

TO BE IN TIME FOR CORRECTION
PROOFS MUST BE RETURNED
BY 12 noon TO THE
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

ISSN 1322-0330



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS (PROOF)

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 24 March 2026

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	621
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 11 March 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 11 March 2026.	621
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	621
Absence of Member	621
Parliament House, Artwork	621
PRIVILEGE	622
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	622
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the member for Sandgate.	623
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	623
Visitors to Public Gallery	623
PETITIONS	623
TABLED PAPERS	624
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	627
Weather Events, Recovery	627
Weather Events, Recovery	628
Primary Industries, Weather Events	628
Fuel Security	629
Fuel Security	630
Fuel Security	630
Fuel Security; E-Mobility Safety	631
Public Transport, Fares; Industrial Relations	632
Bray Park State High School; Schoolteachers, Salary Rate	633
NOTICES OF MOTION	634
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	634

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 24 March 2026

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument.....	634
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	634
Members of Parliament, Anniversary.....	634
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE.....	634
Queensland Rail, Workforce.....	634
Fuel Security.....	635
Fuel Security.....	636
Fuel Security.....	637
Fuel Security.....	637
Fuel Security.....	638
CFMEU.....	639
Transport Industry, Fuel Security.....	640
Transport Infrastructure.....	641
Public Transport, Public Facilities.....	641
Procurement.....	643
Resources Industries, Royalties.....	643
Crisafulli LNP Government, Achievements.....	644
Public Transport, Accessibility.....	644
Integrity in Government.....	645
Queensland Rail, Workforce.....	646
APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) (SUPPLEMENTARY 2024-2025) BILL.....	646
Cognate Debate.....	646
ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	646
Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order.....	646
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	652
Resolved in the affirmative.....	652
MOTIONS.....	652
Suspension of Sessional Orders.....	652
Dissent from Speaker's Ruling.....	652
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents regarding the conflict in Gaza.....	655
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	658
Resolved in the negative.....	658
ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	658
Second Reading.....	658
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST.....	665
Fuel Security.....	665
E-Mobility Safety.....	666
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 19 March 2026, by Queensland Rail, titled 'Queensland Rail shuts down false scare campaign, locks in job security and better customer service'.....	667
Fuel Security.....	667
Fuel Security.....	668
Fuel Security.....	669
Fuel Security.....	670
Bundaberg, Weather Events.....	671
Fuel Security.....	672
Fuel Security.....	673
Fuel Security.....	674
Gas Industry.....	675
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from The Australia Institute, dated May 2025, titled 'Queensland LNG exports and tax'.....	676
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from The Australia Institute, dated May 2025, titled 'Government revenue from LNG exports: Australia vs Qatar'.....	676
ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	676
Second Reading.....	676
ADJOURNMENT.....	724
Bundaberg, Weather Event.....	724
Mudgeeraba Electorate.....	725
Mount Ommaney Electorate, Infrastructure; Fuel Security.....	725
Oodgeroo Electorate, Cost-of-Living Relief.....	726
Ipswich West Electorate, Housing.....	726
Weather Events, Recovery; Fuel Security.....	727
Community Safety.....	727
Toowoomba PCYC.....	729
Open Data.....	729
Scenic Rim Electorate, Fuel Security.....	730
ATTENDANCE.....	730

TUESDAY, 24 MARCH 2026

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.

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: 11 March 2026

A bill for an Act to amend the City of Brisbane Act 2010, the City of Brisbane Regulation 2012, the Local Government Act 2009, the Local Government Regulation 2012, the Local Government Electoral Act 2011, the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to amend the Criminal Code, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Police Service Administration Regulation 2016, the Queensland Community Safety Act 2024, the Weapons Act 1990, the Weapons Regulation 2016, the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 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

11 March 2026

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 11 March 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 11 March 2026.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Absence of Member



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Southern Downs that he will be absent from the House on 24 and 25 March. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

Parliament House, Artwork



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, this sitting week we are showcasing two more works from the Regional Council Artwork Collection, originally assembled in 1979 to mark the completion of the Parliamentary Annexe. The first work, titled *Towards Miles from 'Jay Dee'*, is by Queensland artist Jo

Smiles. Smiles was born in Queensland and studied at the Flying Art School, a not-for-profit organisation supporting visual and media arts across regional and remote Queensland. There she developed her watercolour technique under the guidance of prominent artists, and her work is now held in collections in America, England and Malaysia. This artwork was donated by the former Murilla Shire Council, which is now part of the Western Downs Regional Council.

The second artwork, *Stability and Growth*, is by Joselyn Rogerson from the Queensland Central Highlands. Rogerson, from Emerald, is well known for her watercolour paintings and pen and ink drawings, with her work recognised at regional shows and exhibitions. This artwork was donated by the Peak Downs Shire Council, now incorporated into the Central Highlands Regional Council.

Next sitting week we will feature two more artworks, continuing our showcasing of the regional communities represented in the chamber.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 17 February 2026, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services wrote to me alleging that the member for Sandgate deliberately misled the House on 11 February 2026. The statement by the member asserted that the minister had disbanded a specialist family and domestic violence unit within the Queensland Police Service. The minister argued that the specialist unit in question has undertaken a realignment and reprioritisation of resources. He used the term 'disseminated', whereas the member argued that the specialist unit had been broken up and used the term 'disbanded'. This is a matter of opinion, involving semantics, where the minister and the member disagree on the meaning of a word. Accordingly, I find that the matter is both technical and trivial. 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. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 17 February 2026, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services wrote to me alleging that the member for Sandgate deliberately misled the House on 11 February 2026.

The matter relates to statements made during a private members' motion.

Specifically, the member said:

The unit which was disbanded by the minister is a specialist unit to provide support and drive the QPS's capabilities to prevent, disrupt, investigate and respond to incidents involving family and domestic violence and harm to vulnerable persons.

The minister argued that no units had been disbanded, and rather the QPS is undertaking a realignment and prioritisation of resources to ensure the Service is best positioned to support frontline policing capability, strengthen operational responsiveness and maximise community safety outcomes.

The minister also provided excerpts from a press conference with the Assistant Commissioner of QPS from 2 February 2026 where he explained that the policy area within DV Command is moving to the Office of the Commissioner, the training element within the Command is moving to the Recruit and Development Command and the Operational Support Unit which is 14 Sergeants is moving to the frontline.

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

The member submitted that the term 'disbanded' is defined as 'to break up or cause to break up' and that the minister himself and the Assistant Commissioner of the Queensland Police Services admitted that centralised services are being broken up and going to different areas.

The member also submitted that she was factually correct when stating the decision was made by the minister because the minister welcomed the 100-day review and as the responsible minister would have taken the matter to Cabinet and subsequently changes occurred within the Queensland Police Service, including the disbandment or decentralisation of the unit in question.

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

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

The Minister is arguing that the specialist unit in question has undertaken a realignment and reprioritisation of resources. He uses the term 'disseminated'. Whereas the member is arguing that the specialist unit in question has been broken up and uses the term 'disbanded'.

This is a matter of opinion, involving semantics, where the Minister and the member disagree on the meaning of a word.

Accordingly, I find that the matter is both technical and trivial.

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 member for Sandgate.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to Public Gallery



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from: St Pius Catholic Primary School, Banyo, in the electorate of Nudgee; Hope Adventist School in the electorate of Bundaberg; Bray Park State High School in the electorate of Pine Rivers; and Sherwood State School in the electorate of Miller.

PETITIONS

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

Mt Challenger Wind Farm Project

1,770 petitioners, requesting the House to suspend the proposed Mt Challenger and Crystal Brook/Kelsey Creek Wind Farm Project in its current form and assess alternative, more suitable sites.

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

Tiaro Bypass

Mr Barounis, from 4,687 petitioners, requesting the House to commence construction of the Tiaro bypass on the Bruce Highway.

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

Wynnum and Manly, Residential Planning

445 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that the outcomes of the current public consultation process on proposed amendments to the Low Medium Density Residential planning provisions affecting the Wynnum and Manly areas are fully considered before the government finalises its review.

Local Government Elections, Candidate Eligibility

2,048 petitioners, requesting the House to prevent persons with any association to real estate or property development being eligible for election to a Queensland council.

Child Abuse Material, Legislation

11,777 petitioners, requesting the House to review sentencing laws and guidelines relating to the possession, viewing and intentional searching of child abuse material in Queensland and to ensure stronger penalties and sentencing provisions reflect the seriousness of these offences.

Snapper Rocks to Rainbow Bay, Foreshore Precinct Draft Master Plan

3,105 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct an independent inquiry into the Snapper Rocks to Rainbow Bay Foreshore Precinct Draft Master Plan.

Basketball Courts, Residential Areas

137 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the requirements for all existing and newly constructed basketball courts so they must be located no less than 200 metres from residential homes and introduce a playing curfew between 1700 and 0900.

Proserpine, Bruce Highway Upgrade

415 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the Goorganga Plains and Myrtle Creek sections of the Bruce Highway near Proserpine.

Proserpine Hospital

333 petitioners, requesting the House to construct a new multistorey Proserpine Hospital.

Toowoomba Hospital, Maternity Services Review

772 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure an independent Part 9 investigation into the maternity unit at Toowoomba Hospital.

Housing, Fly Screens

522 petitioners, requesting the House to change the law so fly screens are mandatory on all windows and doors in homes throughout Queensland.

E-Mobility Safety

2,147 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to strengthen Queensland's e-mobility safety framework.

Baffle Creek, Development Proposals

695 petitioners, requesting the House to reject any development proposals for industrial sites in the Baffle Creek catchment and head waters.

Self-Defence

3,594 petitioners, requesting the House to allow citizens to defend themselves without fear of prosecution and allow self-defence of the home as a genuine reason to own a firearm.

Warwick-Toowoomba Rail Corridor, Upgrade

561 petitioners, requesting the House to Upgrade the Warwick—Toowoomba Rail Corridor for regional communities.

Social Housing

937 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a Department of Housing service that assists waitlist patrons gain housing while waiting for their housing allocation.

Homelessness

1,421 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure an Amnesty to homeless persons who are camping in make-shift dwellings, their car, or tents, on public land, car parks or gardens to protect them from council fines or prosecution.

Penalties and Sentences Act

2,770 petitioners, requesting the House to reform Queensland's sentencing framework and repeal s 9(2) (f) and s 9(6) (a), and amend s 9(6) (h) of the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992.

Musgrave Park Cultural Centre

524 petitioners, requesting the House to finish the Musgrave Park Cultural Centre.

Brisbane Stadium

1,950 petitioners, requesting the House to stop state funding for the Olympic stadium/precinct at Barrambin/Victoria Park.

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—

6 March 2026—

[293](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 28, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 19 November 2025 and 9 December 2025

[294](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 22, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled on 9 December 2025

9 March 2026—

[295](#) Ethics Committee: Report No 242, 58th Parliament—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 20 May 2025 relating to an allegation of publishing a false or misleading account of proceedings of the House by the member for Bundaberg

11 March 2026—

[296](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4373-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,708 petitioners, requesting the House to protect residents from home insurance premium costs driven by Temporary Local Planning Instruments

[297](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4322-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,775 petitioners, requesting the House to restrict further development and population growth on Tamborine Mountain

12 March 2026—

- [298](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4352-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,074 petitioners, requesting the House to put forward a referendum to enshrine the right of citizens to veto recent parliamentary legislation or government and/or local government regulations
- [299](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4363-26), sponsored by the member for Moggill, Dr Rowan, from 1,084 petitioners, requesting the House to request the Federal Government call a Royal Commission into Antisemitism
- [300](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4365-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 683 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct a referendum or a statewide postal survey before changing the Electoral Laws (Restoring Electoral Fairness) Amendment Bill 2025
- [301](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4381-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 953 petitioners, requesting the House to support serious penalty and consequences to antisemitism acts, strengthening legislation on antisemitic conduct and intimidating protest activity
- [302](#) Response from the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Perrett), to an E-Petition (4274-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,068 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to stop social media platforms showing the online torture of animals
- [303](#) Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee: Report No. 9, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 27 August 2025 and 9 December 2025
- [304](#) Response from the Minister for Education and the Arts (Hon. Langbroek), to an E-Petition (4358-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 354 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to provide flexible early entry to Prep for children with disabilities and diverse needs
- [305](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4296-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 813 petitioners, requesting the House to reduce and eventually phase out the use of train Klaxon horns on all residential rail corridors
- [306](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4337-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 833 petitioners, requesting the House to design and build the new Barron River Bridge to accommodate microbats
- [307](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4374-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,349 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate the 100 km/h speed limit along the Warrego Highway, east from the Mount Crosby to Warrego Highway onramp over the Bremer Bridge and for TMR to only reduce the speed limits at the times windfarm components need to travel that section of the highway
- [308](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4379-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 384 petitioners, requesting the House to allow cats on Brisbane CityCats and ferries
- [309](#) Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4341-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,463 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure electricity providers make themselves available in all areas of Queensland
- [310](#) Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 11, 58th Parliament—Inquiry into elder abuse in Queensland, government response
- [311](#) Response from the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation (Hon. Powell), to an E-Petition (4384-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 4,165 petitioners, requesting the House to prevent amendments to the Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020 which would remove the end date of 1 July 2026 for damage mitigation permits being granted, which allow for the inhumane shooting of flying foxes
- [312](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4313-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 352 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that the Noosaville Dental Clinic remains open
- [313](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4323-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,488 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure all medical clinic appointment fees for doctor-referred test results be free of charge if the appointment is within 30 days of the doctor receiving the results and the doctor has requested the patient schedule an appointment to review the results
- [314](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4332-25), sponsored by the member for Pine Rivers, Ms Boyd, from 3,123 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to protect access to gender-affirming care for trans youth
- [315](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4349-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 882 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to address the mistreatment, neglect and abuse occurring in Queensland hospitals and psychiatric facilities as reported in the Disability Royal Commission
- [316](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4361-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 902 petitioners, requesting the House to mandate fluoridation of water

[317](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4367-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 284 petitioners, requesting the House to provide closure to former patients and to the families of former patients of Wolston Park Hospital by providing an apology

[318](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4371-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 719 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that any decision by a local government in relation to the fluoridation of water can be overruled by the community

[319](#) Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 11, 58th Parliament—Inquiry into elder abuse in Queensland, government response: Revised Response

13 March 2026—

[320](#) Response from the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development (Hon. Last), to an E-Petition (4347-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,092 petitioners, requesting the House to cause an independent review of the Toobeah transfer, suspend its legal effect and the Indigenous Land Use Agreement, and honour the Premier's commitment to repeal treaty in Queensland

[321](#) Auditor General Report 11: 2025-26—State entities 2025

[322](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 17, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 26 August 2025 and 16 September 2025: Erratum

[323](#) Public Report of Ministerial Expenses for the period 1 July 2025 to 31 December 2025

[324](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to a paper petition (4416-26), presented by the member for Surfers Paradise, Hon. Langbroek, and an E-Petition (4293-25), sponsored by the member for Surfers Paradise, Hon. Langbroek, from 1,262 and 727 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to extend the TransLink bus route from Sea World to the top of the Southport Spit

16 March 2026—

[325](#) Queensland Local Government Grants Commission—Annual Report 2025

[326](#) Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2024-25

[327](#) Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 22, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Auditor-General: Basic rate of audit fees

[328](#) Governance, Energy and Finance Committee: Report No. 23, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 October 2025 and 9 December 2025

19 March 2026—

[329](#) Auditor-General Report 12: 2025-26—Local government 2025

20 March 2026—

[330](#) Supreme Court of Queensland—Annual Report 2024-25

[331](#) District Court of Queensland—Annual Report 2024-2025

[332](#) Magistrates Court of Queensland—Annual Report 2024-2025

20 March 2026—

[333](#) Response from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Hon. Purdie), to an E-Petition (4385-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,481 petitioners, requesting the House to bring in legislation that means new citizens to Australia must wait five years before they can apply for a weapons license

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Explosives Act 1999:

Explosives Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 18

Explosives Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 18, explanatory notes

Explosives Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 18, human rights certificate

Energy Roadmap Amendment Act 2025:

Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 19

Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 19, explanatory notes

Energy (Infrastructure Facilitation) Act 2024:

Energy (Infrastructure Facilitation) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 20

Energy (Infrastructure Facilitation) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 20, explanatory notes

Energy (Infrastructure Facilitation) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 20, human rights certificate

Work Health and Safety Act 2011:

Work Health and Safety (High Risk Plant) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 21

Work Health and Safety (High Risk Plant) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 21, explanatory notes
 Work Health and Safety (High Risk Plant) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 21, human rights certificate

Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026:

Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 22
 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 22, explanatory notes
 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 22, human rights certificate

Planning Act 2016:

Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 23
 Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 23, explanatory notes
 Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 23, human rights certificate

Education (General Provisions) Amendment Act 2025:

Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 24
 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 24, explanatory notes
 Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 24, human rights certificate

Forestry Act 1959, Nature Conservation Act 1992:

Forestry and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 25
 Forestry and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 25, explanatory notes
 Forestry and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 25, human rights certificate

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

Report pursuant to Standing Order 169 (Acts to be numbered by the Clerk) and Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by Her Excellency the Governor, viz—

Local Government (Empowering Councils) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Local Government (Empowering Councils) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025'

Insert—

'Local Government (Empowering Councils) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026'

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Weather Events, Recovery



Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.39 am): Queensland is no stranger to severe weather and over the past few weeks we have been tested again. Queenslanders right across the state have been impacted by intense rainfall and damaging flooding. Our focus now is on getting the community back on its feet and making sure there is no daylight between response and recovery.

Late last week, the far north of our state was impacted by Tropical Cyclone Narelle. It affected both sides of the cape, first crossing the eastern coast between Coen and Lockhart River on Friday morning. The category 4 system brought with it intense rainfall and strong winds. By Friday evening, the system crossed south of Aurukun at approximately 9 pm the same day. Our thoughts are with those in the Northern Territory who were also impacted by Tropical Cyclone Narelle and will also be commencing recovery operations.

Over the weekend, I travelled to Coen and Cooktown with the member for Cook where, thankfully, locals missed the worst of it. There is damage to roads, infrastructure and some structures, but, thanks to pre-positioning of personnel, our crews have been working quickly to restore power and water. Multiple communities are isolated and will remain so for weeks to come.

I am grateful for our police, emergency services, utilities workers, council staff, business owners and members of the community who continue to work together through these disasters. Queenslanders in communities throughout the south-west, western downs, north and Wide Bay-Burnett are also

working to clean up from flooding earlier this month. Many hundreds of homes and businesses were inundated by floodwaters, and I know that Queenslanders in that part of the state are working to support each other however they can.

I also want to acknowledge the communities that have been isolated for some time and their resilience in the face of repeated disasters. We are working well with the federal government to provide critical funding for recovery in affected communities. A key part of that funding will be used for betterment to improve the resilience of key assets. I want to remind all communities, big or small, that this government will continue to provide support and be with you every step of the way.

Weather Events, Recovery

 **Hon. A LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (9.41 am): Approximately 90 per cent of Queensland's land mass has been activated for disaster recovery in the first three months of this year. In response, 59 of 77 councils are receiving DRFA support to assist with clean-up, emergency repairs and longer term reconstruction works. We are ensuring strong resupply is occurring across these communities.

Mr SPEAKER: There is too much conversation, once again, in the chamber. Take your conversations outside, if you must continue.

Ms LEAHY: More than \$173 million in targeted recovery assistance has been made available to primary producers, to small businesses, to not-for-profits, for flood clean-up, for environmental recovery, for betterment of roads and bridges and for mental health support. As we continue with the recovery after Tropical Cyclone Narelle, we will be making available the support these communities need to recover quickly and strongly.

To see the recovery in action, I joined the member for Burnett after the major flooding they had in Bundaberg. The Bundaberg community has faced this disaster with strength and determination. I particularly want to recognise all of the mayors, particularly Mayor Helen Blackburn, the LDMG, the local agencies and the volunteers who have worked tirelessly to protect and help the people of Bundaberg recover.

I also recognise the members opposite for finally making it to a disaster zone. The member for Pine Rivers missed the floods in the west and up north, but she made it to Bundaberg. I am not sure—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, you have the call, but I remind you that I made a ruling about attacks in ministerial statements.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will take control of the House.

Ms LEAHY: I am not sure what it was in Bundaberg that tugged at her heart strings or what was different this time, but I guess we will never know. I acknowledge her efforts nonetheless.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You just reminded the minister of your ruling. She is intentionally defying your ruling. I ask you to bring the minister back to the responsible use of this time for ministerial statements.

Mr SPEAKER: I am listening to the minister very closely—she has finished.

Primary Industries, Weather Events

 **Hon. AJ PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (9.44 am): For the second time this year I rise to speak about the impact on primary producers from flooding and severe weather. The north and north-west, which I spoke about during the last sitting week, is still recovering. I am told that the waters are, again, rising in some regions. North-western communities are calling out for livestock restocking assistance, like they had in 2019. We submitted our request for livestock restocking to the federal government on 30 January. My understanding is that the federal government are still considering this, as is their right. I look forward to their positive decision.

Last week I visited the Western Downs, Central Queensland and Wide Bay-Burnett regions. Producers have reported: loss of fencing; damaged roads and farm infrastructure; and loss of crops and livestock. There have been significant impacts on crops such as mung beans, cotton, grains, sugar cane, macadamias, hay, sorghum and silage. It comes at the worst time—harvest time.

I met and spoke with Kirk and Mitch Anderson at their cotton farm in the Dawson Valley. They were ready to harvest. They have lost a significant portion of their cotton crop, with the rest expected to suffer a significant reduction in yield and quality. There is also major damage to irrigation infrastructure and paddocks. The clock is ticking to repair infrastructure and restore paddocks so they do not miss an opportunity to plant the next crop.

I met and spoke to other producers at Scott and Krystal Muller's broadacre grain and cotton property in the Callide Valley. Many were flood affected. The Mullers' mung bean crop has been inundated. Erosion in fallow paddocks will require earthworks to remediate and prepare for future planting.

In Gayndah I met Sandy McLay at his citrus farm. It was significantly damaged, with lost crops and damaged fences. The Bon Accord Bridge over nearby Barambah Creek has gone. It only reopened last year following previous floods. The mayor and CEO of the North Burnett Regional Council inspected it with me. Accessing Sandy's property now requires a major deviation, which costs time and money. It means he will struggle to get fruit pickers during harvest season.

In Bundaberg I spoke to Richard Zunker, whose cane crop was flooded. Sand and debris are spread throughout the cane. The flooding was so severe a boat washed up next to the field. In Bundaberg I also met commercial fishers, who raised concerns about the impact to their industry.

I thank the members for Callide and Burnett, who were with me, for their advocacy for primary producers. Flooding in Tansey and Boobyjan has impacted community facilities, including the bowls club, campdraft and polocrosse facilities. I went to Rachel Lehmann's farm. Producers in the region have reported significant losses and damage to fences, irrigation equipment and crops of lucerne and cotton.

Across the regions you can see the devastation on producers' faces. You can hear the despair in their voices. The Crisafulli government has their backs. In partnership with the federal government, we swiftly activated assistance for primary producers in affected local government areas. Recovery will not be overnight. It will take years. Producers can access low-interest loans of up to \$2 million to repair and replace damaged plant and equipment and to replant, restore or re-establish affected areas. Grants of up to \$75,000 will allow producers to purchase equipment and materials to clean up and replace lost or damaged crops. Up to \$5,000 in freight subsidies are available for repair and recovery.

My team is working with the Queensland Reconstruction Authority to assess impacts elsewhere and to determine if further assistance is required. I want to reassure these communities and primary producers that the Crisafulli government is in this with them for the long haul.

Fuel Security

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.48 am): Queensland is the most decentralised state in the country. For that reason, access to fuel is more important to us than anywhere else in the country, and we know that Queenslanders are rightly concerned about affordability and access. That is why we were the first state to call this out as an issue. All states and territories are now putting pressure on the federal government to take action and develop a plan to secure consistent access to fuel. It is a national crisis that needs a national solution.

Our request on behalf of Queenslanders is clear: we want information and fuel to flow. Like other states, we are working directly with the industry—with retailers and suppliers—to prioritise supply. The Treasurer wrote to the ACCC to raise concerns about retailers unfairly raising costs for families and businesses. We are pleased they have taken that concern seriously and are investigating reports of anti-competitive conduct. In the short term, we are ensuring information flows back to the federal government. That will help us ensure that we can help shine a spotlight on what truly is a national crisis.

Following National Cabinet last week, the federal government appointed a Fuel Supply Taskforce Coordinator. We were the first state to announce our taskforce coordinator in response. We have appointed Bob Gee as Queensland's point of contact. Bob is experienced and well respected. His work as our Cross-Border Commissioner means he is well placed to represent Queenslanders on the No. 1 challenge that is facing our nation right now. He will attend his first taskforce meeting this afternoon. Following that, he will bring together key industry figures to get feedback from the ground and then feed that back to the federal government.

In the medium term, we are continuing our work to put downward pressure on energy prices. Our Energy Roadmap outlines our plan for affordable, reliable and sustainable electricity. Our Energy Maintenance Guarantee will invest in our existing assets to put downward pressure on power prices.

We have already seen positive signs. Under the latest draft default market offer from the Australian Energy Regulator, residential prices in the south-east could drop by around 10 per cent, with small business prices down by 12.8 per cent. I am today calling on the regulator to ensure this flows through to regional Queenslanders.

In the long term, our government has a plan to continue building our pipeline of resources projects to deliver energy security and economic growth for our state. By unlocking new areas for gas and petroleum exploration across the state we can lock in jobs and energy supply into the future. In the Taroom Trough our government has created the potential to open Australia's first major new oil province since the 1970s. That is the type of planning that should have been done in the last decade. Our government is delivering it.

Fuel Security



Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.51 am): I rise to update the House on fuel supply and fuel security issues arising from the conflict in the Middle East. This is an issue that is understandably causing concern for Queensland families, regional communities and key industries across our state.

Let me begin by acknowledging the reality: global conflict creates volatility in international energy markets. Australia imports the vast majority of its refined fuel which means that events far beyond our shores can impact prices and supply chains here at home. That is why fuel security is, first and foremost, a national responsibility. The Commonwealth government holds the key policy levers including fuel standards, national reserves, import arrangements and coordination of supply settings across the country. Queensland is working constructively with the Commonwealth to ensure they are driving a national response.

From the outset of this emerging situation, I directed Treasury to monitor developments in fuel markets and to engage with industry on potential impacts for freight, agriculture, mining and regional communities. Furthermore, Queensland Treasury collates the real-time data from fuel retailers that feeds into consumer apps such as the RACQ Fuel and Deals app so Queensland motorists are kept aware.

On 5 March I wrote to the ACCC seeking enhanced monitoring of fuel-pricing behaviour to ensure Queenslanders are protected from any unfair practices during this period of global uncertainty. On 9 March I wrote to the federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy, Chris Bowen, warning that Queensland was on the precipice of a major impact on daily life and calling for strong national leadership and the development of a coordinated national fuel security plan.

On 10 March, together with the agriculture minister and water minister, I met with industry leaders to discuss current conditions, and I have remained in regular contact with them to ensure there is direct communication between the government and those at the forefront. I have also remained in regular contact with CEOs and leaders in the fuel industry including again over the weekend.

The Premier has also represented Queensland's interests at the recent National Cabinet. On Friday afternoon I attended the national energy ministers meeting convened by the Commonwealth, reinforcing Queensland's commitment to cooperative national action.

At the federal level, the Prime Minister has established a national Fuel Supply Taskforce to coordinate Australia's response. Queensland has nominated senior official Bob Gee as the key contact to ensure effective communication between jurisdictions and industry. Queensland Treasury is a member of the National Oil Supplies Emergency Committee.

We welcome the Commonwealth's steps to support supply stability including temporary adjustments to fuel standards to increase available volumes, coordination of strategic fuel stock arrangements and ongoing engagement with industry to maintain supply continuity across the national network. While these developments highlight the challenges posed by the Middle East conflict, they also demonstrate that national mechanisms are in place. The Crisafulli government is working constructively with the Commonwealth and other states and territories to support these efforts. Queensland will continue to engage with the federal government to ensure there is a coordinated national response.

Fuel Security



Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (9.55 am): 28 May 2025—almost 12

months ago—that is the date on which I announced I had opened nine new areas for petroleum exploration across the Cooper-Eromanga and Bowen-Surat basins. For those opposite who may need a geography lesson, the Taroom Trough is part of the Bowen-Surat Basin area.

On 5 March this year I released another 18 tenements including 12 petroleum and gas areas totalling more than 7,000 square kilometres—again including land in the Taroom Trough. Because of the action the Crisafulli government took almost a year ago, on 10 February this year I announced that oil had been found in the Taroom Trough—forward thinking, forward planning. As reported in the *Australian Financial Review* on 10 February, analyst Saul Kavonic described the Taroom Trough as ‘the most watched exploration play of 2026 in Australia’ and that Taroom ‘could result in a new oil and gas province, attracting billions in new investment this decade’.

The clear message here is that long before the Middle East conflict we were opening up land in Queensland for petroleum exploration because we saw the value in Queensland having its own domestic supply—and we are not stopping there. We are fair dinkum about opening up Queensland for exploration and the opportunities that brings with it.

Since I started in this role, my mantra has been very clear: ‘I’ll sign; you drill.’ Every proponent who walks through my door knows I am going to tell them that they better have an application in their pocket because we are open for business and we will get the job done.

Mr Bleijie: Drill, baby, drill!

Mr LAST: ‘Drill, baby, drill’—there it is! I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. In contrast, what is the mantra of those opposite? They left piles of applications for petroleum leases and extensions to gather dust in a corner of the office—19 in fact. I can only wonder what the situation would be today if those 19 applications had been granted a decade ago, but they had no plan, no support for the resources industry, no idea how to prepare for the challenges that we are facing today. The question now is: do those opposite support the development of the Taroom Trough or will they do as they always do and bury their heads in the sand, pander to their greenie mates and let ecological ideology run rampant in attempt to shut down our most important industries?

The resources industry in this state now has a government working in lock step with them to unlock supply, drive down energy prices, increase fuel supply and create thousands of jobs for Queenslanders. Queensland is open for business, and the resources industry is responding to that call.

Fuel Security; E-Mobility Safety

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.58 am): The recent events in the Middle East have had repercussions that have been felt across the world including here in Queensland, but in a decentralised state like Queensland it hits particularly hard. Industry sources have advised me that Queensland’s trucking industry uses about 11 million litres of diesel per day. That equates to approximately a \$188 million increase in costs for that industry just over the last 14 days which is difficult to absorb when you are an operator running on already thin margins.

The federal government can and must do more to ensure that we have enough fuel here in Queensland and across Australia to keep our economy going. Our government has been highlighting fuel shortages long before the federal government admitted there was a problem. What have we heard from those opposite? Silence. There has been silence from the Labor opposition here in Queensland. Why were those opposite not standing up to their Labor mates in Canberra, picking up the phone and telling Canberra that Queensland’s small and family businesses were hurting, that the industries that Queenslanders rely on are hurting?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister is the only one who has the call.

Mr MICKELBERG: Why did those opposite not pick up the phone and tell Canberra that thousands were running dry? Our government did. Why did those opposite—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Your ruling in relation to what ministerial statements are about was quite clear: new policy, government reaction to a disaster or incident, or reporting back on government performance—not about politics or political attacks. I would ask you to remind the minister of the instructions contained in your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: I cautioned the previous minister when she descended into a personal attack. Minister, you are aware of my ruling. Tread carefully.

Mr MICKELBERG: While fuel security is a national issue and requires a national response, we will do whatever we can to support the construction sector, the freight sector and the passenger services that Queenslanders rely on. Ultimately, the federal government must do more to ensure that the supply of fuel, not only here in Queensland but right across Australia, is maintained and secure.

During the last sitting, the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee handed down its report into e-mobility safety. It is a comprehensive report and again I thank the committee, led by the member for Lockyer, for their report and thank all of those who contributed to the inquiry. Unlike those opposite, we will not leave important work like this on the shelf to collect dust; we will act.

I am therefore very pleased to advise the House that legislation will be introduced this week to enact the recommendations in the report. That includes giving police the powers they need to get illegal and dangerous riders and devices off Queensland streets, helping to keep Queenslanders safe. The legislation will include new age restrictions, speed limits and licensing requirements and new powers for the seizure of illegal devices. We will also introduce RBTs for e-mobility devices—something Labor promised to implement but never did. I look forward to introducing that legislation this week.

Finally, I will provide the House with an update on the great LNP initiative of permanent 50-cent fares. I can advise that as at 20 March 2026 Queensland—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will not be able to hear this very important announcement with that level of noise.

Mr MICKELBERG: It is a very important announcement. I can advise that as at 20 March 2026 more than 230 million trips have been undertaken since the introduction of permanent 50-cent fares in February 2025. It has delivered Queenslanders more than \$497 million in savings compared to the previous fare structure presided over by those opposite. That means there is \$497 million in Queensland commuters' pockets. Those opposite would have pocketed that. Queenslanders are saving under a LNP Crisafulli government that made 50-cent fares permanent.

Public Transport, Fares; Industrial Relations

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (10.03 am): I congratulate the Minister for Transport and Main Roads on a fantastic policy, because without his leadership and the leadership of the honourable the Premier 50-cent fares would not be continuing right now. They were unfunded. I note a little video the opposition leader posted this morning saying that tomorrow morning he is going to be at the front of Parliament House cooking sausages for people and talking about the LNP's 50-cent permanent fares. I congratulate the opposition leader for spruiking LNP policy. He has more of an interest than the shadow cabinet, which cannot even attend parliament. Look at them. The opposition may think I need them in order to put on a show, but I do not. The reality is that I would be prepared to do it if I were here by myself, so let them go out and do their juvenile antics. I do not care; it is all good. I do congratulate the honourable the Minister for Transport because, as I said, 50-cent fares under Labor were not going to be funded. They would not be in place right now, but they are because we made them permanent. With cost-of-living pressures, we know that Queensland families are loving it.

Queenslanders also know that the Crisafulli LNP government is restoring respect for taxpayer money after a decade of decline under the former Palaszczuk-Miles Labor government. In particular, we ended Labor's CFMEU tax, which would have cost Queenslanders up to \$20.6 billion, leading to the construction of 77,000 fewer homes—sufficient to address the current shortfall in supply—and forcing up rents by 8.3 per cent. Labor was more concerned with dodgy deals for their CFMEU mates while Queenslanders footed the bill.

As part of a package of reforms in industrial relations to drive productivity on Queensland worksites and to keep workers safe, the Crisafulli government immediately reinstated the 24-hour notice period required by workplace health and safety permit holders—that is, the unions—to enter a workplace. We warned the former Labor government that constantly cosyng up to the CFMEU would lead to less productivity and more violence on worksites. They did not listen. It is evident that, following the Productivity Commission report and allegations coming from the CFMEU commission of inquiry, Queenslanders need an industrial relations legislative framework that is fit for purpose into the future.

I am pleased to advise the House that the Crisafulli LNP government has initiated an independent review of both the Industrial Relations Act 2016 and the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003. The review will be headed by two—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There is too much chatter on my left. Members, if you want to have conversations, take them outside.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, should I wait until the entire opposition leaves the chamber or should I—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, you have the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: The review will be headed by two independent experts in workers compensation and industrial relations: Glenn Ferguson AM, a former president of the Law Council of Australia and chair of WorkCover Queensland; and Gary Black, a former commissioner of the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission. Together, Mr Ferguson AM and Mr Black will ensure that Queenslanders are getting the best from their workers compensation scheme and will assist in restoring productivity to Queensland worksites.

Queensland's workers compensation scheme is experiencing a number of trends that may impact performance if not appropriately managed and dealt with. This includes a growing number of psychological claims which impact claim durations and return-to-work outcomes. Other jurisdictions have recently responded to the growth in psychological claims by making fundamental reforms to scheme coverage and entitlements. The number of primary psychological claims has increased by almost 97.4 per cent in the last five years, from 1,950 in 2020-21 to 3,849 in 2024-25. Secondary psychological injury claims have also increased over the last five years, from 1,921 in 2020-21 to 3,118 in 2024-25, including by 19 per cent in 2024-25. In 2024 the former Labor government legislated to respond to the same issues, but the continued rise in these trends cannot be left unchecked.

The scheme is also experiencing a growth in reports of suspected workers compensation fraud to the Workers' Compensation Regulator, impacting the integrity of the scheme and changing expectations in relation to the regulation of insurers, including WorkCover Queensland and licensed self-insured employers. As a result, we have committed to ensure that Queensland workers have adequate protections and fair conditions in their employment. Workers should be safe at their workplace and paid competitively.

The review will commence this month, and I look forward to seeing the excellent work that the independent review will do to improve the industrial relations system in this state after 10 years of Labor using lawfare to protect the CFMEU. It is only the Crisafulli government that can deliver the fresh start that Queenslanders voted for after a decade of decline under Labor, and we will continue to fight for Queenslanders in everything that we do. Queenslanders are encouraged to have their say by visiting the Office of Industrial Relations website for further information.

Bray Park State High School; Schoolteachers, Salary Rate

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (10.09 am): Mr Speaker, with your indulgence, before I begin, may I acknowledge the principal of Bray Park State High School and school leaders in the gallery. I know that you always acknowledge schools that are here. As it happens, I have visited Bray Park State High School twice in the last week to see their new discovery centre, which is part of the \$130 million that we are spending across 11 state schools, including five special schools. I want to acknowledge those leaders who are very keenly following what happens in here. I am sure they would be disgusted at what they see from those opposite. Imagine walking outside in the middle of class and just ignoring the teacher and what is happening in class. I say to those in the gallery: 'Don't do what they do.'

The Queensland Department of Education employs nearly 100,000 people. It is a large, complex department that relies on a centralised payroll system to pay our staff correctly and on time. On 23 March at 10.30 am I was informed by the director-general that the department's industrial relations team had identified an incorrect salary rate that has been applied to a portion of our teaching workforce since 1 September 2025. In August 2025, the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission issued a 3.5 per cent increase to all state award rates of pay. That increase took effect from 1 September. The increase is applied where the updated award wage exceeds the certified agreement wage so that the higher rate is applied.

Due to human error, the new rates were incorrectly compared to the award rates for band 2 steps 1 to 4, rather than band 2 steps 2 to 5. This error led to the incorrect assumption that no pay increase should be applied to teachers paid under these bands. The difference in pay per fortnight between the

award and the certified agreement ranges from \$76.30 in step 2 through to \$90.70 for step 5. I am advised that rates were applied correctly to all other teacher classifications but that band 2 steps 2 to 5 teachers were affected, which covers approximately 10,500 teachers.

On behalf of impacted teachers, I am deeply disappointed and sorry that this has occurred. Yesterday I instructed the director-general to ensure that impacted teachers receive their back pay in full as soon as possible during the next pay cycle, which is next Wednesday, 1 April. I am advised that the average arrears payment is approximately \$830 per impacted employee. The total arrears is approximately \$8,715,000. I am sharing this information with the House in the interests of openness and transparency.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr LANGBROEK: I expect the department to be equally open and transparent with impacted teachers. I also expect the department to improve its processes to minimise the risk that this happens again—

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bulimba, I have cautioned you. You are warned.

Mr LANGBROEK: I also expect the department to improve its processes to minimise the risk that this happens again, and I have provided instructions to the director-general to this effect.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are warned.

NOTICES OF MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.13 am): I give notice that I will move—

That the Planning (State Facilitated Development) Amendment Regulation 2026, subordinate legislation No. 23 of 2026, tabled in the House on 24 March 2026, be disallowed.

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (10.14 am): I give notice that I will move—

That part 2 of the Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, subordinate legislation No. 154 of 2025, tabled in the House on 9 December 2025, be disallowed.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Members of Parliament, Anniversary

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Before we go to question time, I have received a notification that there are a number of members who have just had their 17-year anniversary in the House. They are the members for Kawana, Mudgeeraba, Glass House and Coomera. I expect they will show exemplary behaviour today.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.14 am.

Queensland Rail, Workforce

 **Mr MILES** (10.14 am): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Queensland Rail workers join us in the gallery today. They say that the changes being made by Queensland Rail under the LNP will mean a reduction in their pay of about \$30,000 a year. Can the minister explain why the LNP is cutting the hours of these important staff in the middle of an affordability crisis?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the opposition leader for the question—the first question I have been asked since 24 June last year. It is nice to finally get a question from the opposition on a portfolio, I

would suggest, that is front of mind for many Queenslanders. That tells you how much those opposite genuinely care about these issues.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, you have heard the question.

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Speaker, that tells you everything you need to know about how much those opposite care about these issues.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Speaker, I am happy to yell over the top of them or they can just sit down and be quiet.

Mr SPEAKER: No, you are not going to yell over the top.

Mr MICKELBERG: Let's go to the nub of the issue. Let's be very clear about the issue that the opposition leader has just raised. This is just another grubby scare campaign by a desperate Labor opposition. Let's be very clear. Their scare campaign has been refuted by Queensland Rail themselves.

Mr McCallum interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bundamba, you have just joined the warning list. The minister was directly addressing the question as I heard it before all that noise.

Mr MICKELBERG: I will turn the opposition's attention to a media release from 19 March 2026, last week, which is titled 'Queensland Rail shuts down false scare campaign, locks in job security and better customer service'. I draw the attention of those opposite to the following line—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you are now warned. As I said, the minister was addressing the question.

Mr MICKELBERG: I draw the attention of those opposite to a line in that release, which says—

The model follows extensive consultation with employees and unions, including the RTBU, since 2024.

That was May 2024, in fact. Who was the government in May 2024 which commenced this process? Labor. A Labor transport minister commenced this process in May 2024. That is their record.

Mr Mellish interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, you have joined the list.

Mr MICKELBERG: If the former minister had been paying attention back in May 2024 when this process was commenced by those opposite in their time in government, perhaps he would not have tried to purvey these falsehoods. This is a disgraceful scare campaign from a desperate Labor opposition. In fact, QR were so incensed by the former transport minister's action that they took to his Facebook page to fact check and refute his falsehoods and scare campaign. Those opposite love to purvey falsehoods and love to whip up fear, but the fact is that not a single job will be lost under this proposal and services will be boosted. It is only an LNP government that is investing in Queensland's rail network.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: We will have order before we go to the next question.

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, you are warned.

Fuel Security

Mr MILES: My next question is to the Treasurer. State governments across the country have taken action to deal with record petrol prices and supply concerns. Why has the Crisafulli LNP government failed to act to deliver security and affordability for Queenslanders?

Mr JANETZKI: The Middle East conflict is of serious concern to everyone in our country. It is an important thing that we must address as a nation, and Queensland is certainly playing its part in response to the Commonwealth's national response. If we look at the Middle East conflict and what it means for supply chains, what it has meant for higher prices and what it has meant for supply blockages across the region and into our country, we see that Queensland is not immune from those challenges.

Mr Miles: So do something.

Mr JANETZKI: Those opposite proved themselves time and again that they are not up to the task. They do not take this matter seriously. We have seen the infantile behaviour in and out of the House this morning, but the seriousness with which these questions should be considered is beyond them. It is beyond them, so I am going to run through Queensland's nation-leading response to this challenge.

In the last sitting week I wrote to the ACCC because I was hearing from my members on this side of the House of potential behaviours that were leading to price gouging across rural and regional Queensland. I wrote to the federal energy minister, Chris Bowen. At a time when he was ridiculing the Deputy Premier and our response, I was warning that Queensland was on the precipice of a major challenge. We have done everything that is necessary to engage with the fuel industry. We have put the case time and again; we have taken the stories from across rural and regional Queensland.

Last week the Prime Minister convened National Cabinet, and I attended the ECMC meeting late last week. The National Cabinet had talked about the national coordination response that was necessary. Queensland has appointed Bob Gee to the national coordination effort. Bob is an experienced public servant who will take the supply challenges of rural and regional Queensland to Canberra.

Canberra must lead the national response and Queensland will play its part in making sure that response is delivered. Farmers in Hinchinbrook will not be able to have access to the diesel they need to cut cane without supply chains being unblocked by the federal government. We cannot get the price of a litre of diesel, which the member for Hinchinbrook needs to cut cane, under control without supply chains being unblocked by the federal government. We will continue to take a constructive approach to the national response every single day.

(Time expired)

Fuel Security

Mr DILLON: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. Regional Queenslanders rely on fuel to harvest crops and restock via trucks and they need tourists to drive into town, and they are concerned about affordability and access. Can the Premier outline how the Crisafulli LNP government is advocating for Queenslanders on this issue of national importance?

Mr CRISAFULLI: Firstly, I want to thank the member for what is a really serious question about a really serious issue. I contrast the tone with which he is conducting himself with what I am seeing from the opposition, and I will get to that in a moment. There is not an Australian who is looking at what is happening in the Middle East without absolute fear. There is not one. The member's question goes to the heart of the issues that are defining his community and he articulated them very eloquently.

Ms McMillan interjected.

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

Mr CRISAFULLI: I am going to say it again: this is a really serious issue, and I want this parliament to take it seriously because that is what people are expecting and demanding. Honourable members heard what the member articulated about the issues that matter to his community. However, I want to reflect on some of the pain points we are all hearing about and why together we all have to play our role in making sure that what is a national crisis is front and centre on that agenda. We have spoken about a short-, a medium- and a long-term process that needs to be undertaken, and you bet we are going to play our role. We have done that in the way we have responded—and I have to say that we were the first state to call it out. When we did, the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer were criticised for that, but we will never take a backward step in sticking up for Queenslanders, and this is a really important issue.

I want to reflect on some of the things we have heard. We have heard about uncertainty from harvesting contractors who do not know whether or not they are going to be able to afford to fill up a harvester to go and cut some cane. We have heard from everyday Queenslanders who do not know whether or not they can afford the tank of petrol to go to work or to pick up the kids from soccer. We have heard about the impact on the tourism industry and the fishing industry. We must call out the importance of this issue and we must act.

I say to the opposition: I have seen the response. What they are doing in making this an issue that is not serious is undermining the pain that Queenslanders are feeling; it is undermining the hurt and the uncertainty that Australians are feeling. Right now in this country there are people in small and family businesses who do not know if they will have a business in a month. They do not know and we

get a juvenile response from those opposite. All I am saying to those opposite today is: if you do nothing else, here are two ideas: one is to say to the federal government that they agree with all of the states—

Ms Pease interjected.

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

Mr CRISAFULLI: The opposition should do two things today: one is to say to the federal government that they agree with every other state and territory in wanting to make this an issue on the national agenda; the second is to work with us on those long-term solutions and stop backing the radical green movement that has prevented the kind of drilling that needs to be done in the first place.

(Time expired)

Fuel Security

Mr DICK: My question is to the Treasurer. Has the Crisafulli LNP government considered using its powers as a state to allow Queensland fuel refineries and fuel depots to operate 24/7 during the fuel crisis?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. It is an important one. We have made it clear that we will play our part in the national coordination response. In respect of the honourable member's question, last Friday as part of the ECMC, the Energy and Climate Change Ministerial Council, meeting, at the energy ministers subset of that meeting a range of matters were discussed. The communique made clear that the Commonwealth and the states had powers and the federal government had responsibility for the supply and national response to this crisis. Those opposite may think it is laughable. I do not think people paying more at the petrol bowser is a laughing matter. Those opposite might think it is, but this is a serious matter that requires a serious response. Those opposite proved themselves incapable of delivering as part of that effort.

When the Prime Minister calls National Cabinet, it is obvious that something requires a national response. As the Premier has said, we will play our constructive role in that national response. We are doing so in the ways I have already outlined this morning.

Ms Enoch interjected.

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

Mr JANETZKI: Those opposite should also be aware of the 2006 intergovernmental agreement which outlines clearly that the federal government has a coordination responsibility—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: They should know it because it was the Labor government that signed it. I do not think any of them are bothered to do the hard work that is required in the national coordination response that is necessary in the circumstances. That 2006 intergovernmental agreement, as has been referred to by the federal energy minister, means that the federal government takes the primary responsibility for the coordination of the national response to this, and Queensland is playing its part. We will continue to do so because it is a serious matter. We have seen it play out right across rural and regional Queensland most significantly in supply chain blockages. That is why the role that Bob Gee plays now—and Anthea Harris is leading the national coordination taskforce—is so important in feeding into that taskforce on behalf of Queensland.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

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

Fuel Security

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. My constituents are concerned about the ongoing conflict in the Middle East causing supply shortages and driving up petrol prices. How is the Crisafulli LNP government taking the fight up for Queenslanders to secure more fuel supply, and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for Lockyer for the question and I know the impact that the fuel supply issue is having in his community and particularly in regional and rural Queensland. For our farming communities, our mining communities and mums and dads who are trying to get their kids to school, the costs are over \$3 a litre. We get it; we understand it. That is why the Crisafulli government called it out first. Before anybody raised this issue, we called it out. Our Treasurer called it

out; I called it out. In fact, I called it out directly to Chris Bowen and said, 'What is the federal government doing about this, where is the information supply flowing and why isn't the fuel flowing to regional Queensland in particular?' The prices are up because of supply. We raised it, so let us not be lectured to by those sitting opposite on fuel supply, or the economy for that matter. Who could forget 'Stevo's servos', which would have driven up the cost of fuel? Imagine now the cost—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, we use correct titles in this place, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Imagine if we had the Leader of the Opposition's servos rolled out across the state if he became the premier of Queensland. Fuel prices would not be three bucks a litre; they would be six bucks a litre on top of the conflict in the Middle East. Who could forget the hydro hoax those opposite had—the Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro energy storage system worth \$38 billion? We got rid of it. That would have driven up electricity prices. Who could forget the hydrogen hoax in Gladstone—the green energy scandal—that those opposite invested in and we are now trying to recover \$60 million? Let us not be lectured to by the Labor Party on economics in this state. Let us not be lectured to by the Labor Party on the fuel crisis. Has he picked up the phone to his federal colleagues? We called it out. In fact, on 9 March the Treasurer wrote to Chris Bowen. On 10 March on the Sunshine Coast I did a press conference talking about the fuel supply issues on the Sunshine Coast, particularly for our fishers, and then at 9.30 I called on Chris Bowen to explain the fuel supply issue. On 10 March he attacked me and a federal colleague and said that there was no issue. He then wrote to the Treasurer and said—

Frankly, I am shocked that the Deputy Premier in Queensland would not better acquaint himself with the facts before speaking about such a sensitive matter.

He said—

Fuel stock continues to arrive in Australia on time.

Didn't that all change three days later when the Deputy Prime Minister said we had a fuel crisis! I see all the heads of those opposite looking down because they cannot handle the facts. They cannot handle the truth. It is a Labor issue federally. It should have dealt with it. Instead of playing politics, like the Labor Party opposition is doing now, Chris Bowen should have sorted this out weeks ago.

Fuel Security

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Treasurer. I refer to the Treasurer's previous answer. Will the Crisafulli LNP government take action today to use its powers to allow Queensland fuel refineries and fuel depots to operate 24/7?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With respect to the question as asked by the member for McConnel, I would submit to you that it is the same question with the same content asked of the Treasurer.

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

Mr SPEAKER: I will just take a bit of advice. Did you have anything to add?

Mr de BRENNI: On a point of order, I outline to you that the previous question asked whether the matter was considered. This question asked whether or not they will take action for clarity today.

Mr SPEAKER: I will just take a bit of advice on that. There probably is enough difference in the terminology as just put forward in the point of order that I will allow the question.

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. Given the similarity of the question, the honourable member will not mind the similarity of the answer, because we have been very clear that we stand ready to support the federal government in its national efforts to coordinate a response to the Middle East conflict. We have been extraordinarily clear that we stand supportive of that. The Premier has attended National Cabinet. I have been at ECMC. We have appointed Bob Gee as part of the coordination taskforce led federally by Anthea Harris, who has been appointed to that role by the federal government, and Bob Gee will be playing the coordination role here in Queensland in terms of collating information, finding challenges in supply chains and communicating that through to the federal government to ensure we have fuel flowing to where it is needed most. That is what we need. That is why the national coordination taskforce is so important.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You ruled that the question was a different question. It is about prospective action as to whether or not they will use their powers today. We do not want to hear about yesterday. Will they use their powers today?

Mr SPEAKER: Is the point of order on relevance?

Mr de BRENNI: That is right.

Mr SPEAKER: The Treasurer is giving some background information on this, but I listened to the question. There was a difference in the question, which I am sure the Treasurer will come to.

Mr JANETZKI: Thank you, Mr Speaker. The communique makes clear the relevant responsibilities of the parties and my ministerial statement made clear the responsibilities of the federal government and the state governments in turn, but most importantly—and those opposite refuse to admit it, refuse to acknowledge it; they should know about it because it was a Labor government that signed it—the intergovernmental agreement of 2006 makes it very clear the roles and responsibilities between the Commonwealth and the others in the Federation. What is most important is that it is a calm and methodical approach to this.

If those opposite are unhappy with Chris Bowen and the federal government's response to this national crisis, then they should pick up the phone. We on this side of the House will continue to work collaboratively and constructively with the federal government as it delivers on the national response to the Middle East conflict. We on this side of the House will continue to work constructively, but if those opposite are unhappy with Chris Bowen and the federal government's response to this then they should pick up the phone. They should pick up the phone and reacquaint themselves with the responsibilities. They should read the communiqués, they should understand the role that National Cabinet plays and, most importantly, they should be listening to the people of rural and regional Queensland like we are. Our members are coming in here and raising concerns, ensuring that the voices of their communities are heard and that their feedback through Bob Gee into the national taskforce led by Anthea Harris is made well and truly clear to ensure the national response is addressing their concerns.

(Time expired)

CFMEU

Mr STEVENS: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. My constituents are deeply concerned about the revelations coming out of the CFMEU commission of inquiry—

Opposition members: Oh!

Mr STEVENS:—particularly the culture of fear and intimidation. How is the Crisafulli LNP government keeping Queensland workers safe, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. As soon as the member mentioned the CFMEU, see how loud those opposite got! It is like, 'Talk about something else. Let's talk about something else. Let's pretend we're not listening to what's about to happen,' but they know it is about to happen for the next three minutes. Just like the member for Mermaid Beach's constituents have been concerned, so have I as the industrial relations minister. The member for Mermaid Beach knows as well as anyone in this place how long we have been advocating for worker safety on construction sites and those employed in the Public Service in the Office of Industrial Relations.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Premier, I do not know why the member for McConnel is not listening. Talking about the member for McConnel, I have a quote. Wheelahan KC, counsel assisting the royal commission, started his opening remarks the other day with this—

The theory underpinning this case study is that there was regulatory capture of the Workplace Health and Safety Queensland by the CFMEU during the period that Ms Grace Grace was the Minister for Industrial Relations, that period being December 2015 until October—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Conversations will be taken outside. I am trying to make a ruling. My tolerance has run right out.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I wish it was like the American Congress, where I could reclaim my time for interruptions from those opposite. Let me quote it again. The counsel assisting the CFMEU said—

... during the period that Ms Grace Grace was the Minister for Industrial Relations, that period being December 2015 until October 2024 when the Labor Government was defeated ...

I take the gesticular interjection—rubbing the shirt. She is proud of it. It goes further.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Minister for Youth Justice: the member for McConnel is always overreaching. If I was being mentioned—

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

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. If I was mentioned in a royal commission on the CFMEU in respect of allegations of corruption the amount of times the member for McConnel is, I would not be laughing and I would not be happy about it; I would be very nervous.

Members will know that I hung up the bat phone to the CFMEU. People say, 'What is the bat phone?' Well, here it is—

COMMISSIONER: And this is my ignorance, but just forgive me for it, Mr Newton. Why are they—the CFMEU—

going to the Deputy Premier to make this demand?

MR NEWTON: They had—it was evident they had a direct line of communication into the Deputy Premier's office.

Not mine, colleagues; I can assure you of that. The CFMEU does not have a direct link to me. It goes on—

COMMISSIONER: And who was the Deputy Premier?

Mr NEWTON: Jackie Trad.

It is clear: the allegations of corruption, misuse, abuse, misogyny, sexual violence and physical violence on CFMEU construction sites in Queensland were observed and obeyed by the Labor Party when they were in government. They could have done something and they did not. Shame!

(Time expired)

Transport Industry, Fuel Security

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Treasurer. Brittany Rixon from Rixon Haulage says their businesses will be forced to park up their trucks in two weeks with current fuel prices, meaning 11 full-time employees will lose their jobs. What is the state government doing to support businesses and to help Queenslanders deal with the affordability crisis?

Mr JANETZKI: It is for people like Brittany and businesses like hers that we are standing up for Queensland's interests. Businesses like the one the honourable member has raised are exactly why we are taking this so seriously. I look across our team and think of the range of regional Queenslanders we represent. We care so deeply for businesses like the one the honourable member for Lytton has raised, and we want to make sure the federal government is delivering a response that Queensland deserves.

I think of the member for Hinchinbrook and how the price of a litre of diesel will impact the cost to cut a kilogram of cane. I think of the member for Gregory and how the price of a litre of diesel will impact the cost of a B-double getting beef to market. I also think of the member for Scenic Rim. Many members of parliament have raised their concerns over the last few weeks. The member for Southern Downs fought hard and fought early. The Goondiwindi mayor, Mr Springborg, fought hard and fought early in respect of supply chain blockages that were not letting them do what they needed to do. We will continue to fight to make sure that supply blockages throughout Queensland are addressed by the federal government. Mr Speaker, I reflect on your own electorate and the diesel that is required to take off a record sorghum crop across the Central Downs. How much will it cost cotton producers across the Southern Downs to get their product to market?

We are taking this so seriously. We are listening to the voices of rural and regional Queensland as they are brought here to this parliament—as we take them to Canberra, as we ensure the federal government delivers the federal response that is necessary. I wrote to the ACCC to make sure the behaviour we were observing in fuel retailers was stopped. I understand that this week the federal parliament is passing stronger laws to give the ACCC the powers they need to stop price gouging. We have written to Chris Bowen to make sure appropriate arrangements are made to get supply to where it is needed most. We will not stop. We will work constructively with the federal government. We will continue to fight for businesses right across rural and regional Queensland, like the business the honourable member raised, to make sure, with the federal government, they are getting the fuel supply they deserve.

(Time expired)

Ms Asif interjected.

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

Transport Infrastructure

Mr CRANDON: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering a level playing field when it comes to tendering for major projects across Queensland, and is the minister aware of any examples where the scales were tipped in favour of vested interests during a decade of decline?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Coomera for his question. He is a tireless advocate for restoring productivity so that we can build the generational infrastructure his community needs and deserves.

Mr O'Connor: And he petitions for it.

Mr MICKELBERG: And he petitions for it; I take that interjection from the member for Bonney.

When I was first sworn in as the Minister for Transport and Main Roads I was briefed on the \$6.7 billion blowout to QTRIP that I had inherited from those opposite. There were \$6.7 billion in cost overruns because of failed Labor ideas like the BPIC program and inadequate ministers who could not manage their portfolios. Gold Coast Light Rail stage 3 had blown out from \$709 million to \$1.2 billion. Coomera Connector stage 1 in the Coomera electorate went from \$1.5 billion to over \$3 billion. Centenary Bridge went from \$244 million to \$353 million because of CFMEU thuggery, bullying and deliberately destroying productivity on Queensland job sites. The list goes on. Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail blew out from \$2.6 billion under those opposite to \$5.75 billion under those opposite—all because those opposite sided with their union mates in the CFMEU and put Queenslanders second.

Another project that has blown out under those opposite is Cross River Rail. It went from \$5.4 billion to over \$19 billion. Evidence presented last week at the commission of inquiry spoke about the direct line the CFMEU had to the office of then deputy premier Jackie Trad. The CFMEU were pushing to have the same pay and conditions on Cross River Rail as at Queen's Wharf. It would have added billions extra to the project than we were already dealing with.

Mr Newton, the CEO of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority, presented evidence that detailed a meeting held on 20 December 2018. In his notes he listed the attendees: the then deputy premier; her chief of staff; her media adviser; the Cross River Rail chair, former Labor minister Paul Lucas; representatives from the CFMEU, the ETU, the AMWU, the PPTU and the RTBU. However, the former deputy premier's diary talks about none of those attendees attending. In fact, it just describes the meeting attendees as 'building trades group representatives, departmental staff and ministerial staff'. There is no mention of the CFMEU, no mention of the Cross River Rail CEO and no mention of a former Labor minister. It begs the question: what was then deputy premier Jackie Trad trying to hide? What did Jackie Trad not want Queenslanders to know? Mr Newton's notes describe the meeting as being quite tense and 'at moments ... hostile'. He says 'I was attacked by CFMEU rep'. Those opposite sided with the CFMEU over Queenslanders, and it is Queenslanders who paid the price because of their incompetence.

(Time expired)

Public Transport, Public Facilities

Mr MELLISH: My question is to the Minister for Transport. Without station staff after 1 pm or on weekends, train station facilities like toilets will be locked. Can the minister explain why Queenslanders using our public transport system will be left without access to toilet facilities?

Mr MICKELBERG: That is a pretty courageous question from the former minister who started this process that we have continued; who started a process of engaging with the workforce, talking to the unions, working through how we can deliver the services needed for Queenslanders in our Queensland Rail network. I will continue where I left off on the first question. It is nice to finally get a question from the former minister, the now shadow minister. I would not be asking too many questions either, mate, to be honest, with your record.

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

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Could we have some silence in the House. The member has taken personal offence and asked that you withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. I think Queenslanders take personal offence at a \$6.7 billion blowout on QTRIP under the former failed Labor transport minister, the member for Aspley.

Mr MELLISH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is my understanding that withdrawals are to be unconditional and that was not an unconditional withdrawal.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, did you withdraw?

Mr MICKELBERG: To be clear, I withdrew unconditionally. I was just contrasting what Queenslanders might be offended by. Let me go back to what I said in my earlier answer in terms of the Queensland Rail media release. That media release states—

Queensland Rail will also deliver a major safety boost by increasing the strength of the Authorised Officer unit by 35—doubling the ranks, and will continue to work in close partnership with the more than 90-strong Queensland Police Service Railway Squad officers ensuring safety and security remains a priority.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers!

Mr MICKELBERG: I want to be very clear that this is all about ensuring that we can boost services and deliver the services that Queenslanders need and Queenslanders deserve as we invest in our rail network. It is our government that is delivering better rail services—the Wave on the Sunshine Coast, an absolutely game-changing investment delivered by our government.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Stop the clock. Member for Pine Rivers, you are warned.

Mr MICKELBERG: I know they are not proud of their record. If we look at Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail, a project that runs nearly entirely through Labor seats, one would think if they cared about that project—I can see the member for Springwood jumping up because he is concerned about their record on this—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was about locked toilets. We have not heard anything from the minister about that question.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, the question was around services at stations. I think you touched on it earlier, but if you could clarify that. You have one minute left.

Mr MICKELBERG: I know those opposite are very keen to ignore the issue. The fact is that this station operating model was started by them. It commenced in May 2024 under a former Labor transport minister. There has been consistent and constructive engagement with the unions—in fact, with the RTBU, with the Services Union; strong engagement—and this is all about delivering the services that Queenslanders need and Queenslanders deserve. I will go back to my earlier point: what is their record? Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail, boosting services—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order remains on relevance. The question was about locked toilets.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, there was a specific part to the question. You have 27 seconds to round out your answer.

Mr MICKELBERG: I will continue. Their record is Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail where they did not deliver a project they promised. They failed to deliver a project they promised—from \$2.6 billion to \$5.75 billion. They could not even go to the market to deliver a project in their own heartland.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is the third time I have risen to my feet on a point of order around relevance. You have instructed the minister. If he does not have anything relevant to say about locked toilets he should sit down.

Mr SPEAKER: It is relevance?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, Mr Speaker?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have 10 seconds left.

Mr MICKELBERG: The only toilet that is relevant to this place is the Leader of the Opposition's leadership going down the toilet. He is a weak Leader of the Opposition who could not govern and cannot hold this government to account from opposition either.

Procurement

Mr BENNETT: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth. How is the Crisafulli LNP government ensuring procurement processes are of a high standard and is the minister aware of any periods where the processes were abandoned during a decade of decline?

Mr O'CONNOR: I want to thank the member for Burnett for the question. He is a member who, as a licensed builder, knows a thing or two about the construction industry. For anyone at the QBCC watching, I did check; he has his digital licence, which is fantastic to see. We want to see all tradies across Queensland take up that system if they choose to. I commend the member for his 23 years of service with QBuild. He has been followed by his son who is in a leadership role in the Wide Bay part of our operation. Thank you, member for Burnett.

Under the former Labor government the procurement policies of this state were written and authorised by the CFMEU. It went so far as they did not even bother taking off their watermark when they submitted it to the relevant minister, who was the member for Springwood, when he was baking that into government policy. They had a prequalification system that again had subcontractors who could work on major government projects vetted by the CFMEU to see if they were acceptable, which cut out tens of thousands of subbies across our state from working on those jobs. It saw productivity drop around nine per cent, which led to 77,000 fewer homes being delivered across our state.

Mr SPEAKER: Halt, Minister. Stop the clock. Once again, there is too much chatter. If you want to have a conversation take it outside.

Mr O'CONNOR: It led to 77,000 fewer homes being delivered across our state since 2018. It cost our state billions on major projects, as the transport minister has outlined. If BPICs had remained we would have seen another 26½ thousand fewer homes delivered out to 2030. In the CFMEU commission of inquiry that has been underway in the time we have not been in this place we have learnt that under the watch of former deputy premier Jackie Trad major projects like Cross River Rail became breeding grounds for CFMEU influence, for misogyny, for disruption, for lawlessness and for cost blowouts. The inquiry has heard that Jackie Trad and her office took an 'unusually active role in negotiating those CFMEU deals.' There was a witness to that inquiry who described this as something unheard of in their 40-year construction career. Evidence has shown that Trad allegedly personally intervened, texting project executives to ensure union commitments were honoured as part of those projects. This shows that Labor did not just tolerate this behaviour, they baked it into the system. As the transport minister outlined, Queenslanders were the ones who paid the price, both in fewer homes being delivered and in cost blowouts on those projects. Cross River Rail itself blew out to over \$19 billion and at best it will be opened by 2029, years after it was promised to the people of our state.

We have taken a different approach. The CFMEU are no longer writing procurement policies in this state. We have overhauled those. We are creating new opportunities, particularly for small and family business and regional businesses. It is all about delivering the homes and infrastructure that the people of our state deserve.

Resources Industries, Royalties

Mr BERKMAN: My question is to the Treasurer. Last year's budget sees Queenslanders paying more in vehicle rego than big gas corporations pay in royalties—they are paying just eight per cent—and they are set to make billions in war profits thanks to the US-Israeli war, supported by Labor, the LNP and One Nation. When will the Treasurer raise royalties and finally make gas corporations pay their fair share?

Mr JANETZKI: Our first budget last year was proudly a 'no new or increased taxes' budget. We did that because we wanted to send some clear messages about investment and regulatory and taxation stability across Queensland. After a decade of those opposite breaking tax promises, lifting taxes, introducing new ones, promising that they would not increase taxes but then they would, being out of touch with the everyday concerns of everyday Queenslanders, we wanted to send a clear message to the investment community and, in fact, to the broader Queensland community, that we were a government that was serious about fiscal discipline. Part of that meant that we brought down a 'no new or increased taxes' budget. We made it very clear that we wanted to drive investment, stability and certainty throughout the Queensland economy and that was the best way we could do it in our first budget so that is what we delivered.

I note the honourable member's question, which is an important question in terms of how Queensland is placed in the national framework. Recently people will have heard me speak about gas royalties. Given that Queensland will make up 90 per cent of the national east coast gas market by 2027, Queensland's role in the gas market across the nation is increasingly important. Anybody who has heard me speak recently about Queensland's position in the broader national context of the gas industry will know that I have argued pretty hard for a fair deal in the GST distribution. What has happened across the nation is that other jurisdictions such as New South Wales and Victoria, which make policy decisions not to explore and develop gas, are ultimately receiving Queensland's GST distribution. That is not fair.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The GST and the national market are both interesting, but the specific question was: when will the Treasurer raise royalties and finally make gas corporations pay a fair share?

Mr SPEAKER: A section of the question was about raising royalties. Treasurer, you have 30 seconds.

Mr JANETZKI: I have answered the question by saying that it was a 'no new or increased taxes' budget. That answers the question. I will finish my point by saying that it is not fair that Queensland is penalised for developing an industry that leads to not just state wealth but also national wealth. It is well beyond time that the federal government recognises that and Queensland finally is given its fair share of the GST pie because the GST pie is growing larger but Queensland's share of it is growing smaller.

(Time expired)

Crisafulli LNP Government, Achievements

Mr BAILLIE: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. How is the Crisafulli LNP government placing respect for taxpayers' money at the core of economic management, and is the Treasurer aware of any approaches that gambled with Queensland's future?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. Last week it was a pleasure to be with the member for Townsville and the member for Thuringowa in Townsville to announce \$35 million for the North Rail Yards to unlock that important part of the Townsville inner city. One of the reasons the unlocking of that funding is possible is the fiscal discipline in our first budget. I recall that the budget was very clear: we were going to fund the jobs and services that Queenslanders need most, we were going to provide targeted and timely cost-of-living support and we were going to lay the foundation for budget repair. That is what the first budget did and that has enabled us to invest \$35 million to unlock that important piece of Townsville infrastructure.

The member for Townsville asks about respect for taxpayers' money, which is what we delivered in our first budget. It is a far cry from what the former government did. I look at the member for Waterford, the current shadow treasurer, who sat through 31 CBRC meetings and oversaw the collection of \$70 billion more in revenue in three years than was forecast in the member for Woodridge's first budget. Those opposite collected \$70 billion, yet when we came to government they had left black holes. There was a \$461 million black hole in Child Safety. The Springfield hospital, costing \$638 million, was built but they did not put in a dollar to operationalise it. That is their legacy.

More than anything else, they hated productivity. They wound down the purposefulness of the Productivity Commission and then they wound it up. When we brought the Productivity Commission back, they opposed its re-establishment. Our first inquiry was about the CFMEU and the building and construction industry in Queensland. As those on my side of the House have already mentioned, the Productivity Commission found that the CFMEU were enriched and empowered, but those opposite enabled it. They hate productivity. There were 77,000 fewer homes, a nine per cent drop in productivity since 2018 and 458 pages of damning information on those opposite and the decline in productivity. The legacy of those opposite was higher debt, worsening deficits and more taxes. Those opposite were gambling with Queensland's future and that is why they are no longer in power.

Public Transport, Accessibility

Ms FARMER: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Celine from Bulimba, a support worker, says the cuts to staff and hours at her local station will directly impact those in a wheelchair who rely on station staff to access a ramp. Can the minister explain why the LNP is making public transport less accessible for those who rely on it?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Bulimba for her question. I want to say to Celine that she should stop listening to Labor's disgraceful scare campaign. I would be more than happy to meet with Celine and correct the record. I want to be very clear: the revised station operating model, which was started by those opposite and, to be fair, has been continued by me, is all about ensuring we deliver the services that Queenslanders need on the rail network.

I go back to the Queensland Rail media release because it talks about facts. I know that those opposite are not interested in facts because that does not suit their political narrative, but let us talk about facts. The media release states that this will—

... see station staff rostered where and when our customers need them most.

The change is based on facts and patronage statistics, which show that some stations require more staff at certain times while others are not as busy.

It goes on—

Queensland Rail is simply putting staff where and when they are needed to service the needs of our customers.

Every train service will continue to meet the accessibility needs of customers—

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr MICKELBERG: I say this again for the benefit of Celine and the member for Bulimba, who does not want to listen to the answer but I want to be very clear—

Every train service will continue to meet the accessibility needs of customers—either a station staff member or onboard staff member will continue to provide assistance with boarding requirements.

That is a quote from the Queensland Rail media release, which Queensland Rail felt was necessary because those opposite wanted to continue to peddle disgraceful smear campaigns and fear campaigns. They did it in the election and they are doing it again now. They have nothing else in their playbook.

For the benefit of Celine and all public transport users I will be very clear: accessibility needs will be met. We are investing in the rail network, whether it is delivering the Wave on the Sunshine Coast, fixing their botched Cross River Rail project or getting on with the job of delivering Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail. There has never been more funding invested in rail in Queensland than under this LNP state government. That is our record. I contrast that with their record. They could not even build Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail in their own heartland.

Those opposite continue to peddle these mistruths and it is a disgrace. It begs the question: what are they trying to distract from? Is it that they do not think we should plan for growth? Do they want to replicate the rail fail when the Redcliffe line opened with too few drivers and cancellations? That is their record. We will not make the mistakes they made when they were in government. We will continue to invest in the rail network and deliver the services that every Queenslanders deserves. I urge those opposite to stop these disgraceful scare campaigns.

(Time expired)

Integrity in Government

Mr HEAD: My question is of the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How is the Crisafulli LNP government placing integrity at the forefront regarding the use of hardworking taxpayers' money, and is the Attorney aware of any approaches where taxpayer funds were wilfully wasted during a decade of decline?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: What a great question on integrity and taxpayers' money from the member for Callide, a member who represents so many hardworking Queenslanders, particularly in the mining industry. Just ask the member for Callide whether it was his mine where the CFMEU had a picket line where they were yelling out, threatening to rape and threatening people's children. It was back in 2017 when the LNP, then in opposition, and the honourable health minister, who I believe was the then opposition leader, called out the then Labor government for the abhorrent behaviour of the CFMEU. We called for the government to cut ties with the CFMEU. If they had one iota of integrity, they would have done it then.

It is no wonder their heads are down because what have we discovered with the CFMEU commission of inquiry? It went from bad to worse to absolutely disgraceful. Seriously! We have heard about the increase in cost for the vital Cross River Rail project, which we called out back then as well,

from \$5.4 billion to \$9.83 billion. This was back in 2017-18. We heard about a two-year delay to the Albert Street Station.

When contractors were trying to negotiate for billions of dollars worth of government contracts, what did they have to do? We have heard through the commission of inquiry that they had to actually pick up the hotline to the then deputy premier. When the then deputy premier Jackie Trad wasn't screaming down the phone at former premier Palaszczuk or actually calling the CCC chair on a Sunday—

Mr Nicholls: Calling the member for Cairns something.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I remember. I will take that interjection. I dare say what she was calling the former member for Cairns is probably is what she was calling the former premier and all of the other incompetent ministers over there. Where do the leadership aspirations of the Labor Party now sit? They sit with everyone who was trained up by Jackie Trad. We have seen the disgraceful behaviour of those former ministers, and it will come out through the CFMEU commission of inquiry. We know that the CFMEU has links to all of the leadership aspirants. We know that former minister Scanlon has met with them, we know that the member for Waterford thanked the CFMEU. Frankly, you should all hang your heads in shame.

(Time expired)

Queensland Rail, Workforce

Mr de BRENNI: My question is to the Minister for Transport. Will the minister listen to the QR workers who join us in the gallery today and stop his proposed cuts?

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. A similar question has already been asked of the transport minister—the content of that question is similar. Also, there are imputations and inferences contained within the question. Can the Manager of Opposition Business authenticate the question as asked?

Mr SPEAKER: I will take advice. Member for Springwood, can you authenticate?

Mr de BRENNI: Yes, Mr Speaker. I have spoken directly with the QR workers in the gallery.

A government member interjected.

Mr de BRENNI: One hundred per cent. Those workers there who are members of their union, and they have expressed—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Unfortunately, the period for question time has concluded.

APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) (SUPPLEMENTARY 2024-2025) BILL

APPROPRIATION (SUPPLEMENTARY 2024-2025) BILL

Cognate Debate



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.14 am), by leave, without notice, I move—

That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill and the Appropriation (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill be considered 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.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Declared Urgent; Allocation of Time Limit Order



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.15 am), by leave, without notice, I move—

1. That, under the provisions of standing order 137, the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill, with the minister called to reply to the bill by 4.50 pm on Wednesday, 25 March 2026 and all remaining stages of the bill to be completed by 5.30 pm on Wednesday, 25 March 2026.
2. If all stages have not been completed by the time specified in 1., Mr Speaker shall put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill, including clauses and schedules en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill, without further amendment or debate.

In briefly addressing this motion, I would like to make the following points. Following the House's agreement to consider the Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill and the Appropriation (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill as a cognate debate, this motion is a further procedural step in the orderly management of the business before the House this week. This motion, moved in accordance with standing order 137, provides a clear and structured framework for the consideration of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. It sets out defined timeframes for the minister's reply and for completion of all remaining stages of the bill, ensuring that all members are aware of the arrangements ahead of us in relation to this important legislation. These are not unique arrangements. They are established mechanisms available to the House to ensure that the work is conducted in a way that is disciplined, predictable and methodical. They provide certainty to members, facilitate the proper allocation of time for debate on this legislation and ensure that the legislative program of the government can be progressed in an efficient and responsible manner. Importantly, this motion does not remove—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the House has moved a detailed procedural motion about the time limitations guillotining debate. It would appear to me that the rights of members in this House would be to receive a copy of that motion so that we can properly consider its contents before the Leader of the House concludes his remarks so that we are able to respond accordingly. I now have a copy.

Mr SPEAKER: We will arrange that.

Dr ROWAN: I am of the understanding that the motion is available for circulation through the attendants.

Mr SPEAKER: You have the call.

Dr ROWAN: Importantly, this motion does not remove the opportunity for members to contribute to the debate. Rather, it ensures that those contributions occur within a clear and transparent structure, consistent with the standing orders of this House.

I anticipate, as we have previously seen, that those opposite may seek to characterise this as anything other than it is, but the reality is quite the opposite. It is about ensuring that the House functions effectively and smoothly, that the debate is conducted in an orderly way and that the parliament can make decisions in a timely manner.

Good management of the House is about providing clarity and certainty. It is about ensuring that members understand when matters will be debated and when decisions will be made. It is about discipline with respect to the program of the House so that we can deliver on the legislative priorities before us. This motion reflects that approach. It is a practical and considered use of the standing orders to ensure the efficient operation of the parliament.

The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is committed to ensuring that the business of the House is conducted in a calm, orderly and methodical way with a clear focus on delivery and, as such, I commend the motion to the House.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (11.18 am): I rise to speak to the motion to guillotine debate of important legislation, precisely the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which was introduced into this House by those opposite. I want to put on the record some specific observations I have made of the pattern of behaviour of this bad LNP government when it comes to the way in which they attack democracy and shut down the voices of Queenslanders in this state. We have already seen this government use their big majority to criminalise free speech. Here they are, once again, shutting down speeches and the opportunity for Queenslanders to be represented in this parliament.

The question remains: why does this government continue to hide from scrutiny? They hide from the scrutiny of parliamentary committees. They hide from the scrutiny of stakeholders. This motion seeks to shield them from the scrutiny of this very chamber. Why would they silence the members of this assembly when they once demanded transparency? The result of their silencing of Queenslanders has been botched law after botched law. The risk this motion presents to Queenslanders is that the inadequate time for consideration in detail will result in another suite of botched laws in the name of this

Deputy Premier. The Speaker made a ruling on 14 March. He said that this is where members come to have their say and it should not be treated lightly. That goes to important elements of the passage of a bill through this assembly.

I want to make a specific observation about the importance of consideration in detail. From my preliminary examination of this motion, the Leader of the House has proposed 20 minutes, at best, of consideration in detail to consider the bill as it was introduced and the last-minute amendments that have been dumped on Queenslanders. There is less than 48 hours for this House to consider those amendments. There is zero opportunity for stakeholders to have any say on this. There will be no parliamentary committee scrutiny whatsoever. They come in here to shut down the views of Queenslanders by shutting down the opportunity for us to express their views in parliament. They are punishing those people by not allowing members in this House to have their say.

The government have repeatedly gagged debate on bills in this parliament. They have got legislative reforms wrong time and again, and they have had to come back here to fix the legislation they have botched time and again. We have seen botched bills and fudged figures. Why do they repeat that same mistake every single time?

To conclude: this motion is not about efficiency; it is about control. It is about shutting down the voices that do not agree with them. It is about restricting free speech. They have legislated to restrict the free speech of Queenslanders outside of this House, and today they are using their numbers to restrict free speech inside this House. Let us be very clear: this is about denying Queenslanders a voice. We will not be supporting this motion. There was no opportunity to even negotiate this motion with the Leader of the House. The previous government at least paid the then opposition the respect of informing them the day before what the timelines were going to be.

Government members interjected.

Mr de BRENNI: I did not hear the interjections. I am not taking interjections. On this side of the House, we believe in the rights of Queenslanders to voice their opinions—

Mr Bleijie: I said you're a hypocrite.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Deputy Premier, I ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Mr de BRENNI: I pay his childish and churlish remarks no heed, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, you are to remain relevant to the motion.

Mr de BRENNI: Indeed. On day one of this parliament the Premier gagged debate, and he continues to do it. He continues to deny Queenslanders a voice. We will not be supporting this motion.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (11.24 am): I rise to speak against the urgency motion. Here we are again. It is becoming a constant of how the government conducts its business in that every bill is declared urgent. We need the appropriate time to debate bills. We particularly need the time for consideration in detail, which I would say is one of the most important stages of a bill. There are some bills—and this one is a case in point—that people support parts of but are concerned about other parts. When the time that we can spend in consideration in detail is truncated—and those opposite lamented every time we did it to them when they were in opposition. We did not do it that often. What we are seeing in the House from those opposite is hypocrisy and arrogance.

This is stifling debate. This urgency motion is unnecessary. We need the appropriate time to conduct the business of this House. We would argue that the time allocated is not sufficient for us to do the business. When the government was in opposition for 10 years, we heard various opposition members raise their objections time and again. Now they are being hypocritical and arrogant and not allowing us adequate time to properly talk about the issues that are in the bill before us.

The Leader of the House said, 'We believe the allocation of time is adequate.' We disagree. Generally, the minister in response—which he said will be at 4.50 pm on Wednesday—uses all of their time, whether they need to or not, leaving us with hardly any time for consideration in detail, when parts of the bill may be supported and other parts may not be supported. It takes away our ability to put our position clearly in this House. Even though we see merit in parts of this bill, there are parts that we vehemently oppose. We will be denied enough time for consideration in detail because they will all be bundled together at 5.30 pm. We are not being allowed enough time to put our position clearly in this House that there are parts of this bill we do not support.

The Leader of the House also said that this urgency motion was needed for the smooth and effective functioning of this House. For whom? We do not believe that it is smooth or effective functioning when people are denied their right to speak or their ability to vote against a particular element in a bill. That is not smooth and effective. They were the words used by the Leader of the House when he spoke in favour of the urgency motion. He then went on to say that there was a disciplined and clear program of work. Yes, it is generally noted on the agenda when a bill is to be debated. This urgent bill is on top of that. This motion is to deny adequate time to debate that bill. It has nothing to do with a clear program or discipline. The discipline is that this House gives the right to every member, whether on the government benches or the opposition benches, to have their say on a bill if they wish to speak to it. That is what we have been elected to do. We heard about that time and again from those opposite when they were in opposition, more or less decrying that it would ever happen when they were in government.

Mr de Brenni: Every bill is urgent except for the fuel bill.

Ms GRACE: Yes. Every bill now is urgent—

Ms Fentiman: Except our fuel bill.

Ms GRACE: Yes, except our fuel bill. We are in a fuel crisis at the moment. All of their bills are urgent except the opposition's. We are in a crisis with the war in Iran.

The Leader of the House also mentioned that this was 'practical' and 'considered'. Once again, I ask the question: for whom is it practical or considered?

Dr Rowan: Queenslanders.

Ms GRACE: I take that interjection from the Leader of the House. Queenslanders have a right to hear from the opposition in relation to this bill. They have a right to do that. It is not practical for them not to hear what some of us on this side of the House may want to say. It is not considered for them to have to bear the brunt of that—that we may want to make a position perfectly clear on certain parts of this bill.

It is not considered to deny us the opportunity to vote against certain clauses in a bill, as they did in the last sitting week—bundling it all together, guillotining the debate, guillotining consideration in detail and then forcing a certain outcome on the opposition. That is not practical and considered. It is not in the interests of Queenslanders who want to see a parliament that is open and transparent to see at every opportunity the democratic process being thrown out the door, being thrown away, to demonstrate to Queensland that they are being practical and considered. I disagree entirely with the assertion of the Leader of the House that that is a reason for this urgency motion to be moved and debated.

The Leader of the House also went on to say that this is about conducting business in a 'calm, orderly and methodical manner'. Once again this side of the House disagrees with those words. There is nothing calm, orderly or methodical in conducting business in the manner in which they are, denying people the opportunity to speak on this bill. In addition, there is nothing calm, orderly or methodical in denying the opposition, if it chooses, to vote against amendments or to vote against clauses in the very important stage of consideration in detail. There is nothing calm, orderly or methodical in that. Time and time again we are forced to vote on a bill when the time has expired without us making our position clear. There may be parts of the bill that we agree with but there may be parts of the bill that we disagree with, and this bill is a case in point. There is nothing calm, orderly or methodical in that. It is about restricting free speech.

Consideration in detail is an important element of debate. We were just handed some amendments completely out of the blue that will be moved in consideration in detail to do with an entirely different piece of legislation to do with James Cook University. In terms of consultation, the explanatory notes state that 'neither the council nor any other key stakeholders have been consulted'. That is about the amendments that have just been circulated in the House. We will not have time in consideration in detail to scrutinise those amendments to a completely irrelevant piece of legislation. I understand why they want to move those amendments, but give parliament the time to debate them.

Do not deny us the ability to speak on bills or amendments. Do not deny Queenslanders the right to hear the opposition's position on certain clauses of this bill. Do not deny Queenslanders the right to hear about how they feel that no key stakeholders have been consulted on an amendment that has just been dropped in this House.

This is becoming far too common. We object to it. We will be voting against this urgency motion because, as I said, there is nothing in their conducting of business that is done in a calm, orderly or

methodical manner. This is starting to become an arrogant government that is denying Queenslanders from hearing from the opposition on these bills.

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.34 am): I love the new-found respect for democracy by the Labor Party and the member for McConnell. I wonder where it was for the 10 years they were in office.

Mr Dick: Don't be a hypocrite.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Woodridge, I heard you use some unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr DICK: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr BLEIJIE: I listened intently to the member for McConnell. What has changed, because it certainly was not the position that the Labor Party had for 10 years when they rushed their legislation through? Who could forget the Business Committee motions that we debated every Tuesday morning which guillotined three, four or five pieces of legislation! Now the member for McConnell is saying, 'Oh, the opposition needs time.' Geez, if only they had that position when they were in government. The member for McConnell interjected this morning on one of our members and said, 'Isn't government hard?' I retort by saying to the member for McConnell: isn't opposition hard? It is hard. I say to the member for McConnell that you have to wake up early and do better and do more and work harder.

The difference is this: this is nothing but a technical amendment that we are debating here. We abolished the Business Committee standing order. That is what they had, which meant that they set the business agenda for the week and they rushed it through every Tuesday, so what Labor wanted Labor got. It could have been three bills or four bills. They essentially guillotined every bill they debated every week. They curtailed the time on every bill. We got rid of that standing order. The declaration of this bill as an urgent bill is nothing more than what their Business Committee motion did, yet we are giving them two days.

I actually think that the reason they are objecting to this motion and need time is that they have not decided whether they are going to continue to back the CFMEU or back Queenslanders. That is why the member for McConnell in objecting to this urgency motion is saying, 'We need time to look at different clauses and vote on different clauses.' It is a pretty simple bill: you are either on the side of Queenslanders or on the side of the CFMEU. Make your mind up. Then all will be revealed.

The member for McConnell talks about denied voting rights. No, there is not. They have a chance to vote. They can vote for it or against it—nothing changes. I have seen media reports that the opposition were trying to push out after the last sitting week about these declarations of urgent bills. The only reason we have to declare this an urgent bill is not that it did not go to a committee—it went to a committee for six weeks. Nothing was declared urgent about it. It went to a committee for six weeks. This is the orderly business of the House. Instead of moving a Business Committee motion, you declare the bill urgent as has happened since the establishment of this parliament, and that has stood the test of time. It only changed when Labor were elected and they established the Business Committee motion. The Business Committee motion was often moved by the member for Springwood, who has also had this onset of democracy and now loves democracy—

Ms Bates: Come-to-Jesus moment.

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes. I take that interjection. He has had a come-to-Jesus moment where everything is about democracy now and members of the opposition should be afforded the right to speak. There is nothing in this motion that stops members speaking. In fact we have two days of debate. There is not much in the bill other than you have to decide whether you are on the side of Queenslanders, which the LNP is, or on the side of the CFMEU, which Labor traditionally has been. That is the outcome. That is the decision they have to make. It is not hard. Even for the member for McConnell, I do not think it is an intellectually troubling bill that she could not get her head around. I think she could. Maybe I have a different point of view on the member for Logan. Maybe the member for McConnell could read it and understand it. Basically she ought to make a decision this afternoon—

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

Mr BLEIJIE: It was a compliment.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, just pause for a moment. Member for McConnell, I had not given you the call. There is no point of order. Deputy Premier, you have the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: I thought the member for McConnel was going to object to my complimenting her intellectual capacity to deal with this legislation, but that is okay.

Let's not be fooled by the Manager of Opposition Business. He comes in here, puts his soft voice on and talks about democracy. He puffs his chest out like the old union official enforcer he was, but he puts his soft voice on so as not to be chastised or bullied by the Leader of the House. People understand the Labor Party—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I have been listening very carefully. You are responding to points made by opposition members. I would ask that you ensure you remain relevant to the motion.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, you have to give this some context. They are debating and opposing an urgency motion which is not rushing through legislation. It has gone through a six-week committee process, it is before the House and members will have two days to debate it. The only thing stopping members opposite from debating it is them debating procedural motions like this and continuing to object to these types of motions.

Let's not let the facts get in the way of a good story here. For 10 years the Labor Party guillotined most bills they did, but not under the guise of urgency motions; they did it under the business program motion. The Manager of Opposition Business said in his contribution, 'We did not even have the courtesy of knowing about this motion.' He said, 'We used to give them the courtesy.' As someone who sat in the Business Committee I can tell you what the courtesy was. It was arriving at the Business Committee and being told by the then leader of the house what bills were going to be debated that week, the time allotted to each bill, the guillotine on each bill—and there were no objections—and walking out of the room. Then they came in here and moved the motion they had told us about, we objected to it, we talked about democracy, and they did what they did in government. All of a sudden, now that they are in opposition there is a change of story and everyone should have a right to speak. Do not be fooled by the hypocritical nature of their fake outrage.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, Deputy Premier. Do you have a point of order, Manager of Opposition Business?

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Attorney-General. I am hearing a point of order. I will do so in silence.

Mr de BRENNI: I think all members of the House understand the confidentiality provisions relating to committee business.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order? One moment, Manager of Opposition Business. Could you pause for a moment, please. Manager of Opposition Business, before you continue could you tell me, please, on what point of order you are rising?

Mr de BRENNI: I am pointing out that the Deputy Premier—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No. What is the point of order?

Mr de BRENNI:—is in breach of standing orders and the confidentiality provisions pertaining to committee business—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you raising a matter of privilege?

Mr de BRENNI: It is a matter of privilege. I allege that the Deputy Premier is engaged in contempt—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could you pause, please.

Mr de BRENNI:—and for the dignity of the House—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause, please.

Mr de BRENNI:—he should be brought to order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could you please pause. I asked you three times and you kept talking. Manager of Opposition Business, I have sought advice about the point of order or matter of privilege

you raised, whichever it was. I am advised that standing order 211 did not apply to the Business Committee, so there is no point of order. The Deputy Premier has the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: I might point out to the member for Springwood, the Manager of Opposition Business, that when Yvette D'Ath was leader of the house and I was manager of opposition business we often talked about what happened in the business program motion in this House, so again when Yvette D'Ath was in this position in government it was okay to talk about the affairs of the Business Committee, but not this government. Guess what? We abolished the Business Committee because that was their thing. They set it up. It is like the Labor Party is living in an alternate universe and they think everything is bad because they are now in opposition. It is a fanciful way to look at life. The reality is that the Labor Party will have enough time—two full days—to debate this legislation. They just have to pick a side: Queenslanders, which is the side the LNP government is on, or the CFMEU, which is the side Labor has traditionally been on. That is the decision they have to make. It is not hard. I am sure they can work it out within two days. I move—

That the question be now put.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a motion before the House and, in accordance with standing order 88, I am going to put that motion.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

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

AYES, 50:

LNP, 50—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, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 37:

ALP, 33—Asif, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Sullivan.

Pair: Lister, J. Kelly.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTIONS

Suspension of Sessional Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (11.51 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of the sessional orders be suspended to enable general business notice of motion No. 1, Dissent from Speaker's Ruling, to be now called on.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Before calling the member for Maiwar, I remind honourable members that debate on the dissent motion must be strictly relevant to the question of dissent from the ruling and must not digress into the topic of the question itself.



Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (11.52 am): I move—

That Mr Speaker's ruling on 4 March 2026 in relation to the member for Maiwar's question without notice to the Premier and Minister for Veterans on the same date be dissented from.

The motion standing on the *Notice Paper* in my name is a motion of dissent from the Speaker's ruling on 4 March 2026 that my question without notice on that date was out of order. The substantive

question, which was preceded by a preamble with two factual statements, was to the Premier. Specifically, the question was—

Does the Premier accept that it is possible to criticise the State of Israel and its actions without being anti-Semitic?

In addressing the motion, I will necessarily refer to both the ruling in the House on 4 March on page 450 of the *Record of Proceedings* and to the Speaker's detailed reasons circulated the following day and in the *Record of Proceedings* on page 504.

This is not a motion I bring lightly. It is brought in good faith, and I bring it in the interests of the proper functioning of this parliament. There are only 92 members in this House who can put a spotlight on parliamentary procedure in this way, and clearly fewer than half of those members are ever going to do that. In that context, motions like this are integrally important to address declining public confidence in the institution, no matter how predictable the government's position or the outcome of the motion may be.

I will start by detailing what I consider to be an incongruence between the ruling at the time and the post-hoc explanation that we saw in the Speaker's detailed reasons. The detailed reasons of the Speaker make clear that he had considered possible issues around the anticipation of debate but was 'inclined to allow the question'. We saw that in the House as well where the Speaker was apparently about to allow the question. He in fact called the Premier before the Leader of the House rose on a point of order. At this point—between the question and the Leader of the House rising—the Speaker spent about 45 seconds, on my timing, taking advice, and both the detailed reasons and his conduct suggest that he was inclined to let the question through.

The full reasons make clear that the Speaker subsequently came to a different view after taking further advice. Again, on my timing there were a mere 13 seconds between the Leader of the House rising and making his point of order and the ultimate decision from the Speaker. The ultimate decision, he said, was that he came to the view that 'the question was either seeking an opinion and/or was a hypothetical question' and so was prohibited under standing orders. I would submit to you, Deputy Speaker, and to other members that that is at odds with what the Speaker said on the day. Having apparently reached that conclusion—as set out in the detailed reasons that it was either an opinion and/or a hypothetical—the ruling at the time from the Speaker said that 'the legislation we are debating today' was among the aspects of the question that he thought were questionable.

I will digress for a moment to say that surely there can be no contention that anticipation of debate was really at play in a question time where no fewer than 12 government members got to their feet and put Dorothy Dixers to ministers to provide an opportunity to do nothing more than hurl allegations of anti-Semitism at the member for Cairns. The member for Cairns is perfectly capable of speaking for himself, but I will note that the members for Mulgrave, Nicklin, Cook, Oodgeroo, Barron River and Pumicestone all dished out such Dorothy Dixers on Tuesday, 3 March. On Wednesday, 4 March, it was the members for Gregory, Barron River, Scenic Rim, Hervey Bay, Burnett and Lockyer.

We all heard the responses. The intention of those Dorothy Dixers was clear: to point the finger at the member for Cairns and call him an anti-Semite. While their questions did not refer to anti-Semitism, the relevant standing order 231 makes absolutely no distinction between the questions and the responses. What we saw was a government executing a premeditated plan to make question time all about allegations of anti-Semitism, and ministers were allowed to make whatever fulsome responses they chose along those lines without any question of possible anticipation of the debate.

In the context of this dissent motion, I will make clear that I agree with that element of the Speaker's decision. I question, though, how it remained a feature of his ruling at the time, while it was taken out of consideration in the detailed reasons. It is important to note as well that the unamended bill that was before the House at that point did not actually address anti-Semitism at all, other than its inclusion in the performative title of the bill.

Nonetheless, anticipating the upcoming debate was the only concern the Speaker specifically raised. There is a direct conflict between what the Speaker said at the time in the chair and what was then laid out in his detailed rulings to justify that decision. Deputy Speaker, I would submit respectfully that one could reasonably maintain concerns about whether or how, in those 13 seconds before the Speaker's ruling, he could have properly considered the basis for ruling the question out of order. It is a concerning possibility that the ruling might have been more directly a reaction to government discomfort with the question through the point of order raised by the Leader of the House. That is the case especially in circumstances where I was not afforded the opportunity to respond to the point of order.

I will briefly raise a concern around the fact that the basis of the ruling remains unclear. The words in the detailed reasoning are—

I came to the view that the question was either seeking an opinion and/or was a hypothetical question ...

It might be fair enough for a member of this House to put forward an argument in those terms, but we as members are expected to understand and apply the standing orders in a way that is resolute to their terms. Under this ruling, we still have three possibilities as to why the question was out of order: it was seeking an opinion, it was asking a hypothetical question or it was both—that is, seeking an opinion and asking a hypothetical question. If we are to comply with our obligations with standing orders, we have to rely on being able to understand what they mean and what the Speaker's view is. Whether or not members in this House agree with the ruling, none of us are in a position now to understand the actual singular basis for the question to be ruled out of order.

The Speaker's detailed reasons go on to say that the question was 'seeking an answer based on belief or supposition'. I would submit that that is simply not the case. The question stated—

Does the Premier accept that it is possible to criticise the State of Israel and its actions without being anti-Semitic?

I was not asking for a statement of belief; I was asking as a matter of fact if one can be critical of the State of Israel and its actions without being anti-Semitic. I was not asking the Premier to suppose anything. Yes, the question included the word 'possible', but it was a very straightforward question asking for a factual response on policy.

The government has directly invited itself into this debate. It is a highly relevant policy question in circumstances where they have banned certain words and also in the broader context of them just making up labels. Rallies against war crimes and genocide are now being labelled as 'pro-Hamas' by people who are not interested in distinguishing between civilian lives in Gaza and members of a prescribed organisation.

The Premier and other ministers have in this place and elsewhere made sweeping allegations of anti-Semitism. The Premier and the government appear to be taking their cues directly from the Queensland Jewish Board of Deputies and the Executive Council of Australian Jewry, and the position of those organisations appears to be that any criticism of Israel, the Israeli occupying forces in the Palestinian territories or Israeli government leadership is anti-Semitic. This government is not listening to other Jewish voices in the community let alone the members of the multicultural community more broadly.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is related to relevance in the sense of the prescribed nature of the motion as it is. Whilst I have given some latitude, I ask you to bring the member back to the substance of the actual motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I will take some advice. Member for Maiwar, I have been listening very carefully to your comments and appreciate that the points you have been making have been very relevant thus far. However, I do take the view that you are straying into discussion about matters that are not strictly relevant to the procedural motion. I would ask you to please confine your comments to the procedural motion before us, as you have done thus far.

Mr BERKMAN: That was context I was trying to put around the submission that this is not just a legitimate question but an important policy question. The Premier's understanding, this government's policy, on what is and is not anti-Semitism is absolutely fundamental to Queenslanders exercising their rights and living in society today. I still want to know the answer to the question, and I know countless Jewish people who oppose the Israeli genocide in Gaza who would also like to know the answer to the question. I ask on their behalf. They would like to know: under this government's policy, is their opposition to Israel's conduct anti-Semitic? The Premier cannot continue to hide behind parliamentary procedure on this issue and—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I take that point of order, I am going to talk to the Clerk.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order is the same as my previous point of order. It related to remaining relevant to the procedural motion as opposed to the substance of the topic.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, again, I have been listening and I consider that you have strayed somewhat into matters relating to whether people can protest a conflict and still not be anti-Semitic and also matters that were not actually raised in the question you asked of the Premier in relation to which you are dissenting from the ruling of the Speaker. With one minute and 15 seconds

remaining on the clock, I would encourage you to remain relevant to the procedural motion and not extraneous matters that are not relevant on procedural grounds.

Mr BERKMAN: The point that is important here is that the Premier had called things anti-Semitic that simply are not, and we as a state—we as citizens of Queensland—deserve to know what is this government's policy on criticising the actions of Israel. Just spraying 'anti-Semitism' everywhere has the consequence of devaluing or minimising genuine anti-Semitism of the kind we saw in Bondi. It undermines the common struggle against anti-Semitism that we all should share. He can criminalise what he considers to be anti-Semitic, but we cannot even ask what the Premier means by this.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, if you could address members and refer to them by their correct titles that would be appreciated.

Mr BERKMAN: Apologies, Mr Deputy Speaker; it was a reference to the Premier. We have to be able to ask what is and is not anti-Semitic as a concrete factual question with real legal consequences. The Speaker's ruling went on to mention that questions should be based on facts, not speculative scenarios. To that end, I want to table some facts: the UN Human Rights Council's legal analysis on Israel's conduct in Gaza, a November 2024 press release from the ICC about arrest warrants, the International Association of Genocide Scholars' resolution on the situation in Gaza, the UN's Human Rights Watch statement and the UN reported impacts snapshot from 18 February 2026.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents regarding the conflict in Gaza.

(Time expired)

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (12.04 pm): I rise to oppose the motion of dissent as moved by the member for Maiwar. At the outset I wish to make this important point: motions of dissent from a Speaker's ruling are rare in this House and they are rare for good reason. They are not routine procedural disputes; they are serious motions because they go directly to the authority of the Speaker—that is, the chair—and the orderly conduct of the business of this House. Previous leaders of the House and managers of government business have made precisely this point: a dissent motion is a serious undertaking—one that reflects upon the office and authority of the Speaker and one that ought only be pursued when there is a clear and compelling basis for saying that the ruling was wrong. This is not the case when examining the facts of this matter.

The orderly functioning of this House depends upon the Speaker acting as the impartial umpire of debate applying the standing orders without fear or favour, maintaining order and ensuring the proceedings are conducted according to the rules, protocols and accepted practice of the House. If members are free to disregard rulings whenever they dislike the outcome, what is undermined is not merely one ruling on one day but the authority of the Speaker itself, and this is why this motion should be rejected.

The issue before the House is not whether the member for Maiwar feels strongly about the subject matter of his question. Likewise, the issue is not whether he agrees or disagrees with the answer he believes he might have received. The issue before the House is whether the Speaker's ruling and the subsequent and considered reasons given to the House on 5 March 2026 were correct according to the standing orders and established parliamentary practice. I respectfully put to the member for Maiwar and to all members that they were correct.

It is important when considering this parliamentary motion to understand the sequence of events. On 4 March 2026 during question time the member for Maiwar asked the Premier a question without notice. The Speaker quite properly paused, indicating he would take further advice. As Leader of the House, I rose to a point of order. My point of order drew attention to two matters: firstly, whether elements of the question were seeking an opinion; and, secondly, whether there was a jurisdictional responsibility connecting the question to the Premier's official portfolio responsibilities. That point of order was not some extraneous intervention; it went directly to the requirements of the standing orders and to the proper parameters of question time in the Queensland parliament.

Mr Speaker subsequently determined that the question should be ruled out of order. On 5 March 2026 the Speaker returned to the House and gave full reasonings for his ruling. These reasons matter. They were not cursory and they were not improvised; they were considered. They were careful, structured reflections and anchored in standing orders and precedent.

Mr Speaker identified, firstly, the requirement under standing order 113(1) (a)—namely, whether the question could be described as public affairs with which the Premier is officially connected or be a matter of administration for which the Premier is responsible. Mr Speaker then explained that, given the breadth of the Premier's responsibilities, he had initially been inclined to allow the question although

conscious of other issues, but after further advice and having regard to the point of order that had been raised he came to the view that the question was either seeking an opinion and/or was hypothetical and, therefore, prohibited by standing order 115(b) (v) or 115(c) (i). That is the very core of this matter.

The member for Maiwar's question was not framed as a question about action taken by the Queensland government. It was not a question seeking factual information. Similarly, it was not framed as a question about a policy position of the Premier and/or the state government; nor was it framed as a question about a factual decision, an administrative act or a matter of state responsibility. Instead, it asked whether the Premier accepts a proposition. In other words, it asked for a view, an opinion, a belief. That is exactly what standing order 115 is designed to prevent. A question which asks whether the Premier accepts a proposition is, by its very nature, seeking the Premier's opinion. It is not asking what the government has done; it is not asking what policy the state government has adopted; it is not asking what factual matter the state government can confirm. It is asking the Premier to express a view on a proposition framed by the member asking the question.

Further, the question was also hypothetical in character. It did not seek clarification of an existing policy or a factual action of government. It invited the Premier to opine on an abstract proposition about what is possible. That is not a question tied to a concrete act of state administration; it is a speculative proposition. It is an invitation to comment on a scenario and to give an answer based on a belief, supposition or personal judgement. That is precisely why the reasons articulated by Speaker Weir on 5 March were so important.

Mr Speaker stated that questions should be based on factual matters and policy, not speculative situations or scenarios, and that is exactly right. The question from the member for Maiwar failed that test. It did not seek factual information from the Premier. It did not seek an answer about Queensland government policy. It did not seek an answer about an administrative responsibility of the Premier. It sought an opinion and did so in a hypothetical and abstract way, and for those reasons the ruling was correct. Importantly, the reasons provided by the Speaker were also supported by well-established precedent. On 5 March 2026 the Speaker referred to established rulings, including those of former Speakers Fouras and Pitt, for the proposition that questions seeking an answer based on belief or supposition rather than factual matters or policy are out of order. That is not some unique interpretation advanced for this one occasion; it is consistent with the longstanding practice of this House that question time is not to be used for speculative propositions, hypothetical scenarios or requests for ministerial opinion untethered from matters of responsibility and policy.

The reasoning provided by the Speaker is also entirely consistent with broader Westminster practice. As set out in Erskine May, widely regarded as the foremost authority on parliamentary practice, Erskine May states that questions should be worded neutrally, should not contain expressions of opinion or argument and should not be hypothetical. Erskine May also states that questions should relate to matters of government responsibility. Those principles align precisely with the Speaker's ruling in this case. The member for Maiwar's question was not neutrally framed so as to seek information; it sought assent to a proposition. It did not ask about a concrete government act; it invited an opinion on an abstract and hypothetical matter. The member for Maiwar may not like the ruling—he is entitled to that dissatisfaction—but dissatisfaction is not the test for dissent. This is a procedural motion and the test is whether the Speaker misapplied the rules governing procedure in this House. Here the Speaker did not. The Speaker considered standing order 113(1) (a). The Speaker considered standing order 115(b) (v) and 115(c) (i). The Speaker considered the nature of the question. The Speaker considered precedent. The Speaker then gave full reasonings to the House, and that is exactly what ought to occur in a well-functioning Westminster parliament.

Finally, in concluding my contribution I also say this: question time is a vital mechanism for holding the executive to account, but it only works if questions are framed within the rules. Members are entitled to ask searching questions. They are entitled to ask difficult questions. They are entitled to ask questions that test the state government, but they are not entitled to ignore the standing orders and then seek to blame the chair when the rules are applied to them. The member for Maiwar's question was not based on factual matters or policy; it was framed to elicit an opinion. It was framed in hypothetical terms. It was speculative in nature. Quite simply, under the standing orders it was out of order. The Speaker was correct in his ruling, and that is why I and the state government will be opposing the motion of dissent. I encourage all honourable members to join the state government in opposing the member for Maiwar's motion.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (12.12 pm): This dissent motion requires the House to consider the ruling made about the question from the member for Maiwar of the Premier on 4 March this year and, in doing so, it is important that I do not stray into the substance of the matter which

brought on the question and nor do I reflect on the Speaker personally, and I will ensure that I do not do that in my contribution to this debate, and I will ensure that because this debate is important. It is clear the government will use its majority to inevitably vote down this motion—that much is clear—but nonetheless this debate is important because the ruling last sitting week revealed something, and every member in this House saw what happened in that moment in the exchange that occurred between the member for Maiwar and the Leader of the House on which the Speaker ruled.

I point that out because often in those exchanges—and the Leader of the House pointed this out about established parliamentary practice and the sorts of precedents and conventions that we see—what we often see is premiers jumping to their feet to answer questions even where an informed observer might form the view that those questions are contrary to the standing orders or to Speakers' rulings. Sometimes premiers do that before a ruling is made around whether or not the question is in order. Sometimes, as I think the Leader of the House indicated—or maybe it was the member for Maiwar, so I stand to be corrected—they will do it when clearly a ruling is about to be made. We have seen that many times in this House. We have seen it often in the 58th Parliament—questions that are put to ministers that are borderline hypothetical, questions that are borderline outside the jurisdiction of this House. Those questions, I submit to you, Mr Deputy Speaker Krause, have been allowed.

I think in this debate it is important for us to recognise that precedent, conventions and standards matter. The Leader of the House spoke about established practice, and I want to reflect on that. Where those questions have been asked of ministers previously, and even where those questions may not have been allowed based on the rationale provided by the Speaker in this question, the questions are allowed and the Premier rises immediately to answer these. He does not hesitate. There is no need to wait for a ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Manager of Opposition Business, I am just going to interrupt you there and caution you that this motion is about the question of dissent before us in relation to a specific question and to warn you not to reflect on the Speaker and rulings made in relation to other questions.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker; I am being incredibly careful to not reflect on the Speaker in any way. We do not suggest that the question asked by the member for Maiwar was either hypothetical or wanting for jurisdiction. I do not suggest that. What I am pointing out is that oftentimes the Premier does not wait or provide the opportunity for the Speaker to make a ruling; he jumps and answers the question anyway. However, when the moment becomes uncomfortable, we have seen the Premier rely on the Leader of the House to rise, as he did on 4 March, with what we and, I think, informed observers could only describe as performative points of order. As he did on 4 March, it is on the basis of opinion or jurisdictional responsibility. That was the point of order that he rose on.

We say that those points of order are not designed to assist the Speaker in considering the application of the standing orders but to shield the Premier from the ability to answer the question. It is our observation that when it suits him politically the Premier is very keen to answer those types of questions, but last sitting week something very different happened. Whilst the decision on whether the question was within the standing orders was the Speaker's to make—and we respect his decision to make that ruling—the Premier did something very unusual: he did not seek to answer the question put by the member for Maiwar. He chose in that instance not to show the courage of his convictions, instead choosing silence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, I am going to call you on relevance here. This is about the Speaker's ruling, not anything else. Please remain relevant to the procedural motion.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The question from the member for Maiwar went to an issue that the Premier has been actively engaged on. I will not mention the substance of the issue. As I indicated, it is important not to do that.

It is one, however, that does affect Australians, it is one that does affect Queenslanders, and it is a question of fact that he should know the answer to. It is not hypothetical. Nor is it asking the Premier an opinion. We say that it is asking the Premier whether he is aware of a fact. Therefore, the question could have been allowed and the Premier could have answered. As I said, he often chooses to answer those types of questions. My point is that Speakers do allow premiers latitude in the way they respond to questions because people are supposed to look up to them.

The other point that we think should be made in this debate is: the challenge that the member for Maiwar faced and was referring to on the day is that it was unclear on what basis the question was

ruled out of order at the time and that was not made clear until the following day. I suspect that is why the member for Maiwar has taken the rare step of bringing this motion for our consideration.

I think what is at the heart of this dissent motion is the pattern—and I am not referring to the Speaker—of behaviour of the Premier, to whom the question was asked. When it serves his political interests—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, could you pause, please. Leader of the House, do you have a point of order?

Dr ROWAN: I do, Deputy Speaker; it relates to relevance and remaining within the confines of the procedural dissent motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Manager of Opposition Business, that is a relevant point of order. Your comments have again started to refer to the conduct of other members. This is about the ruling of the Speaker alone. You have one minute and 53 seconds to conclude your remarks in that respect.

Mr de BRENNI: As I indicated at the outset, nothing in our contribution seeks to reflect personally on the Speaker. We have sought to draw the parliament's attention to observations that can be made about the substance of the application of the standing orders and the Speaker's consideration of those. We thank the House for the opportunity to consider this motion.

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

AYES, 35:

ALP, 33—Asif, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Sullivan.

NOES, 52:

LNP, 50—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, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pair: Lister, J. Kelly.

Resolved in the negative.

ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 28 October 2025 (see p. 3333).

Second Reading

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (12.28 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Before turning to the contents of the bill, I would like to thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee for its consideration of the bill. In its report the committee made one recommendation: that the bill be passed. I thank the members of the committee for their consideration of the bill. I would also like to thank the various industry stakeholders, representatives and organisations who made written submissions and appeared before the committee at the public hearing. I acknowledge from the outset that the bill received majority support from the submitters, further demonstrating that this government is delivering work health and safety improvements in line with industry and workers' needs.

The Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring Queensland workers have adequate protections and fair conditions in their employment. Workers should be safe at their workplaces and paid competitively. Furthermore, this government is committed to restoring productivity in Queensland workplaces and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying. To this end, upon coming to government we acted immediately to take action that will undoubtedly lead to significant improvements in productivity on construction sites and greater protections for workers' health and safety.

I immediately hung up the bat phone, which was the CFMEU's direct line into the Office of Industrial Relations—and, incidentally, to the former deputy premier—set up by the former Labor government. I stopped the special hotline arrangement providing special treatment and now the CFMEU go through the 1300 number like every other Queenslander. I sacked CFMEU official Kurt Pauls from the Work Health and Safety Board who was appointed by the member for McConnell despite his extensive history contravening workplace laws. I wonder, incidentally, what due diligence the member for McConnell did on Kurt Pauls to make her sign his appointment and say he was the best person for the job on the Work Health and Safety Board when he had an extensive history of contravening workplace laws.

This government moved quickly to implement a key election commitment by re-introducing the requirement for work health and safety entry permit holders—union officials—to give at least 24 hours notice before entering a workplace, except where there is an immediate or imminent risk to the health and safety of a worker. This brought an orderly system around union entry back to Queensland worksites. We also repealed changes introduced by the former Labor government intended to expressly allow work health and safety entry permit holders to take photos and videos at workplaces.

On 1 January 2026, this government officially scrapped Labor's best practice industry conditions, also known as the CFMEU tax, saving Queenslanders an estimated \$20.6 billion over the next five years. Our landmark reforms are continuing, with the government agreeing or agreeing in principle to 51 of the 64 recommendations contained in the Queensland Productivity Commission report. I note in particular that the commission called for an 'industry reset', highlighting a nine per cent decline in productivity in the construction sector equating to 77,000 fewer homes built since 2018 under the former Labor government.

The Wood commission of inquiry was also launched last year and is well underway considering the many alleged claims of criminality, abuse, misogyny, harassment and misconduct committed by the CFMEU within the construction industry. At the beginning of the March hearings, the commission commenced a series of case studies, with one of those centring on the regulatory capture of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland by the CFMEU during the period that the member for McConnell was the minister for industrial relations. Evidence emerging from the inquiry can only be described as deeply disturbing. It has revealed a pattern of behaviour that strikes at the very heart of an ordered, civilised society. The issue of right of entry and conduct on worksites received significant attention in the first week of the hearings in March. A former workplace health and safety inspector, discussing the more aggressive actions of unions, said—

I worked under the Bligh and Beattie government as well, and we never had this type of interaction with unions, it only happened under the Palaszczuk government.

A current workplace health and safety official, when she complained of the treatment of inspectors on worksites, was told by a superior—Well, we've got a Labor government. This is what it is. Either like it or leave.

None of this is remarkable when it is noted that the same witness revealed that investigations into right of entry breaches ceased, as she described it, 'around about the change of government'. As all members know, that was in 2015. Another line of inquiry for the commission is BPICs. In particular, the commission has put on record it will be inquiring into why the former Labor government introduced a policy mirroring the terms of pattern agreements with the CFMEU and other members of the building trades group of unions despite concerns from the opposition and the Australian Building and Construction Commission, and without any rational economic basis. These are examples of some of the allegations the commission is working through. I take it that the commission has only just scratched the surface of its independent inquiry. Week after week, day after day in the commission of inquiry we are seeing them get to the bottom of it. As I said, I suspect they have only just scratched the surface. It would be remiss of me not to say that in 10 years in opposition the Liberal National Party raised these very issues in this House.

Mr Mander: You in particular!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable Minister for Sport. Thank you.

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

Mr BLEIJIE: Here we go. Here is the protection racket for the CFMEU. It didn't take long!

Mr de BRENNI: My point of order is on relevance. Many of the matters the Deputy Premier is addressing are not relevant to this bill whatsoever. The practice has been that speakers who are alleged to have been irrelevant are asked to validate—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Your point of order is?

Mr de BRENNI:—how their commentary is relevant to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been listening to the Deputy Premier and he has articulated how this relates back to productivity and another issue of productivity the government is dealing with so I do not believe there is a point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Manager of Opposition Business wants some proof. This bill that we are debating today repeals elements that were about to commence, where the CFMEU did a dodgy deal with the former Labor government about information sharing of workers on worksites. The reason we are stopping those provisions from commencing is because of the dodgy relationship this government believes the CFMEU had with the former Labor government. If you listen to the royal commission, what more proof does the member for Springwood need that these are serious issues that we are dealing with. The relationship between the former Labor government and the CFMEU has been on full display. I would say to the honourable member, you are going to get two solid days of it because our members in government will talk about this issue until the cows come home. I know the member has to stand up and protect the CFMEU because, remember, colleagues, it was the member for Springwood who stood out the front of Parliament House and waved to his CFMEU comrades. When they were outside protesting against getting rid of BPIC, the member for Springwood was the lone Labor member who went out there and waved to them. They thanked him for BPICs.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. This bill is in relation to electrical safety and validating and removing a provision.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very much, member for McConnel. There was a set of interjections that the Deputy Premier was responding to. There is no point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is ironic that the two people who are trying to stop me speaking, the member for McConnel and the member for Springwood, are former union enforcers for the QCU and ETU. Seriously, the irony! This is about stopping laws that the Labor Party put in place. The reason we are stopping them is because of the behaviour of the former Labor government, the CFMEU and the other unions. That is why it is abundantly relevant to the bill that we are debating today. It is on the basis that this government continues to deal with issues in relation to workplaces. For 10 years in opposition the LNP raised these issues on behalf of workplace health and safety officers. In the last two weeks of seeing former and current workplace health and safety inspectors on the stand I could not help but feel that they are now vindicated. They are having their say and they are being heard.

Mr Mander: And how were they treated!

Mr BLEIJIE: Exactly! I take the interjection from the honourable Minister for Sport. How were they treated by the former government? They were dismissed with disdain.

Time after time, we brought to the floor of this House motions to stop the CFMEU doing to inspectors what they were doing and those opposite objected. They refused. The Labor Party voted against our CFMEU motions. Who could forget, every time we moved a CFMEU motion, the member for McConnel standing in here and saying, 'Another CFMEU motion! Attacking the CFMEU!' Darn right we did, and I am glad we did! Aren't the chooks coming home to roost now, member for McConnel? Look at the testimony in the royal commission—absolutely worthwhile.

I feel that the workplace health and safety inspectors who raised all of these issues and expressed concerns about these provisions going forward now have a voice because of the Crisafulli government. We tried our best in opposition, but it was not until we won office and established the royal commission that things could be fully exposed. We will change the legislation, as we are doing today and as we have done for the past year and a half, to put the rights of workers ahead of the rights of the CFMEU.

The CFMEU does not have a bat phone into my office. I do not want to talk to them. I got rid of them from the boards. Guess what? I did not even make the call. I made some other poor soul do it because I do not want to talk to those people. I am not going to talk to them. We will sort them out and we will do it in the CFMEU commission of inquiry. Those opposite will be held responsible and accountable for their inaction and their protection of the CFMEU over 10 years, particularly people who had portfolio responsibilities in industrial relations and could have done something but did not.

How on earth can it be that workplace health and safety inspectors, former and current, are saying at a royal commission that they raised these issues over years and the then opposition raised those particular issues in this chamber yet the Labor Party would have everyone believe that they did not know about it? How could anyone believe that? It makes no sense. They did know about it but they

could not act because they would not have been able to go out onto the President's Balcony at the front of this building and wave to the CFMEU comrades who were thanking the member for Springwood for BPIC. Their preselections would have been under threat. Their donations would have dried up. That is why the Labor Party sold their soul to the CFMEU and it is why they threw the workplace health and safety inspectors into the pit of the CFMEU and let the CFMEU have their way with those workplace health and safety inspectors.

I remember at estimates asking questions about the workplace health and safety inspectors who were on leave due to mental health and anxiety issues because of CFMEU attacks and bullying. The member for McConnel and minister at the time said, 'That's rubbish. That's not happening.' I will get the estimates transcripts.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I take offence and I ask that that be withdrawn.

Mr BLEIJIE: Think before you speak.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): One moment. The member has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. When I sum up the debate in the next couple of days, I will bring in all of the *Hansard* transcripts, including from estimates. I was not going to but I will now. I will remind the member for McConnel of everything she said when we asked about these things and everything she said in support of the CFMEU during the debates of our motions and how she voted against the motions that we moved. I will remind the member for McConnel of her history of 10 years as industrial relations minister. It is a history that she will not be proud of.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: She laughs again. I take the laughing interjection. How could the former minister laugh if she had seen the testimony from workplace health and safety officers that she had a duty and a responsibility of care for?

Mr Mander: She should apologise.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection; the member for McConnel should be apologising to those inspectors—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection, 'How is it relevant?' She does not like the truth. As I said, these examples from the commission of inquiry have only just scratched the surface. This bill is an important step towards unwinding 10 years of Labor's decade of decline and restoring productivity in our construction sector.

Before turning to the bill itself, for the benefit of the House I note that I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail of the bill. These amendments will reshape the James Cook University Council membership structure to align the governance structure with other university council compositions and increase alignment with national efforts to strengthen university governance. This change will bring James Cook University back in line with other universities across Queensland. These amendments increase transparency and public trust by reshaping the governance structure to coordinate it with the way others are already operating. Progressing these changes will ensure that the new governing body represents a broad range of skills, experiences and perspectives. JCU should continue to focus on delivering a world-class education to their students rather than contemplating things such as name changes. I will speak to the detail of these amendments at the appropriate time.

First I will speak to the amendments this bill makes to work health and safety legislation. In its last year in office the former Labor government amended the Work Health and Safety Act to introduce a new right for work health and safety entry permit holders, being union officials, and health and safety representatives to directly request information in improvement notices, prohibition notices or non-disturbance notices from the regulator that relate to the workers they represent. This proposed information-sharing law had a delayed commencement date of 29 March 2026. The ability to request information had very few limitations and ultimately lacked appropriate safeguards. That is, there was no limit on how many requests could be made or how often, there was no limit on the number of notices that could be requested and there was no limit on how far back the requests could be made. There was no requirement for the union representative or health and safety representative to explain the reason for requesting the information from the regulator. There was no way for the government to impose any fees to recoup the administrative costs that would arise in actioning those requests.

Relevantly, there are already multiple existing mechanisms in place under the Work Health and Safety Act that allow representatives to access information when performing their roles. For example, entry permit holders can request relevant and necessary documents and make copies of them when they are legitimately inquiring into a suspected workplace health and safety contravention at a workplace. Employers are already required to give copies of notices to health and safety representatives upon them being issued to the person conducting the business or undertaking, the PCBU.

This government was elected by Queenslanders to restore productivity on Queensland worksites and to end the CFMEU misconduct experienced by countless Queensland businesses and workers. That was our promise and that is what we are delivering. Creating an unfettered right for unions to request information from relevant notices increases the risks of further misconduct, particularly when there are already existing mechanisms in place for this kind of information to be provided to workers and their representatives. It would also significantly detract from the important work of the workplace health and safety regulator. Implementing this new ability to obtain information would have resulted in a significant burden on the workplace health and safety regulator and would have detracted from the regulator's ability to perform its core duties.

There is no doubt that processing potentially hundreds or thousands of requests from the CFMEU, without any limits on the making of such requests, would absolutely have imposed a substantial burden. Again, it is plain to see that the new information-sharing power, with its lack of limits or safeguards, could have easily overwhelmed the resources of our dedicated public servants who manage right-to-information requests, potentially causing further delays on actioning genuine requests for information. I also note that right-to-information requests may take time to action for good reason. Right to information is an important process, and it has rules and safeguards. It allows the imposition of a fee to offset the impact of actioning a request. This new power had none of these considerations, risking the unleashing of as many requests as possible without any need to demonstrate genuine cause.

If the bill is passed, Queensland will be brought back into line with the majority of Australian jurisdictions. These laws were unprecedented and were out of step with the nation. However, many things that we saw the former Labor government do were out of step with every functioning democratic society because it always put the CFMEU ahead of Queenslanders. I am pleased to say that this bill wholly repeals the proposed work health and safety information-sharing provision before it comes into effect and makes minor consequential changes. This will in no way diminish the existing rights for worker representatives under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 to request information from a PCBU where it is appropriate for them to do so. I note that it is a legislative obligation that PCBUs comply with these requests where properly made and penalties may be imposed if this does not occur.

I turn now to the committee's examination of the bill and, in particular, the committee's recommendation that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for that. I am pleased to announce that a majority of submitters supported the repeal of Labor's information-sharing laws, which one stakeholder, the Master Electricians, labelled as a 'proportionate and sensible reform, which restores balance between transparency and fairness'. Queensland's construction industry were united in their concerns. As put succinctly by the Civil Contractors Federation Qld—

This was an enormous overreach which went beyond a reasonable and balanced approach to safety.

Haven't we heard that before in the last 10 years of the Labor government—an overreach for the CFMEU.

Construction industry stakeholders raised concern with the historical and irrelevant nature of documents that could be accessed, the ability for unions to cherry-pick documents from worksites and employers without any justifiable grounds, the impacts to productivity and the limited benefit to improving safety. In fact, industry repeatedly warned that these laws would harm worker safety. In their collective view, the laws would provide no real positive safety outcomes. Instead, as indicated by Master Builders, it would 'simply allow unions to go back in time to look at records and history for things that could be five, 10, 15 or 20 years old', dubbing it as a 'fishing expedition' to acquire information to be used in an inappropriate way. Why would a CFMEU official want to go back in the records of 15, 20 years without causing mischief? That was their purpose and, to cause that mischief, the Labor government legislated for that mischief to occur.

Mr Watts: Shame on them.

A government member: A terrible shame.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take all the interjections. Another united view of industry is that these laws would be highly susceptible to being misused and abused by no other than the Labor-aligned CFMEU. For instance, when asked during the public hearing about whether members of Master Builders held concerns about the CFMEU using these information-sharing laws as part of a harassment campaign, Master Builders responded, saying—

Simply, yes, hence we have advocated for not only this piece of legislation in the WHS Act but also other legislation that was changed as part of that same amendment in March 2024 to be repealed because there has been a misuse of power, and particularly seen from the tier 1 builders through the CFMEU and some of the other building trades groups like the electricians' and plumbers' unions.

I will now speak to the indirect ramifications of Labor's ill-conceived laws on productivity on the construction industry. Unlike those opposite, this side of the House is committed to boosting productivity in the construction industry. We have commenced work to counter the record productivity decline Queenslanders faced under the former Labor government, including the nine per cent decline in construction productivity since 2018, equating to 77,000 fewer homes. We re-established the Queensland Productivity Commission, and I am proud to announce that the Crisafulli government is delivering a fresh start for Queenslanders by committing to reforms to boost productivity in the construction industry after the commission's independent inquiry revealed the sector has been strangled by red tape and union indulgence.

The construction industry stakeholders who submitted evidence on the bill share the same sentiment as I have expressed today. For those opposite who fail to comprehend the true impact these laws would have had on productivity, I will take a moment to read directly from the submissions of those who know the industry best. The submission of the Civil Contractors Federation Queensland says—

One of the key causes of this poor productivity growth, in our view, is the deliberate use of industrial rancour as a tactic of the leadership of the CFMEU.

They go on to say—

There is much more work to be done to reform the construction sector to drive productivity, deliver the Olympic Games and manage Queensland's population growth in a responsible fashion. CCF QLD hopes this is the first of many bills to pass through the Parliament with these goals in mind.

I can hand on heart say it will be. Master Electricians warn that the laws 'could further impede construction productivity at a time when the industry is already grappling with acute skills shortages'. Master Builders indicated that if the laws had come into effect they 'would have had a serious negative impact on the building and construction industry', and that they are 'confident that the proposed amendment will assist in improving onsite productivity and support the cultural shift of the industry'.

What has been made very clear is that industry stakeholders do not support the former Labor government's agenda of rolling out the red carpet for the CFMEU. Under the Crisafulli government, industry can rest assured that the days of rolling out the red carpet for the CFMEU are over. There will be no more special carve-outs in legislation to facilitate or embolden the CFMEU, no more tools to be used as industrial weapons against innocent workers and employers, and no wasting the regulator's time and resources assisting unions in their 'fishing expeditions'. It would be irresponsible of this government to allow these laws to take effect—laws which have no barriers or limitations and which would apply to the CFMEU who also knows no bounds, laws that are out of touch with the nation and which offer minimal safety improvements, all the while redirecting the work health and safety regulator from its most important function—keeping Queenslanders safe. Unlike those opposite, this government is committed to restoring productivity and worker safety to our construction sites.

The bill deals with the amendments to the Electrical Safety Act and the Electrical Safety Regulation. The Crisafulli government is committed to protecting the safety and welfare of all Queenslanders. In support of this commitment, the Electrical Safety Act is directed at eliminating the human cost to individuals, families and the community of death, injury and damage to property that can be caused by electricity. This is an important safety framework to prevent harm to both people and property.

This bill makes two important changes to ensure the legislation continues to achieve its purpose. Firstly, the bill confirms the longstanding practice of Queensland electricity entities, such as Energex and Ergon Energy, alerting consumers of issues with electrical equipment through electrical equipment defect notices. This is an extremely important function performed by those providers. The Electrical Safety Regulation 2013 currently provides that an electricity entity can give a written notice to a person in control of electrical equipment to require them to fix any defect that affects the equipment's electrical safety. This scenario typically occurs where an electricity entity attends a residential property to inspect

an electrical installation, identifies defective electrical equipment such as a damaged general power outlet or an unsafe switchboard, and gives a notice to a person in control of the equipment requiring the person to fix the defect.

The Electrical Safety Act includes a regulation-making power for prescribing broad powers for a person to discharge their electrical safety duties or ensure the electrical safety of persons or property. However, the act does not currently include a clearly specified head of power for electricity entities to give electrical equipment defect notices. The bill will rectify that. It will enable electricity entities to continue giving defect notices and, in turn, ensure defective electrical equipment is identified and fixed.

A validation provision is also included so that any notices given under the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013 prior to this bill remain in force, ensuring continuity on the operation of the framework.

The bill also makes amendments to relocate the regulator's existing power to prohibit the sale or use of electrical equipment if the regulator believes it does not comply with relevant safety criteria. This power will be elevated from the regulation to the act in recognition of the potential impact and reach of such a power and in keeping with the treatment of other similar powers.

There are now greater details on the grounds a direction may be given, a 10-year limit on the duration of a notice, and greater clarity on the reissuance of a direction for the same equipment where it continues to present a risk. The existing penalty of \$4,000 remains in place for failure to comply with a direction without a reasonable excuse. However, there is now clarity that the evidential burden lies on the person subject to the direction to demonstrate if they have a reasonable excuse, similar to other offences in the Electrical Safety Act.

I note that the committee unanimously supported all the electrical safety amendments without reservation.

The Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill provides improvements in both the work health and safety and electrical safety spaces and is yet another step by the Crisafulli government to improve health and safety in Queensland workplaces, and to restore productivity on our worksites.

As I said earlier, I want to give a big shout-out and I want to thank all current and former workplace health and safety inspectors and those employed in the Office of Industrial Relations. They have been courageous, they have been at the forefront of reform that they warned about, but the former Labor government chose to put the interests of the CFMEU ahead of the inspectorate and put at risk the safety and health of our own inspectorate and all those involved in the Office of Industrial Relations.

I raised in this House over the years an individual who caused a lot of issues—Ms Burgess—and I am going to say it again.

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I did. Helen Burgess. I raised it time and time again. We saw in testimony from former workplace health and safety officers the issues that Ms Burgess was creating. I remember at a budget estimates hearing I asked the former minister, the member for McConnel, directly about Ms Burgess and the interactions of Ms Burgess and the CFMEU, and the member for McConnel said I was attacking a public servant. Well, now look at all the evidence coming forward. Where was the member for McConnel protecting the majority of public servants in her department, rather than one individual who had a special phone to the CFMEU?

I am incredibly proud of the workplace health and safety inspectors and all those employed in our department, particularly in the Office of Industrial Relations, and I am particularly pleased that they are now having their voice heard in the Crisafulli government Wood royal commission. They were owed that over years, and we are now giving them that opportunity to have their say, to correct the record and to change laws for the better for not only workers on worksites but also public servants trying to do the best they can in a heated environment. No more will this Queensland government accept the bullying, the misogyny and the violence of the CFMEU—or any other union, for that matter—against workers or workplace health and safety inspectors going out doing their job. The accusations coming out of the royal commission that they were told to go after individuals, do not go after individuals, do what the CFMEU wanted, despite not being a workplace health and safety issue on site, but they were still told by individuals to go out and go after the business owner for the benefit of the CFMEU. All that happened while the former minister, the member for McConnel, not only remained silent but also protected them, defended them and attacked us for raising these issues in this chamber.

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 McDonald): The member has taken personal offence. I ask you to withdraw, minister.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The member for McConnel can today, when she speaks, apologise and tell Queenslanders finally if she will back Queenslanders or will she keep backing the CFMEU like she has for so many years.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bleijie, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Fuel Security

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): It has now been a month since Trump began bombing Iran. It is probably the most significant geopolitical event in recent years, possibly since COVID. While it is causing economic pain in every part of the world, it is also hurting Queensland families. Last week the price of petrol hit \$2, and this week it is more than \$3 in many parts of the state—record prices for petrol and diesel.

This is a fast-moving crisis. Queenslanders tell me that they are hurting, that they cannot afford to fill up their cars with petrol and that \$20 or \$50 worth of fuel does not go very far anymore and they cannot afford to put more in. Pensioners are spending more than \$100 to fill up their car. We all know how much \$100 is out of a pensioner's income.

Brittany from Rixon Haulage wrote to me this morning, concerned that within a couple of weeks they will have to shut down and lay off their 11 staff. It is not sustainable for them to continue to operate. It is not just—

Mr Lee interjected.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Member for Hervey Bay and member for McConnel.

Mr MILES: It is not just a question of fuel; this is a full-blown crisis—one that will get worse the longer this conflict drags on. Tourism operators tell us that they now need to pay \$100,000 more for fuel to keep their boats on the reef. Freight operators tell us that they are deciding day by day whether it is worth sending their trucks out. Imagine owning a business and waking up every day having to decide whether you can afford to keep that business running. The implications of that will drive up prices everywhere, most of all at the supermarket, where families are already struggling with the affordability crisis.

While these events have been caused by a conflict thousands of kilometres away that we cannot control, what our government can control is how they respond. The LNP have responded by doing nothing. Doing nothing is a deliberate choice—a choice that this Premier and this LNP government are making every single day. They are choosing to do nothing at all to help Queensland families and businesses. While other states around the country have acted in sensible and practical ways, this Premier has said that he has no power to do so. Other states have convened industry, bringing them together to coordinate supply, monitor prices and crack down on profiteering. What has the government done here in Queensland? The responsible minister over there—the Treasurer—stuttered, 'I wrote a letter.' They have no plan, no coordination, no sense of urgency for what Queenslanders are facing, no empathy and no understanding.

Queenslanders who cannot afford to fill up their car to get to work or school need a government that acts. They do not need a penpal. They need a government that will work for them, will act and will use everything in their power to make things better. The longer this Premier, Treasurer and LNP government sit on their hands, the worse it will get for Queensland families—prices will go higher, more pressure will be on businesses, more families will struggle and more workers will lose their jobs. Queenslanders want this government to do something tangible that will make a difference.

Our Labor team have put forward simple, sensible and practical suggestions that other states have adopted, like convening a fuel security taskforce, which would acknowledge what this is—that is, an economic crisis—or convening an industry operational group so that all of the industries that are impacted such as mining, agriculture, transport, logistics, tourism and retail can have a seat at the table and can work together on solutions. The impacts on all of these industries are not hypothetical or

theoretical; they are real and they are every day. Our farmers, truckies and miners deserve coordination and a seat at the table.

Families who are being smacked in the face by these incredible petrol prices deserve to have Labor's Transport Affordability Amendment Bill—a bill that is before this parliament and this government could choose to support and pass this week. It would limit excessive price rises and let people know—

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The opposition leader is anticipating debate on a bill before the House.

Mr MILES: To that point of order: there is a long-established practice that private members' bills do not trigger the anticipation rule.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek some advice. Leader of the Opposition, I have sought advice. The rule of anticipation does apply; however, I am advised that the chair has some discretion to enable discussion about that. Now that you have mentioned it, I would like you to come back to other matters.

Mr MILES: The fact is that Queenslanders need to know today how much petrol will be tomorrow. It is pretty simple. That way they will know whether they need to rush out and fill up today or it is safe to wait until tomorrow. They are the decisions that Queenslanders are making each and every day. Today the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and I wrote to the Deputy Premier asking him to invoke his powers under the Planning Act to acknowledge that this is an emergency and declare it an applicable event, something that would allow fuel related businesses to operate 24/7 such as fuel depots, freight depots, heavy vehicle service centres, fuel hubs and, perhaps most importantly, refineries.

Why not take this simple step that would allow our refineries to process more fuel to address supply and to meet the unprecedented demand that we are seeing? This is another practical step that this government could take that would make a real difference. Instead, again, they are refusing to act. They say they have no powers, but that is simply untrue. It is true that the powers are there to be invoked in the case of an emergency. Therefore, in refusing to act, the LNP is refusing to acknowledge that it is an emergency. They are saying that this is not a sufficient crisis to use those emergency powers. Tell that to Queenslanders who are sitting on empty and wondering if they can get home without having to stop at the petrol station. Say that to the freight companies that are laying off long-term employees because they cannot afford to operate.

The fact is that this Premier is so desperate to avoid any responsibility for this crisis and in this crisis he would rather do nothing to help. That is the decision that they are making. They are choosing to do nothing. Queenslanders are paying for that choice at the bowser, at the supermarket check-out, when they book a taxi or a rideshare.

The question for this Premier is simple: how bad does it have to get before you accept that it is an emergency and use your emergency powers? It was not when petrol hit \$3. Is it when petrol hits \$3.50? Is it when petrol hits \$4? How many businesses have to close, how many workers have to be laid off, how many servos have to run dry of petrol before this Premier will act? Queenslanders should not have to wait. They expect their government to act in a crisis, to step up, to lead, to do something—to do anything. This is an issue those opposite are on the wrong side of and they should correct it today.

(Time expired)

E-Mobility Safety

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (2.11 pm): It is good that the opposition leader has finally found his voice. He has been silent on the fuel issue for the last two weeks, ignoring the fact that his Labor mates in Canberra are responsible for the very issue he comes in here and jaws on about. He spent 10 minutes talking about the fuel crisis and did not mention the federal government once—the very level of government responsible for the crisis that Australia is currently facing. The question for the opposition leader is: has he picked up the phone to his mate in Canberra or is he just intent on pathetic political point scoring for his own selfish political purposes? I suspect that it is the second.

I rise regarding our government's commitment to dealing with e-mobility—something those opposite also failed to act on. As I previously advised the House, this week I will be introducing legislation to implement the recommendations of the parliamentary committee's inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland. I take the opportunity to thank the committee again and all those who made a contribution. I acknowledge that there are many different positions and perspectives that were expressed through the process.

The recommendations which we will be implementing provide a commonsense response to a problem that was left unchecked by those opposite. Although 'unchecked' may not be the right term given they actually made the problem worse giving rebates for devices that had speeds up to 70 kilometres an hour! How many lives have been put at risk unnecessarily due to their rushed pre-election cash splash without appropriate checks and balances?

There is just one question that remains, and that is: will Labor support these legislative changes? Will they support strong action on this issue or will they again sit idly by and let the problem get worse like it did when they were in government? I ask this question after reading the report's statement of reservation, signed by Jonty Bush MP, Shane King MP and of course who could forget 'Bart Bellish MP', the member for Aspley. 'Bart Bellish' must be the member for Aspley's new alias, but I can assure this House that the member for Aspley is no Clark Kent. The Labor committee members' statement of reservation stated—

It should also be noted that not all of the recommendations or committee comments are supported by the Queensland Labor Opposition.

So I ask: which recommendations don't they support? Are they against giving police the powers they need to confiscate illegal devices? Are they against RBTs for PMD riders? Are they against speed limits on footpaths? Are they against holding children, parents and retailers to account for their actions? Are they against keeping our communities safe?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Bundamba and member for Pine Rivers, no interjections are being taken.

Mr MICKELBERG: I suspect that they do not know what their own position is. I suspect that this is just another issue tearing the Labor Party apart. It is your classic internal factional battle inside the Labor Party room, inside caucus, just like we saw on anti-Semitism, just like we saw on gun control, just like we saw on Adult Crime, Adult Time. It is a tale as old as time.

The genie is out of the bottle. We have a weak Leader of the Opposition who cannot keep his party together. We know what the member for Cooper's position is on Labor's failed e-mobility device rebate scheme. She had one of her constituents ask for it to be reintroduced and she responded by saying it was 'a solid suggestion'. She thinks giving rebates on devices that can travel up to 70 kilometres an hour is 'a solid suggestion'. After reading some of her comments during the public hearings, I think there are a few recommendations the member for Cooper is wobbly about.

Queenslanders should make no mistake: it was those opposite who let this problem get out of hand. They promised to deal with the RBT loopholes and they did not. This government, in contrast, is taking action.

While on my feet, this morning the chamber saw a dreadful display of fearmongering from those opposite. This time their victims were Queensland Rail station staff who, if they believe those opposite, were going to lose their jobs.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Mr MICKELBERG: I want to table for the House the Queensland Rail media release issued to refute their disgraceful claims—another disgraceful fear campaign, but we should expect nothing less from those opposite given their track record.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 19 March 2026, by Queensland Rail, titled 'Queensland Rail shuts down false scare campaign, locks in job security and better customer service'.

They are devoid of principles and ideas, and they can only rely on grubby smear campaigns. Queenslanders deserve better.

(Time expired)

Fuel Security

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): The unrelenting affordability crisis facing Queensland families and businesses continues to grow. The LNP's affordability crisis continues to rip family budgets apart and crush businesses around the state. The battle is not just in the Middle East. The battle is at the kitchen table or in the office at a back of a shop each and every week as families and businesses struggle to pay bills. As each week goes past, Queensland families and businesses are paying more and more for petrol and diesel with no end in

sight. Queenslanders are facing a fuel price crisis. This is the worst fuel price crisis in living memory, and the LNP government continues to do nothing.

I should correct the record. There is one thing the LNP government did. The Premier wrote a letter. Fair dinkum. It is like that scene in that great Australian movie *The Castle*—‘Dad, I dug a hole.’ If you are listening Premier—and I know you are—let me say this: it would have been better for you—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DICK: He will run in the door in a minute.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Members to my left, I could not hear your deputy leader for your cacophony. Please desist.

Mr DICK: I will say this to the Premier: it would have been better for the Premier to have dug a hole because it would have been of more use to Queenslanders than writing a letter. What did the energy minister do? Did the energy minister convene a round table of fuel suppliers to get some action? No, he did not. What he did do last week was convene a round table of philanthropists. That might be a good thing but I say this: it is absolutely the wrong priority for Queensland at this time.

What did the Deputy Premier, Jarrod Bleijie, do—the minister responsible for sustaining and supporting supply chains in Queensland? What did he do during the worst fuel crisis in 50 years? He went to Sydney to meet the King and Queen of Denmark. I want every one of those LNP backbenchers who have been absolutely mute and absurd during this crisis—the members for Cook, Barron River, Mulgrave, Hinchinbrook, Townsville, Thuringowa, Mirani, Mackay, Rockhampton, Keppel, Hervey Bay and Maryborough and the LNP MPs who represent the big electorates of Gregory and Warrego—to go back to their communities at the end of this week and say, ‘The Deputy Premier did nothing for Queensland except meet the King and Queen of Denmark.’ Again, that is the wrong priority for Queensland. That is what we see each and every day from the LNP government.

There is one thing the LNP can do: pass Labor’s Transport Affordability Amendment Bill. Pass it today. We get all of these urgency motions. What about those urgent amendments rushed into the House today about a university? What about the bill Queenslanders have to pay each week for fuel? This government has done absolutely nothing because this is a government of wrong priorities. Queensland is going backwards under the LNP.

I was in Cairns last week and a hardworking businessman asked the transport minister, Brent Mickelberg, what he should do when his suppliers refused to truck supplies because of high fuel prices. I was there. The transport minister told that hardworking Queensland businessman that he needed to have contingencies. He should have had contingencies for a war in the Middle East that no-one asked for and that no-one anticipated. That is the sort of absolute tone-deafness we get from the LNP. That is what the transport minister said to that businessman who is struggling to keep his business together, struggling to keep the doors open, struggling to pay the bills and struggling to keep other hardworking Queenslanders in a job. The transport minister said ‘have contingencies’. That is victim-blaming of the worst order from the people who said that victims should come first.

This is a government of wrong priorities. It is a government that is not acting on the worst crisis in our lifetime when it comes to fuel and it continues to ignore hardworking businesses like Rixon Haulage. There is Brittany trying to keep the business going and getting nothing from the LNP. This is a time for decisive leadership. This state needs divisive leadership. The Labor government demonstrated it during COVID and saved lives and livelihoods, and we are proud of that. What do we hear from the LNP? Nothing. If Queenslanders want decisive leadership, they should not look to Premier Crisafulli.

Fuel Security

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (2.22 pm): Across Queensland today there is concern about fuel supply and increasing fuel costs arising from the Middle East conflict. For many families and businesses, fuel is not just another household expense; it is the ability to get to and from work or the difference between keeping businesses open and keeping them closed. At a time when Queenslanders are already doing it tough, this is adding uncertainty to the pressure. We know that global conflict and instability can have real consequences here at home. Supply chains have tightened and the conflict in the Middle East is weighing heavily on global markets. The impacts on our economy and our budget remain uncertain, just as the situation in the Middle East remains uncertain and volatile. A key consideration is the length

of the conflict. We can be certain that the aftershocks of the war will reverberate through supply chains long after the conflict ceases.

We welcome the federal government's steps to maintain supply continuity throughout the country and we remain committed to advocating for coordinated national action to maintain fuel supply across the country, because global disruptions require national solutions. It is regional communities, small businesses and primary producers who often feel the impact first and most deeply. The Crisafulli government understands these challenges. We called on the ACCC to act on price gouging and they have acted. We called on the federal government to develop a national response and they have started introducing measures. We have met with key stakeholders at a round table, including key agricultural industry bodies, the water minister, the agriculture minister, Canegrowers, AgForce, Queensland Farmers' Federation and the like. We are actively engaging with industry, monitoring developments in fuel markets and working to ensure the needs of regional communities and critical sectors are communicated to the national taskforce that is represented there by Queenslander Bob Gee.

As I said, we welcome the Commonwealth's steps to maintain continuity throughout the country because global disruptions require national solutions. We are continuing to listen to farmers who are worried about getting crops off the field, small business owners managing rising costs, and families trying to make ends meet. Their voices matter. Their resilience is the backbone of our state's economy and they deserve steady, practical leadership in uncertain times.

I listened to the contribution from the Leader of the Opposition today and it was irresponsible and dishonest. The Leader of the Opposition's contribution today was dishonest for the reasons I have just outlined in relation to the steps this government has taken and irresponsible for the way in which he communicated it, and he knows it. Those opposite this morning asked about the Lytton refineries operating 24/7. They really should be listening harder. They should be listening more. They should be taking their responsibilities seriously. The Leader of the Opposition should listen carefully: the Ampol refinery is at capacity, operating 24/7.

Those opposite come in here and all they bring is fear. All they bring are their irresponsible comments. All they bring is a scare campaign. Those opposite should know full well that the federal government is responsible. They are silent on the federal government's responsibilities. They did not mention Chris Bowen once. The member for Woodridge gets up and talks about the cost of living but fails to mention his next-door neighbour and the Reserve Bank cash rate increase. He forgets to mention Jim Chalmers. They forget to mention Chris Bowen and the national responsibility towards delivering energy security in this country. They are irresponsible and they are dishonest in what they come in here and say.

They should think carefully about the seriousness of the offices they hold, particularly the Leader of the Opposition, before they walk in here and play their opportunistic political games, because that is all we are seeing from them. Queenslanders deserve better than that. We are working constructively with the federal government to add to their efforts towards a national solution to this challenge we face, and those opposite should act similarly. They should show responsibility, stand with Queenslanders, listen to their voices and make sure they are acting responsibly in this national challenge as well.

Fuel Security

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (2.27 pm): It is clear that Premier David Crisafulli has no answers and, after listening to that five minutes of waffle and inaction from the Treasurer, it would seem that his Treasurer and energy minister have no answers, either. How can the Treasurer and energy minister accuse us of playing politics when we come here and convey from our communities exactly what families, small businesses and industry are telling us? Somehow that is playing politics, yet we are the ones in opposition raising what Queenslanders are saying. Fuel prices are the only thing people are talking about in our communities, and what they say is that they want to see action. They want to see action from their state government. We have seen absolutely nothing from this Premier and this Treasurer. They have no answers to ease skyrocketing fuel prices. They have no answers for families doing it tough. Families were already struggling with groceries, rent, trying to pay the mortgage, and now fuel—

An opposition member: Rego.

Ms FENTIMAN: Rego, because of course those opposite scrapped the rego discounts. While they have no answers, Queenslanders are literally paying the price. They are being smashed at the bowser.

Despite a lack of answers and lack of action from those opposite, I still have a lot of questions for the Premier about this fuel crisis. Has the Premier checked in on everyday Queenslanders about what support they need? Does the Premier even know how much fuel supply Queensland has? Does the Premier know how many servos are currently without fuel? Does the Premier realise or appreciate the devastating impact that skyrocketing fuel prices are having right across the state? It would seem the answer is 'no' to all of the above, because if this Premier was listening to Queenslanders and he knew how bad this crisis was he would have acted. We have seen every other state in this nation take action, but this Premier has just written a letter. He has not convened any crisis talks or round tables, and he has not pulled industry together. He is not declaring urgent Labor's bill to cap price increases on fuel.

I listened to Queenslanders on the weekend when I was out in my community doorknocking. Tradies were telling me that they dread getting in their car every morning—not because of the early start or the work but because they know what it is going to cost them simply to get to work. I spoke to a couple who use their caravan every Easter to go on holidays but they cannot afford to do that this year. This is what is happening in our communities, streets and neighbourhoods but what is the Premier doing about it?

This crisis is even worse in regional Queensland. Last week I caught up with Tom, a pensioner. He actually pulled out his receipt and told me that on his way home the night before he had filled up his diesel ute and it cost \$164. That is how much it cost Tom, a pensioner in Rockhampton. I think he summed it up best when he said that the Premier should get off his backside and do something. Right now, pensioners like Tom need action. They do not need a letter to the federal government; they need their Premier to stand up for them.

I also met Amber, a first time mum. She joked with me—but there was truth behind it—that she cannot exactly take her baby Sam to medical appointments on her pushbike. She actually needs to get in the car and drive around town in Rockhampton. These people are doing it tough and they need better than a letter from their Premier. These people need to take their kids to school and get to their medical appointments. They cannot get on a pushbike and in some communities they cannot use public transport; they actually have to get in their car and it is costing them every time they do.

Unleaded petrol is up by as much as 80 cents a litre compared to just a month ago. Diesel is even worse, with some Queenslanders paying more than \$1 extra in a matter of weeks. Every other state is acting. Every other state is putting together crisis plans and capping fuel price increases. That is exactly what our opposition leader has put before this parliament. The government could come in here today and declare that bill urgent and stop these extraordinary price rises every day. Queenslanders deserve a government that understands just how tough it is for families and for businesses. What we have seen is absolutely embarrassing compared to every other state. Why are Queenslanders being left behind under this Premier?

Fuel Security

 **Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (2.32 pm): In Far North Queensland fuel prices are not only impacting drivers on their daily commute to work and school drop off; fuel shortages and fuel costs are impacting our farmers, our tourism industry and our regional communities and small business owners who rely on visitors to survive. Nowhere is that more obvious than in Far North Queensland. One in seven people are employed in tourism in our region, and our farmers produce so much food, including 98 per cent of the bananas for Australia.

It is already hard enough in our region with the recent weather events, let alone this fuel fragility facing Far North Queensland and Australia. My heart breaks for the tourism operators impacted by this fuel crisis. A national reef operator in Far North Queensland will see fuel expenses increase by \$1 million from February to the end of the financial year in June. That is \$1 million in unexpected costs. Another operator is facing \$6,000 in additional fuel costs every single day. That is over \$100,000 per month in increases. These costs are hitting operators in the pocket and threatening their ability to run tours both on the ground and in our oceans. The big problem is that they sold these tours six months or a year ago and have to honour that price. This means they will be running these tours at a huge loss. We have nearly gotten through our quiet, wet season and we are now coming into the peak tourism season to make up for it, but my fear is that many of these businesses are going to be in a world of pain if they do not make profits during our high season.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Lytton, you are warned.

Ms JAMES: With a cost-of-living crisis, drive tourism to our region is also at significant risk, especially to the tip of Cape York where fuel is of dire concern. There is also a real risk of flight costs to our region skyrocketing. I know one person looked at a flight three days ago and it has increased by \$600 already. These figures make the reality crystal clear: fuel price increases are not just hurting hip pockets at the bowser; they are putting jobs, tourism and regional livelihoods at risk.

A fact that many people do not know is that from Cooktown to Cape York these communities are totally reliant on diesel to run generators as they are not on mains power. If we cannot keep the flow of diesel into these regions, they will not even be able to flush a toilet, let alone be saved in one of the hospitals there.

Mr Healy interjected.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cairns and member for Algeester, your interjections are not being taken.

Ms JAMES: This is also devastating our farming community. One farmer tells me their freight levies have jumped from 13 per cent to 44 per cent in two weeks. This is not abstract; it directly reduces a farmer's ability to ship produce to markets within Australia. Farmers must spend more just to keep crops viable—like the \$100,000 needed for fertiliser next season that they cannot afford to buy now but they are because without it there is no crop next year and there is a real risk they will not be able to get it in a few months time. Even our prawn trawlers cannot justify the extra cost for fuel to go out and get prawns for our plates at Easter time. This affects not only local markets but also national distribution, reducing available food in other states and increasing pressure on the agricultural sector.

Independent fuel suppliers, like Speewah Country Tavern and Marano's Fuel, are under severe pressure as they are struggling to even get fuel delivered to their servos as the majors are getting priority. This morning I spoke to Michele from Speewah Country Tavern, one of my local taverns which also has accommodation and a servo attached.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Inala, you are warned.

Ms JAMES: They are currently down to zero diesel and they have two days left of petrol. Customers are desperate, with some asking for her used cooking oil to make their own diesel. The tavern had to limit diesel to 40 litres per day, and today they had to turn away the local school bus, forcing it to drive 30 minutes to Mareeba for fuel as they do not have any. There is no guarantee of a supplier arriving tomorrow either. This is their reality. Through heartache and frustration, Michele told me, 'The federal government is blind to regional Australia. They don't care about us.' This needs to stop. These are real stories, real people and real concerns in my community.

Mr Fumer interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Ferny Grove, you are warned.

Ms JAMES: We need urgent action from the federal government to ensure that fuel flows to regional Queensland—not just to the major fuel stations but to the small business owners like Michele and Laurie at Speewah and Marano's Fuel across Cairns. I quote our Premier: 'It is a national crisis that needs a national solution.' I commend the Treasurer for writing to the ACCC, which are now monitoring fuel prices weekly across capital cities and more than 190 regional locations. The federal government has the data. It can see the pressure building in regional economies like Far North Queensland. The federal Labor Party holds the key policy levers, including fuel excise. This is not beyond its control; this is a matter of urgency and a matter of choice. Senator Green needs to stand up to her Labor federal mates and ensure Far North Queensland is not forgotten, especially our tourism industry.

Bundaberg, Weather Events

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (2.37 pm): I am going to talk to the staff from the opposition team and tell them to stop writing speeches for the member for Barron River. It only took four minutes and 40 seconds to realise that she was on the wrong talking points, but she corrected her way.

I want to talk about a very serious matter, which is the challenging couple of weeks the Bundaberg community has faced—not just in the Bundaberg electorate but in the broader Wide Bay-Burnett community as well. In Bundaberg we had a flood event that saw the Burnett River peak at

5 am on Wednesday to 7.4 metres. Homes and businesses across the north, south, central and east were inundated, just as they were in 2010-11 and 2013.

As the floodwaters came up, the community of Bundaberg stood up. I want to take this time to thank our council staff who not only managed the situation by observing the rainfall and the flow of the river but also worked during the response and recovery. Our emergency services, as always, stepped up each and every day and stood strong for all of our community. I also thank all departments and agencies, our amazing SES and our rural firefighter volunteers. Many of them jumped on a plane at the end of the flood event in Bundaberg to go north to help out our fellow Queenslanders in the Far North.

Mr McCallum: Heroes.

Mr SMITH: I take that interjection; they are heroes. I want to thank the following: the Red Cross, who were there at the evacuation centre; the Salvation Army, who provided meals, led by Major Chris Millard; and the Rapid Relief Team, who fed the SES day in, day out and gave our volunteers the support they needed.

It may be rare, but I do want to thank the media as well. Our local media did a great job in sharing that important information for locals. I also want to thank the ETU, who are still currently undergoing Operation Energise, and of course the amazing mud army for the work they did. The devastation suffered by families and businesses will continue during the ongoing recovery. With the waters receding by the Thursday, locals returned to see what damage had been done. Businesses such as Waldo's Mower Doctor sought the help of mates and other businesses. It was wonderful to have the member for Woodridge on hand on that Thursday as we spoke with another business owner, Mark, whose gym was set to open in two weeks time. It was devastated and destroyed by floodwaters, but we were there to help him. It was great to have the Leader of the Opposition at Angels Community Group. They set themselves up to service the community as they do each and every single day.

It was wonderful to meet with everyday residents who were cleaning out their furniture and belongings for a third time, waiting for the council trucks to take away their destroyed belongings. The members for Woodridge, Pine Rivers, Murrumba and Bancroft joined me in going around those streets helping people carry the furniture out of their houses, helping them carry out their washing machines and making sure we showed we were there for everyday Queenslanders. I can report to the House that at no point was any member of the LNP in danger of getting their nice business shirt muddy. The crisp white shirt and the expensive tie of the Premier remained untouched as he watched the SES volunteers shovel sand into sandbags. It was wonderful to see Minister Leahy show up two days after the SES was stood down. Maybe I need to tug on her heartstrings a little bit more and she will come up and say g'day.

It is important to recognise that many who were impacted by this flood were already caught in the Crisafulli government's affordability crisis and now they are caught in the crisis of his lack of action on fuel prices. Diesel in Bundaberg is up to as much as \$3.10 a litre. Unleaded petrol is reaching \$2.50 a litre for motorists. When there is a TV camera in Bundaberg during a flood crisis, the Premier can find a way to it. When flood victims are trying to navigate the cost of recovery and the Premier's lack of action on fuel, he is nowhere to be found. Around the country, every premier has pulled a lever available to them at a state level to help stabilise fuel prices and provide confidence and security to their people. The inaction of the Queensland Premier, David Crisafulli, is impacting flood victims in Bundaberg, the volunteers driving around the neighbourhoods to help out their community and businesses undertaking multiple trips hauling hard waste to the dump. The inaction of the Queensland Premier is impacting farmers trying to feed their families while they feed the nation. Queensland farmers need more than a strongly worded letter. Queensland farmers need a government that takes action with the powers it has at its disposal—

Mr Head: Pick up the phone to Albo. Pick up the phone to your mate in Canberra.

Mr SMITH:—and not have the member opposite go down to Brisbane while his community was flooded.

Fuel Security

 **Mr CHIESA** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (2.42 pm): Today I rise to speak about the four Fs—fuel, food, family and our future. In Hinchinbrook and in regional Queensland, fuel is not just a number on the side of a bowser; fuel powers our harvesters, pumps, trucks, fishing boats, freight, family cars and regional economies. When the price of fuel rises sharply, the impact is immediate and felt first and hardest in the regions. Right now Queenslanders are dealing with both a price shock and a supply shock.

The ACCC has confirmed that the concerns about diesel availability in regional and rural Australia are real; that is fact. Diesel is not optional in regional Queensland. When diesel supply stops, food supply to the shelves stops. I have spoken to people on the ground living this reality. In the Herbert River region one farmer ordered 3,000 litres of fuel more than a week ago. He still has not received it. Normally that delivery arrives within days. It is not just an inconvenience; it is a warning sign. When fuel does not arrive on time it affects planting, harvesting, freight, income and confidence.

Queensland was the first state to call out fuel security issues. The Treasurer wrote to the federal minister on 9 March calling for national leadership and a national plan as the state was on the precipice of fuel insecurity, an issue significantly impacting daily life, yet the National Cabinet response did not come until 19 March.

Let me bring honourable members back to what that means. The sugar industry uses approximately 1.3 litres of fuel to harvest one tonne of cane. When fuel rises by \$1.25 a litre, it costs an extra \$1.63 just in fuel to harvest that tonne of cane. The Herbert River mills, Victoria and Macknade, crushed a total of 3.8 million tonnes. If prices stay high that will equate to \$6.2 million in additional fuel costs. In Tully, 2.2 million tonnes were crushed, potentially adding another \$3.5 million to the fuel bill. That is millions of dollars stripped from regional economies—money that would otherwise support wages, machinery, contractors, small businesses and families.

It is not just cane. A grazier from the Kennedy valley transporting cattle in his cattle truck to Charters Towers is now facing an additional \$255 in fuel costs per trip, or \$21 per head. These costs do not disappear. Then there is the impact on our horticulture and commercial fishers. They are making decisions on whether to plant or to fish. That decision could reduce supply and push up food prices.

What needs to happen? The federal government needs to recognise the strain this is placing on primary producers, freight operators and regional industries more broadly. This is bigger than a temporary price spike; it is a national fuel security issue. It goes to national self-sufficiency, resilience and our ability to keep food and goods moving across the country. The Crisafulli government is doing its part by ensuring there is a flow of information to allow the federal government to deliver supply. We are actively providing assistance towards the national plan, ensuring issues raised directly from regions like Hinchinbrook are being understood by Canberra. Let me tell you: they need some help in understanding some of the issues we face in regional Queensland.

Long term, we are backing supply by opening up new gas and petroleum exploration to secure jobs, growth and energy security in areas such as the Taroom Trough, which has the potential to be the first new major oil province in the country since the 1970s. Contrast that with the Labor opposition. They are not serious about the issue. Why are they not raising the important issues that matter to regional Queensland, like the ones I have mentioned, with their federal Labor counterparts? They had a decade to undertake long-term planning and approvals to secure our energy future to be more self-sufficient, but they spent millions of taxpayers' dollars on hydrogen trucks.

We will continue to ensure Canberra understands the critical nature of this issue. We will continue because, unlike those opposite, when diesel prices surge and supplies falter we know that the consequences do not stay at the bowser. They hit the paddock, the mill, the truck and our fishers. We produce the food that feeds the state. They hit the supermarket and then they hit the kitchen table.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr CHIESA: I wish those opposite would listen. We need fuel to grow food to feed our families and to secure our future. That is what the four Fs are all about.

Fuel Security

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (2.47 pm): The LNP MPs are lining up to list all the reasons we need to act, but they are awfully silent on solutions. We are not hearing any solutions. We heard earlier from the Treasurer. He was talking about the fact that you need a litre of diesel to make a kilogram of sugar cane.

Mr Head interjected.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order, members to my left. That is unparliamentary. Member for Callide, you are skating on thin ice. Members to my left, there will be no more of those utterances made when other people are interjecting.

Mr MELLISH: Earlier we heard the Treasurer say that you need a litre of diesel to make a kilogram of sugar cane and we heard from the member for Hinchinbrook that that has gone up to a litre of diesel to make a tonne of sugar cane. My hat goes off to the amazing improvements made in the last 12 hours by Canegrowers Queensland!

Transport is not a luxury, as we know; it is a necessity, and no-one knows this better than Queenslanders. From Coolangatta to Cape York, Queenslanders drive huge distances every day to get to work, to care for family and to keep the economy moving. However, right now transport has never been more unaffordable. With a 23.4 per cent increase to vehicle rego since the LNP came to office, everyone is feeling the pinch of rising transport costs under this Crisafulli LNP government. Now we are seeing record price hikes for fuel right across the state.

Yesterday it was reported that the average price of fuel in South-East Queensland was \$2.93 per litre for diesel and \$2.42 per litre for unleaded. They are not just numbers; they represent everyday financial pressures on real people. Queenslanders are struggling to afford the basics under this government and now fuel is taking a bigger chunk of the household budget. With Easter and school holidays around the corner, families are cancelling trips and tightening their belts. I know that many are looking to the state government for leadership and it is being found wanting.

The Queensland opposition has called on the Premier to act to help Queenslanders because we know that if the LNP fails to take immediate action our state—the most decentralised state—will grind to a halt and Queenslanders will pay the price. What is this government doing to help regional and remote areas—the very communities it claims to stand for? What is the government doing for motorists in Roma and Cloncurry who are paying some of the highest prices in the state for unleaded? What is this government doing to help motorists fill up in Tully and Ayr, where diesel has jumped by more than a dollar a litre? Spare a thought for the motorists in Bundaberg who are suffering the skyrocketing prices of both. What is this government doing to support Queensland's small businesses? I have been speaking with trucking industry and freight bodies about how the rise in fuel prices is affecting them. They have told me that they have never seen such uncertainty around fuel prices. They are being forced to consider on a daily basis whether they go out and whether they can raise their prices just to keep their lights on, and many cannot raise their prices. While large operators may be able to absorb their losses, small businesses cannot and without government intervention some will not survive these costs. This is playing out right across Queensland right now.

The federal government has taken action but here in Queensland nothing—no plans, no sense of urgency, no calm, steady and methodical leadership. The Crisafulli LNP government must act now. We are calling on this government again to, firstly, act to stand up an immediate fuel security taskforce to keep Queensland moving. We are calling on it to convene an industry operational group to manage Queensland's domestic fuel supply to critical industries like mining, agriculture, tourism and transport. We are calling on it to urgently pass Labor's Transport Affordability Amendment Bill this week. We know that the solutions are there; we are just missing leadership. Every day this government delays taking action is a day that Queenslanders pay more at the bowser, so what does the Premier do? He puts his sincere face on and he says, 'The information needs to flow and the fuel needs to flow.' We have heard that about four times, so this Premier is workshopping catchphrases, not workshopping solutions. This Premier needs to put his pen down, stop writing letters, stop workshopping catchphrases and actually do something.

Another source of embarrassment for this government is from the transport minister, who is no doubt seriously regretting his decision to scrap Queensland's Zero Emission Bus Program. This is a program in partnership with the private sector tasked with reducing the emissions of Queensland's public transport fleet and reducing its dependency on diesel fuel, which would be a very welcome policy right about now. It did not even openly do it; we heard through the Brisbane City Council that this was secretly scrapped. Make no mistake: taxpayers will foot the bill for this change. On behalf of every Queenslanders feeling the pain at the bowser, I call on this government to do something—anything—to keep Queensland moving. Make no mistake: this is a crisis. This is a fuel price crisis. This is a cost-of-living crisis. We have never seen bowser prices like this before. This petrol pump pain is unprecedented. In South-East Queensland the average cost of filling up is well over \$140 and it is more in regional Queensland. This government needs to do more than write angry letters. This government needs to do more than workshop catchy one-liners. Please, Premier, do something for Queensland.

Fuel Security

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (2.52 pm): Across Queensland right now family businesses, farmers and all industries are feeling the pinch of rising fuel prices and it is a stark reminder of just how important

fuel security really is. When fuel becomes uncertain or unaffordable, everything else starts to feel it. We are already seeing what the uncertainty looks like. When supply is tight or prices spike, it creates anxiety for everyone. People start to worry about access, about costs and about whether they can keep moving. In regional areas, where distances are longer and alternatives are limited, that pressure is felt even more. In an electorate like Mirani, fuel is not just about getting from A to B; it is about keeping our industries running, food on our tables, our communities connected and our economy moving.

Agriculture is one of the backbone industries of the Mirani electorate, both in land use and in the number of jobs it supports across the supply chain from sugar cane to beef, as well as mining and the critical port infrastructure that keeps Queensland's exports moving. Every one of these industries relies on secure, affordable and consistent access to fuel: for our farmers like the Barmount Feedlot near Clarke Creek which uses 600 litres of diesel a day to drive its machinery to mix the feed for over a 12,000-head feedlot; for mining, it powers operations and logistics; and at our ports it keeps the entire supply chain moving. If fuel stops, everything stops.

Fuel security is first and foremost a national responsibility, and that sits with the federal government. I welcome the fact that Queensland has taken a strong leadership role on this issue. Queensland was the first state to call out fuel security, with the Treasurer writing to the federal minister calling for national leadership and coordinating a national plan—unlike the federal government, which took five days to realise that we had a crisis. We have also raised concerns with the ACCC around fuel pricing and we welcome the investigation into whether consumers have been treated fairly. Importantly, Queensland is stepping up and working constructively through National Cabinet to support the development of a national fuel security plan.

We are not just talking; we are acting. In the short term, Queensland is ensuring there is a clear flow of information to support the federal government in maintaining supply. We are bringing together suppliers and retailers to understand the challenges on the ground and respond in real time, but this cannot just be about the short term. Australia no longer produces enough of its own fuel to meet demand. We rely heavily on imports, hold limited reserves and sit at the end of a long and fragile global supply chain. When that chain is disrupted, it is regional Queensland that feels it first. That is why long-term solutions matter.

The Crisafulli government is focused on opening up new areas of gas and petroleum exploration to secure jobs, growth and energy security. The Taroom Trough, which was mentioned by my good friend the member for Hinchinbrook, has the potential to become the first major new oil province in this country since the 1970s, and that is an opportunity that we cannot ignore. Over the last 10 years those opposite would not touch something like that because they were too afraid to upset those on the crossbench—the Greens. This is not just about fuel; it is about food production, exports, jobs and the strength of our regional communities. Fuel security is about certainty—certainty for our farmers, certainty for our truck drivers, certainty for our miners and certainty for families trying to get through the day. Here is the simple truth: if the fuel stops, Mirani stops and, if regions like mine stop, Queensland stops without us.

Gas Industry

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (2.57 pm): This war that we are seeing in Iran is illegal, it is deeply irresponsible and it risks spiralling into something even more deadly. We are already seeing that with its expansion throughout the region. For regular people in Queensland, this war—a war that has been enthusiastically supported by Labor, the LNP and One Nation—is already starting to push up the price of everything. It is not simply fuel and energy costs but, through the cost of transport, everything is getting more expensive.

However, there is one group of people in Queensland who are absolutely rubbing their hands together with glee—and I have spoken of them before—and that is our big gas corporations here in Queensland. Because of the US-Israeli war in Iran, which again—I will labour the point—Labor, the LNP and One Nation have all voted to support, those massive gas corporations in Queensland are set to make giant war profits. I will offer one single example which illustrates the point. Santos, a very generous donor to both Labor and the LNP, as reported by the AFR, has done a deal to sell a shipment of Australian gas for more than double the normal price—\$121 million for a single shipment, which I understand is something like \$70 million more than the usual price. Perhaps the most insulting thing here is that, while regular Queenslanders are hurting and our public services are underfunded, we are still letting these massive corporations pay an absolutely piss-ant amount in—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: Withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Maiwar, that is unparliamentary language. Withdraw and do not use it again please.

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw. They pay an absolutely pathetic, measly, ridiculously small amount in royalties. Last year they exported \$21 billion of our gas and paid just eight per cent in royalties, and the current scheme in Queensland has very little scope for that to increase at all, no matter what the price of gas moves to. Wouldn't you know it as well—I can assume it is just good luck on their part—nine out of 10 of these big gas companies also paid zero dollars in corporate tax over the last 10 years, and I table an Australia Institute report just so the numbers are on the record.

Tabled paper: Article from The Australia Institute, dated May 2025, titled 'Queensland LNG exports and tax'.

Queenslanders—everyday people—paid \$2.2 billion in registration last year, in a single year, while gas companies exported \$21 billion worth of our resources and paid just under \$1.7 billion in royalties. Who is prepared to accept that? Who on the government benches will take responsibility for that? I know plenty of Queenslanders who would give an arm and leg to pay just eight per cent in tax, but under Labor and the LNP only one kind of Queenslander gets this special treatment and that is the big gas corporations.

There are alternative approaches. Qatar—we know what is going on there at the moment—essentially exports the same amount of gas every year as Australia. Again referring to work from the Australia Institute, in 2023 Qatar took \$56 billion from their gas exports whereas we in Australia—the entire country—took \$10.6 billion. That is \$56 billion as opposed to \$10.6 billion for Australia. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Article from The Australia Institute, dated May 2025, titled 'Government revenue from LNG exports: Australia vs Qatar'.

In Norway, 78 per cent of the proceeds from their oil and gas industry goes into their sovereign wealth fund. That means that each and every Norwegian citizen has an extraordinary amount of money to their name. They get free world-class education—the list goes on.

This morning when I asked the Treasurer if he would tax big gas war profits, at least he was honest. He just pointed to last year's budget and said no. He was very eager to remind us about the way they are looking after what he calls the investment community. Just remember who that investment community is in the gas sector. It is Santos, Sinopec, Petronas, Origin, ConocoPhillips, Shell and Australia Pacific LNG. I do not want to be too speculative, but maybe it has something to do with the tens of thousands of dollars they get from these big gas companies. That is wildly speculative, I know. The rest of the Treasurer's answer was, frankly, mind-boggling. He went off on a ramble about GST shares and all the rest.

To Queenslanders I say: do not be fooled. We are owed more. We need a government that will big gas war profits. These guys do not work for you; they work for their big donors in the gas industry and, frankly, it is disgraceful. We will not stop fighting for big gas to pay a fair share until we get a return that will pay for the things Queenslanders need for a good life.

ELECTRICAL SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 665, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (3.02 pm): I rise to speak on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Electrical safety is an issue which affects all Queenslanders. Over the last nearly 25 years since the Electrical Safety Act was introduced, the way Queenslanders use and interact with electricity has changed dramatically, with many new technologies and products on the market now that could not be imagined in 2002—things like emergent energy generation and storage technologies including solar power and batteries, electric vehicles and off-grid generation—as well as regulatory, licensing and supply chain duties reform. We had commenced our transition to net zero and as a community have benefited from continuous electrical innovation in our everyday lives. Rooftop solar panels are a case in point.

I am proud to have been the state's industrial relations minister when we legislated some of the best entitlements in the country for Queensland workers, especially those in the electrical sector.

Nation-leading labour hire licensing, wage theft and industrial manslaughter laws, to name a few, were each opposed by those opposite, who are now in government. Labor's time in government is responsible for extremely robust electrical safety laws including: the reinstatement of the electrical safety commissioner and important electrical safety committees after the then Newman government and the now IR minister abolished them; the establishment of a standalone Queensland Electrical Safety Office, improving the rigour of the electrical licensing framework; and the review of the Electrical Safety Act 2002 to ensure our electrical safety laws kept pace with new and emerging industry.

In terms of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 we are generally supportive of the electrical safety aspects of this bill. The bill essentially keeps the original intent in that it provides a clear pathway for electricity entities to continue their longstanding practice of issuing electrical equipment defect notices and unsafe equipment directions. This scenario commonly arises when electrical entities attend a property to inspect electrical infrastructure or an electrical installation and note defective electrical equipment such as an unsafe switchboard or damaged power outlet. The longstanding practice of electricity entities in providing defect notices in respect of unsafe or faulty electrical equipment is a valuable public service, and ensuring their enforceability by nominating an explicit head of power is an entirely appropriate reform agenda. It also elevates the regulator's existing prohibition power for unsafe electrical equipment to the Electrical Safety Act from the Electrical Safety Regulation and modernises the regulator's longstanding power to give directions about unsafe equipment.

Clause 7 provides for the validation of past notices given by electricity entities, and we support that; that is clarifying and very appropriate. Electricity entities have been given electrical equipment defect notices in good faith. There has been a sufficient head of power since the Electrical Safety Act, along with, obviously, the relevant regulations, and this ensures that will continue.

With regard to unsafe equipment directions, clause 4 of the bill provides a robust regulatory framework in addition to elevating them to the Electrical Safety Act from the Electrical Safety Regulation. There is clarity around things like the existing application to allow the regulator to prohibit the sale, installation or use of electrical equipment, setting out the grounds for the regulator to give an unsafe equipment direction and specifying a set period of not more than 10 years. There is natural justice for a person to go to QCAT should they not agree and there is a requirement for the regulator to publish and copy the information with regard to QCAT reviews. It is also important that the bill confirms the regulator cannot delegate its power to give an unsafe equipment direction. A decision to prohibit the sale, installation or use of such equipment must be personally made by the regulator. Failure to comply with the unsafe equipment direction is an offence carrying a penalty of up to 40 penalty units. There is also for transitional arrangements.

When it comes to the Work Health and Safety Act amendments, I think there are very reasonable questions that need to be addressed about the proposed changes to the Work Health and Safety Act contained in the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The member for Kawana bizarrely claimed in this House on 28 October 2025 that I was stopping an amendment 'which meant the CFMEU had direct access to personal information of construction companies in Queensland'. This was not CFMEU specific; it was for all occupations and workplaces. That is how legislation works.

Mr Bleijie: Oh, yeah. Keep saying it; they might believe it.

Ms GRACE: The interjections from the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Relations clearly demonstrate that he has no idea about how legislation works in this state. This is, as I said, for all occupations and workplaces. Those opposite just cannot see beyond their obsession. They look at occupational health and safety only through a CFMEU lens. These laws are for everyone.

The changes we made were as a result, and based on recommendations, of the 2022 review of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and are not yet even implemented. The bill was passed on 28 March 2024. They were due to come in on 29 March 2026. We are talking about a provision in a bill that has not even been enacted. It has not even started, but let nothing stand in the way of yet another classic overreach from the member for Kawana, attacking worker safety again and weakening occupational health and safety worker entitlements. This is on top of them requiring workplace health and safety entry permit holders to provide 24 hours notice to access sites.

The changes proposed by the government seek to remove the right of health and safety reps and workplace health and safety entry permit holders to request information contained in—let me be clear—improvement, prohibition or non-disturbance notices from the regulator. They are the three areas that they can ask for information on. It is not open slather on anything that the regulator possesses.

Those opposite are removing information contained in improvement, prohibition or non-disturbance notices from the regulator only. It is not personal information, which is what the Deputy Premier was trying to somehow weave into it. In recognition of the important role of health and safety representatives and entry permit holders to workplace safety, we considered this an important addition to the toolkit of workers and their representatives in the vital work of making Queensland workplaces safe—a reasonable and necessary avenue in circumstances where relevant information may not be available through the usual employer and workplace channels. This is an alternative path to access workplace notices where an employer's record may be inaccessible or access is refused.

The Work Health and Safety Act has an existing provision that enables health and safety reps and workplace health and safety entry permit holders access to certain information, but only on a 'may be' basis from the PCBU and, as we know, this information from the PCBU may not always be forthcoming. As an example, while this reform has not yet commenced, during the committee process stakeholders, including the QCU, QNMU and the SDA, spoke up strongly against the LNP's proposed removal of section 52 from the act as a further example of the Crisafulli LNP government's attack on workers and their representatives. The Queensland Council of Unions said in its submission that the refusal by a PCBU to provide notices to HSRs and EPHs as required under the act is 'reasonably foreseeable'.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms GRACE: The Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Relations may laugh and scoff, but this is the reality for workers in workplaces every day. Requests are made and they are often refused. The QCU further stated that, for example, such a provision may create—

... a reasonable concern that carrying out associated work would expose them to a serious risk to their health or safety ... In these circumstances, a worker has a right to cease work, and an HSR with the same reasonable concern may exercise their right to direct workers to cease work. Recalcitrant PCBUs may also be reluctant to provide the relevant information to their workers because it may provide an HSR with a reasonable concern that warrants the exercising of other powers and functions ...

These are fundamental rights of workers. It is clear that this is just another path. It is not one to be abused or misused, it is another pathway, and they should have the right to request that. This came out of the review very strongly. I reiterate the example given by my colleague, the member for Kallangur, Shane King, during the committee's public briefing in November where he cited the itinerant nature of workforces, particularly in the construction and building industry. If, for example, there were concerns on a construction site that a particular piece of plant or hazard had existed for quite a period of time and the safety rep was the third one in the last six months because of the nature of the work, how does the new safety rep get that information when the contractors have changed and the person in control does not have the information because now the regulator is saying they are not going to provide it. If a PCBU no longer has the relevant information and another contractor has taken over but the plant is still the same, should not the safety rep, the member for Kallangur asked, have the right to get the relevant information?

He is in good company because the Queensland Law Society agrees. The Queensland Law Society's submission stated—

The provision of relevant information to enable those with health and safety roles to assist workplaces to respond to safety risks is important. It is appropriate, in our view, for the regulator to play a role in sharing information with those officers, with restrictions, to ensure the provision is utilised appropriately and does not cause undue administrative burden.

As I said, this is only for three set pieces. This goes to the most fundamental right of workers in relation to safety—the right to know of a risk or hazard in the workplace and to cease work until it is rectified, if necessary—and to also have relevant information contained in the notices to ensure that they are being adhered to, rectified and/or how often such notices have or are being issued. The government insists that this amendment is about efficiencies—that it would impose administrative burdens on the regulator, both in its set up and ongoing operations, that were beyond business as usual. We have been led to believe that after two years the department is unable to operationalise this reform and address identified insufficient safeguards.

In one of the Deputy Premier's best own goals—and there is a growing list; I have been reading all about rowing in Rockhampton recently—he is the only person I am aware of who is guilty of using and abusing this provision before it had come into practice and before he had even had the chance to cut it. For what can only be described as purely political, nonsensical reasons, on 30 April 2025 I asked the Deputy Premier a question without notice about safety concerns at Callide Power Station. The Deputy Premier volunteered that he had sought almost 10 years worth of information from his department on the number of notifiable events received relating to CS Energy. He did what he is accusing the CFMEU of maybe, possibly—they might use it, they may not use it, it has not come in yet

so they have not been able to use it, but they may—doing. He gloated and ranted about the 52 pages. The minister says here that it is all about me. These are notices issued to CS Energy by inspectors doing their job.

Mr Bleijie: That you got!

Ms GRACE: That I got? I take that interjection. It is ridiculous and nonsensical. The Minister for Industrial Relations deserves no respect. It was not part of my question. The Deputy Premier decided to volunteer this information and shoot himself in the foot in the process. He also made nonsensical comments about these notices that were given. There were quite a few of them. It is a 10-year history. There were 107 improvement notices, five prohibition notices and immediately comply notices which CS Energy rectified. It was good work. Congratulations to those inspectors. I would not be rubbishing them. I am saying good work. They rectified all of those. In effect, the minister is rubbishing the work they are doing. They issued these prohibition notices as part of their work.

The minister pointed out that the Premier had not been informed by me, like I knew about every notice that was going to CS Energy. As if he knows about every notice that is being written by the health and safety inspectors. It is an absolutely absurd statement to make. When we asked a question on notice as to whether the practice had changed—do we now have them letting the department or the Premier know?—the response was that Workplace Health and Safety updated the Premier through standard briefing practices and—surprise, surprise—exactly as I said: Workplace Health and Safety does not, as a matter of course, raise all notifications received with the Premier and Minister for Veterans or publish details of them for the public. This process has not changed. It was confirmed by the department itself. The nonsensical accusation being made at the time was that somehow I was not letting the public or the Premier know. It is a practice that has not changed under this government.

Talk about shooting yourself in the foot! This is exactly what is being considered. We asked how long it took the department to retrieve 10 years worth of information. He is now saying he cannot supply that information because it is administratively burdensome. We asked how long it took. Considering that being administratively burdensome was the reason, after two years, that this provision could not be implemented and must be removed, ours was a very relevant question. The only example we have in this House of use and abuse of this particular section of the bill is by the Deputy Premier asking for 10 years worth of material.

At the public briefing in November, two questions were ultimately taken on notice. The first was in relation to whether the PCBU has the right to request from the regulator any improvement or non-disturbance notices and how long that would take, and the second was in relation to how long it took the regulator to process a request for 10 years worth of historical notices information for the Deputy Premier. In a written response from the director-general the committee was advised that the department had responded to each of the matters. My colleagues who were on the committee and I are still in the dark. We do not recall any response being forthcoming. There was no answer to that question during the hearing other than that no further information would be provided. However, the statement from the director-general does not accord with the *Record of Proceedings*. I challenge anyone in this House to read the *Record of Proceedings* because we had no responses. In fact, we do not have the answers. None were provided. I cannot inform the House of the answer to the question: how long did it take the department to provide 10 years worth of notices? We cannot answer the question. It was never answered because it is an embarrassment to the Deputy Premier and Minister for Industrial Relations.

I would be happy if the Deputy Premier could provide me with an answer so that I can correct the record. How long did it take the department to provide 10 years worth of notices? That was used purely for cheap political pointscoring. Let us be transparent, let the sun shine in and answer the question directly as it is relevant to the manner in which we will vote. It is very relevant to how we will vote on this because if it did not take long then what they are saying about it being an administrative burden is incorrect; if it did take a long time then let us work around that. What a waste of time for cheap political pointscoring in this House by the Minister for Industrial Relations.

Mr Bleijie: Get to the bill. Talk about the CFMEU.

Ms GRACE: This is the bill. I take that interjection. He did not get to the bill at all in his 30-minute discussion. It was all on the CFMEU.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Comments will come through the chair, please, member for McConnell.

Ms GRACE: The whole thing was on the CFMEU.

Mr Bleijie: Hear, hear! She mentioned it!

Ms GRACE: I take the interjection from the Minister for Industrial Relations, who is continually interjecting.

Mr Bleijie: Apologise.

Ms GRACE: I take that interjection. It was all about that and had nothing at all to do with elements of the bill. We know that those opposite see everything related to IR through a CFMEU lens. Debates such as this see them rubbing their hands together and getting ready to trot out the same tired old lines. The truth is: it was federal and state Labor governments that placed the CFMEU into administration. That is the strong action we took. For 10 years, every matter was investigated and is still being investigated because you referred certain people—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Direct your comments through the chair, please, member for McConnell.

Ms GRACE:—such as Helen Burgess to the CCC and they are investigating that to this day. Do not twist it because that is evidence that is coming through. The administrator has already done the heavy lifting. Since the High Court upheld the administration legislation, officials, delegates and organisers have been removed from the employment of and positions within the CFMEU, with no avenue for them to return.

As a relevant minister at the time and a proud trade unionist I can say that that action was not taken lightly. We were incredibly mindful of the importance of public confidence in the ability of registered industrial organisations to act in accordance with the law and to effectively represent their members. We passed legislation consistent with the action that was being taken federally at the time to ensure it would withstand any appeal and it has done so. Our amendments ensured the CFMEU would operate as a registered industrial organisation, which is vitally important in an incredibly dangerous industry where all workers deserve the support of a strong and effective union and to return home safely after a hard day's work. As with all unions, the CFMEU has many hardworking and dedicated people, both at an organisational level and within its rank and file, who are committed to ensuring the best possible representation of workers.

Since the union was placed into administration by a Labor government in this state and federally, I am fairly sure I have not seen any new reports of evidence of the behaviours and events that were occurring pre administration. They are the ones who did the heavy lifting. They are the ones who removed those officials who were responsible for the behaviours. That is because we were responsible for putting them into administration. We cleaned up the CFMEU. Those opposite hate the fact that the administrator is doing the heavy lifting in ensuring an end to behaviours and actions that are not commensurate with an effective and strong union that represents its members and their families.

The government has completely failed to consult with workers, unions and other stakeholders on these changes. Instead, they suggested that the parliamentary committee would provide an appropriate forum for the community and any impacted persons to raise issues in relation to these proposed amendments. That is an insult. They are boxing at shadows at the moment and fail to understand that this provision applies not only to the CFMEU or the construction industry but also to all unions and workplaces including hospitals and schools as well as hospitality, retail, manufacturing, transport and health industries, to mention a few.

There is no evidence that I am aware of that shows any of the provisions have been abused in the past or misused by health and safety representatives or entry permit holders. There was no evidence to that effect. We gave two years notice to get it right. As outlined, the only known use and abuse of the provision has been by the minister himself for some cheap political pointscoring and nonsensical arguments—not to protect the health and safety of workers, not to ascertain whether a hazard has been rectified or a prohibition notice has been adhered to but for cheap political pointscoring. Unions are on to him. As the Queensland Council of Unions said, it is 'establishing a mechanism for informal administrative release of the information from the regulator to the HSR'. The Shop Distributive and Allied Employees Association said it is 'a strong measure to ensure timely, reliable, and independent access to information', which is important. The SDA also said that the regulator is already familiar with right-to-information processes and it is therefore familiar with having to review and redact documents. Expecting workers to use a right-to-information process places an unnecessary bureaucratic hurdle between worker representatives and critical information while also expecting them to pay for the privilege. That is what they are saying. They are saying there are very worthwhile amendments currently in the bill.

Whilst supportive of the amendments to the Electrical Safety Act and the Electrical Safety Regulation, the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 are yet another attempt by the

Crisafulli-Bleijie government, and particularly the Deputy Premier, to keep chipping away at and weakening workplace safety and workers' rights to obtain the relevant information they need to do their vitally important work. These changes will neither hold the recalcitrant employers to account nor require them to provide the information that workers and their representatives need to ensure Queensland workplaces are safe.

It also ignores the fact that in some circumstances such records may not be available, not because of a change in employer but, for example, because of an event such as a flood or fire, or due to changes in HSRs and PCBUs. Records destroyed in a flood or a fire—I know that there are tyre factories that go up in flames—may be required for the health and safety rep to do their work with regard to the entry permit holder to ensure something has been adhered to. They cannot now get that from the regulator because the Crisafulli government, with this minister, is boxing at shadows and making up, after two years of being able to implement this, excuses that it would be an administrative burden. Guess what? There was no administrative burden when the Minister for Industrial Relations asked for 10 years of records for no reason other than cheap political pointscore and nonsensical arguments. What a disgrace! What an absolute disgrace to be boxing at shadows, raising issues which are not concrete in nature.

On this side of the House, we will always stand up for the rights of workers, ensuring workplaces in Queensland are safe and giving them the tools they need to do their job. We will not allow the continued weakening of occupational health and safety laws in this state, particularly for no good reason other than based on a boxing-at-shadows attitude. The ideological basis for the government's continued attacks on workplace health and safety reps, on duty holders and other representatives and workers' rights to representation in the workplace will not be tolerated by this side, and we will vote them down.

A worker sells their labour, not their health, and has the right to return home safely after a hard day's work. Relevant information is essential for them to do their job, and removing access to that information with no answers as to why, no answers to questions we put on notice, no information provided for good reasons for the removal means we will be voting against this provision in the bill. We will always stand up for workers' safety. We will always stand up for the rights of workplace representatives—they do a mighty job—and we will always ensure safety is paramount.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I remind the members for Lytton, Inala and Ferny Grove that they are on warnings.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (3.32 pm): I am pleased to contribute to the debate on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and I am pleased to be chair of the committee that inquired into the bill—it was a very fulsome inquiry into these important changes. It is quite clear—and I align myself with the comments of the Deputy Premier—that there is a very simple question to ask: are you on the side of Queenslanders or are you on the side of the CFMEU and further industrial mischief? The changes we have put in place clearly address the fact that the former government put in place opportunities for them to be able to bypass industrial processes and safety legislation and cause further mischief.

I reject the notion of the shadow minister with regard to the care and attention for Queensland workers that the LNP holds. If you have spent five minutes with the Deputy Premier, you know that it is a very personal matter for him to ensure that workplace health and safety officers are there for the workers.

I must say that I am very pleased, as the former officer in charge of police at Laidley, that I had very serious responsibilities in terms of workplace health and safety, and I worked closely with our workplace health and safety officers to ensure we had great outcomes. I was pleased to take the Laidley police station from eight staff and myself to 25 staff and myself, and we had a very good safety record because we paid attention to those things. I refute the notion that this legislation is a token change because we do care about the safety of Queenslanders.

I listened to the shadow minister when she said she will reject our amendments. That says to me that they are actually not supporting workers and they are siding with the CFMEU again, which is of great concern to me.

The Wood royal commission is hearing some amazing evidence from Queenslanders. I want to place on record my thanks to the brave people who are standing up before that commission and have obviously been subject to a lot of misconduct, bullying and other things. We are now hearing, clearly on the record, what they have had to face in the workplace. That is not acceptable.

I am pleased to be part of a government that reinstated the Productivity Commission and which produced a report into the building industry. I am pleased to see 61 of the 64 recommendations coming along.

With respect to the bill before us tonight, I place on record my thanks to the member for Mulgrave and the member for Cook—my fellow government members—for their work on the committee and the consideration that the full committee had for this matter. I am disappointed with a couple of matters raised in the statement of reservations. I believe that is playing politics with something that is very important to Queenslanders—that is, the safety of people. They are putting politics before people, and that is something that we, importantly, should not tolerate in this place.

I am pleased to stand on the side of Queenslanders and ensure that we get the best productive outcomes. It is not just up to me and the committee who conducted a fulsome inquiry into these matters and uncovered some really great and sensible reforms. I must say that I very much welcome the Master Builders and some of the other witnesses who said that the proportional, sustainable and balanced approach of these amendments will mean we will have productive workplaces whilst ensuring safety for Queenslanders. That is a key piece of evidence for me. It makes sense to reset the balance in Queensland to ensure that we are open for business and that our workers are well protected.

Every worker that goes to work should expect to return home safely, and I certainly prescribe to that. I know that this bill ensures that.

I place on record my appreciation and thanks to the member for Townsville, an electrical engineer, who knows a thing or two about electricity and not getting sparked. In fact, I took counsel from the member for Townsville on some of the specifics around electrical safety. He is actually a real sparky, a colloquial term for electrical engineers. He raised for me some very important matters that Ergon and Energex always report problems with. They know a little bit about electricity safety. You do not want to get a zap while you are handling electrical wires. I think that is what you said, member for Townsville.

Mr Baillie: No, you do not.

Mr McDONALD: It is very dangerous. I want to associate myself again with the comments of the member for Kawana, the Deputy Premier, and his drive to see these changes put in place to ensure we have good, productive and safe workplaces across Queensland.

I note also the comments that have been made with regard to James Cook University. In relation to the University Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 in Queensland, the National Tertiary Education Union were quite prophetic when they expressed concern about James Cook University being able to expand their governance arrangements under their own steam. That was back in 2017. I wish to thank the member for Theodore for raising that point with me. There you go: it was back in 2017 that the National Tertiary Education Union expressed concern about the same issues we are trying to address and correct today, and I appreciate the Minister for Education bringing that to my attention.

I would also like to place on record my appreciation to the secretariat for the work they did in coordinating the submissions and the witnesses. We conducted a number of fulsome inquiries with regard to this bill, and I thank all of those witnesses who contributed greatly.

I would like to come back to where I started and say that this is a sensible bill that gets back to productivity. I know there will be more measures—the Deputy Premier said here today that there will be further changes and improvements to the legislation. One cannot get it right all in one go. This Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is a very sensible bill and is on the side of the workers. I refute the notion of the shadow minister, who was trying to rewrite history by saying that we were not. As we have heard in the royal commission, some of these industrial controls in the workplace were being misused. I know that the measures that will be reversed when this bill is passed in the House will result in improvements for all of those in the building industry.

Again, I place on the record my thanks to the Master Builders and those who gave evidence before the committee. It is important for me to recognise the scope and potential impact on the regulators that those witnesses talked about. Mr Rob Maroney from Master Builders Queensland said it very well. He said—

We also support the passing of this bill. We see it as an opportunity to move back to the model laws in relation to the misuse of power and workplace relations ...

This was the only state where these laws were put in place. It is another example of overreach by the former government that has required correcting. We heard some great evidence before the committee with regard to that. There was no need for those changes in March 2024. I am pleased to

support the committee's recommendation that the bill be passed, and I appreciate the government is following that lead and supporting this bill.

As the state member for Lockyer, I am very proud of the work that is happening in our local community by our builders and electricians—by all of our tradies—to try to get Queenslanders into homes in a safe manner. I would be remiss to not say that things are a bit tough at the moment with petrol prices. I am pleased to be associated with the government that was the first to call that out, and we are working hard and doing the best we can to get the supply rearranged so we can get prices down and see the petrol delivered through all of our service station networks again. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (3.42 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I start by thanking the committee for the work they did on it. Even though they did not reference us, I will reference the chair and the government members who contributed to the committee work as well as the non-government members, the members for Kurwongbah and Aspley. I want to thank Hansard and the secretariat for all of the work they did and the 10 submitters who made a contribution to what was a really important committee inquiry. They gave us a lot to think about.

The Labor opposition supports the continued reform of Queensland's electrical safety framework. In fact, it is in safe hands because of the iterative changes that Labor governments have made to this framework. Electrical safety laws exist for a very simple reason: electricity is essential to everyday, modern life, but when things go wrong the results can be catastrophic and fatal. Strong and robust laws are essential for the safety of workers and everybody throughout the state. Across Queensland, electrical workers, safety inspectors and energy providers carry enormous responsibility every day to keep people safe in their homes, in their workplaces and in public spaces. I want to put on the record my thanks and appreciation for the work that they do. We know that a lot of work is going on with building homes and upgrading infrastructure. They carry an enormous burden and personal responsibility, and I want to put my appreciation for them on the record.

The reforms before the House today deal with two really quite different and distinct matters. The first relates to clarifying and strengthening parts of Queensland's electrical safety framework. The second relates to changes to the Work Health and Safety Act which affect how workers and their representatives access safety information. Labor's position reflects those two different components of the bill. We support the electrical safety amendments, but we do question whether we can support the government using this bill to weaken workplace safety protections.

The electrical safety amendments are generally appropriate. There are a number of amendments in the bill that provide clarity and certainty in the electrical safety framework. We believe that these are sensible and proportionate amendments, in particular the issuing of defect notices by electricity entities such as Ergon and Energex, who regularly identify unsafe equipment when inspecting electrical infrastructure. They might go onsite and notice damaged switchboards, faulty wiring or unsafe installations, and when they identify those issues they need to issue the defect notices requiring rectification.

This bill will confirm and validate what has been a longstanding practice and will make sure these notices are clearly supported by legislation. This reflects a practical safety mechanism that has, in effect, been operating for many years. The reform ensures those defect notices remain enforceable, including retrospectively. Ultimately, that type of reform protects lives and prevents injuries, fires and deaths. The opposition supports those amendments because they strengthen the tools used by electrical workers and regulators to protect the public.

The bill also relocates the regulator's powers to prohibit the sale, installation or use of unsafe electrical equipment from the regulation into the act itself, including the ability of the regulator to issue unsafe equipment directions, prohibiting certain equipment where safety risks exist. Again, this is proportionate and appropriate reform. Relocating those powers from the regulation into the act will provide greater legislative clarity and stronger regulatory oversight and will allow the regulator to respond to emerging risks. We will support those.

The bill has some areas that we would question. It does contain amendments, as the shadow minister has outlined, to the Work Health and Safety Act that remove a proposed mechanism that would allow health and safety representatives to request certain notices directly from the regulator. The purpose of those reforms was straightforward. It was to allow health and safety representatives and union officials who were permit holders to request copies of improvement notices, prohibition notices

and non-disturbance notices that were held, sourced and managed by the regulator. In other words, it would give workers access to timely and relevant information about safety risks in their workplaces.

There are some practical situations where this can often come up—for example, if a new contractor takes over a project after a company has collapsed and the company does not hold that information; where safety records are missing; where workplace records have been destroyed by flood or fire; or where an employee refuses to provide the relevant notice. In those cases, they would be required to go back to the regulator to get access to the relevant and accurate information. We can see that the ability for worker representatives to obtain information from the regulator could be the only practical way to identify serious hazards quickly.

This provision, which is in new section 155A, is yet to commence. It has not been enforced. It was recommended following the 2022 review of the Work Health and Safety Act. It is interesting that the government has declared this to be an urgent bill, but this reform is not in force at the moment. How could it be declared an urgent bill? Why would it be moved so quickly, and why would they guillotine debate today? As a member of the committee, I do not see the argument for that. All this motion does is deny members an opportunity to talk about something we all would have liked the chance to talk about.

Workplace health and safety representatives are workers who step up to help ensure their colleagues go home safely at the end of every day. The proposed provision would have given them a simple administrative pathway to request relevant notices from the regulator. Without it, representatives will have to rely on employers voluntarily giving up that information or, as the committee heard, pursue it through a right-to-information request, which we know can be slower, more complex and costly. When we are talking about workers' lives, we do not want to be adding administrative burdens. It is a real risk that workers will be left without critical safety information when they need it most. When it comes to workplace safety, timing is everything. Delays in accessing that information could mean delays in addressing risks, which could be risking lives.

Also concerning to the committee was the lack of consultation around these changes. The opposition notes that workers, unions and other stakeholders were not meaningfully consulted prior to these amendments being introduced. Instead, the government has relied wholly on the committee process to undertake that consultation process. While committees play an important role in that, we all know, particularly when we are talking about making changes to a workers' safety framework, that a lot of time and a lot of consultation with relevant stakeholders is needed. Workers' safety rights deserve much more than tokenistic consultation; they deserve genuine engagement with people who know what they are talking about.

Submissions to the parliamentary inquiry did raise significant concerns about removing those protections, yet the government is proceeding with it anyway, so that consultation has really not yielded any actual outcome. Unions and workers' representatives argued that the section would ensure timely and independent access to safety information. Even the Queensland Law Society noted the importance of sharing safety information with those responsible for responding to workplace risks.

This issue goes to one of the most fundamental principles of workplace safety—that workers have the right to know about hazards that might affect their health, their safety and even their lives; that they have the right to be able to access information; and that that information is central to the ability of workers and their representatives to identify risks and to raise concerns and, if necessary, to stop unsafe work.

It is the opposition's view that weakening that access undermines a system that is designed purely to ensure that we keep workers safe. For that reason, while Labor supports the electrical safety elements of the bill, we question the changes that do undermine workers' ability to access critical safety information to protect their colleagues on the job. Of course we are always going to uphold and fight for a modern and responsive electrical safety and workplace health and safety framework but not at the risk and sacrifice of workers' safety.

 **Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (3.51 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. As it is commonplace in a world of digital dialogue to use acronyms, it is also called the ESOLA Bill—a relatively innocuous title for a piece of legislation that has a much darker side.

Staying with acronyms for now, I would like to introduce a further player to this emerging story—enter the CFMEU, short for Construction, Forestry and Maritime Employees Union. What does a union for construction, forestry and maritime workers have to do with electrical safety? Well, if you add another

acronym to the story—ALP, short for Australian Labor Party—it seems everything. As much as I deplore the use of acronyms, they do provide fertile ground for the calligraphist to display serifs.

The CFMEU has enjoyed an unholy alliance with the ALP for decades. The CFMEU was formed in the early 1990s through an amalgamation with the BWIU and the UMFA and the ATAIU and later the MUA and the TCFWU, together with elements of the BLF, to create one stronger union movement—

Ms MULLEN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance in terms of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Member, I was listening. The history of the CFMEU is interesting, but I am not really following how it is part of the long title of the bill. I am happy to give you a bit more latitude but can you bring it back to the long title of the bill?

Mr KEMPTON: I am hoping it will become obvious, Mr Deputy Speaker. All together they created a stronger union movement which evolved from a large union driven by the desire, presumably, to improve industrial representation and increase bargaining power. Over time, and in particular over the past decade, the CFMEU has become synonymous with misconduct—

Ms BUSH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The portion of this bill that relates to unions is around accessing specific information. I am not sure what a history lesson is going to provide us in this bill.

Ms BATES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Premier referenced the CFMEU numerous times in his introduction to this bill and in his second reading speech—

Mrs Frecklington: And so did the shadow minister.

Ms BATES:—and so did the shadow minister, so it is relevant.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: On that point, I did not pull up the member when they first mentioned the CFMEU. The member on their feet has been giving a history of the CFMEU so far. I did, member, say I would be happy to give you a bit of latitude in coming back to the long title of the bill. I ask you to bring it back to the long title of the bill now.

Mr KEMPTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Surely such reprehensible conduct would be considered outside the law and would not be tolerated by any government. To the contrary, the Queensland Labor government gave extraordinary power to the CFMEU during its decade of decline.

Nowhere is this more obvious than in Labor's Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which gave unfettered access by union officials to worksites, opening the door to aggressive, intrusive and obstructionist behaviour—behaviour the then Labor minister claimed allowed permit holders to perform their intended roles and functions effectively and to minimise the opportunity for disputation. Other matters of serious concern in relation to the wholly unsavoury and inappropriate relationship between the ALP and the CFMEU are currently being aired in a public forum and are beyond this contribution.

The Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying in Queensland workplaces, particularly by the CFMEU. The Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Electrical Safety Act 2002 provided a framework to protect the health, safety and welfare for all workers including elimination of the human cost of death, injury and damage caused by electricity.

Labor's information-sharing laws would have given unions—let's not beat around the bush: the CFMEU—powers to seek compliance and enforcement information directly from the regulator, and we know how that information would be used to intimidate and harass employers and workers and disrupt the workplace. Further, Labor's laws would have wasted vital resources of the regulator as there was no limit to the number of requests that could be made or how often or how far back requests could be made—another blank cheque for the CFMEU.

Surely the role of the regulator is to protect the safety of workers in the workplace, not to provide open slather for the CFMEU to embark on a campaign of coercion, harassment and intimidation against non-union workplaces. This bill will address that very problem by removing an additional avenue for unions such as the CFMEU to request particular information contained in improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices directly from the regulator. This provision was open to exploitation for non-genuine workplace health and safety purposes and enabled unions to gather information they could weaponise against employers and resulting in an unanticipated administrative burden for the regulator.

The bill will amend the Electrical Safety Act 2002 to provide for electricity entities to give notices requiring action to be taken where they identify defective electrical equipment and to prohibit the sale

of use of electrical equipment based on safety grounds. As a member of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, I would like to acknowledge the chair, Jim McDonald, and other committee members and committee staff for the thorough job done in reviewing this bill. The committee recommended that the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be passed.

Whilst the committee was supportive of the amendment to the Electrical Safety Act and regulation, the committee was not unanimous in supporting the amendments to the Workplace Health and Safety Act and the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act. The Labor opposition members included a statement of reservation, raising concerns in relation to the impact of the proposed amendments were an 'attack' on workers and workers' representatives and that there was a perceived lack of consultation. One of the submitters to the committee hearing, Rob Maroney from Master Builders Queensland, said—

We also support the passing of this bill. We see it as an opportunity to move back to the model laws in relation to the misuse of power and workplace relations laws in this state by bad actors we have seen in the past.

...

Put simply, this piece of legislation is one minor and small step in what we see as a change needed to bring productivity and remove as much as possible the industrialisation of sites away from WHS and keep it in IR and let safety be about safety and proper engagement and support of workers going home safely every day.

One obvious takeaway from this quote is the enormity of the task ahead of us; that is, to unwrap the web that the CFMEU, in concert with the ALP, has wound so tightly around Queensland and which impacts almost every aspect of our lives. The passing of this bill is not only necessary but timely.

Closer to home, and of considerable interest to me as the member for Cook, are the amendments to the James Cook University Act 1997. The commonality with my electorate is, of course, the eponym of the intrepid explorer James Cook. James Cook University is the second oldest university in Queensland with campuses in Cairns, Townsville and Singapore. The academic integrity of our university is second to none. Since 2017 the governance, transparency, accountability and oversight and, consequently, the academic excellence of the institution were put at risk when the JCU council used discretionary powers to reduce the council's size from 22 to 15 and then increase it to 16 members, transferring power of appointment away from the Governor in Council and elected members and significantly increasing the council's ability to self-appoint.

This amendment will repeal the JCU council's power to determine its own membership composition and maintain council at 16 members. In practice, the Governor in Council appointments will increase from three to six, official members will remain at three, elected members will increase from four to five and, importantly, JCU council appointed members will reduce from six to two. I am confident these amendments will guarantee that the JCU council maintains the integrity and focus of the JCU as an academic research leader, ensure the JCU council implements the objectives of the university and ensure the board will be accountable for the role, actions and behaviours of council members and not stray into activities some might describe as woke. I support the bill and the amendments.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (4.01 pm): I rise to speak on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025, a bill that the parliamentary committee I am on, the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee, inquired into. I thank my fellow committee members as well as the member for McConnel for their work on our report. I thank the whole committee. I am sorry the chair did not thank the whole committee, but I thank the whole committee as well as the secretariat, Hansard and everyone else. We may walk down different sides of the road, but on parts of this bill we worked together well and shared the load, let me just put it that way.

I will start with those bits that we did work together on: the amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 which include prescribing a clear power for the longstanding practice of electricity entities to issue defect notices when they discover electrical equipment faults on a property. This usually comes about when an electrical entity or distributor such as Energex or Ergon attends a property to inspect an electrical installation and notices a defect, for example a faulty earth, damaged switchboard or GPO. They then give notice to the person in control of the equipment that the defect must be fixed. Penalties apply if they fail to do so.

Similarly, the amendments in this bill move the power to issue and enforce unsafe equipment directions from the Electrical Safety Regulation into the Electrical Safety Act, clarifying the powers of the regulator as well as definitions and timelines. Unsafe equipment directions can prevent the sale or use of unsafe electrical equipment. I may not have ever mentioned it in this place, but I am a licensed electrician—

A government member: No! Really?

Mr KING: Lucky you are all sitting down—from the electricity supply industry. Keeping people safe is what we do, so I welcome amendments that help the regulator and our frontline workers do that.

What I do not welcome are the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, and I will put on record the Labor opposition's concerns as expressed in the statement of reservation to the committee report that workplace health and safety will go backwards under this bill. Just like the QBCC Bill that was rushed through by the government at the end of last year took workplace health and safety laws backwards when the LNP reduced the legal requirement for QBCC licensees to notify both QBCC and Workplace Health and Safety Queensland—or the Electrical Safety Office in some cases—about serious notifiable safety incidents, instead they brought in a memorandum of understanding for government departments. As I said back then, if you spend enough time working with government processes you get to know that mistakes can happen, but back then a law was traded for an MOU.

This year the LNP says that more informal understandings are not enough for them. They want to bring in more formal legal requirements around the access of health and safety representatives to information concerning the workplace conditions of the workers they are elected to represent. Specifically, they want to wind back the ability for a health and safety representative or a workplace health and safety permit holder to seek information directly from the regulator after an improvement notice, prohibition notice or non-disturbance notice was issued—in other words, information about notices designed to save lives. The LNP think that is a burden on the regulator. Last year they wanted to give government departments and regulators more work. In this case it is too hard.

This is what I think the difference is. Last year when the LNP wanted to make something easier to save some red tape the beneficiaries were their business mates—maybe the ones they can take donations from now. This year the LNP wants to make life harder for health and safety reps, who often come from unions.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance in relation to the bill before the House. The member is clearly straying away from relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Minister, I am listening to the member on their feet. As far as I am concerned, the member is being relevant.

Mr KING: This is absolutely relevant. We are talking about burdens on the regulator. Here is what I think the difference is, just to repeat myself: they are probably the same ones they can take donations from. This year the LNP wants to make life harder for health and safety representatives, who often come from unions. We know that the union movement takes up so much space in the heads of the Premier and Deputy Premier. We have heard lots about unions today and we will probably hear much more. When I say 'unions', I mean the bodies that represent workers in this state, help them earn a fair wage and work safely so they can put food on the table and return home to their families in one piece.

In relation to this bill we heard from a lot of other representative bodies that represent businesses and business owners who resented workers being able to access information that could potentially save lives. These I would also call unions. Those opposite do not have a problem with them. They are the ones that support and may donate politically—just saying. We heard from Master Electricians, the Civil Contractors Federation and Master Builders. They are all great representative bodies, but they do not represent workers so they get away with things. They all thought it was a bad idea to allow workers to access that information and a burden to the regulator. Ironically, as has been said here before, no-one could tell us what burden would be imposed as this bill cuts legislation that was never enacted—it was before it came into effect—except when the Deputy Premier asked for the history of works at the Callide Power Station. We never got a satisfactory answer as to whether that was a burden or not. In fact, the chair tried to block the question. That was only time this has been requested and there was an attempt to have it ruled out as irrelevant—for goodness sake!

I will raise a hypothetical situation that I think would illustrate this. You have a new person in control of a business and they have taken over a site. You are working on the site, and the workplace health and safety rep hears from someone who used to be there that there may be some asbestos. They go to the person in control of the business, who does not have that information. The only way to get that information would be from the regulator, who has that historic information. The only way they would be able to get that after this bill passes—if it passes—is through an RTI. That is a real burden on a workplace health and safety rep. There is a cost burden and everything.

In my opinion, the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 contained in this bill are part of the Crisafulli crusade against unions and blue-collar workers. This bill is another example of a

government that pushes through poor policy which has not been consulted on. The committee process was the consultation for this. They do it unashamedly under the cover of continuing positive reforms that are initiated by Labor. They are counting on us copping the bad with the good once again with this bill as well as new amendments that have just been put in today that have nothing to do with this legislation. I do not support making workplace health and safety weaker. I will always call it out.

 **Mr JAMES** (Mulgrave—LNP) (4.09 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill represents a significant step forward in protecting the health and wellbeing of all Queenslanders. By updating and strengthening our electrical safety laws, we are ensuring that our regulatory framework keeps pace with modern challenges. In addition, the bill refines various aspects of our work health and safety legislation, aiming to restore productivity across Queensland's workplaces. Importantly, it also seeks to address and eliminate systemic misconduct and bullying, with a particular focus on the conduct of the CFMEU.

For these reasons, the Crisafulli government is taking decisive action to repeal Labor's information-sharing laws. These laws would have allowed unions, particularly the CFMEU, to directly obtain compliance and enforcement information from the regulator. The concern is that this information could then be used to harass and intimidate both employers and workers, undermining the intended safety outcomes.

Under the provisions of Labor's information-sharing laws, union officials holding entry permits and health and safety representatives were able to request that the regulator supply them with enforcement and compliance notices issued to businesses. This included a range of notices such as improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices. Labor's laws effectively enabled the CFMEU to collect enforcement information on businesses stretching back decades. In practice, this served little purpose in improving worksite safety and was regarded as unjustified, potentially placing undue pressure on employers and workers alike.

As someone who has been involved in the building industry my entire working life, I understand the importance of electrical safety. The bill has two principal policy objectives. First, it seeks to ensure that Queensland's electrical safety framework continues to protect people and property by reducing and, wherever possible, eliminating electrical risks. Second, it seeks to reduce unnecessary red tape for the regulator and bring Queensland's approach in line with other Australian jurisdictions, particularly with regard to the way information is provided to health and safety representatives and workplace entry permit holders.

The cornerstone of our electrical safety laws—the Electrical Safety Act 2002—is designed to prevent the tragic consequences that can arise from unsafe electrical equipment, like injury, death or property damage. This act provides a robust framework that has served Queenslanders well for over two decades. A key element of this framework is the ability for electricity entities to issue electrical equipment defect notices. These notices are a practical tool used by electricity distributors, such as Energex and Ergon Energy, to alert property owners and occupiers when equipment is found to be unsafe—be it a damaged power point or a faulty switchboard.

If the person in control of the equipment does not address the defect after receiving a notice, they can face significant penalties of up to 40 penalty units. This process is not new; in fact, it has been the longstanding practice since the act commenced in 2002. Nevertheless, there has been uncertainty about whether the act clearly authorises electricity entities to issue such notices. The bill addresses this by amending both the act and its regulation to explicitly provide the head of power for electricity entities to continue this important role. The bill also validates any past notices issued in good faith, ensuring past actions remain effective and above board.

The bill also strengthens the regulator's powers when it comes to unsafe electrical equipment. Currently, the regulator can prohibit the sale or use of equipment deemed unsafe, but this is done through the regulation and lacks the clarity and certainty required for such a significant power. We are elevating this power from the regulation to the act itself, modernising the framework and providing more transparency and certainty for all parties.

The amendments clarify that the regulator can prohibit not only the sale and use but also the installation of unsafe equipment. The bill also sets out grounds for issuing such directions, ensuring due process and limiting prohibitions to a maximum of 10 years, unless otherwise stated. Importantly, the decision to issue an unsafe equipment direction remains with the regulator personally and cannot be delegated, reflecting the seriousness of this power. Those affected will have the right to seek external review through the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, ensuring natural justice. Transitional arrangements in the bill mean that any existing prohibitions—seven in total have been gazetted since

2013—will continue to have effect for another 10 years, so there is no gap in protections as we move to this new framework.

Turning to work health and safety, the bill addresses an issue that arose from recent reforms. In the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024, a new provision was introduced, but not yet commenced, which would have allowed health and safety representatives and workplace entry permit holders to request particular information directly from the regulator. While well-intentioned, attempts to operationalise this reform revealed that it would create substantial administrative burdens and had insufficient safeguards, such as no limits on the number or grounds for requests and a manual review process that could not be automated.

Crucially, this additional avenue is not available in other states or territories and it risks creating inconsistency and inefficiency. The bill, therefore, removes this provision before it can commence, ensuring our laws remain streamlined and aligned with the rest of Australia. This amendment does not affect the existing rights of health and safety representatives or entry permit holders to access information under the Work Health and Safety Act. They will continue to have access to all relevant information through existing mechanisms which already provide for sharing of notices, reports and other critical documents.

In summary, the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 will achieve its objectives by: providing clear legislative authority for electrical entities to issue defect notices, maintaining a vital practice that protects Queenslanders from electrical hazards; modernising and elevating the regulator's powers to prohibit unsafe electrical equipment, ensuring decisions are made transparently and with proper avenues for review; removing unnecessary red tape and aligning our work health and safety information-sharing provisions with those in place across the rest of the country; and making a number of minor and technical amendments to ensure the effective operation and clarity of our safety laws. These changes will contribute to safer homes, workplaces and public spaces throughout Queensland, while also reducing unnecessary administrative burdens on our regulators and keeping our laws practical and effective. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (4.17 pm): Queensland Labor welcomes any improvements to worker safety. Workplace health and safety risks are constantly evolving, and the protections we put in place should evolve too. Workplace health and safety laws must be regularly reviewed and strengthened, not stripped back, diluted or dismantled.

Queensland Labor supports amendments to the Electrical Safety Act and Electrical Safety Regulation. Maintaining the longstanding practice of electricity providers issuing defect notices is something that we can support, but let's be clear: the LNP's proposed changes to the Work Health and Safety Act, through this electrical safety bill, that would repeal section 155A should be of enormous concern to many workers across Queensland. The Queensland Labor opposition will always stand up for the rights of workers to ensure workplaces in Queensland are safe. The same cannot be said for this LNP government. Under this government, workers' safety is under attack.

Section 155A supports workers by allowing their representatives to request relevant notices, avoiding the risk of employer reprisals. This allows a health and safety representative to obtain relevant notices in a less adversarial and timely way, rather than filing a dispute and circumventing issues by applying to the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, a body seeing a lot of issues under this government. With the repeal of section 155A, the LNP government has chalked their agenda up to efficiencies, citing this would impose administrative burdens on the regulator beyond the scope of usual business. Let's be clear: this repeal represents this government's ongoing disdain for workers—a part of a wider pattern of poor industrial policy, aiming to erode workers' safety under the guise of productivity.

Section 155A is not regulatory red tape; it is protection. When Labor committee members asked for evidence to support the government's argument, anticipated processing timeframes or documented misuse, departmental officers were unable to provide answers during the committee hearing process, explicitly indicating that some matters would need to be taken on notice, and I will come back to that.

What did we hear in some of these hearings from unions? The SDA stated that section 155A represents a 'strong measure to ensure timely, reliable and independent access to information'. The SDA even spelt out alternatives for the government. They outlined actions that the LNP government could take instead of simply choosing to repeal section 155A. Alternative approaches were outlined like amending the section rather than repealing, including clear request criteria and privacy safeguards, and implementing a 12-month pilot. The government ignored every solution offered. The government that promised to listen to the experts has so far ignored every concern raised by the experts.

This Crisafulli LNP government completely failed to properly consult with workers, unions or other stakeholders on the Work Health and Safety Act changes in this bill. It is just common sense that consultation on workplace reforms impacting safety should include industry workforce partners. Consultation should not be exclusive or isolated to the discretion of parliamentary committees. It should occur early and never with only select individuals. Ensuring the safety of Queensland workers should never be compromised. The Queensland Council of Unions' submission places on record the Crisafulli LNP government's abject failure to engage with the very workers affected by these changes. The Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union justly called out the LNP, noting that this government

... demonstrates a pattern of poor public policy ... and a dismissal of the evidence and informed recommendations of the 2022 *Review of the WHS Act*. This forms part of a broader and alarming trend of policy regression by the Government in the area of workplace health and safety ...

They are right. Workers' safety is under attack by this Crisafulli LNP government. As the QNMU acknowledges, the changes in this bill do not occur in isolation. These attacks are just a part of a pattern from this government including requiring workplace health and safety permit holders to provide 24 hours notice to access sites and the repeal of the provision allowing health and safety representatives and workplace health and safety permit holders to take measurements, photos and videos and conduct tests in the workplace—all core functions of their roles.

We know that the Queensland Law Society have raised similar concerns. They note that the omission of section 155A means that safety representatives and workplace health and safety entry permit holders will no longer be entitled to request specific information from the regulator. They argue—

The provision of relevant information to enable those with health and safety roles to assist workplaces to respond to safety risks is important.

Workers' safety is at risk. This LNP government claims that the provisions in section 155A would allow information to be accessed illegitimately. There is, of course, one singular case of a third-party information application—an application that came from the Deputy Premier for 10 years worth of notices from the regulator. Does this amount to an admittance of guilt from the Deputy Premier? It is clear that this government is putting politics before people.

There is even more concern when we look at the written responses received to our questions on notice from the director-general of the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. His response failed to appropriately address the questions asked, providing no new information and making a mockery of the committee process. The responses asserted that answers to these issues had been provided during the committee briefing despite, in the clear strong view of anyone watching those hearings, the record clearly demonstrating that no such answers were provided.

The shameful way that this LNP government have conducted themselves throughout this consultation process just shows how little regard they have for Queensland workers. Here we have a Deputy Premier as Minister for Industrial Relations so blinded by his intense hatred of particular unions that it is influencing his ministerial responsibilities by deliberately excluding and ignoring them and the workers they represent. In introducing this bill the Deputy Premier claimed that the LNP Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying. You do not restore productivity by winding back safety measures. You do not stamp out misconduct by removing worker protections. Workplaces deserve to be safe places for workers and the government must ensure that changes to legislation strengthen worker protections, not weaken them.

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (4.23 pm): I rise to speak on this bill for one very simple reason: it is yet another measure from this Crisafulli LNP government directed at addressing the crisis in productivity that has beset this nation and particularly Queensland. I do not support it because productivity is a buzzword or for its own sake but because every expert on what it takes to build economic prosperity will tell you that better productivity is the single most important thing we need to raise living standards for ordinary Queenslanders. It really is that simple. It is about making your pay packet go further. It is about making houses more affordable. It is about getting long-awaited pay increases that cannot sustainably be provided until a workplace can afford to pay them. It is about getting back that feeling, that knowledge, that if I work hard and I am sensible I will be able to finish this life better off financially than when I started. These are not small things. They are at the very heart of the Australian dream.

We in the LNP are determined to get that back for Queenslanders in every corner of this state no matter where they work, what region they live in or how old they are. If they are older, they deserve to have their income, particularly if it is a fixed income, go the distance without feeling like constant inflation is making them poor despite a lifetime of hard work and saving. If they are young, they deserve

to know that their government will take action to increase housing supply and make the cost of building fall so they can, in time, access a place to call a home of their own. If, like our household, they are in the in-between—maybe juggling work or kids or even caring for parents—they are feeling and seeing these things and everything in between as they are stretched to pay in every direction.

What the Queensland Productivity Commission has shown us is that militant unions like the CFMEU have become lawless thugs that are costing ordinary Queenslanders so much—dollars, yes, many dollars. It was also costing them their safety and freedom at work. It was costing investment for our state and all the jobs and opportunities that come with it. It was costing homes for those who need them. Productivity is the big reason this bill matters, and the Queensland Productivity Commission has done extensive work on the crisis in productivity in the construction sector. In fact, it found that in Queensland's construction industry productivity had fallen by nine per cent since 2018. That means in a period of less than a decade—say, eight years—the very same inputs were producing almost a tenth less than they did eight years earlier. That is the same as saying that every product will cost almost 10 per cent more than it did, and I am sure the households in my electorate are feeling that every day.

It was said by the Productivity Commission, and indeed by Treasury, that if productivity had been improved back in 2018 in a sensible way, by not implementing a number of the measures that were put in place by the previous government, we would have another 77,000 homes for Queenslanders since 2018—I repeat: 77,000. That is more than two whole electorates of additional houses in this state, to put it in perspective. It is a phenomenal output that we are without simply because those opposite were more interested in doing sweetheart deals with their sponsors and mates from the thuggish union movement than they were in doing the right thing by the people who live in their electorates.

The hard truth those opposite do not want to grapple with is fourfold. When productivity collapses, Queenslanders pay four times over: the first time in higher project costs; again in having fewer homes, making them cost more and making rents go up; again in having less infrastructure and poorer infrastructure to use every day; and again in a weaker pipeline of work and all of the jobs that come with that. It is not something on which any government should rest.

It is worth looking at some of the things that have been uncovered by the commission of inquiry into the CFMEU that is designed to get to the heart of some of the tactics that were stalling productivity in this state. The first of them was a sense of regulatory capture. In essence, it is alleged before that commission of inquiry that the CFMEU was being treated beneficially as compared with other stakeholders and that the regulator's resources were being diverted towards the matters and priorities of the union instead of the safety and productivity of the sites it regulated.

That is a very dangerous path to take, because when union muscle is prioritised over worker safety dangerous things happen and people get hurt, and we see that in some of the allegations that are coming out in that commission of inquiry in relation to the way that people were being harassed and bullied, becoming psychologically victimised and in fact physically assaulted as a consequence of that method of operating. Concerns about the independence of regulatory oversight and whether decisions were being made in the best interests of worker safety or, on the other hand, whether they were being dominated by union agendas is a really serious matter that is being explored by the commission of inquiry at present, and it needs to be resolved because these are a drag on productivity. These are a drag on the capacity of ordinary households to get ahead financially.

It is also revealing that there has been pressure placed on inspectors in relation to their enforcement activities so that they focused their attention and their enforcement on specific construction companies at the behest of CFMEU officers, leading to a situation where their mates would not have enforcement but those who do not play their games—those who stand up to them—have the regulator directed to their activities. Not only is that not fair; it is a drag on productivity and it is a drag on safety. All of this means that the union's tactics—its work stoppages, its industrial action—have negatively affected timelines and costs without helping working people, without keeping them safer and with all of the harm that is done to productivity and investment as a consequence.

The CFMEU likes to talk a lot about its advocacy for worker safety, but the reality is that many of its methods have compromised safety practices by creating such an intensely adversarial and harassing environment. There has been evidence that working people have often felt pressured and threatened in the course of their work to comply with the directives of those at the top of the union in a way that put their own safety at risk and inhibited their own ability to go to work productively and achieve their own career objectives. Fundamentally, this bill removes a provision that risked turning a safety regulator into yet another lever for thuggish industrial muscle.

Safety is paramount—safety will always be paramount under this government—but this bill makes right a policy overreach enacted by the former Labor government that would have, upon taking effect, gone so far as to make workplaces less safe, made them more prone to bullying and harassment and made them less productive. The bill also takes measures to ensure there is a good framework in place so that electrical equipment defect notices can be issued and that unsafe equipment directions are able to be dealt with under the act. These things are all very important as part of the bread and butter of doing government well, but fundamentally this bill is vital because it ensures that a safety regulator will serve safety, not Labor's union power games.

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (4.33 pm): I send my very best to the member for Oodgeroo. After her contribution she must be feeling a little bit embarrassed in that she picked up the wrong set of speaking points to the bill. She talked a lot about productivity all through her contribution. She got nine minutes through and then finally, with one minute to go, she decided to start talking about the workplace health and safety regulator. She said absolutely nothing about electrical safety—nope, nothing in her contribution about that—but plenty that was completely beside the point of the bill that is before the House. When it comes to the electrical safety aspects of this bill—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr McCALLUM: I can hear the member for Nanango chirping away with nonsensical interjections—the first law officer of the state acting—

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

Mr McCALLUM: I withdraw; I absolutely withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Thank you, member.

Mr McCALLUM: When it comes to making our workplaces safer, Labor will always support safer workplaces and reform that leads to safer workplaces. When it comes to the aspects of this bill that deal with the Electrical Safety Act, I am proud to support the work of all of the workers who are in the energy industry, particularly the work of the Electrical Safety Commissioner, which Labor brought back after the previous LNP government under Campbell Newman got rid of the Electrical Safety Commissioner. It was brought back by Labor and I am pleased to see that this bill will take the head of power that is currently in the Electrical Safety Regulation and hardwire that into the act itself.

Over the last couple of decades the way that we interact and use electricity in our daily lives has changed absolutely dramatically—whether it is solar PVs on rooftops, whether it is batteries that are being installed in our homes, whether it is electric vehicles and the first responders who might be responding to vehicle accidents—our fires, our police—whether it is our mobile phones and all of the electrical devices or devices that have batteries in our homes that we charge overnight. All of these things and all of the changes that we have seen in our lives because of technology when it comes to electricity are relevant in terms of the electrical safety elements of this bill.

I want to acknowledge the great work of the Electrical Safety Commissioner. The parts of this bill which will take the head of power in the Electrical Safety Regulation and hardwire it into the bill will help where an electrical safety inspector provides a written notice to a person in control of electrical equipment requiring them to rectify any defect which has rendered the electrical equipment unsafe. This is really common where workers from Energex or Ergon will attend a property to inspect electrical infrastructure and notice defects. A really great example of that is after the impact of natural disasters such as floods. Right now there are electrical safety checks happening in the Wide Bay thanks to the wonderful work of our frontline energy workers. I want to give a shout-out to the Electrical Trades Union's Operation Energise, which is up there undertaking free electrical safety checks to premises that have been flood affected so that energy can be safely turned on to homes and businesses. The reform that is contained in this bill hardwires that practice into legislation. That is something that we in the Labor opposition certainly support.

When it comes to the elements of the bill that deal with the workplace health and safety act, however, we cannot support action from the Crisafulli LNP government that is going to make Queensland workplaces less safe, and that is what the amendments to the workplace health and safety act in this bill will do. The government argues that the repeal of section 155A is about increasing efficiencies and the usual lines of drivel about removing red tape, noting that those provisions have not yet been enacted.

It was interesting to see during the truncated committee process that when opposition committee members sought to have any evidence provided to the committee proving the assertion that there will

be a greater administrative burden there really was not anything that was able to be provided that would substantiate it—nothing around processing times or improper or excessive use. The government has not met any evidentiary threshold to legitimise their reasoning for not proceeding with section 155. The suggestion that RTI processes could be used instead of these provisions is pretty ironic given that it will add more red tape, it is more costly and it will take longer.

A lot of the contributions from government speakers have been solely about the construction industry. It is important to understand that this reform will apply to every single industry in Queensland, not just the construction industry. When you consider that more than 90 per cent of Queensland workers are in industries other than construction—one in four Queenslanders work in health care, social assistance or retail trade industries—it is no wonder that submitters—the representatives of these workers—were raising concerns about the implications of this reform on their sector. This government will not listen to healthcare workers or to social or community sector workers—absolutely not. That is why the reforms to the Work Health and Safety Act will simply result in Queensland workplaces being less safe.

I think it is extremely important that the government consider that one of the reasons this reform was brought in was that health and safety representatives were fearing reprisal from employers. It is completely appropriate, therefore, to allow them to get information from the regulator so they cannot be targeted by employers that want them out because they want to cut corners when it comes to workplace health and safety. That is absolutely appropriate. I cannot believe that the Crisafulli LNP government wants to take us backwards so that people who are raising legitimate workplace health and safety issues at their work could be targeted by their employer. That is how we will end up with less safe workplaces because of this LNP government. When those accidents happen it will be on the shoulders of everyone in this government.

 **Mr BAILLIE** (Townsville—LNP) (4.43 pm): I rise to make a modest contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 and to speak in support of this bill. I note that the previous speaker, the member for Bundamba, wanted to hear more about the electrical safety aspects of the bill and I do not want to disappoint him. I will provide a very comprehensive, electrical-heavy contribution for his benefit, and I will start right at the beginning.

Before being elected to represent the wonderful electorate of Townsville I was an electrical contractor, and for years I helped residents and businesses with a resource that we use every single day: electricity.

Mr Crandon: Do you have an engineering degree?

Mr BAILLIE: I will take the interjection; I have a mechanical engineering degree and I am also an electrician.

Electricity powers our homes, our business, our places of work—including this place—our hospitals and our schools. It keeps our communities running. In my experience, it is only once we do not have electricity available that we truly appreciate how much it contributes to our everyday lives. At home we rely on the air-conditioner during the hotter months, the hot-water system during the cooler months, the light we search for in the middle of the night, the fridge and freezer that store our food or the oven that cooks our family dinners. We rely on electricity for so many aspects at home. Then we leave home to go to work and we expect traffic lights to operate and manage traffic flow, computers to turn on so we can access emails and files, and cash registers to operate to enable transactions. Electricity allows us to keep our hospitals and operating theatres running and enables our kids at school to learn, connect and prepare for their future. It keeps our big industry moving to advance our economy and it powers the pumps that keep water pressure in the mains so we have water when we turn on the tap. Electricity is vital to maintaining today's way of life to which we have all become so accustomed.

Electricity is something that many of us take for granted until it is not available. I have been on the receiving end of calls when residents and businesses lose electricity supply and contact me directly to advise they have no power. It might be to one appliance or the entire premise, but I can share from experience that getting power supply restored quickly becomes their highest priority. It is worth noting that often when there is a loss of power supply to a premise or an appliance it is due to safety. The first thing an electrician does when there is a report of loss of power is to check the switchboard.

Circuit breakers and RCBOs are safety devices installed to protect people from unsafe conditions. If there are switches tripped, that is usually a good indication that there is a fault in the circuit and that if power were supplied it would be unsafe; however, installation of these switches alone does not provide full protection. One of the limitations of these switches is that, by the very nature by which they work, they only activate when conditions are met that demonstrate the unsafe condition and power

is detected flowing to earth through an unintended conductor or in a magnitude the system is not designed for. An example is when a hot-water element is blown and power is conducted initially via water and then subsequently via water pipes to earth. The circuit protection will activate and stop power supply to the hot-water system. However, safety devices do not detect a damaged cable with a rat chew or a damaged power outlet unless there is a means to conduct to earth or via another conductor. In these circumstances electricity will wait—invisible and silent—for an opportunity to strike. If you are unfortunate enough to touch an exposed live component, you can become the conductor and, depending on how that circuit is protected, put your safety at serious risk.

That is why this bill is so important. Electricians and linesmen who work in the industry are aware of these risks. We can recognise those risks through a visual assessment as well as practical and physical tests. When on site we can recognise serious safety risks before those conditions are met and can take steps to avoid an incident before injury occurs. This bill will clarify that those best placed to make safety assessments and identify potential issues can do so.

Currently the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013 provides that an electrical safety inspector or an electricity entity can give a written notice to a person in control of electrical equipment requiring them to fix any defect affecting the equipment's electrical safety. This situation may arise when an electrical entity, usually a distributor such as Ergon, attends a property while undertaking their duties to inspect an electrical installation and subsequently observes a defective electrical component.

Entities such as Ergon are not resourced nor suited to address all of the issues that may be detected—for example, a damaged power point or an unsafe switchboard is not something that Ergon will be able to directly address—but they can issue a notice to a person in control of the equipment, who might be a home owner or a business owner, to fix the defect. The home owner or business owner would then be obligated to have the defect remedied by a qualified person, most likely an electrical contractor. I spoke to an electrical contractor recently. Ergon had issued a customer of theirs with a defect in the switchboard where the cable was running against the enclosure. Ergon identified that issue and in this instance the electrical contractor attended the issue, identified the exact location and was able to resolve that for the customer—in effect, keeping everyone safe.

It has been a longstanding practice for Queensland energy entities such as Ergon to alert consumers to issues with electrical equipment since the Electrical Safety Act first commenced in 2002. However, while the regulation-making power in the Electrical Safety Act provides the broad prescription powers for a person to discharge electrical safety duties or ensure the electrical safety of persons or property, it currently does not clearly provide a head of power for the electricity entities to give electrical equipment defect notices. To address this issue, this bill will amend the Electrical Safety Act and the Electrical Safety Regulation to maintain the longstanding practice of electricity entities giving these defect notices by including a clear and limited right to prescribe this ability under the Electrical Safety Regulation.

Master Electricians Australia backs this amendment, saying that confirming the ability for electricity entities to continue to give electrical equipment defect notices through clearly prescribed provisions within the regulation will continue to assist the ability of the Electrical Safety Office to keep Queenslanders safe. This bill is about keeping Queenslanders safe at home and at work. Master Electricians Australia has represented electrical contractors in Queensland for 88 years. Its membership is made up of small and medium businesses—and many of them. During their submission in the public hearing, representatives from Master Electricians advised they were pleased to see the necessary steps are being taken to ensure that the regulator's powers to prohibit the sale, installation and use of unsafe electrical equipment are appropriately conferred by the Electrical Safety Act. That is something that we will see more of as we continue to see developments in technology and new products released. Unfortunately a lot of these products are not produced in Australia to our safety standards. We have to be increasingly vigilant about the safety of electrical products being introduced into Australia prior to onsale and picking up that they may not meet our strict design and safety standards.

With regard to the workplace health and safety changes, representatives from Master Electricians said that these are an important step towards restoring proportionality, accountability and efficiency within workplace regulations. I am aware of the time so I will not be able to spend much more time talking about those workplace safety regulations, but they did advise in particular that Master Electricians Australia supports reforms that streamline information requests, prevent any potential misuse of regulatory powers and assure that workplace health and safety oversight remains targeted at genuine safety concerns. Representatives of Master Electricians Australia went on to share that they have seen a number of instances where sites were shut down for a very minor or a very isolated area of a piece of work happening, whereas that could have been sectioned off as more of a proportionate

response to the safety incident that could have been raised. We are about productivity, but also about safety and we want to see everyone get home safe.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (4.53 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This legislation, in large part, maintains the original and sensible intent of Queensland's electrical safety framework. It provides a clear and necessary pathway for electricity entities to continue their longstanding and important practice of issuing electrical equipment defect notices—an approach that has served Queenslanders well for many years. However, while the Labor opposition supports these electrical safety provisions, we cannot support the proposed changes to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024.

These changes undermine important rights for workers and their representatives. Speaking on the Electrical Safety Act 2002, the continued reform of Queensland's electrical safety framework is essential to protecting Queenslanders from electrical risks. The way we use and interact with electricity today is vastly different from when the Electrical Safety Act 2002 was first introduced. Over the past two decades we have seen the rapid emergence of new technologies, renewable energy systems, battery storage solutions and increasingly complex electrical infrastructure. It is therefore critical that our legislative framework continues to evolve alongside these changes.

Labor has a proud history of delivering in this area, reinstating the electrical safety commissioner role after it was abolished by the Newman government. We recognise the importance of strong, independent oversight in safeguarding our communities. The bill amends the Electrical Safety Act 2002 and the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013 to formalise and regularise the longstanding practice of electricity providers issuing electrical equipment defect notices. It does so by creating a clear head of power under the regulation and strengthening the legislative basis for enforcement.

Currently, electricity entities such as Ergon and Energex, as well as electrical safety inspectors, can issue written notices requiring a person in control of electrical equipment to rectify defects that may render that equipment unsafe, such as unsafe switchboards or damaged power outlets. This is a well-established and valuable public safety mechanism. The amendments to this act to maintain this longstanding practice via the creation of a clear right to prescribe this ability under the regulation is supported by the Queensland Labor opposition.

The proposed amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 have been described by the member for Kawana as stopping an amendment that meant the CFMEU had direct access to the personal information of construction companies in Queensland. Let me be clear: this was not a CFMEU specific amendment; it was for all workers and workplaces. These changes proposed by the government seek to remove the right for health and safety representatives and entry permit holders to request information contained in improvement, prohibition or non-disturbance notices from the regulator. In recognition of the important role health and safety representatives and entry permit holders play in upholding workplace health and safety, Labor considered this as an important addition to make Queensland workers safer. This reasonable and necessary addition is vital in instances where relevant information may not be available through the usual employer and workplace channels or where an employer's records may be inaccessible for access if refused. For example, if a new contractor had taken over a project following a financial collapse of a previous contractor or a flood or fire had made workplace-based records irretrievable.

Importantly, this provision would have provided an avenue to gain essential safety information if employers refused to meet obligations to provide information without requiring an application to be lodged with the Queensland Industrial Relations Tribunal. During the committee process stakeholders, including the QCU, the QNMU and the SDA, spoke up strongly against the LNP's proposed removal of section 52 of the WHSOLA Act as a further example of this Crisafulli LNP government's attacks on workers and their representatives. The Crisafulli-Bleijie government argues repeal of section 155A is about efficiency: that it would have imposed unnecessary administrative burdens on the regulator. Yet when Queensland Labor opposition committee members sought evidence to support this assertion, anticipated processing timeframes or instances of improper or excessive use, departmental officers were unable to provide answers and explicitly indicated that some matters would need to be taken on notice during the committee hearing process.

The government has completely failed to consult with workers, unions and other stakeholders on these changes. As mentioned previously, the member for Kawana described changes to the proposed Miles Labor government amendments as stopping the CFMEU having direct access to personal information. It is clear that this is not a CFMEU specific amendment.

It is important to note that it was federal and state Labor governments that cleaned up the CFMEU by putting them into administration. We made it clear at the time that there was no room for illegal behaviour or behaviour that undermines public confidence in Queensland registered unions. We worked closely with the federal government to address these serious issues. Measures taken by Labor governments restored public confidence in the construction industry for all participants and supported fair, safe and productive workplaces for all Queenslanders.

In closing, we support the electrical safety measures. They are practical, necessary and grounded in longstanding practice. They will improve safety outcomes and provide clarity for industry. However, we cannot support the erosion of workers' rights embedded in the proposed workplace health and safety amendments. These provisions diminish transparency and weaken protections and they do so without evidence or proper consultation.

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (5.00 pm): Electrical safety is something that hits close to home for me. In my own family, the electrical trade runs through generations. My husband was an electrician, his grandfather was an electrician and today our son is a fourth-year electrical apprentice. My husband stepped away from the tools to run my international freight business when I was elected but the trade and what it represents is still a big part of our lives. Therefore, when we talk about electrical safety in this place I think about families such as mine. I think about sons and daughters learning their trade, fathers working long days onsite, as mine did when my kids were being raised, and grandfathers who built their careers in these industries. I think about what matters most: that they all come home safely at the end of the day. That is why today I rise in strong support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. It is about making sure our safety framework does what it is meant to do: protect workers while also making sure it is not misused.

The Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying on worksites. If we are serious about productivity on worksites, we also need to recognise one of the broader pressures currently facing our workforce. Over the past fortnight I have heard from tradies across the Redlands, including our island communities, who are worried about whether they can even get to sites, whether there is enough fuel to make the trip and what it means if they lose a day's work. That is why the Crisafulli government acted early, sounding the alarm and working with the industry and the Commonwealth to make sure fuel is flowing to where it is needed most, particularly in regional Queensland, because productivity is not just about what happens onsite; it is about whether workers can get there in the first place.

Unlike Labor, we will never take a backward step when it comes to standing up for Queenslanders and making sure their legitimate concerns, from fuel shortages to workplace safety, are being heard. That is why this bill repeals Labor's information-sharing laws before they even come into effect. Those laws would have allowed union officials and health and safety representatives to request compliance and enforcement information directly from the regulator including improvement notices, prohibition notices and other sensitive material. There were no real safeguards, no limits on how many requests could be made, no limits on how often they could be made and no limits on how far back those requests could go. That was not about improved safety; that was about Labor creating an avenue that could be misused and in many cases weaponised.

The Crisafulli government will not stand for systematic misconduct and bullying, particularly by the CFMEU. Labor's information-sharing laws would have placed a significant administrative burden on the regulator and pulled resources away from their core job of keeping Queenslanders safe. It would have opened the door for unnecessary pressure and intimidation, particularly on small and family-run businesses. Labor's laws unjustifiably enabled the CFMEU to collect enforcement information on businesses dating back decades which would serve limited purpose in making worksites safer.

The regulator's core function is to protect Queenslanders' safety, not to assist in facilitating the CFMEU's orchestrated campaign of coercion, harassment or intimidation against non-union workplaces. In the Redlands we have many of those businesses with local tradies, subcontractors and small operators working hard, doing the right thing and already meeting their obligations. They do not have large compliance teams. They do not have the time or resources to deal with fishing expeditions or repeated requests for historical information. They deserve a system that supports them, not one that adds unnecessary pressure.

The regulator's role must be clear: it is there to protect safety and not to facilitate harassment and industrial tactics. This bill restores that balance. The bill will remove the provisions before they commence and ensure Queensland's safety framework cannot be exploited in this way. Importantly, this approach is backed by the industry. The committee recommended that the bill be passed, and there

was clear support from submitters for repealing these provisions. That tells us that we are getting the balance right.

This bill also does important work in strengthening and modernising electrical safety laws. It provides clarity around the ability of electricity entities to issue defect notices when unsafe equipment is identified—something that has been standard practice for more than 20 years. The bill simply makes sure the legislation properly reflects the practice, giving certainty to both industry and regulators.

The bill also strengthens frameworks for dealing with unsafe electrical equipment. When something poses a risk, action needs to be taken quickly. This bill modernises those powers, elevates them into the act and provides clearer guidance on how and when they will be used. It also improves transparency, requiring decisions to be published and ensuring there are clear review pathways. These are practical and sensible changes that strengthen the system and improve safety outcomes.

In a growing community like the Redlands, this matters. We are seeing more homes being built, more infrastructure being delivered and more tradies on the ground every single day. We rely on those workers and they rely on us to get these settings right. They need a system that keeps them safe, a system that is fair and a system that cannot be misused. This bill delivers on that. It restores integrity to the framework, it ensures the regulator can focus on what matters most and it sends a clear message that workplace safety laws should never be used as a tool for bullying or intimidation.

This is also a test for the opposite side. Will they stand with workers and small businesses or will they continue to back laws that open the door to overreach? Labor's information-sharing laws are one example of more than a decade of Labor enabling the CFMEU. Those laws serve no purpose other than to give the CFMEU another tool to bully and intimidate employers and workers in the construction industry. Communities such as Redlands expect better and they deserve better.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.08 pm): I rise to give my contribution on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will keep my contribution relatively brief and confine it essentially to the repeal of proposed section 155A of the Work Health and Safety Act that was legislated during the last session of parliament in the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act. On commencement, this provision would have provided a means for health and safety officers and union representatives at a workplace to request copies of relevant documents for that workplace from the regulator rather than relying on disclosure by the workplace itself. The notices that would have been available on commencement include improvement notices about contraventions of the act, prohibition notices about activities that are occurring or may occur at the workplace and non-disturbance notices relating to a worksite.

The access to this information, both in terms of the information itself and by whom, would have been limited under proposed section 155A. To illustrate, only representatives of the workplace or the relevant union could access the information and it would not include any personal information or confidential commercial information.

In the predictable or, dare I say, inevitable circumstance where a workplace shirks its obligations to give copies of these notices to health and safety reps, it seems to me just sensible to ensure there is a mechanism for representatives to obtain copies directly from the regulator. This safeguards the ability for health and safety reps to assess risks to the workers they represent and ensures the regulator serves the interests of the workers, rather than just employers.

Some have raised concerns throughout the process that this power would entitle workers' reps to information from historical notices, and not just in respect of more immediate safety risks, but I would suggest that health and safety reps should in fact be able to access current and historical information. This is how they might identify patterns and trends in a workplace and holistically respond to safety concerns raised by workers.

It is news to no-one that the LNP will always prioritise the profits of its corporate donors over the safety and welfare of workers. Their words and actions make that perfectly clear at every opportunity. In fact, that may even be the one instance in which I am prepared to offer them credit for their transparency. Yet, the minister spent the vast majority of the introductory speech insisting that blue is yellow, feigning concern and care about worker safety. However, they undermine their own professed concern when they gleefully gloat about how they have repealed laws that would have given workplace health and safety permit holders a right of entry without requiring 24 hours notice and prevented the commencement of laws that would have ensured that reps could take photos, videos, measurements and conduct tests at workplaces. No matter how this LNP government tries to gild this particular lily—we will put it that way—stripping health and safety reps' powers to gather information about risks and respond immediately is, as a matter of fact, bad for workers. The interests of workplace health and

safety representatives are just as their job title suggests—their interest is the health and safety of workers, and that is not something that need be overcomplicated.

To put it bluntly, if proper protections and attention to the health and safety of workers results in financial loss for the bosses, or even goes so far as a failed business, then it is a business that should fail. We cannot afford to put corporate profits ahead of the safety of workers, and this government has a thing or two to learn about that.

 **Mrs KIRKLAND** (Rockhampton—LNP) (5.12 pm): Today I rise to speak in strong support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. It is not only sensible and responsible but also absolutely essential for the safety of Queenslanders. This bill strengthens our electrical safety system, removes dangerous loopholes and ensures the regulator stays focused on protecting lives, not being dragged into industrial battles. Today, more than ever, Queenslanders need that protection.

In 2017, 35-year-old Queenslander Kerryn O'Connor tragically lost her life because a pump she was using had not been designed, manufactured or tested to Australian safety standards. It was unsafe, uncertified and deadly. Kerryn's death is a stark reminder that unsafe electrical equipment is not a theoretical risk; it is a real and present danger. Sadly, unsafe equipment continues to cause harm across Queensland.

Electrical fires remain one of the most common and destructive types of house fires in our state. According to RACQ insurance data, 27 per cent of all house fire claims in the last 12 months were caused by electrical issues. Firefighters are reporting a sharp rise in fires caused by lithium-ion batteries, especially when people use cheap or incompatible chargers.

Central Queensland has not been spared. Queensland fire and emergency services data shows the region records dozens of house fires each year, many linked to electrical faults, battery failures and overloaded circuits. Older homes, rural properties using pumps and generators and the growing use of the lithium-powered tools all increase the risk. These fires destroy homes, devastate families and put enormous pressure on our emergency services.

Nationally, the picture is even more concerning. Nearly 40 per cent of all fires are caused by faulty wiring, appliances or device failures. WorkSafe Queensland reports that Queenslanders experience an average of 16 serious electrical incidents per year. Every year, millions of dollars in property damage is caused by unsafe electrical equipment. These are not small numbers. They show exactly why Queenslanders must have the strongest possible electrical safety laws.

The previous government had planned to introduce new information-sharing laws that would have allowed union officials and worksite safety representatives to request unlimited amounts of compliance information from the electrical safety regulator. That is unlimited—no limits on how many requests, no limits on how far back they could go and no requirement to give any reason at all.

The government has been clear that these powers could have been weaponised, particularly by the CFMEU, to pursue industrial agendas, rather than genuine safety concerns. That is not what our safety system is for. This bill repeals those laws before they can do damage. Our safety regulator should be spending its time inspecting dangerous equipment, responding to incidents, enforcing safety standards and keeping unsafe products out of Queensland homes and businesses. It should not be tied up responding to unlimited information requests that have nothing to do with preventing incidents or saving lives.

This bill ensures the regulator stays focused on its core mission, which is protecting Queenslanders. This bill also makes Queensland safer by strengthening the laws that control electrical equipment sold in this state. It moves key enforcement powers previously only in regulations directly into the Electrical Safety Act, giving the regulator stronger, clearer authority to ban unsafe products, restrict their sale, recall dangerous items and act faster when a risk has been identified. These powers are needed because unsafe electrical equipment does enter the market. The Electrical Safety Office has documented cases of unsafe imported equipment, non-certified second-hand items, products lacking the required RCM safety mark and equipment that fails Australian standards and poses electrocution or fire risks. As we have seen, the consequences can be fatal.

Electrical safety is not just about electricians either. The Electrical Safety Act covers industries including construction, manufacturing, agriculture, hospitality, health and aged care, retail, events and entertainment, transport and infrastructure, renewable energy and emerging technologies. Any business that uses, installs, maintains or works near electrical equipment has responsibilities under the act, and the bill strengthens the system that protects all of them. Put simply, the government has stopped a set of laws that could have been misused by unions like the CFMEU to demand unlimited

information from the safety regulator. Instead, the bill strengthens Queensland's electrical safety system so unsafe products can be banned or recalled more easily. It keeps the focus on protecting people, not feeding industrial disputes.

This bill is about commonsense. It removes risky, unnecessary powers that could have been abused. It strengthens the laws that keep unsafe electrical equipment out of Queensland homes and businesses. It ensures the safety regulator stays focused on saving lives, not on paperwork battles. It responds to the very real dangers Queenslanders face from unsafe electrical equipment, fires and faulty products. For every Queenslander who has lost their life to faulty electrical equipment and for every Queenslander who relies on safe electrical equipment every day, this bill is the right step forward.

In closing, the following quote is from Matthew Duncan from Master Electricians Australia. He said—

With regard to the workplace health and safety changes, MEA sees that these are an important step towards restoring proportionality, accountability and efficiency within workplace regulations. In particular, MEA supports reforms that streamline information requests, prevent any potential misuse of regulatory powers, and assure that workplace health and safety oversight remains targeted at genuine safety concerns.

The Rockhampton and Central Queensland communities deserve these effective amendments that will ensure both safety and productivity in our growing region. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (5.20 pm): I rise to speak on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 and to place on the record my support for the electrical safety reforms it contains, while also making it clear why the opposition cannot support the amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 that have been inserted into this legislation. The Queensland Labor opposition is generally supportive of the electrical safety aspects of this bill, which maintain the original intent of protecting Queenslanders from electrical risks. Ongoing reform in this space is essential. The way Queenslanders use electricity today is vastly different from when the Electrical Safety Act was first introduced. New technologies, new systems and new risks mean our framework must continue to evolve. Labor has always taken that responsibility seriously. We have a strong record in electrical safety, including reinstating the electrical safety commissioner after it was abolished by those opposite. When reforms generally improve safety outcomes we will support them. That is exactly what we are doing here.

This bill provides a clear and explicit legislative basis for a longstanding and well-understood practice: the issuing of electrical equipment defect notices by electricity entities. For decades, providers like Energex and Ergon, as well as electrical safety inspectors, have issued notices requiring unsafe electrical equipment to be repaired or replaced. That happens every day across Queensland in relation to unsafe switchboards, damaged outlets and faulty installations. These notices prevent injuries, prevent fires and save lives. Ensuring those notices have a clear head of power in legislation is not controversial; it is responsible governance. For that reason, the opposition supports those amendments. We also support the changes that strengthen the regulator's ability to prohibit the sale, installation or use of unsafe electrical equipment by embedding those powers directly in the act. Again, this is sensible, proportionate and necessary.

That is where our support ends. While this bill contains sensible electrical safety reforms, it also contains something else entirely: a deliberate and unjust attack on workers' rights. Let's be clear: this government is trying to hide that attack behind otherwise reasonable reforms. This is not just a safety bill; it is a Trojan Horse. Buried within this legislation are amendments that remove the right of health and safety representatives and workplace health and safety entry permit holders to request critical safety information from the regulator. That right matters. It goes to the most fundamental principle of workplace safety: the right to know about risks. Without that knowledge, workers cannot protect themselves.

This was not some radical or extreme proposal; it was a practical reform designed to ensure workers and their representatives could access important safety information when it is not available through normal workplace channels. Let's be honest: workplaces are not always perfect. There are situations where contractors collapse and records disappear, floods or fires destroy documentation or employers simply refuse to cooperate. In those situations, access to regulator-held information may be the only way workers can understand the risks they face.

What is this government doing? It is removing that access not because it does not work and not because it has been abused—they never even gave it a chance. This provision has not yet commenced and it has not been tested. There is no evidence it would create any burden, yet the government have moved to repeal it anyway.

We are told this is about efficiency and administrative burden. When opposition members asked for evidence—processing times, workload estimates and examples of misuse—there was nothing. There was no data, no modelling and no justification. It is just another decision that has been made first and justified later, if at all. Departmental officers could not answer basic questions and matters were taken on notice. When responses came back, they failed to address the issues raised. That should concern every member of this House. If a government cannot explain why it is removing a safety protection, it should not be removing it.

The government has also suggested that people could simply submit right-to-information applications instead. Let's call that what it is: a delay tactic, a costly process and a bureaucratic barrier. Workers should not need to lodge a right-to-information application to find out if their workplace is safe. That is not efficiency; that is obstruction. It is workers who will pay the price. This change does not exist in isolation. It forms part of a broader pattern. We have already seen this government require 24 hours notice before workplace health and safety permit holders can enter sites and roll back practical powers to worker representatives. Each change chips away at protections. Each change limits transparency. Each change makes it harder for workers to identify and respond to risk. Taken together, this is not reform; it is regression.

There has also been a complete failure of consultation. Workers were not consulted. Unions were not consulted. Key stakeholders were not consulted. Instead, the government has tried to claim that the parliamentary committee process is an adequate substitute. It is not. Consultation is not something you do after the decision has already been made; it is something you do before. This government did not consult; it dictated. When dealing with workplace safety, that is simply not good enough.

We also know what is coming next in this debate. The government will try to dress this up as something to do with the CFMEU. Let me be absolutely clear: the reform was not CFMEU-specific. It applied to all workers and all workplaces. It was Labor governments, both state and federal, that took decisive action to place the CFMEU into administration and restore integrity. There is no justification for using that issue as a smokescreen. When the government talk about the CFMEU, they are avoiding the real issue: taking rights away from every worker in Queensland.

At its core, this is about a simple question: do workers have the right to access information about risks in their workplace? On this side of the House the answer is yes—always. Without that information, workers cannot make informed decisions. They cannot raise concerns. They cannot stop unsafe work. They cannot protect themselves. These are not abstract principles; these are real-world protections that save lives. Removing them weakens safety and reduces transparency. It empowers those who would prefer that information remain hidden. If you make it harder to access safety information, you make workplaces less safe. It is as simple as that.

Let me be clear in closing: the opposition supports the electrical safety reforms in this bill. They are sensible. They are practical. They reflect longstanding and important work that keeps Queenslanders safe. I will not support a bill that uses those reforms as a cover to undermine worker protections. We will not support a government that removes rights without evidence. We will not support a government that refuses to consult. We will not support a government that claims to care about safety while quietly dismantling the tools workers rely on for safety. One cannot claim to stand for safety while voting to take safety information away from workers. That is why Labor opposes these amendments. That is why we will continue to stand up for Queensland workers in this chamber, in our committees and in our communities. Safety at work should never be negotiable.

 **Miss DOOLAN** (Pumicestone—LNP) (5.29 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This is an important bill because it is about restoring balance and integrity and ensuring that workplace safety in Queensland is exactly what it should be about: keeping workers safe, not empowering bad actors. Safety should never be weaponised, it should never be twisted into a tool for intimidation and it should never be compromised by politics.

The former Labor government introduced provisions that went far beyond their stated intent. They created a system where union officials could request vast amounts of compliance and enforcement information with no real limits, no clear safeguards and no proper accountability. Let's be honest about what that meant: it meant the potential for this information to be weaponised, not to improve safety but to target businesses, to intimidate employers and to disrupt worksites. It also meant a significant administrative burden on the regulator, pulling resources away from where they matter most: actually keeping Queenslanders safe at work. That is not a good policy, that is not good governance and that is certainly not in the interests of workers.

This bill takes a clear and decisive step to fix that. It repeals those uncommenced information-sharing provisions before they could be exploited. It restores the focus of the regulator back to where it belongs: protecting workers, not feeding union fishing expeditions. Importantly, it aligns Queensland with other states, ensuring we are not an outlier when it comes to workplace regulation.

This bill is not just about repealing bad law. It also strengthens our electrical safety framework. It provides clarity for electricity entities like Energex and Ergon to issue defect notices—something they have been doing for decades but which now has clear legislative backing. It modernises the regulator's powers to prohibit unsafe electrical equipment, ensuring that dangerous products can be taken off the market quickly and effectively. It brings these important powers into the act itself because, when it comes to safety, clarity matters.

These reforms are not happening out of nowhere. They have been supported by industry stakeholders who are on the ground and understand what is happening. We heard clearly from organisations like Master Builders Queensland and the Civil Contractors Federation. They spoke about the need to restore productivity, to remove the industrialisation of safety laws and to ensure that safety remains focused on genuine risk, not industrial leverage. Importantly, the committee recommended that this bill be passed.

This bill presents a very clear question for those opposite: do they stand with Queensland workers and businesses or do they continue to stand with the CFMEU? This legislation draws a line in the sand. It says that workplace safety will not be hijacked, that intimidation and coercion have no place in our system and that this government will always back fairness, productivity and genuine safety.

I want to bring this back to my community of Pumicestone because this is not an abstract concept. This matters on the ground. In Pumicestone, we have tradies, small builders, subcontractors, electricians and apprentices—people who are working hard every single day to build our community. They are working on local infrastructure and working in small family businesses and give so much back to our community. I give a big shout out to Brendan Harvey Builders on Bribie Island who are going above and beyond to support our community, especially with our grassroots sporting clubs. Only yesterday it was Brendan's birthday, so happy birthday, Brendan!

What do people like Brendan tell me? They tell me that they want to be safe, they want fair rules and they want to get on with the job. This bill delivers exactly that. It ensures that safety laws are used for their intended purpose to protect workers like those in Caboolture, Beachmere, Ningi and Bribie Island. It ensures that regulators can focus on real risks, not paperwork generated by unlimited information requests. It ensures that businesses in our community can operate with certainty, knowing that the system is fair, balanced and focused on outcomes. If we are serious about building more homes, about delivering infrastructure and about growing our economy then we must also be serious about productivity. Productivity starts with a system that works. This bill is a step in the right direction.

This legislation is about restoring common sense. It is about putting safety back at the centre of workplace laws. It is about standing up for Queensland workers, businesses and communities including mine in Pumicestone. At the end of the day, every worker deserves to go home safely, but they also deserve a system that is fair and free from intimidation. That is what this bill delivers. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (5.34 pm): I rise to speak to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 and acknowledge the work of the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee in examining the bill and producing the committee report. As has been said by my colleagues from this side of the House who have spoken before me, there are aspects of this bill which the opposition is happy to support. They are the amendments dealing with electrical safety—those which maintain the longstanding practice of electricity providers issuing defect notices, achieved via the creation of a clear right to prescribe this ability under the Electricity Safety Regulation; and those which relocate the head of power of the regulator to prohibit the sale or use of electricity equipment on safety grounds. In relation to the rest of it—the Work Health and Safety Act 2011—it is actually outrageous and we cannot support it.

The changes proposed by the government seek to remove the right for health and safety representatives and WHS entry permit holders to request information contained in improvement, prohibition and non-disturbance notices from the regulator. Looking at this particular part of the bill and the committee report, listening to the contributions made by the government speakers and watching them over the last 15 months, there is a straight template for the way the government like to put their bills together. It does not even really matter what the subject matter is. Every minister who brings legislation to parliament just have to tick a couple of boxes. They are the same boxes for each bill.

One: can you use this legislation as a vehicle for LNP members to bang on about whatever their current messaging is, even if it has nothing to do with the actual bill? For this bill—tick! Anyone who has been listening to the LNP members for the last few hours will recognise that because they have been banging on about the CFMEU, even though the Work Health and Safety Act is actually for all workers and workplaces.

Two: have you done as little consultation as possible? Tick! We know the government failed to consult with workers on the work health and safety amendments or unions or other stakeholders but instead said the parliamentary committee would provide an appropriate forum.

Three: have you ensured that at least one aspect of the bill is not based on any expert advice whatsoever? Tick! The Queensland Council of Unions, the Queensland Law Society, the SDA—a whole list of stakeholders—talked about how important the workplace health and safety reforms are that we put in place. If they had been asked when the legislation was being put together, we might still have those reforms in place but you never know.

Four—

A government member: Tick!

Ms FARMER: It's coming. You can say it with me, if you want. Do you want me to do a hand movement? I will do a hand movement and then we can all say it. Can LNP members use this legislation as a vehicle to display their real values? Tick!

Opposition members: Tick!

Ms FARMER: Yes, this is a big tick. I have heard all the LNP members talk about productivity and investment, living a good life and improving economic returns and efficiency. Do we stand with workers, employers and small businesses et cetera? All of those things are really important, but not one of them has talked about work health and safety. Not one of them has talked about the right of every worker to be safe at work and to come home safely to their family and friends. Not one of them has said that you actually cannot be productive, that you actually cannot live a good life, that you actually cannot be efficient or contribute to economic returns if you are not safe at work, if you are injured, if you are killed. Businesses cannot thrive if their workplaces are not safe. They cannot do well. They cannot be efficient. They cannot be productive. Does this bill show us the true values of the LNP members? Does this tick one of their boxes for every piece of legislation? Oh, yes, it does. Isn't it great that some things in life are predictable!

Before I finish speaking on this bill, I want to go to the amendment regarding the James Cook University Act—and what a cracker this one is! One would think from the way the Minister for Education had been carrying on about it that this amendment is the equivalent of the minister coming in on his white charger to make sure that the JCU council do not change the name of their university to an Aboriginal name. He is going to save us from wokeness. He is going to show that JCU what for. He is going to revamp that council to ensure they are better controlled. Despite the fact that there is no evidence whatsoever—

Mr Mander: Tick!

Ms FARMER: I can do if you want me to do another 'tick', that is fine. I think everyone is enjoying it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Direct your comments through the chair.

Ms FARMER: I am happy to encourage participation, Mr Deputy Speaker. Despite the fact there is no evidence whatsoever to suggest the JCU council intended to change the name—they were merely tightening up governance—all this amendment does is revert the existing council structure, which was formed by resolution a couple of years ago, to being a prescribed legislative model, which brings it in line with overall council size across all Queensland universities. It is just a housekeeping bill.

If we did not already know what a weak, incompetent and shallow education minister this is, this is a classic example. The minister last week embarrassed himself over the naming of the Glasshouse Theatre, essentially lying to Queenslanders that he had been genuinely seeking their views—

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is not only being irrelevant but she also used unparliamentary language and I draw that to your attention.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. I will take some advice. Member, there was some unparliamentary language. I will ask you to withdraw.

Ms FARMER: I withdraw. The minister today in parliament had to admit he had mucked up the pay of about 10,500 teachers. What is it with this government and IT systems? The education minister, who has forced teachers to go to arbitration and will not even—

Mrs KIRKLAND: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, if I can get to you maintain relevance to the bill, that would be appreciated.

Ms FARMER: This is a minister who desperately needed attention to be taken off him because he has done some pretty incompetent things. The latest thing is that the poor teachers are just asking for an interim pay rise. The money is in the budget and this minister will not even listen, and that is what this bill is about.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw the Deputy Speaker's attention to the fact that the member is not being relevant and it is against standing orders in that regard.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member; I appreciate that. There is a ruling by the Speaker that talks about being relevant to the bill. You may refer to other matters briefly, but please return to the substance of the bill.

Ms FARMER: The point I am making is that he needed to make a big deal about this bill. He needed this bill to somehow be a story that everyone was going to get outraged about. It is just an ordinary housekeeping bill. He needed this bill to say, 'Here is this bright, shiny thing. Look at this over here,' because he has done such a bad job for so many people right across Queensland. That is what this bill is about. Of course we will support it—it is a housekeeping bill—but let's see it for what it is. This is a bill to take attention away from the fact that this education minister is simply not up to the job and he just incurs one disaster after another.

Mr LEE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I know that the member for Bulimba is struggling, but I would ask you to bring her back to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Hervey Bay. I will look after the order of the House. There is no point of order. Member for Bulimba, have you finished your contribution?

Ms FARMER: Yes, thank you.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (5.43 pm): I rise to support the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This is an important bill because it goes directly to the safety of Queensland workers and the integrity of our workplace safety system.

In Toowoomba and across the south-west I speak regularly to tradies, apprentices and small business owners—the people who form the backbone of our great state. They want safety to be real, they want safety to be practical and they want safety to be free from pressure, politics and intimidation. They are not asking for special treatment; they are asking for a fair system, they are asking for a regulator that can focus on real risks and they are asking for laws that protect workers without giving bad actors another tool to bully, disrupt and intimidate. Before I go into the detail, I want to talk about why this bill matters.

The bill is about restoring balance. After a decade of decline, where the balance was lost under Labor, the Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity and stamping out systemic misconduct, intimidation and bullying, particularly by the CFMEU. We are doing that while strengthening real safety outcomes. That matters to workers, it matters to employers and it matters to the communities that depend on safe, productive workplaces. The question for Labor is: are they on the side of Queenslanders and productivity or the CFMEU?

For too long everyday Queenslanders who run family businesses, who employ apprentices and who turn up every day and do the right thing have been pushed to the edge of the conversation. This bill puts them back at the centre of the system. I have met contractors in my electorate who do everything right. They invest in training, they keep their records and they fix hazards. They know that good safety practices protect workers and business, but they also tell me that confidence in the system breaks down when safety processes can be turned into industrial leverage. It breaks down when businesses believe that sensitive compliance material can be hauled out again and again—not to deal with a current risk but to create pressure and disruption. When trust breaks down, safety outcomes suffer, cooperation drops, engagement drops and people become more guarded and not more open. That is the exact opposite of a good safety culture.

Let me be very clear: safety should always be about safety—not about power, not about pressure, not about politics and certainly not about intimidation. This bill repeals Labor's

information-sharing laws before they even begin. Let us be clear about what those laws would have done. They would have given unions such as the CFMEU direct access to compliance and enforcement information from the regulator—information that could then be used to harass and intimidate employees and workers. Under Labor's information-sharing laws, entry permit holders and health and safety representatives could request improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices issued to businesses. There were no real limits to the number of requests, no real limits on how often they could be made and no real limits on how far back they could go. That means decades of enforcement information could be pulled even where it had very little relevance to improving safety today. That is not a genuine safety reform; it is a clear legislative overreach. It serves no useful purpose here in Queensland other than giving the CFMEU another tool to bully and intimidate employers and workers in the construction industry.

It would have imposed a significant administrative burden on the regulator. Instead of focusing on inspections, investigations and prevention, the regulator would have been dragged into processing open-ended requests, manually reviewing material and dealing with the consequences of a badly designed scheme. The bill fixes that. It removes that additional avenue before it can be misused. It restores proportionality, it restores focus and it restores integrity to the system. The regulator's role is to protect safety, not to facilitate campaigns of coercion, harassment and intimidation.

At the same time, this bill strengthens real electrical safety. It clarifies defect notice powers, it modernises unsafe electrical equipment directions and it strengthens enforcement where real risks exist. This is practical reform. It is targeted, it is professional and it is focused on outcomes, not slogans. Importantly, the committee made one clear recommendation: that the bill be passed. That is a very clear signal and it now presents a very clear test for those opposite.

Do they back Queensland workers and businesses, or do they continue to back and enable the CFMEU? If they choose the latter, it tells Queenslanders everything they need to know. It tells them that nothing has changed and it tells them that, if ever given the chance again, they would be back to the same bad old days. In Toowoomba and across South-West Queensland, safety is not abstract. It is personal, it is immediate and it matters. The bill strengthens safety, restores focus and protects the integrity of our system for workers, businesses and communities. Safety should be about safety.

While I am on my feet, I want to add that those same tradies, businesses and everyone else are currently finding it very difficult with the price of fuel. Queenslanders deserve price security. We are doing the work here in the state, but the federal government need to deliver a national plan on supply and price and they need to step up to the mark. I commend the bill to the House. I support all the tradies in Toowoomba and South-West Queensland.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.50 pm): I thought the debate on the electrical safety bill would have had a bit more spark from the LNP backbench. I thought there would have been a bit more energy—a couple more bolts shooting through the electricity that is the Queensland parliament—but, no, they have got no energy. Instead, we are having to listen to the same old talking points over and over again. It is no wonder they have gone so dull; it is because they are having to listen to the same talking points over and over again and the same incorrect statements about unlimited information. The irony is that the very limited LNP backbench want to keep talking about unlimited.

The member for Rockhampton was trying to dredge out the member for Kawana's lines without any success. It would be easier to straighten the Fitzroy than understand what the member for Rockhampton was saying. The member for Townsville's contribution was very interesting. I thought the member for Townsville was going to have a bit of spark because he got up and started his contribution by saying that it would be modest. It was definitely modest in intellectual vitality; it was long, dull and largely bizarre. He said he was going to teach the member for Bundamba something; he called out the member for Bundamba. What he taught the member for Bundamba was that there is electricity in houses, there is electricity in hospitals and there is electricity in businesses. The other shock revelation was that the electricity in those houses is for the ovens and to power the fridges, and that in businesses it is for the cash registers. Let me tell you: the visionaries over there are sensational.

Let us have a chat about these visionary LNP backbenchers who do not even understand what they are talking against. They keep saying that it is somehow against workers to have workplace health and safety reps and workplace health and safety entry permit holders able to come in and request information about unsafe workplaces. Apparently, it is actually against workers to have provisions in legislation to ensure that those who represent the workplace health and safety of workers are able to request information to ensure risks can be remedied. It is outrageous.

There was this constant repetition of terrible lines about unlimited notices. There are three notices: improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices. The QCU outlined this very clearly. They stated—

Improvement notices relate to circumstances where an inspector reasonably believes that a person is contravening a provision of the WHS Act—

It is not someone wanting to go on an expedition to find something that may or may not be there. It is not someone trying to hold up a worksite or a business. They need to have a reasonable belief that there is contravention of an act. That is what we do in this place; we ensure that we put laws in place so people cannot contravene those acts.

In relation to the prohibition notices, the QCU stated—

Prohibition notices relate to circumstances where an inspector reasonably believes that an activity is occurring at a workplace that involves or will involve a serious risk to the health or safety of a person emanating from an immediate or imminent exposure to a hazard or an activity may occur at a workplace—

For instance, if a workplace decides they are going to put tiles down on the colonnade and then for some reason those tiles crack under the weight of the member for Gladstone, maybe we should be reporting that so that people in the workplace can continue to be safe. However, according to the LNP, that would be red tape burden and completely unnecessary because it would slow everything down and there would be intimidation.

In relation to non-disturbance notices, the QCU stated—

Non-disturbance notices relate to circumstances where an inspector 'reasonably believes'—

again, there must be a level of reasonableness in the complaint and the request for the information—

... that it is necessary to facilitate the exercise of their compliance powers to require a person to preserve a site at which a notifiable incident has occurred for a stated period or prevent the disturbance of a particular site ... in other circumstances for a stated period that is reasonable in the circumstances.

Many colleagues on this side have outlined why it is important to recognise health and safety representatives and entry permit holders in the workplace. There is a reason it is always the Labor Party which considers that an important addition to the toolkit of workers and their workplace is that those who represent their health and safety are able to put forward to the regulator information that would remedy risks in their workplace.

The member for Toohey, who is sitting next to me, outlined some examples of when relevant information may not be available through the usual employer and workplace channels and access to such documentation via the regulator is the only way possible—for instance, if a new contractor had taken over a project after a financial collapse or if there was a flood or fire. We have Queensland departments which have lost information through floods before, so I think it is reasonable to suggest that workplace health and safety workers representing Queensland workers should be able to access this information.

The LNP keep talking about the CFMEU, but they completely fail to note that the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union put in a submission supporting our stance on this particular section. LNP members keep asking, 'Will the Labor opposition stand on the side of Queenslanders or on the side of the CFMEU?' I ask: will the LNP stand on the side of Queensland nurses and midwives, or will they say to Queensland nurses and midwives that this bad piece of legislation increases risks to their health and safety?

The LNP are actually going to allow for increased risks in the workplace because those nurses and midwives will not have the protections and provisions that would have been afforded to them in a couple of months time to ensure they are safe in their workplace. The LNP can keep going on and on about the CFMEU and keep rolling out the talking points and speed reading through their speeches because they do not know what they are saying, but we will ensure that every single nurse and midwife across Queensland—who have already been attacked by this LNP government this term when it came to their wages and fair rights at work—know that their workplace is now at an increased risk because of the LNP.

Why is the government doing this? They are trying to say it is about efficiencies, but when their own departmental officials came before the committee they could not actually answer in what way it would become more efficient. They instead threw out a suggestion of an RTI process. An RTI process is costly and can be lengthy as well, so in what way is that red-tape reduction? It is ridiculous to suggest that this is anything more than an attack on unions and Queensland workers.

The Electrical Trades Union has a lot of members who will be impacted by the good reform in this legislation as well as the poor reform put forward by the LNP. With some indulgence, I want to note that the Electrical Trades Union came to help the people of Bundaberg; in fact they are wrapping up Operation Energise today. They went to Bundaberg and did safety compliance checks for pensioners, for people who were uninsured across the flood impacted areas—and with insurance being \$60,000, it means there were a lot of people—and for not-for-profit groups.

We will continue to ensure there is good legislative reform in this state that actually backs in workers, but the LNP need to make a decision. Are they going to support workers and their rights to be safe at work? Are they going to support Queensland nurses and midwives, or are they going to make their jobs more dangerous—almost as dangerous as randomly jumping on a helicopter and flying up north and landing on a hospital helipad?

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (5.59 pm): I echo the words of the member for Mundingburra that we do not know what we are talking about, but I can say that—

Mr Smith: You are the member for Mundingburra.

Mrs POOLE: Sorry, for Bundaberg. I can say that I am not an electrician; I do know what I am talking about with that. I rise to speak in support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will address my contribution in two parts: firstly, the electrical safety and workplace health and safety amendments and, secondly, the provisions that relate to the James Cook University.

The Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity in Queensland and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying, particularly by the CFMEU. This bill is about restoring balance, restoring integrity and restoring common sense to workplace safety laws in Queensland. What we saw under those opposite was not about safety; it was all about power. Labor handed extraordinary powers to union officials, particularly the CFMEU. This was not about protecting workers; this was about enabling a culture of intimidation, coercion and disruption on worksites across Queensland. Labor's laws would have allowed union officials to access sensitive compliance and enforcement information directly from the regulator with no meaningful safeguards, no limits and absolutely no accountability. This is not how it should work and in no way is it acceptable. That is certainly not in the interests of everyday Queensland workers.

In my electorate of Mundingburra we have hardworking tradies, contractors, small business owners and apprentices, and they just want to get on with the job. They want safe workplaces and they also want fairness. What they were seeing under Labor was anything but fair. They were seeing a system misaligned towards the CFMEU—a system where safety laws were being used as a tool, not for protection but for pressure. That is wrong and this bill fixes that. It repeals those extreme information-sharing provisions before they even come into effect. It sends a very clear message that workplace safety is not a weapon. The regulator exists to protect workers, not to serve the interests of militant unions.

The then Labor minister spruiked Labor's bills as strengthening the rights of health and safety representatives to undertake their jobs without barriers, but what it did was give a free right of entry under the guise of health and safety. The then LNP industrial relations shadow minister and now minister nailed it when he said, referring to Labor's bill—

The irony is that we are debating a workplace health and safety law that is about workers' safety and the CFMEU are receiving additional powers to continue their bullying and intimidatory practices on work sites.

It appears the CFMEU are all about 'do what I say, not what I' do when it comes to their bullying and intimidatory practices.

Along with me, I am sure others on this side of the chamber have had the CFMEU turn up outside their electorate office. I had them turn up outside my electorate office late last year and I have to tell honourable members what an experience that was. According to their very own timetable they turned up late. They wandered in when they should have already been underway. It sort of sounds familiar to their everyday practices, doesn't it? It must have been one worker's very first day because he pulled his brand new shirt out of the packet and it still had the fold marks in it. He proudly stood there right at the front. They had another worker who was wearing his thongs. I think they must have been his safety thongs.

Mr Head: Definitely steelcapped.

Mrs POOLE: I take that interjection from the member for Callide. They were his steelcapped thongs. They came into my office and asked where I was, only to be told that I was at a mobile office. They were given the location of my mobile office and they were told, 'Please take up with Janelle. She

would love to have that conversation with you,' and did they? No. They walked out of that office and they chanted a chorus of, 'She won't come out, she won't come out.' She could not come out because she was doing a mobile office and they would not go over to her. It does not matter. That just says everything about the integrity of the CFMEU: do not let the truth get in the way of a good story or, in this case, a good staged event. They could not be bothered to turn up on time, could not be bothered to wear the proper safety equipment and could not tell the truth, but I am sure they certainly put their hand out for their pay.

This bill also strengthens and modernises our electrical safety framework. It provides clarity for electricity entities like Ergon and Energex to continue issuing defect notices—something that has been standard practice for decades. It strengthens the regulator's powers to deal with unsafe electrical equipment. This is also personal to me. My father worked for Ergon Energy in Townsville for over 40 years. He worked in an industry where safety was not just an option; it was critical. There was no room for shortcuts, no room for politics and certainly no room for intimidation or games, because when you are dealing with electricity if something goes wrong the consequences can be fatal. I grew up understanding that. As we would drive along, my dad would proudly point out the power stations, the substations and the generators that he had worked on. He would explain all of the safety equipment that was used and I saw the standards that he worked to. I saw the pride he took in doing the job properly and safely. I saw the respect that workers had for safety systems that were there to protect them and not to be misused. That is why this bill is restoring safety—real safety, not politicised safety. This is about standing up to the CFMEU. This is about saying that intimidation, bullying, harassment and misuse of power have no place in Queensland workplaces.

I now turn to the provisions relating to the James Cook University. This is something incredibly important to my electorate because James Cook University sits in the heart of Mundingburra. It is not just an institution; it is the cornerstone of our community. It supports our local jobs, drives our research and provides educational opportunities for thousands of North Queenslanders. These amendments are about restoring balance. They ensure that the composition of the university council is fair, transparent and accountable. They reduce the ability for the council to effectively appoint itself and instead strengthen independent oversight and proper representation. That matters because when government structures become too insular, when decision-making is concentrated in too few hands, confidence is eroded. We have seen increased scrutiny around governance issues at JCU in recent times. That is why these reforms are so necessary.

These changes maintain the size of the council but they rebalance its composition. They increase Governor in Council appointments—tick—ensuring appropriate elected representation—tick—and reducing the number of internally appointed members—tick. That is about restoring confidence. It is about ensuring decisions are made in the best interests of the university, its staff, its students and the wider community. Importantly, this aligns with what we are seeing nationally: a stronger focus on governance, accountability and transparency in our universities. For the community of Mundingburra, Townsville and North Queensland, this matters. People want to know that their university is well run, that it is accountable and that it is focused on delivering outcomes and not internal politics.

This bill delivers on two very important fronts: it restores integrity to workplace safety laws, standing up to the CFMEU and putting real safety back at the centre; and it strengthens governance at one of North Queensland's most important institutions, James Cook University. This is about fairness, this is about accountability and this is about putting Queenslanders first. Those on that side of the chamber need to ask themselves the question: are they on the side of Queenslanders or are they on the side of the CFMEU? We on this side of the House back Queenslanders. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms DOOLEY** (Redcliffe—LNP) (6.09 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This legislation strengthens safety, restores balance and ensures Queensland's regulatory framework works for workers, businesses and the broader community. As the daughter of an electrician and the mother of a builder, I am very proud to support our local tradies in Redcliffe with this bill and with its intent. At its core this bill is about protecting people. It builds on the existing Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Electrical Safety Act 2002. These laws exist to protect the health, safety and welfare of all workers and of all other people who might be affected by that work and to eliminate the devastating human cost of potential death, injury and property damage caused by electricity. This legislation also represents a clear contrast from the former Labor government's approach, which granted unions, including the ETU and the CFMEU, extensive additional powers through information-sharing provisions. Those laws allowed entry permit holders to obtain enforcement and compliance notices directly from the regulator with minimal safeguards, no limits on

requests and access to historical information stretching back many years. Industry stakeholders raised serious concerns that these provisions could be used not for genuine safety purposes but to harass businesses, intimidate workers and disrupt projects, and we saw this with the Redcliffe Hospital expansion plan.

This bill restores balance by repealing those uncommenced provisions before they take effect, ensuring that workplace safety regulation is focused on protecting workers and not expanding the reach of industrial actors into regulatory processes. For communities like mine in Redcliffe, electrical safety is a daily reality. Whether it is local tradies wiring new homes, technicians maintaining small businesses, council workers repairing infrastructure, Energex crews restoring power after storms or local providers like GNB Energy installing new sporting lights, electrical risk is ever present. Ensuring those workers go home safely is not optional but is fundamental and the Crisafulli LNP government is committed to worker safety.

This bill makes three key improvements. First, it clarifies and strengthens the power of electricity entities such as Energex to issue electrical equipment defect notices when unsafe equipment is identified. This has been a longstanding practice for more than two decades, but the bill removes any doubt about the legal authority underpinning it. In practical terms, this means hazards can be addressed quickly and decisively. In coastal electorates like Redcliffe where salt corrosion, flooding and severe weather can accelerate electrical deterioration, that matters enormously. Defective switchboards, damaged wiring or unsafe installation can lead to fires, electrocution or widespread outages. Providing clear authority to require corrective actions protects not just workers but families, seniors and small business owners right throughout my community. Importantly, this bill also includes retrospective validation to ensure notices already issued in good faith remain effective. That continuity prevents regulatory gaps and ensures safety protections remain intact.

Second, this bill modernises the regulator's powers regarding unsafe electrical equipment. Currently, the regulator may prohibit the sale or use of equipment that fails to meet essential safety requirements. This bill elevates that significant power from regulation into primary legislation, recognising its scope and impact. It also improves clarity and transparency. The regulator will be required to publish directions online and specify grounds for action, include installation as a part of 'use' and limit notices to a maximum duration of 10 years. These changes provide certainty for industry while ensuring the community is protected from dangerous products entering homes and workplaces. For Queensland households, including many retirees and families in Redcliffe, this is critical. Consumers need to be confident that the electrical appliances sold in shops or online meet national safety standards. When unsafe products are identified, government must be able to act quickly and decisively.

Third, this bill repeals uncommenced provisions that would have allowed health and safety representatives and entry permit holders to request enforcement information directly from the regulator with minimal safeguards. This bill makes clear that the additional avenue could have imposed significant administrative burden and been open to misuse for purposes unrelated to genuine safety concerns. Industry stakeholders have strongly supported this repeal and, despite what the opposition claims, we did consult. We had a six-week committee process where submissions were received from people like Rob Maroney from Master Builders Queensland who told the committee—

We also support the passing of this bill ... This provides a platform for productivity to start to return to worksites in Queensland ...

He further stated—

Put simply, this piece of legislation is one minor and small step ... to bring productivity and remove as much as possible the industrialisation of sites away from WHS and keep it in IR and let safety be about safety ...

Similarly, Kristian Marlow from the Civil Contractors Federation emphasised the broader safety dimension, saying—

Safety on the worksite is not just about avoiding incidents but also about ensuring the psychological safety and personal privacy of workers ... Anything that can be done to practically improve the safety of workers ... should be done.

From the Master Electricians Australia Matthew Duncan highlighted the importance of proportional regulation and stated that these reforms restore proportionality, accountability and efficiency within workplace regulations. They also ensure oversight remains targeted at genuine safety concerns. These are the voices that the opposition did not listen to. They represent employers, contractors and tradespeople right across Queensland, including many in Redcliffe who build our homes, maintain our infrastructure and keep our economy moving. This bill also aligns Queensland with other jurisdictions, ensuring consistency across states and territories. That consistency matters for national companies that operate across borders and for many workers who move between projects.

Beyond the technical details, this legislation reflects a broader principle—safety laws must actually improve safety. They must be clear, enforceable and focused on preventing harm, not creating administrative obstacles or unintended consequences. For Redcliffe, the benefits are tangible. We have a diverse workforce—construction workers, marine trades, electricians, small manufacturers, retail operators and essential service providers. We also have critical infrastructure—two hospitals, multiple aged-care facilities, schools, a train station and transport systems that are all dependant on safe electrical supply. Storm season regularly tests our resilience and when severe weather hits power crews work around the clock in hazardous conditions to restore electricity, so strong, clear safety laws support our workers and ensure they can act decisively to manage risks. Local businesses also benefit. Most importantly, families benefit. Electrical safety is not just about workplaces; it is about homes, faulty appliances, unsafe installations and substandard equipment. I support this bill. The committee report recommended that this bill be passed. For my community in Redcliffe, it means safer worksites, safer homes and a regulatory framework that supports both workers and small businesses. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (6.19 pm): I rise to address the debate on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This is an important bill, as it further delivers on what the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government was elected to do: to restore balance, productivity and integrity to Queensland's workplaces after a decade of decline under the former Labor government.

This legislation is about drawing a line under a workplace culture that was allowed to fester under the former Labor government—a culture of intimidation, coercion and systematic alleged misconduct driven by militant unions, most notably the CFMEU. Whilst the Labor opposition may not like hearing it, they simply cannot escape their record. For 10 long years, Labor allowed the CFMEU to embed itself into the very fabric of Queensland's construction sector—not as a representative of workers' interests but as an industrial enforcer dictating terms, targeting businesses and undermining productivity across the state. Queensland saw worksites disrupted, contractors bullied and small businesses and hardworking Queenslanders targeted simply because they would not fall into line with the CFMEU's way of doing things. What did Labor do? They not only enabled it; they backed it and, worse, they legislated for it.

One of the most damning examples of this is the very provision this bill seeks to repeal. In March 2024, the former Labor government passed legislation that would have given union officials, including the CFMEU, unprecedented access to sensitive compliance and enforcement information from the regulator. Under the former Labor government laws, union officials could request improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices—and not just for current matters but going back years, even decades. There were no meaningful limits, no caps on the number of requests, no safeguards to ensure the information would be used appropriately and no cost recovery for the regulator. It was quite simply a blank cheque for the CFMEU.

When considering the historical context of this legislation, we have seen repeated instances, not just nationally but here in Queensland, where CFMEU officials have been accused of bullying conduct, of unlawful site entry, of targeting subcontractors and small businesses and of creating a culture where if you are not aligned with the union you are shut out. That is not safety; that is industrial thuggery dressed up as workplace representation, yet under Labor these behaviours were not stamped out; they were facilitated. This legislation puts an end to that. It repeals Labor's information-sharing laws before they could commence and be weaponised. It ensures the regulator can focus on its core function by protecting the safety of Queensland workers and not acting as a data clearing house for dubious union fishing expeditions and, importantly, it restores balance because safety must be about safety—not about power, not about control and certainly not about enabling one organisation to exert undue influence over an entire industry.

There will be those who will falsely try to frame this as somehow an attack on workers. Nothing could be further from the truth. This legislation is about protecting workers, including their psychological safety, their privacy and their right to work in an environment free from intimidation. It is about protecting the small businesses and contractors that under Labor were too often caught in the crosshairs simply for trying to get on with the job. It is about restoring productivity because when worksites are not being disrupted by unnecessary industrial interference, when projects can proceed without coercion and delay, that benefits all people across Queensland. It means more jobs, it means better wages and it means better value for taxpayers.

The industry itself has spoken. Master Builders Queensland has made it clear that repealing these provisions is a critical step towards restoring productivity and addressing the misuse of power we have seen in the past. The Civil Contractors Federation has highlighted that productivity is the tide that

lifts all boats and that these reforms will help create a more harmonious and productive future. Master Electricians Australia has emphasised the importance of ensuring workplace health and safety oversight remains targeted at genuine safety concerns, not misused for other purposes. The message from industry is clear: they want a system that is fair, they want a system that is balanced and they want a system that is focused on safety, not industrial leverage. This legislation delivers exactly that.

This legislation is ultimately a test not only for the Labor state opposition but also for the Greens political party, because the question is simple: who do you stand with? Do you stand with Queensland workers, small businesses and contractors who want to work in a safe and fair environment or do you stand with the CFMEU? Do you stand with an organisation that has time and again been associated with bullying, with coercion and with conduct that undermines the very principles of a fair and lawful workplace? The reality is that the Labor Party has been captured by the union movement and, in particular, by the CFMEU. Their policies reflect it, their legislation reflects it and their reluctance to call out misconduct reflects it.

Mr de Brenni interjected.

Dr ROWAN: I take the interjection from the Manager of Opposition Business, who has aided and abetted the CFMEU over many years along with those members opposite. To see this we only have to look at the commission of inquiry that is currently underway in relation to matters with respect to the CFMEU. It is not just about the Labor Party; as I said, it is also the Greens. We have seen elected Greens' members standing shoulder to shoulder with CFMEU officials at rallies and we have seen the Greens accept donations from the CFMEU, so they, too, face a choice: will they stand up for genuine workplace safety and productivity or will they continue to align themselves with an organisation whose conduct has been called into serious question?

Queenslanders are watching. They are watching to see whether those opposite have learned anything from the last decade. They are watching to see whether the Greens are prepared to put principle ahead of politics. We know that the Labor Party will never put principle ahead of politics. That is their modus operandi. They will always stand shoulder to shoulder with those unions who have been accused and knowingly undertaken corrupt and poor workplace processes on various worksites throughout Queensland.

Queenslanders are watching to see whether this parliament will take a stand against the culture of intimidation that has held back our construction industry for too long because the consequences of inaction are real. When productivity is crippled, projects are delayed. When projects are delayed, costs blow out. When costs blow out, it is Queensland taxpayers who pay the price. When small businesses are targeted, when contractors are pushed out and when workers are subject to bullying and harassment, it is families and communities that suffer. This is the legacy of Labor's decade in government. This is what this legislation begins to fix.

In the time remaining to me, I also want to precisely acknowledge other important elements of the legislation. The amendments to the Electrical Safety Act provide clarity and certainty around the longstanding practice of issuing electrical equipment defect notices; they modernise the regulator's power in relation to unsafe electrical equipment, ensuring those powers are clearly defined, appropriately limited and aligned with contemporary drafting practices; and they provide greater transparency, greater accountability and greater protection for Queenslanders. They are sensible, practical reforms that strengthen our electrical safety framework and, importantly, they have been supported through the committee process.

The committee recommended that this legislation be passed. A majority of submitters supported the repeal of Labor's information-sharing provisions. In other words, this legislation is not just good policy; it is supported by those who operate on the ground, those who understand the realities of the industry and those who want to see a better, safer and more productive future.

The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is getting on with the job. We are restoring balance, we are restoring integrity and we are restoring confidence in Queensland's workplace health and safety framework. We are saying clearly and unequivocally that there is no place in this state for bullying, for intimidation or for the misuse of power. We are saying that safety must come first, we are saying that productivity matters and we are saying that Queenslanders deserve better than what they got under the former Labor state government.

In closing, I again reiterate that this legislation will be a test. It is a test for Labor and it is a test for the Greens. It is a test of whether they will continue to stand with the CFMEU or whether they will finally stand with Queenslanders. Certainly, Queenslanders deserve better when it comes to workplace environments here in Queensland. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is delivering

the reforms that are needed across Queensland—reforms that are being called upon by Queenslanders and by the construction sector. We will ensure the safety of Queenslanders on worksites and that workers are protected and looked after. We are putting in a good framework. This legislation is certainly helping to deliver that. We will continue to do that for the benefit of all Queenslanders. As such, I commend the bill to the House.

Sitting suspended from 6.28 pm to 7.30 pm.



Mr LEE (Hervey Bay—LNP) (7.30 pm): I rise to speak to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. The Crisafulli government is restoring productivity and safety in the construction industry and that is critical in my electorate of Hervey Bay. Over the next decade in Hervey Bay we will see construction of high-rise buildings, an expanded airport, lifestyle villages and enormous development in residential housing. We desperately need trades to build our splendid Fraser Coast region.

Last week I presented awards to apprentice graduates from the Hervey Bay TAFE campus, including Young Apprentice of the Year, electrician Tayla Axelsen. The Crisafulli government is unapologetically prioritising the safety and wellbeing of young Tayla, electricians and other trades over Labor's dubious CFMEU trade union affiliations. Member for Bulimba: every worker has the right to be safe at work free from CFMEU intimidation—tick!

Jarrold Bleijie, Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations, in his introductory speech said—

While those opposite were more interested in running a protection racket for the CFMEU, this government backs Queenslanders and focuses on workers' safety and not militancy, intimidation, misogyny, bullying, harassment and violence.

The Queensland Productivity Commission's report *Opportunities to improve productivity of the construction industry* exposed Labor's so-called best practice industry conditions as a deception. It turns out that BPIC was an unmitigated sham. The QPC report relevantly states—

No evidence was provided to the Commission to suggest BPICs have improved WHS outcomes across the Queensland construction industry or that BPICs sites have better safety outcomes than non-BPICs sites.

The report goes on to state—

Further, most of the workplace health and safety obligations in BPICs are either covered in legislation, codes of practice or relevant awards.

The final report concluded that BPICs could cost Queenslanders higher project costs—up 25 per cent; delayed access to infrastructure; higher taxes—up to \$20.6 billion; less housing—77,000 fewer homes; higher rents—up 8.3 per cent; and lower investor confidence.

This bill will amend the Electrical Safety Act 2002, the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013, the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024. The legislated purpose of the Electrical Safety Act is to eliminate the human cost to individuals, families and the community of death, injury and damage that can be caused by electricity. Clause 4 of the bill introduces a new section 122D for unsafe equipment directions and provides a robust and contemporary regulatory framework to empower the regulator in giving directions about unsafe equipment. Section 122D currently exists in section 192 of the Electrical Safety Regulation and this will be repealed under clause 9 of the bill.

The offences for noncompliance under the new section remain the same as those in section 192 of the Electrical Safety Regulation. The offence and associated penalties for noncompliance require a reverse onus of proof—a reasonable excuse—for failing to comply with an unsafe equipment direction. Furthermore, the amendments provide clarity and certainty in relation to the existing application to allow the regulator to prohibit the sale, installation or use of an item of electrical equipment or a type of electrical equipment if it is unsafe. It sets out the grounds for the regulator to give an unsafe equipment direction and other matters the regulator may consider in doing so. It specifies that a set period of more than 10 years applies. It ensures procedural fairness for a person to seek an external review of the regulator's decision through QCAT. It requires the regulator to publish a copy of each unsafe equipment direction and a notice with sufficient information for a person to apply for a QCAT review on the department's website. Finally, it requires a copy of the directions and information notice be given to the person selling the unsafe equipment.

This bill confirms that the regulator cannot delegate its power to give an unsafe direction. The Work Health and Safety Act provides a balanced and nationally consistent framework to secure the health, safety and welfare of all workers at work and all other people who might be affected by the work. The WHS Act provides for voluntary health and safety representatives to assist workers and represent

the health and safety interests of workers. WHS entry permit holders, union officials who hold a valid WHS permit, also have a role in facilitating a safe and healthy workplace.

The WHS Act provides for health and safety representatives and WHS permit holders to access and receive certain information, including but not limited to requesting to inspect and make copies of any document directly relevant to a suspected contravention they are investigating pursuant to section 118(1) (d) of the act. Access to certain information ensures that consultation between their representatives and a person conducting a business or an undertaking are relevantly informed about health and safety issues at a workplace. Additionally, section 210 of the act requires that a person who is issued with an improvement, prohibition or non-disturbance notice must, as soon as practicable, display a copy of the notice in a prominent area within the workplace.

On this side of the House we are mindful of Labor's obsession with imposing regulatory and administrative burdens. A good example is clause 52 of the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024. Clause 12 of this bill omits section 52 of the WHS and Other Legislation Amendment Act which, according to a postponement regulation in 2025, postpones the commencement of section 155A until 29 March 2026. Predictably, Labor's botched section 155A placed no limitations on the types of requests to the regulator for information contained in improvement, prohibition and non-disturbance notices. No such provision is said to exist in any other state or territory. This provision could have imposed a colossal regulatory and administrative burden on the regulator to laboriously check requests to ensure that there was no personal information or commercial-in-confidence information unintentionally released in breach of section 271 of the act. The Crisafulli government is repealing this oppressive provision that would otherwise mire the regulator in red tape perpetuated by the CFMEU.

I now turn briefly to the amendment in relation to the James Cook University Act 1997. The amendment is directed at improving university governance and accountability. This amendment will provide for a prescribed membership to improve transparency and public confidence in the JCU membership structure. This bill is a crucial test for the Labor opposition: do they back Queenslanders or will they continue to champion CFMEU militancy. If it is the latter they have not learnt a thing. Queenslanders cannot risk returning to the bad old days of Labor's enabling of CFMEU intimidation, misogyny, bullying, harassment and violence.

In closing, the Crisafulli government is calmly and methodically restoring safety and productivity to the construction industry. It is a fresh start for Hervey Bay and a refreshing change for the Fraser Coast construction industry. The Crisafulli government is closing a dark chapter in the construction industry by swiftly and decisively repealing Labor's botched section 155A. The Crisafulli government will continue to methodically and forensically expose the Labor opposition's blatant and shameful hypocrisy in underwriting systemic CFMEU misogyny, bullying, intimidation and harassment in the workplace. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (7.39 pm): The opposition supports strong electrical safety protections. We support strong workplace health and safety laws for all Queenslanders. However, we will not support laws that take away a worker's right—and it is their right—to know in a timely way about safety risks in their workplace. The truth is that this bill seeks to remove a long-held right for workplace health and safety representatives. It seeks to remove a right to request in a timely way information that is designed to save lives. The pattern that we have seen from this government since they took office is to shut down the views of those who oppose them and now they seek to shut down a worker's right to know about the risks in the workplace that affect them.

The bill removes access to critical safety information for workplace health and safety representatives. Nurses, midwives and retail workers spoke out strongly, opposing this attack on their safety rights. I am sure that the nurses, midwives and workers in retail outlets who spoke out strongly about the LNP's removal of these rights spoke for all workers. For many years before I came to this place I worked in roles that protect and uphold the rights of workers, and I can tell the House that delays to this critical information lead to deaths in workplaces. That will be the consequence of this political attack on working people and workers will face greater difficulty in identifying risks as a result. Safety representatives will be forced into slower and more costly processes to obtain information that could save lives.

There is no evidence of any efficiency in these reforms around workplace health and safety. The claims of efficiency lack any credibility because, as members of the government have said, the provisions have not even commenced. It is about as unjustifiable as initiating a large-scale war because

you had a feeling. We believe that every worker deserves a safe workplace. Workers have a right to know about the risks. Transparency and timeliness are essential for safety in the workplace.

During this debate I have heard many members talk about how important are the elements around electrical safety, and I want to acknowledge that. There is a rapid electrification of homes and businesses across the state. I put that rapid electrification down to the failure of the Crisafulli government to do anything to address things such as fuel costs, which means Queenslanders are taking action themselves with no help from the Crisafulli government.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order relating to relevance to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): I am listening closely. The member has just mentioned it in passing within one sentence. I will continue to listen to exactly what he is saying. There is no point of order.

Mr de BRENNI: The point is that Queenslanders are installing solar panels on their homes which electricians are required to install. They are installing home batteries, which electricians are required to install. Home batteries are being installed at the rate of 944 a day—that is, 944 batteries are being installed by electricians to whom this bill will apply if it is made law. Those 944 cheaper home batteries were made possible by Labor's cheaper home battery program and a quarter of a million have been installed already. People are buying record numbers of electric vehicles and they are installing EV chargers. Electrical safety is important as Queenslanders are taking control over their own energy security because the LNP has just sat on its hands and allowed the Middle East conflict to dictate whether or not people can afford to take their kids to sport this weekend.

I note that the bill has been guillotined. The bill has been declared urgent by those opposite. We spoke against that motion in this House earlier today. However, we have seen no urgency on the alternative to higher fuel costs. Under this LNP government, if you are out in the bush or you are a producer on a farm, big parts of this state where electricians affected by—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I know the long title intimately, and fuel prices are not contained in the bill. I ask that the shadow minister be brought back to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member will stick to the long title of the bill. Bear in mind that parts that are just parts of a sentence moving through to the next one will be regarded as that: just passing through. I remind everyone to stick to the long title of the bill, but let's give this some rein.

Mr de BRENNI: Despite the Deputy Premier's protestations, I am sure that households installing EV chargers and the electricians who are doing that work are interested in electrical safety. Unless the Deputy Premier wants to advise the House otherwise, I assumed that was what this bill was about.

Mr Bleijie: I did not say that.

Mr de BRENNI: He said these remarks were not relevant, but I think they are entirely relevant.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There will be no quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr de BRENNI: I would say that electricians will be affected by these reforms when they are installing EVs in the community. When it comes to the operator of a diesel truck or a diesel tractor, the message from those opposite is: 'You're on your own and your energy bills can skyrocket.' This LNP government are making changes about safety rules for Queenslanders who are installing solar panels on rooftops, EV chargers and batteries, but they are doing nothing if you have to rely on diesel. It demonstrates that the Premier only acts if there is a political angle. This government's desire to bash unions clearly is more important to Premier Crisafulli than the desire to keep Queensland trucks and tractors running. If you are a regional Queensland producer or you are working in a mine, you might be thinking, 'Why does the LNP government have its priorities so wrong?'

I want to address the amendments in the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to the James Cook University Act. Those amendments have been shoved into this bill with no notice to stakeholders. They have been shoved into this bill because the Minister for Education and the Arts was angry that someone wanted to change the name of a place. It is pretty ironic coming from the beleaguered minister who named a building despite specific recommendations to name it something else and then misled Queenslanders about the whole sham consultation. Once again it was a stunt that was carried out and aimed at the far-right extremists who deny First Nations peoples of this state. That is what those provisions were all about. Members opposite have talked about choices. I will respond to the repeated lines trotted out by every single member opposite at the behest of the Deputy Premier.

The LNP has once again misused this parliament for their petty attempt at wedge politics. They said the members of this House had a choice in this debate. The reality is this week the Crisafulli government had a choice to debate something meaningful to Queenslanders. Right now, Queenslanders are suffering due to the impacts of the Middle East conflict—empty servos and diesel at \$3 a litre—but, no, here—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is not a passing remark from the honourable Manager of Opposition Business. This bill does not deal with the conflict in the Middle East and the war in Iran and the Trump administration; it deals with the electrical safety regulations in this state, and I ask the member be brought back to the actual bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Thank you very much. I make the point that if you are mentioning something briefly and illustrating a related point, you do get some latitude. If you are moving down a central argument elsewhere, that is when you will get pulled up. Member for Springwood, you were straying slightly into areas that are not related to the main points under the long title of the bill. Bear in mind, everyone, once you are mentioning things briefly and illustrating a related point, you are allowed to keep going to finish that sentence. Let's just keep going, everyone. Thank you very much, member for Springwood.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. If I may clarify, I was seeking to rebut and respond to the repeated remarks by those opposite about this debate being about a choice. I am simply illustrating what the choice for this government was about. They had a choice to talk about the things that matter to Queenslanders right now or to make this a choice of their respective political—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is a deliberate and flagrant breach of the ruling you have just made. This is not a passing comment in a sentence. This is a deliberately structured part of an argument that the member for Springwood is advancing, and I would ask you to draw him back to being relevant to the bill which is very clear in its long title.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Springwood, could you stick to matters contained within the long title of the bill, the report or the greens.

Mr de BRENNI: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. The LNP government says that they needed to make these reforms to improve productivity, to fix the housing crisis, yet under this government, homes have become less affordable than ever. The LNP slogans about productivity have not, will not and just cannot do anything other than make workplaces less safe for Queenslanders. There is no evidence to support weakening safety laws. We will support electrical safety measures, but we reject the rollback of workers' rights.

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (7.52 pm): I rise to speak on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is about ensuring the Work Health and Safety Act and the Electrical Safety Act work how they are intended, and removing the back doors that were put in place to give the CFMEU rights to information that would do nothing to help with worker safety but help enable their campaign on intimidation of non-union businesses.

In 2024, those opposite passed the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which would give virtually unfettered access by union officials to worksites. While the then industrial relations minister claimed the amendments simply allowed entry permit holders 'to perform their intended role and functions effectively and minimise the opportunity for dispute', this is not the case. While the regulation has not taken effect yet, it is heading in the wrong direction. It opens the door to disruption on worksites, slows projects down, pushes up costs and does very little to improve safety.

We all want workers to be safe and get home to their families—that goes without saying—but safety cannot be used as a shield to justify disruption and people being pushed around on worksites.

We are committed to fixing these issues and stamping out the bullying and standover tactics from certain unions. We will stop the additional avenue for health and safety representatives and WHS entry permit holders, like the CFMEU, to request the particulars of information contained in enforcement and compliance notices, often going back decades, with no bearing on how the businesses are operating today. By allowing them to request these documents directly from the regulator, this would waste critical resources of the regulator because there was to be no limit on how many, how often or how far back these requests can be made. It was nothing but Labor handing another blank cheque to the CFMEU.

The regulator's job is simple: keep Queenslanders safe. It is not there to help run campaigns against non-union workplaces. If it gets bogged down in these requests, that is time taken away from real safety work, and without any costs attached, there is no way to bring on extra staff to handle it. The

job of the regulator is to ensure that businesses are operating with their employees' safety in mind and protecting the everyday Queenslanders who build and contribute to this great state.

This amendment has been supported by both Master Builders and the Civil Contractors Federation Queensland because the change does not impact worker safety but helps protect the mental wellbeing of workers.

Rob Maroney from Master Builders Queensland summed up well what this bill is going to achieve when he said—

We also support the passing of this bill. We see it as an opportunity to move back to the model laws in relation to the misuse of power and workplace relations laws in this state by bad actors we have seen in the past. We feel that repealing this part of the amendment from March 2024 is the first step to doing that. This provides a platform for productivity to start to return to worksites in Queensland, in particular in the sense of supporting the cultural shift that we need to see in relation to how the industry operates.

Safety is not just about the physical side; it is about mental wellbeing, too. We have to get both right. As Kristian Marlow from Civil Contractors Federation Queensland said—

Safety on the worksite is not just about avoiding incidents but also about ensuring the psychological safety and personal privacy of workers. Accordingly, we are supportive of the bill in its entirety and hopeful of its swift passage through the parliament. Anything that can be done to practically improve the safety of workers in the construction industry should be done.

These powers do not exist in other states, so removing them brings Queensland into line with the rest of the country.

This bill also makes changes to the Electrical Safety Act to make things clearer. It confirms that electricity providers, like Ergon and Energex, can issue notices when they find unsafe electrical equipment. This has been happening for more than 20 years, but the law was not as clear as it should have been. These changes remove any doubt and ensure those powers are properly defined. Most importantly, it gives certainty and helps ensure electrical equipment is safe to use. The bill also ensures that notices already issued in good faith remain valid moving forward. This makes it clear how to treat the existing notices before the changes come into effect.

We are ensuring that the regulator still has the power to prohibit the sale or use of electrical equipment by any person if the regulator believes the item does not comply with relevant safety criteria. While this is a significant power for the regulator to have, it is necessary to protect Queenslanders from safety risks with electrical equipment. This is important because it is people's homes, people's lives and also people's livelihoods. In my electorate, we have mills, manufacturing and at the next election we will have several mines. All of these rely on large-scale electrical units, all of which need to be safe to ensure that people's lives are not endangered by electrical equipment just for going to work. We do not want to see a Queensland where a dodgy switchboard or a dodgy appliance causes someone to lose their house or their life.

This bill is about removing the back doors for a campaign of bullying from the CFMEU and about improving safety in our homes and in our workplaces, goals that I fully support. I commend the Deputy Premier for bringing this bill to the House.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (7.58 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on this bill. The opposition has been clear that we are generally supportive of the electrical safety components of this legislation. These are reforms that continue Queensland's strong tradition of protecting people from electrical risk. Electrical safety is not abstract; it is immediate, it is real and often the difference between life and death.

Over the past two decades, the way Queenslanders use and interact with electricity has changed dramatically. From rooftop solar systems to battery storage, from smart homes to increasingly complex electrical infrastructure, technology has moved quickly, and with that comes new risks. That is why the continued reform of Queensland's electrical safety framework is essential. We have consistently prioritised safety. When Labor was in government it reinstated the electrical safety commissioner after it was abolished. The former Labor government also strengthened oversight and ensured safety remained at the centre of the system.

The amendments in this bill to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 and the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013 strengthen what has long been a commonsense frontline practice. Electricity entities such as Energex, Ergon and electrical safety inspectors have for many years issued defect notices when they identify unsafe equipment. We are talking about situations where a worker or inspector attends a property and finds something dangerous—a faulty switchboard, exposed wiring, a damaged power outlet. In those moments, actions must be immediate. The longstanding practice of issuing defect notices is a valuable public service. It ensures hazards are identified and rectified quickly before

someone is injured or worse. This bill provides a clear and explicit head of power for that practice. It removes any doubt about enforceability and it strengthens the system. For those reasons, the opposition supports these electrical safety amendments.

However, that being said, we do have reservations about the proposed changes to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. We do not see these as safety reforms; they are a rollback. It is a reduction in transparency. Ultimately, it is a step backwards for Queensland workers. The government is seeking to remove the right of health and safety representatives and WHS entry permit holders to request information from the regulator, specifically information contained in improvement, prohibition and non-disturbance notices. Let's be very clear about what this means. These notices go to the heart of workplace safety. They identify risks. They document hazards. They outline what must be fixed. Under the previous reforms, workers and their representatives would have had a direct avenue to access that information, particularly in situations where it may not be available through the employer.

Quite frankly, that is not an unreasonable proposition. In fact, in many respects it is a necessary one. Workplaces are not always straightforward environments. Records are not always accessible. Employers do not always comply. Sometimes circumstances mean that the usual channels simply do not exist. Consider a situation, for instance, where a contractor collapses financially and a new contractor takes over a project, or where a workplace is affected by flood or fire and records are destroyed, or the very real scenario where an employer refuses to provide information that they are legally obliged to share. In those cases, access to the regulator may be the only way to obtain critical safety information. That information is not trivial. It can be the difference between identifying a hazard early or learning about it after someone has been injured. The rights in question go to the most fundamental principles of workplace safety: the right to know about a risk, the right to act on that risk and the right to stop work until that risk is addressed. As many speakers on this side have outlined, we have expressed some concerns about this reform in the bill.

This bill should be about ensuring the safety of workers and ensuring the safety of workers is not dependent on whether an employer chooses to cooperate or not. It should be about empowering people to know about risks and to act on risks. It should be about preventing harm. Unfortunately, we see in this bill that the government is seeking to remove the rights that protect those workers: the right to know about risks and the right to act on those risks.

They argue it is about efficiency. They say it would impose administrative burdens on the regulator. When these claims were tested during the committee process, what did we hear? We heard that the department could not provide clear evidence—no concrete data, no modelling of processing timeframes, no examples of misuse. In fact, key questions had to be taken on notice. When alternatives were suggested, we heard that workers could simply lodge an RTI application. Quite clearly, that is not a solution in these circumstances. That is a barrier. RTI processes are time consuming, can be costly and are entirely impractical in urgent safety situations. If a worker needs to know about a hazard, they should not have to wait weeks or months for paperwork. They need that information immediately. Lives, in fact, depend on it.

Then there is the issue of consultation or, more accurately, the lack of consultation in respect of this bill. The government have failed to properly consult with workers, unions and key stakeholders on these changes. Instead, they have relied on the parliamentary committee process as a substitute for genuine engagement, which should happen before the bill is brought to the parliament. That is not good enough. When stakeholders did have the opportunity to speak about this bill, what did they say? We heard strong opposition from organisations like the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union, the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association and the Queensland Council of Unions. They were clear: they did not support these amendments. They are seen as another attack on workers. Piece by piece, we are seeing the system that protects workers being weakened by this government.

The opposition supports the electrical safety reforms in this bill. They are practical. They are necessary. They will help keep Queenslanders safe. We cannot support the rollback of workers' rights and protections under the workplace health and safety framework as proposed by this bill. We cannot support measures that reduce transparency when it comes to workers knowing about risks and being able to address those risks. We cannot support changes that make it harder, not easier, for workers to access critical safety information. When it comes to safety, the standard must always be that if a reform makes workers safer it should be supported, but if it makes workers less safe it should be opposed. On that basis, while we support parts of this bill, we articulate our opposition to the regressive changes to workplace health and safety laws contained in this amending bill.

 **Mr DALTON** (Mackay—LNP) (8.07 pm): I rise to support the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. At its core, this bill is about making sure our workplace safety laws are doing what they are meant to do: protecting workers, supporting businesses and keeping our communities safe. In regions like Mackay, safety is not just a policy discussion; it is something that affects real people every single day. It is about making sure that when someone leaves for work in the morning they return home safely at the end of the day.

A key part of the bill is about restoring balance to our workplace health and safety system. The previous government introduced information-sharing provisions that would have allowed additional access to compliance and enforcement notices held by the regulator. Transparency is important—and no-one in the House would argue with that—but those provisions lacked appropriate safeguards. There were no clear limits on the number of requests that could be made, no limits on how frequently requests could be made and no clear boundaries on how far back those requests could go. That raises a real concern. Without those safeguards, there is a risk that the systems designed for safety could be used in ways that place unnecessary pressure on businesses and workers rather than improve outcomes onsite.

There is also the practical reality of how they would have worked. Every request would have required manual review by the regulator to ensure sensitive or confidential information is not released inappropriately. That takes time and resources. Those are the same resources that should be focused on inspections, compliance and keeping people safe. This bill ensures the regulator can remain focused on that core responsibility.

Now, I want to say this: I do not believe the intent of the previous government was to create problems on worksites, but the outcome of those laws as drafted risked going too far and risked creating unintended consequences that would not have improved safety outcomes. This bill corrects that course. It is also worth noting that these changes bring Queensland back into alignment with other states and territories. Consistency matters particularly for industries that operate across borders. This bill ensures Queensland is not operating outside the national framework.

Importantly, this bill has been tested through the parliamentary committee process. The committee recommended that the bill be passed, and we have seen support from a range of industry stakeholders who recognise the importance of maintaining a system that is proportionate, practical and focused on genuine safety risks.

This bill also delivers important improvements to electrical safety laws. Electricity is essential in our modern way of life but when something goes wrong the consequences can be serious. That is why these reforms matter. They clarify the ability of electricity entities to ensure defect notices, strengthen the regulator's powers to deal with unsafe electrical equipment and modernise the framework to ensure it reflects current practices and expectations. These are practical changes that provide greater certainty and help ensure risks are managed appropriately.

At its heart this bill is about balance. It is about ensuring that workers are protected, businesses are not burdened by unclear or unworkable processes and regulators can focus their efforts where they matter most. In Mackay we understand the importance of getting the balance right. We are a hardworking region, built on industries like construction, resources and energy. We rely on strong safety frameworks but we also rely on frameworks being practical and effective. This bill delivers that balance. It strengthens safety, it improves clarity and it ensures our system is focused on real outcomes, not unintended consequences and CFMEU intimidation. For these reasons, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (8.11 pm): I, too, rise to make a contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Before I talk about the bill itself, I want to comment on the amendments foreshadowed to be moved by the Deputy Premier. Those amendments go to a bill that I previously have discussed in this chamber, and that was legislation introduced back in 2017 called the University Legislation Amendment Bill. That legislation talked about changing structures. Part of the reason we are here today discussing these amendments is the changes that occurred with that legislation.

Concerns about that 2017 legislation were put forward by submitters who took the time to participate in the committee process. One of the submitters was the National Tertiary Education Union. The National Tertiary Education Union expressed grave concerns about the changes that the University Legislation Amendment Bill was trying to implement. Those changes are exactly what we are looking at amending today. It is interesting that back in 2017 the National Tertiary Education Union highlighted that there would be issues with how the board was set up.

Mr O'Connor: You're a soothsayer.

Mr BOOTHMAN: I take that interjection. I want to quote from a speech I gave then and which is exactly where we are at today. I will quote from the *Hansard* when I spoke on that legislation. I said—

The bill also allows the vice-chancellor to subdelegate powers to an appropriately qualified member of the university's staff. This change was welcomed by the universities themselves. Having said that, this change did cause some concern to the National Tertiary Education Union, as they believe that subdelegation should be controlled by the governing body for transparency; however, the department stated that it is a matter for the university's governing body to decide how these delegation powers should be monitored and reported. The NTEU also expressed concern about proposed reforms to the JCU council. They felt that empowering the governing body to determine its own size and composition would reduce accountability and concentrate power in the executive.

Hence we are here today with these amendments. We are here to change that and correct a wrong that was made by the former Labor government at that time.

I will now make my contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The objectives of this bill are, firstly, to ensure Queensland's electrical safety framework continues to protect Queenslanders by minimising and, where possible, eliminating electrical risks to people and property; and, secondly, to reduce unnecessary administrative burden and re-align Queensland with other states and territories.

At its heart this bill is about two related principles. The first is that the Electrical Safety Regulation must be effective, swift and clear because electrical safety hazards do not wait for bureaucracy to catch up. The second is that our laws should be coherent, nationally consistent where appropriate and administratively workable because the best designed safety framework is one that can actually be implemented and enforced without avoidable duplication.

I now turn to electrical safety when it comes to confirming powers and strengthening direction-making. The bill makes three key amendments to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 and the Electrical Safety Regulation 2013. The first is to confirm that electricity entities can continue to give electrical equipment defect notices by providing a clear power to prescribe this ability under the regulation. This is important for a practical reason: defects in electrical equipment often come to light at the point of supply, connection, inspection, repair or network interaction—exactly where electricity entities operate. When defects are identified, the system needs a reliable and understood mechanism to notify, record and require action. Defect notices are a preventive tool. They are not about punishment; they are about early identification, prompt communication and timely rectification.

By confirming that electricity entities can give these notices—and ensuring that the regulation clearly supports that function—this bill reinforces a frontline safety measure. It keeps the chain of responsibility intact. It supports a consistent approach across the sector and it reduces uncertainty for entities and workers about what can and must be done when unsafe or noncompliant equipment is encountered.

The second amendment empowers the regulation to give unsafe equipment directions to prohibit the sale, installation and use of unsafe electrical equipment by elevating the prohibition power from the regulation to the act itself. That is not a minor technicality. Placing a power in primary legislation can provide greater legal robustness. When the risk is significant—where equipment presents a danger of electric shock, fire or harm—Queenslanders expect that the regulator can act decisively and that the authority to act is clear.

I can think of many times in the Theodore electorate when it comes to electrical issues and safety in our homes the people of the Gold Coast are looking for that. They are looking for safety measures so that if there is faulty equipment there are procedures in place to ensure that it is dealt with swiftly and without bureaucracy slowing it down.

Elevating this power also reflects the seriousness of the subject matter. Unsafe electrical equipment can cause catastrophic outcomes: house fires, serious injury and fatalities. It can spread risk widely through supply chains: sold online, installed in homes, used in workplaces, distributed across multiple sites before defects are detected. The regulator must have a clear ability to stop harm at the source, not merely respond after an incident. That is certainly what residents are looking for in our system.

The third amendment clarifies the operation of unsafe equipment directions. Clarity is safety. When directions are unclear, compliance becomes inconsistent and enforcement becomes contested. Clarity about how unsafe equipment directions work—what they can cover, what they can apply and how they interact with other mechanisms—improves the likelihood that suppliers, installers, businesses and consumers understand their obligations and act promptly. Taken together, these electrical safety

measures aim to do what the public expects of this parliament: maintain strong safety frameworks, confirm necessary operational tools and ensure the regulator can intervene early where equipment presents unacceptable risks.

Time and time again we read in our newspapers about fires caused by electrical faults and battery chargers which are not appropriate. That is why this type of legislation is critically important—to ensure the regulator can act promptly for the safety of Queensland residents. Not long ago a local veteran family's house burned down because they were charging their mobile phone with an improper device and it overheated. We need to ensure these devices are identified to ensure the safety of Queenslanders.

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (8.21 pm): I rise to speak on the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in two parts, if I may. First, as a person born in Townsville and an alumnus of James Cook University, I would like to speak to one of the parts of the bill. The education minister has done a wonderful job in bringing this legislation forward. This very important issue has arisen, as many members have mentioned, in relation to the renaming of James Cook University. As an alumnus, I find this absolutely abhorrent. We have one of the most respected navigational experts in the history of the world in James Cook, and to think that anyone would—

Mr O'Connor: Did you study together?

Mr STEVENS: He was a bit before my time. That anyone would even think of renaming the James Cook University is a stain on the people who even considered that, even if it was not a fait accompli. They say they were looking at studies and whatever, but the education minister has done a wonderful job in putting forward this council which, consistent with other universities, will look at the matter in a fair and reasonable manner. I have some history in relation to renaming universities because many years ago there was a new university being proposed on the Gold Coast and I happened to be the mayor at the time.

Mr Head: You were the mayor of the Gold Coast?

Mr STEVENS: I was the mayor of the Gold Coast and Tom Burns ran a south-east planning matter. I was adamant that the new university on the Gold Coast should be called the Gold Coast University, obviously for reasons of promoting the fabulous Gold Coast as an education facility. We already had Bond University. I was there for the opening of that. I have been everywhere. The bottom line is, as I said at the opening of Bond University, it is a jewel in the crown of the Albert shire. Did I tell you I was the mayor of Albert shire as well? I have been everywhere, man. Lucky star—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Members! Member for Bonney, direct your comments through the chair.

Mr STEVENS: In other words, it was critically important that the university remain at the Gold Coast. However, the vice-chancellor of Griffith University, Professor Roy Webb, insisted that it be called the Griffith University on the Gold Coast because of its international reputation. He had a member for Logan at the time called Wayne Goss, who insisted that that was going to be the name, and Griffith University is the name today. It is the biggest campus of all for Griffith University. He has proven to be correct and I have run second again in terms of promoting the Gold Coast university. Naming of universities is critically important, and I am very pleased that the Minister for Education has understood the importance of this issue and put in place a council that has its feet on the ground and will be delivering forward progress for James Cook University. May it always live strongly as the James Cook University in Townsville, a wonderful institution. Professor Ian Saunders started me on my life in economics and accounting, and what a wonderful job he did. I had to move on later, but that is another story.

I would like to move on to electrical safety. There is nothing more important in my life than electrical safety, because as a 19-year-old kid I gave my 55-year-old father mouth-to-mouth and he died. He was alive after my efforts, but when we got to the hospital he had died as a result of an electrical accident, so electrical safety to me is paramount. This bill is about correcting some issues that were put forward by the Labor Party previously, not in terms of electrical safety but in terms of the people who were overseeing other issues. If there is anything involving electrical safety I am 100 per cent for it, I can assure you. Those memories are still vivid in my mind.

This bill is about correcting matters that are not about electrical safety; they are about people from the CFMEU plying their trade in terms of the people who were operating on these building sites in the electrical industry, exposing their personal and business details. This bill corrects those matters,

and rightly so. We do not need the CFMEU and their tactics, which have been well exposed in Victoria. Now they are being more exposed in Queensland. We do not need those tactics, and this bill rightly corrects all of those matters, hopefully including matters that were impacted in my electorate like light rail—a wonderful addition to the Mermaid Beach electorate that the member for Bonney has been a big supporter of.

The bottom line is that, in terms of productivity, as a result of the previous legislation CFMEU workers added \$500 million to the cost of the light rail running through my electorate. I was there when John Holland Construction said, 'We're not paying it.' They won the original light rail 3 construction contract. They said, 'We're not going to pay the BPIC' that was added by the then treasurer, Jackie Trad, in terms of covering electrical trade workers as part of all of the members on that particular build in Queensland. The productivity on light rail 3 was 2½ days per week, which is absolutely disgusting. Really, it doubled the cost of the project in total.

The fact that we are taking this opportunity to remove the CFMEU from the equation in future infrastructure builds is a wonderful thing. I congratulate all involved, including the Deputy Premier, for taking this bill forward. It will put in place reasonable and accountable actions to ensure that all people working on these projects are not subject to matters that would impact on their daily progression in terms of putting this infrastructure in place, particularly electrical practices.

This bill is a wonderful step forward. I congratulate the Deputy Premier. I congratulate the Minister for Education for his important addition to this bill. I am sure we will all be better off when this legislation is passed.

 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (8.30 pm): I thank the member for Mermaid Beach for reminding us yet again that this is around the safety of Queenslanders. A fair day's pay for a fair day's work begins with a fair and safe workplace—a workplace that is free from fear, free from intimidation and free from interference. The Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 is a bill that goes to the heart of restoring balance on Queensland worksites, strengthening safety and delivering fairness for the very people who build our communities—that is, our hardworking Queensland tradies. When we talk about workplace health and safety in this place, we are talking about Queenslanders' safety. We are talking about the carpenter in Yeppoon trying to get a job done before the rain sets in. We are talking about the electrician working late to ensure that a family gets the opportunity to move into their home that day. We are talking about small business owners across the Capricorn Coast who are juggling jobs, staff and rising costs—just trying to keep their doors open. What they deserve and what they expect is a system that supports them—not a system that burdens them, not a system that intimidates them and certainly not a system that can be weaponised against them.

This bill delivers that balance. At its core it does something very important; it repeals Labor's uncommenced information-sharing laws—laws that would have handed the CFMEU unprecedented access to sensitive compliance and enforcement information. Let's be clear about what those laws would have done. They would have allowed CFMEU officials to request enforcement notices—improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices—directly from the regulator. This is not just recent notices and not just relevant notices, but potentially decades worth of information—with no limit on the number of requests, no limit on how often those requests could be made and no clear requirement for those requests to be tied to genuine safety concerns. That is not about safety; that is about power. The people who would have felt the weight of that power are not the big end of town. They are our small contractors. They are the subbies, the local tradies, the family businesses and the people who live in communities like mine in Keppel.

What happens when that kind of information is handed over without safeguards? It creates an environment where compliance history—sometimes going back decades—can be used not to improve safety onsite but to pressure, intimidate and disrupt. I have spoken to tradies in my electorate who are deeply concerned about exactly that. They do not want less safety; they want clarity and consistency and, most importantly, they want to be able to get on with the job without unnecessary interference.

The regulator exists for one purpose: to protect the safety of Queenslanders. It is not to act as a data source for fishing expeditions, not to facilitate campaigns of coercion and not to be bogged down in an administrative burden that takes resources away from real safety outcomes. Let's think about the practical impact. Every single request for information would need to be manually reviewed to ensure no personal details are being released and to ensure commercial-in-confidence information is protected. Yet, under the legislation, there was no ability to charge a fee and there was no limit on the volume of requests. It was inefficient, it was unsustainable and, as it has been described by other speakers today, it was a blank cheque.

This bill closes the door before it even opens. Importantly, it brings Queensland back into alignment with other states and territories, ensuring that our system is consistent, proportionate and focused on what matters—keeping Queensland workers safe. I want to be very clear about this point. The safety of Queensland workers must always come first. Every tradie deserves to go home at the end of the day—every family deserves that peace of mind—but safety cannot be used as a shield for behaviour that undermines workplaces, damages productivity and erodes Queenslanders' trust. When our worksites become battlegrounds instead of places of work, everyone loses. Jobs slow down, costs go up and projects get delayed and, ultimately, it is Queensland families who pay the price.

I offer my thanks to the committee for their report. The industry stakeholders who gave feedback—Master Builders, the Civil Contractors Federation and Master Electricians Australia—were united in their support. They spoke about restoring proportionality, reducing misuse of power and ensuring that workplace health and safety is about safety, not industrial leverage. Most importantly, they spoke about ensuring that, when we balance Queensland workers' safety, we also achieve productivity because safety and productivity go hand in hand. Productivity is not just an economic term; it is the foundation of opportunity for Queensland families. When we achieve high productivity, it means there are more jobs, higher wages, stronger businesses and better value for taxpayers. As one submitter put it, it is a win-win-win.

Alongside these important workplace health and safety amendments, the bill also strengthens Queensland's electrical safety framework. It clarifies the longstanding ability of electricity entities to issue defect notices, providing certainty and continuity in a system that has been operating effectively for over two decades. It modernises the regulator's powers to prohibit unsafe electrical equipment, elevating those powers into the act itself and ensuring they reflect contemporary drafting standards. It provides greater clarity, transparency and accountability in how those powers are exercised. These are practical, sensible reforms—reforms that ensure our safety framework keeps pace with modern risks and reforms that give Queensland workers, businesses and the broader community the confidence that our workers get to come home safely.

This bill is about backing tradies, not burdening them. It is about supporting small businesses, not stifling them. It is about ensuring safety laws are used for their intended purpose—that is, to protect Queensland workers. This bill will not enable bad behaviour, and that brings me to the broader point. This bill is ultimately a test for those opposite. Will they stand with Queensland workers and businesses, or will they continue to back a model that has for too long enabled intimidation, disruption and inefficiency on Queensland worksites? The truth is that this is not an isolated issue; it is part of a broader pattern that we saw over a decade of decline—a pattern of giving more power, creating fewer safeguards and turning a blind eye to the consequences for Queenslanders.

The Crisafulli government is taking a different approach. We are restoring balance, we are restoring accountability and we are restoring confidence for Queensland workers in our workplaces because when tradies can focus on their work, when businesses can operate without fear and when safety is genuinely about safety, our entire community benefits. In regions like mine in Keppel where construction, trades and small businesses are the backbone of our local economy, that matters. It matters for our jobs, it matters for our growth and it matters for the future of our communities and our families. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (8.39 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I thank the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee for the amount of work they put into this. I also thank the secretariat, who did an absolutely wonderful job in pulling the report together for the benefit of this House so it can have a fuller understanding of what we are talking about and what the issues are.

The Crisafulli government is committed to restoring productivity and stamping out systemic misconduct and bullying, particularly by the CFMEU. This is why we are acting swiftly to repeal Labor's information-sharing laws that would have given unions such as the CFMEU powers to seek compliance and enforcement information directly from the regulator—information they could then use to harass and intimidate employers and workers. In fact, I will give some examples later of where I saw fear at a worksite—in talking to the managers of the worksite, in meetings with the people who were running the worksite and the Department of Transport and Main Roads on a particular project in my electorate. It was clear that the BPIC process was alive and well on that particular project. I will be talking about that a little bit later.

When I was looking through all of this and saw the number of times the word 'safety' was mentioned in the bill, I was reminded of the time several months ago when we arrived at the site to

have a safety briefing and the process we went through in that safety briefing. The CFMEU aligned safety officer was ticking off all of the different aspects at the safety briefing. He got down as far as, 'If we hit 37 degrees they are going to have to down tools' and, 'If a dribble of rain falls we will have to down tools' et cetera. It was the Queensland train maintenance facility in my electorate, which is part of the Queensland Train Manufacturing Program, that I am talking about.

Under Labor's information-sharing laws entry permit holders, union officials and health and safety representatives could request the regulator supply enforcement and compliance notices issued to businesses which include improvement notices, prohibition notices and non-disturbance notices. The regulator's core function is to protect Queensland's safety, not to assist in facilitating the CFMEU's orchestrated campaign of coercion, harassment and intimidation against non-union workplaces. As I said, I will be talking about that shortly. These laws are proof that the former Labor government backed the CFMEU's business model of bullying over the safety of workers during their decade of decline, and I will give an example of that in a short while as well. Labor's information-sharing laws are just one example of more than a decade of Labor's enabling of the CFMEU.

I said that I would be giving some examples. The most recent one, the project that I referred to a moment ago, involves some works on Goldmine Road in my electorate. It is important to give some background about Goldmine Road. It is one of two roads that provide access to one of my state high schools, Ormeau Woods State High School, which has more than 1,500 students. The first I knew they were going to be closing one road and reducing Goldmine Road to one lane was when I received some notifications from the Department of Transport and Main Roads explaining that they were going to be closing the road that goes to the high school. There is one other road that goes to the high school, but I will come to that in a moment.

Goldmine Road, which goes to the high school, was going to be open from 6.30 to 9.30 in the morning so students could get to school. Then they were going to reduce the road to one lane from 9.30 am to 3.30 pm. Then they were going to open the road again to two lanes from 3.30 pm to 6.30 pm. That is a bit of a problem because those 1,500 students finish school at 2.30 pm. They were going to have only one lane in, and let me paint the picture of that lane. A total of 22 bus services go to that school to pick up students and there was going to be one lane open each way. Apart from that, the parents would also be using that road to pick up students in the afternoon, yet it was going to be down to one lane.

That had another knock-on effect—and we are talking here about safety. We are talking about the safety of the community as well. The next stops for those buses, after dropping a few kids off on the way through, were three primary schools: Woongoolba, Ormeau and Norfolk Village. They are the schools they were going to next to pick up more students. Imagine this: the bus is going to a high school to pick up all these kids and then gets to the next school 20 to 25 minutes late. What does that do for that school and the safety of those students, all of whom are very young students? We are talking about primary schools in that regard.

We talk about safety and the CFMEU and their requirements for their workers on the one hand—and we are all 100 per cent behind safety for workers. There is absolutely no question about that. However, there is a bigger issue and that is safety for the broader community. I have to tell honourable members that the work we had to go through to achieve a change to a two o'clock opening of those two lanes was unbelievable. We finally got there, thanks to the minister's office supporting me in my push to ensure that occurred. Up until then there was no way they were going to do it.

When we get down to the nitty-gritty—and I am talking about safety for the workers—there was a situation where some particular pits needed to be dug and Goldmine Road would need to be closed for a full day or two half days. I asked the question: why do we need to do it over two days? Why can we not do it on a Saturday, or, God forbid, why can we not do it when the schools are on holidays? There were two reasons. First of all, they could not do it on a Saturday because they had to ask permission of the CFMEU for the workers to work on a Saturday. The CFMEU had to agree that the workers could work on a Saturday to do this very difficult job, a 10-hour job, on that Saturday. Otherwise they would have had to split it over two days and it was all too hard. That was that aspect of it; we had to ask them permission. Secondly, I asked why we could not do it when the schools were on holidays. We could not do it in the first week because of the Easter four-day weekend and then, guess what? They stitched together four more days—

Mr Bennett: RDOs.

Mr CRANDON:—rostered days off, so they could not do it then. Do not worry about the kids. Do not worry about the fact that the road was being reduced to one lane. Do not worry about the fact that

those buses would be late to three primary schools. Do not worry about any of that as long as those workers could have their four rostered days off. So no, they could not do it over the Easter school holiday break, either.

I know I have run out of time. I had a lot more to say on the issue, but I have run out of time. Labor's Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which was passed in 2024, gave virtually unfettered access to union officials to worksites. It opened the door to aggressive, intrusive and obstructive conduct. That was my experience just the other day because we are still stuck with BPIC on that particular project. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (8.50 pm): First of all, speaking of safety, when I was last speaking on a similar bill—the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024, and this bill now seeks to address some of those issues—I was sitting here with a bugged up finger from my own safety incident. In that speech I reminded Queenslanders to ensure that they keep their fingers out of the way when they are putting steel posts in the ground in particular. I noted that only just before when I was revisiting my speech that I delivered on electrical safety not even two years ago in this House.

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr HEAD: I take that interjection from the Minister for Primary Industries. I had had a fair bit of training but apparently not enough and, I dare say, not as much as you when it comes to putting steel posts in the ground when you are out on the land. Nonetheless, in that speech and also in the statement of reservation from the opposition committee members at that time—that is, the member for Condamine, the member for Toowoomba North and myself—we highlighted this particular clause. We referenced the Queensland Law Society, which at the time expressed concern regarding the changes to clause 20 of the Work Health and Safety Act in relation to the power for an investigator to compel the production of documents and answers to questions on behalf of the regulator. In July 2024 the LNP, which was then in opposition, raised concerns around these particular clauses in the Electrical Safety Act, and now that we are in government here we are with a hardworking Deputy Premier fixing these issues. We know why Labor moved these at the time. If you look back through the *Hansard* record, various speeches, including the now Deputy Premier's contribution at that time, highlighted how—and there were other provisions that were brought in in that bill that we have addressed in previous legislation as well—the Labor Party once again was doing the bidding of the CFMEU.

The CFMEU is the master of the Labor Party, and we see that time and again with those opposite. They walk in here and make out that they are on the side of Queenslanders and then all we see is them moving legislation and taking positions to back in the CFMEU. Especially now that there is a commission of inquiry into some of the CFMEU's antics that is thankfully highlighting a lot of the atrocities that it has committed over the years, one would think that members of the Labor Party would be a little more cautious of their relationships, yet they are in here again raising concerns about changes that we are making to strip the power away from the CFMEU which we are not afraid to say because, frankly, it is running riot over this state. It has cost us many billions of dollars through its antics, through backroom deals and direct lines to former deputy premier Jackie Trad, as we have heard many a time. One would have thought that those opposite may have reconsidered how they are approaching things, but no. At the end of the day, once you have sold your soul to an entity like the CFMEU, I do not think you are ever going to get it back. That is the unfortunate reality. They might change their spots and put a new coat on and wander out into the public and make out that they do not have any particular affiliations with the CFMEU, but at every opportunity they are in here putting forward positions that clearly align with the views of the CFMEU. That is what we get under the Labor Party. That is what we get under opposition leader Steven Miles. That is what we get under the whole Labor Party frontbench. They back in the CFMEU over Queenslanders.

Having sat on that committee previously—I was not on the current State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee this time, and I do thank the committee for its work in reviewing this legislation before it came to the House—I went to the effort personally to revise the submission from the Consultative Committee for Work-related Fatalities and Serious Incidents, because I remember having its representatives in front of us in the committee process previously and Mr O'Connor, who lost his sister many years ago, was in front of us and sharing his story. I note that it was supportive of these amendments and that it firmly believed that the proposed amendments outlined in that bill, specifically to the Electrical Safety Act 2002 and Electrical Safety Regulation 2014, were integral to advancing electrical safety in Queensland. I think that is a worthy mention, because that committee does do a lot of great work. It worked with the previous government in terms of some of the changes that were good in that previous legislation and it worked with us in this instance. It was a shame once again, even though there were some good provisions in the bill in 2024, that the Labor

Party could not help itself at the time and ensured it was looking after the CFMEU when it brought what could have been good legislation forward at the time.

What are the consequences if we do not bring this legislation forward? As I have outlined, Labor's laws unjustifiably enable the CFMEU to collect enforcement information on businesses dating back decades which would serve limited purposes in making worksites safer. I know those opposite are trying to make out that this is how you make things safer. Giving a militant union the ability to access decades of information without cause and without reason is a can of worms that I do not think Queenslanders should open. That is giving power to people who, I dare say, are hardly fit to participate in modern society given some of their antics. This morning in question time the Attorney-General was referring to a circumstance at a picket line of the CFMEU where members at a mine were threatening to rape people's family members if those workers were to choose to go into work. Through the commission of inquiry we have seen plenty more circumstances that highlight very questionable behaviour. Giving the CFMEU powers and access to this information throughout the changes made in 2024 was the wrong move, but here we are. The Crisafulli LNP government is correcting it because we are not beholden to the CFMEU. I ask Queenslanders to imagine the vendetta that could be undertaken if they could go through and willy-nilly access that information. I also outline that this does not block the release of that information. There are the right-to-information processes and the rest, but this ensures that there are due processes, as there are with all other government information to be released.

In the final moments of my contribution I want to touch on the change brought in with regard to James Cook University. I second the comments that the member for Mermaid Beach made. Our public institutions—our universities—do need to be reflective of the modern day. Other university boards have a certain structure and in this instance it was clear that the university was perhaps not utilising the structure it had available with the best of discretion.

The media reports around them considering changing the name of the university which reflects a huge part of Australia's history were certainly concerning. We cannot rewrite history. I think that we just need to get on with the job of focusing on delivering good education, rather than running around going off on tangents and changing university names. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Head, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.00 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Bundaberg, Weather Event



Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (9.00 pm): As I mentioned earlier today, the Bundaberg community has been deeply impacted by the flood event of the last couple of weeks. Whilst I spoke about the fantastic work that our volunteers, our emergency services, our council staff and so many other local businesses did to help each other out, I did want to mention the residents who were flood impacted especially those in north, south, east and central—very much the heart of the Bundaberg electorate.

I took the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition with me to talk to locals in south, central and east. We had conversations. We went through homes where water had come up and you could still see the water level marked on the walls. People had lost cars and all of their possessions and belongings. Their children's toys had been decimated by the floodwaters and now needed to be replaced. Every single one of those residents said very clearly that they support the Bundaberg east flood levee—Labor's Bundaberg east flood levee. In the Morrison government, Keith Pitt, the then federal member for Hinkler, personally intervened and stopped the funding for that project. It was the Albanese government that came in and said, 'We will do the work to get it done.' The now federal member for Hinkler, David Batt, said—

I want to see plans finalised and work started to give Bundaberg residents peace of mind before another flood comes ...

...

The East Levee will save hundreds of houses and hundreds of businesses in the CBD as well as East and South Bundy in another flood event and out of all four current proposals is the best value for money.

Those are the words of the now federal member for Hinkler, David Batt.

The federal member for Hinkler supports the Bundaberg east flood levee. The member for Burnett, to his credit, is on record time and time again—I tabled all of the times that he said he was in

favour of the Bundaberg east flood levee. What is concerning is that a minister who does not even have the authority to make a decision on the project is now backtracking for the LNP. Instead of committing to the whole of the levee, they are now talking about staging the process and doing floodgates.

Government members interjected.

Mr SMITH: I hear what those opposite are saying. The mayor says that the levee in east and south will turn the water around and flood north. If those opposite want to believe our kooky anti-vax mayor, who now says that the Bundaberg east flood levee will turn the flood around magically and send it up north—if that is who they want to wed themselves to, they should do that. I talk to the people who live in Bundaberg east, who live in south, who live in north and who live in central. They want the levee built. They do not want half a hospital, they do not want half a levee and they do not want half a minister.

Mudgeeraba Electorate

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.03 pm): With this week being the anniversary of the parliamentary class of 2009, of which I am a member, I wish to take this opportunity to thank my community, as always, for their overwhelming and continued support over the years. One of the most rewarding parts of being a member of parliament is being able to deliver for your local community. This includes improving local infrastructure and services. Despite the difficulties over many years under the former Labor government, who were not particularly interested in supporting our community, I am proud to have delivered many significant projects for our electorate, even from opposition. Now with the Crisafulli LNP government listening to the concerns and needs of our community, I am pleased to have delivered even more for our electorate.

Thanks to the Crisafulli LNP government, work is finally now underway to fix the Austinville Causeway. Locals know I have been relentlessly campaigning to raise the Austinville Causeway over many years. This causeway has been a constant cause of frustration for local families who are routinely cut off from the rest of our community with heavy rainfall. I was pleased to see survey work commencing last month and clearing work commence this month to prepare the site for construction. We are delivering targeted local upgrades like new signage in Springbrook to improve our local road system, with installation expected to begin shortly, weather permitting.

It is not just community projects that the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering across the Mudgeeraba electorate, we are delivering tangible cost-of-living relief for individuals and families, like our Back to School Boost which provides \$100 for every primary school student to assist Mudgeeraba families with school essentials, or the Crisafulli LNP government's Play On! sports vouchers which are currently open for application and provide up to \$200 to support kids to get active and involved in our great local sporting clubs. It is initiatives like our Women's Career Grants program which provides up to \$5,000 to help reduce the cost of returning to work for women in our community and, indeed, right across Queensland, or it is initiatives like the Crisafulli LNP government's permanent 50-cent fares which could soon be used at our new Merrimac train station with major construction expected to be completed in 2026.

Across the board it is clear that the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering a fresh start for our community, with safety where you live, health services when you need them, a better lifestyle through a stronger economy and a plan for Queensland's future. But the work is not done yet. There is plenty more still to be achieved for my community, particularly as we work to fix Labor's decade of decline, and I look forward to the job ahead.

Mount Ommaney Electorate, Infrastructure; Fuel Security

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (9.06 pm): I have been so proud to work alongside my community to advocate for and deliver critical infrastructure upgrades like the Sumners Road overpass and the Centenary Bridge upgrade that is currently underway. Right before the last election I was so proud to stand alongside the member for Murrumba and the members for Aspley and Inala to announce a feasibility study for the Centenary Motorway tunnel between Darra and Toowong. This announcement was the result of the advocacy of thousands of people both in my community and throughout the entire western corridor. I want to thank them again today in this House.

People in my community, people in this House would be aware, are stuck on the Centenary Motorway every day. They do their best to use public transport and take advantage of Labor's 50-cent fares where possible, but sometimes they are doing school drop-offs, making multiple stops on their commute, and they need to use their cars. With the projected growth in this corridor we need the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to look to the future for our community.

With the Jindalee bridge well and truly underway thanks to the former Labor government, locals are rightly asking what is next. We all know the Fig Tree Pocket on-ramp desperately needs to be upgraded. There is congestion leading onto the bridge morning and night because the current design of the on-ramp is not fit for purpose. It is not safe to merge at speed and as a result people slow down and the traffic in the morning travelling outbound from the city can bank up right along the Centenary Motorway heading back towards the Toowong roundabout. There should not be traffic heading outbound in the morning but there is and it is the responsibility of this minister to do something about it.

In the time I have left I want to address the skyrocketing price of fuel in Queensland. I have already received correspondence from locals, as have many members of this House, including business owners, who have told me that while they survived COVID this may be the thing that breaks them. On Monday it was reported the average price of diesel in South-East Queensland was about \$2.90 per litre and unleaded was over \$2.40. With the school holidays and the Easter long weekend right around the corner many families will be cancelling trips to save on fuel. The federal government has taken action. They are working with Asia-Pacific governments to shore up Australia's energy security and the ACCC is already investigating cases of price gouging. On behalf of my community, I am calling on the Crisafulli government to step up and act so that Queensland families and businesses can continue to access fuel when they need it and they can afford to get it at a reasonable price. We have seen the government adopt our transport policies when it suits them—just look at their enthusiasm for our 50-cent fares. It is time for them to listen to Queenslanders again and act to bring down fuel prices.

Oodgeroo Electorate, Cost-of-Living Relief

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (9.09 pm): Peter from Cleveland, now in his late 70s, has worked hard all his life. He has saved and paid his way, even in retirement. Despite doing the right thing for so long, he now reaches his retirement years shocked to find that the cost of living has risen so much that his standard of living will be nothing like what he planned, saved and prepared for. Pensioners experience the same thing and so do working people, especially when wages are stagnant. Inflation has been too high for too long and it is eating away at people's wealth.

While the federal Treasurer was eager to try to point the finger at Iran for the recent increase in interest rates, the Reserve Bank governor belled the cat pretty darned quickly. She pointed out that the inflation relevant to the bank's assessment was much too high well before the present volatility in the Middle East emerged. CPI went up to 3.8 per cent just this January and is likely to rise again. That means there is worse to come on both inflation and interest rates as fuel price inflation is factored into future rises. Now that we are in a fuel crisis, we are paying spectacularly high prices for the federal government's lack of spending discipline in the years leading up to it.

Labor in Canberra are likewise short-changing Queensland in the allocation of GST revenue, punishing this state for its willingness to advance the mining industry, which funds so much of our public infrastructure, hospitals, schools and more. The methodology adopted by the federal government for the allocation of the GST quite literally rewards a state such as Victoria for shutting down its mining industry with the fruits of Queenslanders' labour. You could not make this stuff up. None of it is good news, especially given the slow response from the Prime Minister on fuel supply despite the efforts of the Queensland Treasurer and Premier to prompt swift national action and an ACCC effort to keep an eye on price gouging early in the interests of our fishers, farmers, families, local businesses and households alike.

However, there are glimmers of hope for Redlanders. As a result of this government's efforts to restore stability and sense to this sector, the default market offer for electricity has reduced by 10.1 per cent for Queensland householders and nearly 13 per cent for small businesses. It went up by 19.9 per cent in Labor's last year. Similarly, our work is making our communities safer and driving down insurance premiums. Permanent 50-cent fares are making transport more affordable, even in this difficult fuel-cost environment. We locked that in; those opposite had no way to. Our hospital, which struggled for so long, is getting much needed investments and we are backing in affordable social activities for seniors at U3A Redlands. There is more to do but we are on the job.

Ipswich West Electorate, Housing

 **Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.12 pm): Tonight I rise to speak about the No. 1 issue facing my community of Ipswich West—that is, housing. As one of the fastest growing regions in Queensland, Ipswich cannot afford to be forgotten any longer. While Ipswich is growing rapidly, for too many people the dream of a secure home is slipping further and further from their reach. Families are

under pressure, their rents are rising, the cost of living is at an all-time high and frontline services are stretched to their limits. That is simply unacceptable.

That is why it was so important for me to host our shadow minister for housing, Meaghan Scanlon, last week in Ipswich West. I want to thank her for the time she took to visit some of my constituents in their social housing properties and to meet with our amazing frontline services staff, including all the attendees at the Ipswich Housing and Homelessness Network. We saw and heard from a number of dedicated organisations and people who work tirelessly. Those organisations just want security of funding, which they do not seem to have under this government.

It was interesting to see LNP members come to Ipswich last week to open a housing development initiated and funded by Labor. They are always happy to pose for photos in front of projects that Labor initiated. In fact, in September 2024 the member for Ipswich and I turned the first sod on that development to provide 43 new social housing units for women aged 55 and over. That is what good Labor governments do: deliver affordable homes for people who need them most.

We also saw an announcement about a new 24-unit social housing complex in North Ipswich. Of course, this is a welcomed announcement, but I note this could not have been done without \$14.2 million of critical investment from the Albanese federal Labor government. Huge thanks to federal Labor and our federal member for Blair, Mr Shayne Neumann. It was great to visit the site with him last week.

We must ensure that every Queenslanders, no matter their background, has access to a safe, secure and affordable place to call home. I will continue to call on those opposite to stop dragging their feet and start delivering for the people of Ipswich West.

Weather Events, Recovery; Fuel Security

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.15 pm): Sadly, my electorate of Nanango is no stranger to flooding, and the recent damage across particularly the northern end of my electorate in the South Burnett and Tansey region has meant another tough blow for our communities. Very sadly and tragically, two young Chinese tourists, here to explore our beautiful state, tragically lost their lives on a flooded road near Kilkivan in my patch, and I extend my deepest condolences to their loved ones.

I also want to acknowledge our emergency services, volunteers, council crews and neighbours who once again stepped up, and they did so when it mattered most. Our region now turns to the work of repairing and rebuilding. To everyone affected and to everyone helping in the recovery, I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Right now, all Queenslanders, but particularly those who have to travel long distances, putting fuel in their trucks or fuel in their tractors, are feeling the pressures of ongoing fuel security issues. These issues are hitting our families, small businesses, transport operators and primary producers hard. People in Queensland are frustrated, and rightfully so, because of the inaction of the Albanese federal government, and those opposite know full well that Chris Bowen and Anthony Albanese have been left wanting. Perhaps those opposite should read the press release by Prime Minister Albo and Chris Bowen, put out five days ago. I will quote directly from their press release which says—

The Commonwealth Government is responsible for national fuel security and supply, and will work with States and Territories to support distribution within their jurisdictions.

How embarrassing for the state Labor opposition that are so clueless. They would not even know where regional Queensland was if it bit them on the backside.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw. This is how frustrating the ignorance of the Labor opposition is here in Queensland. I want to give a shout-out to Jared Seiler, who is the President of the Livestock and Rural Transporters Association of Queensland, someone who knows about fuel, knows about trucking in this great state and, I tell you this, he knows about regional Queensland. With the time left, I call on those opposite to pick up the phone to Albo and do something about it.

(Time expired)

Community Safety

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (9.18 pm): Tonight I rise to speak about community safety—two issues, two locations but the same pattern: an LNP government that only acts when it suits

them for political point scoring. They move fast for wedge politics, but they move slow for real community safety. The first issue is Queensland government motorway lighting in Logan. In locations like the M1 and Stoney Camp Road intersection, the lights are still out. Motorists are driving in the dark. When darkness meets rain, it becomes dangerous. Drivers know it. Rain falls. Glare rises. Lane markings disappear. Drivers strain to see. Reaction times lag behind what is needed to take evasive action. The risk to life rises—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It relates to the bill that is before the House about copper theft. I note that the Manager of Opposition Business is straying into territory relating to copper theft, which is pre-empting debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): I will get some advice.

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Obviously lights can be—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, do you have a point of order?

Mr POWER: I do have a point of order. Obviously lights can be out for a variety of reasons.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, I am just taking a point of order.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: He is not in his seat, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr POWER: I was speaking to the point of order already raised.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Do you have another point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, the member rising to a point of order is not in his seat.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take that point of order. Remain calm and I will get some advice on the other point of order. Member for Springwood, that probably is a point of order. I urge you to show some caution.

Mr de BRENNI: I have not mentioned anything that exists in a bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like you to rule, noting—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not need you to tell me what to rule. What is your point of order?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The member is being disorderly and disrespecting your ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will get some more advice. Member for Springwood, I ask you to be cautious around this point. You may proceed with your delivery.

Mr de BRENNI: Lights remain out on motorways, and they have been out for 15 months. I acknowledge James. He has been outspoken on this issue. He has stood alongside local residents and demanded action to repair the infrastructure. He is right. Last week the *Courier-Mail* reported in an article that ‘residents slam “pathetic” government’. The article states—

Logan resident and electrician James Freeman said he was “embarrassed” by the persistent outages, and feared they were “an accident waiting to happen”.

He said—“I love this community and we deserve to drive around safely, but I guess this government just doesn’t think it’s that important ... it’s pathetic.”

It is not new. The government itself has been forced to concede that the issue is one of public safety, yet still nothing has been fixed on these motorways. Before the election David Crisafulli promised less talk and more action, but all that communities in Logan have seen is less action and more delay. If the Premier can move quickly for politics, he can move quickly for safety.

Residents have been clear. They want to see smarter solutions used. They want to see infrastructure locked. They want to see devices that alert to interference installed to stop lighting outages before they happen. The message is clear: fix the lights on the motorway. It has been well over 12 months and the lights have not been fixed.

The second issue is that of Priestdale Road. It is a school and community corridor that is not safe enough. Parents report there is speeding traffic, poor lighting and limited pedestrian action, along with potholes and broken footpaths. The LNP Brisbane City Council has collected tens of millions of dollars

in infrastructure charges, paid for by local families, but they do not see the money being invested in their community. It is simply not good enough.

Toowoomba PCYC

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.22 pm): Last week I awoke to read that the PCYC in Toowoomba had been burnt to the ground. Later that day I spoke with a mum whose child trains at the PCYC and she told me her first thought that morning was not about the building; it was a simple question: where do the kids go now? For so many parents and children in our community, the PCYC is not just a building; it is where kids feel safe, it is where they build confidence and it is where they find belonging. This tragedy means we must focus on three things: supporting young people right now, restoring services as quickly as possible and rebuilding for the future.

For more than 50 years the PCYC has been part of the fabric of our community. It delivers programs that change lives: Braking the Cycle helps young people to get their driver's licence, with volunteers supervising their 100 hours; Drop In youth programs give kids a safe place after school; and gymnastics, which has more than 500 people training every week. It supports parents keeping their kids on track. It supports children who need structure, guidance and opportunity. It works with police, schools and families by stepping in early before young people fall into trouble. Overnight, that support was gone. This is not just a building we lost; it is a critical piece of community infrastructure. The scale and the loss are significant. There were 800 youth sessions delivered last year and 14,000 engagements with young people. Hundreds of children and families rely on it every week.

Right now the PCYC is facing immediate pressure: temporary facilities are required, programs need continuity and rebuild planning is underway. This is where the community and the local, state and federal governments must all step in—to help the PCYC rise again like a Phoenix and continue supporting young, vulnerable people in our community. That is why we are working to secure interim spaces, maintain programs and deliver a long-term rebuild program.

The message from Toowoomba is very clear: parents—and mums in particular—do not just want the PCYC back; they want it rebuilt stronger, bigger and ready to serve our community into the future and for the next 50 years. We owe it to not only every child who will walk through those doors but also every child who has walked through those doors to ensure that this happens and that the legacy of the building continues.

The community are completely committed to this. I look forward to working with the PCYC to ensure we have community fundraising, but local, state and federal governments all will need to put their hands in their pockets so that this piece of critical infrastructure is returned to Toowoomba.

Open Data

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (9.25 pm): The private member's motion in this chamber on 4 March regarding victims of crime data no doubt had Queenslanders pulling their hair out after many years enduring this debacle. That is why one of the recommendations from the former Youth Justice Select Committee was for accurate, transparent reporting and an expanded role for the Queensland crime statistics unit to end the cherrypicking, the arguments and the notion that any policy or legislative change will see an end to crime. Using monthly data makes no sense when graphs clearly show highs and lows, with Griffith University's criminology researcher highlighting the 'long-term downward trends' over nearly 20 years. As stock market analysts say, the trend is your friend.

We have been advised many times that we cannot police or legislate our way out of crime, nor can we 'politic' our way out. The only way to reduce crime is through working together—note that word 'together'—increase resourcing and tackling the contributors, with expert advice made publicly available as requested, which is still absent. One has to ask why? Otherwise, this seesawing will see that long-term trend reverse through a broken system where anyone who speaks out against slogans made into policy are attacked as not caring for victims, which is totally false and everyone knows it.

This never-ending war between the two sides of this chamber is making all Queenslanders victims. The data debacle traverses many areas of government. Housing—there is no data reflecting the extent of need for genuine affordable housing. How do you address it if you do not know? Policing—we fought for QPWS IT to be ungraded to receive offender information from QPS. QPWS got sorted; QPS has not. After being referred by each minister to our new open data minister, we have been referred back. Then we still cannot get the data on national parks funding allocations, and now we need to get an RTI—labelled a 'last resort' by the OIC—to get community consultation data regarding Noosa North Shore airfield. Again, why?

We hope the open data policy review will tackle these transparency issues, as well as produce that flood risk and climate change data. Ultimately, we need an independent, holistic review of our governance and decision-making systems. Please, I am asking both sides of this chamber again: end the politicking, bickering and time wasting. Queenslanders have been and are being brought to their knees. They need to see this chamber united on sorting out the basics—fuel, housing, food, power and crime. No more blame; just explain and get on with it. Queenslanders can deal with the truth.

Scenic Rim Electorate, Fuel Security

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (9.28 pm): Scenic Rim is the best farming region in Queensland, but farmers and businesses are under threat from diesel shortages, spikes in prices for diesel and the imminent loss of crops which may not be harvested very shortly if the diesel crisis is not fixed. We know that without fuel Australia stops, farmers stop and the food supply stops. Families are also suffering in a cost-of-living crisis made so much worse by the Albanese government's inflation-boosting budgets. They cannot control spending and they are driving up inflation and the cost of living across the country. The increased cost of diesel and petrol right now is making it that much harder to put food on the table and pay the bills in the overall context of the Albanese cost-of-living crisis.

It was really encouraging to see the draft determination from the Australian Energy Regulator, which recommended that the default price for electricity come down by 10.1 per cent for households and 12.8 per cent for small businesses—proof that the LNP government's Energy Roadmap is working to stabilise electricity prices here in Queensland and to do our bit to help with the cost-of-living crisis caused by the Albanese Labor government and their inflation-boosting budgets.

Of course, Queensland was the first state to call out fuel security issues. The Treasurer wrote to the federal minister calling for national leadership and a national plan, because this is an international crisis but we need a national plan to fix it. Along the way, Queensland also raised concerns with the ACCC that fuel retailers may be unfairly raising their prices when they do not need to, impacting families and businesses. We welcome the fact that the ACCC is now investigating allegations of anti-competitive conduct in the last little bit of time that has passed.

Queensland will also be providing assistance towards the national plan as outlined by the Prime Minister after the National Cabinet meeting. We had the announcement that Bob Gee, a very respected public servant from Queensland, will be Queensland's representative on this important issue. He is also our current Cross-Border Commissioner. I had the opportunity to speak with Bob Gee recently to highlight the fuel shortage issue and how it is affecting people in the Fassifern area who need to harvest their crops. They are facing the very real likelihood of running out of fuel within the next couple of weeks if this is not addressed.

Drastic action needs to be taken because there will be drastic consequences not just for my community but for everyone who relies on our community to be fed, whether in Australia or overseas. We export a lot of food as well, so it is not just our people who are being affected but also our trading partners. Our action in the short term is to ensure the federal government have all of the information they need to deal with this. In the long term, we are opening up new areas for exploration for gas and other resources including the Taroom Trough, which has great potential to be the first new major oil production area in the country since the 1970s.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.32 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, 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, Katter, Kelly G, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Morton, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Sullivan, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young