensible, balanced approach—one that genuinely puts Queenslanders first.

The bill damages Queensland's reputation for sustainable wildlife management and could cost vital export markets, harming regional jobs and economic growth. Restricting crocodile farming licences to Australian owned entities may deter investment and threaten regional livelihoods. On top of this, the bill sidesteps established governance and accountability frameworks. This opens the door to financial mismanagement and unresolved conflicts with our state's conservation and animal welfare laws.

The Health, Environment and Innovation Committee reviewed the bill and tabled its report on 25 July 2025. The committee recommended that the bill not be passed, citing significant risks to public safety, conservation and the future of Queensland's crocodile farming and tourism industries. The committee found that our current framework provides the right balance between public safety, conservation and sustainable industry practices.

The government fully supports six recommendations from the committee. We have already begun implementing operational improvements through the recently revised Queensland Crocodile Management Plan, the QCMP. The Crisafulli government has delivered the most significant update to crocodile management in almost a decade. Developed with input from communities in Far North Queensland, the new QCMP puts human safety first and ensures local voices are heard. Key changes include: upgrading three high-use recreational waterholes on the Mulgrave River to targeted crocodile removal zones; elevating the Barron River near Mareeba and the Southedge Dam to reportable removal zones where any reported crocodile can be targeted for removal; expanding zone F in the Mareeba Shire for the automatic removal of crocodiles in atypical habitats; installing permanent educational signage at high-risk locations, developing targeted marketing campaigns and producing educational materials in traditional and common tourist languages; and enhancing engagement with Indigenous communities and enabling real-time crocodile sighting reporting through the QWildlife app.

Listening to local communities underpins our approach. The new QCMP includes a mandatory five-year review and crucially an annual four-week consultation period that will give local communities the chance to have their voices heard. Feedback and proposed changes to zonings will be considered on a rolling basis. This empowers local communities to provide feedback and propose changes, ensuring the plan remains responsive and effective without waiting years for a full review.

Queenslanders deserve a crocodile management system that is practical, evidence based and community focused. The bill before us falls short on every count. Let us continue to strengthen our approach, protect our people and our environment and support the industries that underpin our regional economies. For these reasons, I strongly urge the House to reject the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025 and, instead, support the ongoing improvements and engagement embedded in the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan.



Hon. ML FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (5.32 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025. This bill's intention is clear: it is about reducing the risk of crocodile attacks and deaths by crocodile attack in Queensland. I acknowledge the member for Hill for his commitment to this bill and past bills that he has brought into the House in respect of this matter. Unfortunately, this bill is not based on science or evidence. It ignores the work and progress of the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan and other scientific research that has been implemented for over eight years. To understand this point, I want to critique something that probably most people in this House would be familiar with, which is the contribution of the Irwins.

Following the passing of Steve Irwin, the then Australian government—in fact, it was the conservative Howard coalition government—purchased the Bertiehaugh cattle station as a living memorial to honour Steve Irwin's commitment to conservation. This unique 300,030 acre property was purchased via a \$6 million grant as part of the National Reserve System and to honour Steve Irwin's conservation efforts. I had the opportunity to travel there initially in 2009, following the opening of the Australia Zoo Wildlife Hospital, when I represented the then federal minister for environment, Peter Garrett. I want to talk about the reserve for the benefit of people in the chamber who may not have had the privilege of travelling there. For me, it has become a bit of a pilgrimage as I have travelled there about six times.

After arriving at Weipa Airport, you travel for about 1½ to two hours on a dusty bumpy road in a four-wheel drive. Eventually, you come to the beautiful, mighty Wenlock River, which you cross in the four-wheel drive. Generally, that night you get a briefing about what your endeavours will be the next day and about the crocodile research that the Irwins do up there each August. The following morning you are woken by a chorus of birds. You have some breakfast and then the group goes down the Wenlock River in a number of tinnies to check the crocodile traps, which range from bag traps to water traps. It is certainly an experience.

World-renowned research conducted by Australia Zoo involves: the tagging and tracking of crocodiles on the Wenlock River and Ducie River with acoustic technology and GPS satellite transmitters, with over 270 animals having been tagged; and vital research uncovering the distances crocodiles move and their ability to return to their home range after relocation. Australia Zoo has a partnership with UQ that dates back more than 20 years. Each August, Professor Craig Franklin, a professor of zoology in UQ's School of the Environment, and his scientific research team are involved in the annual crocodile research trip with the Irwin family and Australia Zoo.

From my involvement with Australia Zoo I understand that the bill represents some problematic provisions such as zero tolerance zones, which would provide a false sense of security amongst Queenslanders and tourists who may believe that the government has removed the risk of crocodile attacks occurring as the Queensland crocodile authority is supposed to be vigilantly and thoroughly removing or killing all crocodiles within 48 hours. Additionally, the bill proposes to establish crocodile sanctuaries or reserves for crocodiles removed from the zero tolerance zones.

During the briefing on my first night at the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve in 2009, Professor Franklin explained an experiment conducted in 2004. They captured a 4.5-metre male crocodile and relocated it to the east coast of the cape where they let it go. It swam back to its original location, which was a distance of over 400 kilometres, in under 20 days. Therefore, I am keen to see the plan that has been released by the minister today in terms of relocation exercises given the history of such experiments. I am certain he has had some dialogue with the Irwins about this because I know he has a strong association with Australia Zoo and Terri Irwin, as do I.

I commend the good work of prior Labor environment ministers in addressing many areas that today provide safe locations for people. As has been indicated, crocodiles are apex predators and their management is different to what we do in the Shark Control Program, which I was responsible for for 7½ years. You can manage sharks under such a program, but that is not the case with crocodiles. They are a different species. They are apex predators. They will focus on human beings as they would on a cow, a pig or certain wildlife. Anyone visiting crocodile country should always be alert to the risks posed by crocodiles, which are characteristics of that environment, and that is best done through education and current management practices.

I give credit to Dr Terri Irwin for her continued conservation efforts. Her care and commitment in terms of not only crocodiles but also the sustainability of wildlife is highly commended. I wish her all the best in the future.

It is a shame that this bill was not debated before the Hinchinbrook by-election. I understand the purpose behind that. Notwithstanding my involvement in the by-election, there may have been a different result. However, we are debating the bill today and I am looking forward to the contributions of those who are on the speaking list.

Mr Crandon: You might have ended up with only six per cent.

Mr FURNER: No, it would have been greater than that, my friend. It is such a concern that we are playing politics with a bill that, as I indicated, should have been debated in the last sitting week before the by-election. In saying that, as I did earlier, I do wish the member for Hinchinbrook all the very best. I am sure he will do his seat justice. With those few comments, as with the committee report, I cannot support this bill in the chamber today.



Mr CHIESA (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (5.39 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025. As the minister has said, we do not believe the proposed bill is an effective way to deliver strong, commonsense, people-first action on crocodiles in North Queensland. Instead, the Crisafulli government's new Queensland Crocodile Management Plan provides the clear direction our communities need.

Having a seat at the government table means being able to deliver tangible outcomes to make our communities safer. That is why, on my very first day in this place, I am proud to share an important win we have delivered for our Ingham community. Following extensive community feedback, we will be upgrading the high-traffic areas of the Tyto Wetlands to an active removal zone. This means the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service specialist staff will conduct regular patrols of the area, with all identified crocodiles to be targeted for removal. That is the kind of specialised local change that comes from having ministers listen directly to our community—something Labor never did. Instead, the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan released by the member for Murrumba back in 2017 classified the Tyto Wetlands as a general management zone. Given how close the Tyto Wetlands are to sporting clubs, the Hinchinbrook Library and high-traffic local areas, any local will tell you that Labor's approach simply did not stack up, and they knew it.

Labor did not publish a new Queensland Crocodile Management Plan in seven years, whilst communities like mine felt as if their views were falling on deaf ears. That is why the core element of our new Queensland Crocodile Management Plan is consultation. For starters, we will be mandating a review of the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan every five years to ensure it remains up to date and fit for purpose. More importantly, we will also be conducting an annual four-week consultation period to provide a forum for regional communities to be heard. All feedback and any proposed changes to zoning or Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service resourcing will be considered on a rolling basis, and changes to that plan can be made if required without having to wait the five years for a full review.

The bill proposed by the member for Hill does not help us listen to locals and take the action communities expect us to. The Health, Environment and Innovation Committee's report states—

The committee has not been able to ascertain how the QCA would be a marked improvement on the current QCMF. The Member for Hill has not demonstrated how the Bill's proposal would improve operations given it is premised on maintaining existing staffing levels while also limiting their geographic location throughout Croc Country.

Quite simply, the Queensland Crocodile Authority proposed by this bill is nothing more than a reallocation of existing DETSI crocodile workforce, with additional red tape dictating where appointees and the QCA director must live.

The report speaks at length about how some of the bill's more restrictive provisions would only hinder, not help, the ability of specialist crocodile staff to respond quickly and efficiently to any crocodile incidents. Right now, QPWS staff responsible for crocodile management are strategically embedded across communities in Cairns, Innisfail, Townsville, Mackay and Rockhampton. In fact, mandating that Queensland Crocodile Authority staff only reside in Cairns would take them further away from all of those other communities, with little increased benefit to the people of the Far North. That is not fair on Hinchinbrook and it is a core reason I cannot support this bill. However, what I am proud to support is the Crisafulli government's new commonsense Crocodile Management Plan, and it is a win for Ingham. We are already doing the work to deliver the fresh start we promised Hinchinbrook, and there is plenty more to come.



Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.43 pm): Without reflecting on a member's absence, I do want to wish the member for Traeger and his wife, Daisy, all the very best for the upcoming birth of their little one.

I do, of course, in speaking to this bill, want to acknowledge the very real dangers of crocodile attacks on humans, and in no way are any of those members here who are opposing this bill not acknowledging what is a very real circumstance throughout Central, North and Far North Queensland and attacks that the member for Hill identified, especially the specific examples he gave in his speech.

The intention of the bill is to reduce attacks and thus deaths of humans, but, as has been outlined, the clauses of the bill are not supported by the science, nor are they supported by the habits of crocodiles. The bill ignores the outcomes of the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan. It is very important to note, as the member for Nudgee did, that sightings do not equate to attacks and sightings do not equate to deaths. There can be multiple sightings of the same animal. It is absolutely paramount that education remains the key to safety. Education must always be the key to safety, especially around the waterways that the member for Hill was talking about.

The fatality rate from crocodiles remains extremely low, at 0.4 deaths per year. Again as the member for Nudgee outlined, we have seen higher rates of death caused by domestic animals in this state than from crocodile attacks on humans. Strong evidence-based frameworks are the best way to form a management plan. A simple plan to cull for the sake of culling because of sightings is not a sound framework for legislation in this state.

In preparation for this bill I visited Australia Zoo. They do wonderful work in terms of wildlife conservation. They also have expertise in crocodile behaviour, management and conservation. I thank Toby Millyard, who was there as the expert, and Ben Long, the government relations officer who was there to facilitate these meetings with us.

With regard to removal, it is very important to note that crocodiles are territorial animals. They will defend their territory against other crocodiles and against other animals. To say that simply removing a crocodile means a waterway is now completely safe is a dangerous statement to make. We know that there is a reason a crocodile has made an area its territory. There is a reason that crocodile stays there. There is a reason a crocodile that has been flown 400 kilometres across to the other side of the gulf will swim back. There is a reason it wants to be there. If it wants to be there, other crocodiles will want to be there as well. It is very important that we do not think that a removal means the waterway is completely safe. We need to ensure we understand how these animals exist in order to gain the intelligence to create safety education programs and have an understanding of the management of crocodiles. It is a key factor that needs to be considered.

In terms of overpopulation, the member for Hill said that there is an overcrowding of crocodiles up north. From my conversations with the experts at Australia Zoo I can say that they are of the very sound belief that the reason there may be more sightings is that the crocodile population is being restored since the 1974 legislation. There is less hunting and fewer killings of crocodiles and they are returning to a natural state of population.

It is important to remember that these are apex predators. These are animals that have found the golden ticket in terms of their evolution pathway. They are at the peak of evolution. I am sorry if there are some opposite who do not believe in evolution. They have adapted—we will say that—to reach a population of only 30,000. These animals which have achieved the peak of evolution have extended their growth rate to only about 30,000 in Queensland. Why is that? It is because they have adapted to their conditions. The conditions of the waterways in Brisbane and the habitats in Brisbane are not suited to those animals; they are not suited to crocodiles coming down south. The suggestion that crocs are on their way and that it is only a matter of time and therefore that is why we need to start culling crocodiles in North, Far North and Central Queensland does not hold weight against the scientific evidence. It is important that we make sure we are actually listening to the experts, not just responding to sightings.

This bill will increase the number of eggs harvested. There is a suggestion that somehow this will increase the income for Indigenous landholders, so we should ensure more eggs are harvested because it will be a better outcome for First Nations people. That is a really simple parallel line. A couple of years ago a person in Maryborough told me that we should start a hunting program for when the crocodiles come down into the Mary River and it could be run by First Nations people. This is a really straightforward and simplistic answer to try to help Indigenous populations into different sources of income and employment by suggesting that they can do the culling of crocodiles. I imagine it is a little bit offensive as well.

The fact is that for every 200 eggs only one will actually hatch and become a mature crocodile—only one. Crocodiles do not hatch as apex predators. They do not hatch as animals that every other animal in the habitat will not eat. Let's not suggest that every single egg that is laid by a crocodile will

become a big man-eating crocodile. That is simply not the case. It is one in 200 hatchlings. There are actually more failed LNP leaders on that side than one in 200. There are more of them over there! That is just a simple fact.

I say through the chair to the member for Hill: when putting forward proposed legislation about the culling of crocodiles and the reasons to do it, there needs to be a greater level of evidence and scientific research put into the legislation and the explanatory notes. There also needs to be more consideration around the actual management of crocodiles. If we take the suggestion that taking more eggs will bring down the numbers, the numbers will come down but it will be to the extent where they become endangered again. Once they become endangered, as the member for Mulgrave pointed out, it will be a serious blight on our state both in our reputation in conservation and in tourism.

We also have to note that the bill was delayed under the cover of a review, and the minister has had to withdraw his statement and apologise. We are debating this bill today. We did not do it in the previous sitting week because of the Hinchinbrook by-election. It is as simple as that. Whether it is in terms of guillotining four bills, declaring them urgent or not even wanting to face up—


Mr KEMPTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): There is some validity to that point of order, member for Bundaberg. If you could stick to the title of the bill, that would be great.

Mr SMITH: It is very important to ensure we embrace crocodiles moving forward, but we must do it in a responsible way such as around tourism businesses. I imagine jumping into a helicopter and seeing the crocodiles from above would be a great tourism business. Who would not want to fly around in a helicopter to look at the crocodiles in their natural state? It would be wonderful.

Let's be very clear: in a suggestion made by the new member, this is what you get when you have a seat at the table and are able to make decisions on the crocodile management plan. Does that imply that the minister has not taken into account the work of the department and accepted all of their statements? Has he made rogue statements? Is that what is happening here? When you have a seat at the table, you get to run roughshod over departmental staff—is that what has happened today? It would be interesting if we could get some clarification from the minister. Maybe he could put forward all of the correspondence between himself, his office, other ministers' offices, the new member and the department. It would be worth seeing.

In conclusion, whilst we will not be supporting this piece of legislation, we will continue to support the Katter party. They at least rock up, work hard, listen to their people and represent the core of their constituency. We have good dialogue and we will ensure we are working towards legislation that is good not only for their constituents but also for all of Queensland. Member for Hill, I suggest you catch a chopper and have a look at crocs.

 **Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (5.54 pm): Estuarine crocodiles—or, more precisely, *Crocodylus porosus*—are among the largest reptiles to inhabit the planet. They are, in fact, the last of the dinosaurs, as my friend informs me. It is incorrect to call them saltwater crocodiles as they are equally at home in freshwater lakes, rivers, streams and water storage facilities. Estimated to have been around for 240 million years, these highly developed apex predators are an integral component of the diverse ecosystems of much of my electorate of Cook.

Crocodiles can grow up to seven metres and are adaptive and skilled hunters, taking whatever crosses their path, and are increasingly relying upon land-based prey, which, unfortunately, can include humans. Crocodiles pose a significant threat to humans entering their space, and few people survive attacks. With about half of the state's crocodile population being found in Cape York in almost every waterway, finding a balance between preserving this iconic reptile and keeping people safe can be challenging. Let me say now that my position has always been that if by its size, location or behaviour a crocodile poses a threat to human life then it must be removed. This does not condone forays into remote crocodile habitats through reckless or thoughtless acts.

The crocodile management plan that was in place under the previous Labor government was, by and large, workable. However, after a decade of inaction by Labor and an inability to implement the plan, the lines between human safety and crocodile preservation have become very blurred and the interactions, sometimes fatal, are frequent. Of particular concern was the incursion of estuarine crocodiles into the waterways around the farming district of Mareeba over the past decade. Increased sightings and interactions were occurring in creeks, dams and channels as well as in the Mitchell and


Barron rivers and Southedge Dam, where crocodiles were previously unknown. Locals became increasingly alarmed as sightings became more frequent, yet the previous government's response was one of indifference.

I supported the findings of the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee in rejecting the Katter's Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025 that proposed to cull crocodiles and encouraged trophy hunting as management tools. Notwithstanding the existing Crocodile Management Plan and the committee's findings, I continued to advocate for a comprehensive survey of all of the Tablelands waterways, including the Barron and Mitchell rivers, and tributaries to locate and identify all estuarine crocodiles and remove them.

George Adil, affectionately called 'George Dundee'—a landholder impacted by crocodile incursions—started a public campaign several years ago and ultimately lodged a petition with the parliament earlier this year with over 4,000 signatures seeking reform of the Crocodile Management Plan. George and other advocates such as Evan McGrath and Lenore Wyatt should be congratulated for their efforts to raise awareness and get results in relation to this issue.

In just a few short months not only has Minister Powell and his team listened to me as the local member, heeded the advice of the local landholders and made changes to address the current crocodile management issues facing my constituents; he has also put in place safeguards for future management. The update to the management plan will include a reportable removal zone for so much of the Barron catchment as is in the Mareeba shire and for part of the Mitchell River catchment, including Southedge Dam, which was previously included in zone F. This means any crocodile reported and found in these zones will be removed. Further, the minister proposes a five-year review process should the demarcation between natural habitat and human activity necessitate further changes. This will involve a four-week consultation each year to give locals a chance to provide feedback.

I must make some comment about the bill put forward by the Katter party. Someone more inclined to cynicism than I might suggest that the Katters have attempted to garner support for their position by conjuring up images of enormous creatures wandering over the landscape preying on hapless humans. Whatever the motive, the flow of the Katter river has in recent times dwindled to a trickle. The problem with the Katter bill is it creates more bureaucracy, creates an unworkable hunting regime and risks public safety. The proposed update by the Crisafulli government, in my view, gets the balance right between the preservation of estuarine crocodiles and the protection of humans. Critically, the success of this process is the flexibility and review to ensure management practices remain in lockstep with the reality of crocodiles inhabiting locations frequented by humans. I join the rest of the parliament in rejecting this bill.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (5.59 pm), in reply: I thank all of the members who have spoken. When you have been out there pushing for an outcome, you want some indication that you will end up seeing a result. This has not been the case for the last 15 years. Back in 2012 there were 176 reported croc sightings. We are now way over 1,000. People are not reporting croc sightings because they know it is a complete waste of time. If I cast my mind back to 2012, I remember the Newman government promising to take action on crocs. Croc numbers have exploded since the Newman government came to power. They did absolutely nothing.

I do want to give this minister the benefit of the doubt. We have used our leverage to see the minister at present giving the impression that potentially he is going to take action, and that is what we want to achieve. We want to see the government take action because the aim of this legislation is to make our waterways safe.

The member for Bundaberg talked about true science. I am from North Queensland. He says that the bill lacks true science. True science is when you swim across the Tully River and when you swim across the North Johnstone River. That is true science. True science is when we used to see beautiful crystal clear water in the upper reaches of the Tully River, where people would ski and camp on the banks. It is desolate now. There is no-one there because they know that if they swim and snorkel like they used to they will get ripped to pieces.

These are the stories we are hearing day in and day out. It is why we have put this bill together. It is a big job. It is a lot of responsibility. I talk with constituents every week. When I go to the football, the young 16-year-olds are asking what we are doing about the crocs. We see that the mums are worried that the crocs are lurking on the side of the river and coming out of the river, snorting and aggressive, and trying to pull their kids in. These are regular events. We saw recently at the boat ramp at Mission Beach a croc came out of the water and had a go at a 14-year-old. These are the stories we are hearing daily.

I am very proud to say that I have put something together here that we can use as leverage for the government to take action. We want to see something tangible happen so that in two or three years time the croc numbers are reduced so that the waterways are much safer. This is what we are trying to achieve here.

The committee put forward its views in its report on the bill. It is not a great shock to see a committee recommend that a private member's bill not be passed. You can have a go and say that this bill was not put together and that it lacks science—but, no, this is a good bill. It is not something that has just been created within two days. It is something we have worked on for over eight years now.

The member for Glass House incorrectly assumes that all rangers will be based in Cairns. This is in relation to the Queensland Crocodile Authority. Let me clarify in simple terms. The Queensland Crocodile Authority would be based in Cairns because it is the epicentre of the crocodile population. Eighty per cent of the crocs are in North Queensland. Rangers will be stationed throughout regional Queensland, but all decisions with regard to the Queensland Crocodile Management Plan will be made in the region worst affected—that is, Far North Queensland. This will allow for greater engagement with the Indigenous communities and will allow for greater dialogue.

The member for Nudgee is right in stating that the bill includes culling—I have spoken publicly about this—because it is integral in maintaining the crocodile population. However, the member is incorrect in assuming it is about culling crocodiles out of existence. This has never been the case. The object of the bill is to provide a better balance between crocodile numbers and prioritising public safety.

The Northern Territory Crocodile Management Program, which is widely recognised as a world leader, released their 10-year crocodile management plan in 2004. Part of the review was an increase in the culling of crocodiles from 300 to 1,200. This has been very successful. This is what we want to achieve in North Queensland if we are going to claim back our waterways. The reason, as stated by the Northern Territory environment minister, 'was about public safety' and, further, 'We want to be able to go to our national parks and know that there's waterholes that we can swim in safely.' If the Northern Territory, with a world-leading crocodile management plan, is implementing a substantial increase to its culling program for public safety, then why does Queensland, with a poor management program, have an opposite view to enforcing a cull for public safety?

People have died. Others have barely escaped with their lives. Our recreational quality of life has been ruined. Families cannot enjoy the pristine beaches and crystal clear creeks and rivers that generations before them swam in without fear. Twenty years ago you could ski, row, spearfish and swim in peace. Crocodiles have now infested our waterways, which were once a community asset.

I am putting forward the case for culling. I want to read a submission by Dr Tim Coyle from Cairns. This is a really important example. I said about 10 years ago that I would be back here in 10 years time. Well, I am still here 10 years later, but I do want to come back in years to come and see action on crocodiles. That is my ultimate goal. Dr Coyle's submission reads—

I am currently a practising GP in the Cairns area. With many others I am concerned at the effect of social media and phone/tablet addiction in our young people, and hence the loss of a healthier pursuit of outdoor activities. Many enjoyable outdoor activities take place in and around fresh water, lakes and rivers. Only a few years ago the Mulgrave River very close to Cairns was the site of such activities, swimming, kayaking and these days, stand up paddle boarding, which, indeed, I used to do myself on the Mulgrave River at Gordonvale and at Fisheries Crossing on the Mulgrave River on the way up to Kearney's Flats. We used to take our children often to these areas in the Summer months.

For a few years now these areas have been encroached upon and inhabited by crocodiles, making use of such areas quite unsafe.

It is ridiculous that areas of enjoyable rivers such as the Mulgrave River, so close to Cairns, have been left to crocodiles, prohibiting human access.

For the sake of our young people who need river access for enjoyable, safe water activities, please keep crocodiles out of waterways, such as the Mulgrave River that are so close to Cairns.

A local tourist group was also using the Mulgrave River for paddle boarding and kayaking tours and have had to cease such activities because of incursion by crocodiles.

Crocodiles are very dangerous animals and need to be kept in their place, and that is many miles from populated areas such as Cairns, Gordonvale and surrounding areas.

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer to standing order 30. I understand the member has been reading from a document or submission. I am very interested in that document, and I wonder whether or not the member will table the document for the interest of members.

Mr KNUTH: I will table that and the other documents.

Tabled paper: Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill 2025, submission from Dr Tim Coyle [1969].

I was pretty gutted to hear comments about a group of teenagers who were walking in the water while fishing at a creek near Innisfail. When a croc attacked one of them they were called idiots. No, Mr Deputy Speaker, you might have to correct me here but politicians are the idiots.

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I refer to the language the member just used. I submit to you it is unparliamentary language and the member should withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): That is a valid point of order. Member for Hill, could you withdraw, please.

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw. They were not breaking into homes and they were not stealing cars. They were doing what many of our young generation in regional Queensland want to do these days. They were—

Mr FURNER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The bill is not related to any matters related to youth crime.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not believe there is a point of order. The member is being very relevant to the bill.

Mr KNUTH: They were doing what many of our young generation in regional Queensland want to do these days—enjoy our outdoors. Politicians would rather tell them, ‘You can’t do that. We’ve put up croc signs.’ There has been a massive promotion over the last 10 years, putting up croc warnings and croc signs. The tourist industry promotes our pristine waterways and tells tourists to come up to North Queensland, but when tourists get there all they see are croc signs. When they ask, ‘Can we swim here?’ they are told, ‘Yes, you can, but you’ll probably get ripped to pieces.’

Everyone who launches their boat at a local boat ramp in North Queensland is in danger. Recently there was a terrifying near miss at the Carmoo boat ramp when a four-metre croc lunged from the water just metres from a 13-year-old boy and his mother. This is just one example of what is happening across North Queensland. There have been five horrific deaths in the last four years and numerous near misses. There was a doctor attacked up in Cooktown. That was blamed on fish scraps being thrown in near where he fell. It had nothing to do with fish scraps. Basically, the place is infested with crocodiles and that was the issue. There was a 12-year-old boy in the Torres Strait; a publican was taken at Lakefield; an Indigenous elder died at Aurukun; and a fisherman was taken in his dinghy at Hinchinbrook.

As I said before, back in 2010 there was a huge public uproar when the department of environment reported 106 croc sightings and called for action, but as usual nothing was done. In 2023 reported sightings topped more than 1,000 annually. I would also point out that these are only reported incidents. North Queenslanders do not bother reporting croc sightings anymore because they know it is a complete waste of time. Our beaches are plastered with crocodile warning signs so governments can feel like they are doing something. They are not targeting the real problem, which is that croc numbers need to be actively reduced. I will read one more submission from Ocean Rafting, which states—

After 28 years of operations here in the Whitsundays, we have noticed a significant increase in crocodile sightings along our mainland, in marinas, and even out amongst the Islands. Being responsible for guests snorkelling around the Whitsunday Islands feels risky with the presence of crocodiles in the water. Essentially, there is little you can do to protect yourself or your guests from a crocodile on land or in the ocean. We live and work in a tourist town where one in three jobs is in tourism, and if we have an incident with a crocodile, it could impact our entire region. Crocodiles in Queensland are not endangered, as their numbers exceed 100,000. Personally, I think the Northern Territory has a good approach to crocodiles and croc farming. Another consideration is that they are territorial and will continue to move down the coast to find new territory, which means they will be in South-East Queensland in more significant numbers in the coming years. Please do not wait for someone to lose a limb or their life before taking action.

There are those who have opposing views about the Queensland Crocodile Authority, but I want to clarify what this bill proposes. The Queensland Crocodile Authority would be based in Cairns, not Brisbane—not 1,000 kilometres away from where 80 per cent of the crocs are. It would establish an expert advisory committee to ensure our management strategy is informed, practical and economically beneficial, especially for traditional owners who can lead a sustainable crocodile industry. It would implement a zero-tolerance zone, with all crocodiles found in populated waterways immediately removed or destroyed—not studied, not monitored; gone.

If there is a crocodile on your property in the cane fields, bore drains or dams, the bill would give private landowners the right to contact the QCA and have it removed immediately. The bill authorises annual removal programs along the east coast to keep numbers under control and protect human life. This is similar to programs already conducted in the Northern Territory. The bill further allows Indigenous landowners to bring in high-paying clients to hunt crocodiles targeted for removal either by traditional or modern methods. This is also similar to what is being called for by traditional owners and considered in the Northern Territory.

The bill expands and invests in egg harvesting programs and creates economic opportunities for Indigenous communities because responsible management can coexist with conservation and create a thriving, sustainable crocodile industry. The Northern Territory harvests around 90,000 crocodile eggs a year; however, in Queensland just 5,000 are allowed under a pilot program that ends in 2028. We are missing out on a multimillion dollar industry while living with daily risks. It would also protect lives, create jobs and empower local Indigenous communities to fully manage their land and waterways. To those who claim this is about wiping out the crocodile I say that is a complete load of rubbish. This bill is about restoring balance and valuing and prioritising human life first and foremost. If managed responsibly, crocodiles can be an asset to Queensland. Right now they are a serious threat.

If a few man-eating crocodiles were dumped in the Brisbane River you can bet this issue would be fixed overnight. We saw the recent hysteria when crocs were reported in southern waterways, but get used to it. You can resolve the problem now by supporting the Crocodile Control and Conservation Bill. I commend the bill to the House.

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


Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).

HEALTH LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL (NO. 3)

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3933, on motion of Mr Nicholls—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (6.24 pm): I rise to support the Health Legislation Amendment Bill (No. 3) 2025. This legislation is representative of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's clear commitment to ensuring Queensland's health laws remain fit for purpose, contemporary and focused intently on the needs of patients, families and frontline clinicians. This is a broad and practical bill. It strengthens regulation where it is needed, removes unnecessary rigidity where it causes harm and reinforces integrity and accountability across Queensland's health and hospital system. It reflects the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's approach, which is considered reform based on consultation and common sense.

I will first address amendments pertaining to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act. With respect to assisted reproductive technology, many Queensland families have benefited from ART. For many Queenslanders it represents their only pathway to parenthood, but we have also seen over recent years serious errors, distressing failures and lifelong consequences flowing from mistakes in this sector. The previous Labor state government rushed the original legislation, consulted poorly and left behind a framework that was well intentioned but in practice was unnecessarily rigid and distressing for patients and families. This legislation fixes those problems.

It introduces sensible flexibility around the collection of donor contact information, provides appropriate case-by-case discretion to the director-general where strict application of the law would cause undue hardship, strengthens inspection and compliance powers, and futureproofs accreditation arrangements. These are practical amendments that provide safety while restoring compassion and common sense for families navigating deeply personal and emotional journeys.

This legislation also makes important changes to organ donation following circulatory death. As we know, only a very small percentage of hospital deaths can result in organ donation, yet the impact of each donor is extraordinary. Last year alone, 96 Queensland families agreed to donation, leading to 273 life-saving transplants. This legislation provides clarity around consent for critical pre-death procedures, ensuring decisions are lawful, ethical, transparent and made only after life-sustaining treatment has been withdrawn. It will remove uncertainty for families and clinicians and help give hope to the many Queenslanders still waiting for a transplant.

In relation to cosmetic surgery, this legislation closes a regulatory gap and allows Queensland to mandate compliance with new national safety and quality standards. This is about protecting patients, improving oversight and lifting standards in a sector that carries unique risks.


I note that this legislation will also strengthen accountability for statutory office holders across several health portfolio boards. High standards of performance, integrity and conduct are not optional; they are essential. Despite the Labor opposition's concerns, these provisions mirror those already in place across a significant number of other acts, including legislation introduced under the former Labor state government. Natural justice will remain. Governor in Council will retain oversight, and these powers will only ever be used in rare and serious circumstances. Finally, this legislation also makes a minor technical amendment to align Queensland with new national arrangements for occupational respiratory disease reporting.

This legislation delivers very important practical reform where it is needed most. It strengthens patient safety, supports ethical and transparent decision-making and further enhances confidence in our hospital and health system. The health minister, the Hon. Tim Nicholls, is to be congratulated for this legislation. He is achieving significant reforms in the health portfolio. We know that many matters had to be resolved with respect to assisted reproductive technology and cosmetic procedures. This legislation also strengthens the oversight and governance arrangements with respect to our health boards to ensure they are achieving what they set out to achieve—that is, ensuring good clinical service delivery in our regions right across Queensland. The reforms contained in this legislation will certainly achieve those end points.

I take this opportunity to acknowledge the work that the minister and his department have done. The Health, Environment and Innovation Committee provide oversight of legislation that is referred to them and they undertake important work to scrutinise that legislation. I would like to thank those committee members for their work. I thank the committee secretariat as well for compiling the reports that members of parliament look at. Their work and diligence are critically important to not only democracy in Queensland but our clinicians and, most importantly, Queensland patients. With those words, I commend the bill to the House.

Sitting suspended from 6.29 pm to 7.30 pm.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Under the provisions of the motion agreed to by the House, I call the minister to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (7.30 pm), in reply: I thank those members who have made a contribution to the debate on the bill. I will respond to a number of the matters that were raised and summarise again some of the main aspects of the bill. I will also deal with some of the issues that have been raised by members during debate.

First and foremost, I acknowledge there has been strong support from members for the necessary corrections or fix-ups to the Assisted Reproductive Technology Act. They will provide enhanced regulation for families and for the donor-conceived community as well as improved clarity for ART providers. Many members spoke from the heart about the benefits of assisted reproductive technology, what it can offer for those seeking children and how that can provide that support. Indeed, it is an important part of the advances we have seen in medical technology and medical services over the years.

The Crisafulli government has stepped in to fix the problems with this legislation—problems arising as a result of the rush by the former government. The changes are sensible and I am glad they have broad support. The bill addresses the unnecessary hardship that patients and families have experienced as a result of those rushed Labor laws. It is vital for these families and donor-conceived people that these issues are addressed before the act commences in full. I want to thank the many stakeholders who engaged with Queensland Health and shared their feedback about their pain points with the existing laws. Their perspectives and insights have been invaluable to developing these amendments, and that is how it should be.

The member for Miller expressed Labor's support for a range of amendments to the ART Act. He noted that the bill makes welcome changes to address practical problems that have caused issues for patients. I note that the member for Miller agreed that a strict application of the 10-family limit could result in cruel outcomes and that changes to enable case-by-case flexibility in defined circumstances would prevent undue hardship while upholding existing protections. He noted that these amendments were sensible, practical and humane.

I also note that the member for Miller recognised the bill removes unnecessary prescriptive information collection, saying that the requirements do not work in the real world and risk patients and families being prevented from using their chosen donor where one piece of information is missing. He agreed that the bill will support donor-conceived people finding out about their genetic origins while removing the risk of families being punished for paperwork technicalities.

I am heartened by the member for Miller's support for the ART Act amendments today. It is indeed the case that the amendments are needed to address practical problems within the legislation. They are sensible, practical and humane. It is a shame, however, that the former Labor government did not take the time to consider these complex issues when the original act was developed. It is a shame that the former government did not take the time necessary to consult adequately when the original act was developed. Unlike those opposite, we knew that these issues needed to be addressed because this government took the time to consider these complex issues. We took the time to consult stakeholders. We gave the legislation the calm and methodical consideration it deserves given the very real implications for patients, families and donor-conceived people.

Those opposite raised concerns about a potential reduction in transparency and accountability from the provisions in the bill that allow broader grounds for the removal of statutory officers. The members opposite do not appear to accept that this is a provision that is found across the statute book. It can be found in the governing legislation for the Legal Aid Board, the WorkCover board of directors, the board of directors of the Residential Tenancies Authority, the Work Health and Safety Board under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, board members of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority and its CEO, board members of the Bulk Water Supply Authority—the list goes on. Indeed, the parliamentary committee in its report found that the provision exists in at least 21 pieces of Queensland legislation and, lo and behold, it has been used by those opposite. In 2021 it was included in the National Injury Insurance Scheme (Queensland) Act by the member for Woodridge. Not only that but it built on a very similar provision that was included in the very same act when it was originally introduced into parliament by the then treasurer and former Speaker of this place, Curtis Pitt.

I thought I would go back and have a look at *Hansard* and see what the debate on the member for Woodridge's bill from 2021 contained. I thought it would be interesting. I would see if the concerns that have been raised about this bill were raised then. It will come as no surprise to those on this side of the House that I could find nothing. I could not find any concerns raised by the member for Miller. I could not find any concerns raised by the member for Greenslopes. I could not find any concerns raised by any of those opposite that these removal clauses undermine transparency or reduce or erode integrity—not a thing. Hypocrisy, thy name is Labor. That is the story. I could not find those contributions in *Hansard* when those opposite were making these very same changes. Perhaps I might have missed it. That could be the case, so I invite the member for Miller and his colleagues to point me to the concerns they raised about the member for Woodridge's bill.

We do not have to stop there. Another salient example is the very same wording—identical wording—that was included at inception and remains part of the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act. Guess who introduced that bill? It was none other than former premier Anna Bligh. Another former premier, Annastacia Palaszczuk, included the same wording when she was the minister for primary industries. I can provide further and more examples. Those opposite know that there are more examples because they were there, they proposed them and they supported and voted for them. These amendments are not novel and they are not new; they are about ensuring those appointed to guide our health system remain fit for office.

Additionally, I want to deal with the recycled criticism offered by the members for Miller and Greenslopes, who have called out our legislative agenda as being threadbare. We heard the same criticism trotted out for the debate of HLAB (No. 2), and I will say that this criticism has not improved with reuse. They cannot come up with another new argument. To dismiss the health legislative agenda as threadbare is a disappointment and a misrepresentation. Appointing frontline clinicians to boards is not threadbare. Tackling the scourge of illicit tobacco and vapes in our community is not threadbare. Providing the Queensland Institute of Medical Research with a new and fit-for-purpose act after 80 years is not threadbare. We do remember that the only threadbare part about it was the amendment moved by the member for Miller which would have seen QIMR not have a governing council or a governing board. Ensuring the integrity of the community pharmacy business ownership model is not threadbare.

The only thing genuinely threadbare here is the scrutiny that the member for Greenslopes has applied to the various health bills presented by this government. He admitted during the debate of HLAB (No. 2) that he had spent scarcely 10 minutes reviewing the bill before it came before the House. That is the depth of analysis behind the criticisms now being put forward and echoed by those opposite.

Each of the bills has delivered meaningful protections and reforms for Queenslanders. Each of the bills has allowed full and proper debate—not just one bill with everything jammed in but three bills spread out dealing calmly and methodically with the changes that are necessary to fix Labor's health crisis after a decade of decline—so nothing about them is threadbare except, it seems, the review undertaken by the member for Greenslopes and the recycled talking points of the member for Miller.

This bill advances Queensland's health legislation through amendments which secure better outcomes for our patients and establish greater accountability within our health system, in alignment with community expectations. The amendments about assisted reproductive technology improve the legislation through critical amendments which ensure it will operate effectively on commencement and without causing unnecessary hardship to patients, families and those born as a result of these procedures.

The amendments to the Transplantation and Anatomy Act maximise the opportunity for successful organ donations in cases of circulatory death and provide certainty to clinicians and families through clear consent processes. The changes to the Private Health Facilities Act promote the delivery of safe, high-quality cosmetic surgery by requiring facilities to comply with the nationally agreed cosmetic surgery standards. The amendments relating to the governance of Queensland's health system will enable improved oversight and performance by office holders.

Overall, the bill supports the effectiveness and clarity of Queensland's health legislation and will provide better health outcomes for families and the community. For that reason, I commend the bill to the House.

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


Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 57, as read, agreed to.

Clause 58—

 **Mr BAILEY** (7.42 pm): I covered this in detail during the debate, but this is a clause, like a number of other clauses that we will get to, where the minister and the government are attempting to adjust the legislation so that any member of the board can be removed without reason. If this was a government that had shown some sort of integrity and some sort of transparency and openness in government in the way it operated, there might be a little bit more trust. The reality is there has been 12 months of debacles under this minister and we have seen the denial of health care and the denial of best practice in medicine. Whether it is pill testing or whether it is gender services, the record of this government is well known and it is not to be trusted to simply remove people on the basis of without reason.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance and related to the actual specific nature of the clause. I would submit to you that the contribution is not being relevant to the clause as worded.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): I understand that, but I think the member is mentioning that in passing very briefly, but I remind the member to stick to the long title of the bill. Please keep going.

Mr BAILEY: Absolutely. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Clause 57 will simply insert—

The Governor in Council may, at any time, remove a board member from office for any reason or none.

There are subsequent clauses that flow from that. The point we make is that it is legitimate for any member of a hospital board who is being removed to know the reason. I think the public deserves to know what the reason would be. I think the member of the board themselves deserves to understand what the reason might be. I do not think it is particularly democratic for a minister to be able to remove people without providing any reason whatsoever. I do not think that is reasonable. We do not trust this current minister to do that in a reasonable way given his record of botch-ups and a very poor performance in this portfolio over 12 months. We see it in that context and therefore we do oppose this clause.

Mr NICHOLLS: I do not intend to respond to the personal abuse from the member for Miller. That is of course the first refuge of someone who does not have anything to contribute to a debate rather than actually making a proper contribution. Let me take the member for Miller to a number of other pieces of legislation which I have referred to but am happy to refer to again: under the National Injury Insurance Scheme bill, the Governor in Council may end the chief executive officer's appointment for any reason or none. That was passed by then treasurer Cameron Dick. In the actual bill itself in 2016, the words used were 'for any reason or none' by the Hon. Curtis Pitt MP, then treasurer and minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander affairs. With regard to the corrective services Parole Board, the words used were 'for any reason or none' by the Hon. Mark Ryan MP, then minister for police. Let me talk to another piece of legislation that was introduced by the Hon. Judy Spence MP, then minister for police and corrective services, when she said that it is unnecessary for any reasons to be given in relation to the Parole Board membership. There seems to be quite a few examples.

With regard to the Queensland Reconstruction Authority under then minister Anna Bligh MP, it was stipulated that the Governor in Council may at any time remove the chief executive officer from office for any reason or none. Under the residential tenancies and rooming accommodation legislation, the Hon. Robert Swarten—Swarto himself—said that the Governor in Council may end the appointment of a director for any reason or none. In the South East Queensland Water (Restructuring) Act—remember when those opposite were dealing with the Queensland Bulk Water Supply Authority—the minister, the Hon. Andrew Fraser MP, said that the responsible ministers may at any time end the appointment for any reason or none.

With regard to the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003—this one has two barrels in it—it was determined that the Governor in Council may at any time terminate the appointment of all or any directors of the board for any reason or none and the board may at any time terminate the appointment of the chief executive officer for any reason or none. That was introduced by someone whose position in this House was terminated for a good reason—Gordon Nuttall himself. Under the Food Production (Safety) Act 2000, it was also determined that the Governor in Council may at any time terminate the appointment of all appointed directors or an appointed director for any reason or none by the Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk MP, then minister for primary industries. The list goes on. When it comes to hypocrisy, the member for Miller is leading the pack.

Let me point out that in the 12 months that I have been in this role now I have replaced exactly zero—exactly zero. One member has been dismissed because of a criminal offence after being appointed by those opposite. When I came to office, I was presented with the fact that that member was actually in the lock-up. I wrote to that person and asked, 'Is there a good reason why I shouldn't dismiss you under the provisions of the legislation?'

Mr Mander: Due process.

Mr NICHOLLS: I followed due process, to which I did not receive a response. All current board members—those appointed by the former government, including the chairs of those boards—are still in office. Not a one has been replaced. I contrast that to the behaviour of those opposite in office when they won in 2015, because we can remember clearly what they did to the boards at that time. We can remember what they did to people like the Under Treasurer at the time and the directors-general at the time.

When it comes to having faith and trust in the system, the member for Miller's complaints are clearly unfounded. They are based on sheer hypocrisy and, as usual, a lack of in-depth investigation, understanding and honesty in this place. Honesty in this place demands saying: this is what happened here.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Clearly, I find those words offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has found those remarks offensive.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. The hypocrisy of the position taken by the opposition in relation to this clause is plainly evident from the submissions I have made and the points I have raised in respect of previous legislation. It also ignores a couple of other things. Natural justice processes, or what is known as procedural fairness, will continue to apply. Natural justice, which is a common law right, exists such that someone who has received a notice saying they are to go receives a fair notice of it and can make representations in relation to that so that they are heard with respect to any action that may be taken against them. There is also a requirement that the Governor in Council has to be notified, so it goes through a proper Governor in Council process. That goes through a cabinet process which, as those opposite who have been in cabinet will know, involves a submission through cabinet and then a

process of signing off an Executive Council minute to go up to the Governor for approval. There is a very clear and available opportunity for those who feel aggrieved by their dismissal for whatever reason—for any reason or for none—to seek some clarity with respect to their position. When it comes to the issues that have been raised by the member for Miller, the member for Greenslopes and others, I am sure that would absolutely cover off on that particular matter and respond to it.

I did notice that in some of the contributions there was an issue in relation to a comparison with the major sports facilities bill. The member for Greenslopes queried why this bill takes a different approach to statutory appointees. I point out that the Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill includes a clause that refers to members of Stadiums Queensland being removed and it relies on the Acts Interpretation Act for a general power to remove. There is actually a general power under the Acts Interpretation Act. With all due respect to Stadiums Queensland—its role is incredibly important; I think its annual budget is around \$155 million—our hospital and health boards govern multibillion dollar public health service organisations which in many cases employ thousands of staff. In fact, I think the budget of Metro North is somewhere in the order of a record—again—of over \$4.4 billion this year and it employs some 27,000 staff. These organisations are responsible for delivering the critical public health services that our communities rely on. For that reason, I remain unapologetic for setting out these powers in a clear and precise way that both the boards and our community know, understand and can have faith in.

Clause 58, as read, agreed to.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): The question is that clauses 59 to 64, as read, stand part of the bill. Those of that opinion say ‘aye’—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Could you remind the House which are the clauses being put in this question?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question is that clauses 59 to 64, as read, stand part of the bill.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I was of the understanding we were considering the clauses en bloc to 71. I would be happy to do that if you think that is reasonable. The two clauses I wish to speak to are similar in nature.

Clauses 59 to 71—

 **Mr BAILEY** (7.54 pm): I rise to speak in a similar vein but, because there are two of them, I am happy to do them together. The minister raised a range of issues in response to the previous clause. There is a big difference between having ministers who have integrity and in whom you have trust and faith that they will do the right thing and having ministers who do not. What we have here is a situation of the latter, not the former. This is a minister who has botched the flu season, who has cut beds right across the state, who ran away from the election commitment of 2,200 beds—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order relates to relevance with respect to the clauses. I would submit that the content that is now being contributed by the member of Miller is not relevant to the clauses as drafted.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will hear your response to that point of order.

Mr BAILEY: The minister just made a fairly wide-ranging contribution which covered broad context—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Quiet, everyone. I am listening to the point of order.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I will not warn you but I will caution you. We just listened to a point of order, and you know what the deal is when the Speaker is listening to a point of order. We will have silence.

Mr BAILEY: To the point of order, the minister has just covered very broad territory, going back to Gordon Nuttall and beyond. I am simply putting context to why we do not trust this minister with this power. It is highly relevant to this clause. I am outlining his record.

Dr ROWAN: My point of order, again, with respect to remaining relevant to the clauses as drafted, is that it is not an opportunity to provide the broader context that the member for Miller wishes to address. It has to remain relevant to the clauses as drafted.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The health minister spent most of his contribution drawing comparisons in terms of context incredibly broadly and on almost an ad nauseam basis throughout the proceedings of this House. Does the Leader of the House suggest that it is not appropriate that Speakers allow members to provide context? I submit to you that the shadow minister be afforded the same opportunity.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin, move back to your seat, please. You are lucky I did not warn you under the standing orders. Once again, if I am listening to a point of order, I need silence. There were four points of order. There has been some context and some comparison. Member for Miller, you can touch briefly on that but I urge you to keep within the purposes of clauses 59 to 71.

Mr BAILEY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. These clauses, of course, relate to the government giving themselves the power to remove people from boards without reason. The minister has outlined a whole lot of historical matters that he has spun into the debate. There is a big difference between ministers who are trustworthy and ministers who are not. It has been very clear from a year of botch-ups by this minister that he is not trustworthy.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, we only have a little time left in this debate. The interjections are getting rowdier. Bear in mind, we have young people in the gallery today. I suggest we model some good behaviour for them.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Prior to you rising to your feet, the member for Miller used a term that I was untrustworthy. I take personal offence and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. What we have seen is month after month of botch-ups. We saw the minister say today to radiation clinicians, whose pay he will cut by 25 per cent, that they get the wage they deserve—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Firstly, I did not say that and, secondly, I take personal offence.

Mr BAILEY: It is on my socials.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will have silence during the point of order.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Currumbin, I am not going to warn you under the standing orders because we are nearly at eight o'clock. Can we keep going forward? I urge everyone to be on their best behaviour.

Mr NICHOLLS: I take that interjection from the member for Miller, but I also do request that he withdraw because I take personal offence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Miller, will you withdraw?

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. I was here. I heard what the minister said. The video is there for people to make their own judgements. It is on the video. It is pretty straightforward. It enraged radiation clinicians to be sledged like that by this health minister in this place—people who help people being treated for cancer, cancer patients—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Time has expired.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nicklin, cease your interjections.

Mr BAILEY: Just to close—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Is this a point of order, member for Miller?

Mr BAILEY: No, I am just finishing my contribution.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, it is eight o'clock. The time has expired. Please take your seat.

Question put—That clauses 59 to 71, as read, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 59 to 71, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY 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 the consideration of the bill, including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill, without further amendment or debate.

Question put—That clauses 72 to 89, as read, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 72 to 89, as read, agreed to.

Question put—That schedule 1, as read, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Question put—That the bill be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ENERGY ROADMAP AMENDMENT BILL

GREENHOUSE GAS STORAGE AMENDMENT BILL

Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill resumed from 16 October (see p. 3178) and Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill resumed from 26 August (see p. 2367).

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)



Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (8.02 pm): I move—

That the bills be now read a second time.

I would like to thank the members of the Governance, Energy and Finance Committee, led by the member for Coomera, for their consideration of the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill 2025. I would also like to acknowledge the work of the members for Caloundra and Maryborough during this detailed consideration process. The Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill facilitates delivery of the Crisafulli government's plan for affordable, reliable and sustainable energy for Queenslanders. It amends the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Act 2024 which will be renamed the Energy (Infrastructure Facilitation) Act 2025, ensuring legislative settings align with the Energy Roadmap and facilitate private sector investment and new energy generation.

The bill delivers the government's election commitment to repeal the former government's unrealistic renewable energy targets. Removing these targets enables a pragmatic approach to Queensland's evolving energy mix. Renewable energy remains central to the road map with more than 4.7 gig of wind and solar projects under consideration or financially committed, complementing 4.2 gig of operational capacity as at June 2025.

The bill strengthens public ownership provisions, confirming the state will retain 100 per cent ownership of existing operational generation assets, transmission, distribution and deep storage infrastructure. These enduring commitments are backed by clear reporting requirements and supported by our \$1.6 billion Electricity Maintenance Guarantee to improve what we have while we build what we need for the future. To enhance flexibility and efficiency, the bill introduces the Energy System Outlook,

replacing prescriptive planning requirements with a dynamic framework that identifies strategic infrastructure priorities and adapts to system and consumer needs. It also streamlines governance by repealing advisory bodies, the Energy Industry Council, the Queensland Energy System Advisory Board and the Renewable Energy Jobs Advocate, reducing administrative costs while enabling consultation through mechanisms like the new energy round table. Approximately 113 participants from around 89 different organisations have been engaged, representing a broad spectrum of the energy industry.

The bill renames renewable energy zones as regional energy hubs, putting economics and engineering above ideology and creating a more adaptable framework for coordinated transmission investment. It enhances the priority transmission investment framework, the PTI, ensuring least cost delivery of critical projects such as Powerlink's Gladstone project and removes the 2035 sunset clause to provide market and investor certainty. Crucially, the bill establishes a legislative framework for the CopperString project, empowering QIC to deliver this transformational project connecting the North West Minerals Province to the national electricity grid. CopperString will unlock economic opportunities across North and North-West Queensland, enable new low-cost generation and support resource industry development.

Finally, the bill retains the Job Security Guarantee and its \$150 million fund. While the Energy Roadmap resets indicative coal operating timeframes, the Job Security Guarantee remains an important framework to support workers in the industry and provide confidence to coal communities that they are respected and supported. By simplifying legislation, maintaining public ownership and enabling strategic investment, this bill secures Queensland's energy future while fostering regional growth and private sector participation.

The Energy Roadmap resets operating timeframes for state owned coal assets to technical lives with options to further extend into the future if needed. That will deliver nearly \$26 billion less in system costs over the next decade. The former Labor government's decision to close coal units by 2035, regardless of system needs and value for Queensland taxpayers, has been officially abolished. Ultimately, that position was unrealistic, captured by ideology and fundamentally dishonest. State owned coal assets will play a critical role in Queensland's energy system until at least 2046, meaning coal will be part of the state's generation mix for decades. That is great news for Queensland jobs in regional communities. The provisions in this bill support our state owned coal generators by introducing 100 per cent ownership of Queensland's existing publicly owned generation assets that are operational at the time the amendments commence. Only the LNP is legislating to keep our state owned coal plants in public hands.

Renewable energy accounted for 37.3 per cent of Queensland's National Electricity Market connected grid generation in October this year, up from 34.9 per cent when we took office. Right now there are 12 large-scale generation projects under construction or financially committed, including six solar farms and six wind farms. These include major projects like MacIntyre and Wambo, which have already begun generating while ramping up to full capacity. Alongside these generation projects Queensland is powering ahead with investment in critical energy storage solutions. We see this in the 10 storage projects which are committed in our state, including nine battery installations and the Kidston pumped hydro project.

These projects mean jobs and opportunities in regional Queensland. Committed solar and wind projects are creating up to 3½ thousand peak construction jobs in our state and battery projects add more than 1,000 more. That means thousands of Queenslanders are working today to build the energy system of tomorrow. Beyond the shovels in the ground as we speak, the investment pipeline is even stronger. We have 62 generation projects with development approval alongside 40 storage projects approved, plus many more at the feasibility stage. This is a wave of private sector investment ready to roll into our state, totalling in the billions of dollars that are flowing into regional communities.

On top of these projects being built or in the investment pipeline, Queensland already has 79 renewable energy projects operating. They provide Queenslanders with energy from wind, solar, bioenergy and hydro sources. There are also 11 large-scale storage projects online, including three batteries owned by Stanwell and CS Energy, and the Wivenhoe pumped hydro project, which is one of Queensland's greatest energy assets, opened by the former Bjelke-Petersen government 41 years ago.

We know that Queensland is blessed with a world-leading solar resource and Queenslanders are making the most of that abundant sunshine from which our state's moniker is derived. As of October this year, over 908,000 rooftop solar systems have been installed in homes and small businesses across the state. That means nearly 40 per cent of roofs in Queensland have solar panels. The leading

postcodes are in our regions and our outer suburbs. Bundaberg, Mackay and Toowoomba lead, followed by Hervey Bay, Caloundra and Beenleigh. While we welcome households making that cost-saving investment, the increased flow of rooftop solar does create complexities in our increasingly dynamic system, with electricity coming into the grid during the day. This electricity needs to be used and stored to maintain a stable system and for energy to be deployed when it is most needed, at times of peak demand. That is why our Energy Roadmap looks to storage as a critical cornerstone of our state's present and future energy mix, together with the community batteries that we are seeing opening up across Queensland and operated by Energy Queensland.

As part of our Energy Roadmap, Queensland is investing in battery storage on a scale never seen before. Recently I had the pleasure of visiting Stanwell Power Station, where 324 Tesla megapacks had already been delivered. We saw the Energy Roadmap lived out in real life, improving what we have—coal-fired generators—while we build what we need for the future. Those 324 Tesla megapacks are now being hooked up. That 300-megawatt system shows us the Energy Roadmap in action. The battery at Stanwell will provide up to four hours of firming capacity and is an important part of Stanwell's 2.8-gigawatt-hour storage portfolio. Alongside that we see Quinbrook's world-first eight-hour EnerQB battery at Stanwell, unlocking storage that can absorb an entire day's solar generation and deliver continuous supply during peak demand.

At the same time, our rollout of local network connected batteries is supporting communities across Queensland. Eighteen batteries are already energised and 12 more are under construction, including recent completions in Torrington and Emerald, which I had the pleasure of visiting recently. These four-megawatt, eight-megawatt-hour units capture excess rooftop solar and stabilise the grid in communities with high rooftop solar penetration. These batteries can be rolled out quickly and are helping us to harness the benefits of the world's highest uptake of rooftop solar while putting downward pressure on prices. The Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill is about making sure this momentum continues. By prioritising critical infrastructure and creating a clear investment framework, we will turn this investment pipeline into projects and jobs and, more importantly, affordable, reliable and sustainable power for Queensland households and businesses.

I would like to thank all 41 Queenslanders and stakeholders who took the time to make a submission on the bill to the committee, including those stakeholders who appeared at the committee's public hearing. Regarding the submissions, there are a number of points of clarification that I would like to make before members start their contributions on the bill. Firstly, the ETU submission listed Callide C, Gladstone and Millmerran as being extended or otherwise affected by the Energy Roadmap. I note that those plants are either privately owned or joint ventures and their closure dates are decisions for their owners and not the Queensland government or Queensland government owned corporations. Page 30 of the Energy Roadmap notes that 'Operating decisions for Callide C, Millmerran and Gladstone will be made by their respective owners'.

I note the ETU's criticism of the Crisafulli government's \$1.6 billion Electricity Maintenance Guarantee, arguing it does not account for refurbishment beyond the forward estimates. The \$1.6 billion covers every overhaul required within the current four-year forward estimates because that is how budgets work. A four-year budget is not a 10-year maintenance cycle and the guarantee is ongoing. It will continue to fund maintenance in future budgets as required. When attempting to model costs across all Queensland coal generators, public and private, technical lifespans and the recognition of privately owned power stations must be factored into estimates.

The ETU also raised concerns about public ownership and specifically the public ownership of CopperString. As coal continues to underpin Queensland's energy system into the future and with an increasing system reliance on gas, I have been clear that the government has an enduring commitment to 100 per cent public ownership of existing operational generation while ensuring state investment into those assets continues through the Electricity Maintenance Guarantee. The bill crystallises this public ownership commitment and provides certainty to all stakeholders, industry investors, GOCs and the community. One hundred per cent public ownership commitments for transmission, distribution and deep storage remain enshrined in the legislation.

The Energy Roadmap clearly states that CopperString will be delivered by QIC, a government owned corporation. Clause 58 in this bill gives the QIC the authority to deliver the project while allowing partnerships to accelerate construction. Partnering with industry means building our infrastructure faster and smarter, delivering value for Queensland taxpayers. CopperString is central to our Energy Roadmap because it connects the North West Minerals Province to the National Electricity Market sooner, unlocking renewable energy and resource development opportunities for Queenslanders.

As I mentioned in question time this morning, it is clear that we have seen a vote of confidence in the Energy Roadmap and the \$200 million North West Energy Fund that has been activated. The Eva Copper project produces 60,000 tonnes of copper every year and there is a \$2.3 billion investment in Eva Copper by Harmony Gold. These investments in the extraordinary critical minerals in the North West Minerals Province are worth half a trillion dollars. It is that next-generation wave of mineral resources that will power our state's future and power the world's economy. We know of the opportunities that are available to Queensland mining and resources.

We also know the importance of Hughenden, which is at the heart of CopperString. We are seeing investment go into the Hughenden substation and work is being done on renewable projects from Hughenden east. There are billions of dollars worth of renewables projects between Hughenden and Townsville.

Mrs Poole: Hear, hear!

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member for Mundingburra. I have often said that the renewables and, in particular, the wind east of Hughenden are the best in the country, and potentially the wind is some of the best in the world as it blows in the evening. We know of the renewables opportunities along the CopperString transmission line from Hughenden to Townsville, which is a key reason CopperString is so important.

I note the additional savings we already identified when I delivered the Energy Roadmap. Those opposite had let CopperString blow out. It started at \$1.8 billion, went to \$5 billion, then to \$6.2 billion and then to \$13.9 billion once all of the augmentation and additions were added. Those opposite lost control of the cost of CopperString. When I delivered the Energy Roadmap, I made it clear at the very beginning that we would save \$2.1 billion in costs just by bringing back the kV from 500 to 330 so that the additional costs that could be saved would be delivered sooner. Under those opposite, CopperString was not going to be delivered. It would not have been delivered under those opposite. I repeat: it would not have been delivered under those opposite. We are unpacking the renewable investments to get it built sooner and get that renewable energy to market sooner.

Queensland's renewable share has grown over the past year, powered by private sector investment and new projects coming online. Removing legislated targets does not mean less renewables, as I have already explained; it means a market-driven approach focused on getting the right projects built, not seeking out political headlines. Again, as I talked about today in the House, we know what happens when those opposite get their hands on political headlines. I will come to it later in my contribution, but it really is a test for those opposite. Will they double down on Pioneer-Burdekin? At the moment it appears that they will—the \$36.8 billion project, the fairytale underpinning the Energy and Jobs Plan. The expose in the *Australian* makes it abundantly clear. There are 37 pictures in the Energy and Jobs Plan—camp fires and fairy lights—seriously. That is—

Mr O'Connor: Some sort of press release.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member for Bonney. As reported in the *Australian*, it was not enough of an announcement to say 'up to five gig at this project'; they had to say 'five gig'. That was the media announcement. That is what they went for. That is the fairytale. That is how government was undertaken by those opposite. That is the disrespect that those opposite undertook. That is their record. That is their legacy. I have not even talked about Borumba, and I will not get time to talk about Borumba, but, again, when we came to government, that project had blown out from \$14 billion to \$18 billion. The independent report revealed the most shocking aspect of that is that there was a less than one per cent chance of any energy being delivered in the timeframe that they had predicted. There was a less than one per cent chance of any energy being online by 2030, let alone Pioneer-Burdekin.

Mr O'Connor: They like those odds.

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, they are Labor Party odds if ever I have heard them. There was a less than one per cent chance at Borumba, but they had also forecast first energy at Pioneer-Burdekin by 2032. We know what that really was, from the *Australian* again on the weekend: it was a pipedream, a fantasy, a hoax, but that was the basis of their entire Energy and Jobs Plan. They showed again their ineptitude when they did not even know today—they were asking questions of the gas peaker at Kogan—they were that clueless as to their own Energy and Jobs Plan that they did not recognise it was in there. It was in their own Energy and Jobs Plan.

Mr Head: Oops! We're saving it and delivering.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member for Callide. It is another project we are having to come in and save and deliver, because this state needs more gas generation to firm up renewables and they are adding increasing generation to the system. It is another project that we are going to save, and I know the member for Callide is very excited about that.

We keep our government election commitments, and that has been reflected now in the renewable energy targets. We are focused on building projects that deliver, not chasing political headlines like those opposite. Investors can be confident that the Crisafulli government will stand by its election commitment, including net zero by 2050.

I thank the Services Union for supporting 'Queensland's ambition to lead the nation in renewable energy, regional investment and workforce development' in their submission. We share their commitment to a skilled and stable workforce. Let's be clear: repealing advisory bodies does not weaken workforce planning. It removes layers of process and bureaucracy that slow delivery and add cost. The best and fastest way to secure jobs is to build and secure energy projects, not create more committees. This bill replaces ideology with action on investor certainty and infrastructure delivery.

Many of Queensland's energy stakeholders have made submissions which strongly endorse the pragmatic and practical reforms contained in the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill 2025. The Queensland Farmers' Federation submission supports a more flexible approach to achieving net zero by 2025, recognising that predictable and cost-conscious policy is essential for agricultural competitiveness and on-farm innovation.

Local governments share this optimism. My neighbouring council—Smithy and the Western Downs—welcomes the bill's objective to deliver cost-effective, safe, secure and reliable energy. For a region with a strong agricultural and manufacturing base, rising energy costs have been a major challenge. Western Downs stated, 'By working together, significant economic opportunities can be unlocked,' and we look forward to continued work in this region to unlock significant economic opportunities and community benefits for locals in the Western Downs region.

The North West Queensland Regional Organisation of Councils describes CopperString as a game changer for connecting renewable energy to the National Electricity Market and supporting critical minerals like copper, vanadium and cobalt. They commend our expanded \$50 million community benefits fund, which will deliver housing, community infrastructure and workforce development across the CopperString project corridor.

Industry groups are equally supportive. The Queensland Resources Council welcomes the Energy Roadmap's flexible investment framework, while QREC backs the public ownership retention approach, alongside private capital attraction, applauding the \$400 million Queensland Energy Investment Fund and the new QIC Investor Gateway. In the public hearing on 29 October, QREC's spokesperson welcomed constructive elements of the bill and the Energy Roadmap, being the inclusion of emissions reduction within the strategic infrastructure objectives, the continued delivery of the CopperString transmission project and the creation of regional energy hubs, which they noted provided a framework to modernise Queensland's energy system. Renewable energy developer Windlab as well as Coexistence Queensland strongly support the shift to regional energy hubs, citing streamlined delivery, improved flexibility and better regional engagement.

I turn briefly to the dissenting report from those opposite. Labor's dissenting report made a number of outrageous claims, all of which prove they have learned nothing in their year in opposition and, if let back onto the Treasury benches, would undoubtedly pursue the same undeliverable and ideological approach that we saw under the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, as they have again demonstrated repeatedly today in the House.

Regarding Labor's attempts to link repealing renewable energy targets with higher power prices, the truth is—and the modelling in the Energy Roadmap is clear—that there is \$1,035 avoided costs through this system plan as compared to those opposite. That is \$1,035 per household per year for the next 10 years. That is avoided costs than it otherwise would have been under Labor's plan. There it is in black and white. As I have stated, we have 12 large-scale renewable generation projects under construction or financially committed, 10 storage projects, 62 generation projects and 40 storage projects approved, with many more at the feasibility stage.

I referred to this in question time, but I am going to repeat it for those opposite: regarding their opposition to CS Energy's landmark deal with APA to develop the Brigalow gas peaker, this asset does not yet exist, yet Labor seem to be under the impression that ownership of this asset has been transferred. It does not exist. Brigalow is a new project—new generation—private sector investment partnering with government to deliver more generation as the roadmap has promised. APA Group has

announced a joint development agreement with CS Energy to deliver the proposed Brigalow Peaking Power Plant. Labor proposed the same, with the QEJP proposing to partner with Iberdrola for a gas peaking station at Kogan Creek, and the former government, I also note, was talking about constructing Wambo Wind Farm, which is 50 per cent owned by Cubico and Stanwell.

With regard to Labor's concerns about investor confidence, the roadmap includes a clear decision matrix, based on system need, asset integrity and economic viability—far more transparent than the arbitrary dates that those opposite had adopted. Their approach was that all coal closures would be done by 2035.

Labor also raised concerns with coal closure dates and certainty for coal workers. The audacity of Labor to raise these issues is laughable because of their arbitrary coal closure dates. What we have done on this side of the House is backed in the \$150 million job guarantee and we have saved jobs. We respect our regional communities. We do not treat them with arbitrary closure dates of their assets; we respect them. We have saved coal jobs—around Stanwell, around Tarong, around Callide, towns like Biloela, Kingaroy, Blackbutt, Yarraman, Rockhampton, Stanwell—all these regional and rural towns. It is not only the workers who have security but also the small businesses. I will never forget seeing an ABC story, I think it was, on the bakery in Biloela and listening to the small and family businesses that depend on these generators. We have given that certainty as coal will run for decades in Queensland. This plan now supports regional communities. Labor's Energy and Jobs Plan left regional communities behind. That is the truth. Our Electricity Maintenance Guarantee will preserve those assets.


With regard to Labor's claims about consultation, we delivered targeted workshops and extensive stakeholder engagements with 113 participants from 89 organisations. That is consultation. Their claims that Powerlink were not consulted show that they are not paying attention. They are lazy. They are not paying attention. It has been made clear in the Energy Roadmap and I said it on the day: Powerlink led the modelling, so they have been intimately involved. That was noted on page 24 of the Energy Roadmap.

This bill also deals with the announcement by the Deputy Premier regarding repealing the Forest Wind Farm Development Act 2020, ending years of uncertainty for the Wide Bay community. That act was introduced by the former Labor government to fast-track a project in state forests between Gympie, Maryborough and the Fraser Coast without any community consultation or appeal rights. The project has since collapsed, losing landholder support and its venture partner, leaving no viable pathway forward. Repealing this act delivers permanent certainty for local communities and landholders and removes a flawed special-purpose law designed to override community voices.

Furthermore, this bill is being debated in cognate with the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill 2025. My colleague the Minister for Natural Resources will provide further details on the bill and the committee process, but it responds to Queensland's 2024 ban on greenhouse gas storage in the Great Artesian Basin. That ban terminated CTSCo's exploration permit, leaving the company responsible for decommissioning its wells. CTSCo proposed converting these wells into water supply bores for landholders, providing long-term water access, avoiding the cost of drilling new bores and creating a positive legacy. The bill allows CTSCo to either plug and abandon wells or convert and transfer them under strict technical standards, streamlining approvals and minimising long-term liability for the state.

Let me finish with a couple of comments and a couple of challenges for those opposite. They have a choice. There is a clear contrast between their hoax, their hype, their announcement-driven plan and a plan driven by pragmatism, modelling and a calm and methodical approach. Those opposite have to make a clear choice over the next day. Will they double down on the \$36.8 billion Pioneer-Burdekin project that underpinned their Energy and Jobs Plan? Let's also hear from those opposite as to whether they still support tens of millions of dollars being funnelled to 'Twiggy' for hydrogen technology that did not exist. Is that the kind of investment they wanted to see? Will they back in their plan, which delivers higher power prices, or will they support us and the \$1,035 of savings per year for households for the next 10 years? That is their choice, and it is now their turn to show what they believe in.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): There is too much noise in the House. Please lower your voices.

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (8.33 pm): I rise to contribute to the cognate debate. Other members of the opposition will address the Greenhouse Gas Storage Amendment Bill, including the shadow minister for resources, and I will focus my contribution on the Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill.

I rise to speak against the Crisafulli LNP government's Energy Roadmap Amendment Bill. With this bill, the Crisafulli government is putting ideology above economics and above science when it comes to the future of energy in Queensland. The LNP's ideological energy war is costing Queensland investment and jobs and will result in higher power bills for Queensland homes and businesses. Their so-called 'energy roadmap' would more aptly be named 'energy roadblock' because it stands in the way of a clean energy future that lowers bills and creates jobs.

Labor's plan locked renewable energy targets of 50 per cent by 2030, 70 per cent by 2032 and 80 per cent by 2035 into law. This bill will repeal those targets. Labor enacted laws with legal requirements for a majority of the energy generated in Queensland to be publicly owned. With this bill, the LNP will let privatisation rip. Make no mistake: the LNP's ideological opposition to renewables will deliver higher prices and higher emissions and will cost jobs.

Most Queenslanders support a plan for an orderly transition to clean energy that is based on science and economics and backed by continued public ownership, but the LNP have brought forward a plan for more of the most expensive and unreliable forms of energy as they privatise our energy system by stealth. With this bill and the Energy Roadmap policy the Crisafulli government have chosen what is good politically for the LNP, not what is good economically. They have chosen what is good for themselves, not what is good for Queenslanders.

The bill and the policy will not provide consumers caught in a cost-of-living crunch with the lower power prices they were promised by the LNP. Proponents who have seen job-creating energy projects worth billions cancelled by the member for Kawana and who want policy stability and certainty instead will get more risk as our renewable energy targets are scrapped by the LNP. These industry proponents instead will be competing against expensive and unreliable coal-fired power plants, propped up by billions of dollars of taxpayers' money until further notice. Even the LNP trigger for their retirement—the so-called decision matrix—that determines when coal plants will retire cannot rule out early closures of coal units. The LNP have truly chosen the worst of both worlds.

Communities that host energy projects, whether fossil fuels or renewables, will not have any more certainty or clarity around the future of these assets under the LNP's plan. Our industries and the tens of thousands of jobs that depend on them will struggle under this backward LNP plan as they strive to keep globally competitive through clean, cheap and reliable electricity. All the while our power prices will keep skyrocketing.

Despite the promises from the member for Broadwater about cheaper power when he was the opposition leader, the latest ABS CPI data shows that the cost of power in Queensland has increased by up to 468.5 per cent in the year that the LNP has been in office—between October last year and October this year. This has been driven by the LNP's deliberate decision to cut universal energy rebates for Queenslanders. This is yet another broken promise from the Premier, who said that a government he led would provide relief, including universal energy rebates, if the cost-of-living crisis continued. Not only has it continued; it has gotten worse under the Crisafulli LNP government. It will be made even worse by the measures in this bill, which will see power prices continue to go up, driven by the LNP's ideological opposition to clean energy.

This bill has been brought before the House by an energy minister forced to deliver what is good for the LNP's internal politics. We have seen evidence of this writ large publicly. In the lead-up to the launch of the Energy Roadmap, the *Courier-Mail* reported that the LNP's Energy Roadmap would include firm closure dates for Queensland coal generators. I table the article.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 10 September 2025, titled 'Revealed: Qld's new energy plan to set coal power end dates' [1970].

By mid-morning of the day of the report, the Premier's and energy minister's spinners were backgrounding journalists that the *Courier-Mail* reporter was wrong. I believe that the reporter got it right, and the Premier knew the energy minister had coal generator closure dates in the Energy Roadmap. Frankly, it is inconceivable to me that the Premier's office was unaware these closure dates in the Energy Roadmap were being made available to the media.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member for Logan, you are not interjecting; you are arguing across the floor. Please do not.

Mr McCALLUM: So what happened? I suspect that the anti-renewable extremists in the LNP went absolutely ballistic when they saw the report that the LNP planned to shut down coal power plants and, consequently, there was a scramble to immediately remove the closure dates from the Energy

Roadmap. This backflip was driven by a party that has vocal anti-renewable members, receives large donations from fossil fuel companies and relies on votes from climate change deniers. In return, members like those for Mirani, Callide, Maryborough and Rockhampton, who we know do not support net zero, quietly toe the line when they are here in Brisbane.

Make no mistake: there is a massive power play consuming the LNP right now—the anti-renewable ideologues against the more moderates. We have the member for Kawana pulling the plug on renewable energy projects, undermining the member for Toowoomba South. The tragedy is that the mixed signals, the confusion and the uncertainty are sending renewable proponents away from Queensland while Queenslanders pay record high power prices.

Repealing Queensland's legislated renewable energy targets will not only drive up power prices but also damage industry confidence, increase risk and drive clean energy investment into other states. Victoria, South Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory all have legislated renewable energy targets. The Clean Energy Investor Group has reported that already, under the LNP, Queensland has lost our No. 1 spot as the best jurisdiction for clean energy investment. That spot has now gone to New South Wales, thanks to the LNP.

Stakeholders have raised concerns and spoken plainly against the repeal of our renewable energy targets. The Queensland Renewable Energy Council stated—

Our core concern ... is the repeal of the renewable energy targets and the absence of any explicit reference to climate change or decarbonisation pathways in the bill or the accompanying road map.

...

Legislated targets have been instrumental in driving private investment, supporting financial models and aligning industry and government towards a shared goal. Their removal risks weakening Queensland's investment signal for renewables at a time when the state is competing nationally and globally for capital to build the next generation of renewable and storage projects.

...

... there are a number of developers who are reviewing their future pipelines in Queensland, citing the mixed messages from government and inconsistency across approval processes.

The effects of repealing our renewable energy targets will be felt far beyond the clean energy sector. Many industries are using renewables from the Queensland grid as part of their own decarbonisation strategy—industries like mining and resources. As the Queensland Resources Council stated—

... the QRC notes that the changed trajectory for renewables could require further planning and changes to investment decisions. Some resources companies in Queensland have built renewable energy utilisation into their decarbonisation strategies ...

The member for Broadwater when he was opposition leader promised government accountability and clear KPIs, yet this bill will repeal an effective policy mechanism that delivers both. As the Smart Energy Council put it, 'Without clear, measurable targets, the Energy Roadmap becomes a policy without accountability.' Replaced instead with a vague decision matrix, industry is left with more risk and uncertainty. The Energy System Outlook provided in the Energy Roadmap is not even internally consistent. The Clean Energy Council pointed out—

The roadmap's forecast of up to 8 GW of gas-fired generation by 2035 further undermines the sustainability of coal fired power stations in the energy mix where flexible generation will impact upon the economics of these assets.

The Queensland Renewable Energy Council also raised concerns, stating—

The fact that the first investment outlook has been regulated in the bill, the Energy Roadmap section 2, and the fact that there is not sufficient detail in there I think is a little concerning. We would like to see further information on that.

If we consider that the next energy road map is not due for another five years, what does that mean for the investment horizon?

Even the Crisafulli LNP government's own forecasts of increases in gas generation suggest there is no path to coal generators remaining commercially viable over the timelines indicated in their own roadmap. Let me say that again: the government's own forecasts undermine their policy and this bill. This is a government with no credibility, no ability and no clue when it comes to energy policy.

The renewables sector in Queensland was shocked when the member for Kawana cancelled billion dollar renewable energy projects. We saw the Moonlight Range Wind Farm—450 megawatts and \$1 billion worth of investment—called in. Then there was the 1.2-gigawatt \$2 billion Forest Wind Farm that the member for Toowoomba South has moved amendments for which will repeal the Forest Wind Farm Development Act. Let's be clear: what we are talking about is the government

steamrolling over the top of a project where a proponent has spent, I am advised, in the order of \$25 million. This is the definition of sovereign risk which is bad for the Queensland economy, bad for local economies—

Mr Perrett: An absolute hoax—no consultation.

Mr McCALLUM: They do not like it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member for Gympie.

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gympie.

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr McCALLUM: That is right. Here come the tinfoil hats. They are coming out.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, I called you several times then and you continued to shout across the House. I warn you, but just take care.

Mr McCALLUM: There are more projects that are under threat. There is the Marmadua Energy Park—700 megawatts and a 200-megawatt battery—which is under threat of being called in and also the Middle Creek Energy Hub. All up, there is 3.65 gigawatts of renewable energy that represents over \$5 billion worth of investment this government is gunning for because of its anti-renewable ideology.

Recently I heard the energy minister tell a room full of clean energy sector stakeholders, 'Queensland is open for business,' in one breath and then in the next say he 'makes no apology' for repealing the renewable energy targets. This is the kind of arrogance, duplicity and cognitive dissonance that defines both this bill and this government. This bill allows for privatisation by stealth through a framework to funnel in greater private generation as well as privatised transmission infrastructure, including CopperString, along with privatised pumped hydro energy storage projects.

Clause 10 sets different and, in my view, deliberately misleading new public ownership targets for generation and removes the requirement for the minister to prepare and publish a public ownership strategy. Proposed new section 13(1)(a) replaces Labor's previous requirement to set a minimum 54 per cent generation target to be achieved by 2035, replacing it with a very carefully worded target of 'maintaining 100% public ownership of operational generation assets publicly owned on commencement and that remain operational'—snappy but clear as mud.

These are very carefully crafted weasel words. I will expand and tell you why, Mr Deputy Speaker. Under Labor, the law as it stands sets out a legal requirement for a publicly owned generation target of at least 54 per cent of the total generation in our system—locked into law to protect our publicly owned generators. What the LNP are doing with this bill is watering down that requirement and only committing to maintaining ownership of generation that is already 100 per cent publicly owned. How amazing! They are committing to owning something they already own on behalf of the people of Queensland. What that means is that, under the provisions of this bill, new generation can be private. There is no requirement to replace retired publicly owned generation with more publicly owned generation as there would be with the existing 54 per cent overall minimum public ownership law.

The changes around public ownership in this bill are sneaky and deliberately deceptive. They set up a framework for publicly owned generators to be replaced by private ones as our publicly owned power stations are whittled away to nothing, all the while pretending to have set a 100 per cent public ownership target. That's the LNP for you: sneaky, untrustworthy and selling Queenslanders out. We have already seen this occur with the announcement last week that 80 per cent of the new Brigalow gas peaker will be sold off. Selling 80 per cent of a power station that should be fully publicly owned is a gross act of betrayal and economic self-harm. To have CS Energy buy back the power for 25 years is just rubbing salt into the wound.

I fear this is just the beginning of a full scale sell-off of our energy system. The LNP said they would not privatise Queensland's electricity assets, but selling 80 per cent of the Brigalow gas peaker to a private company is privatisation, plain and simple. It is Queenslanders who will pay more as privatisation turboboosts price increases, all because the LNP government has sold them out. The Electrical Trades Union submission made this clear. It states—

The LNP Energy Roadmap is a thinly veiled push for privatisation of the QLD energy system. The LNP is manipulating ownership targets to hide its true agenda to shift the ownership of Queensland transmission and generation assets into private hands, while substantially removing oversight of the Minister's actions.

Furthermore, the Queensland Council of Unions said—

It is a gradual abandonment of public ownership and privatisation by stealth.

Under the bill and policy, the LNP have placed a large 'for sale' sign on Queensland's energy system, despite Queenslanders being crystal clear that their energy system is not for sale. This is a broken promise by the member for Broadwater. I will quote an article in the *Courier-Mail* from last year. It states—

... Mr Crisafulli spruiked certainty, saying should he win office in October cost-of-living measures such as the electricity rebate would stay.

That is a broken promise. It continues—

It has to be in the budget and I'll put the Premier on notice—

meaning the member for Murrumba at the time—

if it's not in your budget, it will be in mine.

Well, that has not dated very well, has it? The article continues—

If government changes in October, Queenslanders need that certainty that that won't change.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, are you going to table that document? Are you still reading from that document?

Mr McCALLUM: I am still reading from it. I will table it in a moment. On the topic of privatisation that article states—

... Mr Crisafulli was adamant selling off assets was 'not on the agenda', saying Queenslanders had made their feelings clear at two elections. 'It shouldn't be on the agenda because you've got to listen to Queenslanders,' he said.

I table the article.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated March 2024, titled 'Cost of living Qld: Leaders outline approach at head-to-head showdown' [1971].

Fast-forward to this bill and our energy system is up for sale. It is not just publicly owned generation that is under threat of privatisation from the LNP. This bill throws the door wide open to privatisation of the CopperString transmission line that should run from Townsville to Mount Isa. When asked if under this legislation the Treasurer would have the power to apply regulation to adjust the regulated asset base and revenue for a private transmission company, at the committee briefing Treasury officials confirmed—

Yes, it is effectively an economic regulation provision to support the delivery of CopperString and it is very much mirroring the approach for the Priority Transmission Investment framework delivered by Powerlink.

Treasury officials also could not rule out that under this legislation a private transmission company could build the western link of CopperString from Hughenden to Mount Isa. When asked if under this bill a private transmission company could build, own and operate a transmission line in Queensland, the Electrical Trades Union said—

I think it has left it wide open to do that. Whether it is intentional or not, certainly there is the opportunity for that to happen under this. All that is protected publicly is the existing transmission, so I do not see how it can not happen.

Under this bill and under the LNP, for the first time Queensland could see a privately owned transmission company operating in Queensland. Labor committed to building the CopperString line all the way to Mount Isa by 2032 whereas the LNP have only committed to delivering the eastern link to Hughenden by 2032. Make no mistake: this is a savage LNP cut. They have cut it in half, and it is the communities from Townsville to Mount Isa and the entire North West Minerals Province that will pay the price.

Worse still, the LNP government cannot give a firm date for when the western link to Mount Isa will be complete. Completing the line to Mount Isa is essential to opening up the North West Minerals Province. It is also essential to existing mining and industrial sectors in the west to help them stay competitive and decarbonise their operation. In the committee hearing on this point the Queensland Resources Council stated—

... we invest in energy infrastructure and decarbonisation. Our sector is investing significantly in lower emissions technologies, renewable energy integration and operational decarbonisation.

However, sequencing of the western link, undisclosed pricing and deliverable delivery timeframes could present issues for resource operators or future investments seeking a line of sight for the final deliverable.

The LNP's piecemeal approach and plan for CopperString means that communities and industry have been left with more uncertainty, wondering if and when it will be built all the way out to Mount Isa and whether or not it will be privately owned by a company that will be squeezing every last cent out of it.

Clause 45 of the bill replaces the purposes for the cost recovery division in part 6, section 68 of the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Act. This new section allows for the recovery of costs associated with the hub transmission network incurred by AEMO, the federal regulator, in addition to the costs incurred by transmission network service providers. However, concerning, clause 47 inserts new section 69A, which expands on the previous definition to include—and I will read from the explanatory notes here—

A government member: Already in consideration in detail.

Mr McCALLUM: I know it is probably a little confusing for some across the aisle. Perhaps they can pay attention. The explanatory notes state—

... any costs, expenses or other financial outgoings incurred by the service provider. This includes, for example, payments to investors to provide a return on capital, depreciation, government taxes ...

It is important to note that the term 'network service provider' is not used here, rather 'investor' and 'payments to provide a return on capital'. To me it is plain that, with this new clause and framework, the LNP is deliberately opening the door for privatisation in regional energy hubs. I call on the minister to provide clarity on the record and rule out privatising the regional energy hubs. The communities where they will be built deserve to know and so does the rest of Queensland.

Central to the Energy Roadmap policy is the LNP's vague generator decision matrix mechanism for state owned coal assets that has left industry and communities with more risk and uncertainty. Instead of firm dates around retirements, the LNP have offered up the decision matrix. I quote from the policy—

This decision matrix triangulates system need, asset integrity, and economic viability of state-owned coal units.

In my view, a better description would be that the LNP's decision matrix triangulates uncertainty with incompetence and ignorance—the LNP trifecta. It seems that stakeholders are not big fans, either. Of the decision matrix, the Queensland Renewable Energy Council submission says—

... the current level of detail is inadequate to guide transparent and consistent decision-making across the sector.

In a committee hearing on 29 October QREC also said—

... greater clarity is needed on how these mechanisms will operate and how decisions such as the new power station timeframe matrix will be made ...

They also said—

The decision matrix has several instances that are a bit ambiguous at the moment and where we would seek some clarity. For example, how will system need be determined? What are the quantitative boundary conditions? What are the performance metrics? What is the weighting of cost competitiveness? What are the definitions of fuel security?

At the committee briefing I asked Treasury officials—

... using the criteria in the policy, if a coal generator was required to shut down would it be the department's recommendation that it do so, so there would be advice provided to the minister?

The response was—

Yes, you are right; the Energy Roadmap includes a decision matrix to inform executive government consideration around the operation of coal assets. Those factors relate to system need first and foremost, asset integrity and economic viability.

I then asked if it was correct the coal generators could be closed much earlier if the decision—

Debate, on motion of Mr McCallum, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.00 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Natural Disasters, Recovery



Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (9.00 pm): In this final sitting week, I want to acknowledge the people who keep our community safe, united and connected—our frontline workers, SES volunteers, neighbourhood centres, nurses and teachers, community sport and arts groups, and the thousands of

locals who simply show up for one another. They have carried a heavy load this year and deserve a proper break and a safe and restful summer and the confidence that their elected representatives are working just as hard to protect the communities that they serve.

That brings me to the reality facing Queensland as we head into storm season—although, as many families have experienced, it started early again this year. The weather patterns we grew up with are shifting. Storms are more intense and more unpredictable and the recovery time between disasters is shrinking. This is now the lived reality of thousands of Queensland households. The division of Brisbane is among the top 10 electorates in the country most impacted by climate related disasters. That means higher insurance premiums, more strain on emergency services, disrupted small businesses and more pressure on households, especially women who we know shoulder the burden of unpaid labour in disaster recovery.

Nowhere is the failure of current systems more visible than the ongoing recovery from the February floods. There are families in my electorate who are still navigating state and local government approval processes just to rebuild their properties—10 months on. Rapidly rising creeks have caused severe land erosion to these properties, leaving some households more than \$50,000 out of pocket before a shovel has even hit the ground. It is extraordinary—and, frankly, unacceptable—that individual landholders are left solely responsible for creek care and for rebuilding creek banks after a catastrophic flood. Neither the state government nor the Brisbane City Council has offered these families meaningful assistance. Instead, home owners have been left to carry enormous personal and financial burdens created by forces far beyond their control.

At the same time, the Queensland government this week moves to wind back renewable energy targets and the Brisbane City Council continues to offer no serious commitments, no timelines and no reassurances on climate adaptation. Queenslanders deserve better. We need coordinated investment in flood resilient infrastructure, urban cooling, early warning systems, community disaster hubs and the skills and jobs that will sustain this work for decades.

As parliament breaks for the year, Queensland is heading into another period of extreme weather. I want it clearly on the record that communities deserve more than reactive clean-ups and sympathy. They deserve confidence that every level of government is acting in their long-term interests—planning ahead, reducing risk and ensuring families are not left alone to navigate impossible costs and endless approvals.

Joyce Newton OAM Memorial Bursary



Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (9.03 pm): Tonight I rise to acknowledge and celebrate our 2025 Joyce Newton OAM Memorial Bursary recipient, Ephraim Hobbs. It is a great privilege to honour my dear friend Joyce each year through this bursary. Many members will know her name, as I have spoken fondly of Joyce over the years. Joyce Newton OAM was a dedicated teacher with a strong and unwavering commitment to her community. Her contributions were truly immeasurable.

After immigrating to Australia in July 1974, Joyce and her husband, Greg, made their home in Maleny. From running the Maleny blood bank each month at the hospital to establishing a nursing mothers group, a playgroup and a kindergarten, through to serving as president of the Maleny Swimming Club, Joyce's service knew no bounds. She earned life membership of the Maleny soccer club after more than 10 years on the executive committee. Her community involvement extended to Girl Guides, teaching at Maleny State High School and serving on the Maleny Community Centre management committee. Indeed, there are simply too many achievements to list.

Tragically, Joyce was diagnosed with motor neurone disease in early 2017 and given less than 12 months to live. She fought bravely until her passing in October 2018. With the blessing of Joyce's family I established this annual bursary for a year 12 student who demonstrates strong community connection and dedication, qualities Joyce embodied. The bursary includes a celebratory dinner in parliament with me and Joyce's family along with a \$1,000 Concept IT voucher to support a recipient's ongoing studies.


This year I am proud to present the bursary to a hardworking young man, Ephraim Hobbs of St Columban's College, Caboolture—at least until recently. His application showed impressive academic achievement, a love of sports and teamwork, and leadership experience as a justice and advocacy captain. He has also volunteered with his church's youth group, participated in medical missions to Cambodia and contributed to children's ministry—all traits that beautifully reflect Joyce's spirit.

Ephraim recently graduated year 12 and has been accepted to study a Bachelor of Nursing Science at the University of the Sunshine Coast next year. He hopes to continue with postgraduate studies in paramedicine, ultimately achieving a double degree. His passion for health care was inspired by his mother's career in nursing, particularly her work in palliative care. In his application, Ephraim shared that he has always been driven to help others and wants to make a meaningful impact in the healthcare sector, believing it will bring personal fulfilment while allowing him to contribute positively to the wider community.

I was delighted just now to host Ephraim and his parents, Crystal and Samuel, for that dinner here in parliament tonight. To Ephraim I say: you are an incredible and intelligent young man with big aspirations. I look forward to watching your journey and seeing the impact you will undoubtedly make in the years ahead.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Before we proceed, members, I understand former premier Rob Borbidge is in the gallery.

Coopers Plains, Level Crossing Removal; Public Service, Wages and Conditions


 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (9.06 pm): Tonight I rise on behalf of the frustrated residents of Stretton on the south side to demand answers from the Crisafulli LNP government about why the Boundary Road level crossing removal at Coopers Plains has ground to a halt. Under Labor, this project was shovel-ready. By 2023, extensive community consultation was complete, geotechnical investigations were finished and detailed design was done. All that was left was to call tenders and start construction. Nearly 14 months into the LNP government there is still no tender, no start date, no timeline and no transparency. A cloud of secrecy has replaced progress.

Boundary Road is not a quiet back street; it is a vital industrial and commuter corridor linking Coopers Plains, Archerfield and Sunnybank Hills. Thousands of vehicles use it daily. Every peak hour the boom gates slam shut for freight and passenger trains, creating congestion, safety risks and loss of productivity. Tradies are late to jobs, parents are late to pick up their kids and local businesses bleed time and money. The community's patience is exhausted.

The government boasts spending billions in its capital program over the forward estimates. If it can find billions for its pet projects, it can surely find the relatively modest amount of funds and the political will to get moving on this project that was fully prepared before the last election. Queenslanders are tired of the excuses and blame-shifting. They are sick of the LNP blaming the previous government, ducking and weaving and breaking promises. They want safer roads and shorter commutes, not glossy brochures and staged photo opportunities. The people in my community deserve straight answers. When will the construction tender finally be released? When will the first sod be turned? When will the diggers appear onsite?

In the time I have remaining I want to send a clear message of solidarity to every radiation therapist and nuclear medicine scientist facing a 25 per cent pay cut because of this government's refusal to honour fair classifications. I say: Labor stands with you and your union. To every Queensland teacher who has been forced to stop work in the fight for fair pay and respect, I say: the opposition stands shoulder to shoulder with you and your union. You deserve better than a real wage cut, broken promises and total disregard for your safety at work. Before the election, the LNP told public servants they had nothing to fear. After the election the story changed. First it was teachers; now it is radiation therapists and scientists. The question is: who is next? Under the LNP government, no public servant's pay, conditions or job is safe. Queenslanders expect fairness for the workers who keep our state running. It is time this government delivered on what they promised.

Cordingley, Ms T

 **Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (9.09 pm): I rise today with a heavy heart on behalf of a community that has waited seven long years for justice. I rise for a young woman whose name has become synonymous with heartbreak across Far North Queensland—Toyah Cordingley. Toyah was just 24—a gentle, humble, loving young woman who dedicated her life to caring for others. She volunteered at an animal shelter, she worked in a local health food store and she adored her family, her friends and her dog, Indi. She lived quietly and kindly with a generosity of spirit that touched everyone who knew her, but on one devastating afternoon in October 2018 Toyah's life was stolen in one of the most horrific crimes our region has ever endured. She went for a simple walk on Wangetti Beach—a walk any one of us could have taken—and she never came home. The shock of that loss did not fade, the violent nature of this crime sickened us all to our core and that pain has rippled outward

from her family to friends, to our entire community, to people who never met Toyah but felt the injustice of her absence. The Cordingley family has endured the unimaginable. Their strength, dignity and unwavering determination in the face of unthinkable pain has been a testament to who Toyah was and the love that she inspired.

Today, after years of delays, obstacles and uncertainty, the Cairns community finally heard the words that they prayed for—a guilty verdict and life in jail for the offender, with a minimum non-parole period of 25 years. I want to acknowledge the dedication of the Queensland Police Service, investigative teams, prosecutors and volunteers who worked tirelessly to achieve this result. This verdict does not heal the wound and it cannot bring back the beautiful young woman whose life was taken so senselessly, but it does bring something the community has yearned for—a measure of justice, a recognition that Toyah mattered and that someone will finally be held accountable. Our community has been hurting for a very long time and you could feel it in the vigils, in the sunflower stickers on cars and shop windows, in conversations at local markets and in quiet moments on that beach where people stop and remember her. Toyah's name has become a symbol of grief, yes, but also of unity, resilience and a collective determination to see justice done. So today we honour Toyah's memory, we honour the light that she brought into the world, we honour the years of pain her family have endured and we honour the strength of a community that has refused to give up or let Toyah ever be forgotten.

Far North Queensland stands with Toyah's family, we stand with every woman who deserves to feel safe and we stand against violence that steals our daughters, sisters, friends and our futures. Today as her killer begins a life sentence behind bars, those who loved Toyah continue their own life sentence—a lifetime of grief, of memories that should have been future moments and not fading photographs. Toyah, your community carried you in our hearts for seven years while waiting for justice and, though nothing can erase the pain borne by those who loved you, we will ensure your memory endures not as a victim of cruelty but as a beacon of compassion that drives us to build a safer, kinder future in your name.

Hauritz, Mr B; Kurwongbah Electorate, Storms



Mr KING (Kurwongbah—ALP) (9.12 pm): Firstly I want to quickly acknowledge the work and life of a friend to many in this place, Bill Hauritz, who passed this week. As the founder of the Woodford Folk Festival with Amanda Jackes, he leaves a legacy few could come close to and he will be sorely missed. My condolences to Ingrid and his family. Vale, Bill.


I want to express my sympathy to everyone affected by recent storms and windy wild weather. I know many homes across my electorate were hit hard during the southern coast severe storms in November. Many locals lost power—me included—across the suburbs of Burpengary, Narangba, Kurwongbah, Whiteside, Petrie, Lawnton, Bray Park and Joyner. Some households lost power for between 12 and 24 hours, while in other parts of my electorate the power was out for almost a week. These outages were evident on the Energex website. My office was inundated with phone calls and emails, as I am sure many other members' offices were too, from constituents who had to throw out their food, constituents who could not go to work and those trying to cope with recovery expenses such as removing fallen trees, repairing damaged property and fixing broken fences. Around a third of the residents in Burpengary Pines, a manufactured home village for over-50s, were without power for five days. I want to give a shout-out to the residents and management there who tried to look after each other while they struggled to stay cool and access fresh food.

I was heartened to hear the announcement on 27 November that disaster recovery assistance had been activated for Moreton Bay. When I checked the list of eligible suburbs, only Kurwongbah and Whiteside made the cut despite clear evidence of severe damage and ongoing power outages across many more suburbs. It is disappointing that I had to write to the Minister for Disaster Recovery to point this out.

While I am thankful the government listened and added Burpengary, Narangba, Petrie, Lawnton and eventually Joyner to the list of eligible suburbs, Bray Park is still missing—a fact I also pointed out to the minister in an email 11 days ago. My office continues to take calls from Bray Park residents who lost food and had damage to property during the storms, and there are plenty of examples on neighbourhood Facebook pages, too. I am calling on the minister to please get this sorted and add Bray Park to the list. I am sure the local council will not stand in your way. If they do, please let me know. With Christmas fast approaching, every cent counts. It is only fair that all families affected by the storms should get our help. That is what happened after ex-Tropical Cyclone Alfred and what should be happening now.

I will conclude by thanking the hardworking Energex crews who worked around the clock in terrible conditions to restore power to all households as quickly as possible. Those brave men and women—it is dangerous work restoring power and high voltage, I know well—gave up time with their own families, their own showers and their own beds to make sure Queenslanders were safely reconnected. I thank them again for everything they do. For those who choose to get abusive to our Energex colleagues and friends: please think what they are going through before you do that because they are out there saving us and restoring our power.

Howatson, Mr KL


 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (9.15 pm): The Chatsworth community has lost a stalwart. I, along with members of my local LNP branch, was devastated when we found out that our mate and colleague Ken Howatson had passed away recently. Kenneth Lachlan Howatson was born on 9 October 1952 and was only 73 years old. He moved from Brisbane to Melbourne as a child and undertook his schooling there before starting a long career at the Ford Motor Company. Indeed, one of his pride and joys was his late-model Ford Mustang, which was kept in immaculate showroom condition. Ken came back to Brisbane in 1993 and worked in project and service management in the aged-care industry with a variety of companies including TriCare, PresCare, Southern Cross Care and Mercy Health.

Ken's life revolved around service to the local community and he was always giving back. He was a member and past president of the Camp Hill Carindale Lions Club. Ken was heavily involved in their Australia Day citizenship ceremony, which has been successfully running now for many years. Eventually he became involved in the Rotary Club of Carindale and held several board positions including club secretary and club president. For close to 20 years Ken was in charge of fundraising, and he implemented the hugely successful footy seats initiative. This fundraising initiative driven by Ken helped raise approximately \$400,000, according to the Carindale Rotary Club. It is no wonder he was bestowed with a Paul Harris Fellow for his service to the club. Ken was made an honorary member of the Carindale Rotary Club five months ago—a well-deserved honour. They say you cannot tie a busy person down, and my mate was no exception. In his retirement he kept himself busy and became an airport greeter a couple of times per week. He also applied to become a Brisbane greeter at the Queen Street Mall.

My involvement with Ken, of course, was through the local LNP branch and SEC in which Ken held many roles. He was an active member of my Chatsworth campaign team. When we have our next campaign meeting early next year I will be setting aside a seat for Ken. He was well regarded by all LNP members who knew and respected him. Ken was my booth captain at several elections and, along with his great mate Drewe Freeburn, would often assist with roadsiding at the corner of Old Cleveland Road and Scrub Road.

Ken is survived by his loving partner, Jan, his mother and two sisters. He was an AFL tragic, especially the Melbourne Demons. He was a Ford enthusiast and avid music fan, particularly Pink Floyd and Led Zeppelin. He played his music on vinyl, the way it should be played, and he liked it loud. He was reliable, hardworking and community minded and had a heart of gold and a wonderful smile. Above all else, he was my mate. Vale, Kenneth Lachlan Howatson. You will be sorely missed, my friend.

Gambling


 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (9.18 pm): Given the disallowance motion last sitting I put this speech aside. However, with the lack of support for that motion and the 894 days of inaction since the federal government received the Murphy report which recommended urgent action to reduce gambling related harm affecting our communities I had no option other than to raise it again. Queenslanders lose in excess of \$6 billion to gambling annually, exceeding spending on essential utilities like electricity and gas. One in three Australian children aged 12 to 17 years are already gambling, increasing to one in two for 18- to 19-year-olds. With suicide the leading cause of death for young Australians and gambling a known risk factor we must protect them. That is our job as adults and as legislators.

Gambling harm is also linked to domestic violence, declining mental health and financial hardship. Our young people are being aggressively targeted and groomed by gambling ads and seemingly fun games via apps such as Roblox, which has 160 million users under the age of 13 worldwide. Young Queenslanders are opening online gaming accounts with devastating speed and ease, using the IDs of their parents or older siblings. Travelling to and from school on public transport offers no escape. Queensland lags behind Victoria, New South Wales and South Australia which have

banned these ads on public transport and surrounding areas of train stations and bus stops. We can take immediate steps to remedy this. To start, Queensland Rail generates less than \$345,000 per year, under five per cent of their total advertising revenue, from gambling ads so why don't we get rid of them? The economics do not justify the inaction, especially when the harm generated is extensive and expensive. Governments should never promote or profit from gambling, nor should political parties or MPs be funded by the proceeds of gambling.

To end this, simply end all donations and follow South Australia's lead. It has been wonderful to see that Noosa Yacht & Rowing Club will remove all onsite gambling and councils are revisiting their policies on land they manage and gaming. What are we doing in this chamber? Like any addiction, whether cigarettes, alcohol or illicit substances, we should not be promoting gambling, especially to our young people. Yes, gambling is in Aussies' blood. However, it should be a bit of fun, a flutter, not what it has become for some whose addictions are seeing their health, happiness, families and finances going into a game that they can never win. Come on, everyone; we can do better for our kids and our grandkids.

Currumbin Electorate, Community Champion Awards

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.21 pm): Tonight I want to acknowledge all of the nominees and award recipients from my community champion awards night held this month. It acknowledged some extraordinary individuals in the category of young person, community organisation, small business and teacher. I want this House to acknowledge the nominees and award recipients of those categories. For young person of the year we had Jemma Wagner and Amelie Austen. Jemma is a Coolangatta surf lifesaver. She has earned 97 patrol hours and assisted with water safety. She holds 45 association awards, has served as a leader at SLSQ's excellence program and is a driving force behind their sustainability. Amelie Austen is an extraordinary young role model and entrepreneur in our community. The winner of young person of the year was Lucas Berezwick. He was nominated by Currumbin Beach Vikings Surf Club for his outstanding contribution to the club. He suffered some personal setbacks with an ACL injury, but that did not stop him. Rather than stepping back he stepped up. He obtained his silver medal, became patrol captain and volunteered over 43 hours.

Next we have small business of the year. We had three finalists in the small business of the year category. The first is Chef Frankie's, who brings Italian soul to our Currumbin community. He brings amazing Italian pasta. One of my favourites is his lasagne. The next nominee was Tugun Village Florist. Penny is a true community champion. Penny makes all of the wreaths that I take for events I go to, including Anzac Day. The winner was Made barber and barista. Josh and Britt are a powerhouse couple who do not just run a barber shop and a cafe but they pour their hearts into everything they do. It makes up the fabric of our community. I was so proud to acknowledge these amazing small businesses in our community.

The next was teacher of the year. Three teachers were acknowledged at my awards. There was Taya Lindner, Marie Turner and Vicky Straw. Taya and Marie are both from Elanora State High School. The students themselves nominated these teachers for the way that they have contributed to their lives. The winner was Vicky Straw from Ingleside State School. I want to read out what one of the students said about Vicky—


She has helped students at her school improve their academic performance with one parent saying Vicky has supported our daughter to reach excellence in her schooling beyond what we even thought was possible.

It is an amazing achievement, Vicky.

Next were the community organisations. The finalists were the Tugun Girl Guides, Elanora State High School's Leo Club and our Country Women's Association ladies. The winner was our Country Women's Association for the work that they do supporting victims of domestic and family violence.

Finally, we had volunteer of the year. We had Lisa Andresen from Currumbin Wildlife Sanctuary, Aylana Watkins from Tugun Girl Guides and Teaghan Hartigan—go the Currumbin Sheagles!—who was the winner.

Far North Queensland, Tourism Industry

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (9.24 pm): The Crisafulli government's handling of tourism in Queensland, particularly in the far north, has become a masterclass in disconnection, delay and directionless decision-making. In one of the most tourism dependent regions of Australia, the

government has managed to preside over declining aviation access, the loss of major events, bungled investment opportunities and a parade of red tape that is now strangling the very industry it claims to champion.


Nothing illustrates this dysfunction more clearly than the Double Island fiasco. Here lies a prime opportunity: an iconic location with a serious investor who is prepared to spend millions of dollars and yet the government has tied the entire process in knots. Instead of clearing a path, they have blocked it at every turn. Remarkably, this is taking place after the Premier told a recent tourism forum that he had established the Queensland Tourism Cabinet Committee. Guess what their job is? Removing roadblocks for new projects! Can you believe it? This simple project has been in the pipes for 14 months.

The same story is playing out with the Wangetti Trail, which is a potential world-class project hailed as a transformative tourism drawcard, but in 14 months it has not progressed past where the previous government left it. Under the Crisafulli government, the project has simply lost its way. The lack of commitment from the local state member, who has stated he has different priorities, is now seen as a significant sign that the project has fallen off the government's priority list. Instead of delivering the visionary new trail promised to the region, the government appears content on recycling old tracks and calling it a solution.

Perhaps the most damaging fail of all is with aviation. In a decentralised state like Queensland, aviation access is the lifeblood of tourism. If the tourism minister knew anything about tourism, he would know of the importance of airline connectivity. Under the Crisafulli government's Connecting Queensland Fund, there is not a single new aviation agreement or even an announcement—not one—since they came to power. Instead, we are going backwards. We are losing airline services like AirAsia and still there are no permanent scheduled Cathay Pacific flights, just seasonal flights. This is happening at a time when every other tourism region in Asia-Pacific is fighting tooth and nail to expand their airline connectivity.

However, the damage does not stop there. The state government pulled funding for Crankworx, Cairns is not getting anything from the upcoming Rugby League World Cup and we are hearing crickets about any international cricket. The fresh start that the Premier talks about is looking a lot more like a joke.

King, Mr J

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (9.27 pm): The Greens political party have abandoned every founding principle they once claimed to stand for and are now completely bereft of any credibility. The Greens political party began as a single-issue environmental movement, but now it has mutated into a hard left-wing ideological outfit driven by Marxist activism and anarchist disruption. The Greens political party have even attempted to expel their own co-founder, Drew Hutton, in a decision that was criticised by former Greens federal leader and former senator Bob Brown. Their ideological decay is not abstract. It plays out in real communities including the western suburbs of Brisbane where division, bitterness and hostility have been actively encouraged by elected Greens representatives and by the extreme fringe they attract.

One of the most visible examples of this toxic culture is a prominent Greens political party aligned supporter and booth worker, Peter Jack King, otherwise known as Jack King. Jack King has held senior roles in major media organisations, including the BBC and the ABC, as a TV producer. Jack King is an active supporter of some of the most divisive, destructive and socially corrosive content circulating in our community. His social media posts and other commentary have included material that many Queenslanders view as racist, openly anti-Semitic, hostile to the LGBTIQ community and dripping with contempt for basic democratic values. These are not the views of someone committed to community building; these are the views of someone intent on tearing communities apart.

Jack King has publicly amplified extremist groups and causes, including material supportive of Palestine Action, which is a proscribed terrorist organisation in the United Kingdom. He has promoted rhetoric that excuses and celebrates violence, that demeans minority groups and that fuels anger rather than understanding. He has also amplified authoritarian regimes overseas, including seemingly promoting individuals who have seized power through coups, suppressed freedoms, targeted critics and criminalised entire communities, including the LGBTIQ community.

This is someone embraced by and applauded by elements within the Greens political movement. His language is their language. His hostility is their hostility. His division is the predictable product of the political culture the Greens political party has created. When a party deliberately cultivates rage, when it rewards agitation over contribution, when it treats hatred as a political weapon, it creates space for contemptible individuals to thrive.

Queenslanders reject this brand of politics. They reject the extremism, they reject the division and they certainly reject the toxic influence of individuals like Jack King who embody everything that is wrong with those who support the modern Greens political party. For the benefit of the House, I table the following articles and social media posts.

Tabled paper: Bundle of social media posts and media articles regarding Jack King [[1972](#)].

I will always call out such disgraceful behaviour which is not in the interests of a civic and civil society.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, Pease, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Sullivan, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young