

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, 12 May 2026

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	1219
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 April 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 30 April 2026	1219
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	1219
Rule of Anticipation	1219
Question on Notice, Ruled Out of Order	1220
Parliament House, Artwork	1220
Queensland Youth Orchestra	1220
Visitors to Public Gallery	1220
PETITIONS	1220
TABLED PAPERS	1222
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1223
Federal Budget	1223
Federal Budget	1224
Federal Budget, Infrastructure	1225
Training and Skills	1226
Fuel Security	1227
Hospitals, Ramping; Federal Budget, Aged Care	1227
Federal Budget, Disability Services	1228
Federal Budget, Road and Rail Infrastructure	1229
Federal Budget, Social and Affordable Housing	1229
PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS	1230
Comments by Member for Ipswich, Clarification and Apology	1230
Comments by Member for Stretton, Clarification and Apology	1230
Comments by Member for Lytton, Clarification and Apology	1230
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1230

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 12 May 2026

Paradise Dam	1230
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 April 2026, from the Chair of Sunwater Board, Mr Jeff Seeney, to the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, Hon. Ann Leahy, and the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, Hon. Ros Bates, regarding a draft Business Case for Paradise Dam.	
	1231
Paradise Dam	1231
Tourism and Events; NRL Magic Round	1232
Paradise Dam	1233
Infrastructure	1233
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure	1234
Infrastructure	1234
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, undated, titled 'Crime panel's link to cabinet 'No issue' insists Gerber'.	
	1235
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure	1235
CFMEU Inquiry	1236
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from social media, dated 30 August 2015, featuring a post by the member for Miller, Hon. Mark Bailey MP, in relation to a Young Labor QLD function.	
	1237
Public Transport	1237
Homelessness Services	1238
Housing Supply	1239
Crisafulli LNP Government, Ministers	1239
Federal Budget	1240
Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games	1241
Health Services	1241
PRIVILEGE	1242
Comments by the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations	
	1242
MOTIONS	1242
Business Program	1242
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	
	1245
Resolved in the affirmative.....	
	1245
Suspension of Standing Orders	1245
LEGAL PROFESSION (STRENGTHENING DISCIPLINARY MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL	1245
Message from Deputy Governor	1245
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 12 May 2026, from the Deputy Governor, recommending the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026.	
	1245
Introduction	1245
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026.	
	1246
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes.	
	1246
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.	
	1246
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Report titled 'Legal practitioner jurisdiction—Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act Statutory Review 2025-26', October 2025.	
	1246
First Reading	1249
Referral to Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee	1249
RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1249
Second Reading	1249
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 17, 58th Parliament—Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, government response.	
	1250
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	1259
International Nurses Day; International Day of the Midwife; Health Services	1260
Stafford By-Election; CFMEU Inquiry	1261
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Luke Richmond Labor for Stafford'.	
	1262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Fiona Hammond LNP for Stafford'.	
	1262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated—political pamphlet.	
	1262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated—photocopy of political pamphlet.	
	1262
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated—photocopy of political pamphlet.	
	1262
Crisafulli LNP Government, North Brisbane	1262
Health Services; Stafford By-Election	1263
Health Services; International Nurses Day	1264
Stafford By-Election	1265
International Nurses Day	1267
Fuel Security	1268
International Nurses Day	1270
Stafford By-Election	1271
Katter's Australian Party	1272
RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1273
Second Reading	1273
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	
	1275
Resolved in the negative.....	
	1275
Non-government amendment (Mr Power) negatived.	
	1275


Table of Contents – Tuesday, 12 May 2026

<i>Tabled paper: Extract from the University of Queensland, Leading for High Reliability Centre report, dated 30 September 2025, titled 'Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model'</i>	<i>1280</i>
WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT REGULATION	1293
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	1293
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	1303
Resolved in the negative	1303
RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1303
Second Reading	1303
ADJOURNMENT	1322
Nurses and Midwives; Health System	1322
Water Security	1322
Nurses and Midwives	1323
Chatsworth Electorate, Customer Service Awards	1323
Nurses and Midwives; Health System	1324
International Nurses Day; Best of the Redlands; Anzac Day	1325
Nurse and Midwives; Health System	1325
Burnett Electorate, Achievements	1326
International Nurses Day; Health Services	1327
Redcliffe Electorate; Tait, Mr B OAM	1327
ATTENDANCE	1328


TUESDAY, 12 MAY 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 Appropriation Bills and other 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:

30 April 2026:

A bill for an Act to amend the Drugs Misuse Act 1986, the Drugs Misuse Regulation 1987, the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Regulation 2026, the State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, the Youth Justice Act 1992 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act authorising the Treasurer to pay an amount from the consolidated fund for the Legislative Assembly and parliamentary service for the financial year starting 1 July 2024

A bill for an Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for particular departments for the financial year starting 1 July 2024

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

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 April 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 30 April 2026.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS


Rule of Anticipation

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 4 March 2026 the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee tabled report No. 21, *Inquiry into e-mobility safety and use in Queensland*. Notice of Motion—House to Take Note of Committee Reports—No. 10 relates to that report.

On 25 March 2026, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads introduced the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill. That bill implements recommendations of the inquiry and report by the committee.


A bill is a superior form of proceedings to a motion and, thus, any issue of anticipation favours a bill. It is clear that any debate of report No. 21 of the committee is likely to be anticipating the bill in terms of standing order 231. Accordingly, I rule that the debate of the committee report will need to be either postponed until after the bill has been dealt with or discharged from the *Notice Paper*.

Question on Notice, Ruled Out of Order

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 3 March 2026 the member for Cooper asked question on notice No. 133 of 2026 to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. The Deputy Premier subsequently requested that I seek authentication of the premise of the question. I wrote to the member for Cooper requesting relevant details to authenticate the facts stated in the question. Following a review of the information supplied by the member for Cooper in response to my request, I found it did not provide sufficient authentication of the facts stated in the question. Accordingly, I ruled the question out of order on 1 May 2026.


Honourable members, I take this opportunity to remind all members that they should be able to authenticate facts stated in their questions. Members should not phrase questions to state as fact that which is not fact but assumption or supposition. Members should not exaggerate facts beyond that which they can authenticate. It is ultimately for the Speaker to determine whether authentication is required and determine whether the member has provided sufficient evidence of authentication.

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, *Bullock Team Wondai Railway Yards 1921*, is by artist Lois Simpson. The artwork was donated by the former shire of Wondai, a local government area in the South Burnett region that operated from 1910 until 2008, when it was amalgamated with several other councils to form the South Burnett Region.

The second artwork, *Allora from Allora Mountains*, is by David Atkinson. This artwork was donated by the Allora Shire Council. The shire of Allora was a local government area north of Warwick in the Darling Downs. It operated from 1869 until 1994, when it was amalgamated with neighbouring councils to form the Shire of Warwick. In 2008, the Shire of Warwick was merged with Stanthorpe Shire to form the Southern Downs Regional Council. Next sitting week we will feature two more artworks, continuing to highlight regional communities represented in this chamber.

Queensland Youth Orchestra

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, this evening the Queensland Youth Symphony is hosting a Symphony on the Speaker's Green. Members and staff are invited to witness the world-class youth orchestra comprising more than 90 extraordinarily talented young Queenslanders aged between 13 and 24 years. The event will celebrate 60 years of the Queensland Youth Orchestra, which educates over 550 young musicians in eight ensembles, comprising three full symphony orchestras, some specialised ensembles and a big band. I look forward to seeing members and staff there during the dinner break.

Visitors to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from: Moorooka State School in the electorate of Toohey; Livingstone Christian College in the electorate of Coomera; Acacia Ridge State School and St Stephen's Catholic Primary School in the electorate of Algester; and Southport State High School in the electorate of Bonney.

PETITIONS

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

Centenary Highway, South Ripley Pedestrian Overpass

Mr McCallum, from 1,093 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a safe pedestrian overpass over the Centenary Highway at South Ripley.

Moreton Bay Region, Pool Shade Covers

Hon. Ryan, from 419 petitioners, requesting the House to enhance sun protection at council owned, public pools in the Moreton Bay Region by installing more extensive shade covers.

Bundaberg, Intersection Upgrade

Mr Smith, from 513 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade the intersection of Elliott Heads Road, Sims Road and Churchward Street, Bundaberg.

Native Woodland Preservation

Mr Berkman, from 1,424 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to preserve native woodland.

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

Victoria Park

1,265 petitioners, requesting the House to allow Victoria Park to continue its operations and develop its accessibility for our community through our active transport network.

Freshwater Raintree

934 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to save the Freshwater Raintree.

Cocos Palms, Removal

458 petitioners, requesting the House to mandate the removal of Cocos Palms from all urban areas and educate the community on safe methods of disposal of deceased wildlife.

Domestic Violence Laws

928 petitioners, requesting the House to review and adapt laws in the best interest of victims of domestic violence, including limiting the number of reasonable adjournments to five adjournments per each domestic violence application.

Firearms

2,842 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to reclassify firearms and accessories.

Workplaces, Autism

585 petitioners, requesting the House to create state initiatives that support employers in making workplaces more inclusive and accessible, specifically targeting the hiring and retention of autistic adults and ensure mandatory, specialised autism training for frontline professionals in health, education and the criminal justice system.

State Planning Policy, Heat

1,571 petitioners, requesting the House to recognise heat as a natural hazard in State Planning Policy.

GST Laws

795 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to update GST laws.

Flying Fox, Culling

719 petitioners, requesting the House to reinstate the planned phasing out of flying fox culling by July 2026.

Rehomed Animals, Desexing

1,051 petitioners, requesting the House to legislate that all animals rehomed through Queensland rescue centres must be desexed prior to adoption.

Beerwah, Car Park Development

2,193 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure a comprehensive community consultation is conducted for the proposed resumption of the Beerwah Co-operative/Shell Service Station site for a 4-storey car park.

Vaping

678 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to prevent smoke and vaping aerosol from drifting to neighbouring private properties.

Renewable Energy

1,035 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to transition to a sustainable, low emission, renewable energy system.

Road Safety Education

2,322 petitioners, requesting the House to implement primary school level of road safety education for pedestrians and cyclists into the curriculum; and road safety education on the use of e-bikes and e-scooters in line with the current legal age of 16 years-of-age as part of the Year 10 curriculum.

Road Safety Rules

3,210 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to ensure road safety rules include motorised and non-motorised road users.

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—

24 April 2026—

[606](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4404-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 333 petitioners, requesting the House to construct a new multistorey Proserpine Hospital

[607](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 18, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 December 2025 and 10 February 2026

[608](#) Queensland Ombudsman—Inspector of Detention Services: Brisbane Correctional Centre inspection report, April 2026

[609](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to a paper petition (4470-26), presented by the member for Hill, Mr Knuth, and an E-Petition (4393-26), sponsored by the member for Hill, Mr Knuth, from 478 and 773 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to deliver the construction of a safe, modern and resilient road infrastructure at Banyan Creek on the Tully-Mission Beach Road

27 April 2026—

[610](#) 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 (4369-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 294 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce a mandatory statutory competency requirement for underground mine supervisors

29 April 2026—

[611](#) Education, Arts and Communities Committee: Report No. 16, 58th Parliament—Consideration of Auditor-General Report 15: 2024-25—Education 2024

30 April 2026—

[612](#) Local Government, Small Business and Customer Service Committee: Report No. 10, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 December 2025 and 10 February 2026

1 May 2026—

[613](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 31, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 December 2025 and 10 February 2026

6 May 2026—

[614](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 25, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 10 December 2025 and 10 February 2026

7 May 2026—

[615](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to an E-Petition (4331-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,959 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce a Monday public holiday when ANZAC Day falls on a Saturday

8 May 2026—

[616](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 26, 58th Parliament—Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill 2026

[617](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 19, 58th Parliament—Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Fisheries Act 1994, Planning Act 2016:

Fisheries and Other Legislation (Aquaculture Authorities) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 36

Fisheries and Other Legislation (Aquaculture Authorities) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 36, explanatory notes

Fisheries and Other Legislation (Aquaculture Authorities) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 36, human rights certificate

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971:

State Development and Public Works Organisation (Taroom Trough Development Plan Works) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 37

State Development and Public Works Organisation (Taroom Trough Development Plan Works) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 37, explanatory notes

State Development and Public Works Organisation (Taroom Trough Development Plan Works) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 37, human rights certificate

Legal Profession Act 2007:

Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice 2026, No. 38

Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice 2026, No. 38, explanatory notes

Legal Profession (Society Rules) Amendment Notice 2026, No. 38, human rights certificate

Drugs Misuse Act 1986:

Drugs Misuse (Controlled Substances) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 39

Drugs Misuse (Controlled Substances) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 39, explanatory notes

Drugs Misuse (Controlled Substances) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 39, human rights certificate

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Act 2003:

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 40

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 40, explanatory notes

Manufactured Homes (Residential Parks) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 40, human rights certificate

Planning Act 2016, Regional Planning Interests Act 2014:

Planning and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 41

Planning and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 41, explanatory notes

Planning and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 41, 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*—

Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2025

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

‘Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2025’

Insert—

‘Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2026’

Appropriation (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2025

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

‘Appropriation (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2025’

Insert—

‘Appropriation (Supplementary 2024—2025) Bill 2026’

MEMBER’S PAPERS

The following member’s papers were tabled by the Clerk—


Member for Gaven (Hon. Scanlon)—

Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes: Erratum

Civil Liability (Holding Institutions Accountable for Child Abuse) Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights: Erratum

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Federal Budget

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.41 am): Queensland is one of the fastest growing states in the nation. More and more Australians are calling our state home. They are moving here for economic opportunities and to enjoy our lifestyle. Queensland plays a vital role in our country's economic success—from the resources sector to agriculture, from tourism operators and small businesses across the state to people preparing to host the world at the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. Queensland is the place to be. With growth comes pressure on roads, rail, housing, hospitals and community services. Queenslanders rightly expect the federal government to step up and invest in the infrastructure and services our state needs. I want to see the federal government back in our growing state by giving Queensland its fair share in tonight's federal budget.

Our government has been working hard to heal Queensland Labor's health crisis. Our Hospital Rescue Plan is driving the delivery of critical health infrastructure across the state: new hospitals, new expansions and new beds as promised, but there is more to do. The federal government must take responsibility for Australians stranded in our hospitals. A funding shortfall from the federal government has left patients, particularly elderly Australians, without suitable care options and languishing in hospital beds. We have been calling on the federal government to help these stranded Australians, but earlier in the year federal funding for residential aged care across the country did not include Queensland. Tonight's federal budget must include investment to increase the supply of aged care in this state and funds to help deliver a functioning NDIS.


We are also committed to making it easier for Queenslanders to own a home. Our \$2 billion Residential Activation Fund is already unlocking land right across the state to build our homes sooner, but we need federal funds to also flow to Queensland. Given our growth, the federal government needs to invest heavily in our state.

Queensland is leading the nation in critical minerals development. That is why I called on the Prime Minister to fund a number of projects in my recent National Press Club address. That includes expansions of key mines to increase production and investment in Queensland, and delivery of critical infrastructure that will help deliver those resources to market more quickly and reliably.

Queensland is also leading the nation with our work to open the Taroom Trough. Our Fuel Security Plan outlines a comprehensive set of actions to drill, refine and store more fuel right here in Queensland. A national crisis needs a national solution not national roadblocks. I look forward to hearing more details about the Australian Fuel Security and Resilience Package announced by the Prime Minister and how it will help fund vital projects in Queensland—projects that our government started working on well before this fuel crisis began.

Our government will always stand up for Queenslanders and fight for our fair share from the Commonwealth. This includes getting a better deal on the GST which reflects our unique challenges as a decentralised state to adequately support our schools, hospitals and essential services. Our government will continue standing up for Queensland and fighting for our fair share of federal funding. We will continue advocating for safer roads, stronger communities, more housing, better transport and economic opportunities for every corner of our state. I hope this federal budget will deliver for Queensland, as it should.

Federal Budget

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.44 am): Tonight the federal Treasurer will hand down one of the most important budgets in recent memory. It is a budget being delivered in a volatile global environment, with war in the Middle East driving pressure through not only fuel prices but also all markets and all budgets: household, business and government. It is being delivered after the Reserve Bank raised interest rates again, taking the cash rate to 4.35 per cent. It is being delivered at a time when Queensland families are already being hit by higher mortgage repayments, higher fuel costs, higher grocery bills and higher insurance premiums. It is being delivered by a federal Treasurer from Queensland. The question is very simple: will Jim Chalmers deliver for Queensland or will Queensland be overlooked again?


Queensland is a decentralised state, with communities from Coolangatta to Cape York, from Toowoomba to Townsville, from Mount Isa to Mackay and everywhere in between. That means our hospitals carry different pressures that require the federal government to address stranded Australians. We have already seen the federal government try to shift NDIS costs to Queenslanders, but the modelling provided was not worth the paper it was written on. Our roads and rail carry different freight that requires, for example, a genuine federal government commitment to 80-20 funding on the Bruce

Highway. Our energy network spans enormous distances that requires federal government investment in CopperString. Our infrastructure needs are national in scale which requires a GST carve-up that recognises that fact. After a decade of failure by those opposite which saw Queensland home ownership hit record lows and homelessness hit record highs, we need urgent funding to help restore the Australian dream of home ownership and deliver a safety net for those who need it most.

Queensland's coal, gas, agriculture, critical minerals and tourism industries underpin national prosperity. When the Prime Minister and Chris Bowen talk about the east coast gas market, they are talking about Queensland gas. Too often when Canberra writes the cheque Queensland is told to wait. That is not good enough. Queenslanders are already seeing the warning signs. In the very same week the Albanese government abandoned completion of the inland rail project from Melbourne to Brisbane, stopping inland rail from entering Queensland, Canberra is pouring another \$3.8 billion into the suburban rail loop in Melbourne. This would take the Albanese government's total contribution to Victoria's suburban rail project to around \$6 billion. This is \$6 billion dollars for suburban Melbourne while Queensland is told to wait for nationally significant infrastructure. It sends a very clear message that, under Labor, Victoria gets priority and Queensland gets excuses.

Tonight, Jim Chalmers must deliver Queensland's fair share. He will not admit that Queensland's GST is flowing south to fix the failures of southern states. While we call on Jim Chalmers to step up, we also call on the Queensland Leader of the Opposition to do likewise. He never picks up the phone to his federal mates to advocate for this state. Today he should—he must!—not for his party and not for Canberra but for Queensland. Tonight Queenslanders will know whether Labor backs Queensland or whether Queensland is simply on its own.

Federal Budget, Infrastructure

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.48 am): There is a real buzz in Queensland at the moment. Whether you are fleeing Victoria to come to Queensland or fleeing New South Wales, there is a real buzz. Houses are being built. Infrastructure is being built. This could all be at risk, with the federal budget handed down tonight, if the Albanese Labor government continues its Queensland cuts.

As highlighted by the honourable Treasurer, the inland rail project has been cut by the federal government. In fact, they are saying it is stopping in Parkes, New South Wales. Parkes is known for one thing and that is the greatest Elvis show, where they all get together. As far as their cut to the inland rail project is concerned, I would say to the Albanese government and to the federal Treasurer when he hands down his budget tonight: a little less conversation, a little more action in Queensland. I would also say that we are going in fighting the federal government for every dollar we can for Queensland infrastructure, including an 80-20 funding split on the entire Bruce Highway, infrastructure spend for the Olympic and Paralympic Games, road and rail projects such as faster rail from the Gold Coast to Brisbane and the Wave on the Sunshine Coast. We want to see money in the budget for all of these infrastructure projects, no matter where you live in Queensland.

All of that is at risk with the federal budget being handed down tonight. If we see federal Labor cuts like we have already seen put out—slightly—by the Labor Party in the past few days then it does not bode well for Queensland. What does bode well for Queensland is a Queensland LNP government that have the right priorities for Queensland's future. We are doing what we said we would do with the fresh start we promised Queenslanders. We believe in fuel security and sovereign capability. That is why the Premier and I recently released AFIP, the Accelerating Fuel Infrastructure Program, which is very similar to our Land Activation Program. We will utilise state land that is not being used at the moment. We are asking private proponents to come forward not only with refinery ideas but also, more importantly, with storage ideas. We have launched that program.


The only thing getting in the way of fuel security, storage and sovereign capability is the Labor Party—not only the federal Labor Party but also the state Labor Party. Has anyone in the state Labor opposition picked up the phone to their federal comrade Senator Murray Watt and said, 'Hey, just get out of the way! Muzza, get out of the way! Let the Queensland government get on with the job of drilling, refining and storing in Queensland.' That is what the Crisafulli government is all about.

Colleagues will remember when the opposition leader was the premier and put on a big show after the budget: 'We're going to go to Canberra and fight for Queensland's fair share. Team Queensland!' What happened to Team Queensland? I remember that trip well. He went to Kevin Rudd's daughter's book launch. I think the main reason he went to Canberra was to attend that book launch. I

suspect the reason he cannot run a Team Queensland argument now is that his team does not back him. To run a Team Queensland, you have to have a team behind you. You have to have a team that backs you and he just doesn't. He is a loner. He is out there all on his own. He has no backing. On this side of the House, things are completely different.

I would say to honourable colleagues that the other thing getting in the way of infrastructure is the CFMEU. Today I can advise the House that the CFMEU commission of inquiry is heading to Far North Queensland this week. They are going to look at the projects built in Far North Queensland to ascertain the cost blowouts and the budget blowouts overseen by the Labor Party. I wonder if the member for McConnel will get another dishonourable mention in testimony this week at the CFMEU royal commission. We will see. From Coolangatta to the cape, the corruption in the CFMEU went all the way to the top. The CFMEU commission of inquiry wants to hear from people in Far North Queensland because, no matter what project the Labor Party oversaw, costs blew out because of the dodgy deals done between the CFMEU and the former Labor government.

Training and Skills

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.52 am): Queensland is already seeing the results of what proper investment into skills and training can achieve. In 2025 the Crisafulli LNP government delivered a record number of apprenticeship completions, meaning more Queenslanders than ever before were qualified, skilled and ready to enter the workforce. Many of them began their apprenticeship journey during and post COVID, thanks to stimulus funding from the then federal Liberal National Party government. The Crisafulli government helped those future tradies—and the businesses that put them on—get to the finish line with measures like targeted wage subsidies and free apprenticeships.

The results we have delivered are testament to what happens when Canberra and Queensland work together to deliver proper funding for skills and training. Not only did we capitalise on that pipeline of potential; the Crisafulli government has also delivered a surge in the number of apprenticeship commencements to ensure we continue to turn the tide on Labor's skills shortage. So far this financial year we have delivered 10,381 new apprentices, and the bulk of them are in areas like construction, utilities and electrotechnology. In the Crisafulli government's first year, construction apprenticeships alone jumped almost six per cent and are on track to surge by more than 25 per cent this financial year. These are men and women who will build our stadiums, hospitals and homes as the Crisafulli government delivers the Queensland of the future.

A decade of decline under those opposite left apprentice numbers in dire straits. By late 2020, the number of Queenslanders taking up apprenticeships had fallen to levels not seen since the global financial crisis.


Mr SPEAKER: I remind members not to stand in front of cameras.

Ms BATES: I shudder to think how much worse the situation would have become under the Palaszczuk-Miles Labor government had the federal coalition not intervened. Last week in Eagle Farm I stood with my federal counterpart, Minister Andrew Giles, at TAFE where we announced a new construction tech centre of excellence to complement the Crisafulli government's new campuses in Petrie and Caloundra. I am thankful for the full-throated support the Albanese Labor government have given to the Crisafulli government's support for and expansion of TAFE. It is clear that they recognise that, in Queensland, we are the side of politics that supports TAFE, tradies and a skilled workforce.

Unlike those opposite, the Crisafulli LNP government understands how critical it is to ensure Queenslanders get skills today for a job tomorrow. We are delivering billions of dollars in infrastructure and programs to overcome the skills crisis Labor left behind. As Canberra prepares to shiver through another budget night, I call on the federal government to not leave Queenslanders in the cold but to properly fund the cost of fee-free TAFE. The reality is that the Queensland government pays more than 70 per cent of the cost of delivering the federal government's fee-free TAFE program. It is also imperative that the Albanese government thaws relations with business groups and properly funds incentives that will help employers keep their apprentices on.

We know that if the opportunities are there then Queenslanders will take them. We know that there are fantastic careers on offer for Queenslanders who undertake and complete apprenticeships. We know that good things can happen when Canberra and Queensland work together; however, unlike the member for Murrumba and his cronies, we are not afraid to take the fight to Canberra and demand that Queensland receives its fair share. The Crisafulli government is doing more than its share of the lifting and it is high time that Canberra picked up its part.

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): We know that all Queenslanders, whether they live at the cape or Coolangatta—farmers, miners, commuters, truck drivers—are all concerned about the cost of and accessibility to fuel across our state. That is why the Crisafulli government has been focused on developing short-, medium- and long-term solutions to ensure supply and increase our capacity to drill, refine and store fuel right here in Queensland.


We are the only state in the country that is taking this seriously. Well before this fuel security crisis began, energy sovereignty was on our agenda. In May of last year and again in March of this year, I released areas for oil and gas exploration across Queensland, including land in the Taroom Trough. All up, I released 21 new areas for oil and gas exploration. In February of this year, before the fuel crisis began, I announced that Omega had found oil in the Taroom Trough—forward thinking, forward planning. On Sunday, the Premier and I stood with BP to announce that we had fast-tracked their lease extension at their Bulwer Island facility, unlocking up to a \$100 million investment in additional fuel storage.

It is worth noting that I originally met with BP in January to discuss this proposal because fuel security was a priority then and it is No. 1, 2 and 3 on my agenda now. Anyone who believes that a country like ours and a state like Queensland that run on diesel are safe with 30 days supply needs a reality check. The lease extension at Bulwer will give BP the confidence it needs to progress its plans to refurbish five idle storage tanks, delivering 54 million litres of additional storage for diesel, gasoline and aviation fuels. Under the new lease, BP will have the option to almost double this with a further 49 million litres of capacity, or potentially construct new storage facilities. We have said that we are restoring our ability to drill, refine and store fuel in Queensland and we are getting it done. This project will increase fuel storage capacity at the facility by around 20 per cent, with works to begin next year.

We made a commitment to Queenslanders that we would pull every lever available to us to take back control of our fuel security. Last week we announced our new Accelerating Fuel Infrastructure Program, which is a joint-agency effort between the Office of the Coordinator-General and Economic Development Queensland. This program forms part of our Queensland Fuel Security Plan and will provide a coordinated framework for industry to put their proposals for new fuel refining and storage opportunities on the table.

We are the only state with a plan and the only state taking fuel security seriously, making the decisions that will return energy sovereignty to our state. That is why we believe we should be first through the door to access the Commonwealth's new \$10 billion fund to secure the nation's fuel and fertiliser security. Our message to the Commonwealth is that Queensland stands ready to co-invest. We are the only state with a plan—the only state taking action. Never again do we want to be at the end of a supply chain that sees Queenslanders suffer because they cannot get the fuel they need to do their jobs.

Hospitals, Ramping; Federal Budget, Aged Care

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (9.59 am): The Crisafulli LNP government promised Queenslanders that we would reduce ambulance ramping. Our latest quarter of data shows we are doing exactly what we said we would. We have delivered the lowest March quarter ramping since 2020, at 38 per cent. That follows the lowest December quarter ramping since December 2020. I contrast that with those opposite, who set and hold the worst ambulance ramping record for a quarter in Queensland, at 45.5 per cent—the worst ever, at 45.5 per cent. This is not a celebration but it is heartening, especially for all of our hardworking health workers who are working so hard to make these figures a reality. I want to thank them for the work they are doing because they are joining us in delivering for Queenslanders.

Our efforts are being hampered by federal Labor. They are not stepping up and delivering what they said they would. They are not providing the supports to stranded Australians who are stuck in our hospital system. Our last census revealed that there has been no improvement in the number of stranded Australians in Queensland. In fact, our latest census shows the numbers have become worse since February, with more than 1,400 patients now stuck in our hospital system who deserve to be looked after by the federal government in aged care or through NDIS funding. That number of stranded Australians has tripled under Anthony Albanese and Jim Chalmers. That is the record of the Albanese government—tripled.


On behalf of those stranded Australians and on behalf of those patients waiting to get into our hospitals, I again call on Jim Chalmers, a Queenslander, to properly fund aged care and the NDIS in tonight's budget. This is Jim Chalmers's opportunity to do the right thing. A little less friction and a bit more action would go a long way to helping those stranded Queenslanders. I have written to the federal health minister to outline that the Commonwealth announcements to date are nowhere near sufficient to address this issue. On top of the pain being caused to those stranded Australians, the cost is over \$3.3 million a day to Queenslanders.

Current projections indicate that Queensland alone will require a further 30,000 aged-care places by 2036-37—in a decade. This challenge dwarfs the 5,000 beds per annum that have been offered by federal Labor across the entire nation. Contrast that. Not only are their aged-care investments insufficient to meet Queensland's needs; Labor's cuts to private health insurance rebates for older Australians are just going to make things worse.

We are ready to roll out programs to tackle this crisis, including Maintenance in the Home and our Long-Stay Rapid Response model, but these do require the Commonwealth to invest. When Queensland was recently left out of the Commonwealth's residential aged care capital announcement, I wrote again to the health minister to outline the opportunities across the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast, the Wide Bay and the Burnett where developments are ready to roll. I have met with these people. They are ready to build.

Queensland is doing more than its fair share. I again call on federal Labor to use tonight's budget to act appropriately, to care for older Australians and to properly fund aged care and the NDIS for the benefit of all Queenslanders—all those who need care and proper care.

Federal Budget, Disability Services

 **Hon. AJ CAMM** (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.03 am): This evening, as the federal Treasurer hands down a budget and before a single dollar is announced, Queenslanders living with a disability will be sitting with anxiety and unanswered questions, and they deserve robust answers about the future of their supports. For months Queenslanders have waited for information to see how the federal Labor government is going to pull services and crucial funding and what it is going to do in terms of plan rollovers and planned cuts under the NDIS.

As the disability services minister, it is humbling to sit alongside people with lived experience and share with them their experience. After convening a round table recently, I heard nothing but frustration, anxiety and disappointment from those with lived experience, as well as from providers and disability advocates. Right now, confidence in the NDIS is being undermined by dodgy providers who are exploiting vulnerable Queenslanders and treating taxpayer money like a blank cheque. Every taxpayer dollar wasted to fraud or exploitation is a dollar taken away from a Queenslanders in genuine need. The NDIS was created to support Queenslanders and Australians living with a disability to live fuller and more independent lives.

All states and territories agree and understand that the scheme must be sustainable; however, the reform, as a cost-shifting exercise, is one we do not support. Sustainability cannot come at the expense of participants and our most vulnerable, and it also should not mean that vulnerable children and families are left worse off.

The Crisafulli government supports genuine reform that strengthens the NDIS and protects those who rely upon it. Changes must start with ensuring taxpayer money reaches the Queenslanders it is intended to support, not shifting the responsibility to the states that have no systems in place nor a reasonable funding envelope to create them. Families deserve confidence that therapies and supports are being delivered ethically, properly and in the interests of their loved ones. These participants are children in need of early intervention, parents trying to navigate a complex system, young people seeking independence and families already carrying the enormous emotional and financial pressure due to cost of living under the Albanese government.


Ahead of tonight's federal budget, the Albanese government and Jim Chalmers have an opportunity to step up, to show leadership, to do the right thing and to explain how they intend to restore integrity and confidence in the NDIS. Unlike the way they have treated the states in the policy delivered via the Press Club, families are entitled to respect and timely answers.

Queenslanders deserve a scheme that is centred on the people it was designed to support. Cost shifting and neglect is not reform. The federal budget should deliver answers to a sustainable NDIS,

not raise more questions and anxiety. We need answers as to how the federal government plans to make the NDIS sustainable.

To disability advocates and their families, rest assured the Crisafulli government will always stand up for those most vulnerable in our community and will ensure we take their voice to Canberra.

Federal Budget, Road and Rail Infrastructure

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.07 am): Tonight, Queenslanders will be waiting with bated breath as the federal Labor Treasurer Jim Chalmers hands down the 2026 federal budget. While I would like to think the federal Treasurer, a Queensland, will not forget about his home state, I must admit I am not holding out hope. Like many Queenslanders, I have been following the recent media coverage where it was announced that the Albanese Labor government would be abandoning any plans to build inland rail to the border and beyond to Toowoomba. What was envisaged as the Commonwealth's biggest rail project in a century is now dead in the water, stopping at Parkes in New South Wales. Once again, Queenslanders will be worse off because of Labor.


Meanwhile, the federal government has announced an additional \$3.8 billion for Melbourne's suburban rail loop to support their Labor mates in Victoria who are facing the polls in a couple of months. If the federal Labor government gives extra billions to their Victorian Labor mates and does not give extra financial support to rail projects like the Wave on the Sunshine Coast or upgrades to the Mount Isa Line, it will be a slap in the face for all Queenslanders.

The Crisafulli government is also fighting for Queensland's fair share when it comes to our roads. One of our most important roads is the Bruce Highway. That is why we fought so hard to restore 80-20 funding that was reduced to 50-50 under the federal Labor government, a reduced deal that was signed off by those opposite and would cost Queenslanders billions. That is why it is so disappointing to hear today's announcement that the federal government will only fund 50 per cent of the upgrade over the Pine River between the Gateway Motorway and Dohles Rocks Road. We fought hard to restore 80-20 funding and we will not be giving up like the former Labor state government did.

If 80-20 funding was all right to fund roads in other states, like the M1 Pacific Motorway, then it should be the standard by which the Bruce Highway is funded here in Queensland. We will continue to fight for 80-20 funding because that is what federal Labor promised and that is what Queenslanders deserve. Queenslanders in every part of this state have been let down by Labor governments at all levels for far too long—Labor governments that forget about them and take them for granted.

Young Queenslanders like Elijah Green from Immanuel Lutheran College, who is in the gallery with us today, deserve to have governments at all levels who will fund and build the infrastructure required to support our growing population here in Queensland, as they have in other states. I am calling on the federal Labor Treasurer to not take people in Queensland for granted tonight. Fund these critical projects and work with us to deliver them for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

Federal Budget, Social and Affordable Housing

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (10.10 am): Our state is experiencing enormous housing pressures after a decade of Labor's actions, which led to supply not keeping pace with demand. That is why the Crisafulli government is focused on one thing: delivery—delivery of more social homes, delivery of more community homes and delivery of more housing supply of all types across our state. We cannot do it alone. The federal government's Housing Australia Future Fund was designed to help states deliver more social and affordable housing.

The contrast between what the former Labor government secured in round 1 of the fund and what the Crisafulli government secured in round 2 could not be clearer. Under HAFF round 1, negotiated by the member for Gaven, Queensland secured just 10 per cent of the available funding—nowhere near our fair share. Under the Crisafulli government, Queensland secured a 20 per cent share through HAFF round 2. That is double the proportion of social homes secured compared with Labor's record from round 1. We are still doing the heavy lifting for the projects that we did get federal funding for. The federal government is only funding a third of these HAFF round 2 homes. We will be fighting to get even more social and community homes funded out of round 3 than we secured through HAFF round 2.

To get more homes built faster, we must have a genuine partnership with the community housing sector. That is why I am proud to share with the House today that 72 per cent of social and affordable


homes in our pipeline are now being delivered in partnership with community housing providers. Under those opposite, after their decade of decline community homes sat at just 16 per cent. That is the difference between a government that talked about partnerships and a government that is empowering the sector to deliver through the right funding and regulation. This government is focused on actually getting homes built, not on having hypothetical houses gathering dust in undeliverable planning approvals. Work is already underway on our projects under HAFF round 2 in Everton Park, Redcliffe and Torquay, with further projects progressing across South-East Queensland and our regions. We will continue working constructively with the Commonwealth and community housing providers to secure the outcomes Queenslanders deserve.

It is incredibly concerning that there does not seem to be a single report about a single new dollar for social and community housing in tonight's federal budget, especially when HAFF round 3 is already oversubscribed with far more projects than it can fund. For a Prime Minister who talks a big game on social housing, that is simply not good enough. We need support for young people experiencing or at risk of homelessness and for new opportunities in home ownership for first home buyers. Housing pressures across our state are being felt differently by different cohorts of Queenslanders. Some young Queenslanders just need somewhere safe as a foundation to get their life on track. For others, it is about getting a foothold in the housing market for the very first time.

That is why the Crisafulli government is taking a broad approach to the delivery of housing supply and housing support. It is backed by our record \$5.6 billion investment into delivering new social and community homes. We will be fighting for our fair share from Canberra. We are unlocking land. We are cutting red tape. We are securing our state's housing foundations. Unlike those opposite, this government is focused on outcomes, not announcements; on delivery, not delay; and on ensuring more Queenslanders can have a place to call home.

PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS


Comments by Member for Ipswich, Clarification and Apology

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (10.14 am): Mr Speaker, I wish to clarify a statement I made on 26 March in the debate on the supplementary appropriation bills relating to 700 Queensland Rail workers losing their jobs. I am advised and can clarify for the House that I should have said that 700 workers risked their hours being reduced, not that 700 workers would lose their jobs. I unreservedly apologise to the House.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will have order.


Comments by Member for Stretton, Clarification and Apology

 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (10.15 am): Mr Speaker, I wish to clarify a statement I made on 25 March in the debate on the private member's motion relating to the sacking of 700 rail workers. I am advised and can clarify for the House that I should have said that 700 workers risked their hours being reduced, not that 700 workers would lose their jobs. I unreservedly apologise to the House.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I expect these personal explanations to be heard in silence. There are occasions when both sides of the House have to make them.

Comments by Member for Lytton, Clarification and Apology

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (10.15 am): Mr Speaker, I wish to clarify a statement I made during an adjournment speech on 25 March 2026 relating to Queensland Rail workers being cut. I am advised and can clarify for the House that I should have said that 700 workers risked their hours being reduced, not that 700 workers would lose their jobs. I unreservedly apologise to the House.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

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

Paradise Dam

Mr MILES (10.16 am): My question is to the Minister for Water. I table a letter from former LNP deputy premier and now Sunwater board chair Jeff Seeney that outlines that the rebuilding of Paradise Dam would not go ahead. Why did the letter have to be leaked to the media for Queenslanders to find out that the Crisafulli LNP government had no plans to rebuild Paradise Dam?

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 30 April 2026, from the Chair of Sunwater Board, Mr Jeff Seeney, to the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, Hon. Ann Leahy, and the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, Hon. Ros Bates, regarding a draft Business Case for Paradise Dam.

Ms LEAHY: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question in relation to water. We know that water is not the opposition leader's beverage of choice.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

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

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asks that you withdraw.

Ms LEAHY: I withdraw. Let me first say in plain English—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We are not going to degenerate into what we had to tolerate at the last sitting. I am going to start warning members on both sides of the House, and I will be warning heavily. Minister, you heard the question.

Ms LEAHY: Let me say first to those members opposite: our government made an election commitment to rebuild Paradise Dam. That is exactly what we will be doing. Let me step through some of the absolutely shameful things that Labor has done with Paradise Dam. Let me talk about Labor's biggest infrastructure fail that we have seen in this state's history. Let's go through some of that history with regard to Paradise Dam. Firstly, Labor built a dodgy dam.

Mr Langbroek: The only one they built.

Ms LEAHY: It is the only dam they built and there were major issues found with the processes of former Labor governments. Secondly, Labor tore down their dodgy dam. Local irrigators tell me that the Labor government did it with no respect and no consultation. Growers in the Wide Bay recall receiving an email at four in the morning, letting them know that water allocations from Paradise Dam were being slashed. Then Labor announced they were building an entirely new wall. The board of Sunwater has written to me with serious concerns about Labor's approach, advising me that Labor asked the consultants to justify this decision in the detailed business case after Labor had already made their political announcement.

We made an election promise that we would rebuild Paradise Dam. This morning I met with stakeholders to reconfirm our commitment.

(Time expired)

Paradise Dam

Mr SMITH: My question is to the Minister for Water. On 5 June 2025 the Deputy Premier said, 'We support rebuilding Paradise Dam and we are not going to wait for the business case.' Is it correct that the Crisafulli LNP government will rebuild Paradise Dam regardless of the outcome of the business case and the decision of the Sunwater board?

Ms LEAHY: I thank the member for the question. Let me repeat what I have said: Labor has absolutely—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The question has been asked. I could not hear the minister. The minister has the call.

Ms LEAHY: I thank the member for the question, but they really need to look at the history of Labor when it comes to Paradise Dam.

Mr Perrett: Look at Traveston.

Ms LEAHY: I take the interjection from the member for Gympie in relation to Traveston Dam.

Mr Langbroek: Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro: what about that?

Ms LEAHY: Let's have a look at Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro as well. Labor cannot walk away from the fact that they built a dodgy dam. They cannot walk away from the fact that they tore down their dodgy dam with no respect and no consultation. They also they hid the cost blowout of Paradise Dam from taxpayers—\$3.2 billion. It was one of 11 water infrastructure projects that had blown out, totalling \$6.5 billion. Labor never revealed that cost to the people prior to the election.

It is a shameful approach that we have seen from Labor. Compare that with our approach. We said we would rebuild Paradise Dam. This morning I met with the stakeholders to reconfirm that commitment to the Wide Bay region. We have designated this project as a coordinated project to ensure it is not hindered by unnecessary red tape. I have written to Sunwater to confirm our government's expectations—

Mr Mellish interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Aspley is warned.

Ms LEAHY:—that the detailed business case needs to provide the comprehensive options and analysis to ensure that the community has confidence and that there is respect for taxpayers' money.

Labor treat this as a political football. They could not build the dam: they built a dodgy dam. Then they had to tear it down. When we talk about business cases, we will take that business case. We will look forward to that business case. Labor need to do a lot better than their fearmongering.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Before I go to the next question, the members for Gladstone, McConnel and Bulimba are all joining the warning list. There was way too much chatter amongst that answer.

Tourism and Events; NRL Magic Round

Mr CHIESA: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. What actions is the Crisafulli LNP government taking to make Queensland the events capital of the country including delivering the future of NRL Magic Round, and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to start by thanking the honourable member for the question on two fronts. Firstly, tourism is very important to his electorate and so are events. The other thing is that I acknowledge his lifetime of interest in rugby league. He is a former caller and a former second rower at Herbert River—someone who loves the sport and loves his region. I want to thank him for what is a very good question.

The honourable member asked about our focus on events. I make the observation about the work of the tourism minister in ensuring this state will be the events capital of this country. Everything we are doing is focusing on that. As part of Destination 2045 we have an unrelenting focus on ensuring that events come to this state. Have a look at what we did with the Edinburgh Military Tattoo. What a great event! Team Queensland got behind it and delivered it like no-one else before.

The honourable member, though, did ask about Magic Round. He is right: Magic Round deserves to be in Queensland. Magic Round is something that could only be staged in Queensland. Yes, the honourable member is right: there are other states circling at the moment. My message to those other states is: 'Hands off. Back up. It belongs in Queensland.' I want to send a clear message to those other states that are circling: 'Never get between a Queenslander and a rugby league field because it won't end well for you.' This is the state where Magic Round will be.

My vision for Magic Round is not only to secure it but also to take it to the next level. It is absolutely vital that, as part of those negotiations with the NRL, we lock it in and take it to the next level. The negotiations which have been going on for some time have been robust, yes, but they have been very professional. It is essential that both parties come to the realisation that Magic Round belongs right here in Queensland.

We are on the edge of something very special in this state. Locking in Magic Round and taking it to the next level will ensure that it kicks up a gear. I want to get a deal done—so does the NRL and so does every Queenslander. I say to the honourable member: in this state there is a real buzz at the moment. The honourable Deputy Premier made that point. There is a real buzz in Queensland. People are looking to this state and they are seeing the opportunities. Part of that is the events and how people are feeling about this state. Part of that is having a long-term vision about delivering infrastructure. I have spoken before about wanting to see upgrades to Suncorp Stadium to ensure we can lift that venue to the next level. We speak about grassroots sports, but Magic Round is a key part of who we are as a

state. This is the only place that could do it. I remain confident that the future of Magic Round will be locked in right here in the state that matters the most.

Paradise Dam

Mr POWER: My question is to the Minister for Water. Will the water minister sack the Sunwater board for intervening in the detailed business case and unanimously deciding not to rebuild Paradise Dam?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I expect to be able to hear the minister when she gives the answer.

Ms LEAHY: I thank the honourable member for the question about water. It is interesting that in the last 19 months members opposite have asked only one question about water. It is definitely not their beverage of choice, that is for sure. We know their history in relation to Paradise Dam. They built a dodgy dam. It was the biggest infrastructure fail. We know that they had to tear down their dodgy dam. We know that they left Queenslanders with some of the highest water bills in this country. We know that they wanted to cut funding to the river improvement trust—something we restored, with a 10 per cent increase. Labor does not have a very good record at all. When it comes to the likes of Rookwood Weir, they were over budget and over time.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw to your attention that this question contains no preamble and was very direct in seeking a relevant answer, so my point of order is on relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: It is a valid point of order. You heard the question, Minister.

Ms LEAHY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have confidence in the board. They are doing the work they are tasked to do. They have expressed concern in relation to what happened under the previous Labor government. They are entitled to do that. They do have serious concerns about Labor's approach. I am advised that Labor asked consultants to justify the decision after Labor made a political announcement around the detailed business case. I encourage the board to do the work they are doing because it is exposing the failures of the Labor Party. It is particularly important that we do know that information.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr Smith interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge and member for Bundaberg!

Ms LEAHY: We know that they do not have a very good record when it comes to water.

A government member interjected.

Ms LEAHY: Yes. The only water infrastructure they delivered was a weir, and that was over budget and over time. We have confidence in the Sunwater board and we will continue to work with the Sunwater board, as we do with all of our boards. It is important that we do that. The sensitivity is coming from the Labor Party because the board has exposed some of—

(Time expired)

Infrastructure

Mr LEE: My question to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering the infrastructure Queenslanders expect, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any other jurisdictions that are failing Queenslanders' expectations?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Hervey Bay for the question. If we talk about infrastructure in the Wide Bay area, we can look at the Residential Activation Fund delivering houses for the people of Wide Bay, including the people of Hervey Bay. I will be there soon turning sod and I will be in Maryborough with the honourable member, John Barounis, turning sod as we deliver the Residential Activation Fund all across the state. The Crisafulli government believes in delivering infrastructure no matter where you live. We were elected on a platform to build infrastructure. In fact, our budget includes \$117 billion in infrastructure over the next four years. It is the biggest capital pipeline that Queensland has ever seen.

This morning the Labor Party are asking questions about dams. They have a sad history on dams in this state. Not only do the ones they build bust; the ones they plan do not get up because they never

consulted with communities like Gympie and the Mary Valley on the Traveston dam. They never did water security. If you look at the other dams they tried to deliver, they said they could not disclose the cost of the Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro dam, but when we were elected we were able to disclose the cost in two days. It was a \$37 billion hit to the budget that they hid from Queenslanders, and I say to honourable members that they knew it. They knew the cost and they deliberately hid it from Queenslanders during the election.

Tonight is the federal budget. It is time for the federal Albanese government to give Queensland its fair share of infrastructure spend. It is time to fund the Bruce Highway 80-20, not to try and go back on the 80-20 funding split to 50-50. No! We got a deal through the community for 80-20. It was the Labor Party in government that said they could only get 50-50 from their federal Labor comrades. It was the Crisafulli government that said, 'That is not acceptable. We want an 80-20 funding split, as it always was,' and we got it. The honourable Minister for Transport and Main Roads demanded an 80-20 funding split for these projects in his press conference today, and not only for the Bruce Highway. We want roads, we want rail projects, we want an investment in dams where communities want them and we want water security. I congratulate the Minister for Water on the effort she has put in to try and fix—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, member for Waterford.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Labor Party's water policy on dams was like the Netherlands': they had to put their finger in the dike because it was going to burst. Their program on water security had no platform of success. The only dam they built fell down. We are getting on with the job. We are building infrastructure. We are fighting the federal government for Queensland's fair share. It is about time the opposition leader picked up the phone to his federal comrade and said, 'Mate—comrade—give Queensland its fair share.' He was all talk in government but he is silent in opposition with—

(Time expired)

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Minister for Sport. The Cabinet Handbook states, 'Each minister acts jointly with and on behalf of Cabinet colleagues' and cabinet decisions reflect collective conclusions. Did the minister declare his current and former relationship with Minister Camm when Olympics matters relating to the Whitsunday electorate were considered by cabinet?

Mr MANDER: I thank the member for the question. This issue has been canvassed comprehensively over the last week, both within the media and in general conversation. I have addressed this issue on a number of occasions. In fact, I am pretty sure these questions were asked in estimates hearings last year as well. All I will say again is what I have said consistently. I met with the Integrity Commissioner on a number of occasions, had relevant discussions about potential conflicts of interest and made the appropriate declarations at the appropriate times. There is nothing more to say. There is one final issue that is relevant to the question: the Deputy Premier made the final decision on venue locations for the games.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Miller is warned. I called for order.

Infrastructure

Mr HUTTON: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering the best value for money for Queenslanders on major projects, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any instances during a decade of decline when there may have been an inappropriate influence over major projects, putting their delivery at risk?

Mr BLEIJIE: I want to thank the honourable member for Keppel for the question because it gives me a great chance to formalise the attack on the CFMEU and the influence the Labor Party had over the CFMEU. This cost constituents in his electorate about 30 per cent extra on government projects, including the Townsville stadium and hospitals, because they retrospectively applied BPIC, Best Practice Industry Conditions—or, as we know it, Labor's CFMEU tax—to projects and it cost Queenslanders 30 per cent more. We have had testimony all through the commission of inquiry with

respect to the CFMEU tax that the Labor Party did with BPIC. The implementation of that tax, which the member for Springwood retrospectively put on construction sites in Queensland, led to cost blowouts, including a 30 per cent cost blowout on those sorts of projects.

If we want to talk about influencing, we not only had ministers in the former Labor government influencing the practices of the CFMEU which led to the blowouts; we also see lots of other influences happening and it is an influence that Queenslanders should be aware of. This is a matter of public policy and public interest that Queenslanders should be aware of. In the last couple of weeks, the Labor Leader of the Opposition has had a lot to say on this, and I say to him that he has set a new standard about the private lives of all MPs that those in the Labor shadow ministry now have to live up to as well. The Leader of the Opposition has said that this is a test of leadership, and this is one of a few things that I agree with him about. It is a test of his leadership and whether he will apply the same standard and threshold to his own team that he now conveniently expects others on this side of the chamber to do.

We have all heard rumours, innuendoes and stories, and I want to refer to an article in terms of the standards that the Labor Party has now set. This *Courier-Mail* article states—

The ... government has argued that several past appointments can be tied to the spouses of Labor politicians, including Therese Oxenham, wife of Opposition Deputy Leader Cameron Dick ... all of whom assisted the Fitzgerald Inquiry.

If that is the test—

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

Government members interjected.

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

Mr DICK: That press article has been edited and withdrawn by the *Courier-Mail*. I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier and I respectfully ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asked that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. I table the *Courier-Mail* article for the benefit of the honourable member.

Tabled paper: Media article, undated, titled 'Crime panel's link to cabinet 'No issue' insists Gerber'.

What was his conflict of interest management plan? Did he release his conflict of interest management plan? Did he release his advice to the Integrity Commissioner when he was the treasurer of the state?

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Are you taking personal offence?

Mr DICK: I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier and I respectfully ask that he withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asked that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. He also thanked one Therese Oxenham in *Hansard* for preparing a bill that he was responsible for as the attorney-general. That is his wife. Did he absent himself from CBRC decisions? Did he release his conflict of interest management plan? Who can forget the rumours going around—

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier about my wife and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and asked that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Who could forget the rumours going around about the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Bundaberg in an alleged relationship when the member for Pine Rivers was a minister? Did they disclose that publicly? Is it true? Did they get a conflict of interest management plan? Did they get Integrity Commissioner advice? This is the new standard the opposition have set, so come clean and tell everyone about the conflict that existed when you were a minister.

(Time expired)

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for Sport. In October 2025 on Camm Connect the member for Whitsunday said in relation to relocating Olympic sailing that it was 'a tremendous win, one I have fought hard to secure'. On Wednesday last week she said that there was 'no advocacy on my part'. Did the member for Whitsunday fight hard to secure sailing in her electorate from the minister or was there no advocacy on her part?

Mr Lee interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hervey Bay, you know that questions are heard in silence, so you are warned.

Mr MANDER: Unlike the deputy opposition leader, I will not take offence at a question when we are being transparent and open about the issues that have been canvassed before.

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

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has taken personal offence and he has asked that you withdraw.

Mr Bleijie: Those in glass houses.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier by way of interjection—

Mr Bleijie: I didn't say him.

Mr DICK: Yes, you did. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not name the member; I said 'those in glass houses'. I am going to name a lot of them today but I did not name him then.

Mr SPEAKER: That point of order is valid. There was nobody named.

Mr MANDER: As I said before, it is important to understand who has what responsibilities in the government with regard to the staging of the Olympic Games. It is quite clear and it has been explained on many occasions that the Deputy Premier is the person and GIICA that are responsible for the locations and the infrastructure that is required for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. My responsibilities lie with the staging of the games. They are two completely separate functions. It cannot be said more clearly than that. I cannot speak for the member for Whitsunday, but there was no advocacy to me about staging it in the Whitsundays because she would have been wasting her time advocating or lobbying me because I was not the person with the authority who made that decision. I will say this: who would argue anyhow about sailing being at the Whitsundays? What person could possibly argue—

Government members interjected.

Mr MANDER: No offence to Townsville, because that is a very attractive place as well, but who is going to argue about staging the games in the Whitsundays because it would be the most unbelievable advertisement to the world about our tourism industry? They can continue to follow this line of questioning, but we could not be clearer with regard to who makes what decisions.

CFMEU Inquiry

Mr BOOTHMAN: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Given the concerning testimony being heard at the CFMEU commission of inquiry about cosy relationships between former ministers and the violent union, is the Deputy Premier aware of any other workplace relationships that Queenslanders should be aware of?

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the honourable member for the question. I was not going to go there, but because I got the question and I know the facts I have to answer the question. The member is right to ask about the cosy relationships between former Labor ministers and the CFMEU because it is being borne out now in the CFMEU royal commission of inquiry. For 10 years, whistleblowers were telling the Queensland Labor government that there was something not right with the Office of Industrial Relations, the CFMEU and the minister. We called it out time and time again in the House and every time we called it out, just like the member for Inala is doing now, they would always back the CFMEU. The Labor Party would always defend and back the CFMEU and they would accuse us of just politicising the CFMEU. There is egg on all their faces now with what we have seen.

The member also asks about relationships that should be exposed. We know that a very high profile relationship was exposed in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* and that was between former minister Mark Bailey and former minister Meaghan Scanlon. That was a published relationship. I did see some of the comments made by the member for Gaven. In that article she is quoted as stating—

But I think most people don't really ask those sort of questions. At a professional setting (like Parliament), everyone is just focused on getting the job done. We really don't talk about people's personal lives. We're there to do the job.

The member for Gaven was on the news last night talking about people's personal lives. They said in that Gold Coast newspaper article that they first met in 2016. I am going to table a photo from 2015 because they are on record as saying they met in 2016.

Tabled paper: Extract from social media, dated 30 August 2015, featuring a post by the member for Miller, Hon. Mark Bailey MP, in relation to a Young Labor QLD function.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, that is not a prop. Table it.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. This quote is from 2015 and it is from the Facebook page of former minister Mark Bailey himself. He said—

Great to chat with & listen to @YoungLaborQLD today with @ShannonFentiman @nikkiaboyd @donaldjonbrown3 @MurrayWatt. In the picture is a young Meaghan Scanlon at 22 years of age and a 47-year-old Mark Bailey in 2015.

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the insinuations, which are false.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you take personal offence?

Mr BAILEY: I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. The question for the two former ministers—the members for Gaven and Miller—is: did they disclose their relationship at the time they entered the relationship? Their story now does not stack up. I would say bring on more questions about this because I have to talk about the members for Springwood, Waterford, Logan, Toohey, Mansfield and many others. I would say that is the standard the Labor Party now sets. We are dealing with a new threshold from the Labor Leader of the Opposition because he is so desperate.

(Time expired)

Public Transport

Mr STEVENS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering public transport options for all Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any deals that may have been kept from Queenslanders during the decade of decline?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Mermaid Beach for his question. It looks like those opposite forgot it was question time and they were supposed to ask us questions. It looks like those opposite forgot it was their turn to ask the government questions and hold us to account. It is always the member for Mermaid Beach who is quick on his feet. He stood up and asked a question and there was silence—radio silence—from those opposite. They have run out of questions—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I know the member for Buderim has a loud voice, but there is no reason he should need to use it in this House.

Mr MICKELBERG: They have run out of questions. They are an opposition so devoid of substance they forgot to ask the government questions. The member for Mermaid Beach asked me how we are delivering public transport options for all Queenslanders after some of the cosy relationships and some of the cosy deals from those opposite. We have seen some of those in the member's patch on Gold Coast Light Rail stage 3 and the CFMEU holding Queenslanders to ransom, blowing out costs on projects under former ministers like the member for Miller and the member for Aspley. Queenslanders paid the price because of their cosy deals. Under our government, we are making 50-cent fares permanent. Queenslanders have saved \$563 million since the LNP made 50-cent fares permanent. There has been a 22 per cent uplift in patronage since the LNP made 50-cent fares permanent—a great LNP initiative.

Some of the other cosy relationships we have seen on the Gold Coast—and the Deputy Premier just spoke about them—were in relation to the member for Gaven and the member for Miller, and they have spoken about that relationship in the media. Some legitimate questions need to be answered by

those opposite in relation to their conduct on the demand-responsive transport project, the trial almost exclusively in the electorate of Gaven. That was a 2020 election commitment that those opposite made and then implemented. I give credit to them: it is one of the few they did actually follow through on.

Mrs Frecklington: I wonder why.

Mr MICKELBERG: One must ask the question why. It must be great advocacy by the member for Gaven. The question is: who suggested the election commitment? Was it the member for Gaven? Was it the member for Miller? Was there any advocacy between the two individuals? Why was Gaven the only electorate that got a demand-responsive transport election commitment? Why only Gaven? Why not Mermaid Beach or Coomera or any of the other electorates on the Gold Coast? Why did the media statement released under the member for Miller's name as the minister responsible only quote the member for Gaven? Was this part of a conflict-of-interest management plan?

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find those comments personally offensive and I ask they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence and has asked that you withdraw.

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw.

(Time expired)

Homelessness Services

Ms BOLTON: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth. Can the minister advise whether homelessness and outreach service providers such as Youturn in Noosa, whose contracts expire in six weeks, on 30 June, will have contract renewal confirmations as soon as possible to provide continuity and reassurance for staff and those in need of their services?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Noosa for the question. I commend her for achieving the core competency of a member of parliament in asking a question in this House—something the opposition has not managed to do.

With regard to the important issue the member for Noosa raises, I firstly want to thank all of our specialist homelessness service workers across our state. For too long they have been operating with uncertainty in their funding. Under the former government they were given multiyear service agreements but not multiyear funding agreements. This meant that the service agreements were not worth the paper they were written on. Every June they would get to a point where they just were not sure they would have a job the following month.

Mrs Poole: No security.

Mr O'CONNOR: They had absolutely no security. I will take that interjection from the member for Mundingburra. We are committed to turning this around and reducing homelessness in our state and supporting more of those at risk of homelessness.

For the information of the member for Noosa, as part of this commitment my department has recently begun significant recontracting activity valued at around \$650 million. That is thanks to our first budget last year which for the first time included multiyear funding arrangements for these services. This funding supports 201 funding schedules across 89 service agreements with these important organisations that deliver these services across our state. In the Noosa electorate this is \$26 million alone for services and products. That is on top of our outreach teams who do regular outreach in Tewantin, Cooroy, Noosaville, Noosa Heads, Pomona and Peregian Beach alongside the state funded homelessness services targeting locations where people are known to be frequently sleeping rough.

We are also supporting an organisation, Youturn, in Noosa to deliver services in the member's electorate. It delivers about 15 places of supported accommodation for the Queenslanders who need it most. This is on top of the wide range of products and services that we have available for the Queenslanders who need help with housing from our private rental market support, our bond loans, our rental security subsidies and our rental grants.

To give the services that the member is advocating for the certainty they deserve and to ensure service continuity, our department has issued three-year funding schedules for these homelessness programs to extend service agreements to 30 June 2029. This longer term funding approach will enable these providers to plan for the future and to continue delivering the critical support they provide to Queenslanders in need. We have already communicated with providers regarding recurrent homelessness funding. I have personally seen some of those letters go out and in my travels I have seen some providers who are very excited about this. We remain steadfast in our commitment to

addressing homelessness and ensuring more vulnerable Queenslanders have access to the support they need as we work towards finding them a place to call home.

(Time expired)

Housing Supply

Mr LISTER: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering a place to call home for all Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any deals that Queenslanders may not have known about during a decade of decline?

Mr O'CONNOR: I thank the member for Southern Downs for his question and, after a decade of decline under the former Labor government, I am very excited to tell the member that we are turning things around. We have our social and affordable housing pipeline up to just shy of 6,400 homes underway across our state, which is around 4,000 higher than the pipeline that we inherited. The Deputy Premier is unlocking land all across our state with the RAF funding infrastructure projects that have been holding back housing for far too long. There could not be a clearer contrast to the approach of the former Labor government. Those opposite loved issuing housing mandates that never delivered any homes and that in fact were a massive disincentive to build homes at all.

In the middle of all of those failed mandates was the former failed and now shadow housing minister, the member for Gaven. When the member for Gaven was housing minister and planning minister she loved nothing more than claiming that she was building social and affordable housing. There was not a council across our state that she did not railroad. There was not a community across our state that she did not ignore. There was not a developer that she did not put a binding mandate on that was undeliverable. The member was determined to mandate social and affordable housing one media release at a time and anyone who stood in the way was declared as a NIMBY by the member for Gaven, but there was one very small corner of Queensland which apparently was immune from social and affordable housing mandates. There was one NIMBY that the member for Gaven was very fond of, and that of course in this instance means 'not in Miller's back yard'.

On land zoned for residential development in Annerley in the member for Miller's electorate, a MID was put forward in his seat on a site that was near a hospital, near shops and near transport. The member for Gaven's own department asked for social and affordable housing to be investigated for this MID, but in the final approval signed by the member for Gaven in August 2024 the member was happy for it to be over the height and happy for it to be a commercial development in a residential zone, but was there any social or affordable housing in that approval? Not one home! In fact, there were homes onsite that were removed for this commercial development. What a hypocrite! Something must have happened for the member for Gaven to not build homes on land that was zoned for housing, and members have to wonder what it was. Did someone fire up their mangocube email account? Did they make a phone call while they were in the lycra cycling home asking for the member for Gaven not to do this? There are serious questions that the member for Gaven has to answer about why Miller seemed to be the only part of Queensland where these mandates did not apply.

(Time expired)

Crisafulli LNP Government, Ministers

Mr MILES: My question is to the Premier. In relation to the Minister Mander and Minister Camm integrity issue, the Premier has said—

... if someone has proof, they should come forward.

Why has the Premier dismissed the evidence provided to his office on 27 June last year by Minister Mander's sister-in-law and not investigated the matter?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I have said it before and I will repeat it again: both ministers have been very fulsome with their answers and they have said they have declared at the appropriate time. I just want to make the observation about how important it is for us as a government and as a parliament to ensure that we are concentrating on the issues that Queenslanders view as important. In the couple of weeks since we were last in this place I have had a look at some of the places I have been and reflected on some of the Queenslanders I have spoken with. I have been in Townsville, I have been in Redlands, I have been in Broadwater, I have been in Coomera, Bundaberg and Stafford. I have spent considerable time in Stafford. It is always lovely when a leader is welcomed by their candidate to be there during a by-election.

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Inala is warned.

Mr CRISAFULLI: What Queenslanders have consistently said to us is they want us concentrating on the issues that matter to them and are important to them. At a time with a federal budget hours away I think about what Queenslanders at home would be wanting from this place. I know they want us to have a relentless focus on their energy bills, and we are doing our part in driving them down. I know they want us to have a credible fuel plan and ensure we continue to advocate to Canberra. They want us to keep driving down ambulance ramping. They want us to do that. They want us to have a laser-like focus on fewer victim numbers, and that is what we must do and we will continue to do. I say to the Leader of the Opposition: I do take a very similar view to premiers who have occupied this chair before when it comes to this space and I think that it is fitting that I do so. I point to a response dating back when the question was—

Will the Premier advise (a) how many ministers have advised the Premier in writing about a conflict of interest between their personal interests and their ministerial responsibilities; and (b) for each the measures put in place to manage the conflict?

The answer from that premier was—

I am advised it would not be appropriate to disclose personal information.

I understand and I respect that answer and I do want to thank the member for Murrumba, who gave it when he was premier!

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, it has come to my attention that you might have used some unparliamentary language in amongst those interjections. I ask that you withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Federal Budget

Mr HUNT: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. Can the Treasurer update the House on why tonight's federal budget is so important for Queensland households and businesses, and is he aware of any risks to Queensland receiving its fair share?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question, because that is a question about what really matters for our state and what really matters for our future. I am sure the member for Nicklin joins with so many of us on this side of the House in looking forward to the federal government honouring the 80-20 split on the Bruce Highway and delivering for Queensland up and down the eastern seaboard and the Bruce Highway, because that is what matters. These are the issues that matter. Today I am privileged to be in a position where I can stand up for Queensland and demand that Canberra does the same, because this budget, as the honourable member has asked, is important. It is an important budget that we see from Canberra tonight. It is important because households and businesses are struggling. They are feeling the pressure, and the longer the war in the Middle East goes on the more challenging the circumstances that Queenslanders and our country face.

It is an important budget tonight for the federal Treasurer to deliver, because we know there is that growing pressure on households. That pressure is not just growing in terms of inflationary pressures through imports, through services and through goods; it is pressure on household budgets and government budgets alike. Therefore, it is important that we get our fair share, and the honourable member asked me what the risks are to Queenslanders getting their fair share. I always say that past performance is the best indicator of future outcomes, and the past performance of the federal Labor government is clear, and we need only look at announcements last week about inland rail. I note that so many on this side of the House have advocated so strongly for inland rail, including you, Mr Speaker, and to see inland rail funding be diverted to Victoria for its suburban rail loop is a disgrace for regional Queensland. It is a disgrace, but it does not stop there.

When Chris Bowen talks about the east coast gas market, he is not talking about the east coast gas market; he is talking about Queensland gas and domestic reservation as proposed by those opposite. He is talking about Queensland gas and Queensland jobs right across regional Queensland. How does that flow through to GST? Southern states are being advantaged by what Queensland is doing. Gas could be explored in southern states, but they choose not to. What is the federal government doing? They are taking our allocation of the GST and giving it to southern states, because they do not care about Australia's national wealth. Canberra does not back Queensland; it invoices it. Canberra does not feed national wealth; Queensland feeds national wealth. Those opposite—and the federal government—should back in Queensland tonight.

(Time expired)

Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games

Ms BUSH: My question is to the Minister for Sport. The minister said that he contacted the Integrity Commissioner on 27 June 2025 for advice about his relationship with Minister Camm. This was the same day the Premier's office received a letter from his sister-in-law. Did the Premier's office direct the minister to declare the relationship, or was the timing a coincidence?

Mr MANDER: Again, this issue has been canvassed comprehensively over the last week or two. Let me be clear about the process. I had no knowledge that a former relative of mine contacted the Premier's office about this particular issue. In fact, I was surprised when I heard that recently. I was told that the reason that did not happen is that the writer requested I not be advised about it. The Premier's office respected that, so I had absolutely no knowledge of that whatsoever.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There will be no arguing across the chamber. Order!

Mr MANDER: I made the declaration totally independent of any source. There was no instruction. It was what I had to do because I knew the requirements of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. Any allegation or inference that I was influenced by anything or anyone is totally and utterly false.

Health Services

Mr WATTS: My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering more beds and frontline resources for our hardworking Queensland Health staff, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to deliver these services during a decade of decline?

Mrs Poole: You're going to need more than three minutes!

Mr NICHOLLS: I take the interjection; I might need more than three minutes, but I will confine myself to the time limit. I thank the member for Toowoomba North for his question because in Toowoomba, of course, we are delivering one of the biggest projects in Queensland Health's history; that is, the new Toowoomba Base Hospital—a hospital that was left languishing by those in the Labor Party. There was not enough money, not enough planning, two campuses and no mental health facilities. We are solving all of those problems. In fact, the Premier and I have been up there to visit. Yes, the Crisafulli LNP government is delivering easier and better access to health services for Queenslanders—no matter where they are—after a decade of decline under Labor, and that includes the 2,600 more beds we are delivering across the state.

We are also pulling all the levers we can to ease pressure on our hospitals and our hardworking staff and to improve hospital flow so that patients can be seen earlier, seen quicker, treated better and discharged to go home, where they want to be. They want to be at home so they can recover. We are doing that not only through our Hospital Rescue Plan but also through our investment in additional transit lounges. Three of those have already been completed: in Cairns, Logan and Gladstone—not in LNP seats, by the way. I know that some of my colleagues will be a bit unhappy about that, but there is more coming across the entire state as we deliver those services. There will be more CT and more MRI machines to deliver more services, including in Cairns South, where we launched an improved service in that growing area.

We have abolished Labor's GP tax, making it easier for people to see the doctor and see their GP. Primary care is a responsibility of the federal government; however, one of the biggest handbrakes on delivering more and better services is Australians stranded in our hospitals. I spoke about that a little earlier today. These are the patients that the Commonwealth government have the opportunity to address in their budget today. They can speak directly to those older Queenslanders—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is a lot of movement around the chamber at the moment. I want to draw your attention to that.

Mr SPEAKER: I will look after that. Thank you.

Mr NICHOLLS:—who, through no fault of their own, are medically ready to leave but do not have a place to go. The Prime Minister promised action, but Queensland continues to be ground zero for Australian patients inside our public hospitals, including in Toowoomba North in the Darling Downs Hospital and Health Service. In Metro North there are 240 Australians sitting there who do not need to be in those beds. That is almost 10 per cent of the available beds in Metro North. I have written to the


federal minister and highlighted this problem. Unlike those opposite, who gave up the fight for 50-50 funding, we are continuing to do so. My question is: will they stand up for Queenslanders or will they back their Labor mates and not back those stranded Australians? I call on the federal government to do their part: pay up and solve the problem.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

PRIVILEGE

Comments by the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.16 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. In question time earlier today, the Deputy Premier made statements, by reference to a *Courier-Mail* article, that my wife had benefited from a government contract or contracts including by reference to the Fitzgerald inquiry. This statement is categorically false and, after speaking to the journalist concerned, the online article was amended by removing all references to this issue. The Premier is aware of this matter—and he is also aware that it is false—as I spoke to him personally about the matter including the conduct of his staff. Any future claim or assertion in the House to the contrary would be deliberately misleading honourable members.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Algester, you are warned.

MOTIONS

Business Program

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 am): In accordance with sessional order 3A, I move—

- (1) That the following business will be considered this sitting week within the times as specified:
 - (a) the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill:
 - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 5.00 pm on Wednesday, 13 May 2026;
 - (ii) all stages to be completed by 5.30 pm on Wednesday, 13 May 2026.
 - (b) the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill:
 - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 12.40 pm on Thursday, 14 May 2026;
 - (ii) all stages to be completed by 1.00 pm on Thursday, 14 May 2026.
- (2) If all stages of the bills have not been completed by the specified times, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes, any statement of compatibility or any override declaration to their circulated amendments; and
 - (b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass 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.

This motion sets out the proposed program for government business before the House this week, including the timeframes for consideration of two important pieces of legislation: the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, and the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill.

This motion sets reasonable, sensible and measured timeframes which ensure appropriate debate, whilst also ensuring the orderly and effective management of the business of the House. Importantly, this motion also continues the orderly progression of government business by the Crisafulli state government, as demonstrated during the previous sitting week when the House considered and agreed to the first formal business program motion of the 58th Parliament. That motion provided all members with a clear and defined outline of the parliamentary program for the previous sitting week. It established certainty around the conduct of government business, allowed members to better prepare their contributions and schedules, and ensured the House was able to proceed in a calm, orderly and methodical way. Indeed, the House will recall that the motion was adhered to closely throughout the course of the sitting week. The program operated effectively, debate proceeded appropriately and the management of the House was strengthened as a result. It is also worth noting that the Labor opposition


did not oppose that motion setting out the business of the previous sitting week. I certainly acknowledge that support. The state government again looks forward to the support of the House for the motion that is presently before us.

The Crisafulli state government has been clear that it is a government that is committed to openness and transparency and that commitment extends to the program of parliamentary business. That is precisely why this motion is being brought before the House today. Queenslanders deserve to clearly see and understand the business of their parliament and what it will be considering during the course of the sitting week. Members of the House equally deserve certainty regarding the proposed scheduling and the progression of legislation and parliamentary debate. Rather than uncertainty or confusion regarding the anticipated program for the week, this motion provides a transparent framework which clearly outlines the intended management of government business across the sitting week.

Without anticipating debate, the two bills that pertain to this motion are important measures which deserve proper scrutiny and consideration by the House. The Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill progresses important reforms related to safety and regulatory oversight within Queensland's resources sector. Similarly, the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill establishes an important new framework relating to the management and oversight of waterways infrastructure and activity. It is therefore appropriate that the House allocate dedicated and sufficient time for the consideration of these matters while also ensuring the effective progression of the legislative program.

It is also important to acknowledge again that the work of this parliament extends well beyond the consideration of government legislation alone. As reflected within the broader parliamentary program this week, the House will continue to consider matters brought before it by non-government members, including the disallowance motion to be debated later today, as well as a private member's bill that I understand will be introduced tomorrow and has been foreshadowed by the Labor opposition. This is alongside the important opportunities provided through the matters of public interest debate and private members' statements to ensure members from across Queensland are able to raise issues, advocate for their local communities and contribute to the broader work of the parliament.

In closing, this is about the orderly parliamentary management of the House for the week. It is about providing certainty. It is about transparency. It is about ensuring that the House can effectively conduct its business in a disciplined and structured manner. This motion achieves that outcome. As such, I commend the motion to the House.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (11.23 am): I rise to address the business program motion moved by the Leader of the House. In speaking to his motion, the Leader of the House spoke about ensuring certainty and no confusion. There is absolute certainty that this is a government so fearful of scrutiny that it is prepared to come into this place and eliminate the important scrutinising work of consideration in detail. In fact, for one of these bills we see consideration in detail is just 10 minutes and for the second bill there is zero minutes. The Leader of the House may as well have come into this place today and moved amendments to the standing orders. The entirety of chapter 26 of the standing orders, the rule book governing how the procedures of this House are applied, sets out how consideration in detail will occur. This business program motion eliminates that for the bills that the Leader of the House said are important bills—10 minutes for one, zero for the other.

If you have integrity as a government then you are not scared of scrutiny. If you have integrity you do not fear scrutiny. Every bill guillotined by this government therefore becomes another integrity issue for the Crisafulli LNP government. The Premier said one thing about these types of motions before the election and he is doing a very different thing now that he holds power. Before the election Premier Crisafulli said scrutiny mattered. After the election scrutiny is gone: questions go unanswered and a motion before the House eliminates the opportunity for members of the opposition and members of the crossbench to put questions to the minister about what the Leader of the House tells us is important legislation. A government confident in its legislation would not fear the scrutiny of this place. A government confident in the integrity of its members, a government confident in the integrity of its ministers would not move a motion that means that they can avoid the scrutiny of this House. That is exactly what has been done.

There are 83 clauses in the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The standing orders say that the Speaker shall put a question on each clause. It is not humanly possible for the Speaker to perform the functions outlined by the standing orders for 83 clauses in the time allowed by the Leader of the House in this motion. I am advised that the shadow minister

intends to propose substantial amendments. There will not be an opportunity for this parliament to consider those amendments. That is wrong.


Ms Grace: It is similar to what is happening at every sitting.

Mr de BRENNI: I take the interjection from the member for McConnel—it is happening every single sitting week. Every time this government abuses the standing orders, uses this motion to eliminate scrutiny is another integrity scandal unfolding. We have seen this government refuse to answer questions about the conduct of its own ministers. We have seen them refuse to answer questions about declarations. We have seen them refuse to answer questions on a whole range of issues. They would not answer questions for weeks about their rail fiasco.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Manager of Opposition Business, I have been listening. You have been relevant, but I think maybe just bring it back to the motion. It is a procedural motion, not about other things.

Mr de BRENNI: What we are doing is pointing out a pattern of conduct by this Crisafulli LNP government that seeks to avoid scrutiny and seeks to refuse to answer questions. Consideration in detail provides this House with that opportunity. That is why this is so relevant. It is another example of this government failing every single time on a very important test of integrity. We will not be supporting this destruction of Queensland's parliamentary democracy.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (11.29 am): I have just heard the epitome of hypocrisy from the member for Springwood. I do believe he has regurgitated every sentence of the member for Glass House when he sat in that seat over there when the member for Springwood was Leader of the House pushing through pieces of legislation that they wished to push through in a hurry. Now from that Manager of Opposition Business seat he brings forward this hypocrisy to try to stop the effective management of parliament this week under the business program motion. The member for Springwood has wasted valuable time speaking to the business motion.


Those opposite will have plenty of opportunity between now and 5.30 on Wednesday afternoon to speak to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Opposition members will simply regurgitate speeches written by their 23 staff. They are the most over-resourced and laziest opposition that I have seen in my 20 years in this parliament. They will say the same thing over and again in speeches written for them by their 23 staff and, basically, they will have every opportunity to do that.

The timeliness of the passing of bills is important. This week we will be debating two bills. Certainly our members will be looking forward to speaking on those bills. I cannot believe that the member for Springwood has any issues with this business program motion in terms of finishing debate on the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 5.30 on Wednesday and on the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill by 1 pm on Thursday. The Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority Bill is a very important bill that will initiate a major new step for north coast members. I cannot pre-empt that debate, obviously, but there will be plenty of time to talk about that particular issue.

Rather than opposition speaker after opposition speaker regurgitating reports written by their staffers, we should perhaps condense that all into one speech from the opposition to cover all of their concerns as well as the shadow minister's amendments to address the issues he is worried about, or talk about them at least, given the time that he will have. Opposing the business program motion, sitting week after sitting week, is becoming very boring. It is a very whingeing and whining opposition. Unfortunately, it is an impediment to the business of the parliament moving forward in a timely manner. It is not as though a lot of legislation is getting done with two bills being debated in a week, but the Manager of Opposition Business seems to have a major problem with that. Can he not put forward speakers who can give concise speeches that outline their concerns or maybe even their support for matters in the particular bills that come before the House?

Certainly, I support the motion of the Leader of the House. He is working very effectively. I thank him for putting this motion before the House to ensure we have a timely resolution of the proper business of the House. We are debating two bills this week, yet the Manager of Opposition Business is squealing about his opportunities. Really, he needs to remember all of the things he said when he was the leader of the House and organised the business program of the House. I would love to have some quotes from him from that time when he pushed things through without any regard for the then

opposition's chances to speak to bills. I support the motion put forward by the Leader of the House and I think the House should as well.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (11.33 am): I seek leave to move an amendment to bring forward the time for consideration in detail by half an hour. I intend to speak to that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Logan, I ask you to resume your seat while I seek some advice from the Clerk. Member for Logan, the time for the debate has expired.

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

AYES, 52:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Blejje, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.


NOES, 36:

ALP, 35—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Suspension of Standing Orders


 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.39 am), by leave, without notice: I move—That standing orders 87, 96 and 150 be suspended to allow the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 and any amendments circulated by the minister to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

LEGAL PROFESSION (STRENGTHENING DISCIPLINARY MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Message from Deputy Governor

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (11.39 am): I present a message from the Deputy Governor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): The message from the Deputy Governor recommends the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

LEGAL PROFESSION (STRENGTHENING DISCIPLINARY MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL 2026

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, DEBRA ANN MULLINS AO, Deputy Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intitled—


A Bill for an Act to amend the Legal Profession Act 2007 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes

DEPUTY GOVERNOR

Date: 12 May 2026

Tabled paper: Message, dated 12 May 2026, from the Deputy Governor, recommending the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026.

Introduction

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (11.40 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Legal Profession Act 2007 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026.

Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.

I am pleased to introduce the Legal Profession (Strengthening Disciplinary Matters) Amendment Bill 2026. In Queensland, solicitors and barristers are held to high professional standards and obligations. These standards are enforced through a disciplinary framework established under the Legal Profession Act 2007. When these obligations are not met, complaints and disciplinary action may follow. This can relate to unsatisfactory professional conduct which occurs when a legal practitioner falls short of the standard reasonably expected by the public. More serious breaches, where a practitioner is deemed unfit to engage in legal practice, are classified as professional misconduct. This framework ensures accountability, upholds the integrity of the legal profession, deters misconduct, and protects the Queensland public as consumers of legal services.

Currently, disciplinary proceedings can be heard either by QCAT or, in less serious cases involving unsatisfactory professional conduct, by the Legal Practice Committee. QCAT's jurisdiction for legal practitioners can be divided into two broad categories: first, discipline applications involving applications brought by the Legal Services Commissioner about the conduct of a legal practitioner, or a review of a decision by the Legal Practice Committee in relation to a discipline application; and, second, a range of other related matters generally involving a person's ability to practise as a legal practitioner in Queensland or, for example, a claim made on the fidelity guarantee fund.

Due to the complexity of these matters and uniquely to Queensland, these types of proceedings must be heard in QCAT by a judicial member who is either a sitting or retired Supreme Court judge. This is historically consistent. Before the jurisdiction came to QCAT, legal practitioner matters were heard by Supreme Court judges sitting as the Legal Practice Tribunal. Currently, these matters are heard and managed by Supreme Court judges, largely at hearing rooms at the Supreme Court; however, the QCAT registry bears the burden of filing and administrative tasks.

Last year, I commissioned former Supreme Court and Federal Court judge the Hon. David Thomas to conduct a statutory review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009. This review was due to be completed and tabled in parliament well before I had the honour of this role in early 2024. However, unbelievably, it remained overdue on account of those opposite in the former Labor government failing to get it underway and failing to release a consultation paper and consult with stakeholders. Labor kicked the can down the road for years and were too afraid to face the realities of the QCAT backlogs and delays. They could not face the funding implications either.

The Crisafulli government acted and delivered by commissioning this review within our first six months. The review is ongoing and considering the legislative framework that regulates QCAT's functions and operations and includes expression consideration of the operation of various professional disciplinary lists, including legal practitioners and whether QCAT remains the most appropriate forum for these jurisdictions.

As the final report for the statutory review is not due to be delivered until July this year, I requested the reviewer to prioritise consideration of QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction. An interim report was prepared by the Hon. David Thomas, titled *QCAT Act statutory review 2025-26: legal practitioner jurisdiction report*. I now table a copy of that report.

Tabled paper: Report titled 'Legal practitioner jurisdiction—Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act Statutory Review 2025-26', October 2025.

I would also like to place on record my thanks to the Hon. David Thomas for his diligent work in preparing and prioritising this report. QCAT is a large tribunal and has responsibility for a variety of jurisdictions, and the report found that the legal practitioner jurisdiction was putting a strain on QCAT's case load, particularly the availability of QCAT's judicial members who are required to hear legal practitioner matters.

In the financial year 2024-25, there were 40 new matters filed with QCAT. However, this number does not tell the full story because in that year QCAT conducted 105 hearings in relation to legal practitioner jurisdiction, comprising 70 directions hearings, three compulsory conferences, 29 final hearings and three final hearings on the papers. Concerningly, the report found that as of August 2025, the average time to finalise a legal practitioner application was around 93 weeks. Obviously, the delays are concerning as they diminish the deterrence effect of the disciplinary framework and heighten risks to legal services' consumers. Justice delayed is justice denied, and 93-week delays for disciplinary hearings are unacceptable for both the public and legal practitioners. Queenslanders should not have

to wait years for allegations involving officers of the court to be resolved. Delays of this length are also inconsistent with the objectives of the QCAT Act to have the tribunal deal with matters quickly.

The report found that legal practitioner matters were also affecting other matters in QCAT, as the jurisdiction was creating a burden on the QCAT registry and occupying a disproportionate amount of time from judicial members which reduces their ability to assist with other essential QCAT work. As a result, the report made 23 recommendations to transfer QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction to the Supreme Court. This is considered reform, informed by evidence, operational experience and consultation.

The bill amends the Legal Profession Act to give effect to all 23 recommendations of the report. The Crisafulli government is acting on the expert advice from a former president of both QCAT and the AAT to modernise and improve the operation of the legal disciplinary system.

While both the Supreme Court and QCAT are managing sufficient demand, the Supreme Court has a greater number of judges when compared to QCAT to service the growing legal practitioner jurisdiction list. Additionally, the Supreme Court already has the inherent supervisory authority over the legal profession. The Supreme Court admits new members to the profession, and it is only proper the Supreme Court be the forum for the most serious questions of professional conduct and ethical standards. At its core, this reform is a simple proposition which not only makes sense but also has immediate benefits. Prioritising amendments to transfer the legal practitioner jurisdiction to the Supreme Court will certainly ease the significant pressure on QCAT's case load and its judicial and registry resources.

As outlined in the report, consultation was undertaken with key legal stakeholders, and there was strong, broad consensus to transfer the jurisdiction to the Supreme Court. The government also undertook extensive consultation in the development of this bill. I am pleased to be introducing this bill today, easing the pressure on QCAT's resources and promoting the best interests of the legal profession and justice system.

I will now turn to the detail of the bill, which gives effect to the transfer of the legal practitioner jurisdiction from QCAT to the Supreme Court. The bill provides that disciplinary proceedings will be heard by a single judge of the Supreme Court exercising the court's original jurisdiction. The Chief Justice will retain discretion as to how this is administered in accordance with the court's usual arrangements, including whether there is a separate list, enabling the Chief Justice to manage the jurisdiction's workload more efficiently.

Consistent with the report's recommendations, the Legal Practice Committee will also continue to operate and determine matters involving unsatisfactory professional conduct. Importantly, the report recommended that proceedings in the Supreme Court should generally remain the same as in QCAT and should continue to operate informally, including that the court is not bound by the rules of evidence and may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate. To that end, the bill preserves the existing provisions in the Legal Profession Act governing how disciplinary proceedings are conducted in QCAT and applies those provisions to the Supreme Court.

Additional provisions modelled on the QCAT Act will also be introduced to maintain the current operation of proceedings. For example, the Supreme Court will have the same power as QCAT to disregard a failure to comply with a procedural requirement, provided the court is satisfied that the failure has not caused prejudice to any party. This less formal approach is well entrenched and familiar to those who practise in this area as it was the same procedure that applied when legal practitioner matters were previously heard by Supreme Court judges sitting as the Legal Practice Tribunal. I am aware that some stakeholders may not support that approach and instead consider that legal practitioner proceedings should be subject to the formality and evidentiary requirements of typical Supreme Court proceedings; however, the report clearly outlines how maintaining an informal approach is necessary to balance the aims of fairness and efficiency and ensure there is no disadvantage to the legal profession or the public at large in transferring QCAT's jurisdiction to the Supreme Court.

Additionally, not all procedural matters are set out in the bill, which preserves the Supreme Court's flexibility to address certain issues through court rules. The Department of Justice, in consultation with the Rules Committee, will consider whether amendments to the Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999 are required before the changes commence. To that end, the bill is set to commence on proclamation at a time when the transfer is fully complete and the court is ready and prepared.

In keeping with the Supreme Court's ordinary jurisdiction, parties will have a right to legal representation and the court will be able to use its existing case management powers such as requiring

participation in a pre-trial conference or directing the parties to cooperate in narrowing the issues in dispute. In line with recommendations in the report, both a legal professional member and a lay member must be appointed to a panel to help the Supreme Court determine disciplinary proceedings. The use of panel members ensures both professional and community perspectives are represented, and it reflects the fundamental principles of fairness, impartiality, openness and accountability in the complaints and disciplinary process for legal practitioners.

As recommended by the report, the legal professional panel member will also now be entitled to remuneration, providing parity with lay panel members, who are already remunerated, which is intended to encourage greater participation from the profession. The report also proposed that proceedings should be able to continue in the absence of one panel member—and stakeholders have supported this flexibility—to avoid unnecessary delay. Therefore, the bill provides that the court may proceed in the absence of a panel member but only where it is in the interests of justice and not proceeding would cause undue delay or expense. This approach preserves fairness, maintains procedural integrity and retains the value of panel member participation.

In line with report recommendations, the bill will clarify how costs are awarded in disciplinary proceedings involving mixed findings across multiple charges. The bill makes clear that nothing in the existing costs provision under section 462 of the Legal Profession Act requires a disciplinary body to order a person pay costs for conduct that was not proven to constitute professional misconduct or unsatisfactory professional conduct. This improves fairness by ensuring practitioners are not automatically exposed to adverse costs on allegations that are ultimately unsuccessful. The reforms recognise that disciplinary proceedings must be robust but also fundamentally fair.

The amendment reflects the 2023 Queensland Court of Appeal decision in *Pennisi v Legal Services Commissioner* and is intended to prevent any interpretation that section 462 requires the court to make a costs order against the respondent lawyer for the whole proceeding, even where some charges have been successfully defended. This clarification promotes fairness and equity and the general principle that costs 'follow the event'. Fairness and accountability should also not be competing principles. A strong disciplinary system must deliver both.

I understand that some stakeholders considered this amendment should go further, including to fundamentally redraft how costs can be awarded under section 462 in relation to disciplinary proceedings; however, this would not be consistent with recommendations 16 and 17 of the report, which stated that section 462 should be retained but clarified in line with the *Pennisi* decision. The approach in the bill achieves this outcome by retaining section 462 as currently drafted and simply including an additional provision to remove ambiguity in relation to proceedings with mixed results against multiple charges.

As mentioned previously, there is a range of other related matters in QCAT's legal practitioner jurisdiction regarding decisions of the Queensland Law Society, Bar Association of Queensland and Legal Practitioners Admissions Board in relation to a person's right to practise as a legal practitioner or a decision by the Queensland Law Society about a claim on the Legal Practitioners' Fidelity Guarantee Fund. Currently, an application can be made to QCAT to review these decisions. The bill amends these QCAT review rights to instead be appeal rights to the Supreme Court.

In line with recommendation 4 of the report, the Supreme Court will hear these matters as appeals *de novo*, meaning the appeal is not dependent on identifying an error of fact, law or exercise of discretion in the original decision. The court will not be limited to the evidence before the original decision-maker and may receive fresh evidence. The intention is that the Supreme Court's review of the original decision is a judicial function rather than an administrative review currently undertaken by QCAT.

Similar to disciplinary proceedings which I outlined earlier, the bill provides that in hearing an appeal or application the court will not be bound by the rules of evidence and may inform itself in any way it considers appropriate, acting with as little formality and technicality as possible. Giving the court this flexibility is important. In relation to these types of appeals, the bill also provides that each party will bear its own costs unless the court considers that the interests of justice require otherwise. These provisions preserve the current approach to review proceedings in QCAT and are intended to maintain access to justice as far as possible in transferring these review rights to the Supreme Court.

Similar to disciplinary proceedings, not all procedural matters are specified in the bill to ensure the Supreme Court retains flexibility to address certain matters through court rules. The bill also provides that decisions of the Legal Practice Committee may be appealed to a single judge of the Supreme Court. Because this type of appeal relates to a discipline application, the bill specifies that it

will be by way of rehearing the evidence before the committee. However, the court may grant leave to adduce further evidence if considered material to the appeal.

This bill will also provide clarity for how decisions made by the Supreme Court about legal practitioner matters can be appealed to the Court of Appeal. In keeping with report recommendations, the bill provides that decisions by the Supreme Court for disciplinary applications, or decisions by the Supreme Court on appeal of a Queensland Law Society, Bar Association of Queensland or Legal Practitioners Admission Board decision, can be taken to the Court of Appeal.

However, when it comes to appeals from decisions of the Legal Practice Committee, the bill introduces an important distinction. If the Supreme Court has heard an appeal of a Legal Practice Committee decision, any further appeal to the Court of Appeal will only be allowed with leave and for a question of law only. This approach recognises that these matters have already undergone thorough consideration—first by the Legal Practice Committee and then by the Supreme Court on appeal.

Finally, QCAT will continue to have jurisdiction in relation to two types of matters that the report considered were not directly connected to disciplinary matters: first, appeals against decisions of the Queensland Law Society to disqualify a person as an external examiner; and, second, applications to set aside cost agreements, although the Supreme Court will be able to hear these in the context of disciplinary proceedings. Importantly, the bill provides that neither of these matters are required to be heard by a judicial member in QCAT.

This bill will provide immediate and tangible relief to QCAT's caseload and judicial and registry resources by alleviating QCAT of the burden of the legal practitioner jurisdiction. QCAT performs important work across a very broad jurisdiction, and I thank them for their hard work. However, legal disciplinary proceedings involve unique questions concerning officers of the court, professional ethics, and the administration of justice. The government considers the Supreme Court is the appropriate forum for these matters. The Supreme Court, with its inherent jurisdiction to control and discipline legal practitioners, is best placed to supervise the legal profession, and transferring the jurisdiction to the Supreme Court is in the best interests of the legal profession and justice system as a whole.

With these reforms, the Crisafulli government is acting on expert advice, strengthening legal disciplinary matters, and restoring accountability and fairness. These reforms also recognise the unique role of the legal profession as officers of the Supreme Court.

This bill is about restoring timely, credible and fair disciplinary processes for the legal profession. When matters take up to 93 weeks to be heard, confidence suffers—for complainants and practitioners, and in the justice system itself. A modern justice system cannot tolerate disciplinary matters of this kind sitting unresolved for years. Queenslanders deserve confidence that allegations of professional misconduct are dealt with promptly and properly. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (12.04 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.


Referral to Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee.

RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 3 March (see p. 376).

Second Reading

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (12.04 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I would like to start by thanking the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for its consideration of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I would also like to take the opportunity to thank everyone who provided written submissions on the bill and took the time to appear before the committee to provide different perspectives and feedback on the various aspects of the bill.

The Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 will implement important reforms to government institutions and regulatory processes to support a safer resources sector that underpins Queensland's long-term prosperity. As part of this bill, Resources Safety & Health Queensland, or RSHQ, is being strengthened to enhance governance, accountability and operational oversight. This legislation will restore confidence in the resource sector's safety framework, ultimately making our resources industry a better and a safer place to work.

Coexistence institutions will be improved by revising governance arrangements, and we are taking some financial pressure off the resources industry by repealing a fee that those opposite had approved to introduce. Finally, proposed procedural and administrative amendments to the mining tenement framework will streamline requirements and remove unnecessary provisions to improve clarity and provide certainty to resources companies that want to do business in Queensland. As I keep saying, our resources sector is open for business, and we will support companies that want to invest here, unlike those opposite who spent the best part of a decade implementing policies, red tape, over-regulating and moving the goal posts in an attempt to shut down new investment in fossil fuels because those opposite do not support the resources sector. Their Labor-Greens alliance simply does not allow it.

The Crisafulli government was elected off the back of our plan to deliver, and part of that plan was to rebuild trust and make Queensland safer for all Queenslanders. Safety in the resources sector is my highest priority. My belief that safety must come before production is as strong today as it was when I was first elected to the parliament. My electorate of Burdekin is home to the majority of Queensland's coalmines and, as a result, is the workplace of tens of thousands of resource industry workers. These workers expect, and rightfully deserve, to feel safe at work. Their family and friends also deserve to expect that they will come home safely once they have finished their shift.

The Queensland resources sector deserves a regulator that is strong, independent and effective. RSHQ, Queensland's regulator, is a statutory body responsible for operating as the independent safety and health regulator for Queensland's mining, quarrying, explosives, petroleum and gas industries. RSHQ was created to ensure the protection of the safety and health of workers and the communities affected by resource operations.

Its primary functions are to enforce legislation, complete investigations, carry out health surveillance and oversee psychosocial hazard regulation. It incorporates Simtars, the Safety in Mines Testing and Research Station, and the Board of Examiners operates within RSHQ. It employs 100 inspectors, and from the period of 1 January 2026 to 31 March 2026 completed 111 coal inspections, 69 explosives inspections, 312 petroleum and gas inspections, and 204 mineral mines and quarries inspections.

Having a strong regulator is paramount because let's just reflect for a moment on the impact that the resources sector has on our economy. There are currently more than 81,000 people directly employed in Queensland's mining industry. In regional Queensland, mining employment accounts for around 60 per cent of all employment. More than 400,000 workers benefit indirectly from the sector, and those indirect jobs are important. These are jobs for the mining services industry and they are the jobs in mining communities—the people who work in the local coffee shops, the publicans, the service station owners, the car dealerships. We know that when indirect jobs are strong our resources sector is thriving.

A strong and safe mining sector means more regional schools with teachers and students, more regional sporting clubs and more community groups. It improves the livability of regional Queensland. Mr Speaker, \$35.8 billion is the amount that businesses and community organisations received from the resources sector in the 2024-25 financial year. Industries of this scale require strong, modern and effective regulation and that is exactly what this bill seeks to deliver. I note the committee tabled its report on the bill on 17 April 2026. The committee made four recommendations, including that the bill be passed. I now table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 17, 58th Parliament—Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, government response.

I will address the remaining recommendations shortly but would first like to touch on some of the issues raised during the committee process, firstly in relation to the proposed amendments to RSHQ and the removal of the role of Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health and its replacement with a board that will provide oversight and governance of RSHQ. Some noted that it was inconsistent with the recommendations of Professor Susan Johnston AM in her 2025 review of RSHQ and questioned whether the new board could effectively replace the commissioner's role in crisis management and advocacy.

I must remind the House that the findings of the review were sobering and reiterate our government's position that every mineworker deserves to make it home safe to their loved ones. To date, the commissioner's role has not served as an effective source of strategic direction or provided regulatory oversight due to the role's ill-defined purpose and absence of clear performance metrics. Professor Johnston made this clear in her review. This lack of clarity and authority culminated in the commissioner's role being ineffective and underutilised, and may I remind the House that under those opposite this position remained vacant for 12 months. If it is so important now, why was it not filled then? The former Labor government left the position of Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health vacant for nearly a year, and then when they finally filled the role their appointee resigned within weeks, taking them back to square one.

In contrast, this bill proposes a new, independent, skills-based governing board that will not only provide strategic direction but also strengthen oversight and accountability while streamlining advisory structures and removing duplication. The board will embed an important layer of accountability by monitoring RSHQ's performance. It will also absorb the commissioner's stakeholder engagement functions and serve as a central point of contact for industry.

The chief executive officer of RSHQ will also be directly accountable to the RSHQ board. This addresses a key gap in the previous governance structure, where no such reporting obligation existed. Transferring the statutory functions of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health to the new board provides clearer lines of responsibility and stronger accountability.

Importantly, RSHQ's status as an independent statutory body will be maintained. The creation of the RSHQ board simply embeds a layer of accountability within RSHQ to ensure it is operating effectively as a regulator. As the regulator, operational decision-making, including crisis management, will continue to be undertaken by the chief executive officer of RSHQ. To be clear, while the chief executive officer must give effect to board directions relevant to their functions, the CEO retains independence in making operational decisions.

This government understands that every worker deserves the right to return home safely at the end of each shift. Queensland can be both a resources powerhouse and a global leader in safety. In many regional communities the resources sector is the backbone of local economies, supporting jobs, families and small businesses—not to mention that Brisbane is found time and again to be Queensland's biggest mining town. The role of RSHQ is vital in protecting workers and maintaining confidence in the industry that many Queensland communities rely on. Safety in our resources sector is not optional; it is fundamental. That is why the work undertaken by RSHQ remains critical to maintaining public confidence, industry accountability and worker safety across Queensland.

Last year our government passed the Coroners (Mining and Resources Coroner) Amendment Bill, and I said from the outset that this bill meant a lot to me. It meant a lot to me because I made a commitment to the families of those miners who lost their lives in Queensland mines and quarries to provide answers. It took its roots at the Moranbah Miners' Memorial service many years ago where I witnessed firsthand the grief these families were still going through in their quest for answers. I debated the bill last year on the 50th anniversary of the Kianga No. 1 mine disaster in the Callide electorate. As a result of that disaster we saw improved safety regulations for a range of activities, and those improved safety regulations were born from the warden's inquiry in Rockhampton between 10 and 24 November way back in 1975.

The role of the Mining and Resources Coroner is based on one of the responsibilities of the original mining warden, and that is to undertake mandatory coronial investigations and inquests and inquests into all accidental mining related deaths, which includes deaths that occur on mines, coalmines and quarries as well as particular sites where petroleum and gas works are carried out. The role of the Mining and Resources Coroner is strikingly similar to the mining warden because the mining warden system worked.

Frank Windridge, Queensland's final mining warden, delivered a report into the 1994 Moura coalmine disaster that resulted in the tragic deaths of 11 men. Frank's report of the disaster held

observations on the role of government when it comes to safety in the resources sector. He said that governments 'have a duty to ensure that mining is carried out in as safe a manner as possible'. More pointedly, he added—

Governments have no moral right to walk away when a disaster happens and decline to accept any responsibility. They are, by association and legislation, clearly involved ...

The Crisafulli government listened to Frank Windridge's words. Families and resource workers deserve answers; they deserve the truth. Our decision to enact a Mining and Resources Coroner means that every work related death on a mine site or quarry will be the subject of a coronial inquiry.

The Crisafulli government wants a resources sector where Queenslanders feel safe going to work and while at work. The Mining and Resources Coroner investigates mining related fatalities and provides timely answers to affected families. Not only that, but the role is to provide recommendations to enhance safety in the state's resources sector to make sure incidents do not happen again. We promised to put victims first by re-establishing a specialist Mining and Resources Coroner, and now with this RSHQ legislation we are also putting workers first. These two very important pieces of legislation work together to restore clear layers of accountability for safety in Queensland's resources sector. The Crisafulli government is restoring trust in the system that was largely ignored by the former Labor government

Regarding representation and membership of the new board, the bill ensures that candidates will be appointed based on their skills and expertise in areas such as governance, safety and health regulation, stakeholder engagement, and financial management to ensure effective governance. I note that some concerns have been raised that the bill does not explicitly require worker representation or petroleum and gas expertise as part of the board membership. Let me emphasise that candidates with these skills and experience are not excluded from participating on the board.

In its report the committee recommended that the department consider staggering the appointment arrangements for members of the board to support the continuity of expertise and governance. The recommendations noted that staggering appointment end dates would assist in mitigating the risk of simultaneous turnover. I support this recommendation. I can confirm that operational practice for RSHQ board appointments will be to stagger these. As there will be five board members, initial appointments will see two board members appointed for three years and three board members appointed for four years. This staggered approach will also ensure continuity within related advisory committees—the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee—which will be chaired by members of the RSHQ board.

The bill positions RSHQ as a modern, effective and adaptable regulator that supports the health, safety and wellbeing of Queensland's resources industry workers. The bill includes a requirement for the board to operate transparently and report on its performance through annual reports, including details of how any ministerial expectations have been addressed. This requirement also ensures transparency in relation to ministerial actions. I would also highlight that ministers are bound by the principles of accountability, transparency and acting in the public interest. While specific legislative provisions in the bill may not explicitly state decision-making be in the public interest, these actions are guided by the Ministerial Code of Conduct, which applies the highest standard of ethics to ministers and are in addition to the ethical standards that apply broadly to any members of parliament.

The committee's third recommendation was that the department conduct a review within 24 months of the commencement of the bill to assess the effectiveness of the legislation in relation to the operation of RSHQ. The government supports this recommendation and commits to this review—unlike the former Labor government that never did a review following the establishment of RSHQ.

I turn now to the proposed amendments to coexistence institutions. This bill introduces safeguards to maintain separation of the Land Access Ombudsman and advisory council responsibilities from the broader Coexistence Queensland roles. It does this by ensuring the role and responsibilities of each institution are clearly defined under distinct and separate acts to avoid potential overlap or confusion. The bill also introduces measures to ensure operational separation is maintained between the Land Access Ombudsman and Coexistence Queensland. This includes preventing Coexistence Queensland members from delegating functions to their chief executive officer that may give rise to a potential conflict of interest for the person acting in a dual capacity as the Land Access Ombudsman. It also enables the ombudsman to delegate their functions to an appropriately qualified officer to avoid conflict due to their dual role as chief executive officer if required.


The bill ensures that the Land Access Ombudsman and Coexistence Queensland remain independent institutions and at arm's length from government departments. Importantly, we have also

removed the need for the resources sector to fund the Land Access Ombudsman—another fee put in place by the former Labor government that was due to come into effect this year. We will not be putting additional fees on the resources sector.

The committee's final recommendation was that the department conduct a review within 24 months of the commencement of the bill to assess the effectiveness of the legislation in relation to the Land Access Ombudsman. We are committed to this review. My department will continue to work closely with RSHQ, the Land Access Ombudsman and Coexistence Queensland in preparation to implement these changes and ensure that there is no reduction of access to support for resources safety, coexistence matters or regulatory requirements.

I want to acknowledge the important role that coexistence institutions play between resource companies and landholders, and this bill allows that to continue. The Crisafulli government is delivering a regulatory model that is modern, accountable and laser focused on outcomes. This bill is an important reset that puts safety, credibility and trust back at the heart of our resources safety system. We are proud of the drillers, the diesel fitters, the engineers and the mine workers of this state—the ones who keep the lights on in Queensland. With this bill, the Crisafulli government is doing the work to keep them safe. We are doing this responsibly, transparently and with the best interests of all Queenslanders in mind.

In summary, the Crisafulli government understands the importance of backing the resources sector because we understand what it means for Queensland jobs and Queensland communities. We are committed to ensuring Queensland remains open for business, open to investment and open to opportunity. We are equally committed to ensuring that growth is supported by strong governance, effective oversight and a clear commitment to worker safety. This bill strikes that balance. It supports a stronger and more accountable regulatory framework, while recognising the enormous economic contribution the resources sector makes to this state. It reinforces confidence in the industry, supports the work of RSHQ and helps ensure Queensland remains a global leader in responsible resources development for years to come. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (12.23 pm): Last week after the May Day march in Mackay, I went to see a special film, and I urge all MPs to take the time to see this film. It was the dramatic film *Pike River*. Many here in this place would know that 16 years ago 29 miners died in the New Zealand Pike River coalmine. As an MP considering this bill, I thought this film was an illustration of what goes wrong when laws and safeguards are watered down and a culture of ignoring warning signs develops. However, it especially showed the grief and pain felt by the families who missed their loved ones.

Although you will be moved by the film when you see it, you will not get to feel as I did, because I was surrounded by the hardworking miners of the MEU and I was in the presence of Anna Osborne and Sonya Rockhouse, who had lost loved ones and had campaigned for justice. They are the real life people who are the heroes of this film. You will also not hear of their experiences, as I did when they answered questions after the film; nor will you hear from Daniel Rockhouse, one of only two survivors, who still lives with the pain of losing his brother in the disaster. If you heard this and if you looked into Anna, Sonya or Daniel's eyes, then you would take pause and reconsider ignoring an expert report commissioned to examine the RSHQ bill.

I want to thank the Mining and Energy Union that put on the special showing of the film and hosted Anna Osborne and Sonya Rockhouse. The 29 deaths at Pike River is not worse than disasters in Queensland mines—unfortunately, it is not by a long way—and to think that those days are behind us and that we do not need to remain vigilant is just plain wrong.

I have spoken in this House about standing at the memorial above the site of the Kianga No. 3 mine disaster 50 years after the disaster and seeing two 85-year-old brothers, walking sticks in hands, paying their final visit to their brother who was lost as a 20-something-year-old, buried beneath their feet, still inside the mine that took his life. They carry the grief, passed onto their sons, of a brother lost and an uncle they would never meet—lost to a failure of safety and regulation. These are the stakes of what we speak about today. I want to make it clear for all members today that this bill does not get it right and it should be reconsidered.

In June 2025, the minister commissioned Professor Johnston of the University of Queensland to undertake the Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model. The Labor members of this House supported this independent review. We noted that the minister in the terms of reference made clear suggestions that there should be consideration of a 'board to provide strategic advice and direction to the regulator', and the minister directed that the 'the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health' also be considered.

Professor Johnston reported back to the minister after considerable consultation with a variety of those involved in the industry, and the report was released in November 2025. The report made 16 significant recommendations, yet as it was released to the parliament the minister immediately made clear that he was going to ignore much of the independent review and make the changes that I think the minister planned to make regardless of the review and with no further consultation with the industry, either about the review recommendations or about the planned legislation.

Let us be clear: this is the opposite of what was recommended in the Professor Johnston report. The Johnston report stated that there should be four phases of implementation that further involved the mining community, both company and worker, to get this right. The report specifically stated that this legislation should be presented for feedback to a variety of voices, including the vital statutory advice committees of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. The statement of reservation tabled as part of the committee report stated—

The Queensland Labor Opposition believes that bypassing the Review's recommended process undermines the very safety framework the Government claims to be strengthening. Rushing complex structural changes in a high-risk industry invites mistakes, and mistakes in the resources and mining sector can have life-altering consequences for workers and their families.

Instead of carefully putting in place the phased consultative process, the minister almost immediately announced that he would ignore this phased process designed by Professor Johnston.

The second recommendation that Professor Johnston made was that, as a vital part of the safety structure for miners, the independent role of Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health, the CRSH, should be retained. Indeed, Professor Johnston made it clear that the role should be strengthened by being more clearly defined. The Johnston report went on to say—

The CRSH should chair CMSHAC and MSHAC, and act as an expert, independent advisor to the governing board on emerging issues and opportunities for improvement in health and safety.

Importantly, in the phased implementation process the report also outlined that the minister and the department should develop a role description for the rescoped commissioner role and within eight months appoint a substantive commissioner. That has never happened under this government. Further, Professor Johnston recommended that the governing board set the KPIs for the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health's role. However, the minister ignored all of these recommendations of his own independent report. In stripping away the vital place of the role of an independent commissioner, the minister has undermined the other changes that are being put in place by this bill that were envisaged to rely on the continuing role of the commissioner.

Although the minister did not consult the industry on his decision to remove the role of an independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health, the committee in preparing its report did seek the views of industry and workers on the decision to effectively sack the independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Members need only look at the submissions given to the committee by the mining industry. It is not just the unions; it is both the company and the workers who disagree with the minister on this issue. Removing the role of the commissioner is a backwards step that creates less independence and will ultimately expose resource workers to a more dangerous workplace. The Queensland Resources Council in their submission stated—

The removal of the statutory Commissioner role results in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister.

It is damning. The Electrical Trades Union went on to say—

The Commissioner has been a critical safeguard, someone who can speak truth to power, report directly to Parliament and act without fear or favour.

The AWU supports the role of commissioner. The MEU supports the role of commissioner. Members should think about that. It is not just one part of the industry that sees the value of the commissioner. The QRC and the unions agree that the commissioner's independent role leads to better safety outcomes. Many submitters went into detail about how they valued the fact that the commissioner was a single person, a direct and clear person, to go to with responsibility. The QRC said—

Under the new governance model, it is not clear how this independent advisory and engagement function will be maintained.

The minister in his speech has given no indication of how that would be replaced. The QRC is politely saying to this House that this model gets it wrong. The Mining and Energy Union made clear the view that the commissioner—

... maintained an outward presence across industry such as mine visits, attendances at safety related conferences, participation in committees and other safety initiatives. A Board will have reduced ability to detect drift in the performance of legislation and other safety matters.

I think this is an honest appraisal of this legislation from people who deeply care about their members. I have seen the commissioner at events, such as the miners memorial, act as a key point of contact informally and formally for safety issues arising. The member for Mackay during this hearing seemed to get it. Mr Dalton asked the MEU—

Gentlemen, based on your members' experience, how effective has the commissioner been in responding to safety concerns on the ground, and where do you see opportunities to improve that function moving forward?

Mr Watts of the union said—

I think the commissioners have been very effective. For example, of the last three commissioners—Kate du Preez, Andrew Clough, Kenny Singer—two of those I have personally worked with on mine sites. They have all been very approachable. They have all been out doing mine visits and being part of committees. They have been a very visible presence out in the field. I believe they have been effective. They have been a point of contact for people to call ... I think we are going to lose that with the board.

Now the member for Mackay and those others have a choice to make. It is clear to those who had read the committee's submissions and hearing transcripts that Professor Johnston had listened to submitters in a way this minister did not. Those who work in the industry insisted to Professor Johnston that the commissioner was part of the process of making mining safer. To sack the commissioner, as we are doing here today, is of course to do the opposite: to make mining more dangerous.

It is also clear that, in abolishing the interests and employment tests that were on the commissioner, the board will not have the same level of independence as the commissioner. The AWU in their submission makes it clear that sections 56 to 58 of the current RSHQ Act that dealt with other paid employment, conflicts of interest and functions do not have similar provisions in this bill, meaning these matters will not apply to the new board members. Professor Johnston's first recommendation was that a governing board should be established to provide strategic direction to, and governance over, RSHQ. Indeed, the bill does create the framework for a governing board. However Professor Johnston envisaged a very different board—a board that worked with the commissioner and gave KPIs and responded to the commissioner. The minister here has pulled at the thread of the Johnston report, unravelling the fabric by only taking some recommendations, weakening others and undermining the whole. The new incoming board will be undermined by not having a commissioner in a supporting role.

Professor Johnston saw the board as working with the commissioner, not without one. The report made clear that 'the governing board should set KPIs for the CRSH role'. The minister has not fully taken on recommendation 1 of the report and has failed completely to follow recommendation 2. Members should be aware that there are two key committees that are tasked with giving advice to the minister: the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee, which looks at non-coal mining and the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee, which looks at the specialist needs of coalmining, especially underground. In their report Kate du Preez states that—

... the effectiveness of the tripartite advisory committee model and its ability to bring together the knowledge and experience of a range of stakeholders to implement a milestone project for the mining industry.

Recommendation 3 highlighted the value of two key committees, CSMHAC and MSHAC, noting that the value the stakeholders had for these key ministerial advisory committees could be improved. Central to this recommendation was that the commissioner continue to chair the committees as a removed, independent and separate chair. Further, we have heard for the first time from the minister that someone from the board will chair those committees, but there will not be the highest standards of integrity that the commissioner had. Further, the report envisaged a greater role for the committees, noting—

The previous requirement for the committees to review and provide advice on legislation, recognised standards and guidelines should be reinstated in the legislation, with the committees reporting on these matters to the governing board.

In the spirit of this recommendation, the first thing the minister should have done was ask the committees to do just that: to review and provide advice on this very bill. However, as we have seen, the minister has done nothing of the sort, taking the typical Crisafulli LNP approach to legislation of ignoring industry, ignoring workers and ignoring local communities.

Separate to much of the mining aspects of this bill, there are also ill-judged changes to the current separate roles of the Land Access Ombudsman and Coexistence Queensland CEO. The bill merges these two positions together, even though some parts of their roles are effectively in conflict. I understand that the minister, in trying to patch this up, has foreshadowed amendments that are yet to be presented. He is acknowledging that there is a conflict and that conflict would have to be managed by the CEO stepping away from the ombudsman role or presumably in other circumstances the ombudsman, who wears two hats, stepping away from the CEO's role. This is not going to satisfy those contacts. I know that the member for Bundaberg will be speaking more about this from a farmer's

perspective. However, the committee received clear submissions from the perspective of farmers and farmer groups that this was a negative step. Glendon Farming Co. stated in their submission—

Palming off the services of the LAO to CQ, as a blunt cost-cutting measure, will exceed the capabilities of CQ and overstretch their resources, as well as create a fraught environment in which conflicts of interest will be extremely difficult and challenging to manage. This will ultimately result in poor outcomes for farmers and regional community members.

That is extraordinarily damning. This was from Glendon Farming Co. Conflicts like this make it more difficult to make long-term decisions and investments for both parties, both farmers and resources companies. AgForce Queensland concurred with these concerns during the public hearing. When asked about this change, Ms Fiskbek of AgForce stated—

Our very broad and overall concern would be creating the role so that the Land Access Ombudsman and the CEO of Coexistence Queensland are effectively the same. Well, they are the same person. The objectives that we understand of the Land Access Ombudsman Act and the Coexistence Queensland Act is that the Coexistence Queensland Act is to facilitate coexistence and the Land Access Ombudsman is to resolve disputes ... The concern is whether or not there is going to be independence between those two agencies—

and the minister has effectively admitted that he got it wrong and he is trying to patch it up. I was in the committee hearing and I went on to ask—

Would it be fair to say, though, that this effectively abolishes the Land Access Ombudsman because they are so conflicted in having those dual roles?

AgForce—do members opposite remember AgForce? They used to like them. Fiskbek said—

I think from our membership concerns it does seem like those amendments, in effect, abolish the role of the Land Access Ombudsman.

That is extraordinarily damning. I know that some of our genuine regional backbench MPs do not want to see the Land Access Ombudsman's role effectively abolished. They would want to support AgForce, and I have good news for them: I foreshadow now that I will be moving a reasoned amendment that will give them the ability to save the Land Access Ombudsman. The bad news for them is that if they vote against this amendment they will also make clear to their farming and regional communities that they are voting directly to abolish the independent and separate role of the Land Access Ombudsman. The choice is theirs.

When legislation is introduced that is significant to both industry and regional communities, the government must ensure that proper consultation with stakeholders and community members takes place. This has clearly and simply not taken place and it means that we are not debating the best bill that we could. I wish I could say to Queenslanders that this is unusual, but this is the Crisafulli LNP government's typical approach in that it ignores advice and does not seek different opinions. Because of this approach, the backbench members of the committee must take an active stand-up role to the failed executive. That is our job. Where it has failed to listen, where it has ignored advice and where it does not even bother to consult, the committee must make recommendations to correct this. No member on the committee heard that there is not widespread support for the commissioner. We all know that. I doubt after hearing the evidence given to the committee that any committee member thinks that sacking the commissioner is a good idea. That is why I am disappointed that the committee report did not make a recommendation to keep the commissioner.

I started this speech reminding members what it is like to look at people face to face and to see the grief of those left behind—brothers remembering brothers, mothers remembering sons, wives remembering a husband. The stakes are enormous and this government is letting down mining communities. Despite commissioning Susan Johnston's review of Queensland's resources safety and health model, the government has disregarded both the review's findings and its recommended process. Australian Energy Producers, amongst others, submitted—it said it most clearly—that the bill was introduced quite quickly without prior industry consultation, with submissions due just nine business days later, and that this limited the timeframe in which the industry and in particular Australian Energy Producers had to consider the provisions and the implications of the possible reforms and if there was anything more that it could have possibly included. This is no way to make changes to mining health and safety oversight. This is certainly no way to legislatively sack the independent commissioner. This minister has pulled apart so many threads of the Johnson report that it has left it a weaker resources safety system. This parliament must recognise that we have a responsibility over the executive when it gets it wrong.

Thankfully on page 61 of the Johnston report we have a pathway to fix some of the minister's errors in ignoring the report. There are four phases. I urge members to go to page 61 to read them because they give us a guide. I will table for members later the four phases of the implementation,

because this has been ignored. With that, I foreshadow that I will move a motion calling for parts 2, 7 and 8 and the associated clauses to those parts to be reintroduced in the House and referred back to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee to specifically implement the recommendations of the Johnston report, specifically the process of consultation and collaborative development. If the minister will not do it, we can as a committee. Professor Johnston called on the minister in recommendation 3 to ensure that the MSHAC and CSMHAC committees review and provide advice on legislation. We have heard that in this case the minister ignored the independent review. This House has the opportunity through the committee process to follow Professor Johnston's advice to consult with those committees to truly get expert advice that the minister is ignoring.

Further, as I stated earlier, the decision to merge the CEO of Coexistence Queensland and the Land Access Ombudsman into the same role should be examined and voted on separately. Backbench members deserve this. Members should directly vote no to this as a separate piece of legislation, not because the statement of reservations argued that it is a poor piece of legislation but because AgForce in the committee hearing expressed—

I think from our membership concerns it does seem like those amendments, in effect, abolish the role of the Land Access Ombudsman.

Members in this House through my amendment, which I will move shortly, have the ability this very week to vote up or down abolishing the Land Access Ombudsman. This is not my expression but that of AgForce. That is why this amendment is so vital for those who place any value on the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health and the role of the Land Access Ombudsman. There is now a chance for individual members to save them. They have the power. If they do not vote to save these roles, then members cannot hide behind the processes of the House. I urge all of them to support the amendment. If—and I hope, but I do not know why they would do this—this foreshadowed motion is lost, we have before the House amendments in order to try and repair some of the damage done, including saving the commissioner. However, as we heard this morning—I want to express this to those listening from mining communities—the business program motion has given us so little time to debate these key amendments that these serious concerns are effectively being trampled on by this process.

I urge members to support this reasoned amendment for two reasons. Firstly, it allows the primary industries committee and its members to do what it should do—that is, take submissions from stakeholders and consider the bill. It also fulfils implementing the bill timetable that is a key of the Johnston report ignored by the minister to restore the commissioner. Anyone voting against this reasoned amendment is in effect voting today to directly sack the commissioner for health safety. They cannot escape this fact. To that end, I move—

That the words 'now read a second time' be deleted and the—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): You are not able to move—

Mr POWELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member has to seek leave to move—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I understand; thank you, Acting Leader of the House. I am just taking some advice.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, if I can just add for your deliberation, we believe it is not necessary to seek leave and a motion can be moved.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is quite obvious; thank you. What is your motion?

Mr POWER: I move—

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

'withdrawn, redrafted and reintroduced as two separate bills:

1. the first bill dealing with parts 2, 7 and 8 and associated clauses to those parts to be reintroduced and referred back to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee to undertake a full and proper examination and report back to the House by 12 November 2027; and
2. the second bill dealing with parts 3, 4, 5, and 6 and associated clauses to those parts to be reintroduced and considered during this week's sitting.'

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The advice I have received is that there is a bill before the House and this is to that bill, so those in favour of that motion?


Mr POWER: No, I am still debating it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: So we are about to have a debate on the motion. The member is going to continue on this and then the government will have the opportunity to respond. You have the call.

Mr POWER: Thank you for informing the government—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Logan, you have the call.

Mr POWER: Further, this is the chance for backbenchers to separate out those parts related to the Land Access Ombudsman and to reintroduce them this week so that members here can save the independent, separate role of the Land Access Ombudsman. Those from agricultural organisations and farmers who are listening should note that if those opposite do not take this opportunity to vote for this amendment they are sacking the independent and separate role of the Land Access Ombudsman. Already the minister has recognised that there are problems with this legislation in that the CEO of Coexistence Queensland may have to stand down, and I also put forward that the opposite may be true—that is, that the Land Access Ombudsman, remembering that they are the same person, may also have to stand down. This creates uncertainty for the resources community and especially for farming communities. As the Glendon Farming Co. said, this is a cheap trick just to save a few dollars. That is why, when this motion is put, I expect those on the committee who heard evidence from stakeholders firsthand to support it.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (12.49 pm): I support the reasoned amendment moved by the member for Logan. Professor Johnston's review was clear: there should be a phased implementation plan to ensure changes to RSHQ are effective, manageable and proper. The Johnston review outlines an 18-month implementation plan, with phases conducted in four-monthly intervals, and the establishment of a review implementation group in the first four months to lead the implementation of the report recommendations. It was not until the second phase that legislative amendments were to be finalised and introduced to parliament. Instead, the minister has rushed legislative amendments that do not follow the review recommendations and carry some risks which were laid out during the committee's process. That is why the member for Logan is moving this reasoned amendment.

Stakeholders were scathing about the lack of industry consultation on this bill, given the changes it makes. We know that this LNP Crisafulli government do not like consultation—and they hate being told when they are wrong even more—but it is stakeholders who have told this government they are wrong. Indeed, the amendment from the member for Logan highlights Professor Johnston's key recommendation in the review—that the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health 'should be retained but should be more clearly defined', not completely abolished and replaced by a board. As the member for Logan mentioned in his second reading debate speech, the Queensland Resources Council in their submission said that 'the removal of the statutory Commissioner role results in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister'. That is why the amendment reads as it does in terms of sending this bill back to committee for further review and consultation.


Let's look at the Electrical Trades Union, the mighty ETU. In their submission on the role of the CRSH they said it is a 'critical safeguard, someone who can speak truth to power, report directly to Parliament and act directly without fear or favour'. This government say they are all about acting without fear and favour—that they are all about integrity and transparency—yet we know that members opposite in those agricultural seats will be doing the exact opposite when it comes to their constituency if they do not support this amendment and send the parts listed by the member for Logan back to committee.

The Queensland Resources Council stated that the commissioner 'provided a direct and accessible point of engagement' and that 'under the new governance model, it is not clear how this independent advisory engagement function will be maintained'. The peak body in resources is effectively agreeing with the amendment moved by the member for Logan. You have the workers' representatives in multiple unions and you have the peak body for resources, mines and large companies throughout Queensland, yet the only ones who are not supporting them are the members opposite. This amendment is exactly what the submitters have called for—for the bill to go back and for greater consultation to be had—because the role of the commissioner is invaluable in the process.

I note that the member for Logan highlighted the words of the member for Mackay. I know that the member for Mackay stands on his principles; I look forward to seeing him join this side once the debate is finished. He asked the Mining & Energy Union, 'Based on your members' experience, how effective has the commissioner been?' The response from Mr Watts of the MEU reads—

I think the commissioners have been very effective. ... They have been a very visible presence out in the field. I believe they have been effective. They have been a point of contact for people to call and talk to. I think we are going to lose that with the board.

This is extremely important. It is extremely important that this amendment gets up.

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (12.54 pm): I had the great privilege and honour of being a member of the select committee that looked into black lung disease, coal worker's pneumoconiosis. The former member for Southern Downs certainly played a significant role in that, as did the former member for Bundamba. Anybody who has visited various mining communities around Queensland, as I did, and listened to the stories of people dying of a disease we had all been told—we had all bought into the myth—did not exist for 40 years, has an impression left on them. The reality is: having heard those stories and gone through that inquiry process, we have a very serious obligation as legislators to get this right so that we are presenting legislation to this parliament that will achieve what it is setting out to achieve. It needs to do what it says on the tin: to keep workers safe. I fully support the amendment moved by the member for Logan.

I scratch my head as to why a government that is committed to transparency and accountability would care to conduct itself in this way. Clearly, they are capable of pulling legislation and working on it. We have seen that already this week in relation to e-mobility. Clearly, they will pull that and do more work on it because they have botched that completely. This is other legislation they have botched completely. Those opposite commissioned an expert to give advice. I know that they do not listen to experts. Why do we bother commissioning an expert if we are going to then completely ignore the advice of that expert when it comes to pill testing or gender services for young people transitioning? At least you did not commission those experts; they just exist.

Mr HEAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would like to bring the member back to relevance to the amendment before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): It is a valid point of order. Member for Greenslopes, you are speaking to the amendment that is before the House with regard to referring the bill back to the committee.

Mr J KELLY: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I was just trying to make the point that a big part of the reasoning driving the amendment moved by the member for Logan is the fact that this parliament—or the government, presumably tabled and accepted by this committee and this parliament—has clearly ignored expert opinion in relation to this legislation. That should be of deep concern. We spent a considerable amount of resources and time on the two reports tabled in this parliament in relation to pneumoconiosis, black lung disease. We heard from a considerable number of experts in this field. We listened to employers. We listened to peak bodies of employers. We listened to workers on the ground—some of whom were workers who were dying of this dreadful disease. They said that if we had had different processes in place and had sought expert opinion earlier, we may have been able to avoid that very situation.

It seems to me very strange that we would be charging ahead with legislation that is clearly so fundamentally flawed that it is failing to receive the support of stakeholders. I, for one, am very concerned. I have stood in this place many times on a range of different issues advocating strongly in support of workplace health and safety for workers. I have spoken before of a relative who died in a workplace injury. I think anybody who has been through those experiences and any family who has been touched by workplace death or illness knows just how important it is that we get this legislation right.

Some of the provisions that have been put forward in the bill are, quite frankly, simply unworkable. They destroy the independence of this process. I think one of the key things that we have to keep coming back to is what led us to be in this situation in the first place. For 40 years—and I will not single out any government, individual, business or union; everybody was involved—Queenslanders perpetrated the myth that we were the only place on the entire planet that did not have black lung disease, pneumoconiosis. That myth was able to be perpetrated because we stopped listening to experts. In fact, we told the experts they were wrong. We stopped having independent thought in this process. We, in effect, had collusion which led to terrible outcomes for working people.

Debate, on motion of Mr J Kelly, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

International Nurses Day; International Day of the Midwife; Health Services



Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Today, on International Nurses Day, we have an opportunity to say thank you—thank you to the nurses who wake up every day and set out to save lives; thank you to the nurses who keep our hospitals running; thank you to the nurses in our GP clinics supporting care close to home; and thank you to the nurses in aged-care homes, community health centres, mental health units and maternity wards right across our great state. Queensland nurses do extraordinary work. They are under pressure every single day—long shifts on busy wards and taking growing demand in their stride. Sometimes they are the first there in heartbreaking circumstances. Despite that, our nurses keep showing up because for nurses theirs is not just a job, it is an act of care, compassion and service. I also want to acknowledge Queensland's midwives following International Day of the Midwife last week—midwives who are there through the fear and excitement, in the calm and the chaos of birth. Midwives are often the strong and reassuring voice when parents need it the most. To every nurse and every midwife across Queensland: we see you, we value you and we thank you.

Health care is not just a concept on paper, it is a system made up of thousands of hardworking health heroes who show up, who care and who make it work. It is not a system that can be fixed with a media release, a slogan or spin. There must be action and investment. I am proud to be part of the Labor team that advanced health care in Queensland. We decriminalised abortion and approved access to women's reproductive care. We introduced free IVF for mothers going through cancer treatment. We recognised our doctors and nurses by providing nation-leading wages and working conditions. Ten years ago today we passed historic minimum nurse-to-patient ratio laws. Those ratios mean that our frontline workers can respond to critical situations quicker, prevent complications, reduce the length of stay and contribute to higher job satisfaction. It was Queensland nurses and midwives who told us they needed these reforms—that these reforms would save lives. That is the difference you can make when you get in a room with unions—with the workers who are on the front line day in, day out.

It is a stark contrast to the approach of those opposite, especially the transport minister. Why is it that the education minister and the health minister could meet with unions and negotiate a deal, but the transport minister does not think it is his job? How many trains need to be cancelled before he takes accountability? It is a hallmark of this government to deflect and distract from the issues impacting Queenslanders. Health continues to be a major failing of this government. They care more about promoting themselves than getting on with the job. In fact, in some parts of Queensland a new hospital is being bulldozed instead of built.

At its core health care is about people; people having confidence that access to health care close to home is there when they need it—people like Pat who joined me outside the Prince Charles Hospital on Friday. Pat is a proud Queenslander and someone who has relied on our health system during difficult times. She called an ambulance after having a fall and waited more than six hours for it to arrive. Pat's story is a reminder that behind every statistic is a human being, a family, a life, someone waiting in pain for care, someone hoping the system will be there when they need it, which is why government investment matters. When governments fail to deliver in health care it is real people like Pat who pay the price. Patients wait longer in emergency departments, our ambulances are ramped for hours and the waitlist for specialist appointments blows out. Queenslanders deserve a government that delivers, not one focused on headlines and excuses.


The problem is only getting worse as our state grows, meaning we need more hospital beds, more satellite healthcare centres, more frontline workers, more mental health services and more investment in the infrastructure that keeps Queenslanders healthy, like at the Prince Charles Hospital where Labor's 93-bed expansion was due to start construction this year. Right now it is just a vacant construction site. Those extra 93 beds promised to northsiders should have been delivered by the end of this term. Instead, we do not know how long that community will have to wait to see those 93 beds delivered. At the same time, the Crisafulli LNP government has outsourced public beds to the private sector. They have penned a deal with St Vincent's at Kangaroo Point to rent out 25 beds at a cost of about \$1 million per bed per year. Instead of renting beds we should be building them where they are needed, like at the Prince Charles Hospital.

I have been out doorknocking every weekend of this by-election campaign and so many people I have met have a connection to the Prince Charles Hospital or the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital. Nurses and doctors are telling me that they are stretched thin on the front line and that they need more resources. This weekend Stafford voters are in a unique situation: they can send this

Crisafulli LNP government a message that they want less talk and more action, more support with the affordability crisis, more beds at the Prince Charles Hospital now—not in the never-never—more action on the fuel crisis, public transport and congestion.

Labor's candidate, Luke Richmond, is a real local with a real vision to fight for his community to get its fair share. It is a community he loves, and where he is building a life with his wife, Maddie. I know that Luke will be a fierce advocate for Stafford should he get the chance. This is an election that will not change the government, but we can say to the Premier, 'Stop the cuts.' Queenslanders deserve better than a government focused on profits over people, a government focused on politics instead of patients. They deserve a government that understands that health care is not about ideology, it is about outcomes; a government that backs health workers instead of taking them for granted and taking them backwards; a government that builds hospitals instead of delaying new hospital beds, terminating contracts for new hospitals and demolishing hospitals that are already under construction. Queenslanders know the difference between someone who turns up for a photo and someone who turns up for the people.

Stafford By-Election; CFMEU Inquiry

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.09 pm): I am sorry; I was taken aback as the opposition leader had a minute and a half to go in the only 10 minutes he gets in the week, but he could not even fill it when talking about the Stafford by-election. He ran out of things to say. The honourable opposition leader talks about fuel security and supply. I think this opposition leader is running on empty. The tank is empty. I would say to the opposition leader that the Stafford by-election will not change the government but it will change the opposition leader—absolutely, it will change the opposition leader.

The leader of the opposition talks about being out doorknocking. I have been doorknocking and one thing is certain: while people do talk about the opposition leader, it is not with the pleasantries that he talked about today. They remember the 10 years under a Labor government. They remember the Labor government's neglect of the Stafford electorate. Fiona Hammond is absolutely giving it a red-hot crack in the Labor seat of Stafford. However, I am getting sidetracked.

I want to update honourable members about the CFMEU royal commission, which is holding a hearing in Cairns today. A few things have already come out of the CFMEU royal commission. A workplace health and safety inspector—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: They are laughing about workplace health and safety, deaths on construction sites and a whistleblower who was forced to go to the royal commission. That is typical Labor—backing the CFMEU. A workplace health and safety inspector, Karim De Ridder, said—

... the constant bullying and abuse from CFMEU officials that I have experienced on construction sites, as described below, have taken a toll on my mental health.

...

As a general rule, in my experience, CFMEU's abuse of inspectors was directed at getting inspectors to issue statutory notices that the union wanted. If I or my fellow inspectors did not do what the CFMEU wanted us to do, we would be subjected to abuse and complaints to WHSQ management.

...

During this conversation I overheard Mr Ravbar shout that we (the inspectors) are—

effing dogs. When asked why nothing was being done about the CFMEU behaviour, De Ridder stated that it was due to—and I quote—'political influence at a higher level'.

I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that the political influence at a higher level was not coming from the Liberal National Party opposition because we were on the side of the inspectors. I put it to you, Deputy Speaker, that the political influence was coming from the Labor Party and its ministry. Who was it? Every day, evidence is coming out of the commission involving the influence of the Labor ministry of the time and none of them have had the intestinal fortitude to stand up and say, 'It was me and I apologise.' None of them have done that. Clearly, they were on the side of the CFMEU and they have not backed independent workplace health and safety inspectors—so it is another day at the hearing.

We have also heard that there was a CFMEU hit squad from South-East Queensland sent up to intimidate public servants into issuing statutory notices they wanted. Who was the minister at the time?

Who was defending the workplace health and safety inspectors? Who was ensuring that public servants were looked after? It was not the member for McConnel because how could all this happen under her nose and she not do anything about it? She says, 'I didn't know about it.' 'I didn't know about it,' she says. 'I don't know.'

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

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

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Getting back to the Stafford by-election, I said that the opposition leader is running on empty and, I have to say, so too is the Labor Party campaign. I have a couple of brochures that Luke Richmond from the Labor Party has sent to the constituents of Stafford. I will table this one from Luke Richmond. It has a how-to-vote card on the back.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Table it, please. There will be no props.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is headed 'Luke Richmond Labor for Stafford'. I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Luke Richmond Labor for Stafford'.

It begs the question, where is the opposition leader? Why is there not a photo of the opposition leader on any of their merchandise? With Fiona Hammond, we are happy to have a picture of the Premier on our merchandise.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No props please, Deputy Premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: I table a copy of Fiona Hammond's merchandise with a picture of our Premier, the leader of the Liberal National Party.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Fiona Hammond LNP for Stafford'.

The opposition leader is absent from their documentation. They are basically saying to the people of Stafford, 'Vote for Luke Richmond but we don't want to talk about Steven Miles, the opposition leader.' They do not want him on the brochures or anywhere else because the more he doorknocks, the more he is on the corflutes and the more he on the brochures then the more their vote goes down and the Labor Party know it.

I turn to the union movement. I table this misleading information from the AWU. We have the TWU with more misinformation. Of course, the UWU has put out more misinformation. They are all running a really scary negative campaign that is misleading the people of Stafford.

Tabled paper: Document, undated—political pamphlet.

Tabled paper: Document, undated—photocopy of political pamphlet.


Tabled paper: Document, undated—photocopy of political pamphlet.

The reality is that we are asking people to back our plan. We are delivering for Queensland. We are delivering for the people of Stafford. Fiona Hammond would make an exceptional member of parliament for the great people of Stafford.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, would you please withdraw some unparliamentary language you used in that contribution?

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Crisafulli LNP Government, North Brisbane

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.14 pm): Keeping your word matters, being honest matters, integrity matters, health care matters and giving the people of Queensland and the people of Stafford the health care they deserve matters. By their actions, the LNP say the healthcare needs of the people of Stafford do not matter. Why do we know this? If northsiders head to the Prince Charles Hospital this afternoon, they should know there will be 93 fewer beds at that hospital by the end of the term of this parliament than was set to be delivered by Labor. They will find out that the LNP government has done the opposite of what it promised. The Crisafulli government promised to improve Queensland's health system. Instead, the health system is going backwards under the LNP. It is a broken promise, it is a failure to deliver and the Premier has broken his word again.

All of this matters today, of all days, as this is the day we celebrate International Nurses Day. Today is also a day to celebrate Labor's safe nurse-to-patient ratio legislation—legislation passed by this parliament 10 years ago today; legislation that was opposed by the LNP. Ten years ago today, our Labor government passed laws to ensure safe nurse-to-patient ratios in state hospitals. Ten years ago today, our Labor government listened to our state's nurses, our heroes on the front line who deliver the

life-saving care Queenslanders deserve. They called for mandatory ratios to ensure patient care and improve the workforce. They called for important changes in the name of safety and, working in partnership, our Labor government delivered.

That was an initiative that has produced a lasting legacy for Queensland but, sadly, under the LNP there is not much for our nurses to celebrate this year. They will tell you that their hospitals are overflowing, that waitlists continue to grow and that they feel overwhelmed. They will tell you how insulting it is to have a Premier and a health minister who continue to tout dodgy health data while our public health system continues to falter. It just highlights again how this Premier and his government are all photo-op and no follow-up; all show and no go.

The centrepiece of this LNP government's failure is its sabotage of the Labor government's capacity expansion program—a program that would have seen more beds delivered for Queenslanders faster, including in places like the Stafford electorate. Under Labor, 93 new beds would have been delivered at the Prince Charles Hospital by 2027. Under the LNP, that is just not happening. Northsiders deserve better than an LNP photo-op by the Premier and an LNP slogan. They deserve more than wall-to-wall blue LNP government advertising. Our nurses deserve a government that backs them with the infrastructure and workforce planning they deserve. Many of the wonderful nurses and other health workers who keep the Prince Charles Hospital running live in the Stafford electorate. They know how much the community is reeling from long wait times and being unable to access the care they need when they need it.

One person who knows first-hand about the problems at the Prince Charles Hospital is Labor's amazing candidate in the Stafford by-election, Luke Richmond. Luke himself has doorknocked thousands of homes. He has been talking to the people of Stafford about their concerns for the Prince Charles Hospital. Luke knows that the people of Stafford worry that the LNP simply will not deliver the health care they deserve. This is a government that has sat on its hands for 18 months, claiming credit for announcements and projects funded by the previous Labor government—that is not governing.

The fact is that, if the Premier were willing to listen to the nurses and frontline workers impacted by his core priorities, he would know that they want the 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital by 2027. If the Premier listened, he would know that the people of Stafford need those extra beds. If the Premier honoured his word, kept his promise and delivered what he said he would deliver then the people of Stafford would be getting those extra hospital beds next year. However, that is not just happening. It is not happening because more and more, day by day, the people of Queensland are working out that the Premier is not a man of his word. Instead, this is a Premier who is all photo-op and no follow-up; a Premier who is all show and no go; a Premier whose flim-flam words masquerade as promises and commitments that do not come true. The Premier who promised it all is now a Premier who has actually delivered nothing much at all.

Health Services; Stafford By-Election



Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.19 pm): Coming from all glib and no idea over there, I think the statements—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the words used by the member for Clayfield.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Let me seek some advice on that. Member for Clayfield, the member has taken offence and I ask you to withdraw.

Mr NICHOLLS: I withdraw. If I had not have listened to the words coming out of the two previous speakers I would not have believed that they had the gall to say what they have just attempted to perpetrate on the people of Queensland and the people of Stafford. I want to address the rampant mistruths—

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

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. Member for Miller, you are warned under the standing orders. Member for Woodridge?

Mr DICK: I take personal offence at the words used by the health minister and I ask him to withdraw. They were directed at me.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Woodridge, I was listening to the member for Clayfield and I did not hear him personally refer to you.

Mr NICHOLLS: If I had not heard myself what was said by those on that side recently and had seen the rampant mistruths being peddled by the Labor Party in the Stafford by-election, I would not have believed it. I think it is important that we set the record straight for the people of Stafford because we have been out in the Stafford electorate, we have been talking to the people of Stafford, not just in the last four weeks like those opposite. Remember, they expelled their former member and they abandoned Stafford—we have not seen hide nor hair of Luke Richmond—other than a 48-hour foray by the member for Aspley who thought he might chance his arm over there. What they are obviously trying to do is draw attention away from the fact that their candidate, Luke Richmond, is one of the architects of Labor's health crisis because he worked for two failed Labor health ministers—acting chief of staff and senior adviser for two of them.

What have we been delivering and telling the people of Stafford? We have been delivering the lowest statewide March quarter ramping since 2020, at 38 per cent—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Waterford! Your interjections are not being taken.

Mr NICHOLLS:—and that follows the lowest quarter in half a decade for December. I contrast that with those opposite who set the worst quarterly ramping record—the member for Waterford—at 45.5 per cent. That was the member for Waterford's record. Who assisted her to set that record? Luke Richmond was right there in the middle of it all. Let's remember, the member for Waterford promised 28 per cent.

Mr Minnikin: How did that go?

Mr NICHOLLS: We had 45.5 per cent—the worst in history. Our data, the most recent data—they cannot believe it—that is reported shows that for the Prince Charles Hospital for the month of March the ramping rate was 30.2 per cent. Under those opposite what was it? The peak of 55 per cent was reached under those opposite. On top of this, elective surgery peaked at over 2,180, but under the LNP it is now down to 1,640—a fall of 500.

With regard to the mistruth about the beds at the Prince Charles Hospital, let's see what the independent review said. It states—

Forecast completion is already 2 years later than was initially announced and it is unlikely with a replan of the project that this program elongation will be reduced.

It further states—

Without substantial scope deletions (moving even further away from the scope proposed by the HHS) and a different construction contract risk allocation there is no apparent pathway to procure this project ...


It was a non-starter, and the cost had more than doubled. There was no paediatric emergency, a lack of operating theatres, and who would have thought you would need a central sterilising department in a hospital? Obviously not the Labor Party because they did not include it. There was no central sterilising department. What are we planning for? We are planning for 93 beds, as the Hospital Rescue Plan has set out for 12 months. We are providing the services that are needed.

Let me deal with the workforce mistruths. With regard to Brisbane North, in the Metro North region there are 1,500 more health workers under the Crisafulli LNP government in the last 18 months, including 126 extra full-time equivalent health employees at the Prince Charles Hospital. What was Labor doing? Their last budget showed 1,700 fewer healthcare employees because they had no money in the forwards, and the member for Woodridge knows it. No money in the forwards!

When it comes to the election on Saturday, the people of Stafford have a clear choice between a government that has failed for a decade and a government with a calm, methodical plan that is dealing with ramping, dealing with employees and building beds that Queenslanders need.

(Time expired)

Health Services; International Nurses Day

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (2.25 pm): I love the opportunity any time I get it in this place to follow the current Minister for Health who spent most of that contribution talking about ambulance ramping. I thought it was so important to put on the record following his contribution that the worst ever ramping on record—worst ever—was September 2025 under this health minister. Ramping was 47.8 per cent under this health minister, when almost half of all patients—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order! Members on my left, I cannot hear the speaker for all of your interjections. I assume you do not want that to be the case. Order, please.

Ms FENTIMAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I will say that again: 47.8%, nearly half of all patients ramped—the worst ambulance ramping on record was under this LNP health minister. Not only has he had the worst ambulance ramping on record, he has failed to deliver the 93 hospital beds at the Prince Charles Hospital that would be available from next year. His own chief executive of Metro North went before the parliament's health committee and said, 'I am actually unaware. I have no information about when any of those beds will be delivered.'

Mr Miles: What an own goal that was.

Ms FENTIMAN: Such an own goal! The minister arranged for the chief executive to appear to try to score cheap political points when in fact it was the chief executive who revealed they have no plan for beds at the Prince Charles Hospital. They have scrapped our plan to deliver 93 beds.

When we are out doorknocking in Stafford on the north side of Brisbane, when we are standing on pre-poll—

Mr Dick: Unlike the member for Clayfield.

Ms FENTIMAN: I take that interjection. Despite the current health minister talking about being out in Stafford, I have not seen him once—not at pre-poll and not out talking to voters. I wonder if that is a deliberate strategy decision from the LNP to have the health minister nowhere to be seen.

But it is the number 93 that locals in Stafford on Brisbane's northside are talking to us about. They are desperately disappointed, angry and frustrated that the 93 beds they desperately need as a growing community, an aging community, where we see more chronic disease presenting to our hospitals, have been cut. They have effectively cut Labor's plan to deliver those 93 beds. Behind every one of those 93 beds is a Queenslanders who will wait longer for care and a nurse under greater pressure.

Today is, as we have heard, International Nurses Day—a day when we recognise the extraordinary Queenslanders who hold our health system together every single day, who look after us when we need them most and who are with families in some of their darkest moments where there is fear and uncertainty. That is a lot of pressure. It is an extraordinary job that they do each and every day. They deserve more support from this government, not less. However, it would seem that this health minister's way of acknowledging our hardworking nurses is to scrap the capacity expansion program which will mean fewer beds not just at Prince Charles but right across the state, putting more pressure each and over day on our nurses and our hardworking health heroes.

Thank you so much, Minister. I am sure our nurses are grateful that you have made it so much harder for them to do their job. I am sure Queenslanders are delighted that you continue to delay access to health care.


Mr Nicholls interjected.

Ms FENTIMAN: I cannot believe that we continue to hear interjections from this health minister, the one who has the worst ramping on record and is refusing to apologise to our nurses for refusing to build the beds that Queenslanders need. What does this mean for Queenslanders who are waiting for an ambulance or who are turning up to the emergency department with sick children? It means that they will continue to wait. It means that Queenslanders who are injured will wait longer for a bed where doctors and nurses can treat them.

When Queenslanders show up to a hospital they deserve to be seen in a timely manner, but this government has walked away from that plan. Ultimately, the people of Stafford have responded to the fact that those opposite have scrapped our plan to deliver 93 beds next year. They are responding to our message that cutting is in the LNP's DNA. Even when they promise they will not cut a thing, they cut and they cut and they cut.

(Time expired)

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (2.30 pm): You have to have thick skin to come in here, having been the minister for health who oversaw the worst quarterly ambulance ramping on record. That is the member for Waterford's record—the worst quarterly ramping rate of 45.5 per cent. That is her record.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: In fact, those opposite were so ashamed of monthly data that they cut the metric. They got rid of monthly reporting because they knew that they could not deliver for Queenslanders. Let's make a comparison. It was 45.5 per cent under Labor and it is 38 per cent under this LNP Minister for Health, who is delivering for the people of Stafford.

The people of Stafford have an important choice to make. The by-election this weekend is an opportunity for the people of the inner north to show Labor that they are not going to buy into their grubby scare campaigns, that the bad old days of being ignored by Labor are over. This weekend the people of Stafford have a choice: they can choose the same old tired Labor—the same old Labor who have not changed their stripes—or they can choose a proven local candidate who will have a seat at the table of government that is delivering for the people of Stafford.

Let's talk about Labor's record when it comes to Stafford. Who can forget the failed Northern Transitway project, promised by Labor for \$53 million. I can see the member for Aspley is getting a bit nervous there. Under him, it blew out to \$172 million, and they still could not finish the project. I know that is not too bad compared with the member for Miller, but that is not a measure of success. Everyone who gets a bus along Gympie Road or drives down Gympie Road knows that those lanes were meant to go all the way to Hamilton Road but they stop at Rode Road, not to mention that the roadsides and median strips were left to wrack and ruin and unfinished by the former Labor government. When I was sworn into this role, I had people asking me, 'What's the go with that section of Gympie Road around Chermiside? It looks disgraceful.' They are right. It is because Labor ran out of money and decided to give up. Our government have gotten on with the job of rectifying that. We are fixing Labor's failures, finishing the project and not blowing out the cost from \$53 million to \$172 million.

Not content with being known as the former transport minister who failed to finish the only level crossing removal that those opposite delivered the whole time they were in government, which was in his own electorate, the member for Aspley was seen softly campaigning in Stafford earlier this year. It was not for the now Labor candidate; it was for himself.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please.

Mr MELLISH: That is untrue. I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, would you withdraw, please?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. Before the by-election—and I am more than happy for the member for Aspley to come in here and correct the record—the member for Aspley was seen holding mobile offices in Stafford, the electorate next door to his. He is the member for Aspley, not the member for Stafford. He has been seen doorknocking in the electorate of Stafford. I am told by union representatives that he sought to jump in to the Stafford—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. Member for Aspley, what is your point of order?

Mr MELLISH: I take personal offence and ask him to withdraw. He is also misleading the House, so I will be writing to the Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, you know how to make a point of order. I do not need additional statements. I will seek some advice. Minister, will you withdraw, please?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw. I refer to the member's own Facebook page. He was seen campaigning in the seat of Stafford before the by-election. He was obviously trying to drive his vote up.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: I am not sure how he was working there.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. What is your point of order, member for Aspley?

Mr MELLISH: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, will you withdraw, please?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw, and he may wish to delete the post. Let's contrast him with Fiona Hammond, the LNP candidate—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. What is your point of order?

Mr MELLISH: He is a slow learner. I take personal offence and ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, you are warned under the standing orders. Minister, will you withdraw your remark, please?

Mr MICKELBERG: I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am the member for Buderim and I will campaign in Buderim, not in Stafford.

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

Mr MICKELBERG: Fiona Hammond has served that community for 15 years.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock, please. Member for Aspley—


Mr MELLISH: I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am going to seek some advice from the Clerk. Member for Aspley, I heard no personal reference in the last statement. There is no point of order. I remind you, member for Aspley, that you are under a warning. Minister, would you resume your contribution, please.

Mr MICKELBERG: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Fiona Hammond, a councillor, has been delivering for that community for 15 years. She is a proud advocate for small business, community groups, sporting clubs and everything in between. She is advocating for and backing this government's plan for a better Queensland. She has called out the former Labor government's inability to deliver for the inner north on local road projects. She is fighting for fuel security—something those opposite were silent on when they were in government and are silent on now in opposition. Unlike the member for Aspley and those Labor members opposite, Fiona Hammond knows what is required to deliver for the people of Stafford. This weekend the people of Stafford have a choice: a seat at the table of government delivering for Stafford or more of the same under Labor.

(Time expired)

International Nurses Day

 **Mr JKELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.37 pm): I hope Fiona Hammond is not planning on catching a train if she miraculously gets elected to this place. Happy International Nurses Day to all of the nurses across the state and happy International Day of the Midwife for last Tuesday—and don't they deserve it! The theme of this year's day is 'Our future. Empowered nurses save lives'. That is certainly something that the Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union know, and I thank them for their advocacy for our professions.

Queenslanders receive better care because the QNMU empowers nurses and midwives. The first pair of hands you will feel on this earth will likely be those of a midwife and the last person you will spend some time with will likely be a nurse. Through all parts of your life, midwives and nurses are working to keep you healthy, care for you when you are sick, get you back to your community and stay by your side when the hope of recovery is slim.

In this parliament 10 years ago today a very good thing happened. In just the fourth jurisdiction in the world, the safe nurse- and midwife-to-patient ratio bill was passed. Ratios save lives: falls have been prevented, teeth have been cleaned, medications have been given accurately and pressure area care has been delivered on time, amongst many other things. Most importantly, nurses and midwives have had the time to be with patients, listen to their concerns, properly assess their condition and provide that human comfort and care that the professions are renowned and respected for. I want to share a small part of the speech I gave 10 years ago. I stated—

What does it mean to be a nurse? It is not about the technical skills, the clinical knowledge or the sometimes dramatic events ... that make for good TV. It is about taking responsibility to care for another human being no matter what their situation.

...

Our profession is the essence of all that is good about humanity: people caring deeply about other people for no reason other than we know it is instinctively the right thing to do.

Since this legislation passed, lives have been saved, patient outcomes have improved, and nurses and midwives have stayed in the profession. We know this because the Queensland University of Technology and the University of Pennsylvania worked together to evaluate the impacts of the legislation. Dr McHugh from UPenn summed it up brilliantly when he said, 'We looked and looked and

looked, and it was consistent across the board—all the things we anticipated and hypothesised that could improve in response to improvements in staffing did improve.’

I want to acknowledge the former premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, for her courage in making this commitment; the work of the then health minister, the member for Woodridge, for supporting this legislation and, of course, the mighty Beth Mohle from the then QNU, now QNMU, for her fantastic advocacy for this. I also want to thank the member for Hill, who supported the legislation and sought me out many times to talk about the legislation.

Of course not everybody in this chamber supported the legislation. I am still the only nurse in this chamber who supported this legislation. The member for Mudgeeraba did not support it. She said that ratios are not the panacea sold to nurses by the QNU. The then shadow minister, the member for Surfers Paradise, said that their party could not support a one-size-fits-all approach. The then newly minted opposition leader, in the job for just a few days at that time and now health minister, did not even speak on the bill, but presumably as the leader he endorsed the views of his fellow members.

I have been talking to a lot of people in Stafford over the last few weeks and they have a lot to say about the performance of the health minister, let me say. I met a lot of nurses, allied health professionals, admin and operational staff who work at the Prince Charles Hospital and they say that, while their hospitals are overflowing and waitlists continue to grow, the best the Premier and the health minister can do is continue to tout dodgy data on ambulance ramping and emergency department wait times while our hospital systems groan. How insulting to those hardworking health staff!

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Pause the clock. Minister for Health, do you have a point of order?

Mr NICHOLLS: I do. I take personal offence at that comment made by the member for Greenslopes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, would you withdraw, please?

Mr J KELLY: I withdraw. They had a chance to do something but they have scrapped plans for the capacity expansion program, which would have seen more beds delivered where Queenslanders need them and much faster. Let’s look at the Prince Charles Hospital. Under Labor, 93 beds were due to be delivered by 2027. Under the LNP, that is no longer happening. In fact, they have not even finished their plan apparently.


The people of Stafford deserve better. They need more than a photo-op and a slogan. Hardworking nurses deserve to know they have a government that backs them with infrastructure and workforce planning. Instead, what do the nurses of Stafford and, in fact, all of Queensland get on International Nurses Day? Did anyone hear either the Premier or the Deputy Premier, with his weird little tales, or the health minister even bother to wish nurses a happy International Nurses Day? I wonder how the wonderful nurses who keep the Prince Charles Hospital going would feel about this.

This is not a government that cares about delivering health services. This is a government that sat on its hands for 18 months, claiming announcements already funded by the former government. This Premier, who apparently listens, clearly is not listening to the nurses of Stafford. If he did, he would know that they want those 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital.

We will be standing with our nurses and with the people of Stafford on Saturday to send this LNP government a message. We will not be seeing the member for Kawana, the former leader of ‘Operation Boring’, because he has not been out there in two weeks. I doubt that he will be going out there. They will not let him near a voter, because that is the No. 1 way they will guarantee a vote for Luke Richmond—by sending out the captain of ‘Operation Boring’!

(Time expired)

Fuel Security

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (2.42 pm): Good government means delivering for Queensland. I have been in the Stafford electorate in recent weeks. I can assure the member for Greenslopes that that community recognises that this government is actually doing something and delivering for Queensland and for their electorate.

I want to talk about the fuel crisis that we are in at the moment because it spreads right across this state. When it comes to fuel security, the messaging and the leadership from our Premier in taking this forward to the national level has been ahead of the game.

Ms Boyd: He wrote a letter!

Mr LAST: Exactly. I take that interjection. That is what those opposite would do. They would just write a letter and wash their hands saying, 'We've done our bit.' We are not going to write a letter.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Order, members on my left!

Mr LAST: 'Write a letter—that would solve the problem. Let's just write a letter.'

Mr Nicholls: Assuming they can write.

Mr LAST: I take the interjection: assuming they can write. We actually have a plan. We have the Queensland Fuel Security Plan that will underpin our fuel security going forward.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Mr LAST: Chris Bowen might stand up in Canberra and talk about 30 days of supply and what that means.

Mr Smith interjected.

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

Mr LAST: That does not cut the mustard in Queensland, not for our farmers, not for our miners, not for our commuters and certainly not for the people of Stafford. We know that in Canberra—and it flows through to the opposition here—they are beholden to the Greens. They are putting ideology ahead of fuel security. They are more interested and committed to putting Green ideology before fuel security in this state, and they should hang their head in shame.

On the weekend the Premier and I met with the CEO of BP and we made an announcement at Bulwer Island at the Port of Brisbane about the 54 million litres of additional storage. That is what delivering for Queensland looks like. The CEO made the comment that he has taken this to all other states in Australia. He said, 'If you want to know how to get business done, if you want a benchmark, go to Queensland. Go and talk to those guys because they just make it happen.' We got the extension of that lease through in record time.

Mr Healy interjected.

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

Mr LAST: The team rolled their sleeves up and they got that lease through to give them certainty going forward to refurbish those five additional tanks—54 million litres, with the potential down the track for another 49 million litres. We have gone out for expressions of interest for extra storage tanks up and down the coast.

Mrs Poole: We'll have it.

Mr LAST: The member for Townsville and the member for Mundingburra are saying, 'We'll take the storage up in Townsville.' We have gone out for expressions of interest right along the coastline because that is what delivering for Queensland looks like: giving them the certainty that we need.

Our fuel plan includes unlocking oil reserves. I have spoken in this place about oil in the Taroom Trough. It is coming out of the ground as I stand here today. It is coming out of the ground right now. We are producing oil. We are going to provide our own fuel. That is a good news story.


Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr LAST: Fiona Hammond gets Taroom. I love that. That is what we are about: we are making it happen. I met with Liberty Energy earlier today—a huge company out of the US—who have said, 'How do we get a toehold in Queensland? We want to come and do business. We're interested in what you guys are doing because you just make it happen. We would love to come to Queensland and invest.' I say, 'You bring over those drilling rigs and let's go because we have plenty of oil. We are more than happy to give you access to that.' We are going to refine more fuel here in Queensland. We are boosting our fuel storage capacity. We are removing state taxes on fuel price rises. We are pushing the federal government to give us some of that funding.

We are doing the heavy lifting in this state, as we know. When it comes to resources and gas, it is a good news story in this state. We are doing it. We are producing it. We are not afraid of resources in this state. We know that they have been demonised by those opposite for 10 long years. The Fraser Institute investment attractiveness index was 39 under their watch; it is 13 in 12 months under our watch. Already money is flowing into Queensland. We are going to continue to do that and Stafford needs to know that.

(Time expired)

International Nurses Day

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (2.48 pm): I join with my colleagues in acknowledging on International Nurses Day our magnificent nurses who keep our hospitals running, who look after patients at their most vulnerable and who too often have to make a system under pressure actually work despite the failures and the cuts of the Crisafulli LNP government. I acknowledge our magnificent midwives as well.

Today marks 10 years since the former Labor government passed safe nurse-to-patient ratio laws through this parliament—an epic reform. Ten years ago Labor listened to nurses. Nurses told us safe staffing levels save lives, they improve health care and they stop unsafe workloads becoming business as usual. We listened, we acted and we delivered. Those ratios have improved safety, working conditions and patient care. That is our record—listening and working with nurses, backing them and patients with real reform.

Compare that with the LNP. Before the election we heard Premier Crisafulli saying he would put doctors and nurses back in charge. What has happened since then? We have seen cuts, delays, a CHO scandal, botching the flu season, secrecy, photo-ops and no follow-through. The LNP have put the spin doctors in fact back in charge and the result is a health system going backwards under Premier Crisafulli and so-called health minister Nicholls. They cut the Workforce Attraction Incentive Scheme. They cut nurse clinic hours. They scrapped pill testing against the advice of health experts.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on two matters: one is the correct use of titles, as you know; and the second is that I take personal offence in relation to the comment made by the member for Miller.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Miller, if you could use correct titles that would be helpful to the chamber. Also, I ask you to withdraw your comment.

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. The LNP walked away from their election promise of 2,200 beds by 2028. They have pushed hospital expansions out to the never-never. They promised no health cuts, but they started cutting soon after they got into office. While our nurses are under pressure, what did the health minister do during pay negotiations? He threatened nurses' back pay. What arrogance. What a disgrace. The LNP praised nurses before the election but then threatened them when it came time to treat them with respect.

Under Labor, 93 new beds were due to be delivered at the Prince Charles Hospital by 2027. Under Premier Crisafulli and the LNP that 93-bed expansion is nowhere to be seen, as evidenced by the committee appearance during the last sittings of a senior Metro North Queensland Health official. There is no timeline, no funding and no construction. Those are the facts of the matter. The LNP scrapped Labor's capacity expansion program, which would have delivered those beds by 2027. What do they have to replace it? There are no shovels in the ground, no timeline and no funding. There is nothing for Stafford and the north side. They cut, they blocked, they axed the project, and now they expect Stafford and north-side residents to be grateful for a barrage of blue taxpayer-funded political propaganda billboards to benefit themselves politically. I have never seen such a level of public expenditure for political purposes as we are seeing under this government. If the LNP cared about nurses and patients they would be building hospital capacity, but they have dudded the north side. Patients at Prince Charles have been dudded and nurses and staff have been dudded. The pattern is the same with the Queensland cancer centre as at the RBWH. That has also been cut when it should have been under construction now under this government. That is their health record.

They blame everybody but never take responsibility for their own actions. They had a plan to get elected but no plan to govern Queensland, let alone run a health system. That is why the Stafford by-election this weekend matters. Many of the nurses and health workers who keep the Prince Charles Hospital going live in and around the Stafford electorate. We know the pressure they are under. That is why they need those 93 extra beds that were promised by Labor and the other side, who reneged.

Luke Richmond understands that. He stands up for Stafford, the north side and the nurses, patients and health services there.

The LNP candidate in Stafford has one job this week, and that is to defend the indefensible of those opposite: defend those 93 beds being ripped away from the Prince Charles Hospital by 2027; defend the axing of the Queensland cancer centre; defend Minister Nicholls's threats to nurses' back pay. I have doorknocked a lot of houses in Stafford, I can assure you—nearly 600—and the health minister was not a popular person—

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


Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. I hear that the health minister has been banned from doorknocking by LNP headquarters because he would lose them votes hand over fist—

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

Mr BAILEY: I withdraw. To prove me wrong, I am looking forward to all of the social media posts with the health minister doorknocking whenever he can on Wednesday morning. I hope he does, because it will increase Labor's margin in the by-election.

(Time expired)

Stafford By-Election

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.53 pm): There we have it: frontbench member after frontbench member of the Labor opposition standing up to try to talk about what is important to the people of Stafford. Do members know what they did not mention once? They did not mention anything to do with a policy around youth crime or victims. Do members want to know why? It is because their policy platform, their very own policy document—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Currumbin, do not use props.

Mrs GERBER:—does not mention youth crime once. I will refer to their policy document, just so opposition members can recall what they have written in their own 2025 Labor policy document. In fact, their candidate for Stafford was the assistant secretary of the Labor Party at the time of this document, so their candidate for Stafford is one of the authors of this document. This document says that the Labor Party will increase the age of criminal responsibility from 10 years to 14 years. Is it any wonder they have not addressed the issue of youth crime when they are talking to the people of Stafford? It is their candidate Luke Richmond's plan to remove mandatory minimum sentencing and increase the age of criminal responsibility. It is his plan to unwind our tough youth crime laws. We know that because the Labor Party came in here time and time again over the past decade and weakened our youth crime laws. We know that because their own—

Ms Mullen interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Jordan.

Mrs GERBER:—Queensland Labor State Platform 2025 document says they will not only increase the age of criminal responsibility from 10 to 14 but also remove—

Ms Mullen interjected.

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

Mrs GERBER:—mandatory minimum sentencing. That means that people who commit some of the most heinous crimes like murder, people who commit sexual offences against children and rapists, who currently face a mandatory minimum penalty of life imprisonment, would no longer face that under this Labor Party because it is their policy, written by their candidate for Stafford, to remove those mandatory minimum penalties. It is disgraceful.

Our candidate for Stafford, Fiona Hammond, has a plan for the people of Stafford. She can get a seat at the table and continue to deliver on our government's tough laws—laws that those opposite have voted against. They voted against tranche 3 of Adult Crime, Adult Time. Their policy platform says they are going to weaken our Youth Justice Act again. Their policy platform says they are going to remove—

Mrs Nightingale interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Inala, your interjections are not being taken.

Mrs GERBER:—mandatory minimum sentencing. Their policy platform means that youth criminals will not face any consequences if they are aged 10 to 14. Our candidate, Fiona Hammond, has a plan for the people of Stafford. That plan not only involves securing our fuel supply and having a plan in the short, medium and long term for fuel security for this state; it also includes health and housing and—guess what?—it includes victims and ensuring there are fewer victims of crime in this state. It is a comprehensive plan to deliver on the issues that the people of Stafford care about.

What do we see from those opposite and the candidate they have put up for the Stafford electorate? We see a candidate who authored their state policy platform document which would unwind those laws and see the people of Stafford with weaker youth justice laws. We see corflutes that, coincidentally, do not have the Leader of the Opposition's face on them anywhere. We see pamphlets which, coincidentally, the Leader of the Opposition is absent from. You have to ask why this Labor opposition is asking the people of Stafford to vote just for a candidate without putting their own leader's face on any of the material. I have a theory about why—

Mrs Nightingale interjected.


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

Mrs GERBER: If they do not secure a double-digit swing to them—like what happened in the other by-election—and if their leader does not secure a swing, he is a dead duck. He is a goner and they know it. The cavalry is not coming over the hill. There is no Labor cavalry coming out in droves to support the Leader of the Opposition, who is white-knuckling it and holding on for dear life.

A government member: Flailing.

Mrs GERBER: Yes, I take that interjection. The people of Stafford have a clear choice here. They can vote for a candidate with a plan that secures their fuel supply and supports victims of crime—
(*Time expired*)

Katter's Australian Party

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (2.58 pm): Last week's announcement of the federal gas reserve policy made me pause and reflect on some of the KAP's activities here in the Queensland parliament. A gas reserve policy is something I have been raising for 14 years in this place and I have repeatedly been told, 'No, we can't do it'; 'No, we won't do it.' Finally, out of desperate necessity, the federal government have yielded and said they are doing it. It remains to be seen whether it will be effective at all or if it is just talk or a Mickey Mouse sort of proposal for a slogan and to avoid media hype. Hopefully, it is a genuine thing that will have an impact on price.

The point is that we were not saying that to be popular; we were saying it was a grassroots policy because it was needed for Queensland and Australian industry. It is trying to marry up the rhetoric with a policy. When you speak of sovereignty, it needs to manifest itself as a policy. In the same vein, I was talking to someone a few months ago about seafood labelling. This is something we have brought to the House on two occasions as legislation and both sides have voted it down. I have heard that this is being introduced in July this year. That is good, but it does make me reflect about this place. We have to keep pushing these things because even though everyone rejects them they will finally get through. Everyone loves to say that there is no point if you are not in government because you cannot achieve anything, but I thought I would introduce some other policy ideas that will no doubt be taken up some time in the future out of necessity.

The first is to do with the uranium industry. At the moment, the rest of the world is changing, including the New South Wales parliament which changed their position the other night. Everyone is engaging in this. We are sitting in the box seat in Queensland with this \$10 billion industry, and that is just the resource we know about in this country. We are in a prime position to take advantage of this—just for a policy setting. I do not know what the pushback is with this anymore because I do not see people in the 'No Nukes' shirts from the 1980s wandering around. It is madness that we are not on that. There is one for a start.

The second is a water policy. The department in Queensland has been a big handbrake on that and governments have not been able to unshackle that. I want to pay tribute to the current Minister for Water because some of the language coming out of her office at the moment has been very strong about releasing water in the Flinders area. There are 500 permanent jobs for the RAFA project, which was formerly known as HIPCo, in Hughenden. That is \$100 million every year in production for what would be a modest investment at the start to try to yield some growth for this state.

I turn to the first home buyers grant. At the moment there is a bit of a Mickey Mouse one for existing homes, but if you expand the first home buyers grant to existing homes in regional and remote areas, particularly western areas, you could utilise all of that under-utilised housing that is weathering away to functional and economic obsolescence. At the moment, 88 per cent of Queenslanders inhabit this area. You can buy a house in Mount Isa for \$100,000 and the first home buyers grant could be expanded to existing homes and be made more attractive. We are talking about smaller numbers because there is not the number of people out there, but they will see the advantage in spending, say, \$50,000 which is matched dollar for dollar on a \$100,000 home. This would reactivate all of these homes that are sliding down to functional obsolescence. There is an opportunity to privately activate thousands of homes west of the Great Divide in Queensland. This is something that we have been pushing for years.

In terms of CopperString, we hear all of the rhetoric and the words sound nice, but in my weekly engagement with the mining industry we are hearing that there is still nothing bankable there going forward. There are questions around timing and costs and when the Western Link will be connected out there.

Biofuels is the big elephant in the room that the government refuses to acknowledge. We are talking about everything else in fuel security except a biofuels mandate. We have an industry that is immediately ready to upscale. There are over 60 countries with mandates. I counted the other day that when the LNP were in opposition they voted four times in this House for an ethanol mandate, and here we are in the face of a fuel crisis still not acknowledging that as a pathway forward.

We are not going to be like other parties out there just shaking our fists in the sky saying how bad everyone is. We will keep giving grassroots policy solutions to this parliament which people can follow the lead on.

(Time expired)


RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL


Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1259, on motion of Mr Last—

That the bill be now read a second time.

to which Mr Power had moved an amendment.

 **Mr JKELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (3.04 pm), continuing: It is an incredible pleasure for me to be on my feet as part of the Labor team sticking up for workers' rights, particularly in this really important area. We heard the member for Logan talking about the film about the Pike River disaster. For any family member with a connection to someone involved in a mining disaster, it must be one of the most difficult and tragic things for them to sit there waiting to know whether somebody they love is going to survive or whether they will in fact sadly die a pretty lonely and horrific death. My thoughts are with those people. We will do what we can to stick up for those people, and that is why I support this amendment. As I look around this side of the chamber, I can say that every single Labor member supports this amendment.

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (3.04 pm): I am happy to rise and speak in this House. It is unfortunate that we have to deal with yet another game from the Labor Party. This game, I would argue, is not about the safety of coalmine workers and mine workers here in Queensland. I have said on the record a number of times during my time in parliament that we need to be getting on with the job of delivering good safety outcomes. Unfortunately, we did not see that from those opposite.

The amendment moved by the member opposite is talking about withdrawing parts of this bill and sending them back to committee and then getting on with delivering some of the other parts of the bill. Funnily enough, those parts that they want to put back through to be passed this week are the parts that the member was just criticising, including the Land Access Ombudsman changes. I am sure that members on this side of the House will be talking about this and I want to give some context here. The LAO cost the taxpayer \$617,000 a year, and across a 12-month period they received only 30 phone calls, 17 emails and two direct inquiries and engagement events.

That is why we need to get smarter about how we do things in Queensland. We need to ensure that we deliver respect for Queenslanders' money. It is a principle of this government that we took to

the election. We are not getting rid of the functions of the LAO, and that is very clear. We are ensuring that we are efficient and effective in what we do, while delivering the outcomes that Queenslanders expect. We need to get on with the job of passing this important bill.

I move to the bits that the member wants withdrawn and sent back to the drawing board. I note that he has circulated amendments to deal with the very issue that he is now talking about needs to be withdrawn and sent back to the drawing board. That is my case in point: we do not need to withdraw a piece of legislation if he himself has amendments that he can move to fix what he says is a big problem. The legislation does not need to be withdrawn and redrafted.

What is this really about? I would say it is about the CFMEU and their union mates. Labor need to come in here and ensure they wheel and deal for their union mates. We see in the amendments they have moved that they are not happy with the fact that their union mates are not getting guaranteed jobs. This government believes in appointing people who have the skills to do a job; we are certainly not beholden to the union agenda we have seen previously.

Another point I would make is that the Primary Industries and Resources Committee, chaired by the member for Burnett, delivered a very comprehensive report but there were only 11 submissions on the bill. I would dare say that this does not demonstrate why the legislation needs to be withdrawn. One of the reasons Labor want the legislation withdrawn and redrafted is with regard to the commissioner's role. I have read Susan Johnston's report, the *Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model*, from front to back. It is incredibly damning about the history and the failures that we inherited from those opposite from RSHQ over a long period of time. I want to quote a couple of things from that report. When a government gets third parties to undertake this sort of work and they do a very good job of it, we have to read the evidence ourselves and ensure we deliver outcomes that are good for Queensland. With regard to the commissioner's role, the report stated—

Relevantly, the Reviewer has not been able to locate any documents that specify exactly what outcomes are expected of the CRSH role.

That is from the time those opposite were in government previously. The Labor Party are now coming in here and talking up how important this role is when under them what was it achieving? I have plenty of other quotes. Here is another one—

I don't know 100% of what they do.

The commissioner—

... is attending forums and visiting mines but is that what he's supposed to do?

An RSHQ employee stated—

I'm not clear on the role of the Commissioner. Is it resourced? It's all a bit murky.


Another RSHQ employee said, 'I think it's a figurehead position.' An industry representative said, 'I think they're largely there to chair the CSMHAC and MSHAC.'

Those opposite are talking about how important this role is and how we have to go back and spend more weeks, which would delay important mine safety legislation I might add. If we withdraw this bill and send it back to the drawing board, that is time during which we would not have a board overseeing RSHQ which provides the important oversight necessary to ensure it is delivering outcomes for the mining sector in Queensland.

I have worked both in New South Wales and in Queensland. When I worked in the coalmines in Queensland those opposite were in charge. It was under the model of those opposite, and I have spoken in this House about it before. I worked at a mine site when a coalminer got killed, and that was a horrendous circumstance. I was not on shift, fortunately, but it happened a couple of days before I was to go back on shift. That was a horrendous thing and no family should have to go through that. That is why we have gone through the process. We made sure we put experts in to undertake a comprehensive report and now we have important legislation to deliver on a lot of these changes.

Mr Power: And you ignored it.

Mr HEAD: I take that interjection from the member opposite who is saying we ignored it. There were three recommendations from that report that I dare say are incredibly important. We are getting on with the job of delivering, and I know that the member for Burdekin is going to deliver on them.

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (3.11 pm): If you listened to the contribution to the second reading debate of the member for Logan and then his blithering attempt to

justify the amendment we are now debating, you would be under no illusion that he is absolutely clueless when it comes to the role of RSHQ in this state. I would say to the member for Logan: go and visit RSHQ and have a talk to them. Talk to the staff, talk to the team, and understand what they do instead of coming in here and criticising the role of RSHQ. He is more interested in talking about a job title than talking about the operations of RSHQ.

This side of the House is about streamlining, making it more efficient and putting in place a structure that will allow that organisation to meet the needs of the resource sector. It will give Queenslanders the confidence that they have a regulator who will have the best interests of those workers at heart, that they will be conducting the investigations when there is a fatality, that they will be doing the inspections to ensure compliance across the board. That is the role of RSHQ and that is why we are debating this bill here today. We are putting in place a board of the highest calibre people. The board members we will choose and have already started to discuss will be people with the skill sets that we need to ensure that RSHQ continues to function, that they have the ability to chair CSMHAC and MSHAC going forward, and that is important as well.

We are focused on the operations of RSHQ. We are not focused on a job title here. I had the opportunity to meet and speak with the interim commissioner on a number of occasions and I saw what he did. That work can be picked up through the board and the restructure that we are currently working through with RSHQ. I remind the member as well that I accept all of the recommendations from the committee. We accept those recommendations. He would have people believe that we are opposed to what the committee found. The committee did a great job in taking evidence and looking at this bill. We accept those recommendations, and I said that during the course of my contribution.

Let me remind those opposite that this is an extremely important safety bill. This is about the safety of our resource industry workers across this state, the tens of thousands of them. That is what is at the centre of what we are doing today. Those opposite criticise us for bringing it forward so quickly. That is how important it is to us. This is extremely important to us and it means we are going to bring it to this parliament so we can get that certainty that those workers need going forward. With those words, I move—

That the question be now put.

Question put—That the question be now put.

Motion agreed to.

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

AYES, 36:

ALP, 35—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.


Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 52:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Power) negated.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (3.20 pm): I rise in support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill addresses a matter of fundamental importance: the safety of workers in Queensland, particularly in the resources sector. Every worker, whether on a mine site, in a quarry or in a gas field, has a right to return home safely at the end of every shift. That principle must sit at the very centre of our regulatory system.

The purpose of this bill is to implement the government's response to the *Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model* to optimise the operation of Queensland's coexistence institutions and provide procedural and administrative efficiency to the mining tenement framework. This legislation responds directly to the findings of the 2025 independent review into the state's safety framework. That review identified serious concerns about governance, accountability and the effectiveness of oversight within the current regulator. It made it clear that reform was not only desirable but essential. This bill delivers on that reform.

With reference to consultation with industry, stakeholders were consulted during the review of the RSHQ model. Stakeholders had the opportunity to provide input on governance arrangements. Their perspectives were considered when assessing the effectiveness of the existing governance model and developing recommendations. The resulting governance reforms reflect a process informed by stakeholder input rather than being developed in isolation. At its heart is the establishment of a new, skills-based governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland. This is a critical step forward. A strong, independent board will provide clear strategic direction, improve oversight and ensure that safety remains the top priority. It introduces a level of accountability and transparency that is essential for public confidence and, more importantly, for protecting workers' lives.

Equally important is the decision to abolish the existing commissioner role and transfer responsibilities to the board. This change removes ambiguity and makes clear that lines of responsibility are established. When it comes to safety, there can be no confusion about who is accountable. The committee noted stakeholder concerns regarding the abolition of this role, particularly in relation to the loss of a clearly identifiable independent advocate and the potential impact on timely, expert advice during safety incidents and emerging issues. However, the committee acknowledges the department's advice that the existing role lacked a clearly defined purpose and a measurable performance framework and that the revised governance model is intended to address these issues and these limitations. The committee notes that the establishment of the RSHQ board provides a more structured and accountable framework for strategic oversight, with clearly defined functions, reporting arrangements and performance expectations. The committee considers that the transfer of the commissioner's functions to a skills-based board, supported by the RSHQ CEO's operational role, will strengthen governance, improve accountability and provide more consistent and coordinated oversight of safety and health outcomes.

The bill also strengthens the role of advisory committees, ensuring that expert voices from industry, workers and technical specialists continue to inform safety standards and practices. Good policy is built on good evidence, and these reforms re-enforce this principle. In addition, the bill improves the framework for land access and dispute resolution through reforms to the Land Access Ombudsman. By enhancing its independence and removing the industry levy, the legislation supports a fairer and more transparent system for resolving conflicts between landowners and resource companies.

The Land Access Ombudsman provides free, independent support to landowners and resource companies to resolve disputes and make good agreements. In 2024 the former government passed the Mineral and Energy Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024, or the MEROLA Act. As part of Labor's changes to the MEROLA Act, the office of the LAO would have been funded by industry, and this funding model saw the resource authority holders pay an annual levy. This levy would have imposed additional financial pressures on resource companies at a time of increased operational, regulatory and financial costs. This bill avoids these impacts and supports the continued competitiveness of Queensland's resource sector by repealing the industry funding model and continuing the existing government funded model.


To strengthen the operation of the LAO while minimising costs, the office of the LAO will be co-located with Coexistence Queensland. The chief executive officer of Coexistence Queensland will be taken to be the LAO and appointed members of Coexistence Queensland are to be the required Land Access Ombudsman advisory council. The committee notes that the bill introduces a number of legislative and operational safeguards intended to maintain the independence of the LAO and ensure the separation of the functions between Coexistence Queensland and the LAO. The committee acknowledges the department's advice that these measures, including the delineation of functions across separate acts, restrictions on delegation and limits on the role of the advisory council, are designed to support operational separation and mitigate potential conflicts of interest. However, the committee also acknowledges stakeholder concerns that the dual-role arrangements may give rise to perceived conflicts in relation to maintaining confidence in the independence of dispute resolutions.

The committee considers that the effectiveness of the proposed arrangements depend on how these safeguards operate in practice, including their ability to maintain stakeholder confidence in the independence and impartiality of the Land Access Ombudsman. The committee further notes that the functions of the LAO will be expanded when the relevant provisions of the MEROLA Act commence. It is important that the LAO continues to function in Queensland, as the committee heard many submissions around that, and we are very comfortable that the LAO's position will be a success for not only landowners but also the resources sector.

The amendments to mining tenure processes are also significant. By modernising systems, including the move to digital spatial data and clearer renewal processes, the bill reduces unnecessary

complexity in maintaining appropriate safeguards. These changes provide certainty for industry without compromising oversight. It is important to be clear about what this bill does. It is not about reducing regulation; it is about improving it. It is about ensuring that our safety framework is robust, accountable and capable of responding to the realities of a modern resources sector. Queensland's resources industry is the cornerstone of our economy, but its success should never come at the expense of worker safety. This bill reinforces that safety is not negotiable; it is essential. By strengthening governance, clarifying accountability and modernising key aspects of the law, this legislation lays the foundation for a safer and more effective regulatory system.

We need to respect our resources sector. I bring to the House's attention that in 2024-25 the Queensland resources sector contributed \$77 million in wages in the Burnett electorate alone, \$26 million has been spent across 48 local businesses and community organisations and it employs over 570 Burnett residents. In Bundaberg there are 452 people employed by the sector, generating \$63 million in wages, and the sector spent \$32 million across local businesses and community groups. It is for those reasons that we continue to support this bill. I acknowledge the recommendations of our committee with regard to staggering appointments as contained in recommendation 2, recommendation 1 that the bill be passed, the recommendation to conduct a review in 24 months for the RSHQ board and, more importantly, the recommendation for a review after 24 months on the Land Access Ombudsman. These are respectful and necessary. We look forward to what good governance looks like. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (3.28 pm): All workers in Queensland should return home safely, and that is especially critical in the resources sector. However, this LNP government does not have respect for workers to return home safely, especially those in the resources sector, as it has shown through previous legislation where it refused to accept mine deaths related to suicide through the Coroner or whether it is this bill. As we have already seen in this debate, members have voted against the motion moved by the member for Logan that would have seen this bill go back for proper consultation and proper parliamentary process that would have ensured a safer component to this bad piece of legislation. Luckily for those opposite, especially those in those resources and agricultural community seats, they will have another opportunity later today to vote against this bill. They will be able to see the error of their ways. We know that there are some opposite who are itching to cross the floor on other matters, and later on they will be more than able to do just that on this bill.

This bill fails to adequately respond to the Johnston review the government itself commissioned. This is yet another example of the Crisafulli LNP government failing to listen to the experts. We have seen that time and time again—even when they call the experts 'consultants', as they did on Paradise Dam. We know what a bungle that was, and this is a bungle as well. In fact, to quote a favourite phrase of the member for Gladstone, 'They botched this bill.' By ignoring the recommended 18-month staged implementation of reforms to the RSHQ and instead rushing through complex regulatory and structural changes, this LNP government is putting the safety of Queensland resource workers at risk.

Stakeholders have serious concerns about this bill, particularly that there was no prior industry consultation. Imagine that. In the industry that drives our state forward, stakeholders are saying that there was no adequate consultation—no adequate consultation. What a shame it is that the minister refuses to accept his responsibility in this state in the role that he has. We have seen that through the abolishment of the RSH commissioner. This bill abolishes the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health, a role that is seen by many stakeholders as vital to maintaining the safety of workers in the sector. The decision to abolish this position goes directly against the advice of Professor Johnston—the professor who did the review commissioned by this government—who in her second recommendation said that the role should be retained but should be more clearly defined.

We would welcome a greater level of clear definition of the role, but to ignore the second recommendation of a review commissioned by the government just shows that this government is reckless when it comes to safety, reckless when it comes to proper parliamentary process and reckless when it comes to bad legislation. Even when the member for Logan gives the minister a chance to get out of it he just gets drawn back in, to quote Michael Corleone. Only the member for Logan got that one! Even the Queensland Resources Council questioned this decision, stating in their submission to the committee—

The removal of the statutory Commissioner role results in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister.

That is the Queensland Resources Council. Do we really expect that the LNP, who prior to the election in 2024 wedded themselves to the QRC, are now saying, 'No, no, they are wrong. They were

right before the election but they are wrong now'? This is the hypocrisy of the LNP government in Queensland.

The commissioner role is clear, accountable and can report directly to the minister and to the parliament and, in the words of the Mining & Energy Union, has been 'very effective'. That was in response to a question put by the member for Mackay. The member for Mackay wanted to know how effective the commissioner role is and the answer was 'very effective'. Surely, on that basis, no doubt we will see the member for Mackay speak to the Clerk to let him know he will be voting in favour of the opposition come the end of this debate.

That is not the only thing that was spoken about. The Queensland Resources Council went on further in their submission to say that the removal of the role would result 'in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister,' but they also said that it should be retained.

As I mentioned during debate of the amendment earlier, the Electrical Trades Union put forward that the commissioner role is a 'critical safeguard, someone who can speak truth to power, report directly to Parliament and act directly without fear or favour'. Where have we heard those words about acting without fear or favour before? That is right—the LNP said that before the election, but now they are very fearful and they are looking for favours.

We also know that the QRC are opposing this—the unions are opposing it, the workers' representatives are opposing it and the representative of the resources industry is opposing it—yet, for some reason, the minister wants to keep trying to drive this bad piece of legislation through the House.

Another issue that was touched on was about the Land Access Ombudsman. This is how good the consultation process has been by the LNP. When I met with stakeholders last night from a peak body in Queensland agriculture and said, 'We will be talking about how the Land Access Ombudsman will be effectively abolished by going into the CEO role of Coexistence Queensland,' this peak body said, 'We haven't heard about that. When is that happening?' I said, 'Tomorrow.' They said, 'But nobody from the government has made that clear to us.' There are peak agricultural bodies in this state that were not even aware that this piece of legislation that impacts their members was going to be debated today.

Mr Power: So arrogant!

Mr SMITH: I take that interjection from the member for Logan. This government are so arrogant that they think they can walk all over key stakeholders across the sector and try to put parts of legislation in one bill and parts in another. Just to be clear, Coexistence Queensland over here and the Land Access Ombudsman over there will under this government be the same person. The CEO of Coexistence Queensland will also be the Land Access Ombudsman.

In our public hearing for the Condamine Alluvium bill we had the CEO of Coexistence Queensland before us. He was recommending, in his role as CEO, that the Land Access Ombudsman powers actually be expanded. In one piece of legislation we have the CEO of Coexistence Queensland saying, 'No, no, no, you need to expand the role of the Land Access Ombudsman,' and then in this one he will be the Land Access Ombudsman. That is how unclear this government is when it comes to legislation. Glendon Farming Co. stated in their submission—

Palming off the services of the LAO to CQ, as a blunt cost-cutting measure, will exceed the capabilities of CQ and overstretch their resources, as well as create a fraught environment in which conflicts of interest will be extremely difficult and challenging to manage.

The member for Logan did great work during the hearing when he had AgForce before him. He put forward a question about concerns within clause 19, which takes the Land Access Ombudsman from their current role and simply makes them the chief executive officer of Coexistence Queensland, to which AgForce said—

Our very broad and overall concern would be creating the role so that the Land Access Ombudsman and the CEO of Coexistence Queensland are effectively the same.


AgForce—the peak body that those opposite swear black and blue they represent and say that is where their home is—say that this is a bad part of the legislation, that they do not know why the minister has put it in, that it makes things unclear and that it is a risk to conflicts of interest, yet members opposite do not even want to acknowledge it, mainly because most of them have not read the bill. They just think everything is okay.

I know who has read the bill and who are fierce champions for their community and the safety of workers in Queensland—that is, the members for Mackay and Mirani. I want to see the members for

Mackay and Mirani do what they do when they go back to their constituents but here in the House—that is, stand up for them and make sure AgForce know that they have a friend in the members for Mirani and Mackay. They will let the whip know, who will let the Clerk know, that they will not be voting with the government but will be voting for the farmers and voting for the workers in our resources industry because they stand up for what they stand for. We know that they will. In fact, we know this because AgForce said—

I think from our membership concerns it does seem like those amendments, in effect, abolish the role of the Land Access Ombudsman.

The members for Mirani and Mackay will lead the way. They will be champions of the resources industry. They will be champions of the workers. They will be champions of the unions because they will let the whip know to let the Clerk know that they are voting with Labor.

 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (3.38 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset, the importance of worker safety must be acknowledged. It is fundamental. Every worker deserves to return home safely, and every family deserves confidence in the system designed to protect them. I acknowledge the unions who have been involved in this process: the MEU, the AWU and the ETU. All of our safety laws in this state and in Australia go back to union members and the hard-won protections that they have achieved over the years. Sadly, too many times in this industry, safety improvements have come after tragedies, disasters and deaths. In this industry, safety is so serious.

Labor's concern here is that parts of this bill could undermine safety. It is also clear that other stakeholders share our concerns—unions and industry associations. During the committee's public hearing, the voices of those directly involved—workers, industry representatives and experts—were heard clearly. Their evidence was consistent and it raised serious concerns. A central issue raised repeatedly was the removal of the Resources Safety and Health Commissioner. This is not a minor administrative change. It represents a direct departure from the Johnston review which recommended retaining and strengthening the commissioner's role. Rather than clarifying that position, the LNP has chosen to abolish it entirely and replace it with a board. At the hearing a simple but critical question was put: what is lost when a single independent decision-maker is replaced with a board structure? The answer was straightforward: in safety incidents timing is critical and leadership must be decisive. Evidence to the committee showed that a commissioner can act immediately, provide advice quickly and respond without delay. By comparison, a board must deliberate, consult and often reconcile differing views before acting. That distinction is not academic. It has real operational consequences. In high-risk industries delays can have serious implications.

Another point raised during the hearing was the value of having a clearly identifiable leader, someone who can be contacted directly when concerns arise. Witnesses described the commissioner as visible, approachable and present in the field, engaging with workers, visiting sites and supporting communities during difficult times. This level of presence reflects more than structure; it reflects leadership. A part-time board replacing that level of responsiveness is unlikely.

Concerns were also raised about the weakening of the tripartite model. For decades Queensland's resources safety framework has relied on cooperation between workers, industry and the regulator. This approach has not emerged by chance; it has been shaped over time, often in response to serious incidents and hard lessons. During the hearing a powerful example was given of a recent safety incident where all parties worked together in the same room to understand what had occurred and how to prevent it from happening again. Such collaboration represents progress. The risk identified by stakeholders is that the proposed changes could erode that progress by reducing the role of worker representation and centralising decision-making. That is not a direction that inspires confidence. Worker representation itself was a major point of discussion. Questions were raised about how a board responsible for safety could operate without guaranteed worker input. The response from witnesses was unequivocal: those exposed to risk must have a voice in decisions affecting their safety. Frontline experience provides insights that cannot be replaced through policy alone. Excluding that perspective weakens the system's ability to respond effectively to real-world conditions.

The issue of independence was also explored in detail. Concerns were raised by multiple members about conflicts of interest and the composition of the proposed board. Evidence indicated that board members may hold other roles within industry, including positions connected to companies subject to regulatory oversight. The bill does not provide sufficient clarity on how such conflicts could be managed.

Questions were also raised about the process behind this legislation. Why has the bill been introduced without detailed government response to the Johnston review? What justification exists for bypassing the staged implementation that was recommended? This bill fails to adequately respond to the Johnston review the government itself commissioned. This is yet another example of the Crisafulli LNP government failing to listen to experts.


Professor Johnston's review made one thing very clear: changes to RSHQ should not be rushed. The review recommended a careful, phased approach so these reforms could be properly considered, properly implemented and properly understood by everyone affected. I table for the benefit of the House the implementation plan set out in the review.

Tabled paper: Extract from the University of Queensland, Leading for High Reliability Centre report, dated 30 September 2025, titled 'Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model'.

That recommendation was there for a reason. These are serious matters. They deal with worker safety, regulatory independence and the ability of departments and experts to provide frank and fearless advice to government. When issues are this important parliament has a responsibility to get it right. The Johnston review outlined an 18-month implementation process. It proposed reforms being introduced in stages at four-month intervals, with the first step being the establishment of a review implementation group to guide the process and oversee the recommendations.

Importantly, the review did not say to rush straight into legislative change. In fact, legislative amendments were meant to come later in the process after proper planning, proper consultation and proper consideration of the consequences. That is not what has happened here. Instead, the minister has pushed ahead with legislative amendments well before the process recommended by the review had a chance to occur. These changes have been brought forward quickly despite concerns being raised throughout the committee process and despite stakeholders warning about the risks involved.

These concerns go far beyond procedures. They affect the quality and durability of the reform itself. Effective safety reform requires consultation, careful design and sufficient time for consideration. Ultimately there has been a disturbing lack of consultation from the government on this bill. It is concerning because it speaks to a pattern of behaviour from the Crisafulli LNP government. Queenslanders deserve better than rushed laws and the political spin that this government continues to serve up.

 **Mr DALTON** (Mackay—LNP) (3.46 pm): I rise today to support the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is about something incredibly important to my electorate of Mackay: keeping workers safe while ensuring our resources sector remains strong, productive and sustainable for generations to come. In Mackay resources are not just an industry on a spreadsheet in Brisbane; they are families, they are jobs, they are apprenticeships, they are local businesses and they are the reason many of our communities continue to grow and prosper. According to the GW3 Lawrence Consulting survey, across Mackay and the Bowen Basin there are an estimated 6,369 resources workers—hardworking Queenslanders—who head to work every single day in coalmines, and more in quarries, ports, transport operations and supporting industries. Many of these workers live in suburbs right across my electorate: Rural View, Walkerston, Marian, Sarina and throughout the Pioneer Valley. Our local economy depends heavily on resources. In 2024-25 the economic impact to the Mackay region amounted to \$15.9 billion in output, \$12.5 billion in gross value added and \$8.4 billion in income. That is quite incredible. Our communities depend on workers coming home safely at the end of their shift. That is why this bill matters.

This legislation responds directly to the 2025 Johnston review which found significant weaknesses in governance and accountability structures within Resources Safety & Health Queensland. The review found confusion around roles, weak oversight and a lack of accountability within the existing system. When we are talking about mine safety, confusion is not acceptable. Queenslanders expect strong oversight, workers expect accountability and families expect safety. This government is delivering exactly that. The bill establishes an independent governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland—a reform that will strengthen oversight, modernise governance and streamline advisory structures. Importantly, it keeps the RSHQ independent while ensuring that there is now a clear governance framework in place.

The CEO of RSHQ will report directly to this new governing board and the board will report to the minister. That is a modern governance structure. That is accountability. That is exactly what the Johnston review recommended. Importantly for workers in Mackay and across regional Queensland, the bill strengthens the role of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. These committees will continue to operate with tripartite

representation, ensuring unions, industry and government all continue to have a seat at the table. That is important because safety outcomes are best achieved when everyone works together. The bill also restores the community's ability to review legislation, standards and guidelines and provides practical advice on regulatory changes. That means stronger consultation, it means practical industry knowledge and it means safer outcomes for workers.

We have heard some criticism from those opposite about the abolishment of the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health, but they fail to acknowledge that the Johnston review itself found widespread confusion about the role. In fact, stakeholders interviewed during the review described the role as a figurehead position. The reality is: the former Labor government created a structure without proper governance arrangements. Even Professor Johnston noted that the original RSHQ structure differed from earlier recommendations because it failed to include a governing board. This bill fixes that oversight. Unlike those opposite, the government is focused on outcomes, not titles, because what matters is not creating another bureaucratic layer; what matters is ensuring workers are protected.


This bill also addresses another important issue: reducing unnecessary red tape and the financial burden on industry. Under previous governments in Queensland, the resources sector has faced rising costs, increased regulation and declining confidence. In Mackay, I hear regularly from mining businesses, contractors and suppliers about the pressure they are under. They want strong safety standards and they want proper regulation, but they also want a system that is efficient, practical and workable. This bill helps achieve that balance.

The legislation repeals provisions introduced under the former Miles government that would have imposed an industry levy to fund the Land Access Ombudsman. When we look at the operational data, it is clear why this change is necessary. The office of the Land Access Ombudsman received only 49 contacts in 2024-25. Forty-two of those were out of scope, only four preliminary investigations commenced and none proceeded beyond the investigation stage, yet under Labor's legislation industry was set to face an additional levy and cost-recovery model from June this year. That simply does not present value for money. The Crisafulli government believes in respecting taxpayers' money and ensuring government services are efficient and effective. This bill reforms the role by merging the position with the CEO of Coexistence Queensland while retaining the independence and dispute resolution functions. Importantly, landholders and resource companies will continue to have access to free dispute resolution services and we are eliminating duplication and reducing unnecessary administrative overheads.

Mackay understands the importance of getting the balance right. We know that resources drive our economy and we know that mining supports local jobs, but we also know that safety must come first. This government is committed to both. That is why we are delivering reforms that strengthen governance, improve accountability and ensure Queensland's resources safety framework is fit for purpose.

Importantly, these reforms are backed by many across industry. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies describe the bill as 'a good step forward to improve safety in the resources industry and transparency within the RSHQ organisation'. Australian Energy Producers supported strengthening governance arrangements and welcomed the removal of the unnecessary industry levy. Idemitsu Australia said that the creation of the governing board was 'an important step forward in the maturity and development of the governance of the organisation'. Those organisations employ Queenslanders. They are businesses operating in regional communities and they recognise the value of these reforms.

For regional communities like Mackay, this bill is about confidence—confidence that our safety regulator is properly governed, confidence that worker safety remains the top priority, confidence that industry can continue to invest in Queensland and confidence that the government is operating efficiently and responsibly. The resources sector will continue to play a critical role in Mackay's future. From our miners and engineers to our diesel fitters, contractors, electricians, suppliers and transport operators, entire communities rely on this industry. Those workers deserve a system that works. This bill delivers that. It delivers strong governance, it delivers clearer accountability, it delivers safer outcomes and it delivers a modern regulatory framework that restores confidence in Queensland's resources safety system. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (3.54 pm): I rise to speak to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset I say that every day, at the end of their shift, workers deserve to go home in the same condition, physically and mentally. That is so

important in both the mining and electricity industries in which I spent a fair bit of my previous life. I wonder how many in this place have worked in and not just walked on mine sites. I know there are a few. The members for Mirani, Traeger and Callide have worked in the mines and it is good to see that a couple of the committee members have as well.

The resources industry has hazards that need to be identified and controlled—and we all agree with this—along with the competing interests of production versus profits versus safety. It is always a trade-off. The industry needs a minister who will listen and be guided by independent and expert advice. In this case that has not happened, as the government commissioned Professor Susan Johnston to do the 2025 Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model and then promptly disregarded a lot of the review's findings and recommendations. The review laid out an 18-month reform timeline including four phases of consultation and implementation, but it has been rushed—sadly, like a lot of things that this government has done. That consultation was to be with all stakeholders—the industry, workers, community groups, farmers and other stakeholders—who have now effectively been shut out of the consultative process as the minister appears to have ignored the road map process.

Rushing complex changes in high-risk industries invites mistakes, mistakes lead to accidents and workers and their families bear the brunt of the effects of that. If any members attend Workers' Memorial Day on 28 April or Miners Memorial Day on 19 September each year, they will know how those days bring home what can and sadly does happen in our workplaces and mines. Weakening safety is the first step towards more tragedy.

Professor Johnston's second recommendation was to keep and define the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Stakeholders backed that recommendation. In their submission, the Queensland Resources Council stated—

The removal of the statutory Commissioner role results in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister.

The council went on to say that 'the Commissioner provided a direct and accessible point of engagement' and that 'under the new governance model, it is not clear how this independent advisory and engagement function will be maintained'. The Mining & Energy Union stated that a commissioner—

... maintained an outward presence across industry such as mine visits, attendances at safety related conferences, participation in committees and other safety initiatives. A Board will have reduced ability to detect drift in the performance of legislation and other safety matters.

The mighty Electrical Trades Union further described the commissioner as 'a critical safeguard, someone who can speak truth to power, report directly to Parliament and act without fear or favour'. It is clear that the commissioner's role provided accountability and enhanced worker safety. The minister's decision to defy the recommendation to keep the role should show the resources industry and its workers what this government thinks of them.

There seems to be a theme from this government in removing workers' safety rights. Recently, in the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, notifications to the QBCC and Workplace Health and Safety were removed. Now, one notifies the other. There used to be a dual notification process that was introduced by our government after the tragic death of Jason Garrels. For the sake of sending a second notification—a second email—that has been removed. I hope nothing tragic happens. Recently, the Electrical Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill removed the ability for workers to approach the regulator to find historic health and safety data that the person in control of the business may not have. That was never actually tested. They said it was a burden on the department although, because it had never been enforced and never tested, I do not know how. That has gone as well, and now this.


The commissioner was also the independent chair of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee, CMSHAC, and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee, MSHAC. Doesn't the industry love acronyms! Both committees provide vital feedback and advice to the minister on industry health and safety, and both committees benefited by having the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health as the fully independent chairperson. Submitters valued CMSHAC and MSHAC, with the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, AMEC, stating—

Independent advisory bodies representing government, employers, and workers are essential for improving safety and health outcomes in the resource industry.

I could not say it better. Taking away the commissioner role is like removing a key brick from the bottom of a wall—it weakens the whole structure. This bill also changes the Resource Safety Health Queensland board and gives the minister the power to remove board members without reason. The bill includes no requirement for worker representation on the board.

Workers inform safety. Good managers know that nobody knows the job better than the worker performing it. Not listening to them and removing their representation changes the production, profit, safety equation significantly. If the minister listens to nothing else, he should listen to the stakeholders and Professor Susan Johnston, who was paid to do a review and should not be ignored, and include the workers' representative on the board and retain the commissioner role. It has not been the pattern for the LNP government to listen, but I do live in hope. Labor introduces worker safety—I give you industrial manslaughter as an example—the LNP, in another example, weakens safety.

I also support the amendment circulated by the shadow minister. This bill sets worker safety back, like so many other pieces of legislation rushed through by this government. I wonder how many fly-in fly-out workers in Stafford will be watching their workplace safety go down the drain this week with this bill unless the minister listens.

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (4.00 pm): I rise to speak in respect of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Queensland's resources sector is one of the engines that drives our state economy. In regions like Mirani, mining, quarrying, gas and resources jobs support families, support small businesses and keep regional communities alive. In my electorate of Mirani, we see firsthand just how important the resources sector is to regional communities. The industry directly contributes around \$399 million in wages and supports more than 2,500 local jobs. More than \$773 million is spent across 372 local businesses and 32 community organisations. When you look at the bigger picture, the total economic contribution reaches approximately \$2.4 billion in gross regional product and supports more than 15,000 local jobs. Those figures are significant.

Behind every one of those numbers is a person—a worker heading off before sunrise, a contractor trying to keep a small business afloat, a family reliant on the security of a good job or an apprentice getting a start in life. Regional Queensland depends on these industries and that is why we have a responsibility to ensure the systems that oversee worker safety are strong, accountable and effective. At the end of the day, no job is more important than ensuring workers get home safely. That is exactly what this bill is about.

The Johnston review found Queensland's resources safety framework was not operating as effectively as it should have been. The review identified weaknesses in governance, confusion around responsibilities and a lack of clear accountability. When you are talking about worker safety, confusion is simply not good enough.

This bill delivers practical reforms to strengthen Resources Safety & Health Queensland and restore confidence in the system. Importantly, the bill establishes a proper governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland. That means stronger oversight, clearer accountability and better governance. The CEO of RSHQ will now report directly to a governing board and that board will report directly to the minister. That is a much clearer and more accountable structure than what existed under the former Labor government. The Johnston review made it very clear that the previous model lacked proper oversight and lacked clarity around who was responsible for what.

The review also highlighted the confusion surrounding the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. In fact, a number of stakeholders interviewed during the review questioned what outcomes the role had actually delivered. One industry representative described it as a figurehead position. Another said they had not seen the commissioners achieving anything. Even union representatives questioned what outcomes had been achieved. The review also noted that the position was frequently vacant. Since 2020, Queensland has only had one commissioner who left the role in November 2023. The former Labor government then left the position vacant for nearly a year, only for their eventual appointment to resign within weeks. That does not provide certainty, that does not provide confidence and it certainly does not provide the level of accountability Queensland workers deserve. That is why this bill removes the confusion around the commissioner's role and instead establishes a skill-based governing board with clear lines of responsibility.

Importantly, this bill still retains Resources Safety & Health Queensland as an independent statutory authority. Worker safety remains the priority. The opposition has tried to claim these reforms somehow weaken worker safety. That is simply not true. This bill strengthens governance, it strengthens accountability and it strengthens the role of advisory committees that provide practical frontline advice.

I want to touch specifically on the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. The opposition have attempted to suggest these committees are somehow being weakened or politicised. Again, that is not correct. These committees

will continue to include equal representation from unions and industry, ensuring workers and industry both continue to have a voice at the table. In fact, their functions are being strengthened under this bill. The bill restores their ability to review legislation, standards and guidelines and provide practical advice on regulatory changes. That is an important reform because good safety outcomes are not achieved by politics. They are achieved by listening to workers, industry experts and people with practical experience.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr G KELLY: Have you ever worked in a mine?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr J Kelly): Order! Comments will come through the chair, member for Mirani.

Mr G KELLY: The Crisafulli government understands that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock! Member for Mirani, comments will come through the chair.

Mr G KELLY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. This bill also delivers important reforms to the Land Access Ombudsman which handles land access disputes. The former Labor government had planned to introduce an industry levy that would force the resources sector to fully fund the office through direct levies and cost recovery fees. At a time when Queensland businesses are already dealing with rising costs, increasing regulation and declining business confidence, that approach simply did not stack up, particularly when the service itself was being very likely utilised.

The operational data speaks for itself. In the 2024-25 reporting year, the office received just 30 phone calls, 17 emails and two direct inquiries at engagement offence. On 49 contacts for possible dispute referrals, 42 were found to be outside the scope. Only four inquiries moved to the initial investigation stage and none progressed beyond that.

The office itself receives more than \$600,000 annually in government funding and comprises the ombudsman and four public servants. This bill removes the unnecessary red tape and scraps the planned industry levy before it comes into effect. This is an important step because we should not be forcing industries to carry unnecessary additional costs for services that are unutilised, especially in regional Queensland where resource businesses support thousands of jobs and local economies.


The reforms also merge the role of Land Access Ombudsman with the CEO of Coexistence Queensland. That reduces duplications, improves efficiency and ensures government resources are being used more effectively. This part is the Crisafulli government's commitment to redesign government. It works better for Queenslanders and delivers respect for taxpayers' money.

I also note that the bill also includes several sensible administrative amendments to modernise the Mineral Resources Act. These changes include modernising mapping requirements, simplifying renewal processes for resources authorities and producing clearer processes around unpaid rent before cancellation occurs. These are practical changes that reduce unnecessary delays and provide greater certainty.

One thing I hear consistently across Mirani is that regional communities want government to get the balance right. People understand the importance of the resources sector, they understand the jobs it creates, they understand the economic contribution it makes, but they also expect strong safety standards and proper oversight. Queenslanders deserve a resources safety framework that is modern, accountable and effective. That is exactly what this bill delivers. It responds directly to the findings of the Johnston review, it strengthens governance, it restores accountability, it removes duplication, it reduces unnecessary red tape and, most importantly, it helps ensure Queensland resource workers are safer on the job.

It is important to recognise that the bill is also restoring confidence—confidence for the workers, confidence for industry and confidence for the regional communities that rely on these sectors. When governance structures are unclear and accountability is weak, confidence is lost. This bill fixes that. It creates a modern governance structure with clearer reporting lines and stronger oversight, and it ensures advisory committees continue to provide practical input for workers and industry.

In regional Queensland we understand the importance of hard work. We understand the importance of industries like mining and resources. We understand the importance of ensuring workers get home safely to their families. This bill delivers practical reforms that strengthen the system, improve accountability and support safer workplaces. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LEE** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (4.10 pm): I rise to speak to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The resource sector is the bedrock to a thriving Queensland economy and integral to our energy and fuel security. According to a GW3 Lawrence Consulting report, the coal resource sector alone provides full-time employment to 204 Hervey Bay people and an estimated gross value-add of \$43.9 million to our local economy. Hervey Bay, like many rural and regional communities, has hardworking fly-in fly-out workers who support our resource industry. We want to see them all return safely to their families.

This bill instigates the formation of a contemporary and accountable regulator that supports the health, safety and wellbeing of Queensland's resource industry workers. In 2025 the Crisafulli government commissioned an independent and impartial Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model. The review was conducted by the University of Queensland's Professor Susan Johnston AM to assess the effectiveness of Queensland's resources safety and health regulator after five years of operation.

The original Resources Safety and Health Queensland Bill 2019 was introduced to establish an independent regulatory framework that workers can trust and to help reaffirm Queensland as one of the safest places to work. One of the RSHQ employees said—

Right now, we have a so-called Board in charge of RSHQ but really it's the fox in charge of the henhouse.

Another stated—

We have Caesar judging Caesar. There is no external accountability.

A union representative stated—

We've often said that RSHQ has removed itself from accountability. I would like to see a lot more transparency.

Another said—

We need someone to hold them to account!

So much for Labor's independent safety regulator that workers could trust. Labor's botched 2019 bill was the creation of an independently-led Palaszczuk government Project Management Office report. Independent? We have all read Peter Coaldrake's report *Let the sunshine in*. In his introductory speech, the Hon. Dale Last, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development, said—

The review assessed Resources Safety & Health Queensland's effectiveness, governance and operational performance, reflecting our government's priority to strengthen accountability in the resources sector and ensure ongoing safety and public confidence.

Most relevantly, the review confirmed that Labor's regulatory model had not increased safety or reduced health risks. The review identified intrinsic flaws in the regulatory model, including: serious in-principle concerns about accountability; limited oversight; unclear organisational roles and responsibilities; leadership and cultural challenges; gaps in technical expertise; and weaknesses in investigation, enforcement and information sharing. When it comes to instituting rushed and shoddy governance practices, Labor takes the prize.

This bill will abolish the role of the commissioner, with its key statutory functions transferred to the RSHQ board. The board will assume responsibility for advisory and performance monitoring functions, previously undertaken by the commissioner. Establishing an RSHQ board will ensure Queensland establishes a best practice, skill-based governing board with a direct reporting relationship to the minister. The CEO of RSHQ will also report directly to the board.

This bill furthermore enhances the Queensland coexistence framework to improve the operational effectiveness of the Land Access Ombudsman. The Land Access Ombudsman industry fund will be repealed under clause 32 of the bill by removing the requirement for an industry model fund comprising an annual levy, cost-recovery fees and supplementary fees. The office of the Land Access Ombudsman will continue to be directly funded by the Queensland government. The CEO of Coexistence Queensland will be taken to be the Land Access Ombudsman and the appointed members of Coexistence Queensland will form a land access ombudsman advisory committee.

Clause 23 of the bill will insert a new part 2A into the Land Access Ombudsman Act to establish an advisory council, formalising the structure, functions and membership. The advisory council's functions will be set out in a new section 31B. These functions include monitoring the independence of the Land Access Ombudsman and providing advice on policy and procedural matters relating to operations, including annual budgets and advice to the minister. The provision is explicit in clarifying

that the council's functions are limited to its role as an advisory council, establishing a clear demarcation between a member's advisory responsibilities and those of Coexistence Queensland.

A new section 31C will provide for the membership of the advisory committee to be composed of a chairperson and up to six other members of Coexistence Queensland, appointed under the Coexistence Queensland Act. The chairperson of the advisory committee is also the chairperson of Coexistence Queensland, and the six members of the advisory council are also members of Coexistence Queensland. The Governor in Council, on the recommendation of the minister, may remove a member at any time for any reason or no reason at all.


Clause 26 of the bill provides for protection from civil liability for acts done or omissions made honestly and without negligence under the Land Access Ombudsman Act. The dual role of Land Access Ombudsman and CEO of Coexistence Queensland could conceivably give rise to a perceived or actual conflict of interest. Safeguards to mitigate the risk of conflicts of interest include the legislative separation of functions, the operational separation of functions, delegation powers under the Land Access Ombudsman Act and limitations on the role of the advisory committee.

This bill intends that both institutions will continue to operate impartially and separately, and the department will conduct a review within 24 months of the commencement of the bill to assess the effectiveness of the legislation in relation to the operation of the Land Access Ombudsman. The office of the Land Access Ombudsman will transition to a statutory body, with the costs minimised by co-locating within Coexistence Queensland. They will utilise their established corporate services, staff and systems under a cost-sharing arrangement. This arrangement is to take practical effect from 1 July 2026.

Finally, this bill makes procedural and administrative amendments to provide operational clarity and efficiency. The bill streamlines the mining tenement framework by amending the Mineral Resources Act 1989 to modernise references to maps, including spatial data; specifying a show cause process to include procedural fairness before cancelling mining tenements for unpaid rent; removing the requirement for ministerial approval to lodge renewal applications within three months or in a shorter period prior to expiry; and clarifying continuation provisions that apply to mining tenements under renewal applications.

In closing, the Johnston review identified fundamental and inherent flaws in the Queensland resources safety and health regulatory model, including, but not limited to: poor governance; limited oversight and accountability; unclear organisational roles and responsibilities; leadership and cultural challenges; gaps in technical expertise; and weaknesses in investigation, enforcement and information sharing.

Labor are all form and no substance when it comes to best practice governance. Labor have demonstrated time and again that they are all about the politics, slogans, mistruths and recycled headline announcements. The Crisafulli government is taking a careful, methodical and objective approach to modernising and reforming the resources safety and health legislation in Queensland. Hervey Bay and Queensland workers deserve a government that they can trust to establish Queensland as one of the safest places to live and work. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (4.19 pm): This bill before the House should concern every single Queenslanders who believes that workers deserve to come home safe at the end of the day because what we are witnessing here is not reform driven by evidence, not reform guided by expertise and certainly not reform shaped by consultation. What we are seeing is a government that commissioned expert advice and then chose to ignore it. Let's be very clear about what is at stake. The resources sector is one of the most dangerous industries in our state. It demands vigilance. It demands independence. It demands that safety is never compromised for convenience. Yet the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 does exactly that.

The Crisafulli LNP government commissioned Professor Susan Johnston's independent review into the regulatory model. That review did not call for rushed, piecemeal change. It laid out a careful staged reform process over 18 months—18 months of consultation, engagement and implementation. What has this government done? They have thrown that road map out the window. They have ignored the very expert advice they sought. They have bypassed meaningful consultation with workers, industry, community groups and regional stakeholders, and they have rushed forward with the structural changes in one of the highest risk industries in this state. That is not leadership; that is recklessness because in this industry mistakes are not theoretical. Mistakes cost lives, mistakes destroy families and mistakes leave permanent scars on communities. When you rush reform without listening—when you cut corners on consultation—you are gambling with worker safety.

One of the most alarming aspects of this bill is the decision to abolish the independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Let's note what Professor Johnston recommended. She did not call for the removal of the commissioner—quite the opposite. She recommended that the role be retained and strengthened. Yet this government has chosen to do exactly the opposite, and we have to ask why. Why would a government remove an independent statutory officer whose sole purpose is to advocate for safety and provide fearless advice? It is because independence is inconvenient and an independent voice—one that can speak truth to power, report directly to parliament and act without fear or favour—is not something this government appears to value.

Stakeholders across the board have raised the alarm. Industry groups have warned that removing the commissioner strips away a clear, independent safety advocate. Unions have described the role as a 'critical safeguard'. The workers themselves—those on the ground; those who face the risks every day—have told us that the commissioner has been visible, approachable and effective. They have described commissioners visiting sites, engaging directly with workers and serving as a trusted point of contact. What replaces that under this bill? A board—a board that is less visible, less accessible and less accountable; a board that, by its very nature, cannot replicate the independence or the direct engagement of a single statutory commissioner. Let us be honest: when you remove a clear line of accountability, when you replace a known advocate with a diffuse structure, you weaken the system. That is not strengthening safety; that is diluting it.

The concerns do not stop there. The bill also undermines the independence of key advisory bodies like the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. These committees play a crucial role. They bring together voices from across the industry—government, employers and workers—to provide advice on safety. Crucially, they have been chaired by the independent commissioner. What happens when the commissioner is gone? Who ensures that these committees remain independent? Who guarantees that their advice is free from political influence? On this, the bill is silent, and that silence should worry every member of this House because without independence these bodies risk becoming politicised. They risk becoming extensions of government, rather than independent sources of expert advice. When safety advice becomes politicised, workers lose.

Let's turn to the composition of the new board. Under this bill the minister has the power to appoint and remove board members without reason. Let me repeat that: without reason. There is no requirement for worker representation. There is no guarantee that the voices of those most affected—the workers and their families—will be heard. Instead, there is a real risk that the board will be dominated by individuals with close ties to industry. Stakeholders have made this concern abundantly clear. They have warned that the board may not be sufficiently representative, that it may lack the perspective of workers and that it may fail to balance the interests within the industry. If that happens, what confidence can workers have that their safety is a priority? Safety is not just about systems and structures; it is about trust. It is about workers knowing that their concerns will be heard, that their voices matter and that their wellbeing comes first. This bill erodes that trust.


The problems extend beyond the resources sector. The bill also proposes to merge the role of the Land Access Ombudsman with the chief executive officer of Coexistence Queensland. On paper that might sound like administrative efficiency, but in practice it raises serious concerns about independence and conflicts of interest. The Land Access Ombudsman exists to resolve disputes impartially. Coexistence Queensland exists to facilitate relationships between landowners and resource companies. These are fundamentally different roles. Combining them risks creating a situation where the same person is both the facilitator and the arbitrator. Stakeholders have been unequivocal in their concerns. They have warned that this merger will reduce independence, create conflicts of interest and disadvantage farmers and regional communities.

Some have gone further, suggesting that this effectively abolishes the independent role of the ombudsman altogether. Once again, we must ask why. Why would a government weaken an independent, dispute resolution mechanism and why would it risk tilting the balance away from landholders and communities? The answer is the same as before. It is because independence is inconvenient.

The Queensland Labor opposition has been clear: if this government were serious about safety reform, it would follow Professor Johnston's recommended 18-month staged process, not bulldoze through major structural change in one hit. That is why we have called for this bill to be split, so the RSHQ governance changes can be properly examined while the remaining provisions can proceed without delay. Instead, the government has rushed ahead, including scrapping the industry levy that was intended to fund the Land Access Ombudsman's functions—yet another example of the Crisafulli

LNP government cutting costs first, leaving workers, landholders and regional Queensland to carry the risk.

Finally, let's talk about consultation or rather the complete lack of it. The bill was introduced quickly. Submissions were due in just nine business days. For legislation of this magnitude—for reforms that affect worker safety, industry operations and regional communities—that is not consultation; that is a box-ticking exercise. It is no wonder that stakeholders have expressed frustration. It is no wonder that Queenslanders feel ignored. This government is not listening. They are not listening to experts. They are not listening to workers. They are not listening to industry. They are not listening to communities. They are pushing ahead with a predetermined agenda regardless of the consequences. This bill is not just flawed; it is dangerous.

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (4.29 pm): The bill before the House is about safety, accountability and confidence in Queensland's resources safety framework. It is a bill that will be of interest to many locals in my neck of the woods given the importance of sand mining in the history of North Stradbroke Island. It is still important as an industry to its residents, even though the mine on the island is no longer operational. It will also have practical impacts for the many Redlanders who work in FIFO roles in mines around the state. It is also relevant to the many local businesses in my region that sell goods and services to the resources industry, albeit in an indirect way. When the industry has good, effective and efficient processes for ensuring safety it makes the whole industry more sustainable. It makes it viable for the long term and a good client or customer for the many businesses and working people whose local roles are connected to the resources industry, even if they may never enter a mine themselves.

The bill is underpinned by an important principle and a real value of this government; that is, every person who goes to work deserves to be safe while they are there and to get home safely. It is our responsibility to make sure that safety frameworks in the workplace are effective. The 2025 Johnston review of the arrangements that were in place for the resources industry's health and safety showed that in several respects the arrangements that were in place for the governance of Resources Safety & Health Queensland fell short. This bill seeks to address those shortcomings and correct course.

It is really interesting that some of the contributions from those opposite complained there was a lack of consultation in the formulation of this piece of work. That surprises me, because when I look to the committee report I see contributions from people who contribute in a vast variety of ways to the industry—everybody from the AWU, the ETU and the Mining & Energy Union through to the Queensland Resources Council, the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, Australian Energy Producers, Idemitsu Australia, the Mine Managers Association of Australia, AgForce—I could keep going. A lot of interest groups from many different perspectives have had their say on this bill, and to suggest there has been a lack of consultation is, quite frankly, to ignore the important work that has been done by the committee.

There is an important historical element to consider as we look at this bill. The act as it presently stands was produced by the Palaszczuk government following the tabling of the parliamentary Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee report in 2017 and the *Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model* in 2018. Following those committees there were numerous recommendations for structures to be put in place to deal with safety implications for the industry. An act was introduced by the Palaszczuk government that put in place an independent statutory body—so far, so good—but it did not provide any direct oversight from an administrative department, which meant that since the formation of RSHQ peak industry bodies and leading firms right across Queensland's resources sector have been elevating their concerns about the lack of oversight, the lack of practical independence and the lack of accountability in RSHQ. Despite those concerns being raised again and again over time, they were largely ignored by the Palaszczuk and later Miles governments, so it is really good to see that early into the role Minister Dale Last commissioned a review of Queensland's resources safety and health regulatory model. Professor Susan Johnston AM was eminently qualified for the role.

The review looked at whether the regulatory model remained effective and contemporary, and it found that the current regulatory model provides pretty limited oversight and accountability of RSHQ. Professor Johnston identified that there was a need to improve clarity around the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health and observed that there were fundamental problems with the design that had been put in place by the Palaszczuk government. For instance, what was implemented in the act by the then Palaszczuk government did not adopt any of the structures that had

been recommended by either the parliamentary committee process or the advisory council. You have to wonder why. Professor Johnston noted in her review—

... the structure put forward in the Bill, and subsequently enshrined in the RSHQ Act, differed from both Reports in a number of respects. Most notably, the [then] current regulatory model does not include a governing board (as by the Select Committee) or an Advisory Council (as recommended by the PMO).


Perhaps, a bit like has been revealed in the CFMEU commission of inquiry, it was a structure that was chosen to confer more power and influence on select union mates than it ever was about genuinely addressing safety concerns. We have seen how those kinds of arrangements play out in the commission of inquiry that is underway. We have heard evidence that Workplace Health and Safety Queensland was subject to regulatory capture by the CFMEU during the time of the former Labor government. The inquiry has heard allegations that the regulator was weaponised for industrial purposes, that inspectors were pressured to act on CFMEU demands, that resources were diverted toward union priorities, and that a culture of fear developed inside the very agency that was meant to protect Queensland's workers. It is a disgraceful warning of what happens when safety regulators lose their independence and accountability to the point that when the police were being called by people on construction sites in fear of violence the union captured regulator was calling them off, running a protection racket for union bullies instead of protecting workers. Working people, no matter what industry they are in, deserve regulators who answer to the public interest. That is why this bill matters. It strengthens oversight, clarifies accountability and helps to restore confidence that Queensland's resources safety framework is focused on its one and only job: keeping workers safe.

The Johnston review found weaknesses in governance, confusion around roles, including a lack of clarity around the role of the commissioner, and a lack of clear accountability in the existing framework. In fact, there was some pretty interesting feedback provided during the committee process that indicated not only was Professor Johnston right in saying there was a lack of clarity; the people who were operating in the industry had really confused perspectives about what that role was meant to be. An industry association described it as, 'Our members are unclear about the distinct value-add of the commissioner role.' An industry representative said, 'The role is just a figurehead, I think?' An RSHQ employee working in the very agency said, 'I think it's a figurehead position.' Another employee of RSHQ said, 'I don't understand the role. Is it a stakeholder management role?' An industry representative said, 'I have not seen the commissioners achieve anything.' Another said, 'The commissioners have achieved zero outcomes.' When that is the kind of feedback a commissioner is getting, you have to think there is a need for improvement, because when safety systems lack clarity workers lose confidence that someone is properly watching the shop. Working people deserve better than that.

The bill establishes a skills-based governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland, strengthening that oversight and accountability. That matters, because sometimes when everyone is responsible too often no-one is practically responsible. This bill transfers the functions of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health to the new governing board, clearly replacing those unclear arrangements. It strengthens the advisory committees by restoring their ability to review legislation, standards and guidelines and allows them to provide practical advice and regulatory changes. The point is simple: safety regulation needs to be clear, practical and effective.

In addition, the bill removes unnecessary duplication in the Land Access Ombudsman's arrangements and repeals the previous government's proposed industry levy. That is part of making government work properly: cutting out duplication where it does not help while strengthening oversight where it matters.

To finish, I share a story that my office heard just this morning from a constituent who called in. He had worked as an apprentice on the Straddie sandmines in the late 1970s. I am going to call him John but that is not his real name; I want to respect his privacy. He spoke about enduring assault, humiliation and harassment as a young apprentice, and decades later the trauma of that has not left him. His message was simple: no worker, no apprentice, should ever be left at risk in the workplace. We back you, John, and we are backing you with this bill.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (4.39 pm): I rise to make a relatively brief contribution on this Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. At the outset I will make the point, as others have said, that there was an absurdly short turnaround for submissions—just nine business days. If the government are actually going to point to the committee process as being the substance of their engagement and consultation with the community, let us not pretend that nine days for submissions is anything of the sort.

It is the case that this bill takes some steps towards implementing recommendations from the Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model. However, to be frank, as we see all too often, this is really a cynical way of introducing quite far-reaching administrative changes that not only were not recommended by that review but also actually run counter to it and serve to quite directly undermine the independence and integrity of some key regulatory bodies around Queensland's resource system. It does so putting workers safety at risk.

I will start with the resources safety changes. This bill removes the independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health and transfers all of those statutory functions to the newly created Resources Safety & Health Queensland board. The CEO of the RSHQ will be appointed by the Governor in Council and can be removed for any or no reason. This is a manoeuvre that has become quite familiar under the LNP government. None of us have forgotten the recent changes that provided for a similarly simple dismissal of board members who served on our hospital and health service boards. Clearly, having important regulatory roles like this where key figures can be removed for any or no reason puts at risk their independence and the independence of the advice they are going to provide and the work they are going to do.

The 2025 Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model recommended maintaining the commissioner's role with a more clearly defined scope. It did not recommend that board members who hold similar functions should be able to be dismissed at the whim of the government of the day. Instead of following that recommendation, the LNP simply abolished the role and handed strategic direction to a board that is appointed at the recommendation of the minister but will also be subject to the minister's written performance expectations—and that is on top of the insecurity of tenure.

Turning to the Land Access Ombudsman, this is a body that plays an important role in mitigating at least some of the extraordinary power imbalance that exists between landholders and resource companies. The Land Access Ombudsman provides a free, independent service for resolving disputes in relation to conduct and compensation agreements and make-good agreements. The scope of the LAO's work is fundamentally quite limited though, in that it is prevented from helping landholders who are seeking support or dispute resolution advice when they are entering into agreements. Anyone with any familiarity about make-good agreements or conduct and compensation agreements knows that the point of negotiating and entering the agreement is the key moment where the power imbalance plays out. That is where landholders are left at the whim of these massive, extraordinarily well-resourced companies with their banks of lawyers standing in the wings. That is when these landholders, wind farmers and folk that the LNP purports to represent need the assistance.

Changes to the Land Access Ombudsman's scope were set to commence on 19 June this year. We would have seen the ombudsman's role given power to engage in dispute resolution at the stage of negotiating agreements, and importantly it would have introduced an industry funded model to cover the costs of this service. What about that is not just plain sensible? It would have improved those powers so that landholders can get assistance when it is most consequential and it would have got the industry to cover the costs of it. That sounds incredibly sensible.


Instead, the LNP has just folded to its fossil fuel donors once again and it will repeal the industry levy before it even commences and the Land Access Ombudsman will be collapsed into Coexistence Queensland. As others have said, this is a body that exists to facilitate resource expansion. Coexistence Queensland is something of a misnomer in a regulatory scheme where landholders still do not have basic rights to say no to resource companies entering private property. Coexistence Queensland is about facilitating that incursion of resource projects onto private landholders.

I think it is really important to pinpoint again how obsessed this government is with subsidising the resources sector. This is a massive industry that can clearly afford the quite meagre \$600,000 that is allocated to the Land Access Ombudsman in the next budget. It is entirely appropriate that this cost is covered by the sector itself. However, instead of these multibillion dollar companies that profit from Queensland's resources footing the bill and covering the basic support services for landholders and farmers, it is now going to fall to the Queensland taxpayer to foot the bill.

This is where it gets really twisted. Apparently, they say that, because this is now a public expense, they have to cut costs by reducing the independence of the Land Access Ombudsman. The industry supposedly cannot afford to pay for the scheme, so rather than just paying for it and keeping it functioning as well as possible, we are going to bring it within Coexistence Queensland—which is a body with a completely different mandate which cannot be expected to serve the function that the Land Access Ombudsman is supposed to. The department has even accepted that these conflicting roles

within Coexistence Queensland might cause conflicts of interest and raise questions around independence.

Once more, just to bring us back around as I finish, on top of that, with the Land Access Ombudsman now being the CEO of Coexistence Queensland, existing provisions apply to that function, which means that the Governor in Council can remove the Land Access Ombudsman for any reason or no reason whatsoever. It seems in any circumstance where this government feels it might be at risk of getting advice that it does not like—whether it is HHS board members, the Land Access Ombudsman or their Resources Safety & Health Queensland board members—they reserve the right to kick these people out at a whim for any reason or none. Insecure tenure like this undermines the independence and the quality of advice that the government is going to get, but it sits perfectly with their absolute determination to run roughshod over any kind of accountability and to ensure that they get public servants telling them what they want. So much for frank and fearless advice

 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (4.49 pm): The opening scene from the millennial Christmas classic *Love Actually* starts with the embrace of mums and dads with kids at an airport. Like many from regional Queensland, I am regularly attending airports and when I look out at the people who are at the opening gate I see that five out of 10 of them are mums or dads in their hi vis returning home from a shift they have done in one of our resource sector mines somewhere in this great country.

I rise today to speak in support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Central Queensland is a region proudly built on the hard work, resilience and strength of Queensland's resource sector. For Central Queenslanders, mining is a way of life. It sees convoys of mining vehicles, decked out with all their safety decals, driving west each morning before sunrise, with workers drinking their thermoses with a coffee or tea from one of the myriad cafes in Yeppoon, Rocky or beyond. Over 2,000 mums and dads from my electorate alone participate in the drive-in drive-out or fly-in fly-out mining and resource sector. This high-vis brigade, as they are affectionately known, are woven into the fabric of our community and every single one of them deserves to come home from work safely. However, we know that is not always the case. Today, as I speak on this legislation, I would like to acknowledge that there are those who have been lost in absolutely tragic circumstances.

In Keppel, miners are our neighbours. They are the parents who are coaching our junior soccer teams after they get back from their swing. They are the families who are balancing the sacrifices of FIFO and DIDO life. Our government, the Crisafulli government, has made it clear that Queensland must remain a resources powerhouse. We must also ensure that the systems protecting workers are modern, accountable and effective, because strong resources industries and strong worker protections do not have to be mutually exclusive. In fact, I would say they go hand in hand.

Queensland's resources sector supports one in every five jobs across the state and contributes one in every \$4 to Queensland's economy. It delivers royalties that help fund hospitals, schools, roads and frontline services. In Keppel, resources companies directly contribute \$345 million in wages and some \$270 million in local spending. That investment supports the more than 2,000 direct jobs in resources, the more than 275 local businesses that have purchasing contracts with mining industries and the more than 18 community organisations that receive charitable support for their everyday activities as well as the capital builds funded by our resource sector.

This government understands that Queensland cannot power ahead by talking down the industries that have built this state. We understand that coal, gas and resources continue to play a critical role in delivering affordable and reliable energy by ensuring our sovereign capacity—and this is not just for Queenslanders but for all Australians and for our trading partners throughout the world. While others seek to divide between city and region, between industry and environment or between jobs and progress, the Crisafulli government believes Queensland can and must achieve both economic growth and responsible development. Central Queenslanders are practical people. We know that you cannot run an economy on ideology—you run it on jobs, on productivity and on investment—and we want to ensure that every person in our resource sector gets home safely. That is why this bill also addresses unnecessary duplication. It addresses red tape and inefficiency within government structures.

The bill repeals provisions introduced under the former legislation that would have imposed an industry funded levy model for the Land Access Ombudsman. During the committee process industry raised serious concerns around rising costs, the consequences of overregulation and the declining investment confidence in Queensland because of the burden of regulation. This government has listened. Just as we listened to Queenslanders at the last election, we have listened to this industry and


we are backing them. We understand that if Queensland becomes too difficult then it puts the mums and dads of my community and Keppel's jobs at risk. We understand that if we have systems that are not keeping people safe but are creating red tape that rolls them again and again, it will simply become too expensive to invest and too expensive to develop projects and those jobs of the people from my community will simply go elsewhere. That helps no-one.

This bill reforms the structures of the Land Access Ombudsman. It removes unnecessary duplication and ensures a more efficient approach moving forward. We promised Queenslanders that we would listen to them. We promised Queenslanders that we would ensure that where there was red tape that needed to be removed our government would take it out. Importantly, industry stakeholders gave us this information, including the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies and the Australian Energy Producers. They welcomed the decision to reduce the cost burden to the sector of items that were not improving the safety of our workers.

This legislation also establishes a new governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland. This reform is about providing stronger oversight, clarity and accountability, and restoring confidence in the safety framework under which Queensland's resource sector works. Importantly—and it may seem a little wild—the advisory committee will represent practical industry experience. Once again, we will have people who have worked in the field, who have worked in a mine, who have played a role in the resource sector who will have the ability to review legislation and review standards and guidelines. That matters because when we listen to Queenslanders we hear the challenges and the opportunities, and safety outcomes improve when the voices of workers, operators and industry professionals are heard.

One thing Central Queenslanders understand deeply is that the resource sector is more than just economics. It is our people. It is the mums and dads boarding a plane before dawn. It is the partner who is keeping things running at home while their loved one is away for seven-on, seven-off. It is the children counting down the day until mum or dad returns home or stops doing night shifts so they can actually do a family WhatsApp or a Teams call at a suitable hour. That is why safety must remain front and centre: because every Queensland worker deserves to come home safely.

The high-vis brigade has helped build modern Queensland and our government is backing those high-vis workers. This government is proud to stand with regional Queenslanders, we are proud to back mining and resources, we are proud to back affordable and reliable energy and we are proud to back the hardworking men and women whose efforts keep Queensland strong. To the thousands of resource workers across Keppel and the broader Central Queensland, I say: this parliament sees your contribution, we value your sacrifice and we recognise the vital role you play in our state's future. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (4.57 pm): I rise to contribute to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Once again, the Crisafulli LNP government has ignored the experts, putting the safety of Queensland resource workers at risk. The government has ignored recommended reforms and instead cobbled together regulatory and structural changes that diminish health and safety. Industry was not consulted, stakeholders were not considered and laws were rushed. In submissions, stakeholders raised concerns about a timeline that pushed through these laws. There was not appropriate time in which valuable consultation could have been undertaken. There was little time for proper consideration of the bill and it shows. Nine business days does not allow enough time for meaningful submissions when there is little insight from the industry that the bill seeks to protect.

The relevance of the bill is questionable. The abolition of the role of the commission is one example. The Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health is vital in maintaining the safety of workers. The minister's own review of the act by Professor Johnston specifically mentions the importance of retaining the position. However, the LNP government has completely abolished it, ignoring the experts and risking lives. The commissioner role is clear and accountable, directly reporting to the minister and the parliament. It is a crucial advocate for Queensland resource workers. The role is an accessible point of contact for workers to raise issues through the chain of command. The commissioner is identifiable, with its provisions clearly defined. The new RSHQ board does not have any of these qualities, severely limiting the voice workers have in their safety.

The Queensland Resources Council questioned the abolition, the Australian Workers' Union has raised concerns and the Mining & Energy Union is firm in the usefulness of the role, so yet again the Crisafulli LNP government has gone against the experts and the workers and removed it. The Queensland Labor opposition will move amendments to ensure this role continues to support workers

and act as a key safeguard. Queensland Labor supports the role continuing to work in conjunction with the newly created Resources Safety & Health Queensland board as recommended by Professor Johnston. However, the LNP's new RSHQ board has its own issues that diminish workers' safety. In the new board the minister can directly remove members—

Debate, on motion of Ms McMillan, adjourned.

WASTE REDUCTION AND RECYCLING AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Hon. LM LINARD (Nudgee—ALP) (5.00 pm): I move—

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

This regulation—quietly tabled in the House late last year in December with extremely limited consultation, no identifiable public notification and contained in totally unrelated legislative amendments—is a cynical attempt, at best, to hide another watering down of environmental protections in this state under this Crisafulli LNP government and another decision by Queensland's environment minister that prioritises any and every interest over the interests he is appointed to serve—those of conservation and environmental stewardship and protection. The regulatory amendments hidden in the Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025 have the effect of continuing the lethal take of flying foxes in Queensland, so absolutely nothing to do with waste reduction or recycling. What we are talking about is the shooting of flying foxes—some species of which are endangered, all of which are protected under state and/or Commonwealth environment legislation.

Flying fox depredation of cultivated fruit crops in eastern Australia has been contentious since early colonisation when the expansion of agricultural areas and clearing of foraging habitat impacted wildlife populations. While the science, evidence and community sentiment of how to manage this issue has since moved on, the LNP has not. In 2023, following public consultation involving scientists, animal welfare experts and environmental organisations, our then Labor government announced a three-year phase-out lethal take of flying fox, after which shooting would no longer be allowed. The two limbs of the announcement at the time were a significant reduction in the number of flying foxes that could be taken annually at orchards during the three-year phase-out period and the culling of flying foxes at commercial fruit orchards to be phased out by 1 July 2026.

It was not a rushed decision. It was a three-year phase-out period that provided growers time to transition to exclusively non-lethal crop protection methods, and commercial fruit growers acknowledged it as such. The number of damage mitigation permits issued in Queensland had decreased from a peak of 44 permits during the pre-ban period in 2003-04 to only six granted in 2024-25. Our decision also coincided with the Commonwealth's Horticultural Netting Program to encourage fruit growers to transition to exclusion netting, with funding available at the time to assist growers to transition to exclusion netting—the most effective non-lethal fruit crop protection measure. We recognised then, as we recognise now, that this is a very real issue for some growers and that they should be supported to make the transition—a transition that not only ends an inhumane practice but results in more effective crop protection for them.

This regulation undoes all of that, and it does so in a sneaky and underhanded way without any opportunity for consultation with environment and animal welfare groups. The department of environment impact analysis statement states that in July 2025 the department commenced targeted consultation with industry as the primary stakeholder group impacted by the DMP phase-out provisions but did not consult with any conservation or animal welfare groups as the welfare impacts of shooting flying foxes are well established and unlikely to have changed since consultation on the phase-out provisions in 2023. That is an absolute cop-out. I have spent 23 of the last 25 years of my working life in government, whether as an elected member, public servant or ministerial adviser. While it is no doubt much easier just to consult with the people who say what you want them to say and not consult with the people you know will say things you do not want to hear, it is not how a democracy works. Engaging with dissenting voices is a cornerstone of legitimate policymaking and it is the sign of the rot of a bad government when it becomes normal operating procedure, as it has under this Crisafulli LNP government over the past 18 months.

This sort of selective consultation is nothing short of gagging stakeholders who have a direct investment in the outcomes of this issue—no consultation with them in this decision and no notice of this regulatory change was given to them. That is hardly the transparent, accountable government promised by this Premier, who says one thing and does something totally different or nothing at all. Conservation and animal welfare groups have been vocal on the need to phase out lethal take of flying foxes.

The decision we made in 2023 reflected strong community expectations and aligned Queensland with every other Australian state that had already banned lethal control methods due to unacceptable welfare and environmental outcomes and due to the fact that exclusion netting is the most effective measure to mitigate crop damage. We are now out of step with the rest of the country. The approach our government took in 2023 was a sensible one. It recognised that growers need to protect their crops and their livelihoods and it recognised that government has a responsibility to help them do that in ways that are effective and sustainable. The continuation of lethal take is not good policy. Keeping a flawed approach in place because it is politically easier rather than taking the course backed by evidence is simply not good governance. The point of policy in this area should be to help growers adopt methods that actually work over the long term.


The department's written briefing to the committee states clearly that the 2023 changes were made due to welfare concerns and because exclusion netting is the most effective measure to mitigate crop damage. It provides a physical barrier, it is reliable and it offers ongoing protection in a way lethal take does not. Not only is it more effective, but the obvious point is that it is also more humane and it is better for our ecosystems. In a state like Queensland where our natural environment is one of our greatest assets, that role should not be dismissed. Flying foxes play a critical role in pollination and seed dispersal, particularly for rainforest trees and eucalyptus. Given they travel long distances, they play a vital role in the regeneration of forests after fire, drought and clearing. As the RSPCA put so aptly in its media coverage of this issue, without them entire ecosystems become less resilient.

Queensland is home to grey-headed, black, little red and spectacled flying fox—all of which are protected under Queensland's Nature Conservation Act. The spectacled flying fox is listed as endangered under the NCA and therefore a damage mitigation permit cannot be granted for the lethal take of this threatened species for the purposes of crop protection. It is also listed as endangered under the EPBC Act at the Commonwealth level. While the department's material makes clear that a spectacled flying fox cannot be taken under a permit and that applicants must demonstrate they can differentiate between species, the risk of misidentification means the potential shooting of vulnerable or threatened species. Shifting to non-lethal take is not only more effective for farmers; it also removes risk and supports the conservation of key native animals. It is also just more humane. Shooting can lead to non-fatal injuries, causing considerable pain and prolonged death. The killing of pregnant or lactating females can lead to the resultant death of dependent young. These are our native protected wildlife and there is a more effective, more humane method to deal with the issue that shooting is trying to solve—an uncomfortable truth but a truth nonetheless.

A staged end to lethal take, time for growers to transition and practical support to invest in alternatives—that was the path set by Labor when we were in government. It was a policy position that recognised both the needs of industry and the environmental value of native wildlife. This government has chosen to walk away from that approach and from the work already done to support growers to transition beyond this practice. Humane World for Animals said in their submission that they are concerned that the reinstatement of lethal control creates scope for increased uptake over time including by landholders who had previously transitioned away from shooting. That is the reality we now face in Queensland. This Crisafulli LNP government and the Minister for the Environment have chosen to turn back the clock while providing absolutely no actual support to growers to improve the protection of their crops. The flimsy reason given in the impact analysis statement as to why three years of transition should be tossed aside is that the transition to full exclusion netting is not a viable outcome for some growers due to current financial or operational constraints, but not one dollar is offered to assist growers. No assistance is offered at all—just a rollback of the progress made to date and radio silence from this government.

Queenslanders should be able to expect decisions in this place to be based on evidence. They expect governments to support farmers properly, not just preserve the status quo and call it a solution. Labor recognised in 2023, as we recognise now, that this is a very real issue for some growers and they should be supported to make the transition—a transition that not only ends an inhumane practice but also results in more effective crop protection—but this regulation undoes all of that. As I said earlier,

it does so in a sneaky and underhanded way. For these reasons, I urge the House to support the disallowance motion.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.11 pm): I rise to speak against the disallowance motion. We are removing the arbitrary phase-out end date for damage mitigation permits. We know that Labor commenced a three-year phase-out of the permits in 2023. This is not the first time I have spoken against a Labor disallowance motion on the serious issue of damage caused by flying foxes. In February 2013, the then member for South Brisbane moved a disallowance motion against the nature conservation amendment. Those who heard the contribution will remember the member likening flying foxes to butterflies. It was a very disturbing night.

The damage caused by flying foxes is a serious issue. For decades growers in the electorate of Burnett have been trying a range of nonlethal methods to deter flying foxes from their crops: lighting, bird fright, netting of different types, drones, sound and quad bikes et cetera. This process is something they have had to do to protect their livelihoods. In addition, we are certainly willing to protect industries and employment in rural Queensland as part of the rebuilding phase after major flood events. Rural Queensland needs help. The unemployment rate in some electorates is high. Tornadoes and floods have devastated what infrastructure was on some farms. I say to those opposite that that infrastructure is not able to be insured. This is something that should be considered as well. Again, the change to what was being proposed is welcome and very timely. We need legislation to protect farmers, jobs and livelihoods, and after the damage caused by the recent floods there is no power and there are no nets.

I have examples of the losses. I hope members opposite can understand that 20 per cent of crops over two nights taken by flying foxes is real and tangible. It could be argued that that is waste reduction. This is an industry that represents more than 400 farmers and \$1.5 billion of farm gate industry locally in the Burnett electorate that we are incredibly proud of, and they need some support and sensible legislation. As I mentioned, our region contributes \$1.5 billion to the Queensland economy each year due to the significant production of the horticulture industry, which has a gross value of produce in excess of \$573 million for nuts, vegetable commodities and hundreds of millions for field crops including sugar cane, sorghum and maize.

I have many examples where DMPs work in deterring flying fox damage in a diverse growing area like the Wide Bay-Burnett, Queensland's most productive irrigated agriculture region. That is why we will oppose the disallowance motion. In addition to leading the state in the output of citrus and avocado, we are the largest producing region in Australia for sweet potato, macadamia, chilli and passionfruit. We are home to a thriving berry industry, from blueberries to strawberries, and we have significant protected cropping environments to support the year-round production of figs, cucumber and many other crops.

The cost to farmers in my electorate has been enormous, with little evidence or science to support the fact that any success was achieved under the wildlife management regulation 2006. The previous arrangements did nothing to assist with the ecological sustainability of flying foxes. I was frustrated every time I visited a farm or had one of the farmers contact me to say that the previous legislation would not allow lethal management to assist in crop protection.


I would like to highlight some of the topographical and practical challenges and key issues. Some landholders have existing permanent tree crops planted to the boundary, leaving no room for the poles or other infrastructure required to install netting without removing productive rows of trees. In areas prone to frequent severe weather events, full-frame exclusion netting may not be viable due to high maintenance and replacement costs as well as limited insurance coverage. As I mentioned earlier, some of these nets are millions of dollars in costs to install, with no insurance.

From earlier consultations, other concerns raised were: supply chain and labour constraints affecting netting availability, particularly labour needed to replace or repair damaged netting; permanent netting structures can impede other operations such as pollination and pruning and may alter the surrounding ecosystems and microclimates within netted areas; retractable or temporary exclusion netting has a shorter life span due to wear and damage each time it is deployed or removed and it can also be costly and labour intensive to operate; and holes caused by birds, bats or other animals can be difficult to repair and may trap animals inside the netting. All that said, these nonlethal alternatives can cost millions of dollars.

My electorate has suffered with the poor management of flying foxes over many years. Finally, a sensible and detailed solution has been proposed. For many years, the opposition has given little heed to the problems that growers and their families suffered due to the damage caused by flying foxes, particularly during the night. A small number of permit holders are able to take limited numbers only,

and they are required to comply with a code of practice regarding acceptable shooting practices to ensure any result of pain and suffering is minimised. Permit holders are also required to keep daily records of shooting activity by completing return of operation forms which document the time, date and location and the number of animals taken.

In closing, I want to acknowledge the team at Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers—Bree Watson and her team—for their work and their advocacy over a long period of time; Craig Van Royan; and Derek Foley, president of the Australian Lychee Growers Association, and Jill Houser, the executive officer of the Australian Lychee Growers Association, for their tireless and very timely advocacy. We will continue to work with you to make sure the production of agriculture—particularly primary industries—is supported and respected in our areas.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.17 pm): We are talking about the damage mitigation permits which are issued by the department of the environment that allow Queensland farmers to shoot flying foxes for the purpose of crop protection up to an annual statewide quota. DMPs first ceased in 2009 under the then Bligh government; however, they recommenced in 2012 under the Newman government. The former Labor government, as we heard outlined by the member for Nudgee, made a commitment to repeal lethal take laws. Following extensive public consultation, it was confirmed it would be banned from 1 July 2026 after a three-year phase-out. Let's be very clear: this was not rushed reform without consultation which we see so often from this LNP government. The phase-out was announced in 2023 with a full three-year transition. Industry were made aware and there were programs put in place around netting to ensure crop protection. One of those was, of course, the Commonwealth's Horticultural Netting Program, a dollar-for-dollar program up to \$300,000. It is worth noting that since industry was made aware this transition would be coming into effect, industry has dropped their permits to six. In the year 2024-25 there were only six permit holders to shoot flying foxes across all of Queensland.


I note the member for Burnett thanked a couple of people. I happened to talk to one of those people about 15 minutes ago. They said that even with this repeal they will not actually go back to shooting because nets are more effective. Perhaps the member for Burnett should call his growers a little bit more and have a bit of a chat. I know it has been tough because they have been shouting at him about his backflip on Paradise Dam, but the netting program is dollar-for-dollar up to \$300,000. Since this was announced, the particular grower I spoke with on the phone has gone from one farm to four farms. He has had them netted and believes that netting is the most cost-effective way.

A responsible government should listen to the growers. When one of the six permit holders says nets are the most effective way, the government needs to consider how we invest more in nets. If there were a Commonwealth Horticultural Netting Program that ended but needs to be started again, has the environment minister lobbied Jim Chalmers, the federal Treasurer, for more money for netting for our Queensland farmers? Has the Minister for Primary Industries spoken with his federal government counterpart to ensure that there is more money for netting?

Growers are saying that the No. 1 protection, the most effective way to protect their crops, from flying foxes is netting so why would a responsible government not move heaven and earth to ensure there is more funding available so this most effective measure can be implemented? Why would a government not commit to that funding? Why would a government not say to the federal government, 'Why don't we go 50-50?', and even increase that funding? Maybe they could make it dollar for dollar up to \$500,000. Would that not be a wonderful piece of government strategy to look after growers? All we hear from the other side is 'a decade of decline', 'Labor does not stand up for the growers', 'They do not do anything for the growers,' but where is the money, comrades? Instead of funding growers so that they can get netting, they are repealing a piece of legislation for six permits. There is no money from that side. Did anyone hear the member for Burnett announce how much money this state is giving for netting?

Ms Bush: Zero!

Mr SMITH: I take that interjection from the member for Cooper—zero! Zip, zero, nada! One would think that the member for Burnett, who spoke so passionately about his growers—one I spoke to 15 minutes ago said, 'Hey, Tom, can you get us more money for netting because that is the best thing the government could do'—would lobby his own government for that. The federal budget is being dropped tonight. There will be a state budget soon. I am looking forward to the primary industries minister and the environment minister announcing bucketloads—in fact, they should announce a dam load—of money to ensure that netting is there for our growers. As I often say, thank goodness for the member for Burnett. He gives me so much to talk about.

 **Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (5.22 pm): I rise to make my contribution against this motion. Flying foxes are megabats of the genus *Pteropus* and all four species are protected pursuant to the Nature Conservation Act 1992. Flying foxes are often and probably more correctly known as fruit bats due to their reliance upon fruits, nectar and pollen for sustenance. It is this affinity with fruit that has brought the flying foxes to our urban areas, backyards and orchards. Fruit grown in Far North Queensland is an important component of our regional horticulture industry worth \$563 million annually. There is a school of thought that altered land use practices and fire regimes have not only directly impacted the range of flying foxes and their diets but also, more importantly, directly influenced their numbers. It is thought that the numbers of most varieties of flying foxes have, in fact, exploded due to large volumes of food now available in our urban areas and orchards.


The presence of flying foxes in orchards are the ingredients for a perfect storm; a perfect storm that can have a huge financial impact on a handful of growers, some of whom have orchards in my electorate of Cook. Add to this storm the fact that a vast number of flying foxes are found in or emanate from my electorate of Cook. This interaction between flying foxes and farmers often leads to tensions over the management of flying fox incursions into orchards and the impact on farmers' livelihoods. Emotions can run high when conservation and animal welfare groups and the media are added to the mix. There are several tools available to farmers to deter flying foxes from orchards, ranging from netting and lights to scare tactics. Whilst these options are useful in most circumstances to mitigate losses, in some they simply do not work due to cost, weather, terrain and other factors such as animal entanglement. One method that has been available to a select few orchardists and has proven to be effective is flying fox damage mitigation permits for crop protection.

It is an offence to kill or otherwise harm a flying fox in contravention of the Nature Conservation Act and there are substantial penalties. The department will, however, issue a limited number of permits each year. These permits are not easily obtained and allow the lethal take of flying foxes by shooting. These permits can only be achieved in very limited circumstances such as only by a landholder who has previously held a permit, a code of conduct applies, the total number of animals that can be shot annually will be subject to the quota at present levels and the number of kills are closely monitored by the department.

Let us put this into perspective. The total number of flying foxes across all species across the state contained in the quota is 1,630 and the maximum in respect of each permit is 103. Of the millions and millions of flying foxes that fill our skies in the evening, orchardists are only able to take 1,630 by lethal means. These permits are not easy to obtain as there is a rigorous process. Why would an orchardist not choose to control flying foxes by lethal means when he might potentially see his crops invaded by hundreds if not thousands of animals? Orchardists believe that if they can deter by lethal means the scouts that frequent their orchards then that will prevent those scouts leading the larger flocks to the orchard.

In 2023 Labor commenced a three-year phase-out process of damage mitigation permits in respect of flying foxes by lethal means. The Crisafulli government is reversing this phase-out following consultation with farmers and industry. The minister has taken a calm and methodical approach to this issue and will ensure that nothing else changes. The rules will stay tight and the safeguards strong. The regulation removes the 30 June 2026 end date for phasing out damage mitigation permits for crop protection and that is all. As stated, eligibility remains tightly restricted. Only commercial fruitgrowers who have previously held permits can apply. To obtain a permit the grower must demonstrate the flying foxes are causing or may cause damage to his crop, reasonable preventative measures have been attempted, significant economic loss is likely without intervention and the permit will not adversely affect the survival of the species in the wild. I can only wonder why Labor thought it necessary to phase out these permits in the first place given that since 2020 only 13 growers have needed permits and in the last season only six permits were needed. Six permits equates to 618 flying foxes taken by lethal means.

The damage to crops in Queensland runs into hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars each year. The impact of the legal take on millions of flying foxes each year appears to be less than 1,000. All that was required in relation to this issue was a calm, methodical approach following consultation with growers. I rest my case.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (5.27 pm): I rise to speak in support of the disallowance of the regulation. My contribution will focus on the clauses which reflect the government's decision to remove the phase-out of lethal damage mitigation permits for flying foxes—a decision that is a deliberate policy choice to continue the routine killing of a protected native species rather than transition towards modern, nonlethal management approaches which just about every jurisdiction in this country is now doing. In

2023 the Palaszczuk Labor government set a clear direction. That direction recognised three things: that flying foxes are a protected species under Queensland law; that the science and evidence base has shifted; and that there were better and more effective ways to manage conflict between agriculture and wildlife. As a result, Queensland committed to a phase-out of lethal take permits which was due to expire in July 2026.

This position was based on evidence and economics. It reflected the growing body of evidence that shooting is ineffective at protecting crops at scale, raises serious animal welfare concerns and does not actually address the underlying drivers of conflict. Instead, our policy direction was to support a transition towards full exclusion netting, modern deterrents and coexistence-based land management. This regulation, however, reverses that trajectory. By removing the expiry provisions, it cancels the phase-out and reinstates an ongoing lethal control framework without a clear transition plan or an investment in nonlethal approaches. It puts Queensland behind in modern agricultural practice.

In New South Wales licensed shooting ended in 2021 following an independent review that found that shooting was ineffective, was ethically problematic and contributed to population decline. Importantly, New South Wales invested in netting subsidies and growers reported practical benefits: protection not only from flying foxes but also from hail, a reduced need for nightly interventions and greater long-term certainty for their crops.


These approaches recognise that the goal is not to manage wildlife through force but to protect production systems effectively and sustainably. An important part of the debate is recognising that flying foxes are keystone pollinators and seed dispersers. Therefore, it is not simply an environmental issue; it is also an economic one. Flying foxes maintain ecosystems that underpin our food security, water systems and regional economies. Without those ecological services, we do not just lose biodiversity; we undermine the systems that support food production itself.

At a time when regional Queensland is already under pressure from rising fuel costs and supply uncertainties, the resilience of our production systems has never been more important. Higher fuel costs flow through to transport, irrigation, fertiliser and inputs. They increase the costs of getting goods to market and reduce margins across the supply chain. In that context, it makes no sense to rely on labour-intensive responses like shooting that require a huge amount of ongoing cost and effort without delivering any kind of reliable protection. What does make sense is investing in systems that reduce exposure to these pressures, like netting and exclusion methods that provide consistent and long-term protection and that reduce repeat labour.

If we are serious about supporting regional economies through the fuel crisis then we should be backing approaches that reduce risk, not entrenching ones that add to it. At the same time, these species are already under pressure. The grey-headed and spectacled flying foxes are both listed as threatened at a national level. It is also important to understand how flying foxes behave. They are highly mobile animals that move across landscapes in response to food availability. When disturbed in one location they move to another, often to a neighbouring property, and they often return later. Shooting does not remove the problem; it shifts it. The member for Cook spoke about scouts but that has been widely disproved. That simply does not occur. Often the bats that come out early are pregnant mothers and they are the ones being shot.

Shooting does not provide reliable crop protection at scale. It is a short-term response to an ongoing challenge. Across Australia, jurisdictions are moving in a different direction. New South Wales has ended licensed shooting. Western Australia does not permit it. Other states are moving towards protection, exclusion and coexistence. Queensland is now moving in the opposite direction and that presents a reputational risk for our state. We are developing a reputation for reductionist policy, a retreat from evidence-based reform and a willingness to step backwards when others are moving forward.

Nature is not an externality to the economy. It is the infrastructure that supports agriculture, water, climate stability and long-term productivity. When we weaken those systems, we increase our risks and our costs through degraded land, reduced yield and increased volatility. This regulation asks us to accept that it is easier to continue an outdated practice than to complete a transition, but the evidence does not support that approach. Queensland had a pathway that balanced agricultural needs, ecological reality and long-term sustainability, but this regulation abandons that pathway. For those reasons, I support the disallowance motion before the House today.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (5.32 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the disallowance motion for part 2 of the Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, which was tabled in the House on 9 December 2025. This amendment to part 2 of the regulation specifically applies to repealing the phasing out of damage mitigation permits, DMPs, which were to

expire by 30 June this year. DMPs are issued to fruitgrowers, permitting them to shoot flying foxes to protect their crops. The former Labor government changed the laws in 2023 to phase out DMPs, to give growers time to implement nonlethal crop protection methods. We did this due to welfare concerns about the inhumane shooting of flying foxes and because the evidence shows that protective netting is the most effective measure to mitigate crop damage.

At the time of the changes, a Commonwealth grant program for the installation of exclusion netting was available to commercial fruitgrowers, but a review undertaken 12 months ago by the department showed that some commercial growers were not able to meet the impending deadline despite the three-year lead time and the Commonwealth grants. In their submission to the committee, the Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation reported that, since DMPs were reintroduced over 10 years ago, many commercial fruitgrowers have moved away from the lethal take of flying foxes and have installed permanent netting. As we heard from the member for Bundaberg, it is actually working.

Scientific evidence does not show that shooting flying foxes effectively reduces crop damage or economic loss. The significant issue with this amendment is the way the LNP government has sneakily abandoned the committee's proper consultation process. The accompanying explanatory notes to the regulation state that consultation was only done with industry stakeholders and that 'consultation with other stakeholder groups did not occur given that conservation views are unlikely to have changed since consultation on the phase-out provisions in 2023'. In their submission to the committee, the RSPCA said that 'this approach risks limiting access to current scientific, welfare and environmental evidence that is directly relevant to the regulatory change'.

The LNP do not want to listen to the most up-to-date scientific evidence on this regulation change. They also do not want to listen to stakeholders who can point to evidence proving that permanent netting is far more effective at protecting crops from flying foxes than shooting. This government boasts about bringing back transparency and accountability, but gagging certain stakeholders who have an opposing view is hardly being true to the principles of transparency and accountability. It is a form of censorship.

Shooting flying foxes poses significant welfare risks that threaten the survival of endangered flying fox populations. Shooting can lead to non-fatal injuries, causing flying foxes to endure considerable pain, distress and even a prolonged death. The killing of pregnant or lactating females can lead to heartbreaking outcomes, resulting in the death of dependent young. With low reproductive rates, the loss of breeding females has a disproportionate impact on population viability, especially for threatened species such as the spectacled flying fox and the grey-headed flying fox.


In their submission, the Humane World for Animals say that they are concerned that 'the reinstatement of lethal control creates scope for increased uptake over time, including by landholders who had previously transitioned away from shooting'. This is another example of the Crisafulli LNP government taking Queensland backwards. Queensland is the only jurisdiction in Australia that still permits shooting flying foxes for crop protection. I repeat: Queensland is the only jurisdiction in Australia that still permits shooting flying foxes. All other states and territories have moved away from lethal control, in recognition of animal welfare risks and the key ecological role of flying foxes as pollinators and seed dispensers.

The economic and environmental benefits of using nonlethal methods for protecting crops against flying foxes are undisputed by the experts. Permanent exclusion netting of crops can reduce crop losses to near zero. This provides long-term protection and predictability of crop yields, improving farmers' long-term planning and income stability. Shooting flying foxes has only limited effectiveness. It often provides only short-term, localised deterrence and other animals quickly replace those that are removed. It does not reliably prevent crop damage across a season and it requires ongoing labour costs and the monitoring of crops.

The Labor opposition acknowledges that fruitgrowers may suffer real financial losses due to damage caused by wildlife. I know from when I was the assistant minister for local government that flying foxes are an issue for nearly every council in Queensland, for various reasons. However, we also recognise that there are significant up-front costs to installing and maintaining netting and that the insurance market has limitations that make it difficult for growers to insure netting against extreme weather events. Smaller farms may find it especially difficult with their limited financial capacity, especially with rising fuel costs, but this is where the LNP government needs to step up and provide practical policy responses—not go back to allowing growers to shoot flying foxes. That is not a solution.

In their submission the department stated that industry stakeholders had advocated for more netting subsidy programs, alternative nonlethal options and insurance support or a risk-sharing mechanism for storm damaged netting infrastructure. These are policy solutions that the LNP government has completely ignored. Instead, the LNP is taking the easier route by extending the use of DMPs with no end date in sight and by disregarding policies that would incentivise all Queensland fruitgrowers to invest in nonlethal crop protection methods by 30 June. The LNP government is a do-nothing government that prefers to cut good regulations that were working. The department's own submission actually stated that many fruitgrowers have already installed permanent netting to protect their crops and that in 2024-25 only six active DMPs were in place, as the member for Bundaberg said. The LNP has been in government for almost 18 months and it has done nothing to help those six DMP holders to move towards nonlethal methods of protection for their crops.

While other Australian states and territories have moved away from shooting flying foxes, our Premier is taking our state backwards to retain an out-of-date, ineffective DMP system that endangers our flying fox populations and ignores the economic benefits of nonlethal methods of crop protection. This government needs to reconsider this environmentally vandalous amendment and take account of the expert scientific evidence that supports nonlethal methods of crop protection.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.40 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution on this disallowance motion. I support the motion, to be clear at the outset. The purpose of the motion is to disallow provisions that would otherwise allow a wide-scale recommencement of the culling of flying foxes. What it will do is allow for damage mitigation permits to be issued. These are permits that allow fruitgrowers to shoot and kill flying foxes.

Government members interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: They can object as much as they like because they do not want to be seen as the Disney movie villains that they are, but ultimately that is what it is about. It is about repealing regulation that prevents the issue of damage mitigation permits to kill flying foxes.

Now, let's be clear, flying foxes are not just super cute; they are keystone species. They are essential to ecological function. They are essential to the health and vitality of the surrounding environment and the collapse of their populations has profound ecological impacts. They are essential to the distribution of seed and pollen within our woodlands and rainforests. We have heard a lot from other speakers on this issue, but a single flying fox can distribute 60,000 seeds across 50 kilometres in a single night.

They are also hugely culturally significant for Aboriginal people and communities. Jiritju Fourmile, a Gimuy Walubara man from the Yidinji nation, described a devastating heatwave in November 2018 which killed a third of the Australian population of spectacled flying foxes in one week. He explained—

The Flying-fox is a big part of our Aboriginal community... One of the most magical things about Gimuy used to be watching the Flying-foxes cover the evening with a curtain of black. Now, we barely see any. Soon, we will probably see none... This will mean another connection to Country gone. What else will then keep us connected to the land? One less animal means one less Goopi, one less spirit.

In 2023, laws were introduced to phase out the issuing of these permits, offering industry plenty of time to prepare. This is not something that has just happened overnight. These regulatory changes permanently revert to the position that growers can continue to obtain permits. The justification given in the explanatory notes was that industry was concerned about the cost to install and maintain permanent exclusion netting and related insurance.

The end of last year was when the regulation was tabled, and I was genuinely curious about what work the department has done to actually understand the difficulties and what are the problems that these primary producers are facing. I asked the Minister for Primary Industries a question—question on notice 38—in February this year. On 12 March, the minister came back with an answer. The question was—

With reference to the control of flying foxes for crop protection—Will the minister advise (a) how many Queensland growers the department has assessed are unable to transition to full exclusion netting and (b) in relation to (a), (i) in which Local Government Areas are these growers located, (ii) what specific constraints prevent each of them from transitioning to full exclusion netting and (iii) what solutions has the department considered to address these constraints?

The minister's answer was actually quite shocking. He stated—

The Department of Primary Industries has not conducted a formal assessment of growers affected by flying foxes who are unable to transition to full exclusion netting. As no formal assessment has been conducted, there are no details to respond to (b) in identifying specific growers.

That applies obviously to specific barriers or regions where there are those barriers. It is not just a bit absurd; it is kind of reprehensible, I would suggest, that a decision like this could be made without even having done any kind of formal assessment of the obstacles to meeting—

Mr Powell: Let me address that.


Mr BERKMAN: It would have been nice, I will say in response to the minister's interjection, the minister for or against the environment, that is if the Minister for Primary Industries might have had some information to hand to respond—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Members' comments will come through the chair.

Mr BERKMAN: It is baffling to me that the government can point the literal gun at a keystone species without strong evidence that lethal control is effective in protecting fruit crops. There are non-lethal methods that exist that we know are effective. There is an absence of any reliable evidence to show us that shooting flying foxes will be a reliable way to protect fruit crops.

It is extraordinary to me that they will go to this extent without real evidence in support, but they do not turn the same sort of scrutiny to major supermarkets whose aesthetic standards lead to extraordinary proportions, like 30 per cent, of crops being dumped before they even leave the farm gate. There is no reasonable basis to continue the provision of damage mitigation permits for the killing of flying foxes, especially in the context where we are seeing climate impacts over time causing mass mortality events for these same species that are supposed to be protected.

Again, I support this motion and I would call on the government to reconsider their approach to this. We know there are alternatives and we know that they can be effective if only primary producers are given the support that they need from government.

 **Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP)** (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (5.46 pm): I rise to oppose the motion to disallow part 2 of the Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025, subordinate legislation No. 154 of 2025, the member for Nudgee gave notice of moving on 24 March 2026. In doing so, I commend the members for Burnett and Cook for their contributions. I also note that those opposite raised very valid and sensible suggestions around what should and should not be done in this space and even made reference to a number of the statistics which I will in turn use myself.

In starting my contribution, I want to refute some of the claims made by those opposite and those on the crossbench. The shadow minister made the statement that this undoes previous conservation efforts. As I will explain in detail in a moment, and as I think the member herself said, permits have dropped to just six in recent years and that lethal take is minimal, as the member for Cook outlined in his contribution. That does not, in any sense of the word, undo previous conservation efforts.

The shadow minister suggested there was no consultation. That is completely and utterly false. What the member should have said is there was no additional consultation undertaken with the conservation sector. There was very detailed consultation undertaken with the horticultural sector and the agricultural sector, and I will unpack that a little bit in more detail, and that also goes to the claims made by the member for Maiwar.

A number of members opposite made the statement that Queensland is now out of step with other states. Well, we do not shy away from the fact that we ensure there are Queensland solutions to Queensland conditions. We are a large state where one-size-fits-all does not always apply.

The shadow minister said this will increase shooting again. That is simply not the case. As I will unpack, the only thing that has changed is the sunset date. There is no expansion of the scheme. There was a downward trend, and we anticipate that downward trend will continue.

The member for Bundaberg suggested it was all about money. Unfortunately, member for Bundaberg, it is not, and as my department found when they were out on the ground in the member for Burnett's electorate in particular, netting is not always an issue of cost. Previous support packages have been well embraced by farmers from across the state. Most new farmers will automatically go to look at exclusion netting. They do appreciate that it does provide a better return, but in some instances it is a question of topography, so whether it is slope or hydrography—that is, the orchard might be on a flood plain that actually makes exclusion netting impossible. Members opposite even raised the fact that in those instances it is not the cost of construction, it is the cost of reconstruction when insurance claims are required.

The member for Ipswich talked about the need for additional policy settings. I can assure the member that the department and I will continue to work with the number of growers who require these

permits to look at all policy settings. This removes the hard deadline to allow us to have those conversations.

We all hear about political exaggeration, which all of us are probably prone to, but the Greens member for Maiwar takes hyperbole to another level in terms of the sensationalism of his words. He suggested that this was somehow going to bring back widespread shooting. It will not. Let me unpack exactly what we are talking about so the member for Maiwar can be very clear on this. The Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2025 contains a simple amendment to the Nature Conservation (Animals) Regulation 2020 to remove the 30 June 2026 end date for the phase-out of damage mitigation permits that allow lethal take of flying foxes as a fruit crop protection measure. The amendment targets only that phase-out date. All other provisions for managing lethal take of flying foxes are retained. I repeat: all other provisions for managing lethal take of flying foxes are retained. To be clear: there has not been an opening up or an expansion of the opportunity to gain damage mitigation permits for the lethal take of flying foxes. I thank the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee for considering it and for determining that they were satisfied that the amendments are appropriate.

I turn now to eligibility. If a grower has not previously held a damage mitigation permit to shoot flying foxes then they remain ineligible for a permit, consistent with the provisions that were commenced in 2023. Other restrictions on issuing damage mitigation permits for lethal take of flying foxes, including limited annual take quotas—which the member for Cook, again, spelt out very clearly—and requirements for permit holders to adhere to a code of practice, also remain in place.

In addition to restrictions on who is eligible to apply for a permit, there are several other requirements growers must meet before they can obtain a permit. Eligible growers must demonstrate that flying foxes are causing or may cause crop damage, that reasonable preventive measures have been attempted, that significant economic loss is likely without intervention and that the permit will not adversely affect the species' survival in the wild. Permit holders are also required to comply with the code of practice for the ecologically sustainable lethal take of flying foxes for crop protection, which includes significantly reduced lethal-take quotas for each species.

As others have said, since 2012 only a small number of commercial fruitgrowers needed or continually sought a damage mitigation permit to allow them to shoot a small number. Since 2020 no more than 13 growers needed a DMP. In 2024 that reduced to only six. That is significantly down from a peak of 21 permits in 2017-18. There has also been a significant decline in the number of flying foxes taken lethally. The total number of flying foxes that can be taken annually—the annual quota—will remain at current levels for each of the four flying fox species in Queensland. For the grey-headed flying fox, the annual quota is 130. For the black flying fox, it is 700. For the little red flying fox, it is 800. As the spectacled flying fox is listed as endangered under the Nature Conservation Act, DMPs—damage mitigation permits—cannot be issued for this species and it cannot be lethally taken for crop protection.

The code of practice makes it clear that permit holders must be able to clearly identify animals before they can be taken, and any unlawful take will remain a serious offence under the act. I point out to members, particularly the member for Maiwar, that the majority of eligible damage mitigation permit holders are outside of the range of the spectacled flying fox in North Queensland. As to how many flying foxes have actually been taken, for the five-year period between 2018 and 2023, on average, approximately five per cent of the quota were taken. Based on 2024-25 permit data, approximately 10 per cent—170 animals—of the total annual quota of 1,630 were taken. The department expects these trends to continue in the foreseeable future and is committed to ensuring permit data remains accessible to the public.

I turn now to engagement. We have worked with the fruit-growing industry during the phase-out period to help identify and manage potential risks and issues encountered by growers. We have also sought advice from industry. In 2025 I requested that the department engage with the Australian Lychee Growers Association and the Bundaberg Fruit & Vegetable Growers association to seek feedback on the progress towards transitioning to nonlethal crop protection and hear firsthand any issues with the phase-out. The department engaged with these associations and, to the member for Maiwar's point, undertook farm visits in the Bundaberg region to better understand growers' needs and concerns, including the varying nature of horticultural practices.

The department also wrote to relevant industry peak bodies and local government bodies representing fruitgrowers seeking feedback on any implementation challenges during the phase-out period and to review current management practices. Industry consultation occurred over a four-week

period, from 8 July to 5 August 2025, and the department received feedback from six submissions in addition to the issues raised during the site visits.

Through this process, it became clear that some existing DMP holders were not able to meet the transition timelines previously set. The consensus from industry was that the variable nature of horticultural businesses means that for operational, environmental and financial constraints permanent, full exclusion netting remains an unviable option for certain growers to address crop damage. I repeat: it is an unviable option for certain growers. As I have said, in most instances it is around topography, whether that be slope or flood plain. That means that the high costs and the vulnerabilities of permanent netting structures to storm damage were also identified as key barriers, particularly for those smaller farms. If it was just about the money, all farmers would have taken netting on board. No-one disputes that it achieves the greatest outcome in this space.

It was in response to this industry feedback that the objective of the government's action was to balance the financial and operational challenges faced by growers with the welfare and conservation needs of flying foxes. To achieve this, the government has sought to maintain current arrangements and continue allowing controlled lethal take under the DMPs in accordance with the code of practice only as a last resort. Again, I repeat: the only repeal is of the phase-out end date.

Those opposite have asked why we did not engage with the conservation sector. It is very clear that the views of these groups, particularly around the impacts on the welfare of flying fox species, are well known and will not have changed since the previous engagement and previous consultation that was considered in landing on the position that the government has taken. We have considered that nonlethal strategies are broadly recognised as the most effective form of crop protection, but it is not universally available. This was balanced with the ongoing financial and operational challenges for particular growers. While the impact of flying foxes on crops is felt by only a few individual growers, the impact to their livelihood has been determined to be significant.

I acknowledge that flying foxes are a protected species and critical pollinators. I also acknowledge the importance of ensuring animal welfare. I recognise the important work that wildlife and conservation groups and wildlife carers do across Queensland. These matters have been considered, and the impact on wildlife rescuers and carers across the state has been weighed in making the decision to remove the end date for the phase-out. The government has acted in the interests of a balanced outcome between the operational challenges faced by a small number of growers and the welfare and conservation needs of flying foxes. The government has provided for damage mitigation permits as a limited, last-resort measure while the industry continues to work with government to progress towards effective use of nonlethal methods. I oppose the motion.

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

AYES, 36:

ALP, 34—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 54:

LNP, 52—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.


Resolved in the negative.

RESOURCES SAFETY AND HEALTH QUEENSLAND AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading


Resumed from p. 1293, on motion of Mr Last—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (6.04 pm), continuing: As I was saying, in the new board, the minister can directly remove members without any reasoning, clearly raising concerns about the independence and government influence over the board. Affording this power to the minister creates an environment of fear where there may be reluctance to provide honest and direct advice to the minister. Those who are placed on the board do not have the requirement to act independently in the public interest. These provisions cannot be identified in the bill—provisions that are key to ensuring functioning representation of workers. These issues were raised by many stakeholders during the committee process, which the LNP has again ignored.

In addition to this reduced autonomy, there is no obligation for the board to include any workers. There are no requirements in the bill that outline that the composition of the board must require worker representation—a health and safety board for the benefit of resource workers without any actual workers. Workers are the backbone of the industry, and a lack of inclusion means the board fails to represent the industry whilst risking the safety of many. These two factors mean that advice given to the minister may be considered to be flawed. It will simply be yes-men comforts. There may be no constructive feedback provided. The minister can pick and choose who they want on the board and it does not have to be the foundation of the industry. This is a clear step backwards for worker safety. The Queensland Labor opposition will move amendments to ensure advice accurately represents the values of the industry—workers included. This will include all critical perspectives so the safety of everyone is fairly and rightly considered.

The Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee are additional core components that keep resource workers safe. These committees provide the appropriate transparency and feedback to the government and minister. The commissioner acts as a chairperson on these committees, ensuring independence. By the Crisafulli government removing the commissioner role, it removes the independence required to ensure that monitoring and feedback have the interest of workers as their core priority. A lack of independence in these committees directly harms Queensland resource workers. Committees can be politicised and interference can be more easily made. Stakeholders were clear on the negative effects of removing this independence, yet the LNP government has ignored the advice once again. This shows the blatant disregard for the health and safety of resource workers. The intentions with this bill are clear and on display. The Labor opposition will move amendments to address these issues to ensure the bill reflects the intention of the Johnston review—that is, to protect Queensland workers.

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (6.07 pm): I rise to speak in favour of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. From the outset I would like to thank Minister Last, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, for all the work that he has put into this. I also thank the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for their work.

I rise to speak on this amendment bill as the member for Mundingburra, and I do so proudly. My electorate has been built on hard work, on industry and on the contribution of workers and their families who are connected to the Queensland resources sector. Across Townsville and North Queensland, we know that mining is not something that just happens out west—out of sight, out of mind. The economic and social impact of the resources sector flows directly into communities like Mundingburra every single day. Many families in my electorate rely on the fly-in fly-out and the drive-in drive-out work. They are the mums and the dads who drive the long distances or fly to the remote mine sites to provide for their families. They sacrifice birthdays, sporting events, school assemblies and weekends at home because they are committed to putting food on the table and building a better future for their children and for all of Queensland.

These workers deserve one thing above all else: they deserve to come home safely, and that is what this bill is all about. This legislation delivers important reforms to strengthen the governance, accountability and oversight within Resources Safety & Health Queensland following the independent Johnston review. The Johnston review found weaknesses in that governance, confusion around responsibilities and a lack of accountability within the current framework. This bill addresses those shortcomings by establishing a skills-based governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland, the RSHQ. It improves oversight. It modernises the system to ensure it remains focused on one thing and one thing only—protecting workers.

As a former police officer of nearly three decades, I know that when a system lacks accountability it is the frontline workers who, sadly, ultimately pay the price. Good governance matters and good government delivers good governance. Clear lines of responsibility matter and oversight matters. In an industry as important and high risk as mining and resources, getting safety right is absolutely crucial.

These reforms matter enormously to Mundingburra and North Queensland. Townsville is the gateway to the North West Minerals Province. We are a service hub for the mining industry. We have heavy vehicle operators, contractors, engineers, mechanics, transport workers, aviation workers and countless support industries that are all connected to the resource industry. Queensland Resources Council figures show just how significant this industry is to my electorate of Mundingburra. In 2024-25, QRC member companies directly contributed \$68 million in wages, supported 514 jobs, spent \$72 million across 280 local businesses and supported seven community organisations. The total economic contribution reached \$266 million and supported an additional 1,770 local jobs. They are not just statistics: these numbers represent local families who are paying mortgages; they represent small businesses who are staying open; they represent our apprentices getting opportunities; they represent our sporting clubs receiving sponsorships; and they represent our cafes, our tradies, our mechanics, our fuel stations and our local retailers surviving and thriving.

Resources are a critical economic driver for communities like Townsville and the broader North Queensland region, but while we recognise the enormous economic contribution of the sector we must also recognise the human side of the fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out worker. They are our relatives—our mothers and fathers, husbands and wives, sons and daughters, sisters and brothers, friends and neighbours. For many workers who fly-in fly-out or drive-in drive-out, those arrangements mean long periods away from home, fatigue from travel, mental strain and time separated from loved ones. These workers operate in demanding environments and often under significant pressure, and that is why strong safety systems are so important. Queenslanders should never have to choose between earning a living and returning home safely to their families.


This bill strengthens the governance of RSHQ while retaining the independence of the regulator. It creates a governing board to ensure the regulator is operating effectively and efficiently. Importantly, this bill also cuts unnecessary red tape and reduces unnecessary financial burdens on the industry. This bill repeals provisions introduced under the former Labor government that would have imposed an industry funded levy for the Land Access Ombudsman. Let me be really clear: the Queensland resources sector is already carrying enormous costs under Labor's royalty regime and rising operating pressures. At a time when investment confidence matters, Labor wanted to add yet another layer of cost and another layer of bureaucracy. This government, this side of the chamber, understands that if you want strong regional economies you need to back the industry, not burden it with unnecessary additional red tape. Nowhere is that more important than in North Queensland.

We know that investment in mining and resources creates jobs not just on mine sites but also in communities like mine in Mundingburra. Every new project creates opportunities for local suppliers, local transport operators, local accommodation providers and local workers. That is particularly important for the young people in our region. Many North Queensland families have built stable and successful lives through mining and resource employment. Our FIFO and DIDO work has provided opportunities for workers to earn good wages and support their families and, most importantly, allowed them to stay living in regional Queensland rather than having to relocate interstate. That matters for our schools, it matters for our sporting clubs, it matters for our community organisations and it matters for regional growth.

One thing I have always believed in, both in policing and now in parliament, is that workers must know that safety is a priority and not just an afterthought. That is why these reforms are so important. We support a strong resource sector because we understand what it means for regional Queensland, for Townsville, for North Queensland and for the Mundingburra electorate. We understand the value of the men and women who get on those planes or drive on those highways every week to work in the remote parts of our state. We understand that every one of those workers deserves a system that prioritises safety, accountability and common sense.

The Crisafulli government is committed to making Queensland safer, strengthening regional economies and restoring confidence in government systems. This bill reflects those priorities. It strengthens governance, supports worker safety, reduces unnecessary red tape and backs in an industry that is absolutely critical to North Queensland and to my electorate of Mundingburra.

To every fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out worker in my electorate and across North Queensland I say that this government—the Crisafulli government—sees you. We value you and we recognise the contribution you make to our state each and every day. We thank you. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (6.17 pm): A lot of what I would like to say I probably already said when I was speaking to the fine amendment moved by the member for Logan, but I will never miss an opportunity to stand up and fight for workers' rights. I know that every member on this side of this

House will take that opportunity as well. I consider the right to be safe at work fundamental and the right to go home from work in one piece fundamental. Sadly, far too many workers still lose their lives or are permanently injured at their workplace.

Just a few weeks ago I stood outside this place 100 metres from here on International Workers' Memorial Day remembering all those workers around the world who have died as a result of workplace injuries as well as those who have been permanently injured. I stood with the mining union, the Australia Workers' Union, the nurses union, the shop assistants union, and every other union in the state that came together. I can tell you that the miners union and the AWU are not impressed with the activities of this government. I know they are not impressed with this bill. Good on the government. Get in an expert; there is nothing wrong with that. That is a good, sensible thing to do. The not-so-good thing to do is completely ignore the advice of that expert. Sadly, I think by going down that path we have a bill here that is deeply flawed—or, as I would probably say, yet another bill that is botched. It is another botched bill. I think that is a word we are going to hear a lot going forward.

I do not think we can talk about this bill without understanding why we are talking about this bill. I had a look back at the *Black lungs white lies* report today and saw the list of people who participated in that select committee. I believe I am the only one left in the parliament who participated in that select committee. Whenever a piece of legislation like this comes before this parliament, I think all of the members of that select committee would feel an obligation to ensure that we get the legislation right for those people that this state failed. Many institutions across the board failed workers over a 40-year period, causing many to sadly lose their lives.


One of the questions that kept recurring during that very extensive and lengthy select committee was how did we get here: how did this problem occur? Someday, someone a lot smarter than me will write a book about it, but at the end of the day there was collective delusion. We believed something that clearly could not have been true, we chose to ignore some of the evidence and there was collective delusion. In fact, it was a classic case of the emperor's new clothes. This is why the independent voice is so very important. When you look at Professor Johnston's recommendations around strengthening and refining that voice, I think it is something that the government should take on.

I also think the power of the tripartite model in this industry is extremely important. I know people want to set up employers and unions as being at one another's throats constantly. However, in my 10 years as a union official and my time as a union delegate, for me the key word in industrial relations was 'relations'; it was about building relationships. While there were inevitably disputes between workers and employers in my time as a union delegate and union official, ultimately there were a lot more times when we worked together to try to solve problems.

When it comes to the problem of trying to keep miners safe, I think a really strong system is having a truly tripartite body that has union representatives, workers' representatives, employer representatives and, via the regulator, government representatives. If you break that down and make the input of any one or two of those groups tokenistic, you weaken the entire system, and that is what is going on here. I think it demonstrates the hypocrisy at the core of this government. They like to jump up and tell you that they are about transparency and they love to listen, but the reality is that, when employer groups and unions are telling the government that they have this wrong, it says to me that we have a government that is not listening.

What will be the outcome of that? Firstly, the bill will be botched because it has been rushed; and, secondly, workers will suffer and that is my real concern here. I think it is a failure to the bipartisan approach that was taken during the select committees that led to the *Black lungs white lies* report. As the only member still in this parliament who was a part of that process on the ground, I feel an obligation to point that out. We have an obligation not just to the working people of Queensland who suffer the impacts. I spoke to people during that inquiry who were managers in some of those mines and they felt terrible about some of the outcomes that occurred in their mines and I believe it will haunt them for life. We have an obligation to everybody involved in the mining industry to get this right.

Labor will never give up on fighting for workers' rights. We will continue to do that. I will do that and I know that all of my colleagues on this side of the House will do that. I do not care whether that is a worker in Coles, Woolies or Aldi or someone working in a hospital, a cafe or a mine, we will stick up for them. Labor does not support this bill.

 **Mrs KIRKLAND** (Rockhampton—LNP) (6.23 pm): I rise in support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Before I continue with my speech, I would like to thank Minister Last for the work that has been done on this. It is great to have a minister

so connected to and immersed in the industries and the sectors they represent. Thank you, Minister Last.

The bill is about one simple principle: safety first. It is about the men and women who go to work in our mines, quarries, gas fields and explosive industries and the families who expect them to come home safely at the end of every shift. In Central Queensland and in Rockhampton and right across the Bowen Basin, this is not a concept that can afford time for frivolous politicisation, as we experienced for years under the previous Labor government. For our families, safety is personal. The Crisafulli government made a clear commitment to deliver a safer Queensland. That means we do not just talk about safety; we build the systems that deliver it and we ensure our regulators are fit-for-purpose, accountable and capable of acting decisively when risks emerge. This bill does exactly that for the resources sector—delivering a practical package of reforms.

The bill includes strengthening the governance and safety following the 2025 independent review led by Professor Susan Johnston. The bill proposes merging the role of Land Access Ombudsman into the position of CEO of Coexistence Queensland, thus tightening governance and delivering clearer accountability and stronger oversight. The Johnston review found weaknesses that could not be ignored: limited oversight and accountability; unclear roles and responsibilities; leadership and cultural challenges; gaps in senior technical expertise; and weaknesses in investigation, enforcement and information sharing. In a high-risk sector, those governance weaknesses can become safety weaknesses.

That is why this bill also establishes a five-member RSHQ board to provide strategic leadership, guidance and independent oversight, and it transfers the former commissioner's functions to that board with the commissioner role being abolished. These changes are all about clarity and efficiency. Who is accountable for direction, performance and oversight, and who is responsible for day-to-day operations? In Rockhampton and Central Queensland, we know that after a serious incident, people will ask questions: who was responsible, who had the right expertise at the table and who ensured lessons were shared across sites? This bill helps answer those questions through stronger oversight and clearer lines of accountability.

Importantly, the bill requires the board to have the right mix of skills across governance, regulation, investigations, occupational health, stakeholder engagement and strategic oversight. That is what Queenslanders should expect from a modern regulator. The bill also strengthens transparency by allowing the minister to provide a statement of expectations to the board and requiring reporting on those expectations and the actions taken in response. It is not about political interference; it is about clear, public accountability for performance in a regulator whose work directly affects workers' safety.


How those opposite can brazenly stand there and purport to actually care about the families and workers within the mining, resources and agriculture sector is nothing short of farcical. Labor have never cared about the regions—only parading when it suits their political agenda. We live in the regions where friends and families put their lives on the line so that the rest of Queensland—indeed Australia—can prosper.

Since the Land Access Ombudsman role was created by the previous Labor government in 2018, the LAO has only managed to fully resolve just two disputes, and the commissioner role was unclear, sitting vacant on repeated occasions since the role's establishment and it was completely vacant for almost an entire year, after which the newly appointed commissioner resigned as quickly as he was instated. The role simply did not deliver safety and it did not take responsibilities. In fact, from the comments around the role written into the Johnston report it would seem the position was a complete waste of time—yet another failed idea out of those opposite.

Through this bill we will see better advice, better consultation and, through reformation and strengthening of the advisory committees, better connection to decision-making. By having a board member chair those committees and by restoring their role in reviewing legislation standards and guidelines, the bill creates a clearer pathway for practical industry and workforce experience to inform regulatory settings. Across Central Queensland we need clear standards and practical guidance. This is essential for locals, contractors, apprentices and specialist operators working across the different sites and conditions. That clarity simply was not there under the previous government's arrangements.

The bill also supports the continued expansion of the Land Access Ombudsman for fair dispute resolution without new industry levies. That matters, because the LAO provides a free and independent pathway to resolve land access disputes outside costly and adversarial court processes, and it supports earlier dispute resolution during negotiations as well. The previously proposed industry levy and cost recovery model had raised real concerns about cost impacts and uncertainty.


Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

 **Mrs KIRKLAND:** This bill is a sensible outcome for Central Queensland, where we need a coexistence framework that works for landholders and industry alike without adding complexity and cost that can inflame disputes rather than resolve them. It keeps the dispute resolution service independent and accessible without creating those additional cost pressures.

The bill also makes sensible amendments to the Mineral Resources Act. It replaces outdated map-based requirements with spatial data, removes rigid renewal lodgement timeframes and confirms that a tenement continues while a renewal application is being decided. It introduces a show cause process before cancellation for unpaid rent. These are practical changes that improve certainty, efficiency and natural justice. For Central Queensland operators, that means less time dealing with outdated processes and more certainty for the business, workers and contractors who rely on these approvals being managed efficiently. This is not about lowering standards. It is about removing unnecessary administrative burdens so attention stays where it should: on safety, compliance and real risk.

Central Queensland is a huge family of people who attend all of our mining resource sector. In fact, in Rockhampton one-third of our community are either directly or indirectly employed through this sector. In Central Queensland we know that the strength of the resources sector must never come at the cost of worker safety. This bill strengthens the oversight, it improves accountability and it supports fair dispute resolution. It removes outdated obstacles so that the system can focus on managing real risk.

This bill is about safety first. That is delivering on the Crisafulli government's commitment to a safer Queensland. That is why I commend the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (7.32 pm): I rise to speak on the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Let me begin with the principle that should unite every member of this House: every Queensland worker deserves to return home safely at the end of every shift. That principle matters in every industry but nowhere more so than in Queensland's resource sector, an industry where risks are real, where the consequences can be catastrophic and where strong, independent safety oversight is absolutely essential. That is why the Queensland Labor opposition has serious concerns about this bill. It is not because reform is unnecessary and not because governance improvements should not occur but because this government has ignored the very expert advice it commissioned and has rushed through complex structural changes without the proper consultation that Queensland workers, industry and regional communities deserve.

The Crisafulli government commissioned Professor Susan Johnston to undertake a review into Resources Safety & Health Queensland. That review made 16 recommendations. Importantly, Professor Johnston recommended a staged 18-month implementation process involving consultation and careful reform. Instead—surprise—this government has ignored that road map entirely and rushed ahead with major legislative change. That is no surprise to us here because that is becoming the pattern of this government. It appears their training wheels are still on.

Government members interjected.

Ms PEASE: Stakeholders made it abundantly clear during the committee process that they were not properly consulted. I say to those laughing on the opposite side that perhaps occasionally taking advice from the experts would not go astray. The Australian Energy Producers stated that the bill was introduced quite quickly and without prior industry consultation and that stakeholders were given just nine business days to prepare their submissions. When we are talking about worker safety in a high-risk industry, consultation is not optional. Getting this wrong has real consequences.

One of the most concerning aspects of this bill is the abolition of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Professor Johnston specifically recommended that the commissioner's role be retained and more clearly defined. Instead, again, this government has abolished it altogether, ignoring that expert advice. The Queensland Resources Council itself warned that removing the commissioner would result in the loss of a clearly identifiable, independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the minister. The Mining & Energy Union described the commissioners as visible, approachable and effective out in the field. Workers knew who to contact; industry knew who to contact. There was accountability. There was independence. There was a direct line between workers' concerns and government decision-making, but this bill weakens that independence. That is why the opposition will move to retain the independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Labor's supports the establishment of an RSHQ board, but the board should complement the commissioner, not replace

them. The two should work together because independent oversight should never be sacrificed for bureaucratic restructuring.


The opposition also has serious concerns regarding the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. Currently, the independent commissioner chairs both bodies. Under this bill, that independence will disappear. Given this government's growing reputation for political appointments, stakeholders are rightly concerned that safety bodies intended to operate independently may become politicised. Worker safety should never become subject to political influence.

Another major issue is the composition of the proposed RSHQ board. The bill contains no requirements whatsoever for workers' representation—none. At the same time, the minister is given broad powers to remove board members without reason. The Australian Workers' Union warned that the board may ultimately be dominated by senior industry representatives and may not fairly represent workers and their families. That is deeply concerning. If a board is making decisions about worker safety then workers themselves deserve to have a seat at the table. That is why the opposition will move those amendments to ensure tripartite representation on the board, including representation from workers and relevant unions.

The concerns do not stop there. The bill merges the Land Access Ombudsman and Coexistence Queensland by making the CEO of Coexistence Queensland automatically serve as the ombudsman. Stakeholders told the committee that these are fundamentally different functions. One body facilitates coexistence; the other resolves disputes. Combining those two roles risks conflict of interest and undermines independence. AgForce raised concerns that these changes effectively abolish the independence of the Land Access Ombudsman altogether.

Regional community and landholders deserve confidence that disputes will be handled independently and fairly. The Queensland Labor opposition believes this bill should have been split. The RSHQ governance provisions should have been sent back for further examination and consultation in line with the expert advice from Professor Johnston's recommended 18-month process. The government chose not to do that, and that reflects a broader pattern from this Crisafulli government—rushed legislation, inadequate consultation and political spin instead of careful policymaking.

Queenslanders deserve better than that. Workers deserve better than that because, when it comes to mine safety and resource safety, there is simply too much at stake to get it wrong. Labor will support the reforms that generally strengthen worker safety, but we will also stand up when independence is weakened, when expert advice is ignored and when consultation is threatened as an inconvenience rather than as a responsibility. If this government refuses to listen and refuses to accept those safeguards then the responsibility for the consequences of weakening Queensland's resource safety framework will sit squarely on those opposite.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to speak on behalf of those I serve as the member for Southern Downs on the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. In doing so, I thought I might take a note from the book of the member for Mundingburra, who proudly spoke about the importance of the resources industry to her electorate, and it is no less the case in my electorate of Southern Downs. I can see Minister Last nodding in agreement, because as he travels around Queensland he has a very strong knowledge of the importance of the resources industry for our livelihoods and for the prosperity of communities all over the state. I am sure that one thing which everyone in this House agrees upon is that the safety of those who work in and have careers—devote their lives—in the extraction and processing of resources in our state is of the utmost importance. All of us in this place are horrified when we see cases of workers in the resources industry injured temporarily, sustain lifelong injuries or even be killed, and it is that sentiment which animates us all here.

Members might think of my electorate of Southern Downs as a place that grows grapes, produces cattle, wine, great tourism opportunities, a lot of cotton, grain and so forth.

Mr Dillon interjected.

Mr LISTER: Thank you. I know my honourable friend the member for Gregory would always understand these things, but my electorate does have a significant resources industry as well. We mine coal because we have a very efficient coal-fired power station in my electorate at Millmerran. The workers who work in the coalmining operation that supports that particular power station are destined to be the beneficiaries of the improvements in regulation for safety that this bill provides. My electorate also has tin, silver, gold and rare metals like tungsten and so forth. They have not been mined for some time in most parts of my electorate, but with the international commodity prices as they are for things


like tin I will bet you a penny to a pound, Madam Deputy Speaker O'Shea, that we will see the extraction of tin and other minerals again particularly around the Granite Belt. Almost every piece of equipment we use such as iPads and phones and even mundane things such as a home toaster or the key used to open a car with the press of a button all depend on lead-free solar. The only way they can make that now is with tin and a tiny bit of copper, and hence the price of tin has gone through the roof. I am quite sure that those commodities on tenements and workings which a generation or two ago became unprofitable will once again be extracted. I look forward to seeing the industry do so in a responsible way and in a way which engenders prosperity, jobs and pride for the communities that I represent.

I cannot help but say that in the course of this debate I have heard a number of members on the opposite side wax lyrical about their commitment to fighting for the safety of workers. As I said, I am sure that those views are sincerely held. However, it begs the obvious question: why is it that they have stood aside and watched the mistreatment of workers which has been exposed in the CFMEU royal commission, which is occurring at the other end of George Street? It seems that a different standard applies down there. This is about the safety of workers. It is not about having safety regulations abused by militant unions in order to coerce employers into unreasonable arrangements because, let us face it, everybody in this House knows that that is what happens. So this is real safety for workers. It is about having a framework and a disciplined system which puts their interests at the forefront and which deals with lessons learnt about structures which have been proven to be suboptimal.

I turn now to the Land Access Ombudsman. The LAO was established by the Palaszczuk government in 2018 as an independent statutory appointment under the Land Access Ombudsman Act following the recommendations of the independent review of the former GasFields Commission of Queensland, which is now Coexistence Queensland. That review was conducted by Professor Robert Scott and the Scott review identified the need for a free, independent service to assist with resolving alleged breaches of conduct and compensation agreements and make-good agreements once contractual dispute resolution options were exhausted. In my neck of the woods this means mostly the coal seam gas industry, because just on the border of my electorate with Mr Speaker's electorate of Condamine there is a growing gas industry and coexistence there is something which has animated community opinion and the Land Access Ombudsman is one of the things to which people have been referring.

We need to take an honest look at the efficacy of these arrangements. I recall the minister saying that it costs about \$600,000 a year to fund that position and it has only dealt with a paltry number of disputes, so we have to ask ourselves whether, therefore, it is the right way to go. There is other legislation, which I will not speak of in detail, which proposes to take care of those things in another way and which I will look forward to speaking to in due course. I would say to my electors, both those who support this and those who have concerns, that this is absolutely in the best interests of landholders because the bureaucratic intervention that is no more efficacious than a costly law suit is not something that we should be sticking with, and I certainly embrace the innovations in this bill.

Lastly, when it comes to looking after the interests of landowners, the Crisafulli government can look them in the eye proudly and point to reforms which have made a real difference to the rights of landowners in my electorate of Southern Downs. This is but one part of them. There was legislation introduced by the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning which restored to country people the right to object to unwanted renewable energy projects, and that is no small thing. Where a community has its voice statutorily stripped and all decisions regarding their welfare and their concerns are made by rubber stamp in Brisbane, you do the people a disservice. I am proud to support the Crisafulli government in this and other measures to safeguard the rights and liberties of landowners in my area. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (7.47 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I want to state up-front how especially critical it is that, in the resources sector, health and safety be of paramount importance. Every worker in Queensland should return home safely from work, and this is based on the premise that a worker sells their labour and not their health. The most concerning issue with this bill is that the government fails to once again listen to the experts and does not adequately respond to its own government commissioned review. Ignoring the recommended 18-month staged implementation of reforms to the RSHQ, the government has instead rushed what are some complex regulatory and structural changes and the weakening of these laws will risk the safety of Queensland resources workers, and resources workers should be alarmed. Mining disasters and injuries should be avoided in a robust regulatory environment. As usual, there was no prior industry consultation—a most concerning pattern of behaviour by this government—and therefore it is not surprising that stakeholders have raised

serious concerns about the bill, and rightly so. They are not our words; they are the words of the submitters. A very important recommendation of Professor Johnston was that the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health should be retained but should be more clearly defined.

What do we see in this bill which those opposite are defending? The role is to be abolished, which goes against the views of many stakeholders who believe this role is vital to maintaining the safety of workers in the resources sector. Even the Queensland Resources Council, the peak council, questioned this decision. You would think they would know what works and what does not work in their industry. They stated to the committee that 'the removal of the statutory Commissioner role results in the loss of a clearly identifiable independent safety and health advocate and adviser to the Minister'. Instead of listening to the experts, the peak council and many stakeholders, this government will abolish, cut and sack the commissioner. The continuation of the role of commissioner has overwhelming support from stakeholders—

A government member interjected.

Ms GRACE: I heard a sigh from over there. Yes, the industry is collectively sighing about what is going on in this bill—who are eager to see the role be clear, accountable and report directly to the minister and the parliament. The Mining & Energy Union stated the commissioner has been 'very effective' and said, 'They have been a very visible presence out in the field.' This is directly opposite to the reasons the minister decided that this role is no longer necessary.

Although we support the creation of the RSHQ board as recommended by Professor Johnston, we believe that the CRSH should also continue in order for them to work with each other and deliver to industry vital, independent advice to government. What are they afraid of? There is no rational reason this should not be the case to deliver better outcomes for resources workers and their families. We will move amendments to ensure the sensible recommendation to not abolish the CRSH role and ensure the commissioner works with the RSHQ board in a tripartite structure that will deliver a robust health and safety outcome, instead of weakening the laws as proposed by this bill. Make no mistake: they are weakening the laws.

The ETU further describes the CRSH as a 'critical safeguard, someone who can speak truth to power, report directly to Parliament and act without fear or favour'. In addition, the QRC went on to say 'the commissioner provided a direct and accessible point of engagement' and that 'under the new governance model it is not clear how this independent advisory engagement function will be maintained'. That is very important in the resources industry. Those opposite are talking about this bill but have no idea exactly what they are saying.

These are extremely important issues and the minister has failed miserably to explain the reasons for the change. This is deeply troubling for all stakeholders and goes against expert advice and recommendations. Those workers who have lost their lives and their families deserve more than the watering down of health and safety laws in the resources industry—against all of the recommendations of the experts and many stakeholders. This is no doubt a backward step—no ifs, no buts—which will ultimately expose resource workers to a more dangerous workplace. This is a serious disregard of the government's responsibility.

Under the current legislation, the commissioner is also the independent chair of both the CSMHAC and the MSHAC. Obviously, abolishing the commissioner role removes independence from these committees. How is that good for health and safety? How is that not weakening health and safety laws? Will someone please explain it to me? I invite the minister to do so. The sacking of the commissioner no doubt weakens and compromises the independence of these committees for no good reason. What is the reason for doing it?

A government member interjected.

Ms GRACE: I take that interjection about calming down. I will not calm down. This is a very important bill, and it is very important to the health and safety of workers in a very hazardous industry. Mining disasters are not something anyone should take lightly or compromise on. It is important that the RSHQ board under this bill has a tripartite structure—it is the only way it will work in its composition—and is able to provide frank and fearless advice to the minister, free from reprisal and/or removal. Therefore, it is of no surprise that concerns have been raised over the ability of the minister to remove board members without reason. This could severely impact board members' willingness to provide transparent advice without fear of repercussions.

In addition, submitters raised concerns that there is no requirement for worker representation on the board. That is typical of what we are seeing at the moment and is ideologically driven. We will move

amendments to the bill to ensure there is representation from at least one current employee of the industry and at least one representative from a relevant union that represents their workers.

A government member: Which one? Your CFMEU mates.


Ms GRACE: Yes, CFMEU; I will take that interjection. This is the mining employees union, the Mining & Energy Union, and they represent their workers and their industry impeccably. We propose at least one representative from a relevant union to ensure the most fulsome of advice is being provided from workers who actually do the work.

Even more bizarrely, the bill merges Coexistence Queensland and the Land Access Ombudsman, who have similar but very different objectives but will share the same CEO and reduce the independence of both. Stakeholders raised serious issues such as the power imbalance between landholders and other users of land including resources companies. No-one put it better than Glendon Farming Co. when they said—

Palming off the services of the LAO to CQ, as a blunt cost-cutting measure, will exceed the capability of CQ and overstretch their resources, as well as create a fraught environment in which conflicts of interest will be extremely difficult and challenging to manage. This will ultimately result in poor outcomes for farmers and regional community members.

These are the very people those opposite claim to represent! They are the ones complaining about the changes they are making—farmers and regional communities. How can those opposite sit over there and let this happen? They are the very people those opposite claim to represent, and there they are talking up this bill. It is actually unbelievable.

When experts are ignored, when recommendations from a review commissioned by the government are ignored and when there is criticism of the Crisafulli LNP government on the lack of prior consultation, no wonder their approach to legislative reform is not being supported. These are rushed laws full of political spin. The resources industry and workers deserve better than this, particularly from a government that promised to be open and transparent. This bill creates serious risk to the safety of resource workers by removing the independent Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health—against expert advice—and challenges the independence of important bodies to deliver for both workers and farming and regional communities, whom those opposite claim to represent. This bill should have been sent back to the committee process, as moved by the shadow minister, to clean up these serious flaws. This bill does not deliver health and safety in the resource sector; it weakens health and safety laws.

 **Mr DILLON** (Gregory—LNP) (7.57 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise to speak to the bill. At the outset I thank the minister. The minister has done a tremendous job in restarting what had become a stagnated sector of the Queensland economy.

Mr Butcher: Resurrecting.

Mr DILLON: I take that interjection; resurrecting an industry that had been maligned by the Queensland government, by a succession of ministers, and was completely alienated by mainstream government decisions. Not only has he been signing so they can drill and dig and mine and refine oil—not only has he been ensuring exploration continues—but he has had fundamental to his position the very responsibility that everybody who sits in his chair has and that everybody in this place should bring to the table; that is, the safety of the people who will undertake mining and exploration—the very activity undertaken by 3,500 people across the electorate of Gregory and 71,000-plus people directly employed in this sector of the Queensland economy. There is a responsibility to make sure that not only do they arrive home safely every day but also they enjoy their job. The very principles that underpin safety underpin their health and happiness at work.

I thank the minister, his team and the department who have been instrumental in this integral piece of legislation. I take exception to a comment made earlier by a member opposite that it is the responsibility of everyone in this place to take seriously the ability for workers to arrive home safely. The members opposite did not because one of the most fundamental principles around safety for anyone who has been in a dangerous workplace is accountability. The structure they put in place completely removed accountability and deferred away from that to a structure that had no oversight. This minister and the Crisafulli government takes responsibility for ensuring that, within its power, every worker arrives home safely. The accountability that will be implemented by the establishment of this board will directly, as a result of recommendations from experts, restore accountability and oversight when it comes to safety.

It does not matter whether you are looking at accountability on the ground, whether it is in any element of a workplace, accountability stops at the very top of the structure that stands up for and

defends workers' rights. That is not a union; that is our health and safety agencies. That is people who have actually been there. In one of my last contributions in this place, about a totally different piece of legislation, I talked about the experts. We have had them in the member for Callide who provided advice. He worked in a dangerous environment—a mining site. The member for Mirani worked in one of these hazardous workplace situations and truly understands the system as it is presented and the flaws that occur consistently in that.

There has not been just one review. There was the select parliamentary committee that goes back to 2017 that called for rigour, integrity and accountability to be restored into this process. It is not like we were the only ones to discover this on coming to office, which has been the case with so many other messes, including all the approvals the minister had collecting dust on a desk or in a filing cabinet or locked in the cupboard—I do not know if the locks were still there, Minister, but they were probably, like everything else, changed on your way in.

Realistically, we have found, and continue to find, the need to pick up reviews from way back and implement legislative change that should have been done during a decade of decline under those opposite. It is almost farcical to believe that those opposite, who are the puppets of the trade union movement, have not taken integrity and accountability around worker safety seriously. One would probably give them a tick for that. It was an abject failure—an F-, if they go that low in report cards. I think in the woke environment they operate in it would be pass or fail or maybe come again tomorrow, but realistically it is an F-. Put them right down where they belong because they did not have any serious approach to ensuring that workers in Gregory or right around the state of Queensland came home safely.

I also want to take a little time to talk about the amalgamation those opposite are so upset about—that is, in relation to the Land Access Ombudsman position. For those who set up Coexistence Queensland, I point out that one of the six key values is independence and integrity. It is a government agency with independent oversight and appointed people. Why are we duplicating that at \$661,000 a year? A few hundred thousand here and a few hundred thousand there is a few hundred million and all of a sudden there is no money for hospitals, youth justice, small business support or social housing. We waste money on duplicating processes like the Land Access Ombudsman instead of saying we have a government organisation that is built on integrity, displays leadership in the sector and is accountable. That is exactly who should be looking after something that is a relatively small work impost.

Those opposite could not even think of questions in question time today. They were outjumped. If they cannot even think of a question, I suppose they think two jobs in six years is a probably a heavy workload for the Land Access Ombudsman position that they could not fill and when they did fill it the occupant resigned after a few weeks. How do we look to the people of Queensland if we sit in this place and say, 'Let's just continue to support an inflated position that is not delivering,' when we have an existing organisation that can deliver the services, has the runs on the board under stable leadership with well-respected individuals and has the correct oversight in place to deliver the Land Access Ombudsman's role.


We know these people. On both sides of the chamber we have worked with the people at Coexistence Queensland. They are a reputable organisation with clear credibility and runs on the board right across rural Queensland and the resources extraction sector, especially gas and coal. We hear from those opposite that we do not understand land access and we do not understand the impact on farmers. I am somebody who has only walked on a coalmine, but I have been on plenty of farms that coexist with coalmines. The reason that we have the equity value in farming in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, is direct result of our ability to coexist with the resources sector, especially coal and gas. Anyone who thinks otherwise is kidding themselves. Therefore, as a government we understand it, we know it, we live it as farmers and miners, regulators, ministers, Coexistence Queensland. We get this because we are connected to an industry and closely associated with the true experts in the field.

We listened through the committee. I commend the member for Burnett and the members for Mirani and Mackay for their terrific work in scrutinising this legislation and working with all stakeholders and submitters to arrive at a position that eventually recommended the bill be passed. This morning we heard all of the noise in the business program motion about why we are guillotining debate and yet now there is silence in the chamber. Normally I struggle to hear myself think. By their silence, and perhaps the lack of speakers left on this bill, I assume that we have actually explained it well enough that they realise that this very important piece of legislation, which they should have brought before the last parliament, is something that they will wave through. But wait! Will they?

Earlier today we saw an attempt to split the bill. Why did they do that? Like every piece of legislation that comes in here they do not know whether or not they are going to back it. If they hedge here today to split it that gives them an option to maybe back it tomorrow and they can maintain face with their stakeholder controller, the union movement, and still pretend to be the friend of the farmer, as they did for the last decade when they said they went into bat for them. Just stand up for something and believe in it. Stop going all over the place.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Mr DILLON: That is exactly right. I take the interjection from the member for Currumbin. They say one thing in here and another thing out there, whether it is to victims of crime, whether it is to farmers or whether it is to coalminers who turn up in Gregory every day to ensure the very growth and prosperity of this state is protected. We owe it to them to protect them in their job. I commend this legislation and the work of the minister to the House.

 **Ms MARR** (Thuringowa—LNP) (8.08 pm): I rise in strong support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This is a worker focused reform that delivers on our Crisafulli government's clear commitments: making Queensland safer for the men and women who power our economy and redesigning government so it actually works for the hardworking families who pay for it. For the people of Thuringowa and the city of Townsville, the bill matters deeply in the daily lives of thousands of our local families. Thuringowa is home to thousands of resources workers, many of them FIFO. Every few weeks they kiss their partners and children goodbye in our suburbs, pack their bags and head west to the Bowen Basin or north to the mines that keep Queensland moving. They work long, demanding shifts in tough and often hazardous conditions. They do it so they can come home and build a better life: pay off mortgages, support local businesses and give their kids opportunities they never had. Their safety is not negotiable; it is our fundamental duty. Their families deserve to know that when they say goodbye at the front door the system regulating those mines is strong, professional, accountable and relentlessly focused on sending their loved ones home safely at the end of every swing. For too long, that confidence was badly eroded.

Under the former Labor government, the Johnston review lay the problems bare. Professor Susan Johnston's independent examination revealed weak governance, confused roles, blurred lines of responsibility and a serious lack of accountability. In 2020, the Palaszczuk-Miles government created RSHQ as an independent statutory body but they ignored key recommendations from the 2017 CWP select committee and the 2018 regulator report. They failed to establish a proper governing body. They left workers with a structure that looked good on paper but delivered confusion on the ground. The position of the Resources Safety & Health commissioner became a classic example of Labor failure. The role was frequently vacant, was unclear in purpose and achieved almost nothing of substance. Industry representatives described it as a 'figurehead'. Union representatives said that the commissioners achieved zero outcomes. Even staff inside RSHQ reportedly struggled to explain what the role actually added to safety. For years, Labor left that critical position empty or unstable. That is not how you protect miners. That is not leadership.

The Land Access Ombudsman told a similar story of bureaucratic bloat. Established in 2018, it fully resolved just two disputes, both in its very first year. In 2024-25 it received 49 contacts, referred 42 out of scope, launched four preliminary investigations that went nowhere and handled only 30 phone calls, 17 emails and two in-person inquiries for the entire year, yet Labor still planned to impose a new industry levy and cost-recovery fees on the resources sector from June this year. That would mean more red tape and more costs passed directly on to companies that employ FIFO workers from Townsville and Thuringowa. Enough was enough.

This bill fixes Labor's mess. It establishes a skills-based governing body for RSHQ. The CEO will report to the board and the board will report to the minister. There will be clear lines of accountability, stronger oversight and no more confusion. The statutory functions of the old commissioner will transfer to this board, finally delivering the professional governance structure that experts recommended years ago.

We are also strengthening the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee. These committees will once again have the power to review legislation, standards and guidelines, providing practical, independent advice on how to drive real safety improvements. Importantly, they will remain tripartite, with government, industry and unions sitting together at the table. Workers' voices will continue to be heard where it counts most. For FIFO families in Thuringowa, this means a modern, fit-for-purpose regulator. Better governance leads to better risk management, higher standards and, ultimately, fewer incidents. Every improvement in safety culture at


the site level gives our local workers a better chance of coming home safely. That is the bottom line. Nothing matters more to this side of the chamber.

On the Land Access Ombudsman, we are delivering respect for taxpayers' money. The standalone position ends. The role will now be held by the CEO of Coexistence Queensland. This change delivers real efficiency, reduces duplication and maintains service levels without the unnecessary new industry levy that Labor wanted to impose. Industry groups, including AMEC and Australian Energy Producers, have welcomed this reform. It lowers the cost of doing business in Queensland, which protects and grows the very jobs that support families in my electorate.

Last year Thuringowa saw the direct benefit of a strong resources sector, with \$86 million in wages paid by QRC member companies, 636 direct jobs, \$22 million spent with local businesses and a total economic contribution of \$203 million, supporting 1,562 local jobs. That is real money—mortgages paid, kids in sport, weekends away, small businesses thriving and confidence in our community. When we cut unnecessary red tape and improve the regulatory framework we make Queensland more attractive for investment. That means more shifts, more rosters, more opportunities and more families supported in Thuringowa and across Queensland.

I have heard the concerns raised by some unions and the opposition. They worry about the board, about independence and about worker representation. Let us be clear and honest in our response. The Johnston review was independent. This government is implementing 15 of its 16 recommendations. The new board will be skills based and focused on expertise in safety, governance and regulation. Worker representatives are not excluded. Unions remain at the table through the strengthened advisory committees. The facts are clear: the old model was not delivering the clarity, the accountability or the safety outcomes that workers deserve.

The Primary Industries and Resources Committee has recommended that this bill be passed. Industry bodies, including the Mine Managers Association, have supported the move to a governing board as a genuine step forward for both safety and good governance. This bill is about putting safety first while restoring confidence in the resources sector. It honours the men and women who go underground, operate heavy equipment and work far from home for weeks at a time. It says to their families in Thuringowa and across Townsville that this government sees them, values their sacrifices and is taking concrete action to protect them and their loved ones. The Crisafulli government is delivering a modern, accountable and effective safety framework. We are removing Labor's inefficiencies and bureaucratic failures. We are backing the workers who power Queensland and the families who wait anxiously for them to come home. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BAILLIE** (Townsville—LNP) (8.16 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on and speak in support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. I acknowledge the minister and his passion for the industry. I have never seen a minister so passionate about the industry. Whether it be a bottled sample of Taroom Trough oil or a bottled sample of Graphinex graphite, he shows his passion by kissing that bottle. I think if we could bottle his passion then we could probably sell that, too. The minister's passion for this industry, and seeing him apply it on a daily basis so that the industry can continue to take steps forward, is a fantastic asset for this state. I also acknowledge the contribution of the committee that examined this legislation. I commend them on their fine work.

There are many workers across Queensland's resources sector including miners, operators, tradies, contractors, engineers, truck drivers and safety officers. The families who support them every single day need to be acknowledged as well. They are hardworking Queenslanders who deserve to come home safely at the end of every shift. As someone who spent close to a decade working for a global supplier and manufacturer of mining and construction equipment, I understand the scale of some of the equipment that these industries work with. With some of that bigger equipment, it would surprise many that even something as apparently menial as changing a tyre can result in a fatality if done incorrectly. When working as a small business owner and tradie in the electrical industry, which is extremely dangerous, any mistake made might be your last. What is probably even more difficult to comprehend is that any mistake made might be your customer's last. That is a big responsibility to take on. In that industry, we have to take safety very seriously. We know how important it is and we know what it takes to actually see it applied and delivered to worksites. In those instances, safety has to be practical, it has to be accountable, it has to be clear and it has to work in the real world. That is what this bill is about. It is about making sure Queensland's resources safety framework actually delivers for workers.

The Crisafulli government went to the election with commitments to be a government that works for Queenslanders and to make Queensland safer, and this bill delivers on both of those commitments. It strengthens governance, removes duplication, restores accountability and importantly puts worker safety back at the centre of the system.

The resources sector is absolutely critical to Queensland and particularly important to regional communities like Townsville and right across North Queensland. In Townsville, we see every day how the resources activity supports local jobs, local businesses, local sports clubs and local families. Our city is a major service and logistics hub for North Queensland mining operations. Whether it is equipment maintenance or engineering, transport, manufacturing or fabrication or materials moving through the port, the resources sector helps keep our region strong.

In addition to the local industry and employees, in Townsville we are also home to many fly-in fly-out and drive-in drive-out workers. We are working hard to make it easier for the fly-in fly-out workers to get to the airport. We have put forward a strong business case, currently before the minister, to connect the airport to public transport. We are also working hard to make it safer for drive-in drive-out workers to get to their worksites, with upgrades to the Bruce Highway.

According to the Queensland Resources Council, in Townsville alone, the resources sector supports thousands of local jobs and contributes hundreds of millions of dollars to the regional economy. When the resources sector is strong, small businesses in Townsville benefit, too. The local cafe, bakery or burger bar benefit. The mechanic benefits, the transport operator benefits and the local apprentices get real opportunities. But none of that matters if the workers are not safe and if they are not coming home to their families. That is why this bill is so important.

This bill responds directly to the 2025 Johnston Review of the Queensland Resources Safety and Health Regulatory Model. That review identified some very serious concerns. It found weaknesses in governance, confusion around responsibilities and a clear lack of accountability. The system was not functioning as effectively as it should, and unfortunately this is another example of the former Labor government creating another hollow headline—a structure that looked good in a press release but failed to deliver proper oversight in practice. The former Labor government introduced the Resources Safety and Health Queensland Act in 2020, but the current regulatory model does not include a governing board, despite early recommendations identifying the need for one. The Johnston review highlighted that oversight gap very clearly, and this bill fixes that mistake. We are taking commonsense steps forward. Queensland's resource sector is incredibly important to our state's future, as we continue to progress and develop as a state and contribute to our nation.

Queenslanders rightly expect two things from government: they expect workers to be protected and they expect governments to spend money responsibly. This bill achieves both of those outcomes. It modernises governance arrangements, strengthens oversight and it restores accountability. It cuts duplication and it reduces unnecessary costs and red tape.

Unlike those opposite, this government understands that safety and economic strength are not mutually exclusive. In fact, strong safety outcomes support a stronger industry. When workers are safer, businesses have greater certainty, communities have greater confidence and regional Queensland benefits because more people are continuing to feel safe and have been appreciated at work. Something that often is not really acknowledged is the fact that when you have a safer workplace, it is often cleaner and you often have employees who are more engaged, feel more appreciated and put more into their job because they know the employer has their back as well.

For Townsville, this matters enormously. North Queensland has been built by hardworking people willing to roll up their sleeves and get the job done, and that is how we will continue to move our great region forward.

From the North West Minerals Province to the trains on the rail and the trucks on the highway, where applicable to the refinery or processing plant, right through to the exports leaving the Port of Townsville, our region helps power the Queensland economy. For the workers who contribute to that outcome, the least they deserve is a safety framework that is modern, accountable and effective, and that is exactly what this bill delivers. This is practical reform, it is sensible reform and it is reform that puts Queensland workers first. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr WATTS (Toowoomba North—LNP) (8.25 pm): I rise to talk to the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. We have heard a lot here tonight, but there is no doubt that our side of the chamber, and I think in fact everybody in the chamber, firmly believes that when a Queenslanders goes to work in our resources industry, they absolutely deserve to come home safely. It is not a slogan, it is not a media line; it is actually a basic obligation of this place and the

government and the minister to ensure we set that framework correctly. From the coalmines in Central Queensland, the gas fields in my patch in the Surat Basin, to quarries and exploration projects across Queensland, thousands of workers every day rely on a safety system that is clear, accountable, modern and effective. When that system is not working properly, the government has a responsibility to fix it. That is exactly what this bill does: it fixes it. The bill strengthens governance, it improves accountability, it restores clarity and it ensures that Queensland's resources safety framework is focused on one thing above everything else—protecting workers.

The bill delivers three major reforms. Firstly, it establishes a modern governing board for Resources Safety and Health Queensland, creating stronger oversight and clearer accountability. Secondly, it strengthens advisory structures while removing duplication and confusion that existed under the former model. Thirdly, it removes unnecessary red tape and the costs associated with the former Labor government's Land Access Ombudsman funding model under the Mineral and Energy Resource and Other Legislation Amendment Act. Together, these reforms deliver safer workplaces, better government and stronger confidence in Queensland's resource sector.

That is really important in my region because on the Darling Downs \$244 million in wages comes in from the resources sector, 2,600 people's jobs depend on the resources sector and 1,100 businesses in my patch and 300 community organisations all benefit from having the resources sector there, and that contributes to \$1.1 billion spent across the region. This is a really important industry to the Darling Downs, and to ensure that we do it properly is most important.

That is why the minister commissioned Professor Susan Johnston to undertake an independent review. The Johnston review found weaknesses in governance, confusion around roles, limited oversight and a lack of accountability. Importantly, Professor Johnston noted the structure created by the former Labor government differed significantly from earlier recommendations made by the parliamentary Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee. Notably, there was no governing board.

That oversight is what this bill fixes. The Johnston review made 16 recommendations. The bill directly implements key recommendations by retaining RSHQ as an independent statutory authority, establishing a skills-based governing board, transferring oversight functions to the board that strengthen the Coal Mining Safety Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee, and removing governance confusion around the commissioner's role. Operational management remains with the chief executive officer, while strategic governance is strengthened through a new board structure.

The Labor opposition has attempted to argue that these reforms weaken safety. That argument simply does not stand up to scrutiny. The advisory committees remain tripartite, with representation from the unions, industry and government. In fact, their powers to review legislation, standards and guidelines are being restored and strengthened under this bill. The opposition ignores the critical fact that the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health was plagued by confusion and uncertainty. The Johnston review itself recorded stakeholders describing the role as 'a figurehead position' and questioning what outcomes had actually been achieved. Even more remarkably, the same group of people from the former Labor government who have been in here complaining left the role empty. If it were so important, why could they not get someone to fill the role? If it were an indispensable role, why was there no-one in the chair?

The bill replaces confusion with clarity, fragmented accountability with proper governance and uncertainty with direct responsibility and oversight. The bill also addresses unnecessary bureaucracy and rising costs imposed on Queensland's resources sector. I associate myself with the comments of the member for Gregory, who clearly outlined the chaotic mess and lack of financial accountability that surrounded that bureaucracy.


The former Labor government legislated for the Land Access Ombudsman to become an industry funded statutory body, funded through levies and cost-recovery fees. Those changes were due to commence next month, but the office was significantly underutilised. The office received 49 contacts in 2024-25: 42 were outside scope and no investigations proceeded beyond preliminary stages. Across the entire year, the office received only 30 phone calls, 17 emails and two direct inquiries as engagement events, yet Labor still wanted to impose additional levies and compliance costs on industry. That is obviously the Labor way. This is how the CFMEU has operated across our state: productivity drops, expenses go up and others who are working hard are taxed to pay for it, or in this case levied to pay for it.

The Crisafulli government, under Minister Last, has taken a much more sensible approach. The bill merges the role with the chief executive officer of Coexistence Queensland, reduces duplication, retains independent dispute resolution services and removes unnecessary industry levies. That is respecting taxpayers' money, reducing red tape and making government work better, which is what we all came here to do.

Significant industry stakeholders support the objectives of this bill. Australian Energy Producers supported strengthening governance arrangements and welcomed the removal of the industry levy. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies described the reforms as 'a good step forward to improve safety in the resources industry and transparency within the RSHQ organisation'. The Mine Managers Association of Australia supported the proposed governance structures and the establishment of the governing board.

Queensland resource workers deserve to have confidence in a system that protects them. Communities deserve to have confidence that safety is being properly governed and that it is a priority of the structures that are looking after that governance. Industry deserves to have confidence that regulation is modern, accountable and efficient. Taxpayers deserve to have confidence that government structures are not just duplicating roles and increasing costs or creating unnecessary bureaucracy. The bill delivers on all of those outcomes. It strengthens oversight. It improves accountability. It restores clarity. It puts worker safety first. The Crisafulli government said that we would redesign a government that works for Queenslanders, and that is exactly what this bill does.

We have heard how important it is across the Darling Downs. In my little electorate, which is 110 square kilometres on the north side of Toowoomba—effectively a provincial town—\$36 million in wages is earned from the resources industry. There are 251 employees in the resources industry who are all earning a good wage and spending that money in the cafes and other small businesses in my electorate. Across the local businesses in my electorate, 131 are associated with contracts with the resources industry. Different community organisations, whether they be sporting or cultural, are well supported by the resources industry in my electorate. That is why safety in the resources industry is important. We want to be world-leading. We want to ensure the world is looking to us for safety structures, and that is exactly what this bill delivers. I thank the minister for it.

 **Hon. AJ PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (8.35 pm): I rise to speak on the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The aim of this bill is to enhance the accountability, governance and oversight of Resources Safety & Health Queensland, to optimise the operation of the Land Access Ombudsman and to improve procedural efficiency in the mining tenement framework. Underpinning our changes is our overriding respect for the safety of Queensland workers and for taxpayers' money. We are also making government work more efficiently.

To achieve these goals, this bill will abolish the role of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. In its place, we will establish a five-member board with oversight and governance responsibilities. The bill will reinstate a function of the Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee and the Mining Safety and Health Advisory Committee to review and provide advice on legislation, standards and guidelines.

The bill will also revise the governance arrangements of the LAO and repeal a proposed industry levy. It will revert to government funding and support the expansion of the LAO's remit and transition to a statutory body from 1 July this year. Despite what those opposite are saying, the position of the LAO is not being abolished. The position will be held concurrently with Coexistence Queensland. Importantly, LAO staff will continue to permanently support the LAO in its role of providing a free and independent dispute resolution service. The bill will also modernise and streamline mining tenement processes. This includes clarifying cancellation processes and transitioning maps from spatial data.

The Crisafulli government is delivering a modern, accountable system that puts safety first and restores confidence in the safety framework. Our changes will make the sector safer for every mineworker and deliver on the Crisafulli government's commitment to making Queensland safer. We are also removing unnecessary red tape and respecting taxpayers' money by making government more streamlined and efficient.

In 2020 the former Palaszczuk government established Resources Safety & Health Queensland. It is responsible for safety and health outcomes across the state's mining, quarrying, petroleum, gas and explosive industries. Since its formation, there have been significant concerns regarding its accountability and oversight. Labor chose to ignore those concerns—I am not surprised. There are countless examples across the state of the former Labor government choosing to disregard

accountability and oversight. Considering this, my colleague the Minister for Natural Resources, Minister Last, commissioned a review into Queensland's resource safety and health regulatory model. Unsurprisingly, the Johnston review found the system was letting down the workers it was supposed to protect.

Our changes respond to three of Professor Johnston's 16 recommendations. Those three involve the establishment of a skills-based governing board for RSHQ, transferring the function of the commissioner to the new governing board and reinstating the functions of the advisory committees—the CSMHAC and MSHAC—to provide independent, practical advice. As the remaining 13 recommendations are operational, they will be progressively implemented under the new governing board.


I note that AgForce Queensland raised concerns about our changes regarding the reform of the Land Access Ombudsman. While it acknowledged our objective to strengthen the governance arrangement, AgForce is concerned that the ombudsman's mandate conflicts with that of Coexistence Queensland. It asked for the LAO to remain a standalone statutory body. I note AgForce's concerns, but they are not backed up by the practical realities of what is happening under the LAO. The members of AgForce and the broader community rarely utilise the service of the LAO.

Since its establishment by the Palaszczuk government in 2018, the LAO has fully resolved only two disputes. Both were referred to it six years ago in 2018. To put this in context, this is a wholly government funded body which receives an annual allocation of \$617,000. The office is also comprised of four Public Service officers. In 2024-25 it received 49 inquiries about possible disputes. Of these, 42 were out of the scope of the LAO and referred elsewhere. Following further investigation of four of these inquiries, none proceeded further. The remaining three inquiries were for information requests. Across the same 12-month period, the LAO received 30 phone calls, 17 emails and two direct inquiries at engagement events. This is less than a phone call a week or an email every three weeks. This is not value for taxpayers' money. It is a bit disingenuous—almost hypocritical—for the Labor members of the committee to cite these concerns from AgForce and claim—

When legislation is introduced that is significant to both the industry and regional communities, the government must ensure that proper consultation with both stakeholders and community members takes place.

Through the last decade of decline Labor refused to openly and honestly consult with regional communities. It rode roughshod over the industries which underpinned our rural and regional communities—industries such as agriculture, fishing, forestry and mining. There is a litany of egregious examples of a Labor government riding roughshod over rural and regional communities. The former Labor government made lip-service an art form in contrast to genuine consultation. It treated consultation as a box-ticking exercise. In some cases it made stakeholders sign confidentiality agreements instead of seeking genuine consultation.

Labor members are being disingenuous about citing the concerns of AgForce, which is under the misapprehension about the new arrangements. I reiterate that the position of the LAO is not being abolished. It will be held concurrently with Coexistence Queensland. As I said earlier, this bill will make the sector safer for every mine worker. It respects taxpayers' money and makes government work more efficiently. Importantly, it delivers on the Crisafulli government's commitment to making Queensland safer. I support the bill.

 **Miss DOOLAN** (Pumicestone—LNP) (8.42 pm): Tonight I rise to speak in support of the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This bill is about one simple principle: every Queensland worker deserves to come home safely at the end of their working day. Whether they work underground, on a gas field, in a quarry or on a remote mine site in the middle of regional Queensland, their safety must always come first.

As the member for Pumicestone, I know just how many local families are connected to the resources sector. We have hardworking men and women across Bribie Island, Beachmere, Ningi, Sandstone Point and Toorbul who spend weeks away from their loved ones to provide for their families. Many are fly-in fly-out workers. Many work long hours in difficult and isolated conditions.

One of those locals is Jordan from Beachmere, a fly-in fly-out worker, who, like so many Queenslanders, sacrifices precious time with family in order to earn a living and support our economy. Behind every statistic is a real person like Jordan—a son, a partner, a parent, someone whose family waits for them to come home safely. That is why this debate matters. This bill recognises that safety systems cannot simply exist on paper; they must actually work in practice and, importantly, they must be accountable.

The 2025 Johnston review found weaknesses in Queensland's current resources safety framework including confusion around roles, weak governance structures and limited accountability. This is deeply concerning. When we are talking about worker safety, ambiguity is dangerous. Weak oversight is dangerous. A lack of accountability is dangerous. This bill addresses those issues directly by establishing a skill-based governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland, strengthening oversight and ensuring clearer governance arrangements. Importantly, this reform keeps RSHQ as an independent regulator while improving how it functions. This is not about weakening safety protections; it is about ensuring the system actually delivers outcomes for workers.

The bill also strengthens the role of advisory committees, allowing them to once again review legislation, standards and guidelines, and provide practical advice on regulatory changes. That matters because frontline workers and industry experts often understand operational realities better than anyone else. Their voices deserve to be heard.


We know there has been debate around the removal of the Commissioner for Resources Safety and Health. Some stakeholders have expressed concerns, and I acknowledge those concerns. It is also important to acknowledge what the Johnston review found. The review identified confusion surrounding the role and effectiveness of the commissioner's position. Stakeholders interviewed during the review question what the role actually achieved and whether it delivered meaningful outcomes.

This bill replaces that uncertainty with a clearer governance structure. A governing board with defined oversight responsibilities provides stronger accountability and clearer leadership. While the Labor opposition seek to create fear around those reforms, the reality is that many industry stakeholders support the objectives of this bill. The Queensland Resources Council acknowledged the need to strengthen governance and accountability at RSHQ. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies described the bill as 'a good step forward to improve safety in the resources industry and transparency within the RSHQ organisation'. Australian Energy Producers also supported strengthening governance arrangements through the establishment of a governing board.

This bill is also about restoring confidence in government systems and ensuring taxpayer money is used responsibly. The reforms to the Land Access Ombudsman arrangements are another important part of this legislation. The current system has been underutilised despite significant taxpayer funding. The bill streamlines these arrangements while maintaining access to dispute resolution services for landholders and industry alike. That is a sensible reform. Queenslanders expect governments to spend money wisely. They expect duplication and unnecessary bureaucracy to be reduced wherever possible.

This legislation also repels the proposed industry levy that would have imposed additional costs on the resources sector. At a time when Queensland faces economic pressures and global competition for investment, we cannot ignore the importance of maintaining confidence in our resources sector. The resources industry supports regional jobs, local businesses, apprenticeships, infrastructure investment and economic activity across our state. Many local businesses in my electorate indirectly benefit from the hard work of FIFO workers and resources families. Cafes, retailers, sporting clubs and community organisations all feel the positive economic impact.

However, none of that economic contribution can ever come at the expense of worker safety. That is why this bill strikes an important balance. It strengthens accountability. It restores confidence in the regulator. Most importantly, it seeks to create a safer system for Queensland workers—for workers like my friend Jordan in Beachmere, for every FIFO family waiting at home, for every Queensland worker who deserves to know that their government takes workplace safety seriously. Queensland workers deserve a safety framework that is modern, effective and accountable. This bill delivers important reforms toward achieving that outcome. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (8.49 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this very important legislation, the Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This is an important step forward in strengthening Queensland's resources safety and health frameworks, improving accountability and delivering a safer resource sector for every worker who goes to work in our mines, quarries, petroleum and gas operations, and other resource industries across our state. I have quite a few fly-in fly-out residents—people like Darren, Robert, Phil and Shirley, whom I talk to from time to time. They stop at my roadsides to discuss what is happening in our wonderful state—what progress is being made by the Crisafulli government to protect workers in their workplaces and our vision for Queensland. The Minister for Mines has been so passionate about building the petroleum industry for quite some time and has been at the forefront when it comes to the Taroom Trough, an area that is certainly close to Shirley's heart as a worker in those regions. I passed on her comments to the minister a couple of months ago now. She told me at a roadside that she wanted to

say thank you to the minister for his diligence and foresight in protecting Queensland and helping protect Australia from the fuel crisis we have seen in recent times around the world.

The Queensland resource sector is one of the great pillars of our economy. It supports thousands and thousands of jobs. Even in the electorate of Theodore there are a lot of fly-in fly-out workers such as tradies, diesel fitters and all of these individuals who bring money back to the Gold Coast. Those fly-in fly-out occupations are an important economic driver for the Gold Coast and our regions. We seem to forget how important the resources industry is to our economy, hence why it is so important we make sure we have safety standards up there with the world's best. This bill contributes to ensuring there is a safe workplace for these workers. We expect every worker in every occupation in the resource sector to come home safely. We expect that the laws we pass in this parliament will ensure that the people who are providers for their families will come home safely to continue to provide for their families, and the role of the parliament is to ensure this does happen.

Why does this bill matter? The Resources Safety and Health Queensland and Other Legislation Amendment Bill delivers reforms that will establish an independent governing board for Resources Safety & Health Queensland, RSHQ. This is significant and necessary reform. It will strengthen oversight and streamline advisory structures, reducing duplication and providing a clear framework for decision-making and accountability. For too long—and this is something I have heard from people like Phil and Robert—there has been too much bureaucracy and overgovernance when it comes to these areas. They want a strong framework that protects them on the worksite. They feel there is too much confusion; therefore, this bill is about clearly outlining the responsibilities of the framework and what the authority is meant to do. Workers and industry alike must have confidence that the regulator is operating effectively, independently and with the protection of workers as its highest priority.

This bill responds directly to the findings of the 2025 Johnston review. That review delivered a clear, confronting message: Queensland's resources safety framework was letting down the very workers it was designed to protect. The review identified a number of serious issues including weaknesses in governance, confusion around roles and lack of clear accountability. To be blunt, these are high-risk industries and governance failures have real consequences for these workers. Confusion in roles can delay action, poor accountability can undermine confidence and weak oversight can place lives at risk.


The Crisafulli government has listened to those findings and it is acting. By establishing an independent governing board for the RSHQ this bill provides stronger leadership, creates a clearer strategy direction and enhances oversight of the regulator. It will also help ensure that the RSHQ is focused on providing its core purpose: protecting the safety and health of Queensland resource workers. This reform streamlines the advisory structure and removes duplication, which is a frustration when it comes to these types of areas. A modern safety framework should not be weighed down by overlapping bodies, unclear responsibilities and inefficiencies in arrangements. It should be practical, responsive and accountable. It should support good decision-making and ensure advice is timely and expert focused, because these individuals are the individuals who are growing our state. They are the individuals who are bringing revenue to our state from the export of the natural products which are growing our economy.

The coat of arms behind us here tonight is a testament to how this state was built on the resource industry, and we must work to deliver an industry that is safer while ensuring it has the necessary protocols in place to ensure these men and women who work in these very important areas come home safely. Importantly, this bill is not about changing administration structures; it is about restoring confidence in the industry. It is about ensuring workers, families, industry and the broader community can have faith in the Queensland resources safety framework. It is about creating a system that puts safety first in practice, not just in words.

The resource sector is complex and each area has its own direct needs. One size cannot fit all. Having said that, ensuring the technology is in place for a changing workplace and work practices is critically important for this industry. That is what good governments and the Crisafulli government are about: dealing with Queensland's needs and ensuring that a safety and health framework can meet the challenges of today whilst preparing for the challenges of tomorrow. This bill will help deliver a modern framework. It makes the sector safer for every mineworker. It strengthens the system that exists to protect them and delivers the Crisafulli government's commitment to our workers in this state to make sure they come home safely to be reunited with their families.


Debate, on motion of Mr Boothman, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.00 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Nurses and Midwives; Health System

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (9.00 pm): Today is International Nurses Day and I take this opportunity to honour our hardworking Queensland nurses and reinforce our commitment to them. I also acknowledge our wonderful midwives for their international day, which was last Tuesday. I am thrilled to celebrate with all nurses and midwives the 10-year anniversary of the former Labor government's safe nurse-to-patient ratios legislation passing through this parliament. It was a very proud moment for many of us on this side of the House as well as for nurses, the QNU and the then QNU secretary, Beth Mohle, who campaigned tirelessly for ratios because ratios save lives. It was not too proud for those opposite, who opposed the bill.

The Labor government backed our nurses then and two years later backed our midwives with ratios that included babies in the count. The Labor opposition backs our hardworking nurses and midwives today. Today those ratios have improved job satisfaction and improved the quality of care that nurses in our public hospitals provide. All the research demonstrates that it has delivered exactly what they said: it is saving lives. We listened then and we will continue to listen today, because there is still work to be done and it starts by listening to our frontline healthcare workers.

They know that hospitals are overflowing and that waitlists continue to grow, and they feel overwhelmed. They will tell you how insulting it is to have the Crisafulli government tout dodgy data on ambulance ramping and emergency department wait times while patients continue to suffer. They know we need additional beds and that we needed them yesterday; we need them now. Our plans for the capacity expansion program would have seen more beds delivered faster, but those plans are now scrapped and relegated to the never-never—no timeframes, no details, no contractors, no builders, but every weak excuse that we are sick of hearing.

The cutting of the capacity expansion program has resulted in 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital that were due to be delivered by 2027 now no longer happening, with timeframes unknown, and they have not even finished redoing their plan. They are not going to be delivered by 2027. This is not good enough for the people of Stafford who have expressed their concerns for the Prince Charles Hospital and how government inaction is affecting their health needs.


I join the member for Dickson, Ali France, in her calls to save the Queensland Cancer Centre—calling on the Crisafulli government to prioritise cancer patients and start construction of the Queensland Cancer Centre and the 150 beds now. In a petition, the member for Dickson states that this has been cancelled until at least 2031, putting patients' lives at risk. We know firsthand that the RBWH cancer services are under immense pressure. Our Stafford candidate, Luke Richmond, will not stop campaigning for the extra beds.

(Time expired)

Mrs NIGHTINGALE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to the unparliamentary language used by the member for Redcliffe.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): I am afraid that I did not hear any unparliamentary language.

Water Security


 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (9.03 pm): I rise to inform the House of my delight at seeing that the Crisafulli LNP government is making the right decisions about water security in my electorate of Southern Downs. It was announced recently that the Toowoomba to Warwick pipeline—which I have always thought was of dubious value—will be staged. The pipeline from Toowoomba will go to Clifton and will continue to Warwick if and when we know it is necessary. The department has advised that there is about 190 years between events when Warwick is likely to run out of water. There is currently at least four years of water in Warwick's water storages. The idea of installing very expensive infrastructure which is not going to be used at the cost of long-suffering ratepayers is something that I am very pleased to see will be avoided. The corridor for the pipeline will be maintained and it will be constructed if necessary.

I think the question of water security in my electorate of Southern Downs has to be looked at in an integrated fashion. We have the town of Stanthorpe, which members will remember ran out of water entirely. It was reliant upon trucked water from Warwick—Warwick's water given to Stanthorpe. We must never see that happen again. There are a number of options. There is the possibility of a pipeline from Warwick to Stanthorpe to provide the water that Stanthorpe needs, but that is a very expensive looking option. I reckon we would be looking at half a billion dollars to do something like that. That would only be water for the town of Stanthorpe and, importantly, not for our farmers. It would not provide enough water for those who live outside the town and have to go into town to purchase water from the council in the event their tanks run dry, which is what happens in droughts. That is why I support Emu Swamp Dam.

I want to thank the minister, the Hon. Ann Leahy, for her very positive engagement with me over options to progress this project. It is a transformative project which provides water not just for the town but also for our farmers, who did it extremely tough in 2019. They are the lifeblood of our community. They and their workers, their staff and the businesses that depend on them provide prosperity, jobs and a wonderful society on the Granite Belt.

I want to see us build Emu Swamp Dam. I want to see new water, not water which is pumped from someone else's supply. If we are going to have a drought that occurs perhaps every 190 years, you can bet your bottom dollar that when we need that water it probably will not be there yet. We want independent, new water on the Granite Belt. We want water for Stanthorpe so that it can stand on its own two feet and so we can return Warwick's water, which is earmarked for the town of Stanthorpe when it next runs dry, back to Warwick. That is real water security. I look forward to keeping my community informed about progress in identifying ways to build Emu Swamp Dam.


Nurses and Midwives

 **Dr O'SHEA** (South Brisbane—ALP) (9.06 pm): On this International Nurses Day and with International Day of the Midwife last week, I would like to extend my personal thanks to all of the nurses on both sides of this House for their care and dedication to Queenslanders as well as the nurses I have worked with over the years and the many nurses who have cared for me and my family; to the nurses in emergency at the PA Hospital who worked side by side with me looking after trauma patients at the roadside or in our resuscitation rooms for their professionalism, humour and lifelong friendship; to the nurses in alcohol and drug and psychiatry for sharing their years of experience with me and for their patience, wisdom, extraordinary care and understanding for their patients; to the midwives at the Mater Hospital, who safely delivered my three sons and cared for all of us with such skill and kindness; and finally to the nurses at the Queensland Children's Hospital, who provided exceptional care to my boys throughout years of major surgery as well as the inevitable broken bones.

Over the years working in hospitals I saw nurses struggling with increasing paperwork and unmanageable patient loads leading to reduced job satisfaction and often burnout, with some having to leave the profession that they loved. The former Labor government listened to the nurses and responded, bringing in Australia's first nurse-to-patient ratios 10 years ago today. This was literally life-changing legislation not only in terms of increased job satisfaction for our nurses but backed up by research that found that the ratios improved patient outcomes by reducing deaths, length of hospital stay and readmissions to hospital and were economically feasible as the savings from shorter lengths of stay and fewer readmissions were more than twice the cost of the additional nurse staffing. This initiative was so successful that, in an Australian first, the Labor government went on to count babies as well as mothers in midwife-to-patient ratios to enable midwives to have the time to provide essential support to mothers and their babies as well as to appoint Australia's first Chief Midwife Officer to represent the over 3,000 midwives in our state.

We need to continue to support our nurses across Queensland through providing the essential workforce and infrastructure they need. That is why I would urge the government to start work now on the expansion of the Prince Charles Hospital as well as the Queensland Cancer Centre to provide the beds and specialist care Queenslanders desperately need.

Chatsworth Electorate, Customer Service Awards

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (9.09 pm): I want to acknowledge five outstanding small businesses in the Chatsworth electorate that have been honoured for excellence in my 2026 customer service awards. As the Minister for Small and Family Business, I hold my Outstanding Customer Service Awards annually to celebrate businesses that make a significant contribution to our local community.


These businesses not only deliver exceptional customer service but also play an important role in strengthening our local community, supporting our economy and fostering strong community connections. These awards celebrate excellence within local small and family owned enterprises and it gives me a great deal of pleasure to acknowledge businesses that consistently go above and beyond for their customers and the wider Chatsworth community.

I want to begin with 4Front Accountants in Carindale which were recognised with this year's Outstanding Customer Service Award. This recognition is a testament to a business that has built strong and lasting relationships with professionalism, trusted advice and service. I also acknowledge Brisbane Tuition, a highly respected local business that continues to make a significant difference in the lives of students and families. Camilla is dedicated and passionate about helping young students achieve their academic goals. The positive feedback from local families speaks volumes about the supportive environment she creates and the care shown to every student who walks through her door.

Crafty Monk Brewing is another outstanding local business that deserves credit. It is a welcoming community hub where locals can gather and connect. Its friendly atmosphere, commitment to customer service and involvement within the local community have made it a much loved family business. Businesses like Crafty Monk Brewing demonstrate the important role hospitality venues play in bringing communities together. Little Sprinkle Co. in Carina is a much loved business that has built a strong reputation through creativity, innovation and outstanding customer service. Steph founded the business in 2019 and it quickly became an instant success on social media after she began transforming cake offcuts into takeaway desserts. Steph has since grown Little Sprinkle Co. into one of Brisbane's most popular dessert destinations and it is not uncommon to see lines out the front of the Carina store and down the road.

Additionally, Sprout & Swap in Tingalpa is another wonderful family owned business that deserves this award. As a preloved baby and children's clothing store, it supports local families in a practical, affordable and community focused way. Businesses like Sprout & Swap demonstrate that excellent customer service is about more than simply making a sale; it is about understanding the needs of local families and creating a supportive environment. Its thoughtful approach, combined with its commitment to affordability and sustainability, has earned it the trust and appreciation from locals. Small businesses are often the first to support local events, employ local people and invest back into our communities. To 4Front Accountants, Brisbane Tuition, Crafty Monk Brewing, Little Sprinkle Co. and Sprout & Swap, thank you for the valuable contribution you make to the Chatsworth community. I again take this opportunity to congratulate you all on receiving the 2026 Outstanding Customer Service Awards.

Nurses and Midwives; Health System

 **Mrs NIGHTINGALE** (Inala—ALP) (9.12 pm): As we have heard, today is International Nurses Day—a day to honour some of our hardest working Queenslanders in our state and to thank them for their commitment and care. This year's theme is 'Our Nurses. Our Future. Empowered Nurses Save Lives' and, as a former nurse myself, I know just how true that is. I know the pressure of walking on to a ward with far too many patients and not enough support and to carry the responsibility of someone's life in your hands, and I know how critical it is that nurses have the time, resources and backing to do their jobs safely. That is why today also marks 10 years since the Labor government legislated safe nurse-to-patient ratios. Ten years ago we listened to frontline nurses calling for structural reform to ensure safer workloads, better care and a sustainable workforce, and we delivered.

Those ratios have improved job satisfaction and strengthened patient care across Queensland. We later extended that protection to midwives supporting the youngest and most vulnerable Queenslanders, but nurses will tell you there is still more to do. They will tell you that hospitals are overflowing, waitlists are growing and they feel overwhelmed—and when nurses say that, we should listen. What do they get from this government? Spin, photo opportunities and dodgy data dressed up as progress. While frontline workers cry out for support, the LNP has scrapped the capacity expansion program, walking away from the beds our hospitals desperately need.

At the Prince Charles Hospital, Labor had 93 beds on track to be delivered by 2027. Under the LNP? Gone. There are no beds, no plan and no timeline, yet they think it is funny. While they are failing to fund hospital beds, this government is so out of touch that it thinks spending \$41,000 advertising a \$20,000 school whiteboard grant is acceptable—just to have their Delivering for Queensland slogan up during a by-election. That is not delivery; it is a dereliction of duty. It is indefensible and Queenslanders should be furious. The people of Stafford now have the chance, in this by-election, to send this government a message. One voter said to me, 'Tell dodgy David to do better.' That is a slogan I can

get behind because, while this government spends tens of thousands on political stunts, nurses are stretched—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the longstanding convention in this House of referring to members by their correct titles.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): I will take some advice. Member, I ask you to use correct titles. I also ask you to withdraw the comment you made which was unparliamentary, referring to the Premier as 'dodgy David'.


Mrs NIGHTINGALE: I will withdraw, Deputy Speaker. I was merely quoting a voter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I do not want to debate about this; I want a withdrawal. Then you can proceed with your speech or you can take your seat.

Mrs NIGHTINGALE: I withdraw. As a voter recalled to me, they are clearly unhappy with the current Premier and his decisions that are failing the people of Stafford. The people of Stafford have one choice: they can make a decision to send this government a message to do better.

(Time expired)


International Nurses Day; Best of the Redlands; Anzac Day

 **Hon. AJ STOKER** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (9.16 pm): It is International Nurses Day. I want to take a moment to acknowledge the extraordinary work of nurses across Queensland, in particular the nurses at Redland Hospital and at the Redland Mater who care for our local community day in and day out, along with the nurses in aged care and in our local GP clinics who do a phenomenal job. Nurses and midwives are there for us in some of the most difficult, vulnerable and important moments of our lives. It is a really important calling to care for others. In my role as an assistant minister I love working to ensure we have more nurses and more skilled health workers to meet Queenslanders' needs now and into the future. I see so many wonderful young people investing in themselves through great programs like free TAFE, the IHNA here in Brisbane City and Blue Stone Medical to become our next generation of nurses, with the support of the Crisafulli LNP government. To all of the nurses and nurses-to-be: thank you for your professionalism and dedication. Our community is so much better because you are working in it.

The nominations are in for the Best of the Redlands and it is time to vote for your favourites. By taking the time to cast your vote, you are helping to celebrate the businesses, organisations, volunteers, clubs and local characters who help to make the Redlands such a special place to live and work. The Redlands has so many great people who quietly just get on with the job of supporting others, building up our community and making our suburbs and islands better. I know that the members for Redlands, Capalaba and I are excited to see who gets the vote so, please, take a moment and vote for your favourites. Give them a shout-out and help to put our very best locals on the statewide map.

This is the first time we have gathered in the chamber since Anzac Day. This year thousands gathered at the Cleveland dawn service to honour those who have served our nation. As usual, the Redlands RSL did a wonderful job of honouring with respect the memory of those who have served, particularly those who came from the Redlands and those who have returned but carry scars from their service. At the dawn service we were all orientated to the cenotaph, to the flags and to the catafalque party, but I confess I always get the most encouragement from turning around, because when I look behind me I see a sea of Redlanders of all ages and backgrounds—a real mix of who we are as a community but united in acknowledging and respecting the incredible sacrifice of those who made us a nation. Thank you to everyone who helped make it happen again this year: from our RSLs in Cleveland and on Straddie to the Birkdale Scouts at Wello and our local schools who, supported by the RSL, are developing a great next generation of leaders.

Nurse and Midwives; Health System

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (9.19 pm): For 10 years our side listened to the state's nurses, the workers on the frontline delivering life-saving care to Queenslanders every day. They called for mandatory ratios to ensure patient care and improve their experiences at work. They called for important changes in the name of safety and that is what we delivered. Nurse-to-patient ratios have improved job satisfaction and the quality of care nurses in our public hospitals are able to provide because when they show up for a shift they know there are rules to ensure they are not being overloaded with patients. These ratios were so successful that in 2024 we introduced ratios for midwives caring for the youngest and most vulnerable in our state.

If you take the time to talk to any of our wonderful nurses working in our hospital system they will tell you there is more to be done. Northside nurses tell me how insulting it is to have a Premier and health minister continue to tout dodgy data on ambulance ramping and emergency department wait times while their hospital systems continue to suffer. They are clearly cherrypicking data that suits them. Nurses from the Prince Charles Hospital tell me positions are not being backfilled properly and nurses are under more pressure and higher workloads than ever before. It highlights how this Premier is all photo-op and no follow-up.

Those opposite have scrapped plans for the capacity expansion program, which would have seen more beds delivered where Queenslanders need them faster, like the Prince Charles Hospital expansion. Under Labor 93 beds were due to be delivered by 2027. Under the LNP that is no longer happening. In fact, they have not even finished redoing their plans. There is no timeframe for the 93 beds under this minister, no matter which way he tries to squirm out of it. Brisbane northsiders deserve better than a photo-op and a slogan and our nurses deserve to know they have a government that backs them with the infrastructure and workforce planning they need.

So many of the wonderful nurses who keep the Prince Charles Hospital running live in our part of the northside. They know how much the community is reeling from long wait times and being unable to access the care they need when they need it. We have been out talking with locals about their concerns for the Prince Charles Hospital and how much this government's inaction is costing them. The nurses, the doctors, the wardies—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.


Mr MELLISH: I hear the member for Buderim making a bit of noise. Perhaps he should be looking for trains for the weekend. Perhaps the minister should be worrying about his own e-mobility legislation. You did a great job with that one, Minister! E-mobility, fantastic job!

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Members on my right!

Mr MELLISH: As I was saying, one would think the minister would have other important jobs but he is too busy playing politics to worry about his real job. The nurses, doctors, wardies, admin and office staff at the Prince Charles Hospital do amazing work. They did even more incredible work during COVID. I salute them. They do not have a government that cares about delivering the health services North Brisbane needs. Stafford needs someone who stands up for them every day, a genuine local who cares about health care like Luke Richmond, not a recycled council candidate who lives in my electorate of Aspley, not in the Stafford electorate. For northsiders the choice is clear.

Burnett Electorate, Achievements

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (9.23 pm): Tonight I would like to recognise four outstanding young local athletes.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): I just want everyone to remain quiet. I have given you a good run tonight. You are all sitting about six seats apart from each other and having a free run. Let us hear the rest of the adjournment contributions in silence.

Mr BENNETT: Tonight I would like to recognise four outstanding young local athletes who are making names for themselves in track and field and I could not be more proud to support them through our Local Heroes grants. Phoebe, Fenix and Coral from Agnes Water State School have each been selected in the Wide Bay U12 Girls AFL team and will travel to Cairns next month to compete at the state championships. Congratulations, team. We will be cheering you on from home.

I also want to give a shout-out to young Michael Ebert from Childers, a rising athletics star who has already been invited to compete in world qualifier events. Michael is no stranger to hard work and has been fundraising to reach his dream with plenty of sausage sizzles. Again, it is a privilege to be able to support him in a small way. While currently recovering from injury, he is a sports superstar to watch. We wish him all the best. These young locals embody determination, resilience and regional pride. Our whole community is excited to see them compete and make us proud.

Our community is at its strongest when we stand together. This month we are standing together to say no to domestic and family violence. I recently attended a candlelight vigil in the Bundaberg CBD where we paused to remember lives lost, stand with victim-survivors and reaffirm our commitment to

change. It was a powerful reminder that behind every statistic is a person, a family and a community impacted.


Organisations such as Edon Place do extraordinary work on the front line each and every day, providing counselling, crisis support and practical assistance to those who need it most. Their dedication saves lives. I thank Lynn, Scott, Tracey and the entire team for the tireless work they do in our community and for hosting the vigil.

This month also marks an important milestone with the completion of the Hearts of Purple crisis accommodation project. It has been incredibly rewarding to volunteer my time and experience as a builder to project-manage that build, which will make such a meaningful difference. Working alongside the charity to deliver safe, purpose-built accommodation has been a genuine privilege. At its heart, this is about stepping up when it matters and ensuring vulnerable people have a safe place to turn, particularly if they are in crisis. To the project team: thank you very much for your dedication.

Finally, Small Business Month is a time to recognise the hardworking local businesses that are the backbone of our economy and the heart of our community. They create local jobs, sponsor our sporting clubs, support our community groups and keep our regional towns thriving. A big shout-out goes to Tim Sayre from the Bundaberg Chamber of Commerce and Margaret Smith from the Childers Chamber of Commerce for their leadership and advocacy.

A massive thank you goes to Katrin and her incredible 'Flower Power' team at From Farm to Vase who pulled off the impossible this Mother's Day. I was so proud to partner with them to deliver 500 bunches of flowers to mums and carers in aged-care and retirement villages across the Burnett. That is what small business is all about: community, care and connection. This is also a time to remember just how many people are employed in our small businesses. As a community, this is your opportunity to show your support: buy local, shop local. Let us step up, as the CBD and Bundaberg need your support.


International Nurses Day; Health Services

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (9.26 pm): On International Nurses Day, I say thank you and pay tribute to the wonderful nurses from across my community, across the north side of Brisbane and, of course, across the entire state. They do a tremendous job. As the daughter of a nurse, I appreciate just how hard they work, day in and day out. This is also a very special day because it commemorates the 10-year anniversary of Labor in government delivering safe nurse-to-patient ratios legislation—legislation that sadly did not get bipartisan support in this chamber but was delivered nonetheless with fantastic results and outcomes. We have seen huge successes since those ratios were introduced in 2016. They were, in fact, expanded to midwives, who deal with the youngest and most vulnerable patients in our state. We have seen those mandatory ratios improve patient care. They improve experiences at work. They help with workloads to make sure there is not an overload of patients. As a result, we have seen reduced deaths, shorter lengths of stay and fewer readmissions. There is no denying that those are fantastic outcomes across our health system and for our frontline health heroes.

What nurses and health professionals are telling us right across the state right now is that they are in a system that is under pressure and a system that is overwhelmed, particularly on the north side. Folks in my community and folks right across the north side utilise the Prince Charles Hospital as our critical lifeline to health service delivery. Right now, that hospital should have shovels in the ground. It should have work underway to deliver 93 beds to my community and the growing community of the north side. However, that is currently at a standstill under the LNP, with no delivery timeframes in sight. It is a shame. The statistics are showing that this is a hospital well and truly under pressure. We have seen ramping increase by 15 per cent on the LNP's watch. We have seen a 45 per cent increase in the number of patients waiting longer than clinically recommended in our emergency department. We see specialist appointment waitlists continue to grow on the LNP's watch.

What northsiders want more than anything is to have confidence in our health system. They want to have confidence that they can get health care when they need it most. They know that our health system is filled with fantastic, dedicated professionals. They need the government of the day to come good on election commitments and actually deliver what they said they were going to deliver for our community and to deliver what was promised.

Redcliffe Electorate; Tait, Mr B OAM

 **Ms DOOLEY** (Redcliffe—LNP) (9.29 pm): Happy International Nurses Day! RN to RN, I want to extend heartfelt thanks to all our nurses across Redcliffe at our hospital, our GP clinics, aged-care

homes and community teams. Thank you for all you do to care, support, listen, educate and advocate for our patients. To my amazing nursing team at My Care Enterprises, you are all angels. Thank you for going above and beyond every single day to keep our clients at home, right where they want to be.

Our annual Raise it for Redcliffe Hospital Giving Day Appeal is on 21 May, fundraising for continued upgrades to the Redcliffe Palliative Care Unit. I invite everyone to my trivia night this Saturday at the Redcliffe Leagues Club in support.

May is a massive month with a lot on in Redcliffe. It is Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, with our Moreton Bay Says NO to Violence walk along the Redcliffe Parade on 29 May. As a community, we walk together to raise our voices against violence and commit as a community to prevention.

It is also Queensland Small Business Month. To celebrate, I am hosting the Redcliffe Business Awards in partnership with the Redcliffe Chamber of Commerce. Thank you to the Bendigo Community Bank at Margate for being our gold sponsor, and to silver sponsors Redcliffe Treehouse and Jacaranda Kitchens. With nine categories and People's Choice award, thank you to the hundreds of businesses who have nominated or been nominated. These awards celebrate the dedication, innovation and resilience of our local small businesses and recognise their amazing contribution to our economy through employment and services. Category finalists will be notified this year and winners announced at a gala event on 28 May.

This week is National Palliative Care Week with the theme 'Getting to the heart of it: Big questions, real answers'. As a palliative care nurse for over 25 years and former vice-president of Palliative Care Queensland, helping make death less scary is so important. Caring for people at the end of life has been a sacred part of my nursing career. A reminder: palliative care is for anyone at any age with a life-limiting illness, including children and young people. Please join me tomorrow for our Palliative Care Queensland lunchbox session in the Speaker's Hall.

In closing, vale, Bob Tait OAM. Redcliffe has lost an iconic legend, the founder of Bob Tait's Aviation Theory School from Redcliffe Airport. Thank you, Bob, for everything you gave to aviation in Redcliffe, Queensland and Australia. Rest in peace, Bob.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.32 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, 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, Hatcher, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young