



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Email: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)

Phone (07) 3553 6344

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

### Tuesday, 2 June 2026

Subject	Page
<b>ASSENT TO BILLS</b> .....	<b>1521</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 26 May 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 26 May 2026. ....	
	1521
<b>ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD</b> .....	<b>1521</b>
<b>By-Election, Return of Writ</b> .....	<b>1521</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Endorsed Writ for the election of the Electoral District of Stafford. ....	
	1522
<b>Member Sworn</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>Alleged Contempt of Parliament</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>Comments by Member for Waterford, Apology</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>Parliamentary Broadcast, Terms and Conditions of Use</b> .....	<b>1522</b>
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1523</b>
<b>Speaking's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House</b> .....	<b>1523</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Member for Waterford. ....	
	1523
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee</b> .....	<b>1523</b>
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1524</b>
<b>Parliament House, Artwork</b> .....	<b>1524</b>
<b>Visitors to Public Gallery</b> .....	<b>1524</b>
<b>APPOINTMENT</b> .....	<b>1524</b>
<b>Change in Ministry</b> .....	<b>1524</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from <i>Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary</i> No. 16 dated 22 May 2026, regarding the acting arrangements for the portfolio of Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. ....	
	1524
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>1524</b>

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 2 June 2026

<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>1525</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1529</b>
Citizen’s Right of Reply .....	1529
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1529</b>
Resources Industries .....	1529
Resources Industries; Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure .....	1530
Resources Industries; Fuel Security .....	1530
Resources Industries .....	1531
Energy Prices .....	1532
Energy Prices, Small and Family Business; Small Business Month .....	1532
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure .....	1533
Sunshine Coast, Rail Infrastructure .....	1534
Termination of Pregnancy; Health System .....	1535
<b>JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>1536</b>
Reports .....	1536
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Strategic Review of the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman, May 2026. ....	1536
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Information Commissioner Report 3: 2025-26—Let’s get digital: A review of online proactive disclosure practices by government agencies. ....	1536
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	<b>1536</b>
Child Safety System .....	1536
Child Safety System .....	1537
Resources Industries .....	1537
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1538
Resources Industries .....	1539
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1540
Resources Industries .....	1540
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1541
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure .....	1542
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1543
Health Services .....	1543
Shark Control Program .....	1544
Community Safety .....	1545
Domestic and Family Violence .....	1545
Youth Crime .....	1546
Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence .....	1547
Speaker’s Ruling, Question Out of Order .....	1547
Destination 2045 .....	1547
<b>MOTIONS</b> .....	<b>1548</b>
Member for Stafford, First Speech .....	1548
Business Program .....	1548
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to. ....	1550
Resolved in the negative .....	1550
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1551
Resolved in the affirmative .....	1551
<b>STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION (CRITICAL MINERALS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1551</b>
Introduction .....	1551
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. ....	1551
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes. ....	1551
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights. ....	1551
First Reading .....	1557
Referral to Primary Industries and Resources Committee .....	1557
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1557</b>
Second Reading .....	1557
<b>MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST</b> .....	<b>1564</b>
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance .....	1564
Labor Party, Performance .....	1566
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance .....	1568
Member for Woodridge; Mental Health Levy .....	1568
Minister for Health and Ambulance Services, Performance .....	1570
Small and Family Business, Federal Budget .....	1571
Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence .....	1572
Energy Prices .....	1573
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance .....	1573
Labor Party, Performance .....	1574
Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance .....	1575

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 2 June 2026


<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1576</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1576</b>
<b>ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD</b> .....	<b>1587</b>
<b>First Speech</b> .....	<b>1587</b>
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1590</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1590</b>
<b>MEDICINES AND POISONS (MEDICINES) AMENDMENT REGULATION</b> .....	<b>1598</b>
<b>Disallowance of Statutory Instrument</b> .....	<b>1598</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Midwives' (Version 5).....	1598
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Midwives' (Version 6).....	1598
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1604
Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10). ....	1604
<b>TRANSPORT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT REGULATION</b> .....	<b>1604</b>
<b>Disallowance of Statutory Instrument</b> .....	<b>1604</b>
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1607
Resolved in the negative. ....	1607
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1607</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1607</b>
<b>DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT</b> .....	<b>1611</b>
<b>Dissent from Speaker's Ruling</b> .....	<b>1611</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1611</b>
<b>Dissent from Speaker's Ruling</b> .....	<b>1611</b>
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1616
Resolved in the negative. ....	1616
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1616</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1616</b>
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time. ....	1625
Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10). ....	1625
<b>Consideration in Detail</b> .....	<b>1625</b>
Clauses 1 to 214, as read, agreed to. ....	1625
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to. ....	1625
<b>Third Reading</b> .....	<b>1625</b>
<b>Long Title</b> .....	<b>1625</b>
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b> .....	<b>1626</b>
<b>Centenary Highway</b> .....	<b>1626</b>
<b>Mulgrave Electorate, Sugar Industry</b> .....	<b>1627</b>
<b>Centenary Highway</b> .....	<b>1627</b>
<b>Queensland Day, Best of the Redlands Awards</b> .....	<b>1628</b>
<b>Centenary Highway</b> .....	<b>1628</b>
<b>Mermaid Beach Electorate, Development</b> .....	<b>1629</b>
<b>Ipswich West Electorate, Traffic Congestion</b> .....	<b>1629</b>
<b>Lennie, Mr ND</b> .....	<b>1630</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Order of Service for Mr Neil Douglas Lennie. ....	1630
<b>Airtrain</b> .....	<b>1631</b>
<b>Police Service, Retirees; SES Regional Awards</b> .....	<b>1631</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE</b> .....	<b>1632</b>

## TUESDAY, 2 JUNE 2026


---

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Pat Weir, Condamine) read prayers and took the chair.

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I acknowledge the Aboriginal people and Torres Strait Islander people of this state and their elders past, present and emerging. I also acknowledge the former members of this parliament who have participated in and nourished the democratic institutions of this state. Finally, I acknowledge the people of this state, whether they have been born here or have chosen to make this state their home and whom we represent to make laws and conduct other business for the peace, welfare and good government of this state.

### ASSENT TO BILLS

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

The Honourable P. Weir MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

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

26 May 2026:

A bill for an Act to amend the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Coexistence Queensland Act 2013, the Land Access Ombudsman Act 2017, the Mineral and Energy Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2024, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999 and the Resources Safety and Health Queensland Act 2020 for particular purposes

A bill for an Act to establish the Sunshine Coast Waterways Authority, and to amend this Act, the Public Sector Act 2022, the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, the Transport Operations (Marine Pollution) Act 1995 and the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994 for particular purposes

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

Yours sincerely


Governor

26 May 2026

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 26 May 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 26 May 2026 [\[823\]](#).

### ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD

#### By-Election, Return of Writ

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I am advised by the Clerk that the writ issued by Her Excellency the Governor on 17 April 2026 for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Stafford has been returned. In accordance with standing order 38, I now call the Clerk to read and table the result of the writ.

**The CLERK:** Honourable members, the writ for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Stafford was returned on 22 May 2026 with a certificate endorsed thereon by the Electoral Commissioner of Queensland of the election, on 16 May 2026, of

Luke Thomas Richmond to serve as such member. I table the endorsed writ. I now call the honourable member forward to take the oath of allegiance and of office.

*Tabled paper:* Endorsed Writ for the election of the Electoral District of Stafford [\[824\]](#).

### Member Sworn

Mr Luke Thomas Richmond, having waited at the bar of the House, was invited by Mr Speaker to enter the chamber.


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

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

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Contempt of Parliament

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (9.34 am): I rise on a matter of privilege. This matter is serious and goes to the personal integrity of members and the integrity of the Ethics Committee process. On debate of the motion of contempt on 14 May 2026, the member for Waterford stated at page 1484 of the *Record of Proceedings*—

I also want to make a comment about the timing of the release of this Ethics Committee report.

Further, the member for Waterford said—

The government has been sitting on this report and waiting until two days before a by-election to release it. Again, that is another example of them using the parliament as a political plaything. That is what is happening here.

**Opposition members** interjected.


**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! I will hear the matter of privilege in silence.

**Mr STEVENS:** This statement by the member for Waterford is a reflection on the committee and me as chair and attributes improper dealings and improper motives. Mr Speaker, it is well-established Ethics Committee practice to table its reports on the Thursday of a sitting week.

The facts are as follows. The minutes of the meeting show how the matter was considered over a lengthy period of time. The minutes of meeting No. 30 on Wednesday, 22 April 2026 indicate that report 244 was adopted and the report and attachments were authorised for publication that day. I was advised by the secretariat that the report could not be tabled the following day as, under standing order 214, the opposition members of the committee had seven calendar days within which to provide a statement of dissent or reservation, neither of which materialised. I was also advised that the minutes of the meeting of adoption on Wednesday, 22 April 2026 needed to be approved before they could be included in the report. These minutes were actually approved on 13 May 2026, the day before the tabling of the report.

The member's inferences and allegations of improper actions or motives are not supported by the facts. Neither are her arguments the government was manipulating the process. I call on the member to take it upon herself to apologise to the House and correct the record.

### Comments by Member for Waterford, Apology


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (9.37 am): In relation to my contribution on the debate of the Ethics Committee report of the last sitting week, if I inadvertently reflected on the chair or the committee then I apologise to the House.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member has offered an apology.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### Parliamentary Broadcast, Terms and Conditions of Use

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I am becoming deeply concerned about the number of breaches of the—


**An opposition member** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The next person will be warned. I am becoming deeply concerned about the number of breaches of the broadcast of proceedings rules which the Clerk and I are having to contend with. I am increasingly concerned that members or their agents are either ignorant of the rules or, worse, knowingly or recklessly breaching the rules in the pursuit of their social media clicks. These matters have largely been dealt with informally, but the increasing number of breaches tends to indicate that this approach is not deterring misuse. It may well be that this House has to take stronger measures to enforce obedience of the rules that this House has set.

All members should consider themselves warned about the use of broadcast and adherence to the rules. From this point forward, all complaints about breach of broadcast rules are to be in writing by the offended member to the Speaker. I will then determine if the matter is to be dealt with informally or formally.

## PRIVILEGE

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

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 9 April 2026 the member for Waterford wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence deliberately misled the House on 25 March 2026. The minister alleged that none of the five former child safety ministers had asked her a question in question time. I note that on 14 May 2026 the minister apologised to the House, and this is recorded at page 1407 of the *Record of Proceedings*. Accordingly, I consider the minister has made an adequate apology and I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table redacted correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt and misleading of the House by the Member for Waterford [\[825\]](#).

I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 9 April 2026, the member for Waterford wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence deliberately misled the House on 25 March 2026.

The matter relates to statements made during Question Time.

Specifically, the Minister said:

*'I will take that interjection from the shadow minister because I am yet to have one question about this portfolio from the five former child safety ministers. One is not there because we have in the House our local member from North Queensland.'*

The member argued that this was false and provided evidence of two previous questions she had asked of the minister. One with respect to the child safety portfolio, and the other relating to domestic and family violence. The member noted that she was the Minister for Child Safety between 16 February 2015 and 11 December 2017,

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

The Minister submitted that neither of the questions that were asked by the member fell within the child safety portfolio. She argued that the first question related to information technology and the administrative workings of the department and the second question related to the operations of the Queensland Police Service.


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

From the submissions put forward, I consider that the first question that the member asked of the Minister was related to the child safety portfolio. This is reflected in the Record of Proceedings. However, the second question is related to the Domestic and Family Violence portfolio.

I note that on 14 May 2026, the Minister apologised to the House and this is recorded at page 1407 of the Record of Proceedings.

Accordingly, I consider the Minister has made an adequate apology and I **will not** be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.


### Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the Clerk received allegations that the member for Waterford breached the broadcast footage terms and conditions with social media posts on 14 and 19 May 2026. In accordance with standing order 268(2), I have now referred these posts to the Ethics

Committee for a breach of section 37 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 for improperly interfering with the free exercise of the Assembly of its authority under standing order 266(22) for wilfully disobeying an order of the House. Also relevant is section 58(3) of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001. Also related was a social media post on 18 May 2026. In respect of this matter, I have referred the member to the Ethics Committee under 268(2) for a breach of section 37 of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 for improperly interfering with the free exercise of the Assembly of its authority under standing order 266(13) by publishing a false or misleading account of proceedings before the House; and by bringing the House into odium, contempt or ridicule or lowering its authority—a constructive contempt. As these matters are now before the committee, standing order 271 applies and the matters should not be discussed in the House.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS


### 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, *Esk War Memorial and [Mount] Glen Rock*, is by artist Myrtle Hermann. Mrs Hermann was born in the Solomon Islands in 1921 and settled at Crowley Vale in 1960. A self-taught artist, she began painting while working as a nurse, creating handpainted bookmarks to earn extra income. She later exhibited her work in Brisbane and sold paintings across Australia and overseas. This artwork was donated by the Esk Shire Council. The second artwork, *Council Chambers Old and New*, is by Denis Glindemann, who began painting at the age of 13.

**Mr Stevens:** Mighty Albert shire!


**Mr SPEAKER:** This artwork was donated by the Albert Shire Council. Next sitting week we will feature two more artworks, continuing to highlight regional communities represented in this chamber.

### Visitors to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise members that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Clayfield College in the electorate of Clayfield, Murrumba State Secondary College in the electorate of Murrumba, Monkland State School in the electorate of Gympie, Aspley State High School in the electorate of Aspley, Helensvale State School in the electorate of Theodore, Watson Road State School and Pallara State School in the electorate of Algester, and Coolum State School in the electorate of Ninderry.

## APPOINTMENT

### Change in Ministry

 **Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.43 am): I lay upon the table of the House the *Extraordinary Queensland Government Gazette* of 22 May 2026 which outlines a recent acting arrangement made with the ministry by Her Excellency the Governor. This arrangement provides for the appointment of the Hon. Andrew Powell, Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation, to act as and to perform all of the functions and exercise all of the powers of the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

*Tabled paper.* Extract from *Queensland Government Gazette Extraordinary* No. 16 dated 22 May 2026, regarding the acting arrangements for the portfolio of Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games [\[826\]](#).

## PETITIONS

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

### Jourdan, Ms S

**Hon. Ryan**, from 1,222 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Attorney-General to convey to the Queensland Coroner the request by Sandrine's family for a full public coronal inquest which examines all evidence (including new evidence), forensics, and witness accounts [\[809\]](#).

### Gambling, Advertising

**Mr Berkman**, from 3,774 petitioners, requesting the House to ban gambling advertising on all government-owned or controlled public and state assets in Queensland and review of existing policies and contractual arrangements to ensure vulnerable persons are protected [\[810\]](#).

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

**Atherton, Community Safety**

1,085 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to address community safety in Atherton [\[811\]](#).

**Non-State Schools**

267 petitioners, requesting the House to establish an independent complaints and investigation mechanism for non-state schools in Queensland and to introduce protections for individuals raising concerns about a child's education [\[812\]](#).

**RSPCA**

381 petitioners, requesting the House to remove all RSPCA powers under the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 [\[813\]](#).

**Dementia Care**

1,448 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to provide hope and better care for Queensland's growing dementia population [\[814\]](#).

**On-Street Car Parking**

360 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to reduce car parking congestion on streets and roads [\[815\]](#).

**City of Moreton Bay, Flood Mitigation**

270 petitioners, requesting the House to cause an investigation into the City of Moreton Bay Council's handling of flood mapping, overland flows and enforcement of structures that potentially divert, concentrate or block runoff to and from others' properties [\[816\]](#).

**Government Buildings and Property**

235 petitioners, requesting the House to investigate and begin the process of removing the words Queensland Government from publicly owned buildings and property and replacing with the words "publicly owned by the people of Queensland" [\[817\]](#).

**Brisbane, Maritime Training School**

426 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to establish a maritime training school in Brisbane [\[818\]](#).

**Public Trustee**

1,029 petitioners, requesting the House to do all in its power to cause a full public investigation into the Public Trustee with intention to reform taking into account the wishes of the people who have experienced first-hand the operation of the Public Trustee [\[819\]](#).

**Youth Crime, Breach of Bail**

3,292 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure youth criminals with more than three bail offences be directed into compulsory military service for five years [\[820\]](#).

**Queensland Health**

1,216 petitioners, requesting the House undertake a range of measures to address systemic failures across Queensland Health [\[821\]](#).

**Hunting**

5,000 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to allow regulated public land hunting [\[822\]](#).

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—

15 May 2026—

[730](#) Response from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Hon. Purdie), to an E-Petition (4378-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,582 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure firearms policy and legislation is proportionate and evidence-based

[731](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 24, 58th Parliament—Waste Reduction and Recycling (Strengthening the Container Refund Scheme) Amendment Bill 2026

[732](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4306-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,440 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a Queensland Criminal Cases Review Commission and Fair Compensation for wrongful convictions

- [733](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4314-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,091 petitioners, requesting the House to stop the issue of all on the spot traffic and parking fines
- [734](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4413-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 229 petitioners, requesting the House to end unfair employment barriers for people with Amblyopia in Queensland
- [735](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4453-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 588 petitioners, requesting the House to declare the antisemitic laws are there to protect all semitic peoples and to put such a definition in the legislation
- [736](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to a paper petition (4509-26), presented by the member for Traeger, Mr Katter, and an E-Petition (4460-26), sponsored by the member for Traeger, Mr Katter, from 1,654 and 4,812 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to oppose the proposed abolishment of the North Queensland electoral district of Hill; call on the Queensland Redistribution Commission to retain the electorate of Hill and ensure fair representation for North Queensland communities
- [737](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to a paper petition (4505-26), presented by the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Lee, and an E-Petition (4461-26), sponsored by the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Lee, from 383 and 1,903 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to act decisively in objecting to the removal of the Hervey Bay Hospital from the Hervey Bay State electorate district
- [738](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity (Hon. Frecklington), to an E-Petition (4463-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,306 petitioners, requesting the House to repeal the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Act 2026
- [739](#) Letter, dated 10 April 2026, from the Chair, Aboriginal Centre for the Performing Arts Board, Mr Selwyn Button, to the Minister for Education and the Arts, Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, presenting the financial statements for the Aboriginal Centre for the Performing Arts (ACPA) and Audit Closing report
- [740](#) Aboriginal Centre for the Performing Arts Pty Ltd—Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2025

19 May 2026—

- [741](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. Bleijie), to a paper petition (4511-26), presented by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(3), and an E-Petition (4472-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,088 and 3,209 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to pause the Logan City Council's draft planning scheme to undertake an independent audit of the hydraulic modelling, further public consultation and to revise mapping accurately to prevent misclassification of safe land

20 May 2026—

- [742](#) Response from the Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism (Hon. Simpson), to an E-Petition (4478-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 696 petitioners, requesting the House to have Queensland follow Scotland and make period products free for all

21 May 2026—

- [743](#) Response from the Minister for Primary Industries (Hon. Perrett), to an E-Petition (4427-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 798 petitioners, requesting the House to protect our pet companion animals so important to families in our community
- [744](#) Response from the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business (Hon. Minnikin), to an E-Petition (4429-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 588 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that all government employees supply an identification number or form of identification in their dealings with the public
- [745](#) Response from the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services (Hon. Gerber), to an E-Petition (4430-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,803 petitioners, requesting the House to review youth justice bail and sentencing laws to ensure they are effective in addressing repeat serious youth offending and maintaining community safety
- [746](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4403-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 155 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake works to upgrade Main Street, Proserpine
- [747](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4409-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 99 petitioners, requesting the House to reduce the speed limit on a section of 4AK Road, Oakey from 80 km/h to 60 km/h
- [748](#) Response from the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation (Hon. Powell), to an E-Petition (4442-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,715 petitioners, requesting the House to align with the Northern Territory with respect to managing our wild crocodile population
- [749](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4382-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,468 petitioners, requesting the House to amend community treatment order provisions to require integrated treatment and intensive rehabilitation programs for mental illness and substance abuse disorders

- [750](#) Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4489-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,479 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to consider the long-term fuel security of the state
- [751](#) Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4359-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,969 petitioners, requesting the House to lift the ban on nuclear
- [752](#) Response from the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership (Hon. Janetzki), to an E-Petition (4383-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,330 petitioners, requesting the House to abolish Stamp Duty or GST from any and all insurance policies
- [753](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee: Report No. 27, 58th Parliament—Consideration of Auditor-General Report 14: 2024-25—Managing Minjerribah futures funding
- 22 May 2026—
- [754](#) Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 20, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 11 February 2026 and 3 March 2026
- [755](#) Auditor-General Report 14: 2025-26—Managing funding from the mental health levy
- [756](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Mickelberg), to an E-Petition (4466-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 477 petitioners, requesting the House to advocate for and implement a cyclist yield law, commonly known as the “Idaho Stop”
- [757](#) Response from the Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Hon. Powell), to an E-Petition (4464-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,216 petitioners, requesting the House to ban greyhound racing in Queensland
- [758](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4350-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 5,800 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures for urgent reform of the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme
- 25 May 2026—
- [759](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services (Hon. Nicholls), to an E-Petition (4319-25), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 5,283 petitioners, requesting the House to amend legislation to provide a full medical defence for patients who test positive for THC when taking medicinal cannabis as prescribed by their doctor
- 26 May 2026—
- [760](#) Queensland Music Festival—Financial report for the year ended 31 December 2025
- 28 May 2026—
- [761](#) Health, Environment and Innovation Committee: Report No. 25, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 3 March 2026 and 24 March 2026
- [762](#) Response from the Minister for Police and Emergency Services (Hon. Purdie), to an E-Petition (4432-26), sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 2,842 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to reclassify firearms and accessories
- 29 May 2026—
- [763](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 32, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Office of the Information Commissioner
- [764](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 33, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Queensland Family and Child Commission
- [765](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 34, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Office of the Queensland Integrity Commissioner
- [766](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 35, 58th Parliament—Oversight of the Queensland Ombudsman
- [767](#) Justice, Integrity and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 36, 58th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 11 February 2026 and 3 March 2026

#### TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

#### STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Nature Conservation Act 1992:

- [768](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) (Revocation of Barnard Island Group National Park) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 42
- [769](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) (Revocation of Barnard Island Group National Park) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 42, explanatory notes
- [770](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) (Revocation of Barnard Island Group National Park) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 42, human rights certificate

## Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995:

- [771](#) Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 43
- [772](#) Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 43, explanatory notes
- [773](#) Transport Operations (Road Use Management—Vehicle Registration) (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 43, human rights certificate

## Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation Act 2003:

- [774](#) Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation (QOTE) Notice 2026, No. 44
- [775](#) Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation (QOTE) Notice 2026, No. 44, explanatory notes
- [776](#) Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation (QOTE) Notice 2026, No. 44, human rights certificate

## Magistrates Courts Act 1921:

- [777](#) Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2026, No. 45
- [778](#) Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2026, No. 45, explanatory notes
- [779](#) Domestic and Family Violence Protection Amendment Rule 2026, No. 45, human rights certificate

## Penalties and Sentences Act 1992:

- [780](#) Penalties and Sentences (Penalty Unit Value) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 46
- [781](#) Penalties and Sentences (Penalty Unit Value) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 46, explanatory notes
- [782](#) Penalties and Sentences (Penalty Unit Value) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 46, human rights certificate

## Public Trustee Act 1978:

- [783](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 47
- [784](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 47, explanatory notes
- [785](#) Public Trustee (Interest Rate) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 47, human rights certificate

## Environmental Protection Act 1994, Nature Conservation Act 1992, Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011:

- [786](#) Environmental and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 48
- [787](#) Environmental and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 48, explanatory notes
- [788](#) Environmental and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 48, human rights certificate

## Penalties and Sentences (Sexual Offences) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025:

- [789](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 49
- [790](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 49, explanatory notes

## Criminal Code Act 1899:

- [791](#) Criminal Code (Government Agencies) Regulation 2026, No. 50
- [792](#) Criminal Code (Government Agencies) Regulation 2026, No. 50, explanatory notes
- [793](#) Criminal Code (Government Agencies) Regulation 2026, No. 50, human rights certificate

## Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991:

- [794](#) Criminal Practice Amendment Rule 2026, No. 51
- [795](#) Criminal Practice Amendment Rule 2026, No. 51, explanatory notes
- [796](#) Criminal Practice Amendment Rule 2026, No. 51, human rights certificate

## Water Act 2000:

- [797](#) Water Plan (Moreton) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2026, No. 52
- [798](#) Water Plan (Moreton) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2026, No. 52, explanatory notes
- [799](#) Water Plan (Moreton) (Postponement of Expiry) Notice 2026, No. 52, human rights certificate

## Economic Development Act 2012:

- [800](#) Economic Development (Land Activation Program (SEQ Tranche 1) Provisional PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 53
- [801](#) Economic Development (Land Activation Program (SEQ Tranche 1) Provisional PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 53, explanatory notes
- [802](#) Economic Development (Land Activation Program (SEQ Tranche 1) Provisional PDA) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 53, human rights certificate

## Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) Act 1997:

- [803](#) Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) (Stand-alone Power Systems) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 54
- [804](#) Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) (Stand-alone Power Systems) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 54, explanatory notes
- [805](#) Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) (Stand-alone Power Systems) Amendment Regulation 2026, No. 54, human rights certificate

Major Sports Facilities and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026:

- [806](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 55
- [807](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 55, explanatory notes
- [808](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 55, human rights certificate

## MOTION

### Citizen's Right of Reply



**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.47 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That this House—

1. notes report No. 45 of the Ethics Committee tabled on 14 May 2026 and the recommendation of the committee that a right of reply be incorporated into the Record of Proceedings; and
2. adopt the committee's recommendation and incorporate the right of reply into the Record of Proceedings.

---

RESPONSE BY MAYOR HELEN BLACKBURN TO STATEMENTS MADE BY THE MEMBER FOR BUNDABERG, MR TOM SMITH MP, ON 24 AND 26 MARCH 2026

On 24 March 2026 during the Adjournment debate and on 26 March 2026 during debate on the Appropriation (Parliament) (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill and Appropriation (Supplementary 2024-2025) Bill, the member for Bundaberg referred to me in a way that I was readily identifiable as the 'the mayor' and 'the mayor of Bundaberg'.

The member for Bundaberg made assertions regarding my stance on vaccinations and my understanding of flood mitigation in the Bundaberg region.

I have served my country and been vaccinated against every disease. I also support bodily autonomy. Any concerns I have raised regarding flood mitigation have been based on engineering advice, hydrological modelling and community consultation.

I do not believe that any Bundaberg residents are responsible for the impacts of flooding and I would never diminish the hardship experienced by flood-affected families.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Resources Industries




**Hon. DF CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.48 am): Under our government, Queensland is open for business. We are a resource- and mineral-rich state and many of our regional communities rely on the jobs and the skills that the industry provides. We want the industry to be strengthened with more investment and more opportunity. That is why our government is providing investment certainty through streamlining approvals and fast-tracking projects. We will be clear and quick if the answer is a yes. If the answer is a no, then it will be direct with the reasons. Our approach has already helped secure thousands of jobs, with new investment in projects right across the state.

Domestically and internationally, there is growing demand for critical minerals. Queensland is home to 51 of the world's most sought after critical minerals. That means we are well placed to capitalise on what is a generational opportunity. The government is working to provide dedicated support to advancing our critical minerals supply chain. We have also expanded Queensland's state-of-the-art critical mineral processing facility in Mackay which will help test, refine and scale up new processing technologies. A common user facility in Townsville will open later this year for prospective miners to trial production processes and produce minerals samples. Through our joint investment with the Australian government into the Mount Isa Mines copper smelter and Townsville refinery, we have prioritised regional employment, growing the economy and getting critical minerals to market quickly and reliably.

There is so much more to do. We are continuing to call on the Australian government to support a proposal to jointly fund four investment-ready critical mineral projects across the state. It follows the Export-Import Bank of the United States expressing their interest in investing in Queensland's Esmeralda graphite project. This marks the largest single financial commitment to date under the US-Australia critical minerals framework. It shows the confidence that the US has in Queensland's critical minerals projects. We want the momentum to continue.

Later today, the Deputy Premier will introduce legislation into this House to help accelerate critical minerals projects. We are ready for investors who want certainty—whether it be conditions, taxation or environmental approvals. Our government is pro investment and pro growth. We are ready to work with people who want the same.

### **Resources Industries; Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure**

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.50 am): As the Premier said, Queensland is open for business under his government. There is a real buzz in Queensland, particularly in the resource sector. We want to use every lever available to the state government to unlock the resource sector and to drive projects in Queensland—not only in the resource sector but also in ecotourism projects across the state. To do it you have to have the legislative means, ability and will, and this government does. I advise the House that today I will introduce new legislation, the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026—the first major amendment to the act in over 10 years.

On 20 October 2025, the US President and the Australian Prime Minister executed a framework to secure the supply of critical minerals. This includes a US\$1 billion investment from both countries to unlock an \$8.5 billion pipeline of critical minerals projects. Queensland is leading the nation with new laws to streamline the approvals process and powerful tools to enable the development of these important projects in the state.

The legislation I will introduce today includes new state significant notifications, modification orders and a revitalised tenure resolution process. The bill will grant powers to the government as a swift mechanism to resolve unanticipated regulatory barriers that would otherwise stall projects, allowing project-specific targeted intervention. It will also remove duplicative processes in the coordinated projects framework and the state development areas. This will streamline the delivery of common user infrastructure for critical mineral projects across the state. The modernisation of these laws will position Queensland as a nation leader when it comes to approvals, getting strategically significant projects off the ground sooner and creating thousands upon thousands of jobs for Queenslanders.


On the subject of getting things done, yesterday the Premier, the tourism minister and I turned the first sod on the Victoria Park Brisbane Stadium as construction begins on a new 63,000-seat stadium that will benefit all of Queensland. This is on top of all of the infrastructure investment for the games across regional Queensland. After 1,200 days of Labor chaos and indecision, the 2032 Delivery Plan released in March 2025 is on track. It sets out the Crisafulli government's vision for the legacy the games will deliver for all of Queensland, including regional and rural Queensland. As per the delivery plan, GIIICA have now taken ownership of Victoria Park, with construction starting on the early works from midnight on 1 June.

I say to honourable colleagues: even though Queensland was robbed of the State of Origin win, nothing will stop this Crisafulli government delivering for Queensland. Incidentally, I advise all honourable members that the *Courier-Mail* is running a petition to change the referee for the next game. I encourage all Queenslanders to sign it and to get behind the petition. Go the mighty Maroons!

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! It sounds like that one has quite a bit of support.

### **Resources Industries; Fuel Security**

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (9.54 am): Queensland is rich in resources, with world-class assets right under our feet. The Crisafulli government is delivering a stable regulatory and operating environment that is seeing investment and, importantly, confidence return to Queensland. After a decade of a Labor anti-mining and anti-gas agenda that drove investors away and put thousands of regional Queensland jobs at risk, our message is clear: we want your business and we will back companies that invest here. The message from our allied nations, in particular the US, is just as clear. They want what Queensland has to offer. We have 51 of the world's critical minerals under our feet, and moving projects from potential to production is at the top of my list of priorities. It is why the Deputy Premier is introducing legislation today to fast-track approvals for critical minerals projects. Investors cannot, and will not, wait 10 years for a project approval.

I am meeting with the US Consul-General again later today and I will be reiterating how serious Queensland is on moving these projects forward. It is not just critical minerals that we are progressing. In case anyone has forgotten, the global fuel crisis is far from over. We have no certainty of supply. We still do not know when the ships will arrive and we have no control over global supply chains. Just yesterday I had several resource companies tell me that they are now planning for potential fuel shortages until at least Christmas this year.

We are not sitting on our hands with a wish and a prayer that this will sort itself out. At the beginning of March I opened a further 18 new areas for exploration for petroleum, gas, coal and vanadium. That is 12 petroleum and gas areas totalling more than 7,000 square kilometres; four coal areas across the Bowen and Surat basins; and two vanadium areas north-east of Julia Creek containing one of the largest vanadium resources in the world. Of that area released, five areas were in the Taroom Trough, with two committed to domestic supply under an Australian market supply condition.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr LAST:** They love it, because we are getting it done.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mrs Frecklington:** Labor lies.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Nanango needs to withdraw some unparliamentary language I heard in amongst all of that.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, if you come to my attention again, you will be warned.

**Mr LAST:** There is an additional block committed to domestic supply in the Cooper Basin and another in the Bowen/Surat basin. Of the 18 blocks of land released we received 44 bids from 30 different companies. We have bids flowing in for Queensland's resources—minerals, coal, petroleum and gas. We are seeing the green shoots of returning investment confidence to Queensland after those opposite did their very best to shut down our resources industry. We know that those opposite do not support Queensland's resources industries. They do not care for the thousands of Queenslanders who work in the industry. They do not care about the regional communities that rely on mining and gas projects for their prosperity. They sure do not care about streamlining approvals and making business in Queensland easier.

The Crisafulli government is cementing our position in the global critical minerals supply chain. We are getting the settings right to encourage new projects in Queensland. We said when we came to government that we would streamline approvals and reduce red tape for resources projects. The world wants our critical minerals. They are demanding it, and we will get it done.

### Resources Industries

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.58 am): Queensland is a critical minerals hub and the world knows it. Here in the Queensland of Opportunity we are the envy of many of our trading partners, who know that we have a wealth of resources here at home and under our feet. What is more, we know how to get them out of the ground. We know how to use them. We know how to help our trading partners do it, too. To help Queensland businesses take advantage of the growing global demand for our critical minerals, the Crisafulli LNP government is streamlining approval processes to give investors the certainty they never had under the former Labor government.

There are businesses in Queensland that are already doing incredible things. Just look at Graphinex up in Townsville. Graphinex is turning raw graphite mined and processed from its Esmeralda project into battery-ready anodes. These battery anodes can be used in lithium ion batteries, positioning Queensland as a reliable supplier for global manufacturing of electric vehicles, drones and robotics.


Alongside the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, I was with Graphinex at the International Mining and Resources Conference in Sydney last year when they received their letter of interest from the Export-Import Bank of the United States for \$1.3 billion, the largest single financial commitment under the US-Australia critical minerals framework. With our government's support, we are ensuring they can achieve what they are striving for fast.

We are not just backing one business, nor one critical mineral. Through QIC's critical minerals fund, we are supporting businesses across Queensland's critical minerals supply chain. Whether that be Silica Resources Australia's silica for use in glass, solar panels and automotive industries, Vecco Group and Idemitsu Australia's vanadium electrolyte facility or Austral's copper sulphide production, we are backing Queensland's critical minerals businesses to succeed on the world stage.

Queensland is uniquely positioned to play a leading role in building technologies that enable energy transition, advanced manufacturing and defence. We are helping our local businesses take advantage of the critical minerals we have access to. Whether that be sharing them with our international partners or using them here at home, our government is backing Queenslanders to make the most of what we are blessed with. Our critical minerals are a key trading commodity and we are working with our international trading partners to get them what they need. Australia has bilateral collaborations on critical minerals with many markets, including the US, Canada, India, South Korea, Germany and the United Kingdom. With the EU free trade agreement still to come into force, Queensland's market access for critical minerals will get a significant boost—and we are positioning Queensland to take advantage.

Unlike the former Labor government, we are working with our international trading partners that are looking to invest in our resources here in Queensland, that are looking to support us, that are looking to partner with us, and we are helping them do it. We are streamlining approvals, we are removing roadblocks to investment and we are working across government to get these projects across the line, because members of this government actually like each other—we get along—and we are working together to ensure we deliver for Queensland—and it is leading to results. There are so many more opportunities to come. Those opposite did not realise it and took our international relationships for granted. They squandered opportunities for Queensland both here at home and abroad, but we are turning this around. We are delivering a better lifestyle through a stronger economy, and our critical minerals play a huge part in that. Under a Crisafulli LNP government, the world knows that we are the Queensland of Opportunity and anything is possible here.


### Energy Prices

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (10.02 am): Power prices in Queensland are set to fall. After a decade of surging power prices under the former Labor government, including an increase of 19.9 per cent in just one year alone, Queenslanders are feeling the pressure when it comes to their power bills, which is why last week's default market offer from the Australian Energy Regulator is so welcome. From next month, South-East Queensland households on the flat rate standing offer rate will see prices fall by 7.2 per cent, while those on standing offer time-of-use tariffs will see even greater reductions of 10.7 per cent. Small businesses in the south-east will see reductions between 10.4 per cent and 14 per cent. These are the largest reductions in more than a decade, and it is the biggest reduction of any default market offer jurisdiction in the country. That is in stark contrast to the near 20 per cent rise in a single year under Labor, driven by their ideological obsessions.

The AER's offer reflects the intent of the Crisafulli government's Energy Roadmap: to provide affordable, reliable and sustainable power for all Queenslanders. We are improving what we have, while we build what we need for the future. Underpinned by boosting private sector investment in new generation and storage projects and properly maintaining our existing generators, the Energy Roadmap is putting downward pressure on power prices, as we said it would. After a decade of Labor's neglect, our \$1.6 billion Electricity Maintenance Guarantee is improving the reliability of our base load coal-fired power stations. The road map's pragmatic approach, with coal for longer, more gas and boosting private sector investment into renewables, means that under the Crisafulli government's plan, Queensland households are forecast to pay \$1,035 a year less than they would have paid under Labor.

It is simple: we put economics and engineering before ideology. It shows that our balanced approach is working. It is real, structural cost-of-living relief for households and businesses. Every dollar saved on power bills matters. That is why I have written directly to every electricity retailer in the state demanding they pass on the lower costs to households and small businesses. It is only right that if the cost of power falls retailers should pass it on to customers. If they do not, retailers must answer to Queenslanders and there can be no excuses.

### Energy Prices, Small and Family Business; Small Business Month

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (10.05 am): I echo the comments of the Treasurer and congratulate him on delivering both the Crisafulli government's Energy Roadmap and an historic price drop for many small and family businesses. After a decade of decline under those opposite, small and family businesses faced price hikes over and over. In fact, power bills skyrocketed by almost 20 per cent in one year under those opposite. Now under the Crisafulli government, South-East Queensland small and family businesses will see prices decrease by up to 14 per cent from 1 July. In fact, many

small and family businesses are in line for the largest drop in prices—more than those in South Australia and New South Wales, which are also subject to the default market offer. Energy retailers are on notice: pass on savings from the Australian Energy Regulator’s final default market offer to every household and business. I also look forward to the decision by the Queensland Competition Authority in relation to regional Queensland energy prices in the near future.


This is the type of relief that small and family businesses have been crying out for. When you meet small and family businesses face to face, as all members on this side of the House do regularly, you understand firsthand the challenges they are currently facing. They tell us that federal Labor’s mishandling of the fuel crisis is having a significant impact on small and family businesses throughout the state. The size of that challenge increases the further north and west you travel in Queensland, with one tourism operator in Far North Queensland calculating an extra \$6,000 a month in fuel expenses. Then there are the multiple interest rate rises, again the result of a Labor government unable to rein in inflation. Just as Queensland’s small and family businesses are fighting those issues along comes Jim Chalmers with a great big tax on small and family businesses. The impact changes to discretionary trusts and capital gains tax will have on small and family businesses is significant. It is a broken promise to rival the Gillard Labor government’s carbon tax backflip more than 15 years ago.

The weekend past saw the conclusion of a very successful Queensland Small Business Month. There were 225 events across the state, including those supported by our Event Delivery Grants. This year also marked the launch of our inaugural Collaboration Partner Program, with 52 organisations joining with the Crisafulli government to host events that celebrate and support small businesses. For the first time we delivered three small business expos—in Cairns, on the Gold Coast and in Brisbane—with almost 1,000 small and family businesses attending. Our Mentoring for Growth program delivered 184 tailored mentoring sessions to address the specific needs of small business owners. For those unable to attend events, we expanded our digital engagement through our new Breaking Barriers video series, allowing access to resources and critical content. I was delighted to travel the state and meet the entrepreneurs in Maroochydore and the professional businesswomen in Morayfield and attend events hosted by chambers of commerce in Townsville, Toowoomba and Cairns and small businesses in Rocky, Yeppoon and right throughout Brisbane and the Moreton Bay region.

I would like to congratulate all members on this side of the chamber for getting behind Small Business Month, with a particular shout-out to the member for Pumicestone. I joined the member at the Pumicestone Business Excellence Awards, along with the Premier and almost 350 local businesspeople. It was in stark contrast to the days of Queensland Labor’s champagne-cork-popping soirees at Parliament House. I was also pleased to launch round 1 of the Regional Business Gateways program to build capability, strengthen local industries and drive regional economic development. The Capricorn Business Hub was promised and delivered by the member for Rockhampton, Donna Kirkland, and we delivered Secure Communities Partnership Program grants to small businesses across Queensland as we continue to drive down victim numbers in the wake of Labor’s youth crime crisis.

That shows the stark contrast between the Crisafulli government, which is delivering for small and family businesses, and the decade of decline they faced under those opposite. Small and family businesses know they can count on the Crisafulli government to deliver, whether it is a reduction in power prices or programs and events that support them to grow and to thrive.

### **Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure**

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (10.10 am): There is a buzz in Queensland, and there is a reason for it. Queenslanders can see a government that is delivering—a government that is doing what it said it would do, a government that is getting on with the job. Yesterday was another important milestone on Queensland’s journey to 2032 and beyond. Initial works are now underway at Victoria Park.

Queenslanders can see the difference between the Crisafulli government and those opposite. After years of uncertainty, delays and indecision, we have put the games back on track and we are taking them right across this great state. We are getting on with delivering the infrastructure and the legacy that Queenslanders deserve, because Victoria Park is about more than the Olympic and Paralympic Games. It is about creating something that Queenslanders will benefit from for generations to come: a world-class green space; a world-class stadium; a world-class events destination—a venue capable of attracting the biggest sporting events and entertainment acts in the world, a stadium worthy of Queensland’s future.

As I said, getting the games back on track was never just about Brisbane. It was always about ensuring every corner of Queensland shares in the opportunities that come from 2032. That is why Destination 2045 matters, and today marks an important milestone. One year ago we launched Destination 2045, Queensland's first 20-year tourism plan—a plan to ensure Queensland makes the most of the green and gold runway to 2032 and beyond, a plan that cements Queensland as the home of the holiday and a plan that creates jobs, attracts investment and delivers opportunities right across the state. More importantly, it is a plan backed by action. One year on, we are delivering with seven new international aviation routes. More than \$30 million has been committed to new tourism experiences, with the Ngaro Track and Thorsborne Trail delivered. Outback Queensland and Great Barrier Reef education experiences programs have been extended through to 2029. The Tourism Support Hub has been delivered and the Magic Round is locked in till 2032.

While those opposite spent a decade talking about potential, we are getting Queensland moving again because Destination 2045 is not a document sitting on a shelf; it is a plan we are delivering alongside every wonderful member of the tourism industry. It is a plan that creates new experiences, backs regional Queensland and drives visitor numbers.

As Victoria Park moves from planning into delivery and as Destination 2045 enters its second year, Queenslanders can have confidence in the future—confidence that the benefits of 2032 will reach every region, confidence that Queensland is making the most of this once-in-a-generation opportunity and confidence that this government will continue to do what we said we would do. That is how we build a legacy, that is how we deliver for Queensland and that is how we keep the buzz in this great state.

### Sunshine Coast, Rail Infrastructure



**Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.13 am): Twenty-one years ago, the then Labor government made a promise to the people of the Sunshine Coast. They promised that heavy rail would be delivered from Beerwah to Caloundra by 2015. In a 2009 media release the then transport and main roads minister said the project would be 'starting from today'. The project was never started. 2015 came and went and there was no rail line. It was another broken promise. Again, the Sunshine Coast was let down by Labor.


In contrast, the Crisafulli government is delivering for the Sunshine Coast. The Deputy Premier, the hardworking member for Caloundra and I were at Bells Creek on the weekend to announce that the Crisafulli government have awarded design and preconstruction contracts to build heavy rail for stage 1 of the Wave. The railway line that Labor promised but failed to deliver is happening now under the Crisafulli government. This 19-kilometre section of track between Beerwah and Caloundra will service new stations at Aura and Caloundra, and the station at Beerwah will be upgraded.

I take this opportunity to congratulate the Beerwah Coast Connect consortium that will be delivering the brownfield works, the CoastalTraX consortium that will be delivering the greenfield works and the signalling providers—Alstom and UGL. I would also like to acknowledge the TMR team that have been working to deliver this project alongside our funding partner, the Australian government. While this announcement is an important milestone, it is just the beginning. Planning and procurement activities are also underway for the remaining sections. Stages 2 and 3 of the Wave will deliver a high-quality public transport solution all the way to Maroochydore and the Sunshine Coast Airport—something those opposite could not even think about, let alone deliver.

We are also getting on with other projects that the previous government never completed or never started—projects such as Cross River Rail and Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail. Those projects are finally moving forward under the Crisafulli government. I can advise that major works will be occurring in coming weeks to move both of these projects forward. That will require closures on the Gold Coast and Beenleigh lines from 27 June to 19 July. I encourage everyone to plan their journey ahead of time using the Translink app, consider their transport options and allow plenty of travel time. Every effort will be made to carry out those works as planned but, due to ongoing protected industrial action by unions, there may be changes to those arrangements. Any changes will be communicated to customers with as much notice as possible.

Unlike those opposite, the Crisafulli government is delivering important rail upgrades such as the Wave, Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail and Cross River Rail. We are delivering for a growing Queensland. We are getting on with the job of delivering the generational infrastructure that Queenslanders missed out on under Labor's decade of decline.

### Termination of Pregnancy; Health System

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (10.16 am): Queenslanders have had enough of Labor's scare campaigns. Queenslanders have had enough of Labor's mistruths. Queenslanders have had enough of Labor's failed playbook to scare vulnerable people in our community. In recent days, from those opposite we have seen shameless fearmongering suggesting that the member for Traeger's misinformed and misconceived disallowance motion will change access to termination-of-pregnancy services in Queensland—shameful. This is a repeat of the same shameful campaign they waged in the lead-up to the October 2024 election when they were soundly repudiated by the people of Queensland. Let me be clear: there have been and there will be no changes to termination-of-pregnancy laws, and those opposite know it. They know it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, there is a motion to be debated later today. I caution you.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I understand. Those opposite know that the disallowance motion will make no change whatsoever to established access to termination-of-pregnancy services or medication. However, that does not stop them from stoking fear and division in our community. It is a shameful—

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw your attention to standing order 231. This is a clear anticipation of a debate that is set down on the *Notice Paper* for today. I would ask you to instruct the minister to not offend that standing order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, there is a debate later on. I encourage you to speak about other matters or conclude your statement.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Mr Speaker, I address the shameful fear campaign being run by the Labor Party as a political tactic of posting shameful social media posts, which you yourself have just spoken about and referred to. It is part of a shameful and desperate campaign from a desperate leader of the opposition and Labor acolytes who have not had a new idea—

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on anticipation. The minister has continued to deliver the same narrative in relation to the same matter, notwithstanding your clear instructions for him to cease doing that.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There are two things, Minister: once again, do not go close to that motion which is to be debated later today or matters that have been referred to the Ethics Committee this morning.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. The tactics of the Labor Party to stoke fear and division in our community are the same tactics that they used when they spoke about reducing—

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Logan, I cautioned you earlier. You are warned.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** These are the same tactics they used when they spoke about changes to the number of health workers, changes to hospitals, changes to satellite health centres—all the claims that they made during the October 2024 election campaign—

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You clearly ruled on 24 June 2025 about the content and approach to ministerial statements. It is a privilege that the minister holds to be able to make this statement. He should comply with your directions in relation to it.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, this is an opportunity to talk about issues and information under your portfolio of interest to the general public. There are plenty of other opportunities that you may wish to take to talk about other issues.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, indeed it is, and I am very happy to talk about the issues in my portfolio.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Also, Minister, we are running late, so I encourage you finish up very quickly.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will complete my ministerial statement. There have been claims made in relation to the health portfolio, for which I have responsibility, including: satellite health services would be privatised; there would be fewer health workers under an LNP government; and hospital beds would not be delivered. The now member for Stafford, the former architect of Labor's failed capacity expansion program with two failed ministers, has made claims in relation to the delivery of three new hospitals and 10 expanded hospitals.

To displace those claims and mistruths, the fact of the matter is this: there have been an extra 9,000 full-time equivalents employed in the health sector since the LNP government came to power, including 931 first-year intern doctors—the largest single intake in Queensland's history, larger than

New South Wales and larger than Victoria; CT and MRI machines being delivered across the state; the new Hospital Rescue Plan has started to be rolled out; and funding has been provided for Mater Springfield, which those opposite left unfunded with no services. Nineteen months on, they have no new policies and no new ideas and they are using the same baseless scare campaigns that saw them get eight per cent in Hinchinbrook and suffer an eight per cent swing against them in Stafford. It is no wonder the Leader of the Opposition is 'Mr Eight Per Cent'.


**Mr deBRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Clearly, the minister has strayed into content that is far outside the scope for which you have allowed for ministerial statements. I would ask you to ensure he complies with your statement.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, Deputy Premier! The period for ministerial statements has expired.

## JUSTICE, INTEGRITY AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Reports

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (10.24 am): I lay upon the table of the House two reports: the report titled the *Strategic review of the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman*, pursuant to section 85(6) of the Ombudsman Act 2001; and a report of the Office of the Information Commissioner titled *Let's get digital: a review of online proactive disclosure practices by government agencies*, pursuant to section 184(5) of the Right to Information Act 2009 Queensland. I commend these reports to the House.


*Tabled paper:* Strategic Review of the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman, May 2026 [827].

*Tabled paper:* Information Commissioner Report 3: 2025-26—Let's get digital: A review of online proactive disclosure practices by government agencies [828].

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**Mr SPEAKER:** Question time today will conclude at 11.24 am.

### Child Safety System

 **Mr MILES** (10.24 am): My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. Following recent tragic incidents related to children in Queensland, can the minister assure the House that notifications about children at severe risk of harm are not sitting unactioned in the Unify backlog?

**Ms CAMM:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question because any opportunity to shine a light on vulnerable children in this state should be taken in a positive way, particularly when it comes to notifications. I say, firstly, to my frontline staff, particularly those working in intake and assessment: thank you for the work that you do each and every day across the state, it is a very hard role.

We were the government that brought forward the scheme with regard to reportable conduct. We have also brought through our blue card reform. I am looking forward to standing alongside the Attorney-General and having more to say on the failures of the child safety system with the wrapping up of the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry as well. I place on the record my thanks to Paul Anastassiou KC, the Commissioner, for his very considered approach and diligent work. He certainly went far and wide and also interviewed many across the child safety department.

I acknowledge the tragedy that we saw reported in the media last week. I know the Premier made comment—and I share those comments—and offered his condolences to the family, friends and neighbours of the little person who suffered a shocking death.

Sadly, child safety is often brought into the spotlight on the back of horrific circumstances. It is often that my department is blamed on the back of horrific circumstances. However, it is the responsibility of all members of the community and all members of this House to treat such matters with great respect—respect for the Child Protection Act, respect for the justice system and respect also for the police investigations that are underway. As I never have, and as those opposite never have, I will not speak in specifics of particular cases. There will be a number of findings, I am sure, but I will let the police do the important work that they must do. We have a process to go through, whether that be through the coroner or the Child Death Review Board.

What I will say to those opposite is that we have undertaken significant work in the child safety system and particularly in the reform agenda, and we have done that work alongside the commission of inquiry. I certainly look forward to the release of the report of the commission of inquiry later this week.

*(Time expired)*

### Child Safety System

**Mr MILES:** My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. In February, the outgoing PeakCare CEO stated—

We should be (in a better place), but we're not, and that's incredibly disappointing for all of the ambition and plans that were made to see how far backwards the system has gone.

It is now June. Is the minister more focused on her reported integrity matters than protecting vulnerable children from harm?

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question is seeking an opinion. Under the standing orders, I would submit to you also that there are a number of other elements which mean it should be ruled out of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There was an imputation in the question. I will get you to ask that question again with no imputation.

**Mr MILES:** My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. The outgoing PeakCare CEO said in February—

We should be (in a better place), but we're not, and that's incredibly disappointing for all of the ambition and plans that were made to see how far backwards the system has gone.

It is now June. Can the minister assure the House that she is focused on protecting vulnerable children from harm?

**Ms CANN:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question, and I can confirm that I have a laser-like focus when it comes to protecting children from harm. Unlike the revolving door of child safety ministers under the previous premier's leadership, the Crisafulli government has made a commitment to both my department and the sector, including PeakCare. I certainly welcome the appointment of the new CEO of PeakCare. She is not only an incredible leader across early childhood but also a foster carer. Her experience has given her incredible insight into the child safety system and other carers, particularly how foster carers were treated for a decade under those opposite.

I can assure the Leader of the Opposition—the second leader to be held in contempt of this parliament—that I stand firm in my integrity and in my commitment to vulnerable children, foster carers, kinship carers and my department. What we have observed, what foster and kinship carers have observed—I recently attended the QFCC's youth summit and listened to the lived experiences of children who, by their own admission, feel that they were failed by the former government. They feel that they were failed not only because they did not have a minister sit long enough in the chair to actually care but also because the government of the day did not back them—did not back the department, did not back the minister. That was uncovered in the commission of inquiry.

I welcome the questions so that we can share with Queenslanders that we will not give up on children. We will fix the broken child safety system. I assure my frontline staff that they have my support in ensuring they have the resources and the policy settings. As a government, we will fix the broken system. We are on track to deliver our government election commitments. We will release the findings of the commission of inquiry. I look forward to being asked lots of questions after we release those reports about how we will fix all of the broken elements of the child safety system that we inherited.

### Resources Industries

**Mr HEAD:** My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. How is the Crisafulli LNP government delivering easier pathways to extract critical minerals in Queensland, and is the Premier aware of any alternatives during a decade of decline?

**Mr CRISAFULLI:** I thank the honourable member for Callide for his question and note his keen interest and long-term pedigree in the industry. I remember that during the Callide by-election, when I got to know the now member for Callide, we spoke at length about his time as a geologist and about his great interest. I remember that time very well. I also remember that in that by-election there was a

swing of about six per cent away from the government of the day, which is about what you would expect after about 18 months. I remember it, and I have to say that the member for Callide's interest in the industry remains.

Queensland is open for business. I want people, wherever they are, to understand that there is certainty and stability in everything we do—around regulation, around taxation, around approvals. When people are looking to invest, I want them to look at this great state.

The member asked about critical minerals. I do see the opportunity for critical minerals. This is the next wave of opportunity for this state. I think about what that would have meant years ago to the first people investing in the coal industry. I think about those early adopters of the tourism industry. This is an opportunity for Queensland. We are in the box seat to grab it. I have to acknowledge the work of both the Prime Minister and the President in signing the MOU. It is a great play, but only Queensland is in a position to benefit from that for a number of reasons. Firstly, we have 51 of the critical minerals that the globe needs. In an era of great instability, there is no doubt that the US is looking to trusted partners like Australia and we are in the box seat to grab that.

I want to talk about four projects, and I used my address at the National Press Club to talk about them. The four projects show that we are ready to go. The processing facility in Mackay will research the opportunities to use what comes out of the tailings. The common user facility in Townsville will allow us to take things to the next level to make sure we can put more through the port. There was a lot of talk before, but now we are getting on and doing something. There is action on this side. In the Far North, in Cairns, there is the opportunity with the tungsten mine. It is a great opportunity. I acknowledge all of the members of the Far North. Finally, there is the Mount Isa to Townsville railway line. If we can expand its capacity, not only will it be great for our coal industry and provide stability but it will also open up opportunities. When people are looking to invest, it could be the difference that gets us over the line.

There is a wealth of opportunity in the north-west. We have to grab it. What the Deputy Premier plans to do today in this House is set up our planning framework. We are in the box seat. Queensland is open for business.

### **Domestic and Family Violence**

**Ms McMILLAN:** My question is to the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. During Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month, the minister distributed just one media release on the government portal and did a single press conference with the gallery. Can the minister assure the House that she is focused on her duty to protect vulnerable Queenslanders?

**Ms CAMM:** I thank the shadow minister, who I believe—

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I take the interjection. I am not too sure if the shadow minister did media. I do take my role very seriously. While those opposite are worried about how many media releases are going out, who is on the front page of the paper, clickbait and the social media content they are pushing out to scare women at the moment, we are focused on meeting with stakeholders. I am focused on visiting the frontline services.

Our government is focused on fixing the mess that was left by those opposite. We are focused on delivering. I was so pleased to stand with the Premier to highlight the incredible work that DVConnect have done in reforming their call answer rate. I know that those opposite are worried about what is on the socials, what is in the paper and who is going to be the next leader of the opposition—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I might have hit a nerve there.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms CAMM:** I wish the Minister for Housing had said that earlier because I would take that interjection.

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** Thank you. I take that interjection. The shadow treasurer is going for contempt to be eligible to be the next leader of the opposition. While they are playing games over there, we are busy getting to work. I was pleased to be in Ipswich to open a Hope Hub, which is part of our election commitment and also part of our new reform strategy which is focused on recovery as a long-term effort for the prevention of domestic and family violence.

The increase in DVConnect's performance across our state has been exceptional. If we reflect upon estimates and previous years when I sat opposite in the shadow minister's role, there was always a discussion that the sector needs more money. I was so pleased to hear reflections from Amie Carrington from Ipswich and Joanne Jessop from DVConnect on the way in which they are focused on delivering service performance and delivering for their community and for their stakeholders. To take call answer rates from 42 per cent when we came to office—a shameful indictment on those opposite—to 84 per cent now, my record as the minister will stand on its own. Those opposite can continue to talk down and scaremonger women in this state, but we will not.

*(Time expired)*

### Resources Industries

**Mr DILLON:** My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. What leadership is the Crisafulli LNP government showing to make it easier to develop more mining opportunities for critical minerals in Queensland, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any contrasting leadership approaches?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the honourable member for Gregory for the question. If the member hangs out in the chamber just after question time, he will see exactly what his government is doing in the critical minerals space, not only what we are doing in the critical minerals space but also how we are using every lever of state government available to unlock the resources sector, the agricultural sector, the primary industries sector and the ecotourism sector—all levers the state can pull to ensure we are creating generational jobs in this state. I thank the member because his area is going to play a vital part with the new laws we are going to introduce today.

Mr Speaker, you cannot talk about critical minerals without saying that the only thing more critical than critical minerals is the critical condition of the Leader of the Opposition's position in the state. His position as Leader of the Opposition is on life support. I can say that and I am not even the health minister! Mr Speaker, you do not need to ask me that; you just have to ask his own colleagues. If we have a look at what some of his colleagues have said to the media recently—without giving a name but they are quoted as being an MP—one Labor MP said, 'We can't keep going with that (30 per cent vote), that's bad. Certain people have to come to that realisation.' Another MP said, 'We're in a dire situation under Miles's leadership.' That was an MP.

**Mr Healy** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Cairns!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** The best is from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Speaker, I really want them to hear it. The best is from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr Healy** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The member for Cairns is warned.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** After the Stretton by-election, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition came into parliament and gave a lecture about results of by-elections. He said—

It was a complete failure. It was a total debacle. Not only did the Leader of the Opposition steer the LNP to a loss in the Stretton by-election; the loss was so bad that it set a new record—the worst swing achieved under any opposition leader in a government-held seat in Queensland recorded in over two decades.

There is a new record set for a leader of the opposition receiving the worst by-election result in over half a century—and that is the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Murrumba. His words have come back to bite. I remember him standing in here, exuding his arrogance at the time. His words have come back to bite. They had a 30 per cent primary vote. The Leader of the Opposition has taken a dead red seat to the fourth most marginal seat in this state—1.3 per cent—a total failure of the opposition leader. Just ask his own colleagues!

*(Time expired)*

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will have silence in the chamber.

## Domestic and Family Violence

**Ms FENTIMAN:** My question is to the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The minister said that the domestic and family violence reform strategy would be released in 2025, yet the 12-page strategy was quietly released without media release or press conference on Friday, 22 May. Was the delayed strategy released quietly so that the minister did not need to address the media about other matters?

**Ms CAMM:** It was not released quietly; it was released in a room full of 80 stakeholders who are delivering on behalf of our government.

**Ms Fentiman** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Waterford, you have had a fair go this morning. You are warned. Minister, you have the call.

**Ms CAMM:** Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month was a very busy month. I had the pleasure of traveling to Bundaberg and announcing an extension of a partnership with the Local Government Association of Queensland. I know that the CEO, Alison Smith, very much welcomed that. I travelled to Mackay, my home town, with the member for Mackay and we marched on the streets with about 1,500 students—they were all around the age of the students who are in the gallery—in purple shirts, calling on the community to show respect. It was inspiring. Domestic and family violence is a whole-of-community issue and it is going to take a whole-of-community response. That is different from those opposite.

**Mrs Gerber:** They were focused on headlines.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection. The focus of those opposite is a matter for them, but we have a different style because we are getting on and delivering. We opened a new Hope Hub and we have another one coming forward at Kawana. I am looking forward to meeting with the Deputy Premier around opening our third Hope Hub here in Queensland.

The phase 1 reset of our domestic and family violence strategy, as I expressed to the stakeholders in the room—and they came from far and wide. We had CTC from the Kingaroy region, and I will be catching up with them next weekend. We had representation from Far North Queensland and from all across the state. One thing that I know is particularly hard for the member for Waterford to understand is that, as I have expressed to the specialised sector, domestic and family violence will take a whole-of-community response. They are an important part, but they are just one part of the community. We need to engage others and we are doing that. The police minister and I are also working on further reforms such as the EM pilots in North Queensland. We will continue to reform—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Stop the clock for a second. There is way too much chatter. If you want to have a conversation, take it outside. One person has the call, and that is the minister.

**Ms CAMM:** I want to share with the member some comments by the former implementation supervisor Cathy Taylor, who I believe former minister D'Ath appointed. She stated—

At this point in the reform program, it is critical that a whole-of-system perspective is adopted, to improve coordination of policies and implementation actions in pursuit of overarching system objectives ... a shift to systems stewardship is needed.

I am committed to stewarding a system but I represent one part and so do the stakeholders we fund. We need the whole community to come on the journey so we can end domestic and family violence.

## Resources Industries

**Mr WATTS:** My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development. How is the Crisafulli LNP government showing leadership in securing a strong critical minerals future, and is the minister aware of any examples of where strong leadership has not been shown?

**Mr LAST:** I thank the member for the question because leadership matters. Leadership decisions are important because they attract investment, they secure confidence and, more importantly, they secure jobs for Queenslanders. Contrast the leadership on this side of the House with those opposite, particularly when it comes to critical minerals in this state. We have talked about that at length this morning and how important critical minerals are for this state going forward. We were not content to just sit on our laurels when we came into government. We got out there and we started to sell the message to rebuild that confidence. The Fraser Institute survey about investment reflects that. We have gone from position 29 under those opposite to position 13 under our watch in 12 months.

The message that we are open for business and we are backing our resources sector is resonating. We recognise that every missed opportunity is costing Queensland. We recognise that these critical minerals are not just rocks in the ground; they are the building blocks of manufacturing and they are about underpinning sovereign capability in this state. We are getting worldwide interest in our critical mineral space at the moment. Have a look at what resulted from the trade mission I led to the US last year: graphene and steel; EZ Resources' tungsten mine at Mount Carbine; and RZ Resources down here at Pinkenba. The level of interest is continuing. I addressed an AmCham event last week and the topic was 'Taroom Trough, bigger than Texas?' Who would have thought that the Taroom Trough and Texas would be in the same sentence, but there it is. We are capitalising on that because the oil that is out there in the Taroom Trough—drilling is going on as we speak—is going to help secure sovereign capability in this state.

Let's have a look at what those opposite are doing in this state. There was an eight per cent swing at the Stafford by-election. The only reason they got across the line was that they cosied up to their Greens mates for preferences. We now know that they are on a collision course, because the member for Waterford is having secret meetings with the coal companies. How is that going with the Leader of the Opposition and the deputy leader? They are doing deals with the Greens. They are on a collision course. We know that the member for Waterford is doing the numbers and there are rumblings over there. Here it comes! We are watching this space with much interest because we know that a leadership coup is on.

*(Time expired)*

### **Domestic and Family Violence**

**Ms ASIF:** My question is to Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The police union has said that the government's new police protection directions are too restrictive and cannot be used in the majority of incidents. Has the minister failed to advocate for better protections for domestic and family violence victims?

**Mr Purdie:** How novel—working together.

**Ms CAMM:** I can hear my honourable colleague the police minister, with whom I enjoy working very closely.

**Ms Mullen** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** What I would say to the member opposite—

**A government member:** Ten years.

**Ms CAMM:** I take the interjection. Under those opposite we saw victim numbers increase. We saw domestic and family violence increase. We saw police not given the resources to combat domestic and family violence.

**Mrs Frecklington:** Police were leaving in droves.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection from the Attorney-General. Police were leaving in droves, they were burnt out and they were not being supported by those opposite. When we first got into office we took a different approach. I know it is very hard for those opposite to understand. Because of the factional wars that go on, Labor ministers do not work together, but on this side of the House the first thing the police minister and I did was convene a round table with frontline police and representatives from all over the state. The other thing those opposite do not like is that we have so many police officers who have served our great state at different levels and in different parts of the state who understand what it is like to enter a house in the middle of the night with a victim of domestic violence and a perpetrator and who understand what resources and referrals they need. In relation to police protection directions, at first we were not sure whether those opposite supported them or not.

**Mrs Frecklington:** They voted against it.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection. They voted against them, yet here they are asking questions in the House as to whether or not we are going to continue them or if they go far enough. We are continuing to work on further reforms to the domestic violence act. The feedback we have heard from victim-survivors is how appreciative they are of the experience they have when police have the power to put protection in place immediately. Under those opposite we saw the decline of DVConnect. A victim could not even get the phone answered, let alone police having the tools they need.

We welcome the advocacy of the police union. We engage with the police union. I also welcome the advocacy of Women's Legal Service, a specialised service, and victim-survivors themselves. We will continue with our reforms and bring in new laws to hold perpetrators accountable. We will continue

to fund frontline services to support our police and improve the system for victim-survivors and ensure that persons using violence will be held accountable every day of the week. We on this side of the House want to see a reduction in victim numbers. We know it will take time because of the mess those opposite left—

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I take the interjection—7.2 per cent already. We have more work to do, and we will work closely with frontline police to make sure they have the tools they need to deliver.

*(Time expired)*

### **Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure**

**Mrs YOUNG:** My question is to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations—

**Ms Pease** interjected.

**Ms McMillan** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Just hold on, member for Redlands. Member for Lytton and member for Mansfield, you are both warned. Member for Redlands, start your question again, please.

**Mrs YOUNG:** My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the Deputy Premier update the House on the progress the Crisafulli LNP government has made in delivering generational games infrastructure ahead of 2032, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches during a decade of decline?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the member for Redlands for the question. The first thing I would say is that we are delivering not only for South-East Queensland but all across regional and rural Queensland. The members for Redlands, Capalaba and Oodgeroo are getting the Redland Whitewater Centre, which I am pleased to advise the federal government has said is not a notifiable project and does not need EPBC approval. The federal government is on board with us and we are getting on with the job.

As I said, the Premier, the tourism minister and I turned the first sod on the new 63,000-seat stadium. If only we knew the Labor Party's position! The member for Cooper put up a Facebook post opposing the Brisbane Stadium again. It is not even in her electorate, but in the last 48 hours she has written a big post about opposing Brisbane Stadium, so we still do not know where the Labor Party is at in terms of the delivery of the Olympic and Paralympic Games.

The reason they have different positions is that they do not have a leader who can keep the team unified. If you want to talk about Labor Party MPs and the failings of the opposition leader, one quote I did not mention before—I will now; I will get back to it—was in the *Courier-Mail*. It said that backbench MPs were also not satisfied with the Leader of the Opposition's performance, telling the *Courier-Mail*, 'Parliament, opposition ... it's the worst workplace. I absolutely hate it.' I wonder who it is. It can only be one: the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I can imagine him every night trundling up to his room, 'Oh, I hate opposition!' The Labor Party has a born-to-rule mentality. That is why they cannot do opposition and that is why they have spectacularly failed in the Stafford by-election. The Labor Party under Steven Miles lost 10 per cent of their vote in Stafford. The Labor Party vote went down 10 per cent. That ain't a win; that's bad leadership.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I am not sure which side most of the noise was coming from, but the Deputy Premier is the only one who has the call.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Talking about infrastructure, let's look at the National Aquatic Centre. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition did a disgraceful video yesterday. He said that the National Aquatic Centre is a vanity project for the Premier and Deputy Premier. I would say to the deputy opposition leader—he is laughing: say that to a young girl or young boy who aspires to be the next Olympian or Paralympian swimmer. I would say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition: say that to Susie O'Neill, Hayley Lewis, Ariarne Titmus, Cam McEvoy, Kieran Perkins or Paralympians Alexa Leary and Lucky Patterson. I dare you to go out there and tell them this is a vanity project for their swimmers.

We are extending the CFMEU commission of inquiry until the end of December to hold the Labor Party accountable.

## Domestic and Family Violence

**Ms BOYD:** My question is to the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. There have been only 12 domestic and family violence offenders fitted with ankle monitors, despite the minister stating in 2025, last year, 'The first 150 GPS trackers for high-risk perpetrators will be issued later this year.' Can the minister assure Queenslanders that she is focused on protecting domestic and family violence victims?

**Ms CAMM:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I find it ironic that the member for Pine Rivers is asking a question around protecting victims, particularly holding perpetrators to account, when in her region that she shares with the member for Murrumba they could not even fund a high-risk team under their government. The domestic and family violence service out there, CADA, continually advocated for funding around high-risk perpetrators because under that government and under that member the number of high-risk perpetrators in her region was quite significant. That is why the electronic monitoring trial is being carried out in the member's electorate and region.

I welcome the opportunity to speak about our government's election commitment. The fact is that those opposite are talking about an electronic monitoring trial that they never brought in. If you were a perpetrator of domestic and family violence under that government, there were no consequences for actions.

**Ms Boyd** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! The member is being perfectly relevant. Member for Pine Rivers, you are warned.

**Ms CAMM:** We can talk about the percentage of success with the trial. I will continue to strengthen the legislation and provide the police and corrections staff with the tools they need to ensure the success of that election commitment.

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection from the victim support minister. We will continue to come into this House because we do not just make announcements and then not deliver anything. That was the record of those opposite. Those opposite weakened laws, including the youth justice laws, each year that resulted in greater victim numbers in this state. We will continue to strengthen laws in Queensland and provide the resources that we need.

**Ms Farmer** interjected.

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

**Ms CAMM:** When we talk about a pilot, we will assess and reform, and we will do whatever it takes to deliver safety in our communities. I have heard firsthand from frontline police and our services with regard to what they think is working and what needs to be improved. I thank the opposition for the focus on domestic violence and child safety because they are very important portfolios. Unlike the factional war that is underway over there and the leadership challenge that we know is coming, we will continue to deliver.

*(Time expired)*

## Health Services

**Mrs KIRKLAND:** My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government showing leadership in delivering health services where Queenslanders need them, and is the minister aware of any approaches where a lack of leadership has led to poor outcomes?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** What a great question from a great member for Rockhampton—a member who in 2024 had a very large swing to her in that traditionally Labor seat. She has gone on to fight for improved services in Rockhampton, including reducing the worst ambulance ramping rate in regional Queensland under those opposite, from 56.1 per cent down to 38.5 per cent as at March 2026, as well as the investment in an expanded emergency department, a new fast-track centre, a fracture clinic and a step-up step-down mental health facility—all in only 19 months. That is what a hardworking, good local member with a good government focused on delivering for Queenslanders can deliver. That is what we are doing.

We are fixing up Labor's mistakes during that decade of decline that saw patients languishing on waiting lists for elective surgery longer than they needed to, that saw ambulance ramping blowing out of control and that saw a failed capacity expansion program that the independent reviewer Sam

Sangster disclosed was undeliverable and an exercise in futility. We heard the poor old member for Miller feebly defend the project saying, 'They were planned as well as they could be at the time.' What he really should have said is: 'They were planned as well as they could be at the time by Labor.' That is the only part about it—the 'missing \$2.4 billion member for Miller': we remember that one as well.

I am also asked about the lack of leadership and whether that led to poor outcomes. I am certainly aware of some of those poor outcomes and there is no doubt that those on that side are now aware of them. They are very aware of the fact that at the halfway point of the term Labor's achievements include its worst primary vote in 70 years—and that is a pretty poor outcome for those on that side—as well as an 8.1 per cent swing against them. We know that those over there know about it because, as the Deputy Premier so graciously stole my lines from me, an article stated—

"Parliament, opposition ... it's the worst workplace," one Labor MP said. "I absolutely hate it."

I want to know which Labor MP that was. Was it the member for Cooper, who sits there with her earplugs in so she does not have to listen to her own side? Was it the member for Woodridge, whose frustrations continually play out in here? He is the one, to quote a phrase, who still holds the marshal's baton in his backpack but gets no chance to wave it around. Or was it the member for McConnel, the Old Guard still sitting there defending the CFMEU? Which one of them over there finds it a terrible place?

*(Time expired)*

### **Shark Control Program**

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Following the recent fatal shark attack and growing concerns from fishers about the explosion in shark numbers resulting in lost catches and increased safety risks, will the government introduce stronger shark control measures to protect Queenslanders who work, fish and enjoy recreational activities in our coastal waters?

**Mr PERRETT:** I thank the member for the question. We take the management of our fisheries seriously in Queensland. I acknowledge the tragic death of that gentleman in North Queensland. It certainly sent shivers across that part of Queensland, particularly the spear fishermen and women in that area. As the member knows, in last year's budget we included an increased commitment of \$88 million to the Shark Control Program in Queensland. We did that very deliberately because we put the lives of humans before anything else, and that is the main purpose of the Shark Control Program. It was done under the previous government, and I acknowledge that, but it is something we have continued and enhanced in this state.

There are ongoing challenges across the state with respect to shark management. I hear about shark numbers from recreational fishermen and commercial fishermen. Something that we did commit to as part of that Shark Control Program, as the member would be aware, is a study into shark numbers across the state. That work continues and is nearing completion, and some advice will come to me shortly about what we need to do to manage shark populations in this state. As we said in the lead-up to the last election in relation to that program, we make decisions based on science. That is why I have instructed my department to do the work so we can make those decisions based on science and not ideological views. As a result of that work, recommendations will come forward but I will not pre-empt that. I am expecting that shortly, member for Hill.

I again acknowledge the challenges that we have across the state in managing sharks. There are waters where we manage them directly, and there are also waters, particularly in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, where the federal government sets certain provisions on how we manage those sharks.

We will continue to do what we can in that space. We will continue to make representations to the federal government around some of those challenges and their success or otherwise. I assure the member that we do take these matters seriously. Again, when there is a death, when there is a shark attack like that, it is felt across the state. It is felt by the people who are close to it. We have seen that particularly with the member for Pumicestone and the tragic death there early last year and also in Central Queensland.

We do take these matters seriously. We are assessing shark populations across the state, particularly those target shark species for the Shark Control Program. I will update the House as necessary.

*(Time expired)*

## Community Safety

**Mr BAROUNIS:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. Can the minister update the House about the Crisafulli LNP government's work to make our community safer, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to keep Queenslanders safe?

**Mr PURDIE:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I know how committed the member is to ensuring that the police in Maryborough have not only the resources they need to do their job but also the laws. As the government, we made a firm commitment to the people of Queensland that we would do that. We are delivering on that commitment, whether it is Jack's Law; Daniel's Law; Adult Crime, Adult Time, which those opposite more recently opposed; the tougher drug laws; or the designated business and community precincts we announced recently, which those opposite opposed.

Alarming, it was only in March that we passed nation-leading legislation to fight anti-Semitism and keep guns out of the hands of criminals and terrorists—another bill that those opposite opposed. These new laws are keeping people safe. Under this new legislation, a new offence was introduced under section 540 of the Criminal Code that prohibits acts done in preparation for, or planning, an offence likely to cause the death or grievous bodily harm of another. The person commits the crime even if the planned offence does not occur. I can update the House that the first person in Queensland has been charged with this offence. I do not intend to go into the specifics of the case except to acknowledge the work of our police in using these laws to keep people safe.

As a government we need to be agile, we need to respond to changing threat levels and methodologies of criminals and we need to give the police the resources they need to keep people safe. The contrast between our law and order policy and that of those opposite cannot be clearer in this instance. We listened to our police. We identified that this was an emerging issue—lone actors conducting acts preparatory to a casualty event—and that there was no offence in Queensland law for police to decisively and pre-emptively take action, and I want to commend the police for doing that. Those opposite opposed those laws so that would not have been a crime. If those opposite were in government and we still listened to their way of doing things, it would not have been a crime.

I acknowledge that the member for Stafford is here in the House. He has not made his maiden speech yet, but I wonder if he is going to acknowledge in his maiden speech that he was one of the co-authors of their most recent policy document, which still, to this day, affirms Labor's policy of raising the age of criminal responsibility in this state to 14. Not only would the offence that was being used yesterday for the first time not be an offence; the person alleged to have committed the crime would not be held accountable. That is the stark contrast between those opposite and the Crisafulli government, which does give law and order resources to our police.

*(Time expired)*

## Domestic and Family Violence

**Ms PUGH:** My question is to the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The Crime and Corruption Commission chair expressed his concerns over the slow establishment of a police integrity unit, despite recent support from the police union. Has the minister advocated on behalf of domestic and family violence victims to fast-track the establishment of a police integrity unit and, if not, why not?

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to direct ministerial responsibilities. I seek your clarity in relation to the question as asked and directed to this minister and whether it should be more appropriately directed to the police minister.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will take a bit of advice on that question.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. To provide some assurances to you, I state that this question is directed to the correct minister. It is clearly outlined in her responsibilities around advocacy on behalf of domestic and family violence victims, and that is what the question pertained to.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, you would have a clear idea of what part of that question may fall under your ministerial responsibilities and what may not. I will allow you to answer it as you see fit.

**Ms CAMM:** I am happy to address advocacy on behalf of domestic and family violence victims because, as a shadow minister for four years, I heard advocacy from victims who were ignored by those opposite. In answer to the question asked by the member, those opposite had two years—

**Mrs Frecklington:** Two years.

**Ms CAMM:**—as the Attorney-General has confirmed, in regard to that. What have we done in domestic and family violence? In the last 12 months we convened a working group of victim-survivors who shared with me their lived experience.

**Mr McDonald:** They truly listened.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection from a former police officer and member for Lockyer. We truly listened to their lived experience and particularly system failures that they experienced under those opposite. It is why the police minister and I and the Attorney-General—and I know it is so terribly confusing for those opposite to think that the police minister and I sit in a room together with members from the sector and members from the police.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I hear the member for McConnel groan, but I can tell members that I have heard from frontline police and senior officials who said that never happened under the former government because it would have ended in a screaming match and ministers throwing things—

**Mr Crisafulli:** Staplers.

**Ms CAMM:**—and staplers; I take that interjection—and locking people in cupboards. That was the culture of those opposite. Why is the culture different now? It is because here on this side of the House we are committed to delivering what we said we would for Queenslanders—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Currumbin and member for McConnel, the quarrelling will cease.

**Ms CAMM:** We are delivering on our commitment. That is why we are have delivered on the design of the North Queensland hub for domestic violence, which will focus on delivering a doubling of capacity of 24/7 crisis response. It is why we will continue to deliver further reforms. It is why we funded \$2.5 million to Protea Place and \$1 million to WillowTree 37 when those opposite failed to listen to the advocacy of those members of the community, to the advocacy of victim-survivors and to the advocacy of communities that were funding services because those opposite failed to do so.

On this side of the House we are committed to listening to the advocacy of communities and listening to the advocacy of our members. Unlike those opposite, who are advocating for a change in leadership and all of the other politics going on there, we are focused on delivering outcomes—

**A government member** interjected.

**Ms CAMM:** I take that interjection from the minister. We are focused on both delivering outcomes for victim-survivors and ensuring the system is designed in the best possible way to deliver safety for people in our community. We have a number of initiatives across domestic and family violence. I will continue to work very closely with the police minister on strengthening reforms and ensuring we are there for victim-survivors.

*(Time expired)*

## Youth Crime

**Mr CHIESA:** My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. Can the minister update the House on the Crisafulli LNP government's strong action against crime and any alternative approaches that created a youth crime crisis?

**Mrs GERBER:** I thank the honourable member for Hinchinbrook for the question. He has been, and continues to be, a fierce advocate for stronger laws for his community. The Crisafulli government was elected on a promise of delivering stronger laws. We have delivered Adult Crime, Adult Time. We have delivered rehabilitation and early intervention programs. We have also seen a reduction in the number of victims of crime across our communities. I know that this past week the member for Hinchinbrook, alongside the members for Thuringowa, Mundingburra and Townsville, met with victims of crime and heard their stories. They met with a victim, Lynette, whose home was broken into and who had a knife held at her throat by alleged youth out on bail. I want to thank those members for bringing Lynette's story into this chamber, for advocating for victims of crime, for advocating for stronger bail laws and for continuing to fight for 'breach bail, go to jail'.

It is the LNP members for North Queensland and Far North Queensland who continue to give their communities a voice and continue to bring the stories of victims of crime into this House because they are fighting for stronger laws, as they should. We are a government that listens. We are a

government that is listening to those members and their strong advocacy, but what is the Labor opposition doing? The Labor opposition is not only not listening; it voted against Adult Crime, Adult Time, it wants to go back to weaker laws and it wants to stop holding youths accountable for crimes.

When a 13-year-old commits a terrorist offence, they will not be held accountable under Labor's policy. They would not be held accountable if Labor was in government because its very own policy document says it is going to raise the age of criminal responsibility, which means that a youth aged 10 to 14 who commits an offence would not be held accountable for that offence. They would not face any consequences, they would not face the law and victims would not have justice. Guess who was one of the architects of this state Labor policy? Labor's very own member for Stafford, whom the people of Stafford rejected in that one in three rejected the Labor Party. The vote went down 10 per cent. Alongside the member for Stafford, who else in this House has a mission to see the age of criminal responsibility raised? Labor's very own wannabe leader of the opposition, the member for Waterford. It is her mission. She said it in her maiden speech. We cannot trust Labor. It will go back to weak laws.

*(Time expired)*

### **Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence**

**Ms PEASE:** My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. The minister's colleague the member for Clayfield has advocated to keep the health portfolio. Has the minister advocated to keep her ministerial duties despite ongoing service failures and government integrity matters?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Hold on. I am going to get a bit of advice.

### **Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, I do not see that that question in any way comes under the portfolio of the minister and ministers come under the Premier, so I rule that question out of order.

### **Destination 2045**

**Mr HUTTON:** My question is to the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation. As Queensland marks one year since the launch of Destination 2045, can the minister advise the House how the Crisafulli LNP government is backing regional tourism, growing events and unlocking new ecotourism opportunities and how this compares to Labor's record in government?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, you have two minutes to respond.

**Mr POWELL:** I want to start by thanking the member for Keppel for his question. He is a great advocate for regional tourism in this wonderful state and commend him for his successful outcome in terms of Great Keppel Island through our first round of the Tourism Icons Investment Fund. As the member asked and as I mentioned earlier, today does mark one year for Destination 2045, and what a year it has been! What a difference a year makes, because Queensland tourism now has a government that is doing something—a government that is backing it, a government that believes in it, a government that is delivering for it, because under those opposite it did not have that. Those opposite used to stand up in front of a camera and make announcements and talk the talk, but behind all of that we now know, led by the member for Cairns and his predecessors, that they had a secret plan to rip funding away from tourism in this state. The department of tourism was going to see a 95 per cent drop in its funding and Tourism and Events Queensland a 50 per cent drop in its funding.

As we have mentioned today, we are on the cusp of something pretty special here in this state with the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. How is the tourism department and TEQ, our primary marketing body, going to market the state in the lead-up to the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games with a 95 per cent funding cut or a 50 per cent funding cut? We have taken action. We have delivered, in conjunction with the industry, a 20-year tourism plan and we have backed it up with record funding—\$1 billion over the next four years. It means we can fund projects on Great Keppel Island. It means we can back in Roddy Rees and his work in Cairns. It means we can do work in the Whitsundays and across this great state, and we will continue to do that.

*(Time expired)*

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

## MOTIONS

### Member for Stafford, First Speech



**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.25 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of the sessional orders be suspended to allow the member for Stafford to make a statement at 4 pm today not exceeding 20 minutes noting his election.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

### Business Program



**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.25 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 Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill:
    - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 8.40 pm today;
    - (ii) all stages to be completed by 9 pm today.
  - (b) The Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill:
    - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 8.15 pm on Thursday, 4 June 2026;
    - (ii) all stages to be completed by 9 pm on Thursday, 4 June 2026.
  - (c) As agreed to by the House earlier today, the member for Stafford will make a statement at 4 pm today not exceeding 20 minutes noting his election.
  - (d) General business notice of motion No. 1—Dissent from Speaker's Ruling to be called on at 7.30 pm today.
2. If all stages of the bills above 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 program sets out the proposed business of the House for government business before the Queensland parliament this week and provides certainty to all members regarding the consideration of legislation and other matters before the House. As members would be aware, the purpose of the business program is to assist the orderly and efficient conduct of proceedings in this chamber. It provides clarity to members, ministers, shadow ministers, committee members and all those who support the work of the Queensland parliament regarding the timing and sequencing of business to be considered.

This program before the House provides for the completion of two significant pieces of legislation. Firstly, following the commencement of debate during the last sitting week, the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will continue to be debated today, with the minister to be called on to reply by 8.40 pm and all stages to be completed by 9 pm. Secondly, the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill will also be considered this week, with the minister to be called on to reply by 8.15 pm on Thursday and all stages to be completed by 9 pm. These timeframes have been determined having regard to the complexity of the legislation, the anticipated level of member participation and the overall business requirements of the House during this sitting week.


It is also important to recognise that, notwithstanding the legislative business before the House this week, members will continue to have a range of opportunities to participate in parliamentary proceedings and raise matters of importance to their electorates and to Queenslanders more broadly. Throughout the sitting week, all members will have opportunities to contribute through questions without notice, matters of public interest, the consideration and debate of committee reports, private members' statements and the adjournment debates, which are held each evening. These important elements of our parliamentary business program ensure members have the opportunity to represent their communities and contribute to debate on matters of public significance.

Importantly, these arrangements ensure members will have a reasonable opportunity to contribute to the debate while also enabling the House to progress its legislative program in an orderly and structured manner. That is certainly what the people of Queensland deserve and what they want

under their state government. The business program before the House has been structured with these opportunities firmly in mind. It provides for the progression of the government's legislative agenda while continuing to preserve the many avenues in which members can actively participate in the work of this parliament.

This motion also reflects a matter that has been agreed to by the House today: at four o'clock this afternoon the member for Stafford will make a statement not exceeding 20 minutes noting his election to the Queensland parliament. The motion further provides for general business notice of motion No. 1, 'Dissent from Speaker's Ruling', to be called on at 7.30 this evening. As members would appreciate, dissent motions are serious and warrant timely consideration by the House.

At the core of this program is ensuring the House can effectively manage its workload while providing opportunities for debate and scrutiny. That is what the Crisafulli Liberal National Party government is delivering for Queensland. We know that those opposite, after a decade of decline, failed to deliver anything for Queensland. That is why the Crisafulli government is getting on with the business of delivering for Queensland.

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (11.30 am): Broadly, members on this side have no problems with the environment bill timeframes, but other members may have more to say on that. Of course, we are all very keen to hear from the member for Stafford at 4 pm. That is a great initiative we can all support. On the timeframes relating to the e-mobility bill, it is clear that the legislative mess continues. It is no surprise that the government wants to curtail both the time for debate and consideration in detail for this bill. Essentially, we will have 25 minutes for consideration in detail of amendments that have been dropped via media release this morning—on the next iteration of this government completely botching this bill from start to finish. After wasting 11 months on an inquiry which had no proposed legislation in front of it, this government dropped the e-mobility bill into parliament without any actual consultation on the bill itself. Unsurprisingly, it has been labelled a disaster by all stakeholders.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There will be an opportunity to debate the bill later on. I submit to you that the member is now straying into debating the bill, which will be debated later this week.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr McDonald): One moment. I will take some advice. Member for Aspley, if you can continue to address the issues of the procedural motion within the context of those bills.

**Mr MELLISH:** Thank you for your guidance, Deputy Speaker. Whilst there are many specific technical and policy issues with the bill, I cannot go into those at present and nor will I. This bill has been equally criticised by the community and stakeholders on many of those aspects. On the actual timeframes—the process of this bill and what has happened—there has been some of the most vehement criticism of a bill I have seen during my time in this parliament. You would think this government would have given more time to consider this bill and the specific clauses in this bill, given the very significant changes the government has dropped in the media but which still have not been circulated in the House. I have not seen them. They are not in front of me at the moment. We do not have in front of us the very significant changes the government proposes to make. No doubt the Premier will show his typical arrogance and want to plough through.

For the benefit of the House—and I will not get into the specifics of the recommendations—there are nine recommendations from the committee's report into this bill. Two of those are the usual ones about recommending the bill be passed and recommending the bill be examined, but seven of these recommendations contain serious and significant fundamental changes to the bill, and we are being given 25 minutes to examine those. The minister should hang his head in shame when it comes to how this bill has been treated in the parliament. These changes should be sent to go through a committee process. Not only is that not happening; they are likely to be rammed through in the 25 minutes proposed for consideration in detail with zero broad public consultation. We do not even know what those amendments are. I do not have them in front of me.

The Premier and the minister have absolutely bungled this bill from day one. They have not learned their lesson. They are ramming this bill through in one week of parliament with 25 minutes to consider the proposed amendments. The Premier said that this was nation-leading legislation. When they tabled the bill they sent out members of the front bench and the backbench to make videos calling it 'nation-leading'. They were so proud of it. The Premier was strutting about on breakfast TV saying he had got it spot-on, but after the messy thud this bill has made in the community they have been deathly silent. We have not heard boo about the very poor reception this bill has had—not from the backbench, not from the minister, not from the Premier and not from the front bench.

I know that the member for Lockyer has tried his best to steer this bill through its inquiry, but stakeholders are telling me that the minister is blaming the member for Lockyer. That is what they are telling me. The minister does not want to own his own bill. He is blaming the mess on his committee chair. To be fair, the member for Lockyer has worked hard to try to get some outcomes in relation to this bill but, when he has a minister and a Premier who take no responsibility for their own legislation, he is on a hiding to nothing. This 'nation-leading' legislation needs more panelbeating than a demolition derby car trying to pass a roadworthy. With the Minister for Transport behind the wheel, you had better duck for cover!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We are debating a procedural motion before the House and the member is quite clearly now debating the contents of the bill—whether one ought to support or not support the bill. I would ask that you bring him back to the procedural element of the motion.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Aspley, if you could remain relevant to the procedural motion in the context of the bills that are being debated.

**Mr MELLISH:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Over 4,000 Queenslanders made a submission to the committee inquiry into this bill and this Premier and this minister want to allow less than 30 minutes for us to examine their last-minute changes. This minister likes to bluster in this chamber. He cannot stand up to scrutiny for less than 25 minutes. You can bet your bottom dollar the transport minister—

**Mr Mickelberg** interjected.

**Mr MELLISH:** I am not taking interjections from the transport minister. You can bet your bottom dollar the transport minister is going to obfuscate and filibuster his way through those 25 minutes. How many questions will he answer?

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr MELLISH:** I am not taking interjections. I move—

A. That all words after 'as specified' in clause 1. be removed and the following inserted—

- (a) for the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill:
  - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 8.40 pm on Tuesday, 2 June 2026.
  - (ii) all stages to be completed by 9 pm.
- (b) for the Transport and Other Legislation (Managing E-Mobility Use and Protecting Our Communities) Amendment Bill:
  - (i) minister to be called on in reply by 6 pm on Thursday, 4 June 2026.
  - (ii) all stages to be completed by 9 pm.

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

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** One moment, Deputy Premier. I will just take some advice. What is your point of order? I am keen to hear the rest of the motion.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** That is my point of order. The time had expired. The member cannot move a motion when his time has expired.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, Deputy Premier. One moment. I have received clear guidance with regard to this. The member is able to move the motion up until the point that time had expired. I put the amendment that has been moved by the member for Aspley.

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

*In division—*

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr McDonald): Member for Woodridge and member for Jordan, you are warned.

**AYES, 34:**

**ALP, 33—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, 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.

**Mr SPEAKER:** The time for the debate having expired, the question is that the motion be agreed to.

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

**Mr SPEAKER:** Ring the bells for one minute.

**AYES, 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.

**NOES, 34:**


**ALP, 33**—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, J. Kelly, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahan, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

**Grn, 1**—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

## STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION (CRITICAL MINERALS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.46 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Environmental Offsets Regulation 2014, the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971, the State Development and Public Works Organisation Regulation 2020 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 Primary Industries and Resources Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 [\[829\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes [\[830\]](#).

*Tabled paper:* State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[831\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. On 20 October 2025, the United States president, Donald Trump, and Prime Minister Anthony Albanese executed a framework to secure the supply of critical minerals which includes a US\$1 billion investment from both nations to unlock a US\$8.5 billion pipeline of critical minerals projects. We have made no secret of the fact that we want the trade deal to support new job-creating critical minerals projects right here in Queensland. The nation-leading policy proposals contained in this bill will reform the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 to keep Queensland at the front of the pack when it comes to securing more job-creating investment in major projects and show the world that Queensland is open for business under the Crisafulli LNP government. It will be the first bill prepared for substantial amendment of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act in over a decade.

In the race to secure our fair share of investment to unlock job-creating critical minerals projects, this act gives Queensland a competitive advantage to take advantage of emerging opportunities and trade deals as global demand for critical minerals increases. Whilst other states and territories have taken steps to replicate Queensland's state development act and the function of a coordinator-general, nothing beats the original. Queensland's act uniquely combines facilitation, land use planning, infrastructure coordination, public works delivery and environmental assessment under one function. This bill will bring about reforms to build on that advantage, cementing Queensland under an LNP government as the No. 1 place in Australia to do business.

Let us not forget that the Labor government of the last 10 years of decline could have amended this bill and proceeded with these nation-leading reforms but chose not to. These nation-leading reforms seek to modernise and improve existing functions in the act as well as adapt new legislative tools developed in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and South Australia in a way that suits

Queensland's regulatory framework and keeps us one step ahead of the competition. Critical minerals are the immediate focus. However, these amendments will create pathways and powers applicable for any project of strategic significance to the state. The location of Queensland's critical minerals deposits will require significant planning, investment and active intervention to bring the projects to market at scale. This effort will join Queensland's proud history of resource development, which time and time again has brought the public and private sector together to deliver major economic outcomes for the state and ensure rural and regional Queensland continues to be the economic engine room of our great state.

To support this endeavour, the Crisafulli government has been making real change to improve and streamline approval processes across all sectors. However, projects are complex and unique. Designing frameworks that regulate risk whilst also being flexible enough to deal with unforeseen issues is an ongoing challenge, especially given many critical minerals resources are only being developed and processed at scale in Australia for the very first time. The state must be able to plan, prepare and respond effectively. The bill proposes new and revitalised functions to be housed in the act that will give Queensland that ability. This bill is a key component in Queensland's push for a fair share of investment in job-creating critical minerals projects. Consequently, it must become a reality quickly. The act has long been a key part of Queensland's competitive edge. It has been used to enable development of some of Queensland's most important industries, including the resources sector. The act serves as an essential instrument for the government in promoting economic development. It is important to ensure the toolkit is available for any priority sector. The ability to apply the act to other sectors ensures the state is ready to respond to and progress significant projects for emerging priority sectors now and into the future.

The bill proposes a suite of new and improved major project facilitation powers for projects of importance to the state. State strategic projects will be projects that the government designates as being of greatest significance to the state. For those projects, powerful tools will be available to enable their development, including the new state significance notice and the modification order, along with revitalised tenure resolution powers. These will allow for responsive, strategic and flexible intervention to create solutions and drive delivery of major projects.

The bill reforms the act's infrastructure and land use planning frameworks for resource development and industrial land, giving government the tools to plan and deliver critical minerals development from pit to processing to port. The bill also better integrates approval processes for resource sector development with the environmental impact assessment process for coordinated projects under the act. It makes a variety of process improvements, clarifications and modernisation changes to ensure the act is administered efficiently and effectively. Therefore, the amendments are substantial, touching on almost every operative part of the act—a scale of change not seen in over two decades. The intention is to use these new and improved powers to drive development of the resources sector, especially critical minerals. Many of the amendments are designed to overcome barriers to critical minerals development, including facilitating infrastructure to get minerals to market.

The act's functions reach across legislation and portfolios to seek coordination of outcomes. This can sometimes interfere with the business-as-usual operations of the public sector. This is intentional. The act's role is to give government the means to directly deliver the outcomes needed for Queenslanders quickly. Important protections do, however, remain in place for environmental, economic, social and cultural values. These powers respect those boundaries and work within them, providing a range of new tools that can overcome process duplication and delays for projects of significance to Queensland.

I will deal with projects of significance. A major component of these amendments is improvement of the state's mechanism for identifying and facilitating projects of state significance. The act has contained the prescribed projects framework for two decades which allows for the declaration of important projects as prescribed projects. Once declared, powers under the act can be used to facilitate the project for almost every process undertaken and decision made about it across the regulatory space.

The amendments proposed in this bill substantially amend the prescribed project framework by broadening purposes to focus on project enablement, improve existing functions like the step-in notice and establish new powers. The new powers are all part of the facilitation suite for state strategic projects. State strategic projects are those prescribed projects declared by the minister because they are critical, essential or of the highest priority to the state because they will contribute to the achievement of the government's objectives for the state or region in which they are located.

For the time that a state strategic project declaration is in effect, the act allows for the making of state significance notices and modification orders, registration of strategic infrastructure easements and acquisitions of land. Changes to land and tenure management through strategic infrastructure easements and acquisitions will allow Queensland to resolve land availability and infrastructure co-location challenges, including for the private sector.

I will now deal with the state significance notice. The state significance notice will allow the minister who administers the act to require decision-makers to consider the purposes of the prescribed projects part of the act. State significance notices will also allow the minister to state additional project-specific matters a decision-maker must consider. The notice retains the decision-maker's autonomy whilst ensuring the state's interests are considered and weighed up as a priority. Decision-makers will include ministers, state agencies, councils, port authorities and others. They will be required to consult with the minister when considering their decision.

I will deal with the modification order element of the bill. Modification orders allow for the modification of the way that a piece of legislation applies to a state strategic project. The modification order will give the government a swift mechanism to resolve unanticipated regulatory barriers that would otherwise delay or stall a project of greatest importance to the state. It is intended to address situations where existing legislation produces an unintended outcome or does not contemplate new technologies or project types such as emerging critical mineral projects.

The modification order is explicitly intended to align Queensland with Western Australia and the Northern Territory, where similar powers were introduced in 2025. This ensures Queensland remains competitive as an investment destination for priority projects and does not operate at a regulatory disadvantage compared to other resource-rich jurisdictions.

Project delay is one of the great costs incurred in project approvals, often more damaging to a project's feasibility than compliance or assessment costs. By allowing targeted modification of how legislation applies to a specific project, the modification order helps preserve the project viability and time to market, especially where market windows are narrow. Rather than requiring amendments to the entire development or approvals framework, the modification order allows project-specific targeted intervention. This enables issues to be addressed without time-consuming legislative amendments or individual projects that might be unnecessary for other projects.

We do not take these new powers lightly. They are necessary tools in our toolkit to secure and facilitate major new job-creating projects, but they also come with accountability and transparency. Checks and balances are a key factor for this new power. A modification order will not be able to take a decision away from a minister, the Governor or Governor in Council. To make an order, the act's minister must be satisfied that the order is necessary to enable the project by removing duplication or modifying a process that does not appropriately provide for the project. An order cannot be made if it would result in significant detrimental effects on the environment which, under the state development act, includes economic, social and cultural dimensions as well as ecological ones.

The purpose and objects of the relevant act must also be considered. It is not—I repeat, it is not—the intention that orders are made that are at cross-purposes with the modified act. The restriction on orders have been designed to avoid outcomes that the modified act expressly seeks to prevent. Importantly, an order will not result in mining in a national park or carrying out greenhouse gas storage activities in the Great Artesian Basin because acts regulating those places clearly prohibit them. I can already foreshadow and foresee where the Labor opposition will go with this. They will say what this bill is not. I want this repeated on the record, to displace the impending myth from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition when he looks at this bill. I repeat for the House, in no uncertain terms: an order will not result in mining in a national park or carrying out greenhouse gas storage activities in the Great Artesian Basin because acts regulating those places clearly prohibit that.

I am glad the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the shadow minister for state development, is in the House to hear that today because when he does what we expect him to do with the Greens in Queensland, we will be able to point back to this moment in time and say he is wrong, he is misleading and he is spreading misinformation like we have seen from the Labor Party on so many occasions.

**Mr DICK:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is an introductory speech for a bill. That is most disorderly. I also take personal offence at that and ask for the member for Kawana to withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Deputy Premier, you have been asked to withdraw. Would you withdraw, please?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** To the other point of order, I have been listening carefully to your introductory speech and I give you the call to continue.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Introductory speeches of legislation are used by courts to interpret laws. Introductory speeches are used by departments to interpret laws when they have a decision to make, so it is very important that we get the facts on the table at the outset of the introduction of these laws. The fact that the deputy leader, the shadow minister, has already taken objection shows where his mindset is already at and that is why—

**Mr DICK:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is false, misleading and personally offensive as a consequence.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What is your point of order? Is it personal offence?

**Mr DICK:** Yes, because it is false and deliberately misleading about me and my intention. It is highly personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw. I look forward to the Labor shadow minister for state development backing and supporting this bill.

**Ms Grace:** Just get on with it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the shadow minister for industrial relations. ‘Just get on with it,’ she says. That is what this bill does. This bill does that! If you want to talk about resource projects, critical mineral projects, a decade of decline under the Labor Party, I wish the shadow minister had taken her own advice she is now giving me, and I wish the Labor Party had ‘just got on with’ this sort of thing when they had a decade to do it. They did not! We know the shadow minister was more interested in protecting the CFMEU than getting on with resource projects and critical mineral projects in this state.

**Ms GRACE:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is nothing to do with the bill before the House. I take personal offence and I ask that it be withdrawn.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, the member for McConnel has taken personal offence. Would you withdraw, please?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I withdraw, Mr Deputy Speaker. This is a benefit of this legislation: one of the restrictions we have had on these projects being developed has been the influence of the CFMEU over the years, and that is why it is vitally important to keep bringing these matters to light. That is why it is so important the CFMEU royal commission continue its good work. We have agreed to extend it to December 2027 because projects, infrastructure and resources have not been able to proceed in Queensland as efficiently and speedily as possible because of the bad influence of the CFMEU, protected by a bad Labor government for 10 years. I would offer a piece of advice for the shadow minister for industrial relations—

**Ms Grace:** I don’t need it.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. She says she does not need it, but I think she does. If I were her, I would not be interjecting when I talk about the CFMEU. I would just sit there and not interject because she is in no position to interject.

**Mr DICK:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. None of this is relevant to this legislation. This legislation does not amend the industrial relations bill. It is most irrelevant to the bill. I bring him—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members! Member for Woodridge, could you start your point of order again, please, because I could not hear amongst all the interjections.

**Mr DICK:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The contribution by the member for Kawana is entirely disorderly because it is irrelevant to the bill. This bill does not—

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

**Mr DICK:** It does not amend the industrial relations bill.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Relevance, thank you. Thank you, member for Woodridge, for your point of order. I have been listening carefully to the member for Kawana and Deputy Premier’s contribution, which is the introductory speech to a bill. When the Deputy Premier is responding to some interjections and giving context to the bill, he is being relevant to the introductory speech. I would ask him, though, to be mindful that it is an introductory speech and the nature of that address to the House.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. For the benefit of the House, I said at the outset of the introduction of this bill that this is more than critical minerals; this is projects of such state significance that the government says it is of state significance so that it will include infrastructure projects. For the deputy leader—or I might say the member for Woodridge if he wants to go on seats—the member for Woodridge, I do know what is in the bill because it is my bill, it is this government's bill and we are introducing it. It does apply to infrastructure, it could apply to infrastructure and I think infrastructure delays because of previous matters with the CFMEU is pretty relevant. I am not going to be silenced by the Labor Party on the CFMEU. I am not going to be silenced on infrastructure blowouts under the former Labor government of 10 years during which he was the treasurer. I am not going to be silenced despite his best efforts. I am going to continue to fight for workplace health and safety officers as I will and have done for many years.

If it applies to infrastructure, critical minerals or resources, these modification orders will be made as subordinate legislation. The requirement to table the regulation will ensure parliament can scrutinise the order. It will require a regulatory impact assessment, be subject to certification with regard to human rights and be designed to avoid or minimise impacts on environmental, social, economic and cultural values.

The modification order cannot remove the need for key approvals such as environmental authorities, resource tenures, development permits, cultural heritage management plans or landowner's consent. Nor can it affect federal processes, interfere with the cultural rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples or modify liability for taxes and royalties. This ensures the power is facilitative, not deregulatory in a way that undermines core safeguards.

As far as the land acquisition elements of the bill are concerned, the State Development Act provides a head of power for compulsory acquisition of land by the Coordinator-General. For the past decade, that power has included acquisition for private projects via the private infrastructure facility mechanism. This mechanism will no longer be in place. Instead, these amendments seek to redeploy acquisition functions to state strategic projects. These amendments would allow a proponent for a state strategic project to make an application to the Coordinator-General to consider whether a compulsory acquisition of land for the project should be undertaken.

This power is not intended to be a proponent's first and best option. This is an option of last resort where good-faith negotiations have been unsuccessful. Evidence that those negotiations have failed is required before such a path will seriously be considered. The Coordinator-General will engage with the landowner to verify the status of negotiations, and the proponent must have the capability to undertake the project in a timely way. The power may only be used if the Coordinator-General and the minister are both satisfied that it is in the state's interest that the acquisition be undertaken to facilitate the project's delivery. The proponent is required to make a final unconditional offer once the Coordinator-General has endorsed the application. If that offer is not accepted, a recommendation can be made to the Governor in Council to declare the state strategic project to be a purpose for acquisition of land by the Coordinator-General.

Such a regulation must be tabled in the House and is subject to parliament's scrutiny, and only with the legislative authority can the Coordinator-General undertake that acquisition. The taking of the land follows the well understood process under the Acquisition of Land Act which ensures the landholder is given due process, has a right to object and be heard, and is properly compensated for the acquisition.

Removal of the private infrastructure facility framework from the act also means that previous land entry facilitation powers have been reallocated. Now, proponents of prescribed projects will be able to apply for land access authorities where negotiations have been unsuccessful. Proponents of state strategic projects will be able to carry out temporary enabling works under an authority subject to Governor in Council approval. Safeguards from the discontinued investigator's authority mechanisms have been retained, including requirements for the Coordinator-General to consult with the landholder, and obligations on authority holders to identify entrants, and rectify or compensation damage or loss incurred in carrying out any authorised activities.

Another area of focus in these nation-leading amendments is coordinated projects. These are major projects that undergo a comprehensive environmental impact assessment process facilitated by the Coordinator-General. These assessments are wide in scope but do not result in approvals by themselves. To streamline the subsequent process of obtaining approvals, the amendments improve integration with the Regional Planning Interests Act and Transport Infrastructure Act. For transport, the Coordinator-General will be able to set out conditions to apply to a proponent's approval to work on, encroach on, access and temporarily control access to state controlled roads or to interfere with railways. This will provide up-front certainty about conditions following the impact assessment process.

For a regional interest development application, proponents will benefit from additional streamlining, acknowledging the work undertaken in the coordinated project process. Proponents will no longer have to prepare duplicative reports or undertake public consultation about the same issues consulted on in the environmental impact assessment. Applications can effectively move directly to the decision stage, relying on the Coordinator-General's evaluation and conditions stated for the approval.

In terms of infrastructure coordination plans, development of the state's resources takes more than tenure and regulatory approvals. It requires infrastructure, workers and investment in our resource communities. Above all, it requires coordination. The bill reforms the disused prescribed development mechanism for deployment in the modern era. Now known as an infrastructure coordination plan, it will provide a mechanism for cooperative planning of infrastructure that enables significant resources development. Amendments will allow the government to direct investigation and planning of infrastructure required to enable and support resource projects to be delivered by government agencies, councils, government owned corporations and the private sector through an infrastructure coordination plan. A plan will identify the relevant project or collection of projects, set out the infrastructure requirements for the development and coordinate its delivery. The infrastructure can be enabling or common-user infrastructure needed for the projects themselves and also include development-supporting trunk and social infrastructure for resource communities to meet demands driven by development.

To expedite delivery, planning approvals for the infrastructure coordination plan's function will be referred to the Coordinator-General, and where it is in the interests of the state the minister may decide the application. Infrastructure coordination plans, where deployed, would holistically plan for infrastructure that is normally scoped on by a project-by-project basis, sequentially, by proponents. Greater efficiencies, reduced impacts, higher productivity and lower costs arise from cooperation and coordination, which this framework can provide. The development of an infrastructure coordination plan would be a collaborative effort across government, GOCs and councils, facilitated by the Coordinator-General. However, the minister for the act will ultimately be responsible for recommending its approval to Governor in Council by regulation—another important accountability and transparency measure.

The amendments to state development area provisions in the act will strengthen application, approval and compliance processes in SDAs and bring them in line with other jurisdictions, including the Planning Act 2016. In particular, the ability to standardise development assessment processes for SDAs will provide clarity and certainty to industry. Provisions will also clarify matters such as how an SDA approval may be conditioned when it lapses. The status of applications and approvals where an SDA development scheme is approved or removed from effect will also be clarified. Strengthened enforcement provisions will ensure where a development offence is suspected or is occurring the Coordinator-General can quickly and effectively investigate and remedy the situation. A robust compliance and enforcement system is a critical safeguard for the community's interests.

The bill also introduces the ability to selectively regulate development that occurs beyond the boundary of an SDA. This provision is intended to cater for projects that are necessary for the SDA or may otherwise require multiple approvals from other jurisdictions. This is intended as a reserve tool that will provide clarity to all stakeholders as to how these major projects are assessed. The SDA changes in the bill will ensure these areas continue to be sought-after locations for private sector investment and cater for major industry and infrastructure activities. The changes will provide clarity to the regulation of the movement and key downstream refining and processing facilities that add value to Queensland's critical minerals supply chain.

Other amendments clarify that the Coordinator-General can recover costs for assessments and other functions performed for proponents on a voluntary contractual basis. It is intended that recovery extend to the contributions of other agencies towards the relevant task—for example, coordinated project evaluations—only where there is no fee paid or where an alternative to the prescribed fee regime is sought by a proponent. Correctional and mechanical changes give proper effect to provisions and ensure clarity of use and effect for officers, proponents and community. These address longstanding operational issues to support the efficacy of the larger reforms of the bill.

These important reforms ensure Queensland is able to take the opportunities now open to us, building on our strengths as a stable, dependable, highly skilled and resource-rich state. They ensure export industries with huge potential to benefit all Queenslanders are not buried under red tape. They ensure Queensland will not miss its chance to be recognised as a serious global business hub for critical minerals and other significant industries. The total economic demonstrated resource value of Queensland's major minerals is estimated by Geoscience Australia to be \$1 trillion, with approximately \$700 billion concentrated within the highly prospective North West Minerals Province.

Commercial mining projects will get off the ground quicker in Queensland, the supply chain will be bolstered and industry will grow, particularly in the north. The Crisafulli government is delivering a fresh start for Queensland businesses with the launch of the QueensLand of Opportunity—a bold new global brand to position the state as Australia’s gateway to investment, trade, study and work.

Securing a better future for Queensland requires bold action. It requires innovation in legislation and processes. It requires looking beyond ‘how things have always been done’. These amendments give government that ability. These nation-leading reforms are just another way we are showing the world that, under the Crisafulli government, Queensland is once again open for business, open for job-creating investment projects and supporting our rural and regional communities and economies.

In introducing these nation-leading reforms, and as the father of a mineworker, I acknowledge and pay tribute to all in the region—the fly-in fly-out mineworkers and the permanent mineworkers based in rural and regional Queensland—who work tirelessly every day to drive our state’s resources sector. These are the men and women at the literal coalface of Queensland’s biggest industry who put themselves on the line in high-risk working conditions each and every day for the benefit of all Queenslanders. I commend the bill to the House.

### First Reading

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (12.16 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 Primary Industries and Resources Committee


**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from 14 May (see p. 1513), on motion of Mr Powell—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (12.17 pm), continuing: I would like to reiterate what I said in the last sitting week: this bill is about recognising that environmental stewardship and economic opportunity are not mutually exclusive. They go hand in hand. The Crisafulli government stands for smaller government, cutting red tape and getting out of the way of people wanting to have a go. This bill not only delivers on that but also ensures there are strong environmental protections. It recognises that environmental stewardship and economic opportunity go hand in hand. It frees Queensland’s tourism operators—some of our biggest and loudest champions for Queensland’s natural environment—from the burden of multiple applications, duplicated fees and inconsistent processes. This bill introduces a single, integrated one-stop shop permit system. It removes duplication, aligns expiry dates and simplifies the processes.


For too long we have seen a system that, frankly, locked up Queensland’s natural assets and threw away the key. Over a decade, only three ecotourism projects were approved—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mrs YOUNG:** That is the legacy of those opposite interjecting right now—interjections which are not being taken. Just three were approved in a decade. At a time when global demand for nature-based tourism was growing, Queensland was falling behind. This bill turns that around. It provides certainty, it encourages investment and it supports innovation, and it does so while maintaining the environmental safeguards that Queenslanders expect and deserve.

The truth is that people do not come to Queensland despite our environment; they come because of it. They come for our beaches. They come for our wildlife. They come for the unique landscapes that cannot be found anywhere else in the world. If we want to continue to share those experiences—if we want to support regional economies like the Redlands—we need a system that enables responsible access, not one that stifles it. This bill delivers that system. It is practical, it is balanced and it is forward-looking.

For the Redlands, it means more opportunities to showcase what we already know—that our region is not waiting to become an ecotourism destination; it is already one. With the right framework in place, we can ensure growth is sustainable, community driven and environmentally responsible. I commend this bill to the House and I commend the government for delivering on this commitment to support both our environment and our economy.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (12.20 pm): I rise to address the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. I will start my contribution by speaking to the backdrop. The 2024 Queensland State of the Environment Report made some pretty damning findings. First, the remnant vegetation in 12 out of 13 bioregions is under increasing pressure due to land clearing and fragmentation. Second, between 2019 and 2024, 48 additional fauna species and 66 additional flora species became threatened. The Statewide Landcover and Trees Study for 2022-23 was only published in July last year, but it confirmed that 0.35 per cent of all Queensland's woody vegetation was cleared in just 12 months. That is an area that is equivalent in size to the ACT, and nearly 44 per cent of all of that clearing occurred in Great Barrier Reef catchments, which has major downstream impacts on the reef.

Queenslanders have very good reason for concern not just because of that backdrop but because of the LNP's track record on the environment. This is a government that will happily destroy culturally significant inner-city green space at Barrambin, Victoria Park, for a stadium—no less for a stadium that the Premier explicitly promised they would not build. Equally they are prepared to decimate our chances of achieving net zero by 2050, undermining renewable energy projects and continuing to subsidise coal-fired power beyond 2050.

We have seen this environment minister's work before. He has been reinstalled in the role after the three years he had as environment minister under Campbell Newman when he disbanded and sacked all of the workers in the Office of Climate Change. None of us will forget his comments when he told us he was still to be convinced of the degree to which humans are influencing climate change. This is a Minister for the Environment and a Minister for Science who treats science as an article of faith—so, yes, I am concerned about the legislative program he is bringing forward and I am concerned about the consequences of this bill.

The bill makes a suite of changes that chip away at community participation rights and regulatory power as well as handing over greater power to corporations to self-regulate. It is difficult to cover all of the detail in this bill in the time available, but I want to focus many of my comments on this by pivoting to code managed environmentally relevant activities. Currently, Mr Deputy Speaker, as I am sure you and all members know, an environmental authority is required for all environmentally relevant activities, or ERAs. That is a good thing because it means each operation is considered in its specific context and the department has eyes on what is going on across regions to assess cumulative impacts. Under this bill, proponents will no longer require an EA, an environmental authority, for code managed ERAs. This is a fundamental and deeply problematic change.

The department indicated in the committee hearings that this will likely involve small-scale resource extraction but we do not yet know which ERAs will be code managed. There were also clear indications from the department before the committee that ERAs themselves could be redefined so that some activities may no longer be covered by the regime at all. There are no real limits on what can be transitioned to code management. The minister must be satisfied that the risk of environmental harm is known and can be effectively prevented, minimised, rehabilitated or remediated by requiring compliance with the code. That does not even require that the harm is known to be minimal. In theory, it allows code management even for activities with major environmental impacts provided that a code can describe how impacts should or could be remediated or rehabilitated. What happens if that does not occur?

What is the problem with code management more fundamentally? In essence, it means that no assessment of the impacts is undertaken at all. The department steps back. It is entirely for the industry to self-regulate, plus there is no requirement under the bill for proponents to even register that they are undertaking code managed ERAs. If these activities are not registered, that is an extraordinary barrier

to compliance and enforcement activities. I have long been on the record saying that it is a major issue that registers themselves are not always publicly available, but here the LNP does not even want its own department to know what is going on across the state.

As for small-scale mining activities, there is another boon for small-scale mining operators in this bill. Under the bill, they will no longer have to put up a surety and existing sureties held by the department will be refunded, believe it or not. A surety in this context means money that is paid by operators to the state to protect against any failure to rehabilitate. In effect, it is like the bond you pay when you move into a rental property. Why on earth should miners be exempt from this? Are we simply pretending that there is no real risk that they will not rehabilitate or remediate their land? Is the minister and this government simply accepting that Queenslanders need to foot the bill for any uncostered remediation works or that we are just going to let it go—that we are just going to let them damage the environment and that will be it?

What else is there? I am going to have to fire through these changes. The bill removes community consultation on terms of reference for environmental impact statements. This is an important opportunity for communities to ensure a proponent's environmental assessment addresses values that are important to the community, and in 100 per cent of cases terms of reference are changed in response to public consultation.

The bill claims to remove so-called duplication in assessments. In reality, what it does is just move environmental assessments for some projects outside of the Environmental Protection Act—that is the act the primary purpose of which is the protection of the environment. Instead, it will see more assessments done under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act—that is an act the primary purpose of which is to facilitate and fast-track development, with minimal environmental protection and oversight. That shift itself is truly emblematic of the LNP's priorities.

On the assessment and auditing of progressive rehabilitation and closure plans, PRCPs, Queensland's PRCP requirements were introduced in 2019. That is over six years ago, but so far of 206 mines required to produce a PRCP, as at June 2025, 144 of those do not yet have an approved PRCP. Instead of strengthening laws to address this poor performance, the bill just further chips away at existing protections.

Existing mining proponents are supposed to be transitioning to progressive rehab and closure plans, with assessments based on best practice contemporary environmental management. The point is that, after raking in profits from the destruction of Queensland's environment, legacy mines should at least be required to rehabilitate to a contemporary standard. Under the bill, the department would now be asked to consider the historical context of operations and could waive through plans based on out-of-date standards.


The bill removes public interest evaluation when proposing to leave non-use management areas as part of a PRCP. This is essentially policy speak for pit voids. That is science speak for really big holes in the ground that continue to drain groundwater forever. This bill removes the requirement to provide a public interest evaluation, prepared by an appropriately qualified person, when proposing to leave one of these giant holes in the ground.

The effect is that decision makers will have to consider the public interest without the benefit of an actual assessment. I will say that again. Decision-makers will assess the public interest without an actual assessment of impact. It is absurd. The bill also removes mandatory three-year rehabilitation audits, which will be replaced with audits when the department feels like it, and proponents will be entitled to challenge the frequency of those audits if they think it is too burdensome. It is just laughable.

What else do we have on this veritable shopping list of environmental protection erosions? The department will now give proponents six months to pay up for residual risks with the possibility of an extension for a further six months if they do not feel like paying it then. What a double standard. If you have an unpaid SPER debt you get just 14 days notice before your licence is suspended, but they will get six months with a potential further six months. There are new single integrated permissions for tourism activities in different protected areas which will not invoke the same assessment criteria that currently apply, extended reporting periods for underground water impact reports from three years to five years and extended duration of permits for activities in protected areas to 15 years.

My time is nearly gone, but it is honestly nuts how much this bill does in terms of how regressive it is in so many different areas of environmental protection. Frankly, what else should we expect from a wildlife-hating, climate-denying LNP government that is intent on taking us backwards—

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr VORSTER** (Burleigh—LNP) (12.30 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise in this House as a fierce defender of the environment. Those of us on this side undertake that responsibility individually and collectively because it is in the name of our side of politics. You see, Mr Deputy Speaker, as conservatives we believe in conserving things not only for the enjoyment of current generations but also to nurture them, to look after them and to nourish them to ensure future generations have the opportunity to walk through our national parks and reserves and take in the breathtaking beauty of Queensland. That is not solely because it is the right thing to do by the environment—our shared communal backyard, as it were—but also because through our environment Queensland enjoys significant economic dividends.

The tension, the member for Maiwar would say, is that you cannot have economic dividends while also enjoying environmental dividends. He somehow believes there is a zero-sum game afoot. The only zero-sum game will be the number of Greens MPs in this chamber in the long term because people will look through the rhetoric of the Greens political party and see that, while they talk up environmental aspirations and environmental policies, they continue to deliver zero.

Those on our side of politics know that, in order to look after the environment, environmental departments and volunteers need to be properly resourced, and the only way to resource those volunteers and hardworking departmental staff of the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service is through a strong economy. More than just having a strong economy, we need to unlock economic opportunities in these natural areas. I cannot help but be reminded of a quote attributed to Sir David Attenborough, someone I look up to immensely and always have as a city councillor who defended our environment. He said—

No one will protect what they don't care about; and no one will care about what they have never experienced.

The tragedy of the approach prosecuted by the Greens political party and Labor opposition is that they would have us lock up these areas to deprive young people, visitors and locals of the opportunity to enjoy these spaces, to imbue their majesty, to understand the incredible cultural and community asset we have on our doorstep. They would deny us the ability to value what we have in our backyards, to undermine the political will to do something about it.

We are not waiting. On this side we have a government that is not only delivering for Queensland; we are delivering for Queensland's environment by unlocking these places to new opportunities, to build the capacity of volunteers to look after these spaces and to encourage responsible visitation to drive the investment that we need to look after them even more. In my own electorate of Burleigh, the Minister for the Environment delivered a \$630,000 election commitment to supercharge the work of environmental volunteers in Burleigh Head National Park, Burleigh Knoll Conservation Park, Tallebudgera Creek Conservation Park and David Fleay Wildlife Park, bringing volunteers into these spaces to nourish them, look after them and deal with a decade of decline under Labor's watch where there was no proper resourcing whatsoever.

Having made the commitment, what struck me during the recent election campaign is that Labor failed to make any commitment whatsoever. I wondered whether they were simply disinterested in the Labor electorate, but then I reflected on their record in office. I remember being a councillor in division 11 and meeting a resident in Parnell Boulevard, or it may have been Fairlight Avenue. As an independent councillor walking those streets, I had an ambulance officer come up to me and say, 'Hermann, what happened to our koala research facility?' As a city councillor I wondered, because I had never really heard about this koala research facility, so I did my research. A quick google search revealed that then minister Kate Jones—and I think the member for Gaven was involved in that media release—announced \$2.7 million for a koala research facility on the Gold Coast.


I hear those interjecting 'what is the relevance?' I am responding to an interjection by the member for Cooper earlier questioning our view on koalas. What I discovered when I did my research was that the former Labor government took \$2.7 million that was earmarked for world-leading koala research on the Gold Coast and reappropriated it for a roller-coaster at a theme park. While those opposite bleat about the plight of koalas, when they had something to do with it they snatched the money from the koalas and walked it into a theme park and built a roller-coaster. What about the emotional roller-coaster of the koala ambassadors who were counting on Labor to keep their promises? We know they cannot keep their promises. When they walk in here and talk about the environment, their track record and their aspiration, it means absolutely nothing.

Together with the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Currumbin, when I did my research into the diabolical proposal to build a quarry in the middle of a koala area I discovered it was a Labor government that marked a key resource area over koala habitat. Their plan was to take koala

habitat and turn it into an open-cut mine. I put all this on the record because those opposite will post on social media, they will hold media conferences, they will issue media releases and they will clothe themselves in the Greens political party uniform just for bucks. They will clothe themselves in green robes, but the environmental emperor has been exposed. They are wearing no clothes at all because they deliver nothing for our community, nothing for our environment.

I turn my attention to the bill. I want to thank the minister for crafting a series of reforms in this omnibus bill that will unlock environmental opportunity in our natural areas. This bill will ensure more Queenslanders, more visitors and more volunteers have an opportunity to explore these natural areas so they can appreciate them, become ambassadors for them and, together with the Crisafulli LNP government, roll up their sleeves and get to work. In my community, that approach is already paying dividends. I want to thank environmental volunteers like Gary Scott, Patrick, Regina Kidd and Andy. There are just too many to name, but I thank them because their work is being supercharged through the approach of this government. It is not just the money; it is the care and attention.

I recently had the opportunity to welcome the Minister for the Environment to these areas and he got to see firsthand the work of these volunteers. He saw that the quiet desperation in their eyes was slowly starting to fade after successive governments had failed to back them in by wrapping them up with red tape and green tape and making it diabolically difficult for them to do the thing they are most passionate about—that is, to look after our natural environment. This bill unlocks opportunity and it unlocks areas. It streamlines things and gives more people the opportunity to discover the green behind the gold on the Gold Coast. It ensures we have a swift take-off on that runway to 2032.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (12.40 pm): I think we just heard another audition for the front bench. I also wonder about the relevance.

I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill was presented to the House as a measured, sensible reform—a bill that will ‘improve administrative efficiency’ and ensure Queensland’s environmental framework remains ‘contemporary, effective and responsive’. Those words seem reasonable and they sound responsible, but when we examine the detail and move beyond the language of ‘efficiency’ and ‘streamlining’, we find a series of changes that weaken oversight, reduce independent scrutiny and narrow opportunities for public participation. This is not simply about red tape; this is about environmental safeguards that exist for a reason.

Queensland’s environment is not an administrative inconvenience; it is the foundation of our economy, our tourist industry, our agriculture, our water security and our way of life. Let us begin with one of the most significant reforms in the bill: the introduction of code managed environmentally relevant activities, or code ERAs. Under the current system, environmentally relevant activities require an environmental authority. That process allows for site-specific assessment and tailored conditions. It ensures scrutiny and it provides transparency. This bill replaces that, in many cases, with a code-based system for so-called ‘lower risk’ activities. We are told these activities are low risk because their impacts are well-known and manageable, but who decides what is low risk? It is the minister, by regulation.

Stakeholders raised concerns about the lack of clear criteria defining lower risk activities. They warned about cumulative impacts—in that many small-scale activities, each deemed low risk in isolation, can together produce significant environmental harm. Local governments expressed concern about how compliance would be monitored and who would bear the cost of enforcement. Environmental organisations warned that heavy reliance on self-assessment by proponents reduces transparency and shifts responsibility away from the regulator. Yet the government presses ahead. This is proof that, under the Crisafulli LNP government, Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures.

This transfers environmental risk from proponents to communities. We then turn to small-scale mining activities. This bill removes surety requirements for small-scale mining and transitions them into the code managed framework. Surety exists for one clear reason: to ensure, if rehabilitation is not completed, the cost does not fall on taxpayers. Stakeholders raised concerns that removing financial security could leave landholders and the broader community exposed if an operator fails to meet its rehabilitation obligations. We are told that the general environmental duty will provide sufficient protection. If the general environmental duty does not hold funds in trust for rehabilitation, it does not guarantee financial capacity.

Queensland has seen the consequences of inadequate rehabilitation in the past. We introduced progressive rehabilitation closure plans to strengthen accountability and reduce long-term environmental liabilities, yet this bill weakens aspects of that framework as well. The current system

requires an independent public interest evaluation where a non-use management area is proposed. That independent process ensures decisions about land that cannot be fully rehabilitated are made transparently and in the public interest. This bill removes that independent evaluation and replaces it with public interest considerations to be addressed within the application itself. That is not the same thing. An independent evaluation provides objectivity, it provides confidence and it provides distance from both the proponent and the regulator. Removing that safeguard diminishes transparency at precisely the moment it matters most—that is, when land may be permanently altered.

The bill also removes mandatory three-yearly rehabilitation audits and replaces them with discretionary audits initiated by the department. Mandatory audits provide certainty and routine oversight, and they ensure rehabilitation progress is examined at regular intervals. Under this bill, audits occur when the department decides they are necessary. Accountability should not be discretionary. Regular, independent auditing of rehabilitation progress is not red tape; it is responsible governance.


We must also consider the changes to the environmental impact statement process. Under the current framework, draft terms of reference for an environmental impact statement are publicly notified. This allows affected communities, local governments, First Nations groups and stakeholders to identify issues that must be examined before the assessment framework is finalised. This bill removes the requirement for public notification of draft terms of reference. The government argues that consultation on the draft environmental impact statement itself is sufficient, but stakeholders warned that early consultation ensures the right issues are included from the beginning. If we narrow consultation at the front end, we risk narrowing the scope of scrutiny throughout the entire process. Environmental impact statements are used for the largest, most complex and potentially most harmful projects. Those projects deserve robust public input, not a reduced process.

This bill also extends the reporting timeframe for underground water impact reports from three years to five years. Stakeholders expressed concern that this change could delay detection of impacts on water bores, particularly in sensitive groundwater systems. Water security is critical to regional Queensland. It underpins agriculture, communities and ecosystems. Extending reporting cycles in groundwater monitoring may reduce administrative burden, but it also increases the window in which impacts may go undetected.

We must ask ourselves: are we streamlining responsibility or are we incrementally eroding precaution? Throughout the committee's report a consistent theme emerges. Stakeholders supported efficiency but only where it did not dilute environmental protection or reduce public participation, and that is the key issue. Environmental regulation is not simply about process. It is about trust; it is about confidence that decisions are made transparently, independently and with proper scrutiny.

The bill increases reliance on subordinate legislation and it expands ministerial discretion. It shifts certain decisions from independent evaluation to internal consideration. Each individual amendment may appear modest, but taken together they alter the balance of Queensland's environmental framework. They tilt the balance towards administrative convenience away from independent oversight.

Queenslanders expect development to occur. They understand the importance of industry, mining, tourism and infrastructure. They also expect strong environmental safeguards. They expect that rehabilitation will be real, not theoretical. They expect that groundwater impacts will be monitored regularly. They expect that large projects will be subject to comprehensive and transparent assessment. They expect that public interest decisions will be independently scrutinised. This bill does not strike the right balance.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (12.50 pm): I rise today to speak on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a bill that sits at the intersection of two critical responsibilities of government: protecting our government and ensuring our regulatory systems are effective, efficient and fit for purpose.

This bill is part of a broader implementation of environmental law reform in Queensland and nationally. At the state level we are streamlining and modernising. The bill will cut red tape and modernise our environmental laws, especially by simplifying approvals for low-risk activities, while updating how environmental impacts are regulated. Federally, we see major reforms in the EPBC Act, introducing more standards, new agencies, new reforms and more red tape. These federal reforms are under review by the Queensland Productivity Commission and I encourage everyone who has issues with the impacts of the 2025 environmental protection reforms on Queensland to have their say. That includes people locally who continue to act for reform and continue to advocate for changes that were made under the previous government. We continue to work through those because we need science-based approaches. I would love for the members who talk about groundwater and water

security to come and work with us in the regions who live and breathe this every day. I assure them that we have full faith in our minister. He has been a long-term advocate for the environment; previously he was the environment minister and he continues to be. I can assure honourable members that he is no easy pushover regarding these reforms. These are well thought out, well researched and well canvassed. I can say that the consultation that has happened locally has been well received.

Let me begin by stating clearly that environmental protection is not optional; it is fundamental. The health of our land, water, air and biosecurity underpins not only our economy but our way of life and the legacy we leave for future generations. Any reform in this place must, therefore, be approached with care, balance and a firm commitment to maintaining strong environmental standards. This bill seeks to improve how environmental regulation is administered, making processes more streamlined, reducing duplication and providing greater clarity for stakeholders. These are worthwhile goals. Inefficient systems can create unnecessarily delays, increase costs and undermine confidence for our communities and businesses alike. When approvals are slow and inconsistent, it is not only the proponents who are affected but also the public, who expect timely and transparent decision-making. All of us in this place would have examples where we have seen proponents in our region trying to conduct enterprise, trying to get things done, only for it to be tied up for years and years in environmental approval processes. It does not make any sense and it should not happen.

Why does this bill matter? For business and industry it allows for faster approvals for low-risk activities, lower compliance costs and more predictable regulatory pathways. However, efficiency must never come at the expense of integrity. Streamlining should not mean weakening oversight. Simplification should not result in reduced scrutiny, and faster processes must not compromise the scientific rigour or community consultation that are essential to sound environmental decision-making. The true test in this bill lies in whether it treats both objectives simultaneously—and of course it does—improving administrative effectiveness and efficiency while maintaining and strengthening environmental protections. These are positive elements in this legislation. Measures that clarify processes, reduce unnecessary duplication between agencies and modernise administrative frameworks can help to deliver more predictable and transparent outcomes. These reforms can benefit everyone involved—government, industry and the community.

At the same time, it is essential that safeguards remain robust. Environmental decisions often have long-term and sometimes irreversible consequences. Once ecosystems are damaged, they are not easily restored. That is why strong assessment processes, independent oversight and meaningful public engagement must remain central to any regulatory framework. We must also ensure that regional communities and local stakeholders continue to have a genuine voice. Streamlined processes should not become processes that are less accessible or less accountable.

Everyone in my electorate would know about Middle Island. This special part of the world is a place of history and natural beauty. I want to give a shout-out to Neil Mergard and the team at 1770 LARC! Tours, who run regular day trips allowing people to experience its magic firsthand. A special shout-out goes to Stuart Buchanan, who recently retired as the Bustard Head Lighthouse keeper. His extraordinary commitment and enduring legacy will be told in the great story of the lives of sisters Bertha and Elsie Bowton. Some know them as the 'hermit sisters of Middle Creek' whose isolated life on this island is part of local folklore. It was a pleasure to attend a farewell for Stuart and to listen to some of his stories—great history, great legacy.

This island has a long history. As we move toward a new chapter, the Middle Island conservation group are currently preparing to restore the island to its original state from before the Bowton sisters and before habitation. The aim in this bill is to improve administrative efficiencies to ensure regulatory frameworks within Queensland's environmental legislation remain contemporary, effective and responsive. Unfortunately, the journey to remove the structures on the island has been anything but straightforward. The Middle Island conservation group has been caught in years of red tape and bureaucracy. While they remain committed to complying, the regulatory burden has been significant and it is clear that greater clarity and practical guidance are needed. This example shows how the bill can improve administrative efficiency, making environmental legislation more contemporary, effective and responsive while continuing to uphold strong protections of our natural and cultural heritage.

With the couple of minutes I have remaining, I will acknowledge the department and the minister's office in facilitating and navigating a way forward for these proponents, who clearly have the Middle Island area at heart but, more importantly, are compliant and fully committed to making sure the island is what it should be. It took the LNP Crisafulli government to navigate a pathway forward, find the ways we can get on to Middle Island and do the work that needs to happen there.

Good environmental policy is not about choosing between protection and development; it is about managing both responsibly. It is about ensuring that economic activity proceeds in a way that is sustainable, is evidence-based and aligns with the broader public interest. The bill presents an opportunity to improve how we do things but also demands vigilance. As legislators, our role is not only to pass laws effectively but also to ensure they will endure, they will protect what matters and they will serve our community fairly.

As I get to the end of the time allotted to me, I acknowledge that the intent of this bill is to create a more efficient regulatory system. However, I emphasise that efficiency must always be paired with accountability, transparency and strong environmental safeguards. If we get the balance right, we can deliver a system that works better for everyone while preserving the natural environment that sustains us. As I have a couple of minutes remaining I will go off script and again give a shout-out to the work that has happened locally in the Burnett electorate—

**Mr McDonald:** A beautiful environment.

**Mr BENNETT:**—and the Bundaberg area. I take that interjection. It is a great place. I also point out that there are plenty of hotels but members should make sure they book early because we need them to come visit.

**Mr McDonald:** Lots of turtles.

**Mr BENNETT:** Yes, the ‘member for turtles’ has been a hard legacy to maintain over a long period in this House, but somehow we have managed to maintain that. On that great segue, I can say that we have just finished one of the major projects of the 2045 tourism strategy of environmental outcomes for the Mon Repos visitors centre. A new car park is now providing the opportunity for people to visit that centre. Mon Repos receives 30,000 visitors a year and we thank the minister for the work that has happened there.

**Ms Grace:** A great Labor project.

**Mr BENNETT:** It is a great government project looking after turtles and ensuring the local member is a true advocate for turtles. I acknowledge that a former minister for the environment, Steve Dickson, was the true instigator of the Mon Repos reforms throughout all of the construction activities. We are incredibly proud of our volunteers, our rangers and the environmental outcomes that are happening from that great institution. More importantly, locally it has been great to see the resurgence in volunteers wanting to monitor the coast all the way from Agnes Water through the Woongarra coast right through to Mon Repos. This bill gives them the accountable frameworks to operate in and the confidence that the government has their backs, but most importantly it offers protection for those most iconic nesting sea turtles that roam that area.


I want to give a shout-out: if people are looking for a holiday destination, come to the Burnett coast and Coral Cove. I commend this bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bennett, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

## MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

### Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): This Premier made a lot of big, sweeping promises. He said his word would be worth something, that when he said something he would mean it and he said his ministers would be held accountable, but right now, nearly halfway into this term, it is clear none of those things were true. He said he would build the hospitals Queensland needs but then used a supposedly independent review to stall hospital projects right across the state, including 93 beds at the Prince Charles Hospital and the Queensland Cancer Centre was cruelly pushed into the never-never by this LNP government. He promised no new stadiums but this week they held another photo-op for an almost \$4 billion project that does not even have a business case—a project the independent delivery authority reportedly said would probably blow out, just like the aquatic centre that nobody recommended which has already doubled in cost because, by the Deputy Premier’s own admission, architects get carried away. This is an Olympics program crippled by an Olympic-sized scandal as the Olympics minister is stood aside amid an integrity scandal for who knows how long.

The member for Everton eventually stood aside because he could not provide enough evidence to convince the AEC that he ever lived at the place he said was his home. This Premier also promised to fix the child safety system, but the child safety minister is so distracted by that same integrity scandal

she cannot even do the one thing that ministers in this government love to do. Members of this government are so fond of photo-ops that it is all they seem to do, but the child safety minister cannot even hold a photo-op. She cannot even have a photo-op. The entire Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Month the minister essentially spent in hiding. She is hiding so hard she could not even stand up publicly to launch the prevention strategy she was six months late delivering. Quietly uploaded to the internet, it was a 12-page so-called strategy without so much as a media release.

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I draw to your attention the misleading aspects of that statement by the Leader of the Opposition given what was said in question time and I ask you to consider that matter.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Leader of the House, you know that for—

**Ms Boyd** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Pine Rivers, you are warned under the standing orders. Leader of the House, you know that there is a procedure for making complaints about matters of privilege. I would urge you to use that rather than making points of order that are not points of order.

**Mr MILES:** It was a strategy stakeholders waited and waited for but, as they told us, they were very disappointed in. When child safety officers tell us they are in crisis because of this minister's Unify IT failure, the minister is in hiding—a failure so great that child safety officers have labelled it 'the single most dangerous and impactful change' they had seen in decades of practice. Another said, 'Child safety equals *Titanic*. Unify equals iceberg.' These reviews are not just concerning; they are scathing of the system that child safety officers use to keep kids safe, and this morning the minister failed to give a clearance on whether any notifications about children requiring protection are sitting unactioned in the Unify backlog. Children could be at risk of harm.

So with one minister benched and another minister in hiding, it is little wonder that LNP backbenchers have started to whisper about which other ministers they do not think are performing. Media reports say that LNP members are agitating for at least three other ministers to be moved on: the education minister, who promised to improve NAPLAN results and then said they do not actually matter; the Minister for Women, who cannot be up-front about whether she supports a woman's right to choose; and the trade minister, who has spent more time on overseas junkets than she was in this parliament. That is knives out for no less than five ministers—more than a quarter of the cabinet—and the contenders are lining up.

The member for Moggill can barely contain his excitement that he might finally get the ministerial job he thought he had after the election. The member for Chatsworth was jumping out of his skin to be promoted from the back of the ministerial benches to almost the back of the ministerial benches. The member for Glass House tried his best to show that he could do the Olympics job he is acting in, although his ministerial statement did not convince anyone that there was a buzz in Queensland right now. We know the member for Gregory is auditioning but that he would actually prefer to take the member for Warrego's job—there is no love lost there—and so too are the member for Redlands and the member for Oodgeroo. In fact, the member for Oodgeroo is so, so desperate for her chance. She is someone who came into this place with such strong convictions—convictions she has shelved for the sake of her own ministerial ambitions. The member for Clayfield was forced to insist that he wanted to stay the health minister. I have to say he was not very convincing. This could all be considered backroom political machinations if the stakes were not so serious. With more than a quarter of the cabinet under a cloud, it is little wonder this government is failing to deliver for Queenslanders, failing to protect—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Pause the clock please. Sorry, Leader of the Opposition. Your own members are interjecting too much and I could not hear you just then. Members to my left, show some respect.

**Mr MILES:**—vulnerable children, failing to implement signature policies like PPDs and electronic monitoring, failing to build hospitals, failing patients waiting at the ramp or for a specialist appointment, failing to deliver business cases for Olympics infrastructure, failing to do anything at all to help Queenslanders struggling with the cost of living. Those backbenchers not agitating for a promotion are watching their backs in their own seats. They know One Nation is coming for them and they are worried, and they should be. Regional Queenslanders are turning to One Nation because they know this government is not listening and is not really delivering for them. The Premier might say that he is not

fazed by One Nation or by the rise of Pauline Hanson here in Queensland, but his backbenchers sure are and that will only push this ideologically driven LNP government one way—further to the right, further to the chaos and crisis that we are seeing on the LNP benches in Canberra, further into the ideologically driven decision-making that puts politics over people. The state of this government under those opposite will see Queenslanders lose each and every time. It is proof of this government's failure to deliver for Queenslanders and failure of those opposite to focus on anything but themselves and their own political self-interest.


It is this distraction that is dogging the Premier—a distraction of their own making. This Premier is all talk and no action. He has failed to live up to Queenslanders' high expectations. He has failed to make the big decisions when it counts. As the government benches buzz with excitement about who might be next in line for a promotion, the true test of leadership comes for this Premier: will he hold his failing ministers to account—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Before the Leader of the Opposition continues, I will caution the members for Townsville, Mundingburra and Cook.

**Mr MILES:** I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. She is on the list of five ministers her own backbench want to see moved on. This Premier said that he would hold ministers like the member for Whitsunday to account, and it is time for him to rip the bandaid off. Queenslanders deserve better than a government paralysed by its own integrity scandals, by its own ambitions and by its own fears of Pauline Hanson and One Nation. They deserve better than to be dragged backwards by a government, by ministers and by a Premier who fail to deliver and who fail to live up to their word.

### Labor Party, Performance

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.11 pm): We have had 10 minutes from the opposition leader and we have heard not one new policy, thought or idea—just drivel. I came into this House prepared to listen. I have seen the article written by the state political reporter at the *Courier-Mail*. It talks about the opposition leader not having any policies. The article states—

"We've got to be different from government," one Labor MP says.

**Ms Grace:** You didn't have any for 10 years!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** And we won. We are here and you are there. I quote—

"We've got to be different from the government," one Labor MP says. "It's hard to get fired two-and-a-half years out (from an election) ... but we need something."

I was desperately waiting for policies. I received this. I am not sure who it is meant to be in regard to, but I will read it out and people can work out what they want. It is called *The Numbers Game*. It reads—

Poor Steven stood before the crowd,  
Trying to sound both strong and loud,  
But every speech and every grin  
Raised whispers of what might come in.

The caucus room was calm and neat,  
With nervous glances down the seat,  
No one said much, no one spoke  
But calculators weren't a joke.

Some counted left, some counted right,  
Some checked the numbers late at night,  
While Steven talked of future plans,  
His colleagues studied voting hands.

“Full support!” the shadow ministers cried,  
 Then quietly asked who’d switch sides,  
 The smiles were wide, the handshakes firm,  
 But rumours spread at lightning term.

A leader’s strength is tested hard,  
 When every lunch becomes a card,  
 And every meeting, every chat,  
 Feels like a leadership thermostat.

So Steven marched and held the line,  
 Insisting all was going fine,  
 While somewhere in the back row seats,  
 The numbers danced to different beats.

For in politics, the oldest rule,  
 Can make the mightiest look like a fool:  
 It’s not the speeches, polls or press—  
 It’s who can count the numbers best.

I reckon that was written by the former member for Maryborough, Bruce Saunders, who is sitting up in the gallery. I reckon he dropped it in my in-tray over the lunch break. We know that he thought he was a big numbers man, but I was in Maryborough on the weekend on the invite of Mr Johnny Barounis, the member for Maryborough. My God, the things John Barounis has delivered for Maryborough in 1½ years outweigh and outnumber the things Bruce Saunders ever delivered in Maryborough when he was an assistant minister.

This Leader of the Opposition just suffered the worst result in 50 years for an opposition trying to win—he is shaking his head. In the Stafford by-election the Labor Party got 30 per cent of the primary vote. Their vote went down 10 per cent. In a two-party preferred race, the primary vote of the LNP in Stafford was 41 per cent. That is despite the misleading campaign they ran about hospitals—and the health minister will deal with that. There was a 41 per cent primary vote for the LNP. Stafford is a dead red Labor seat—

**Mrs Nightingale** interjected.

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

**Mr BLEIJIE**:—and it is now one of the most marginal Labor seats in the state. If that is leadership and if that, according to the Leader of the Opposition, is their momentum going to the 2028 election, I will take that momentum every day of the week.

**Mr McCallum**: We still beat you.


**Mr BLEIJIE**: I take the interjection from the member for Bundamba, who said, ‘We still beat you.’ There is winning a dead red Labor seat or suffering the worst electoral result you have had as a branch for at least five decades. That is because the people of Stafford rejected the Leader of the Opposition—they rejected his policies, because he does not have any—and they rejected the deputy leader. That is why the murmurings and whispers are happening. Do not take my word for it; it is in the media. Your Labor members are quoted.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE**: Maybe the members screeching and yelling at me are the ones who are quoted in the *Courier-Mail* articles in terms of whispers about the leadership. We know that the Leader of the Opposition is done like a cooked Sunday roast. The knives are out for the Leader of the Opposition. He has suffered his worst result for the Labor Party: an eight per cent primary vote in Hinchinbrook and an eight per cent swing against them in the Stafford by-election. That is no win; that is a failure that is on him.

*(Time expired)*

### Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): I have two words to say in response to the member for Kawana: 'Luke Richmond', the Labor member for Stafford. That is what I say in response to that drivel from the Deputy Premier. Today we welcomed a new member to this parliament—a Labor member who will stand up for the people of Stafford. He will ensure the 93 beds are delivered at the Prince Charles Hospital. What do we see on the opposite side of this chamber? We see the ultimate vote of no confidence; that is, the Premier's vote of no confidence in the Minister for Regional and Rural Development and not one, not two, not three and not four but five assistant ministers. So little confidence does the Premier have in that minister and five assistant ministers that he is spending up to \$400,000 a year to pay someone outside the parliament to do their job. While it is a nice little earner for LNP mate Andrew Cripps, it is a not-so-nice little backhander to the members for Burdekin, Gregory, Barron River, Mundingburra, Rockhampton and Callide. It says everything about an LNP government that is dysfunctional and divided—a government paralysed by chaos. It has a minister referred to the Federal Police, a minister forced to stand down, and multiple ministers refusing to answer serious questions about their portfolios or even face the media. These ministers are clearly not up to the job.

There is talk about multiple ministers who will not be recontesting the next election. They are 18 months in and they are already out of puff. It explains why the member for Surfers Paradise is so disengaged from his education portfolio. For the minister, school is out—summer is here. He has checked out and lesson plans have been replaced by retirement plans. Likewise, the member for Mudgeeraba is clearly getting ready to move on from her current expensive overseas junkets to her expensive post-retirement overseas junkets. Then there is the member for Maroochydhore: 34 years in this House and still battling for relevance. No wonder the member for Maroochydhore wants out. They have not even been here half a term and it is all proving too much. It is a perfect storm of chaos and confusion. The incompetence is spreading like a contagion. The minister for the Olympics has lost his job. How can the Minister for Tourism, who cannot do his current job, possibly run the Olympics as well?


Something has to give. There are just too many cracks in this government. As much as the Premier wants it to go away, the abortion issue continues to drive a wedge right through the middle of the LNP government. The health minister lurches from one public disaster to the next. The health minister, who by the LNP's own measure is the worst health minister in all of history, has delayed critical health infrastructure that would have delivered more hospital beds and key services to communities across the state. Ambulance ramping is up. The specialist outpatient waitlist is up. Under the LNP government Queensland's health system is going backwards.

The Deputy Premier has axed thousands of affordable homes. The Premier has refused to offer Queenslanders a single cent of real cost-of-living relief. The youth justice minister cannot keep staff locked in her own office let alone in youth justice facilities. The police minister has permitted a terrible insult and injustice to be inflicted on the grieving families of slain police officers. The child safety minister has been missing in action ever since her African safari, unable to provide any answers or explanations while her department's bleak catalogue of failures continues to grow. 1 William Street seems less like the tower of power and more like *Fawltly Towers*. The Premier and his LNP government are all talk and no action. I note the front page of the *Townsville Bulletin* yesterday reported that young criminals are breaching their bail conditions at unprecedented rates—that is right, the crime problem that Premier Crisafulli promised to fix has now reached a new record high.

For the Premier, it is all about appearances. This government is all show and no go; a conga line of incompetent and underperforming ministers who have to go. It is proof that Queensland is being dragged backwards under the LNP, dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failure. Stop the kerfuffle; bring on the reshuffle.

*(Time expired)*

### Member for Woodridge; Mental Health Levy

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.21 pm): If ever we have heard a cry of impotence, it is that that we have just heard from the member for Woodridge—impotent in policy. When the member for Woodridge talks about a position, we know there is one position that he will never get and that is the job he has always coveted but never had the guts to go for—that is, the leadership of his own political party. He never had the bottle, never had the guts, never had the capacity and, more importantly, never had the numbers. It does not matter whether

'Blocker' has gone—and 'Blocker' looks like he has gone—the member for Murrumba's No. 1 numbers man, it does not matter if Alex Scott from Together union gets in, we know that they both hate the member for Woodridge when it comes to being the Leader of the Opposition. They will not have a bar of him, and for good reason. This is a former health minister who locked his own office to his own director-general. We remember that aspect of it. He is the one who said, 'No, I have important papers in my office; I cannot have my director-general coming in. Don't you know I am a very important man? I have been the Attorney-General of Tuvalu.' That is the impotence of the member for Woodridge.

**Mr Dick:** He's had a good go, Deputy Speaker. I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Member for Clayfield, would you pause for a moment. Member for Woodridge, do you have a point of order to make?

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

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Clayfield, would you withdraw?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Indeed, I withdraw.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I give you the call, Minister, member for Woodridge, you are warned under the standing orders. You had proceeded to address the chamber very loudly before I had given you the call on a point of order. You have been here a long time. You are warned.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I think I have said enough about the member for Woodridge. There is so much more to his failed ambitions that I would like to say, but there is another very important matter I do wish to bring to the attention of the House.

The independent Queensland Audit Office recently published its report into the management of the mental health levy. It was a scathing assessment of Labor's health legacy because it found that those opposite failed to establish effective governance arrangements for the now multibillion dollar plan. The Auditor-General's report said there was a lack of governance, no coordinated approach to planning and no evaluation of how the levy funds were spent. To put it simply: Labor had no idea where taxpayer dollars—now amounting in the billions—were going or whether the investment was delivering better health outcomes for Queenslanders.

Who was sitting there when this was introduced? None other than the member for Murrumba, the member for Woodridge, the former health minister and now shadow treasurer, and all of those on that side. Who else was there? The new member for Stafford, the chief of staff at the time when it was introduced, sat there as a senior adviser overseeing the expenditure of billions of dollars and failed to have a proper program in place. That is not me saying it; that is the audit conclusion from the independent Auditor-General. Effective governance arrangements for the levy were not established when it was introduced. This included not defining the scope of the levy's use, its outcomes and responsibilities. That is what the Auditor-General said.

It is not the first time we have had an independent Auditor-General's report into Labor's mismanagement of funds when it comes to Queensland Health. It does not matter whether it is their failed Sustaining Capital Program that saw hospitals not have their air conditioning repaired, not have essential services put in or not have existing facilities maintained, this is another scathing and damning report into what is going on there. That is the failure of Labor all over the place.

We have announced an additional \$350 million in levy funding for new and expanded mental health, alcohol and other drug services, including funding for announcements made by those opposite which they had not funded. We have 30 new perinatal mental health beds across the state, more mental health clinicians in emergency departments—one of our election commitments—and we are strengthening triage and support for vulnerable Queenslanders at all times as well as funding for step-up step-down facilities in Rockhampton and Townsville.


Under the Palaszczuk-Miles Labor government the mental health system was in a shambles and it is no surprise when we read those stories. As the opposition leader, the member for Murrumba is yet to release a new policy. Those opposite had the worst primary vote in 70 years in Hinchinbrook and an 8.1 per cent swing against them in Stafford. A seat they held by over 10½ per cent they now hold by 1½ per cent. The mistruths and exaggerations—

*(Time expired)*

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Clayfield, I unfortunately missed unparliamentary language that you used during that address. I ask that you withdraw that.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I apologise and withdraw.

### Minister for Health and Ambulance Services, Performance

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (2.27 pm): I find it a bit rich that the health minister would attack Labor for bringing in huge reform in terms of the mental health levy when it is he who goes around the state trying to pretend the mental health facilities that he is opening have something to do with him and this government. Whether it is in Cairns, Hervey Bay or on the Gold Coast, we see state-of-the-art mental health facilities being built and funded because of the reforms of the Miles Labor government and we see this minister turning up trying to claim credit and trying to imply it is something to do with the current government when what we have seen from them is cuts.

It is a bit rich for the Minister for Health to be talking about leadership when in the 2017 election, as leader of the LNP, he melted down three times. We all remember that last week of the campaign when he fell to pieces in three different interviews and the LNP vote went off a cliff. Who could forget the roller-coaster and the member for Clayfield trying to get the trail bike into gear? We remember! This morning we saw embarrassing performances by the health minister. We saw the Deputy Premier of this state wasting the time of this chamber with some petty political paragraphs of poetry, bringing out his amateur thespian performances in the parliament of Queensland when he should be taking the job a lot more seriously.

If ever there was proof that Queensland is being dragged backwards by a Crisafulli government that is paralysed by its own failures, it has to be the humiliating performance over the last three weeks of an out-of-touch and arrogant health minister trying to claim credit on social and mainstream media for a swathe of hospital expansions and a new hospital. Every single one of them—the QEII Hospital expansion, the PA Hospital expansion, the Toowoomba Hospital expansion and the Mater Hospital Springfield—is due to Labor.

The health system is going backwards under this health minister and this Premier. Spending millions of taxpayer funds on kilometres of blue bunting outside hospital expansions and other infrastructure projects and online ads is no substitute for building the health infrastructure this state needs. With no individual significant health infrastructure projects of his own, this health minister has no vision for health other than cutting hours at nurse-led clinics, demolishing the Yeronga child mental health clinic and cutting hospital expansions like the 93-bed Prince Charles Hospital expansion—and welcome to Luke Richmond, the member for Stafford. I can assure the health minister that the people of the north side know about the 93-bed expansion. The health minister was told not to go into that by-election campaign because they knew he would drive their vote backwards. He was banned by LNP headquarters because they know he is poison out there. Why? It is because he has delayed, for years and years, hospital expansions at Redcliffe, Townsville, Mackay and Coomera. There will be no new ED at Rockhampton Hospital which is desperately needed, so that is no surprise. The specialist outpatient waitlists have surged by over 60,000 Queenslanders under this government, and this minister babbles on in the background but does not make much sense.

When it comes to the inevitable reshuffle of the weakest cabinet in Queensland—well, since 2014—despite public comments otherwise, the health minister will no doubt be angling to get out of health as quickly as he can. I suspect he will pitch behind the scenes to take over his coveted portfolio, that of attorney-general. Watch out, member for Nanango! Your chamber neighbour is headed your way. We know that he continues to whinge about having health, even out the front of the Queensland Media Club. More than a year after getting the job, he is still whingeing.


Under this minister we have seen a botched flu season, we have seen a spend of three times more on self-promotion than flu promotion and we saw record ramping in July last year. That is his record. People know he is a liability to this government and he is not in control of the portfolio. We see health staff being blamed for things that are his responsibility. What do we have? The flu numbers are terrible again this year, under the same minister. He has learnt nothing from last year's record ramping and the overwhelming of emergency departments. We see that vaccination rates are pathetic, particularly for kids aged under five.

**Mr Nicholls:** The two lowest quarters since COVID, since you jokers were in—lower—and higher uptake.

**Mr BAILEY:** He might interject, but kids under five deserve health care and he is not delivering it.

*(Time expired)*

## Small and Family Business, Federal Budget

 **Hon. SJ MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business) (2.32 pm): It is always a privilege to follow the member for Miller, who I believe was called 'foolish' by the CCC. I probably used that quote at least 25 times when I shadowed him and I see things have not improved.

When you meet people from small and family businesses face to face, as members on this side of the House regularly do, you understand quite intrinsically the challenges that they face. Small and family businesses are not simply a financial holding or an instrument of commerce; they represent years and sometimes a lifetime of work, sacrifice and community participation. They engage with their communities through sporting groups, charities and other aspects of daily life that depend on them for critical support.

Right now, small and family businesses are facing one of the most significant threats in a generation. It is clear that the impact of the Albanese government's fuel crisis, combined with the federal Labor government's multiple interest rate rises, will hurt and is hurting small and family businesses right now in Queensland. Suddenly, along comes the federal Treasurer, Jim Chalmers, and the Labor Party with a great big tax on small and family businesses. Changes affecting capital gains tax and discretionary trust arrangements will have significant consequences beyond the balance sheet of small and family businesses. The worst part is that those tax increases were specifically ruled out by the Prime Minister a little over a year ago, before the federal election. Instead of truth and consistency, Queensland small and family businesses have a Prime Minister and a federal Labor Treasurer delivering a triple blow: higher fuel prices, multiple interest rate rises and, now, further tax rises built on a foundation of broken promises.

Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry CEO Andrew McKellar said, 'There is no economic rationale for piling more tax on businesses'. Business Chamber Queensland CEO Heidi Cooper said, 'Higher taxes on investment will only make it harder to grow, hire and compete.' Business commentators have been just as scathing. Writing in the *Australian*, Robert Gottlieb said—

Concealed in the detailed additional documentation was a devastating set of blows designed to hit successful family businesses.

However, tone deaf as always, social services minister Tanya Plibersek told businesses, through News Limited, that small and family business representatives were telling them to have a 'Bex and a good lie down'.

Small and family businesses have made it clear that Prime Minister Anthony Albanese is not the business partner they want or need. For the benefit of those opposite, during the recent Queensland Small Business Month I had the chance to meet a range of start-ups and budding entrepreneurs who had taken over the wharf at Mooloolaba for the fifth annual Forward Fest. Held over three days on the Sunshine Coast, the festival brought together entrepreneurs, investors, creative types and policymakers, under the theme 'Ride the wave', to explore the future of business, technology and impact-driven leadership. Many were young, including a group of teenagers I met who are making their first pitch to potential investors. This is what the Crisafulli government is encouraging—having a crack.


However, it was at about the time of that event in mid-May, about a week after the federal budget, that the impact of federal Treasurer Jim Chalmers's tax on small business became patently clear. From that point on, right across the state, the conversation absolutely changed. I attended round tables with groups of small business people in Cairns and Townsville and their responses to the federal budget ranged from genuine concern to outright anger. Under this federal budget there is no longer an incentive to take an idea, a technology or an opportunity and invest blood, sweat and tears and your own money.

**Ms Pease** interjected.

**Mr MINNIKIN:** I note the member for Lytton likes to share pictures of herself with the federal Treasurer, visiting him not once but twice over the past 18 months. Is the member telling the federal Treasurer of the damage his budget will do to Queensland small and family businesses? I have written to the federal Minister for Small Business, Dr Anne Aly, requesting that these matters be added to the agenda for the small business ministers meeting next month. At the end of the day, we on this side of the chamber get it. It is in our DNA. Those on that side talk about it but they are, as usual, clueless.

*(Time expired)*

## **Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence**

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (2.37 pm): Queenslanders were promised action. They were promised leadership. They were promised a government that would put the safety of children and women first. Instead, what they have received from the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence is a growing record of missed opportunities, broken promises and failures of leadership. After 19 months in office, Queenslanders expected a comprehensive domestic and family violence strategy that matched the scale of the crisis confronting our state. Domestic and family violence continues to claim lives, devastate families and leave lasting trauma in communities across Queensland. In response, the minister delivered a 12-page document devoid of measurable targets, devoid of clear accountability mechanisms and devoid of any meaningful way for Queenslanders to judge whether the strategy will succeed or fail. Queenslanders deserve more than glossy brochures and press releases. They deserve a government with a plan and a minister prepared to be held accountable for delivering it.

Then there is the minister's judgement during one of the most challenging periods for her portfolio responsibilities. While Queensland communities were confronting disasters and recovery efforts were underway, the minister chose to proceed with an African safari holiday. At a time when Queenslanders were looking to their government for leadership, the minister was absent. Leadership matters, presence matters and accountability matters.

The minister also promised 150 GPS monitoring devices for high-risk domestic and family violence perpetrators. This was presented as a key reform to enhance victim safety and strengthen perpetrator accountability, yet Queenslanders are still waiting for answers about why only 12 have been administered.

The same can be said of the government's police protection directions framework. Frontline police officers and victim-survivors deserve a framework that is practical, effective and capable of improving safety outcomes. Instead, serious concerns have been raised about whether the framework is workable and whether it is delivering the protections that were promised.


Ministerial responsibility does not stop with announcements. It extends to implementation. That is why the failures surrounding the Unify IT system are so concerning. Reports suggest warnings were raised before the rollout. Those warnings were ignored. Queenslanders deserve to know why. Risks were identified but not acted upon. Queenslanders deserve to know why. Adequate oversight was not exercised. Queenslanders deserve to know why. When the Unify data blackout occurred, it disrupted critical services and created uncertainty for frontline workers and vulnerable families. The response demanded transparency and accountability.

The minister must also explain why the Child Safety Commission of Inquiry was not afforded the time many stakeholders believed was necessary to undertake its important work. Queensland's child protection system faces profound challenges. Every opportunity to uncover systemic failures and identify lasting reforms should be maximised, not constrained. While no minister can prevent every tragedy, every domestic and family violence death must compel governments to examine whether they could have done more. The tragic death of Hayley Malcolm and her unborn child shocked Queenslanders. It raised difficult but necessary questions about the effectiveness of our systems, our interventions and our protections for children at risk. Those questions deserve answers. Those families deserve answers and Queenslanders deserve answers.

When we examine the minister's record, a pattern emerges: a domestic and family violence strategy without meaningful targets; a promise of GPS monitoring devices that remain unfilled; a police protection direction framework plagued by concerns; an IT rollout marked by failures and disruption; questions surrounding the management of a critical commission of inquiry; and an absence of leadership when Queensland communities were facing significant challenges.

These are not isolated incidents—all in 19 months. They are evidence of a minister who has repeatedly failed to meet the expectations of her office. This is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government, Queensland is being dragged backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures. The portfolio of child safety and domestic and family violence prevention are among the most important responsibilities in government. They require urgency. They require competence. They require a relentless focus. Most importantly, they require leadership. There has been no evidence of this.

## Energy Prices

 **Hon. DC JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (2.42 pm): Power prices are fundamental to every part of our economy. They are a significant factor in every household budget, and for a small business, power prices can be the difference between a profit and a loss, which is why we committed to putting downward pressure on power prices and we put that commitment at the heart of our Energy Roadmap. Now we can say the plan we have in place is beginning to work, and we demand energy retailers bring down bills.

The Australian Energy Regulator's direct market offer for next financial year will see prices on the flat rate standing offer fall by 7.2 per cent.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** They do not like hearing it. They do not like hearing it: after 10 years, a record 19.9 per cent increase in just one year alone. They do not like hearing the truth.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr JANETZKI:** I am going to come back to that. Small businesses in the south-east will see reductions between 10.4 and 14 per cent, which is welcome news for small and family businesses. That is the biggest drop in more than a decade, and the biggest drop of any DMO across the country. We are expecting a similar result for regional Queensland when the QCA delivers its report in the next week or so, and we will be fighting hard to ensure any savings there are passed on to regional customers as well.

This increase in power bills, the fundamental input to everything across our economy, was driven over 10 years by the former Labor government's ideological obsessions. I will run through a few of them. I will start with Pioneer-Burdekin, the battery of the north, the cornerstone of their Energy and Jobs Plan—the very cornerstone. Imagine being so ideologically obsessed that the people in the Eungella Valley find out that their lives are about to be upturned on the news. Imagine! Imagine that those opposite would think that appropriate, that people of an entire valley—hundreds of families—would have their lives turned upside down after hearing about it on the news because the then premier decided to make up a media announcement to get through to try to win a few Greens preferences in Brisbane. That is what happened. That is what happened when they announced Pioneer-Burdekin—\$7, \$12, \$36.8 billion!

Do you know what? They decided to announce it, but the media release was not announceable enough. The media release initially said 'up to five gig'. What did they change it to because it was not announceable enough? They said, 'Five gig.' Imagine the ideological obsession! I notice how quiet those opposite have gone, because they know it. They know they turned the Energy and Jobs Plan into a farce. That project was a hoax. There was no funding for it. They cared only ever about the politics. Their battery of the north we know was a hoax from bottom to top.

When we released our Energy Roadmap we said there would be \$1,035 because a third of the Energy Roadmap was based on modelling. Their Energy and Jobs Plan was 57 pages and 37 pictures. That is what their Energy and Jobs Plan was. That is what they cared more about—announceables and media announcements—while our Energy Roadmap involves coal for longer, and more gas and private sector investment into renewables and storage. That is what we want to see across the system. Their plan was all announceables and media spin.


I go back to their ideological obsessions. Another one of their favourites was around hydrogen. The self-proclaimed first hydrogen minister in world history, the member for Springwood, and his offside, the assistant minister for hydrogen development—the member for Bundamba—

**A government member:** Hot air!

**Mr JANETZKI:** I will take the interjection. There were a couple of ministers for hot air—Tweedledee and Tweedledum—the ministers for hydrogen. That was the depth of their ideological obsession.

On this side of the House, we will continue to deliver the Energy Roadmap. We will continue to invest in what we have while we build what we need for the future because it is what Queenslanders deserve.

## Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (2.47 pm): Well, there you have it, in black and white! Thank you to Hayden Johnson for a very insightful article on the weekend saying out loud what has been talked about in the corridors for some time now and certainly what the backbenchers have been thinking

over there, particularly the ones who want the frontbench jobs, as the Minister for Trade gets up and talks about paperclips, as the Minister for Women gets up and refuses to say where she stands on reproductive rights, as the Minister for Water gets up and makes an announcement about Paradise Dam which directly contradicts what the Premier says about it, and, most importantly, as we watch the integrity of the member for Everton and the member for Whitsunday get called into serious question, so much so that the member for Everton is so badly affected he has to stand aside while an Australian Federal Police investigation has to be undertaken. You watch those backbenchers and they are horrified at what is playing out in front of them. 'How did these people get those jobs?' they are thinking. 'How are they allowed to stay in their jobs?' You can see it on their faces.

We have heard who wants their jobs the most: the member for Redlands, though she must be worried about that koala thing; the member for Oodgeroo, though she must be worried about the Cherish Life thing; and the member for Burleigh, though he did not even get mentioned. How appalling is that? The cold hard facts are that this Premier has so much dead wood on his frontbench and he has compromised Queenslanders so much in his first 18 months by keeping them on that he literally has to do something about it, and the standing down of the member for Everton is his opportunity to do it without going out and actually saying, 'These people on my front bench are just not up to the task,' which is what he really wants to do. There are too many questions of integrity and too many instances of his ministers dragging Queensland back to the dark ages.

That takes me to the education minister, who must surely be in the firing line. We know that he did not want the portfolio in the beginning. 'Why do I have to have such a hard one?' he asked. He still went ahead and did over the poor member for Moggill, who had been slogging away and thinking that maybe he would finally get his chance. We know that the education minister took it, and the deal was that he could go when his defined benefits maxed out, which we hear is not too far away.


What has this minister achieved? This is the minister who went to a special education leaders conference and said that occupational therapists were a great source of dating when he was at university. This minister managed to insult teachers so much that over 70 per cent of them voted to reject his EB offer and go on strike twice in six months. It had been 16 years since the last strike and nearly 30 years since teachers had gone out twice in a period of 12 months. This minister then dug his heels in and now teachers are in a protracted arbitration process and have not been given a pay rise in two years. He told the secondary principals last week that it was the fault of the teachers—no sympathy for them at all.

That is what this minister does to the people to whom we say, 'Please look after our children. Please help them to lead good lives.' When our teachers—our precious teachers—asked for a three per cent interim wage increase while arbitration was in progress, he said no, even though he had the money put aside. When they told him time and again that occupational violence in their classrooms was unsustainable, he told them that behaviour had in fact improved by eight per cent. One only has to read the comments on his Facebook page to know what teachers thought about that. 'Is this a late April Fools joke?' asked one. 'Have you been into our schools lately?' asked another. When this minister announced 1,000 new teachers and said how well remunerated they are, his Facebook page lit up again. One said, 'How many teachers have left because of the terrible working conditions?' Another commented, 'Cool—what about the retention rate?'

This minister promised to reduce red tape by 25 per cent, but the school opinion survey for last year shows that only 42 per cent of school staff feel like the initiatives to reduce red tape are making a difference. He promised to improve NAPLAN results and then he said, 'No, that doesn't really matter.'

These ministers are dragging Queensland backwards. This Premier and these ministers went to the election and promised Queenslanders that life was going to be better, but they can see now that this Premier and these ministers are all talk and no action. They are all photo-ops and no follow-up. Queenslanders are beginning to see what this Premier is about, and he will have to make some hard decisions if he is going to convince Queenslanders that he is serious about delivering for them. He needs to make some hard decisions and get rid of the deadwood. He should give a couple of these guys on the backbench a break.

### Labor Party, Performance

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (2.52 pm): It gives me so much pleasure to follow the failed former child safety minister. The former minister dares criticise the Crisafulli government's actions when it comes to the protection of children in this state—dares criticise anything that is happening in the government—when she oversaw the watch house crisis and failed bail house program.

First, let's talk about bail houses. The bail house program was a failure because nearly every single youth who went into the bail houses offended again. I think it was the deputy premier at the time who said, 'Hang on a minute, Minister, I don't want one of those bail houses in my backyard.' Suddenly they abandoned the plan because the almighty then deputy premier Jackie Trad—and we know that there are a few people over there who want to see Jackie come back. I think it would be a bit of fun if Jackie came back. It would actually give a bit more grunt to the opposition than they have now.

The Minister for Youth Justice talks about the youth justice crisis under the former youth justice minister. Those who were not here at the time should google the former minister's name and '*Four Corners*'. The *Four Corners* report exposed the fact that the former minister brought 17-year-olds back into the juvenile justice system. Even if you were the new member for Stafford, who had written it into the Labor Party program, you would think, 'Hang on a minute: should we budget for more beds in the youth justice system?' One would think yes, but not those opposite. What happened? The system fell apart under the former Palaszczuk-Miles government.

Who was there? The member for Bulimba presided over those failings. The member for Murrumba seriously needs to think about whom he will put on his speaking list when it comes to talking about government failures. In stark contrast, the Crisafulli government are doing everything we possibly can to deliver for Queenslanders. We are making sure we are putting victims first. The Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support is having to spend all of her time tidying up the failures of the member for Bulimba from when she was the youth justice minister.

What about the child safety system? Those failed former child safety ministers—there is one, there is two, there is three and there is another one back there—

**Mrs Gerber** interjected.

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Member for Currumbin and member for McConnel, stop your quarrelling.


**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** We know that this Labor Party is running on empty. This opposition leader is running for cover, and we know that they have been put to the test. What was that test? That test was the Stafford by-election. In 2012 the Labor Party managed to get 33 per cent of the primary vote when Stirling Hinchliffe lost his seat. Three weekends ago the Labor Party's primary vote under opposition leader Miles was 31 per cent.

**A government member** interjected.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I take that interjection; they crashed to 31 per cent. Fewer than one in three people decided to support the member for Murrumba as the Leader of the Opposition. If it were ever going to be more, one would think there would be a swing to the opposition, as always happens in by-elections. That did not happen in this case. The people of Stafford know that he is a failed opposition leader, he was a failed premier and he still has the same mob of failed former ministers sitting around the shadow cabinet table failing to plan and failing to deliver.

In stark contrast, the Crisafulli government is delivering for the people of Queensland, putting the people of Queensland first. They need to stop thinking about themselves and their glitzy press releases. That is all the former Palaszczuk-Miles government used to do, and the results were obvious. In 18 short months we are already getting on with delivering what Queenslanders asked us to.

### **Crisafulli LNP Government, Performance**

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (2.57 pm): Just when we thought things could not get any more chaotic on that side of the House, the *Courier-Mail* treated us all to an article full of speculation about who is on the way up and who is on the way out and which ministers have racked up enough failures to find themselves on the chopping block. It does raise a few questions: who is chatting to the *Courier-Mail*? Who is leaking against their colleagues? Spare a thought for some of their frontbenchers, including the member for Currumbin. I imagine it would have been a real kick in the guts to open the paper and find that they had been written off as discarded ministers by their own colleagues.

It has always been this way for the member for Mudgeeraba, has it not? It dates all the way back to the Newman government, when she was the first nurse that Campbell Newman sacked. She battled her way through 10 years of opposition to finally be given the portfolio she worked so hard for—hang on, wait! No, that is not right. She was sacked by this Premier, too. She was sacked from the health

portfolio right after they won the election. Maybe that is because of her lacklustre performance in opposition. Everyone remembers when she came after our hardworking regional healthcare workers. Here is a snippet from a news article from when the member for Mudgeeraba was the shadow health minister. It states—

The Queensland Nurses and Midwives' Union ... is appalled at comments made by LNP frontbencher and Opposition Health Spokesmen Ros Bates ... calling regional health staff employed by Queensland Health 'duds'.

How shameful! Who could forget when she called me a 'fool' for stating that our hardworking health staff were drinking Berocca? She was kicked out of the chamber over an electrolyte drink! That must have really 'peed' her off!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Member for Waterford, I am going to ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I withdraw. That, I believe, was the 23rd time in the last term that she was excluded from the chamber. Although she was sacked from Health, the failures keep on coming. Perhaps the government needs to create a new role. Rather than Minister for Finance perhaps it should be 'Minister for Paper Clips and Petty Cash'. As the minister tasked with driving responsible expenditure, she billed taxpayers \$67,000 to install a new frosted glass door, a new kitchen and a mega boardroom in her office. Then, on a taxpayer-funded trip to Japan, she put in \$22 for medicine and \$11.42 for 'room service for milk to take medication' on the government tab, mind you—and don't forget the heat pack she ordered as well.

More alarmingly, there is the \$12,000 for photographers to follow Ms Bates around Japan, South Korea, Singapore and India. Then of course she came in here and told a member on this side of the House, 'It's not about getting your ugly mug on TV.' She has the hide to call me 'photo-op Fentiman'. She has \$12,000 worth of photographers following her around overseas on a taxpayer-funded junket!

It is one thing for the opposition to point out the government's problems; it is another thing entirely when they are coming from inside the government's own ranks. After 19 months of this government, Queenslanders have seen plenty of excuses and plenty of internal chaos. They are still waiting to see the results. It is all talk and no action—all photo-op and no follow-up.

Where are the results on cost of living that this Premier promised Queenslanders? Where are the results on driving down the cost of living—rent and groceries? It is hard for families out there to make ends meet. There are no results on health. There are no results on affordable housing. The truth is that all of this chaos is proof that, under the LNP, Queensland is being dragged backwards.

This Premier made big promises at the election—he made big promises about helping Queensland families—and we have seen none of it. If the Premier is looking for the source of the government's problems, he only needs to look around his own cabinet table. Judging by the paper, it seems he may not be looking at those same faces for very much longer.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1564, on motion of Mr Powell—

That the bill be now read a second time.

**Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (3.02 pm): This omnibus bill makes amendments to environmental legislation to adopt a risk-based approach to oversight, to reduce red tape and duplication and to streamline processes for activities deemed low risk in the resources and tourism sectors. As always, the devil is in the detail, and I am going to go through a couple of those.

Significant changes include environmentally relevant activities, or ERAs—identified as having lower environmental impact or risk, such as small-scale mining—transitioning from environmental authorities, or EAs, to codes declared through regulation. Whether an activity is suitable to be managed through an ERA code would be decided by the minister, with 'low risk' being poorly defined, as well as regulations and codes not yet finalised. Assessing anything as 'low risk' without clearly defined assessment criteria, finalised regulations or a mandatory centralised and easily accessible public register understandably raises concerns. Detail is needed on how these codes will maintain the necessary environmental safeguards, oversight and compliance.

Multiple submitters, including the Sunshine Coast Environmental Council and the Queensland Conservation Council, note that less oversight and no public register restrict the ability for government and communities to monitor the long-term, cumulative environmental impacts of activities. The Queensland Environmental Law Association cautioned that locally specific environmental concerns are also at risk with a uniform code. At a minimum, ERAs should be registered with DETSI and made public. The bill also removes public notification and consultation on draft terms of reference, or TORs, for environmental impact statements, or EISs. This is the initial opportunity for community input into major projects under assessment, with DETSI confirming that 100 per cent of cases—that is 100 per cent—are amended following this consultation phase.

The Environmental Defenders Office notes that this loss of notification and consultation risks issues being missed or needing to be raised as objections later. Therefore, intended efficiencies would not be achieved. Community participation and transparency, as we all know, are the foundation to credible environmental management. As the Queensland Trust for Nature submitted, this early consultation phase should be retained. I would like to add that community consultation and participation are foundational for everything we do.


Prioritising efficiency over environmental protection is evident with the proposed single integrated permit, or SIP. This sees a one-stop-shop permission issued for commercial tourism activity in protected areas, state marine parks, state forests and recreation areas, with DETSI stating that the intention would be 'to get more businesses to apply and more permits issued'. This understandably rings alarm bells for communities and tourism operators in protected areas that seek strengthening, not weakening. Concerns were also raised that a lack of caps on commercial operators could undermine the sustainability for existing tourism operators, and we have many fabulous ones in Noosa.

The Queensland Conservation Council and the Sunshine Coast Environmental Council noted the insufficient detail around how intensified tourist activity would be managed including for cumulative impacts over the permit periods, which can be up to 15 years, and suggested measurable performance indicators be used. With sites such as the Cooloolo Recreation Area, as I have raised many times, already impacted by government failures to manage excessive visitation during peak season and poor behaviours, they cannot be subjected to what has been labelled 'unfettered commercial activity' by Wildlife Queensland. Reducing red tape for our businesses is important but not without appropriate safeguards for our existing businesses, environment and communities.

Underground water impact reports are vital to safeguard our water and food security, with farming communities raising significant concerns including subsidence caused by coal seam gas activities. Although deemed 'out of scope', as I raised in my statement of reservation, there has been no progress on a framework to address this, and the former government did not reintroduce amendments in 2024 to manage these impacts. There was also opposition from almost all stakeholders to the proposal to extend to five years the UWIRs, indicating the current three-year period should be maintained.

Sufficient detail on how these issues will be managed and addressed is lacking and, even though I support greater efficiencies, as I have spoken about many times in relation to our parliamentary processes, I cannot support the bill in its current form.

I would like to thank our chair, my fellow committee members and our incredibly hardworking secretariat for their work. What I really appreciated during this inquiry was the productive and respectful manner in which it was undertaken.

 **Miss DOOLAN** (Pumicestone—LNP) (3.08 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is about delivering an environmental framework that is strong, practical and fit for purpose. Queenslanders expect us to protect our environment. They expect us to safeguard our waterways, our coastlines, our forests and our wildlife for future generations. They also expect governments to operate efficiently, make decisions in a timely manner and reduce unnecessary bureaucracy that creates costs, delays and frustration without improving environmental outcomes. That is exactly what this bill seeks to achieve. The bill modernises multiple acts across the minister's portfolio to streamline approvals, reduce duplication, strengthen compliance powers and improve regulatory certainty while maintaining strong environmental safeguards. Importantly, these reforms are grounded in extensive stakeholder feedback. Businesses, industry groups, tourism operators and regulators all identified administrative inefficiencies, unnecessary duplication and regulatory complexity that added burdens without delivering meaningful environmental benefit.

In my electorate of Pumicestone, environmental protection is part of everyday life. We are fortunate to live in one of the most naturally beautiful parts of Queensland. From the Pumicestone Passage to the beaches of Bribie Island, our environment shapes our lifestyle, our tourism industry and

our local economy. Our local businesses rely on healthy waterways. Tourism operators like G'Day Adventures and Bribie Island Gondola rely on pristine natural attractions. Families rely on safe and protected coastal ecosystems, and our community understands that environmental sustainability and economic prosperity must work together.

I acknowledge the incredible work of Bribie Island Turtle Trackers, led by Darren, which works tirelessly to protect and preserve our local marine environment. Their volunteers are out there early in the mornings and late at night monitoring turtle activity, protecting nests, educating the community and ensuring future generations can continue to enjoy the natural beauty that makes places like Bribie Island so special. Groups like Turtle Trackers remind us that environmental protection is not just about legislation passed in this chamber; it is also about passionate local people on the ground who dedicate countless hours to care for the environment because they genuinely love our community. In electorates like Pumicestone, where our lifestyle, tourism, economy and local identity are so closely tied to our environment, organisations like Turtle Trackers play a vital role in preserving what makes our community unique. I thank Darren, Diane and every volunteer involved for the extraordinary contribution they make to protect our precious coastal ecosystems.

One of the key reforms in this bill is the move toward a more targeted, risk-based approach for environmentally relevant activities, ERAs. Currently, the system can impose significant administrative requirements even on low-risk activities. The bill introduces the ability for certain low-risk activities to instead operate under ERA codes rather than requiring full environmental authorities. Let's be clear about what this means. This is not about removing environmental protections and it is not about weakening standards. It is about reducing unnecessary duplication and creating a more efficient regulatory framework. Operators will still be required to comply with strict environmental conditions. Environmental safeguards will remain in place, but low-risk activities with well-understood impacts will no longer be trapped in unnecessarily burdensome approval processes. That means less red tape, lower administrative costs and faster decision-making while maintaining oversight and accountability.

This is supported by stakeholders. The Property Council of Australia supported the bill's intent to streamline processes and remove unnecessary duplication while maintaining strong environmental protections. The Civil Contractors Federation stated that the reform should protect the environment while making approvals easier for low-risk activities, and the Queensland Environmental Law Association supported the amendments aimed at improving administrative efficiency and delivering contemporary environmental regulation. That support matters because it demonstrates that this legislation strikes a practical balance between environmental responsibility and economic efficiency, a balance between strong oversight and workable regulation, and a balance between protecting nature and supporting jobs.

Another important reform contained in this bill relates to mine rehabilitation and closure planning. The existing framework introduced under the former Labor government created significant complexity and practical challenges for environmental authority holders transitioning into the system. This bill addresses those issues by removing duplicative public interest evaluations, improving procedural clarity and creating a more practical pathway for rehabilitation planning and compliance. Importantly, rehabilitation obligations remain and environmental standards remain, but the system itself becomes more workable and effective because a rehabilitation framework that is overly complicated and administratively bogged down does not deliver better environmental outcomes; it simply creates confusion, delays and inefficiencies.

Other areas where this bill delivers important reform relate to compliance and enforcement. In this chamber we sometimes hear that streamlining regulations somehow means weakening protections, but this bill strengthens powers against repeat environmental offenders. The amendments expand the court's power to order forfeiture not only of property seized as evidence but also property used in the commission of offences. That is important because we have seen repeat offending involving unlawful tyre dumping, illegal waste transportation and unlicensed environmentally relevant activities. Communities rightly expect action against people who deliberately damage the environment. They expect fairness for the businesses and individuals who actually do the right thing, and they expect governments to close the loopholes that allow repeat offenders to continue offending using the same equipment and vehicles. This bill strengthens those enforcement mechanisms while ensuring safeguards and fairness remain through judicial oversight.


The bill also extends timeframes for investigating complex environmental offences. Frankly, that is common sense. Environmental investigations are often highly technical and scientifically complex, and impacts are not always immediately visible. Expert evidence can take significant time to gather and assess, so the current timeframes can make it difficult for regulators to properly investigate serious

matters and commence proceedings. This bill extends the timeframe to two years for summary offences and three years for more serious and complex offences. That ensures regulators have adequate time to gather evidence properly, pursue proceedings fairly and hold offenders accountable.

I will also speak about reforms relating to ecotourism and tourism operators, because this is particularly relevant to communities like mine in Pumicestone. Queensland's tourism industry is one of our state's greatest economic strengths, and nature-based tourism is an incredibly important part of that. Currently, tourism operators can be forced to navigate multiple permits and approvals across different land tenures for essentially the same activity. This bill introduces a framework for a single integrated tourism permission across protected areas, state forests, recreation areas and marine parks. Operators will be able to submit one application online and receive one streamlined permission with one fee and one expiry date. Again, environmental protections remain and assessment processes remain, but unnecessary duplication is removed. That is especially important for the small operators and family-run tourism businesses that contribute enormously to local economies. In places like Bribie Island, tourism operators are deeply connected to the natural environment. Their businesses depend on preserving it. They understand its value better than anyone else, so this bill helps support those operators while continuing to protect the environmental and cultural values of the areas in which they operate.

This legislation reflects the commonsense philosophy of government. Queenslanders want strong environmental protections but they also want a government that functions efficiently. They want clear rules, they want certainty, they want decisions made in a timely manner and they want practical outcomes instead of unnecessary bureaucracy. This bill modernises environmental regulation and strengthens enforcement against offenders. It reduces duplication, it streamlines approvals and it improves rehabilitation processes. It supports tourism, jobs and sustainable economic growth while maintaining strong environmental safeguards. Importantly, during the committee process there was broad support for the intent of the bill, particularly around reducing duplication and modernising the framework. Notably, opposition members of the committee did not provide a dissenting report.

Communities like mine in Pumicestone understand that environmental protection and economic prosperity go hand in hand. This bill delivers a framework that is practical, modern and responsive. It supports local industries, protects our environment, reduces unnecessary red tape and ensures Queensland continues to have strong, effective environmental regulation that works with both communities and the environment. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (3.17 pm): The Queensland Labor opposition will always support action to streamline and improve the efficiency of our state's development as long as it does not come at the expense of protecting our incredible environment. That balance is fundamental to responsible government. It is possible to promote economic activity whilst safeguarding the natural assets that define Queensland. Unfortunately, when we examine the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025 it becomes clear that this government's approach risks tipping the balance in entirely the wrong direction.

Anyone will tell you how lucky we are to have such incredible biodiversity right here in our backyard—from the Great Barrier Reef to the Tablelands, from the sandy shores of Stradbroke Island to the Daintree rainforest. These places are not just beautiful landscapes; they are the foundation of our identity, our economy and our international reputation. They support tourism, agriculture, research and regional jobs. Protecting them is not an ideological exercise; it is simply good governance.

Despite this bill being over 200 pages long, it raises more questions than it answers for conservationists and industry alike. A bill of this size should bring clarity and certainty. Instead, stakeholders have been left grappling with ambiguity and concern. That alone should give the government pause. What we see throughout this legislation is a government obsessed with the notion of reducing green tape. This is hardly surprising. The environment minister had his heart set on pursuing that agenda during his last time in the portfolio. As always, the devil is in the detail, and unfortunately there is not a lot of detail in this bill.

One of the most significant changes proposed is the reframing of how environmentally relevant activities, or ERAs, are regulated. These activities include industrial operations and intensive industries with the potential to release emissions that impact the environment and surrounding communities. Historically, such activities have required environmental authorities to ensure proper oversight. Under this bill, the government proposes to introduce a new code-based system for certain ERAs deemed 'low risk'. On the surface, that might sound sensible. Code-based regulation can work where activities

generally present minimal environmental risk. But here lies the problem: what exactly counts as 'low risk'? The bill does not clearly define it. Industry groups, environmental groups and traditional owner groups have all raised concerns about the absence of clarity. Without clearly defined thresholds, we are effectively being asked to sign off on a framework without knowing how it will actually operate in practice.

This lack of detail is deeply troubling. The implementation of code-based regulations will significantly reduce the oversight applied to certain projects, allowing proponents to operate under a set of standardised rules rather than case-by-case assessments. In some circumstances, that may be appropriate, but environmental systems are complex and impacts are rarely uniform.

Perhaps most concerning is the proposal that eligibility for ERA codes will effectively be self-assessed by project proponents themselves. As the Environmental Defenders Office pointed out in its submission, allowing proponents to determine whether they qualify for these streamlined codes without prior scrutiny from government or the public is opposite to the fundamental purpose of environmental regulation.

Oversight exists for a reason. It protects ecosystems, it protects communities and it protects responsible operators from the reputational damage caused by those who cut corners. When we can reduce external scrutiny on how proponents conduct their projects, including mining projects, we increase the risk of reduced compliance. When compliance drops, it is our environment that ultimately pays the price.

When we look at this legislation in the broader context of the government's environmental agenda, a troubling pattern begins to emerge. At the same time that this government is weakening oversight and consultation in environmental approvals, it is also promoting a glossy vision of Queensland as a global ecotourism capital under its Destination 2045 strategy, which most of the tourism industry are still trying to work out. The government's 45 by 45 campaign promises a future built on low-impact, high-quality ecotourism experiences. It sounds impressive, but when you examine the detail—or lack thereof—it begins to look like a textbook example of greenwashing.

The government speaks of low-impact tourism, yet it has provided no clear or enforceable benchmarks defining what that actually means. There are no transparent capacity limits, no measurable ecological footprint standards and no credible regenerative targets. In effect, large-scale commercial developments risk being rebadged as 'ecotourism' simply because it suits the government's marketing narrative. That approach directly contradicts the purpose of the Nature Conservation Act, which requires activities in protected areas to support the conservation of natural conditions. You cannot stretch the definition of ecotourism so far that it loses its meaning altogether.


The contradiction does not stop there. This same government has scrapped renewable energy targets and extended reliance on coal-fired power generation—policies that directly undermine the health of the Great Barrier Reef, the very natural asset at the heart of Queensland's tourism industry. Coral bleaching, stronger storms and declining reef health are not theoretical risks; they are happening right now as we speak. If the reef were ever to be placed on the World Heritage in danger list, the reputational damage to Queensland tourism would be significant. Against that backdrop, the government's ecotourism branding looks less like a genuine environmental strategy and more like a marketing exercise designed to mask policy choices that move us in the opposite direction.

It is impossible to discuss this issue without addressing the record of the environment minister himself. The minister speaks frequently about balancing environmental protection with economic development, but his track record tells a very different story. During the Newman government era, policy changes triggered a dramatic resurgence in land clearing across Queensland. Government figures later confirmed that nearly 300,000 hectares—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Lister): Member for Cairns, I am pretty tolerant of a bit of latitude, but you are straying a long way from the contents of the bill. I ask you please to return to being relevant to the long title of the bill.

**Mr HEALY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, prevention is always more effective and far less expensive than remedy. Once ecosystems are destroyed, restoring them is often impossible. Some losses are permanent. Queenslanders expect their government to learn from past mistakes, and certainly not repeat them. Ultimately, what this bill shows us is that this government has learnt very little. Transparency and integrity must sit at the heart of environmental governance. You cannot claim to be ethical while weakening the very safeguards that protect our natural heritage. This is essential to our tourism industry and its growing potential. This is what investors are also looking at.

This legislation should have been an opportunity to demonstrate that Queensland can remain productive and prosperous, whilst protecting the landscapes and ecosystems that make our state unique. Instead, what we have before us is a framework filled with uncertainty, driven more by ideology than science. This should not come as a surprise to many people. Queenslanders deserve better than this. They deserve environmental policy grounded in transparency, accountability and genuine stewardship of the remarkable natural assets we all share. This bill is concerning, and that has been reflected by the tourism industry and many in it.

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (3.26 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is about delivering practical environmental reform for Queensland. Queenslanders expect strong, environmental protections, as they should. We are lucky to live in one of the most beautiful parts of the world. Queenslanders also expect a system that is practical, efficient and easier to navigate. Right now, too many businesses, landholders and operators are buried under unnecessary red tape, duplicated processes and delays that add costs without improving environmental outcomes. That is exactly what this bill seeks to address.

This legislation modernises environmental regulations while still maintaining strong safeguards for Queensland's natural environment. It is about improving efficiency, reducing duplication and creating a system that focuses regulatory attention where it is actually needed. That matters greatly in regional Queensland, particularly in my electorate of Mirani. Mirani is built on hard work and productive industries. We are an electorate powered by agriculture, mining, transport, manufacturing and tourism. We are home to sugarcane growers, cattle producers, small family businesses, contractors, tourism operators and mining communities that help drive Queensland's economy.

The people in my electorate care deeply about the environment because their livelihoods depend on it. Farmers rely on healthy land and reliable water. Tourism operators rely on protecting the natural beauty of places like Eungella and the Pioneer Valley. Mining companies understand that they have obligations to rehabilitate land and operate responsibly. Regional Queenslanders are frustrated by unnecessary red tape and complicated processes that slow projects down, create uncertainty and make it harder to get things done. People are tired of processes that feel disconnected from practical reality. I hear it all the time from local businesses and producers. They are not asking for environmental standards to disappear; they are asking for common sense. They want clear rules, they want practical timeframes, they want systems that are easier to navigate and less duplicative. That is what this bill delivers.

One of the key reforms in this bill is a move towards a more targeted and risk-based approach to environmentally relevant activities, ERAs. At the moment, Queensland's environmental approval framework can often treat low-risk activities with the same heavy-handed processes as high-risk activities. That creates unnecessary administrative burden and cost. This bill introduces opportunities for low-risk activities to instead operate under clear environmental codes rather than lengthy approval processes. That is practical reform. Importantly, environmental safeguards are maintained. Operators will still need to comply with environmental conditions, but the process becomes simpler and more efficient.

In my electorate we have local councils, quarry operators, contractors, farmers and small businesses trying to navigate approvals while also managing rising costs, workforce shortages and economic pressures. Reducing unnecessary delays and duplication helps those businesses focus on doing what they do best: employing locals, supporting communities and keeping regional economies strong. Agriculture in particular will benefit from a more practical and responsive system. Mirani is home to major agriculture industries including sugarcane, beef cattle and horticulture production. These are industries that already deal with enough uncertainty through weather events, moving markets and rising input costs. The last thing they need is unnecessary red tape slowing down low-risk activities or creating confusion around what rules they need to follow.

This bill recognises that environmental rules should match the level of risk involved. That is a sensible approach. I always welcome the reforms around underground water management. Water is one of the most important issues for regional Queensland communities. Landholders deserve confidence that groundwater impacts are properly monitored and that there are clear processes in place if concerns arise. The changes allowing bore owners to formally request assessment are practical and fair. At the same time, extending underground water impact reporting timeframes from three years to five years provides greater efficiency while maintaining oversight and safeguards. These reforms recognise that regulation should still protect landholders while also operating in a practical and workable way.

The mining and resources sector is another critical part of Central Queensland's economy and is a major employer for many communities in and around my electorate of Mirani. This bill includes important reforms around mine rehabilitation and closure planning. The current framework has created challenges and uncertainty for many operators transitioning into the rehabilitation system. Industry and regulators alike have identified issues with duplication, unclear processes and overly complicated rules. This bill addresses those concerns while maintaining the core objective of rehabilitation and responsible closure planning. Importantly, rehabilitation obligations remain. This is not about weakening environmental responsibilities; it is about improving clarity, improving consistency and making the system function properly. That is something regional communities support because they understand the importance of balancing environmental responsibility with economic sustainability.


These reforms are also important at a time when many regional industries are increasingly concerned about the growing complexity of environmental regulations coming from Canberra. The Treasurer's decision to direct the Queensland Productivity Commission to investigate the impacts of proposed changes to the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 is an important step. Communities across regional Queensland deserve to understand what these changes could mean for agriculture, mining, infrastructure, tourism and future investment. One thing Queenslanders do not like is fly-in fly-out federal politicians making decisions about regional communities without properly listening to the people on the ground or even answering their questions. Listening to one landholder alone does not provide the full picture. Properties, businesses and communities across my electorate are all different, and people deserve the opportunity to have their voice heard. Communities around places like Clarke Creek have been seeking answers and certainty around these proposed EPBC changes and the impacts they could have on farmers, landholders and regional industries. Local people deserve genuine consultation, not token visits and decisions made from Canberra. Queenslanders want strong environmental protections, but they also want practical laws that do not unnecessarily delay projects, increase costs or undermine regional jobs and industries. That is particularly important in the electorate of Mirani, where productive industries are not just businesses; they are the backbone of entire communities and local economies.

I also support the stronger compliance and enforcement measures contained in this bill. Most operators across Queensland do the right thing. Most businesses want to comply and operate responsibly, but there are repeat offenders who knowingly cause environmental harm and continue to break the rules. While most industries in regional Queensland understand the importance of balancing development with environmental responsibilities, unfortunately some renewable energy developers have been slow to the party.

People in Mirani care deeply about protecting our local environment, our waterways and our wildlife habitats, yet locals are increasingly frustrated to see remnant vegetation bulldozed and koala habitat disturbed while communities feel they are the ones left carrying the impacts. No industry should get a free pass. Whether it is agriculture, mining, tourism or renewables, the expectation should be the same: if you operate in regional Queensland, you respect the environment and you work with the community, not over or above them.

This legislation strengthens powers to deal with repeat offenders by allowing courts to order forfeiture of equipment and vehicles used in unlawful environmental activities. This bill also reflects something broader about the approach of the Crisafulli government. This government is focused on delivering practical, commonsense reforms that support economic growth while maintaining—

*(Time expired)*

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (3.36 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. At the outset, the opposition acknowledges that there are elements of this bill aimed at improving administrative efficiency and reducing duplication across environmental approvals processes. We understand the need for regulatory systems to remain contemporary, effective and responsive. Whilst the government talks endlessly about efficiency and streamlining, Queenslanders are entitled to ask whether this bill gets the balance right, because environmental protections are not simply administrative hurdles. They are safeguards that exist to protect Queensland communities, ecosystem waterways and future generations. The concern with this bill is that in too many areas the Crisafulli government appears more focused on reducing oversight than on maintaining confidence in the system.

The government claims this bill will reduce the regulatory burden. It claims it will remove duplication and deliver faster approvals. However, throughout the committee process and stakeholder consultation there were repeated concerns raised that important scrutiny mechanisms are being

weakened in the name of convenience. One of the clearest examples is the removal of public notification requirements for the draft terms of reference for environmental impact statements. Community consultation is not red tape. Public participation is not an inconvenience. Queenslanders deserve the opportunity to understand and comment on major projects that may impact their communities and environment, yet this government's approach once again appears to be 'announce first, consult later'. This is becoming the hallmark of this government, and I have spoken previously in this place about this.

The lack of respect for stakeholders is breathtaking. It is not a good way to govern. The opposition is particularly concerned that this bill centralises greater decision-making powers into administrative processes while reducing transparency and opportunities for public scrutiny. The explanatory notes make it clear that the bill establishes pathways for certain environmentally relevant activities, ERAs, to be regulated through codes rather than through traditional environmental authorities. The government said that this is about efficiency, but stakeholders have raised concerns that code-based systems may reduce site-specific assessment and weaken accountability over time. Queenslanders understand that once environmental protections are watered down it is communities and ecosystems that bear the consequences.

This issue is also a deeply personal one for me. Long before environmental protection became a political debate, my great-grandfather Percy Pease, who served as Queensland deputy premier and secretary for public land during the 1930s, was helping to shape Queensland's conservation legacy. Percy Pease was one of the great champions of our state's national parks and conservation estate. He played a pivotal role in protecting some of Queensland's most treasured natural areas. He resisted calls to allow logging in Lamington National Park, he supported the expansion of the Queensland national park network and was instrumental in the protection of more than 100 Great Barrier Reef island national parks. His vision helped preserve many of the landscapes and ecosystems that Queenslanders enjoy today. Environmental stewardship is part of my family's story. Protecting our environment for future generations is not only good public policy; it is a responsibility that I have grown up understanding and valuing. It is very much in my family's DNA and I wonder what Percy would be saying about this bill.

The bill also removes the public interest evaluation process for progressive rehabilitation closure plans. The government said that these evaluations create administrative burdens without clear benefits, but the opposition believes public interest considerations matter. Mining rehabilitation affects local communities, agricultural land, waterways and future land use. Queenslanders expect rehabilitation obligations to be independently scrutinised and enforced properly, not streamlined away because they are inconvenient for government or industry.

The opposition also notes concerns around the expanded use of delegated legislation in the bill. The explanatory notes acknowledge that future ERAs will increasingly be prescribed through regulation rather than through primary legislation. That matters because regulations can be changed far more easily and with far less public scrutiny and attention. Queenslanders expect the parliament, not just ministers and departments, to remain central in determining what activities require environmental oversight. While the government insists that there will still be parliamentary scrutiny through disallowance processes, the reality is that major policy decisions should not quietly disappear into subordinate legislation wherever possible.

The opposition is also concerned about the government's approach to balancing environmental protection with commercial tourism activities. Queensland's protected areas, state forests and marine parks are not simply economic assets; they are environmental treasures. Of course tourism matters—it supports regional economies and jobs—but environmental integrity must remain the priority. The government's push for single integrated permissions may streamline operations for tourism businesses, but we must ensure commercial convenience never overrides environmental safeguards. Throughout the bill there is a recurring theme: the government consistently frames environmental protections as barriers to efficiency rather than safeguards worth defending, and that is why Queenslanders are cautious. The government talks about cutting red tape, only for communities later to discover that important protections and consultation rights have quietly disappeared along the way. Environmental groups, legal organisations and community stakeholders raised concerns about reduced oversight, reduced public notification requirements and the potential weakening of environmental scrutiny. These concerns need and deserve to be taken seriously. This government cannot simply dismiss every criticism as being antidevelopment or antibusiness. Queenslanders want both economic growth and strong environmental protections.

The opposition will continue to raise concerns whenever this government appears to prioritise speed over scrutiny, because environmental legislation should not simply be about making approvals faster; it should be about protecting Queensland's natural environment while providing certainty and fairness for industry and communities alike. That balance matters, and Queenslanders are increasingly concerned that this government is losing sight of that balance. This is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards—backwards by a government that is paralysed by its own failures. Rather than building trust and confidence in environmental decision-making, this government is reducing transparency, limiting opportunities for community participation and concentrating more power behind closed doors. Queenslanders deserve better than a government that mistakes security for inconvenience and consultation for delay.

**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PEASE:** For those opposite, keep doing your auditions. You will have to try a little bit harder because no-one is really listening to you. Keep going. Keep trying.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Martin): Order, members.

**Ms PEASE:** Here we go—more auditions from those on the government benches. All of the backbenchers are going for it. Member for Southport and member for Lockyer, keep going. Too often the Crisafulli government appears to be more interested—certainly the backbench is more interested—in headlines and its members more interested in positioning for an opportunity at a ministerial portfolio than about reducing regulation and building genuine confidence and environmental governance.

**Mr Perrett** interjected.

**Ms PEASE:** I would be worried a little bit about your seat too, member for Gympie. They might be gunning for you too, mate!

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Through the chair, please.

**Ms PEASE:** The opposition believes Queensland can absolutely support investment.

**A government member:** You're making it up, Joan.

**Ms PEASE:** I think not. I have heard rumours coming from the backbench over there, thank you very much.

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

**Ms PEASE:** Those goals are not mutually exclusive—


**Government members** interjected.

**Ms PEASE:** He is there! There you go—the member for Gregory! He is there patting you on the shoulder!

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There has been far too much quarrelling across the chamber. If there are any more interjections, you will be warned. Member for Lytton, I ask you to please address your comments through the chair.

**Ms PEASE:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. Member for Gympie, watch your back. Those goals are not mutually exclusive, but achieving that balance requires proper consultation, transparency and respect for community expectations, not simply dressing up deregulation as efficiency. The opposition will continue to scrutinise those reforms carefully, because once environmental protections are weakened rebuilding public confidence is far harder. Queenslanders expect this parliament to protect jobs, protect communities and protect the environment at the same time. That is the balance we should always strive for. I thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your guidance and for your recommendations about keeping to the bill, but once again I take all of those interjections from those opposite. Keep on auditioning. No decisions have been made as yet, so keep going.

 **Mr HUTTON** (Keppel—LNP) (3.46 pm): Farmers are stewards of the land, people who earn an income drawn from the paddocks of our land and know how important it is to look after and maintain the environment of Queensland. A wise farmer once said that in nature there are neither rewards nor punishments but there are consequences, as is being found by those in opposition. There is a wisdom

in that observation for governments as much as individuals. Queenslanders expect us to protect the natural environment that defines our state, but they also expect us to understand the consequences of overly complex systems, of unnecessary duplication and of regulatory delay. They expect environmental protections that are strong but also practical—systems that work not only in theory but also in the real world where our farmers live; where our regional communities thrive; where local businesses, local tourism operators and industries are all trying to navigate government processes to make our state stronger.

Our environment is not just part of our identity; it is part of our economy, part of our lifestyle and part of the inheritance we leave to the next generation. Whether it is the Great Barrier Reef, our beautiful beaches, our national parks, our waterways, our bushland or our productive landscapes, Queenslanders expect them to be protected, but they also expect governments to exercise common sense—something that was lacking in the decade of decline. They expect systems that are efficient, systems that are understandable by the common man and focused on delivering outcomes rather than just processes for process's sake.

That is why I rise today to support the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill reflects a simple but important principle—environmental regulation should focus on delivering environmental outcomes, not creating paperwork for the sake of paperwork. For far too long stakeholders across Queensland have raised concerns about administrative inefficiencies; overlapping approvals at a local, state and federal government level; inconsistent processes; and unnecessary red and green tape that added cost and delay yet did not improve the environmental protections of what Queenslanders cherish most.

The Crisafulli government has listened. This bill modernises environmental regulation, streamlines approvals, reduces duplication and delivers greater certainty, all while maintaining strong safeguards for Queensland's natural environment. It is practical reform focused on outcomes and delivery. I acknowledge the member for Southport and his committee, which reviewed this legislation. I appreciate the report and the feedback they were able to give, noting there was no statement of reservation from those opposite.

This omnibus bill amends a range of legislation across the portfolio including the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Water Act 2000, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Forestry Act 1959, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006. This bill delivers reform across seven key areas: reforming environmentally relevant activities, defining environmental priorities, improving mine rehabilitation and closure, strengthening compliance and enforcement, improving investigation timeframes, streamlining underground water management and reducing red tape for ecotourism operators, who are the front line of the new tourism economy in Queensland. Thank you, Minister Powell.

These reforms matter because Queensland, and Keppel particularly, are growing. The expectations of our government in my community are growing, and if we are serious about protecting our environment while supporting a strong regional economy then our regulatory system must keep pace with the modern world. In my electorate of Keppel we understand that balance deeply. From the Capricorn Coast to the mighty Fitzroy River system, our natural environment shapes both our identity as locals and our economy. Tourism operators, local businesses, recreational users and conservation groups all rely on having a healthy environmental ecosystem. They rely on healthy environmental outcomes, but they also rely on having government systems that are workable and predictable. The Capricorn Coast Land Care Group that was first started in 1987 spends time each and every week volunteering down at Farnborough Beach and Mulambin Beach as well as working with local schools including Yeppoon State School. These hardworking volunteers are calling out for consistency, access to support and getting rid of the delays that stop them from being able to do what they would like to do: improve our local environment.


One of the most important reforms in this bill is the move to a more targeted risk-based approach to environmental relevant activities, ERAs. Not every activity carries the same environmental risk, yet under previous frameworks low-risk activities were often captured within processes which were designed for far more complex operations. This created unnecessary burden without improving environmental outcomes. This bill focuses regulation where it matters most. It reduces red and green tape for low-risk activities while maintaining strong safeguards and oversight where genuine environmental risks exist. This does not weaken environmental protection; it strengthens the effectiveness of environmental regulation by ensuring resources and attention are directed to where they can have the greatest impact.

The bill also addresses mine rehabilitation and closure. Queenslanders rightly expect mining companies to rehabilitate land and meet their obligations. The resource sector supports jobs and communities across Central Queensland, including many families in my seat of Keppel, but with that role comes responsibility. The former government introduced progressive rehabilitation and closure plans in 2019, but stakeholders identified significant practical challenges and duplication within the framework. This bill responds by removing unnecessary duplication, improving audit timeframes and creating a clearer transition pathway for environmental authorities. Importantly, this is about improving the system so rehabilitation outcomes can actually be delivered more effectively. In Central Queensland we have form on this. Look at Kershaw Gardens. What was once the Rockhampton tip now has playgrounds, walking tracks and a beautiful water play feature and each and every year hosts the CapRescue colour run that the member for Rockhampton and I proudly participate in. Probably most importantly, it has Wyatt's Wonder Web in tribute to past councillor Tom Wyatt, who was a brilliant representative of both the Rockhampton and Livingstone shire areas.

I welcome the measures in this bill aimed at reducing red tape for ecotourism operators. Tourism is one of Queensland's greatest strengths, particularly in regional communities like mine in Yeppoon. Across the Capricorn Coast, operators are working hard to showcase how they are environmental stewards. Too often they are finding themselves getting wrapped up in green tape, navigating multiple approval systems across different land tenures and agencies. This bill delivers a single integrated permission system for tourism operators across multiple land tenures. This practical reform reduces duplication while maintaining environmental safeguards. It also delivers on the Crisafulli government's Destination 2045 commitment to streamline approvals and support tourism operators to grow local jobs and support our local economy.

The Crisafulli government understands that environmental protections must remain strong, but we must ensure we have a system that is workable. That is the balance this bill seeks to achieve. It delivers clearer rules, faster decision-making, better coordination across government and stronger regulatory certainty. Most importantly, it delivers practical environmental reform focused on outcomes rather than process for process's sake.

In closing, Queenslanders value their environment deeply. In regional communities we live close to it, we work alongside it and we depend on it for our economic future. Queenslanders also value practical solutions and governments focused on delivery. This bill reflects those expectations. It modernises environmental regulation, reduces duplication and supports stronger outcomes for both Queensland's natural environment and the Queensland economy. I thank the minister for the introduction of this bill and I commend it to the House.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (3.56 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. It is great to have a full chamber for my contribution. It is also great to welcome the supporters, friends and family of the new member for Stafford, Luke Richmond. He is a great champion for the labour movement. He will make a great contribution in a few moments as well.

At the outset, let me make it very clear that the Queensland Labor opposition will not oppose this bill. We do not oppose it because there are elements within it that seek to improve administrative processes, streamline approvals and modernise aspects of Queensland's environmental regulatory framework. The Queensland Labor opposition will always support actions to streamline and improve the efficiency of our state's development, as long as they do not come at the expense of protecting our incredible environment or undermine the community's right to have a say about development proposals. That is the fundamental issue before the House today. The question is not whether efficiency is desirable; the question is whether this bill strikes the right balance between efficiency and environmental protection.

Unfortunately, despite this bill being more than 200 pages long, it raises more questions than it answers for both the industry and conservationists alike. Any proud Queenslander will tell you how lucky we are to have such incredible natural biodiversity right in our own backyard. Every corner of our state has a claim to fame when it comes to biodiversity and the natural environment, including the Morayfield state electorate with the great Sheepstation Creek Conservation Park, among other things.

Queensland's environment is not simply a collection of natural assets; it is part of who we are. It supports jobs, tourism, agriculture, communities and future generations. Protecting our environment is about protecting jobs, protecting communities and protecting the future of our state. This is why environmental legislation must always begin from a simple principle. Environmental protection must

remain the priority. Regulatory efficiency is important and administrative improvements are worthwhile, but environmental protection cannot become an afterthought. That is the concern many stakeholders have expressed throughout the consideration of this bill.


The minister has repeatedly spoken about reducing red tape and green tape. In fact, this government appears obsessed with the motion of reducing green tape. The minister had his heart set on doing exactly that during his previous time in a previous government in this portfolio but, as always, the devil is in the detail, and there is not a lot of detail in this bill. One of the most significant concerns relates to the proposed changes surrounding environmentally relevant activities, commonly referred to as ERAs. The government proposes to establish a code-based framework for certain activities that it considers to be low risk. On the surface that may sound reasonable, but what exactly is considered low risk? The bill does not tell us. Industry stakeholders have asked, environmental groups have asked and conservation organisations have asked—and they are still waiting for a clear answer. The government is asking this parliament to hand over significant regulatory discretion without providing sufficient details about how that discretion will ultimately be exercised.

Debate, on motion of Mr Ryan, adjourned.

## ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF STAFFORD

### First Speech

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

 **Mr RICHMOND** (Stafford—ALP) (4.00 pm): I acknowledge the traditional owners of the land, past, present and emerging, and pay my respects to the world's oldest continuing culture. The suburbs within the seat of Stafford began as a mix of rural and industrial land, home to dairying, tanneries, fellmongeries, quarries and brickworks. As Brisbane grew that land gave way to the postwar housing expansion that built the foundations of the communities that we know today. Stafford is no longer defined by tanneries and fellmongeries. Today it reflects the modern metropolitan economy. Our top quality schools draw in young families hoping that their kids will have the same opportunities that they were afforded. Stafford is the home of vital community infrastructure: the Kedron-Wavell RSL Sub Branch, sporting clubs that are too many to name and the Stafford & District and Chermside Meals on Wheels—ordinary people coming together to do extraordinary things.

Mr Speaker, I stand before you here today with great joy and pride in being Stafford's new Labor MP, but I also stand here with a sense of sadness and in the shadow of a tragedy. Jimmy Sullivan was taken from us too soon. He was my mate. He gave me my start working in politics, something we both saw as an honourable vocation. I remember his infectious laugh, his cheeky smile and his infuriating habits. I remember his love of our local community and his insistence on showing up for it. I remember my sadness when I saw Jimmy's health decline, and I remember the day of Frankie Sullivan's funeral. It was the worst day of my life. I remember it vividly and I think about it most days. I can only think that if it impacted me so significantly what must it have been like for Jimmy? While I will have more to say about Jimmy during the condolence motion, for now I say this: Jimmy, rest easy.

In the shadow of that tragedy, I have been humbled and honoured to have the support of Trish Bartlett and Terry Sullivan. I am proud to know them and privileged to call them friends, and I hope that they are enjoying their much deserved holiday. Being a by-election candidate is dangerous for one's ego. Being the only show in town means you get extraordinary access to people and resources and an extraordinary number of people to thank.

To the Leader of the Opposition, Steven Miles, deputy leader Cameron Dick and the Queensland Labor parliamentary team: thank you for your tireless work and enduring support. I have been fortunate to have worked with the state Labor caucus in different capacities, but I am more fortunate still to call you friends. I am indebted to my great mate Ben Driscoll, State Secretary of the Queensland Labor Party, who ran an incredible campaign. Thank you to Isabella Scattini, whose brilliant strategic mind will make her an excellent assistant state secretary. To Megan Kennedy Clark, who is already an excellent assistant state secretary and formidable campaigner, I say thank you. Thank you to Sasha Marin, Emily Searle, Cameron Boon, Jeremy Wong, Darcy Walsh, Archer Skinner, Seth Hempstead, Kimani Van Ingen. All of you worked your guts out on the biggest single seat field campaign in our party's history and without you I would not be standing here. Thank you to Sean Leader and Djaisi Robinson who were kings of the pre-poll booths. To Chris Hancock, thank you for your prompt return from Mexico and for all your support and friendship. To Lexie, Jack and Riley, I am sorry I was not the

most willing talent for your creative ambition, but I am truly grateful for your efforts. To my friends inside and outside the movement—Aggi, Cam and Ham, Bisma and Mitch, Zac, Josh and Jill, Joey, Quinn, Shauna, Gwen, Clare and Chris, Liam, Tom and Sophia, Olivia, Aamna, David, Finbar and Rachel, Jared, Benton, Anika and Finn, Bart, Michael and Una—a heartfelt thank you. To all of the branch members who came from far and wide: thank you. As a northside Labor MP I must acknowledge Wayne and Kim Swan, giants of the Labor movement. Together they are an unstoppable force and they have been sources of inspiration, invaluable advice and encouragement.

Thank you to the mighty trade union movement—to Gary Bullock, Alex Scott, Jacqueline King, Rohan Webb, Sally Gunner, Wendy Streets and Neil Henderson. I cannot articulate my gratitude, but I will demonstrate it in this place by fighting tirelessly for the working people you go into bat for every day. To Josh Millroy of the TWU and Justin Power of the SDA, thank you for your support, advice, friendship and leadership. To AWU state secretary Stacey Schinnerl, thank you for your unwavering support, for your steadfast friendship and for your commitment to working people. I will not let you down.

To my parents-in-law, Rosie and John, and my siblings-in-law, Kat and Andreas, thank you for everything. To my sister Isabella and her husband, Alex, I am sorry I had to miss your wedding and I hope you are enjoying your honeymoon. Izzy, you are an inspiration to me. You and your colleagues are at the front of my mind each and every day in this job. Everything that I have in my life is because of the love, dedication and sacrifice of my parents, Lynn and Craig. Mum's emotional intelligence, intuition and care for others is unparalleled. As the unofficial but undisputed convenor of the Total Fusion Chermside social club, her organising skills would shame the most seasoned union official. She cannot be here today—she has flown to the UK for her sister's funeral—but I am sure she is watching along, assuming she has managed to get the parliament livestream working. My dad is my best mate and the smartest person I know. It is to the great fortune of those opposite that it is I who stand in this place and not my father. Mum and dad would do literally anything for my sister and me. They fostered in me a sense of social justice and social responsibility and helped me find the confidence to make my voice heard. At the heart of my Labor values are the values that they instilled in me. In the lottery of birth I won the jackpot. Mum and Dad, I love you.

To my brilliant wife, Maddie: you are the love of my life and a life with you is well spent. Your belief in me and your desire for me to achieve success has driven me further than I could have ever imagined. One of things I love about you most is your conviction that roles such as these are meaningless if they are not used for a purpose. I vow to make the time that I spend in here, and the sacrifices that you make for that to be so, in service to a greater purpose. Thank you, my love.

Finally, can I thank the people of Stafford—the friends, the neighbours, the former colleagues and the strangers—whom I have the honour to represent. The story of Stafford is the story of my life. Stafford is where I went to school. My time at Padua steeped me in the Franciscan tradition which holds that the measure of any society is how it treats those with the least. Stafford is where I got my first job and where I learned firsthand the value of hard work and the dignity and meaning of secure employment. Stafford is where Maddie and I are building our future, reminding me of the importance of home ownership in providing stability, security and a sense of place. Stafford is home to the Prince Charles Hospital where my sister works as a nurse and where I held my grandfather's hand as he took his final breaths, affirming the importance of universal health care in providing dignity to people at their most vulnerable.

For me, Stafford epitomises the best ideals of the Australian dream: a place that is egalitarian, where a surgeon and a support worker can live on the same street; where in a working-class suburb like Chermside you can walk into one of Australia's pre-eminent hospitals and be treated by world-leading clinicians for free; a place where people live in the knowledge that if they work hard they will be given the opportunity to reach their potential. Mr Speaker, this reality is at risk of slipping away. Economic inequality is being recharged. Oxfam reports that in Australia 48 billionaires now hold more wealth than the bottom 40 per cent of our population. That inequality is taking its toll. For too many Stafford locals the prospect of their kids being able to afford a home in the community they love is a pipedream, where teachers doubt their ability to provide kids a top-class education in our public schools, where patients wait longer to be seen and clinicians feel the moral injury of providing patients care in facilities that do not have the resources they require.

Ordinary people struggling to get ahead while the super wealthy entrench their position is one of the reasons we are seeing the rise of far-right populists. We know that far-right populists talk a big game, but they will never actually deliver for working people when they are funded by the very billionaires who cause this problem in the first place. I believe that the way to beat the far right is by returning to the first principles of the labour movement: to fight for social justice and to deliver every Queenslander the opportunity to fulfil their potential.

I fought this campaign on a single conviction that every Queensland, regardless of their income, their postcode or their family circumstances, deserves world-class universal free health care. For the people I represent, that leads straight to the doors of the Prince Charles Hospital—an institution that changes the trajectory of people's lives. Its clinicians have skills that in many other countries would be reserved only for those who could afford to pay. Our universal healthcare system is not a given; it must be fought for. I commit to the people of Stafford that I will continue to fight for the 93-bed expansion at the Prince Charles Hospital and that I will always do what I can to protect and expand universal health care in Queensland.

Delivering a universal health system is but one part of the fight for social justice. A quality education changes the trajectory of a life. I will fight for our educators to be paid what they are worth because every child whose teacher is supported is a child whose potential is unlocked, and the cost of failing those children is paid by all of us for the rest of their lives.

Having a place to call home is an essential element of the good life but, with rising rents and interest rates and house prices having soared, many Stafford locals feel that the roof over their heads is a source of stress rather than solace. I believe that we should use the powers of state government to mandate the availability of affordable housing in significant new residential developments and that housing should be considered a human right rather than an asset to speculate on.

No Queensland can fulfil their potential if they live in fear walking the streets. The right to feel safe is at the heart of reaching one's potential. Those who commit criminal acts deny others that right and they should be held to account. Further to that, when someone falls into a life of crime then, by definition, they are not reaching their potential. Our task is not just to hold them to account; it is to do everything we can to pull them back towards a more productive life. It means we need to be tough on crime and tough on the causes of crime, to borrow a phrase. That is why early intervention matters. The pathways into offending, and particularly youth offending, begin long before any contact with the justice system. That is why I believe the Malinauskas government got it right with one of their first moves in government, to call a royal commission into the early years development of South Australian kids. If we want to be able to deliver the best life for Queenslanders we need to be laser focused on ensuring that all Queenslanders get the best start, regardless of the circumstances of their birth or their family composition.

At the heart of the Labor concept of a good life is the simple proposition that it is built on dignified work, an income you can raise a family on, a workplace that is safe and where you are treated with respect, and the recognition that comes from contributing to your community through your efforts. We cannot do this on goodwill alone. It requires the state to invest in the skills, public services and protections that make decent work possible. It requires revenue. We should raise revenue in accordance with two key principles. The first is growing revenue through inclusive prosperity. Economic growth that creates the kinds of jobs a person can build a life on, a well-funded health and education system and a socially inclusive society are not at odds with a strong economy; they are the foundation of one. When more Queenslanders enjoy the dignity of work, more Queenslanders contribute and the resources of the state grow with them. The second is by ensuring that we do not unfairly burden working people in our pursuit of properly funded public services. Wherever possible, the burden of taxation should be shifted away from individuals and small businesses and toward the multinational companies whose business model relies on extraction rather than value creation.

Queenslanders who get up early and work hard do not see their income skyrocket based on international conflicts. The Queensland Labor Party has a proud record in this regard. At the heart of the decision to raise coal royalties was a recognition that a rise in coal prices was not due to commercial ingenuity but global factors that supercharged corporate profits while exacerbating pressures on the hip pockets of Queenslanders. The current royalty regime should not lapse at the end of this parliament. It should be made permanent.

We are now seeing similar dynamics play out in relation to gas exports. Too much of this debate is left to Canberra. Queensland is not without power. This parliament has the authority to raise royalties on gas exports and the responsibility to reinvest every dollar in helping Queenslanders to reach their potential. I believe that it is time for the Queensland parliament to have a conversation about whether gas exporters can do more to pay their fair share. With gas exporters profiting from global price rises, it is not good enough to tell Queenslanders that they must go without hospital beds or frontline staff because resources are scarce. We should be courageous in taking on vested interests to deliver for ordinary Queenslanders.

Artificial intelligence will reshape our economy and our social fabric. Harnessed properly, AI can enhance our wellbeing and help more people reach their potential. That will only happen if workers lead the deployment of AI in their workplaces. The people most affected by these tools cannot be

afterthoughts in someone else's decisions; they must be the ones making them. We should be deliberate about where this technology is deployed. Our ambition should not be to erode secure employment; it should be to lift productivity and improve the lives of workers and the public services they deliver.

Cynicism in our politics is growing and it has to be reversed. Trust cannot be demanded; it can only be earned. Therefore, to the people of Stafford I say this: I will work every day to earn yours and to prove that the political process can deliver for ordinary Queenslanders and that, regardless of your background, you will have the opportunity to build a life of dignity with strong public services backing you each and every step of the way.

Throughout my campaign I spent a lot of time talking about my grandfather's time in palliative care. While he cannot be here today, I am proud to have my nan, Maureen, watching from the gallery. I conclude my contribution with this recollection: one afternoon at the Prince Charles Hospital palliative care ward, Grandad had been having a nap. When he woke up, he told Dad that he had had a dream. In that dream, Grandad and I had been saving the world together. When pressed for detail, Grandad advised that this mainly entailed me taking a series of meetings and in the event that someone disagreed with me Grandad would be on hand to give them a swift right to the ribs. Those who knew my Grandad Mac will attest that this was his preferred method of conflict resolution.


I tell this story to say two things. The first is that, for anyone in this place who finds themselves on the opposing side of an argument with me and starts to feel a twinge in their ribcage, I cannot rule out that it is Granddad Mac politely asking you to reconsider your position from beyond the grave. The second is to say that, while I would not be so hubristic to think that my time in this place will lead to global salvation, I do hope that my time as a parliamentarian will, in some small way, help make the world a better and fairer place.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p.1587, on motion of Mr Powell—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (4.18 pm), continuing: I rise to continue my contribution to the debate on the bill. While I am on my feet, can I say what a marvellous first speech that was from the new member for Stafford. He is an outstanding human being and also an outstanding contributor to our Labor team. It is great to have him contributing in this parliament.

The government is asking this parliament to hand over significant regulatory discretion without providing sufficient detail about how that discretion will ultimately be exercised. The introduction of code-based regulation means some proponents will effectively be able to self-assess whether they meet prescribed requirements. That represents a significant reduction in direct oversight.

The Environmental Defenders Office told the parliamentary committee that eligibility for ERA codes would be self-assessed by proponents with no prior scrutiny or oversight by government or the public. They described that approach as directly opposite to the regulatory functions the department should perform. Those are not my words; those are the words of experts whose role it is to examine environmental law and regulation. Similarly, the Queensland Trust for Nature warned that without clearly defined thresholds and safeguards this approach risks allowing environmentally harmful activities with specific and serious impacts to proceed without adequate scrutiny.

The North Queensland Land Council expressed concerns that a simplified, standardised approach may be applied to small-scale mining activities that are deemed low risk by the state. Therein lies a problem. Environmental impacts are often highly site specific. A one-size-fits-all approach may be administratively convenient, but it is not always environmentally appropriate. What may be low risk in one location may have significant consequences in another. Environmental regulation requires nuance, judgement, oversight and transparency. The Labor opposition is not opposed to code-based approaches where activities are genuinely low risk, but Queenslanders deserve confidence that those activities have been properly addressed before they are exempted from more rigorous scrutiny. Unfortunately, that confidence is not provided by this bill.

Another area of serious concern is the government's ongoing assault on public consultation. Public consultation matters. In fact, those opposite spent much of last year telling Queenslanders exactly how important public consultation was. Apparently, that principle only applies when it suits the

government's ideological agenda because now we see a bill that seeks to remove public notification requirements for draft terms of reference for environmental impact statements. When it comes to renewable energy projects, those opposite demand consultation. When it comes to environmental authorities and major industrial projects, suddenly consultation becomes inconvenient.

The minister argues that consultation opportunities will remain later in the process. However, evidence provided to the parliamentary committee tells a different story. The opposition uncovered departmental advice showing that public notification of draft terms of reference resulted in changes to the final terms of reference in 100 per cent of cases examined—100 per cent. It demonstrates that the current process works, it demonstrates that public consultation improves outcomes, and it demonstrates why removing consultation opportunities is such a poor decision.


The Queensland Conservation Council stated that public notification provides an early opportunity for community input into the assessment of major projects. That seems entirely reasonable. The Queensland Law Society similarly warned that removing notification rights would reduce opportunities for public participation and create inconsistencies across environmental assessment frameworks. If consultation consistently improves outcomes, why would any government seek to remove it? The answer appears to be convenience, but convenience should never outweigh accountability.

You cannot claim to be committed to environmental protection whilst systematically removing opportunities for scrutiny and public participation. The concerns surrounding this bill must also be viewed in the broader context of this government's approach to environmental policy. The truth is you cannot say you want to protect the environment and address climate change if you do not believe in things like net zero. The preservation and conservation of our environment requires action to reduce emissions, it requires a commitment to renewable energy and it requires a commitment to protecting natural assets such as the Great Barrier Reef, yet this government has already scrapped renewable energy targets established under the former government. Those targets were designed to support Queensland's transition—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Lister): Member for Morayfield, when I was in the chair earlier, I pulled up the member for Cairns for straying from the long title of the bill on this very subject. Can I ask you, please, to confine your contribution to one that is relevant to the bill before us?

**Mr RYAN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know that the community cares about environmental protection. They want responsible development. They want economic growth. They want clean waterways and healthy ecosystems. They want proper rehabilitation of disturbed land. They want confidence that governments are acting in the public interest. Queenslanders expect their government to protect our environment, but this government proves through its actions that it is anti public consultation, anti environmental protection and anti public protection from noise, pollution and industrial hazards. It should have been possible to deliver sensible, administrative reforms while strengthening environmental protections. It should have been possible to improve efficiency while maintaining transparency. It should have been possible to support development while preserving public participation in the development process. Instead, we are presented with legislation that creates uncertainty, reduces scrutiny and shifts risk away from proponents and onto communities and the environment.

The Labor opposition will not oppose this bill because there are aspects of it that improve administrative processes and because we recognise the importance of reducing unnecessary regulatory burden when it is appropriate, but our support should not be mistaken for endorsement of the government's broader approach. This approach is further proof that the Crisafulli LNP government is dragging Queensland backwards and it is a government paralysed by its failures.

 **Hon. AJ PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (4.25 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The explanatory notes state that this bill aims to improve administrative efficiency and ensure the regulatory frameworks within Queensland's environmental legislation remain contemporary, effective and responsive. This will be achieved by reforming the regulation of environmentally relevant activities, defining environmental priorities, improving mine rehabilitation and closure, strengthening compliance and enforcement, providing timeframes for investigating offences, streamlining underground water management and reducing red tape for ecotourism.

The Crisafulli government's Destination 2045 committed to reducing red tape by reviewing our laws and regulations, and permitting processes to reduce timeframes and barriers. This bill delivers on our commitment.

Across the state we are cleaning up the messes left by Labor's decade of decline. That 10 years of Labor can be defined by costly, unnecessary and unproductivity requirements, burdensome red and green tape, inconsistencies, administrative inefficiencies, unclear regulatory processes and duplication. In many instances, Labor's costly bureaucratic conditions delivered little to no benefit to the environment. Even stakeholders and regulators found Labor's frameworks administratively complex, duplicative and unclear.

In contrast, the Crisafulli government is focused on practical, commonsense solutions. We are focused on reforms that deliver certainty, accountability and better outcomes for Queensland's environment. We are delivering clearer rules, faster decision-making and better coordination across government.

Our guiding principle in this omnibus bill is to simplify and streamline processes while delivering good outcomes for the environment. One of these includes environmentally relevant activities, or ERAs. These activities regulate where a contaminant will cause environmental harm if it is or may be released into the environment. Prescribed ERAs are listed in the Environmental Protection Regulation 2019. Examples they cover include animal feedlots, sewage treatment, chemical manufacturing, oil refining, metal forming, meat processing, mineral and bulk material handling and battery manufacturing. As the minister outlined in his speech, this bill introduces a more targeted, risk-based approach to regulating these activities.

Amendments in this bill will provide more opportunities to respond better to risk and be clearer about whether an action has an adverse environmental impact. They will also allow ERAs to be managed by a code for low-risk activities without requiring individual environmental authorities. It means less bureaucracy while maintaining strong protections where they are needed.

The member for Nudgee raised AgForce's concerns about transparency and accountability and its call for a publicly accessible or departmental register of code assessable ERAs. Cynically, it was just after lauding the efforts of the Environmental Defenders Office, an organisation known to demonise the environmental credentials of primary producers. The former Labor government paid lip-service to concerns of industry stakeholders such as AgForce. It treated primary producers with contempt and demonised their advocacy about environmental issues. I judge them on their record.

Who can forget that in 2022 the former Labor environment minister forced industry stakeholders to sign unprecedented confidentiality agreements to view secretly drafted environmental legislation? They wanted to gag industry stakeholders from taking concerns to their members. That was only four years ago. When I asked, then premier Palaszczuk refused to rule out dictating to graziers the number of cattle they could run under their new rules. When Labor were caught out, they obfuscated and dissembled. Labor wanted to be able to unilaterally and retrospectively shut down farms by way of a bureaucrat's decision. Labor were going to increase the amount of red tape in new environmental approvals such as environmental impact statements. Labor have never valued transparency and accountability when it comes to agriculture production.

Late last year we saw the federal government, with the support of the Greens, rush through changes to the EPBC Act. These changes were almost immediate. They were made at the last minute without consulting industry. Industry was deliberately misled about being able to make a submission. The changes sold out farmers and regional communities. At that time, AgForce president Shane McCarthy described the situation as 'a dog's breakfast' and 'a hill that agriculture could die on'. He said—

The Greens-backed proposal will not protect the environment—it will damage it ...

Labor's new-found concerns are cynical and disingenuous. The Crisafulli government values transparency and accountability. We have tasked the Queensland Productivity Commission with investigating the EPBC changes which have raised concerns about increased regulatory burden, compliance costs, uncertainty and delays. When announcing the inquiry the Treasurer said that, after a decade of decline—

The Crisafulli government is delivering certainty and efficiency for the state's resources, agriculture and housing sectors ...

This inquiry will examine how we can balance environmental outcomes while driving economic growth without tying up businesses and project proponents in bureaucracy and regulation.

Measures in this bill already consider issues about transparency and accountability. Operators may be required to be registered to operate under the code. This registration will be considered and consulted on at the time of making each code. If registration is required, contact details and the nature

of the activity will be made available not only to the administering authority but also to the public. Records will be made available on the relevant department's website. This will ensure transparency and accountability. The committee also addressed AgForce's concerns in its report. It found—

The process for developing an ERA code ... which includes notification and receiving submissions, is well adapted to ensure a robust and transparent approach in the development of ERA codes.

It is telling that the Labor members of the committee did not provide a statement of reservation or dissenting report. One can only assume that they were satisfied with these assurances.

The Crisafulli government has a massive task ahead in cleaning up Labor's mess. The Queensland government currently administers more than 9,300 environmental authorities. It is an understatement to say that this number is excessive. It is inefficient, costly in both money and time and disorganised. To deal with this, the Crisafulli government is conducting a staged review process to determine which activities are potentially appropriate to be regulated through an ERA code. The environment department advised the committee—


Agricultural ERA Standards ... may be considered for transition to an ERA code in future. However, this would form part of a separate process and be carried out in consultation with stakeholders.

This bill also amends timeframes for an underground water impact assessment and creates a process for bore owners to seek a direction for a bore assessment to be completed by a resource tenure holder. Both the Queensland Farmers' Federation and Cotton Australia supported several key provisions which strengthen transparency and improve protection for water users. These include updates to the annual underground water impact report—UWIR—which provide regular insight into groundwater conditions; consolidation of baseline assessment obligations for cumulative management areas, enabling the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment to prepare comprehensive baseline assessments for all water bores on and off tenure; and a formalised process for landholder initiated bore assessments which include clearer review and appeal rights where landholders believe their bore performance has been impacted by resource activities. The Queensland Farmers' Federation said—

These measures represent meaningful improvements to the management and accountability framework.

Nevertheless, they both raised concerns about the new timeframe changing from three to five years. Currently, an underground water impact report is required every three years. This will be changed to every five years. This is because under the current three-year timeframe the OGIA frequently seeks multiple extensions to collate the necessary data for the report. Three years is clearly too tight a timeframe. The committee found that the change is a practical response to the challenge of meeting reporting deadlines and the current need for extensions. It also noted that existing provisions allow the CEO to request an earlier report or amendment to a UWIR. This would go some way to assessing stakeholders' concerns.

This bill simplifies processes while improving outcomes for the environment. Importantly, it delivers modern, practical and commonsense reforms which are good for Queensland and Queenslanders. I support the bill.

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (4.35 pm): The objectives of this bill are to improve administrative efficiencies and ensure the regulatory framework within Queensland's environmental legislation remains contemporary, effective and responsive. This bill responds directly to stakeholder feedback about unnecessary red and green tape, administrative inefficiencies and regulatory processes that add cost and delay without improving environmental outcomes. Much of this is thanks to the former Labor government, which left behind frameworks that stakeholders and regulators identified as complex, duplicative or unclear.

It is no surprise that the Labor members of the committee did not provide a dissenting report or statement. I acknowledge that they are not opposing this legislation, but they are talking about all of the concerns they have with it. If they spent a little less time doing the numbers on their leader and more time doing some work, they might be able to put in a dissenting report or a statement of reservation.

This bill modernises the Environmental Protection Act with a more targeted risk-based approach that reduces duplication and focuses regulation where it matters most. These reforms are about delivering clearer rules, faster decision-making and better coordination across government. These changes will: reframe the way that environmentally relevant activities are identified and regulated; define Queensland's environmental priorities; improve mine rehabilitation and compliance and enforcement powers; streamline underground water management; and reduce red tape for ecotourism. The Queensland government currently administers over 9,300 environmental authorities. I dare say that would take a lot of work.

This bill supports the transition of small-scale mining activities to regulation under the ERA code and clarifies that the requirement to give surety does not apply to these small-scale mining activities. These small-scale mining activities are considered low risk and financial provisioning is not warranted.

A staged review process will be undertaken to determine which activities are potentially suitable for regulation via an ERA code, with resource activities the initial focus of the review. Based on stakeholder feedback, other activities that may be considered suitable for regulation via an ERA code include sewage pump stations, small dredging operations, chemical storage, certain bulk material handling facilities and certain extraction and screening activities operated by local government.

It is important to note that operators will remain obliged to complete rehabilitation as a condition of operating under the ERA code. The bill also requires a consultation process to be undertaken when making a new ERA code or substantially changing an existing code. Public submissions will be invited on the draft ERA code for at least 30 days.

During consultation on the government's 20-year tourism plan *Destination 2045: delivering Queensland's tourism future*, feedback indicated that there was excessive red tape for tourism operators such as multiple permits and approvals required for the one activity within protected areas, like national parks or waterways. This bill includes amendments to facilitate delivery to improve this situation by introducing a single integrated permission which can be granted to businesses conducting tourism activities on lands or waters administered by Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service. This will ensure there is a single expiry date and a single fee to assist with streamlining.

For all the tourism operators, this is important and comes at a critical time when a lot of tourism operators throughout the bush, throughout my patch and throughout Western Queensland are struggling with lower tourism numbers thanks to the fuel crisis in the country and concerns on the back of the Iran war. It is fantastic to be part of a government that is doing all we can as a state to support measures like this that are going to directly support those businesses on the front line that are struggling with not only the cost-of-living crisis but also the fuel crisis. It is also great that as a government we are doing all we can to drill, refine and store Queensland fuel.

I can vouch for the good work that the environment minister is doing. Recently in Biloela there was an environmental issue from a business that collected and managed chemical spills which had ceased operating and the business premises was left abandoned. At this premises there were thousands of litres of all sorts of chemicals and oils stored in containers. I was contacted in March by a neighbouring electrical business, Star Precision Electrical, regarding concerns due to oils and chemicals leaking onto their property from their neighbours. As a result, they were unable to perform hot work in their workshop on site due to safety concerns from these chemicals.

We took this up with the environment minister's office, and within a short time they had undertaken short-term action to prevent migration of the hydrocarbons offsite and applied absorbent material and bunding throughout the site and along the boundaries. This situation worsened in the weather event which hit Queensland in late March, and the department have now engaged contractors to contain and mitigate further risks. Star Precision have since sent their thanks to the minister for his and his department's prompt action and their appreciation for the seriousness in which this matter has been treated.

We have since learnt that this is a matter that should have been sorted out by the previous government. Instead, it was essentially ignored. It is another example of those opposite failing to deal with environmental issues that might be a little tricky. I will put this in context. We want to streamline red and green tape. When it comes to actual environmental damage and matters that the environment department should be dealing with, this is a case in point that the minister will ensure that the department is doing the job that Queenslanders expect.

We know that the history of those opposite is that if you are a farmer or a mining company they will hang you out to dry without hesitation. If you are not either of those then they might just turn a blind eye, as they did in this instance because their green ideology only goes so far to shut down the industries that actually support the Queensland economy. In contrast, the Crisafulli government prioritises safety and real environmental outcomes, supports words that we speak in this chamber with action, and follows through on its commitments by delivering for Queenslanders.


In this legislation there are some measures to improve mine rehabilitation and closure plans. This is incredibly important. Over the years, as a former coalminer, I have seen firsthand the work that goes into rehabilitation plans from the mining industry. In the time I have been in this House, not only as the member for Callide but also in recent times as the assistant minister, I have seen some of the great work that mining companies do when it comes to mine rehabilitation and closure. It is an incredibly

expensive process. From memory, some companies spend upwards of \$70,000 per hectare in their mine rehabilitation plans. To put that into context, given the value of the land in comparison, it is significant. It shows how seriously mining companies take this.

There are a lot of Queensland-based companies that are actually world leaders when it comes to mine rehabilitation. New Hope coal is a fantastic example. They have world-leading mine rehabilitation programs. I dare say that Queensland can continue to be world leaders in many respects but also in environmental outcomes for mine closure. It is important that the red and green tape around those plans is something that is workable for these companies so that they can get on with the job of ensuring they are utilising Queenslanders' resources for the sake of the royalties we get as a state, for the jobs they generate and for all the additional activities and economic prosperity that they bring the state, as well as ensuring good environmental outcomes. These changes are a good step in us delivering that for Queensland.

The submissions broadly show support for the bill with industry groups also supporting these reforms. To quote AMEC, the Association of Mining Exploration Companies, 'The overall consultation process has been outstanding, with recognition and amendments made to address many concerns.' In their submission, the Property Council of Australia said, 'The Property Council is broadly supportive of the policy intent to modernise the Environmental Protection Act, streamline processes, and remove unnecessary duplication, whilst maintaining strong environmental protections.'

This is another great piece of legislation from the Crisafulli government, with a hardworking environment minister who is doing great work. There are many great things that I continue to advocate for including more park rangers across the great electorate of Callide so that we can ensure we get on top of the mess we inherited from those opposite. We know that our national parks were left in a complete mess. This minister and this government are working hard to clean them up. In doing that, we want to ensure we do not have unnecessary red and green tape in the way for all of the industries in Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (4.45 pm): I rise to address the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. At the outset, I wish to place on record my support for this legislation and commend the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation for bringing this important reform to the Queensland parliament. The member for Glass House will be, over successive terms, the longest serving environment minister here in Queensland. He is working extremely hard as part of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government. I certainly commend him for his efforts.

Queenslanders rightly expect strong environmental protections. They expect their governments at all levels to safeguard our unique natural environment, protect native wildlife, preserve our waterways and support sustainable development. They also expect government regulation to be practical, effective and efficient. Those objectives are not mutually exclusive. Indeed, one of the hallmarks of good government is ensuring that environmental protection frameworks are robust, contemporary and focused on achieving real outcomes rather than creating unnecessary complexity and administrative burden. That is precisely what this legislation achieves. The Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill modernises Queensland's environmental regulatory framework, removes duplication, strengthens compliance mechanisms, improves rehabilitation processes and delivers greater certainty for stakeholders while maintaining strong environmental safeguards.

Importantly, this legislation reflects the broader approach of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government. Our state government rejects the false choice that Queensland must somehow choose between a strong economy and a healthy environment. We understand that environmental protection and economic prosperity go hand in hand. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government also recognises that sustainable environmental outcomes are best achieved through clear rules, effective regulation, strong enforcement and practical partnerships with communities, landholders, conservation groups and industry. That is why this legislation delivers practical reforms that improve efficiency while maintaining the environmental protections that Queenslanders expect. It reduces duplication, streamlines approval, strengthens enforcement powers against environmental offenders and provides greater clarity regarding Queensland's environmental priorities.

As the state member for Moggill, I am particularly proud of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government's environmental credentials and our strong commitment to supporting grassroots environmental stewardship. The electorate of Moggill is fortunate to be home to remarkable natural landscapes that contribute significantly to the environmental character of Brisbane's western suburbs.

As the Minister for the Environment knows, there are a number of election commitments that we have delivered in the electorate of Moggill that have enhanced environmental protection and conservation efforts by a number of groups. I am going to outline some of those. From the Brisbane River and Kholo Creek through to Moggill Creek, Gold Creek, Pullen Pullen Creek and the extensive bushland reserves throughout our western suburbs, our local environment plays a vital role in the lifestyle, character and amenity of our community. Protecting and enhancing these natural assets requires more than legislation alone. It requires local knowledge, dedicated volunteers, community partnerships and governments willing to invest in on-the-ground environmental outcomes. That is exactly what the Crisafulli LNP state government has been delivering.

As part of our ongoing support for local environmental conservation, the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government has delivered \$375,000 in funding to five outstanding environmental and catchment organisations across the electorate of Moggill. Each organisation has received \$75,000 to support projects focused on restoring waterways, protecting native species, enhancing biodiversity and expanding environmental education opportunities within our community. These investments are delivering real outcomes where they matter most: on the ground in local communities within the catchments that help sustain our environment for future generations. I acknowledge the outstanding work of the Moggill Creek Catchment Group. For many years this organisation has played a vital role in environmental restoration, community education and conservation activities throughout our local area.

I was delighted that the first state budget of the Crisafulli Liberal National Party government delivered on our \$75,000 election commitment to upgrade the Gold Creek nursery. This important investment will enhance volunteer opportunities, strengthen native plant propagation capacity and further support local environmental regeneration projects throughout the western suburbs of Brisbane. This investment demonstrates our government's commitment to supporting practical environmental outcomes through partnerships with local organisations that know their community best.

I have also had the privilege this year of participating in several community environmental events made possible through the funding support provided by the Crisafulli LNP state government. In March I joined local families, volunteers and community members of the Pullen Pullen Catchments Group at a community tree-planting day. It was wonderful to see residents of all ages coming together to restore native bushland, learn about our local environment and contribute directly to improving biodiversity outcomes within our community. Events such as these not only deliver environmental benefits but also foster a deeper appreciation and understanding of conservation amongst future generations. Importantly, this initiative was supported through the delivery of the Crisafulli LNP state government's \$75,000 election commitment to the Pullen Pullen Catchments Group.

Similarly, in April I was pleased to support the Kholo Creek Catchment Group's community planting day. More than 1,000 native trees were planted as part of this fantastic community initiative. Again, local families, volunteers and environmental advocates came together with a shared purpose: restoring habitat, improving biodiversity and enhancing the long-term health of the local environment. This project was made possible through the delivery of our \$75,000 election commitment to the Kholo Creek Catchment Group. These real outcomes demonstrate what can be achieved under a state government which is committed to partnering with passionate organisations and community volunteers.

Environmental protection is not simply about policies and legislation; it is about empowering local communities to take action and supporting those who dedicate countless hours to improving our natural environment. This legislation appropriately recognises the importance of protecting Queensland's significant environmental values whilst ensuring regulatory frameworks remain contemporary and effective. The reforms establish greater clarity regarding environmental priorities and improve the administration of environmental regulation without creating unnecessary additional burdens.


This legislation also strengthens compliance and enforcement provisions, ensuring that those who deliberately cause environmental harm can be held appropriately accountable. Environmental laws only work when they can be effectively enforced. The enhanced powers contained within this legislation will help prevent repeat offending and provide greater protection for Queensland communities and the environment. These reforms are balanced, sensible and focused on outcomes. They reflect a government that is committed to both environmental protection and good governance.

Before concluding, I acknowledge an upcoming community event that highlights the strong environmental awareness and stewardship that exists within the electorate of Moggill. This Saturday, 6 June—which also coincides with Queensland Day—the Kholo Creek Catchment Group will host a World Environment Day celebration at the Mount Crosby State School hall. This event will feature

environmental education displays, children's activities, citizen science opportunities, local conservation information, community stalls and presentations focused on protecting native wildlife and ecosystems. Once again I am delighted that the Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is supporting this important local event. It represents exactly the kind of community-led environmental initiative that helps build greater awareness, strengthen conservation outcomes and inspire future generations to value and protect Queensland's unique natural heritage.

Queensland's environment is one of our state's greatest assets. Protecting it requires strong laws, effective regulation, practical partnerships and ongoing investment in local conservation efforts. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government has demonstrated that we are committed to delivering both strong environmental outcomes and practical regulatory reform. We are backing local environment groups, supporting conservation projects, investing in environmental education and ensuring Queensland's environmental protections remain effective and fit for purpose.

I also acknowledge the committee for the diligent work they have undertaken in relation to scrutinising this legislation. The Crisafulli Liberal National Party state government is delivering for our environment here in Queensland. The Minister for the Environment, the Hon. Andrew Powell MP, who is also the state member for Glass House, is achieving some fantastic outcomes after a decade of decline under the former Labor government. That is really important for communities right across Queensland and in particular the electorate of Moggill. Once again I acknowledge his contribution and that of his department and staff, because they are certainly achieving a lot here in Queensland. There was a lot that needed to be achieved. This legislation is extremely important. As such, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (4.55 pm): I am pleased to follow the Leader of the House with this contribution to the debate. I pay my respects to the minister and his team for the work they have done on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I also pay my respects to the chair of the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee, the member for Southport, and the members for Redcliffe and Hervey Bay for their work on the committee. I do not say that lightly, because the bill was supported by Labor members of the committee, who did not prepare a dissenting report or statement of reservation. We have heard that the opposition is going to support the bill, which is sensible.

The minister has taken a practical approach and genuinely listened to the community. That is vastly different from what had gone on before. Contributions from those opposite referred to the government not listening to some people, but they are quoting from a very few and not talking about all of those submitters to the bill, the witness who appeared before the committee and the stakeholders who were consulted very broadly. I say to the minister and his team and the department that their work on this bill is very well commended.

I really like the term 'stewardship'. I usually talk about stewardship in terms of the agricultural community, because farmers are great stewards of their land. They want to make sure it is there for generations. Likewise, tourism operators and those in the ecotourism world are stewards of the beautiful environment in which they operate and do business. It is very important that we listen directly to those tourism operators who are the stewards of those environments.

Those who know me well know that I enjoy going fishing from time to time when I get a chance. It is a great pastime, but we would not have the same opportunities in Queensland if the industry was not so well looked after by recreational and professional fishers. I recognise the Minister for Primary Industries here in the chamber tonight. I am going to talk to him about some of the great changes he is bringing about. I had the great opportunity to go to Tasmania and New Zealand. They really showcase what is possible when it comes to ecotourism events and the wonderful experiences you can have. I applaud the minister, his team and the department for the work they are doing in this place.


I refer to the member for Callide's comments earlier about national parks. An old adage was that if you lived beside a national park the government were the worst neighbours to have because they did not do a lot of work in that space. We want to make sure that we have rangers there and that the managers of the national parks have the resources to manage them so that the old adage—of the state being your worst neighbour—will be a thing of the past.


I love the phrase that it is hard to be green when you are in the red. It is important that we get the balance right between the environment and economics. That is where I think the minister, his team and the committee have done a great job.

Debate, on motion of Mr McDonald, adjourned.

## MEDICINES AND POISONS (MEDICINES) AMENDMENT REGULATION

### Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Before calling the member for Traeger, I remind honourable members that debate on the disallowance motion must be strictly relevant to the question of the disallowance of clause 5 of the Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Amendment Regulation 2026. What is relevant are the specific effects of that clause, the purpose of the disallowance and the effects of the disallowance. All of these are within scope and relevant to the debate. However, members must not digress into matters relating to orders of this House that restrict debate of certain topics or those broader topics. Those matters are beyond scope and irrelevant to this debate. Debate on a disallowance motion, which is permitted by the Statutory Instruments Act, will not be allowed to be used as a Trojan Horse for other matters. Members who ignore this caution will be warned once to get to the topic and then be sat down.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (5.01 pm): I move—

That clause 5 of the Medicines and Poisons (Medicines) Amendment Regulation 2026, subordinate legislation No. 16 of 2026, tabled in the House on 3 March 2026, be disallowed.

This disallowance motion helps the LNP keep their word when they said there would be no changes to these sorts of laws. We saw regulations coming through that included reference to the drug MS-2 Step. At the commencement of my contribution, I will table those papers which I guess set those guardrails for this debate that the Deputy Speaker just referred to. I table the *Extended practice authority, 'Midwives'—version 5* and the *Extended practice authority, 'Midwives'—version 6*.

*Tabled paper:* Extract from Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Midwives' (Version 5) [832].

*Tabled paper:* Extract from Medicines and Poisons Act 2019: Extended Practice Authority 'Midwives' (Version 6) [833].

If I quote from elements of these two papers, it becomes apparent why we saw the need to raise this and challenge it in the parliament. In relation to the use of abortion drug MS-2 Step, page 9 of version 5, which is the previous version, states—

For use in early medical termination of pregnancy. Only if the midwife has completed specified training and has been approved by their employer to administer or give a treatment dose of mifepristone and misoprostol (e.g. MS-2 Step).

In stark contrast, page 4 of the new version, version 6, regarding the same life-ending drugs only states that the training requirement is 'A course approved by the midwife's employer'. It has moved from making reference to 'the midwife has completed specified training and has been approved by their employer' to being 'A course approved by the midwife's employer'. That has been taken out. That is a glaring omission in the change that is being proposed to this new regulation. It has been added to a suite of regulations around flu treatments and bundled in with that. That is unfortunate because it would have been nice to just specifically address that. I have no real intention of addressing the rest of the regulation that refers to similar procedures around flu treatments.

Like I said, nowhere in version 6 are the words 'approved by their employer'. I am curious to hear from the government what they were trying to achieve with these changes and why it was necessary. I accept that MS-2 Step was put in by the previous Labor government to make this more accessible, but with the new party in government there has been a change to how that can be administered to omit the requirement of being approved by their employer.

I am honestly standing here trying to work through the implications of that. I am sure there are certainly some, but I cannot visualise a hypothetical scenario of where that would play a part. The question then is: why was it put there in the first place and why was it necessary to omit that it had to be approved by their employer? The only conclusion I can draw is that it is to make it more accessible than it was before by omitting a condition that was there before. You would have to assume it would make it a bit more onerous for whoever is administering this drug in the first place.

What was wrong with the old version, and why do we need to change it? That is the heart of the matter that we want to debate and why we have introduced this today. It was changed with the stroke of a pen, as happens with regulations. We do not like that and we have exercised our right in this parliament to draw that back in for debate. Notwithstanding the constraints that have been agreed to by this parliament to stop any debate around an issue that this connects with and really cannot be detached from, it still stands that if you see something you disagree with you should be able to bring it back in here and block it. That is the whole purpose of disallowance motions against regulations.

Everyone is quite welcome to debate this and talk about flu vaccines, and it is unfortunate this has been bundled in with that. That was triggered by making a change to what was there initially when this was introduced in the previous government, with the MS-2 Step drug being introduced and made

accessible. There has been a change to the way it is administered, so it has now been bundled in with these regulations of other flu vaccines. As far as we are concerned, there would be no need for this disallowance motion if there was no change. If the requirements had not been relaxed, there would be no need for us to be here now. Protection against the flu is fine. I have not spent a lot of time investigating what impact the regulations have on flu treatment. It is just very unfortunate that it is bundled in with this MS-2 Step. We cannot ignore one because those others have been bundled into that same regulation.

An important part of this debate tonight is the statistics. What is very interesting and significant in this debate is that in 2024 there were 17,009 prescriptions of MS-2 Step—

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think you gave very clear guidelines at the beginning of this debate in relation to what this debate is in relation to. I believe the member for Traeger is probably straying away from the effect of the motion itself.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause):** I will seek some advice from the Clerk. Member for Traeger, I give you advice to come back to the specific effects of the clause, the purpose of the disallowance and the effects of the disallowance and to remain within scope of that to be relevant to the debate.

**Mr KATTER:** I will certainly do my best, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I will take your advice. I might need some guidance because what I was just talking about related directly to the MS-2 Step stats, which is what we are talking about in clauses 5 and 6 where its regulation is being relaxed. I am trying to get to the heart of the issue of why it is being relaxed. That is the whole point of this disallowance motion. I do not know how anything could be more central to the purpose of this disallowance motion than talking about clauses 5 and 6 and the impact this change is going to have.

Before I was interrupted I was saying that in 2024 there were 17,000 prescriptions of MS-2 Step in Queensland and in all of Australia during that same year there were 45,000 prescriptions. That means 37 per cent of the entire nation's doses of MS-2 Step were prescribed in Queensland. On a pro rata basis, it should have been around 15 per cent or 16 per cent. That is close to double the national average on a pro rata basis and, again, I would like an explanation for that. I seek advice from the government as to why we are making these changes when the actual use is double what would be expected on a pro rata basis. It is 37 per cent of the national total prescribed, so the question remains—and it is probably amplified by a reflection of that statistic—why did the government seek to relax the standards around it when the uptake is much higher than that of any other state in the country? That defies logic considering the knowledge I have about this issue. Certainly it would be seen as an advocacy approach towards greater access to this drug. With 37 per cent, and I am told it costs \$400 per script, that is \$6.5 million. Interestingly, that is paid to one supplier, which is an effective monopoly in that market that the Australian taxpayer is providing for that service.

I might be pre-empting the debate. The government might say they are trying to provide better access for people who take advantage of this pill and this service and that it is the woman's right to have that access. I acknowledge the other side of the argument, and as we always stand on this issue—and we are saying there are two sides to this—there is also the element of the life that this drug is taking. We cannot separate this debate at this point to ask what is the effect of this pill, because no-one can argue that this is not a relaxation of the existing application of MS-2 Step. What the government can argue is that they do not recognise it is a life that this change is affecting, about which I have moved this disallowance motion. We in the KAP and those in that pro-life camp say that they are affecting lives, which makes this is a really important thing to talk about in this parliament with regard to this regulation as it applies to clauses 5 and 6. That is very important as we see it.

The government might argue that this change would be seen as fixing women's health care, that effectively giving more pills is health care and so a lot of the time—and this will come out in the debate—I am sure they will say that we are denying people health care. In a lot of these circumstances—and reference is often made to Aboriginal communities—they will say that girls in traumatic circumstances need access to midwives and the government are making that easier through clauses 5 and 6. They talk about all sorts of trauma such as sexual assaults—all of those issues. We acknowledge they are terrible issues that place enormous stress on the woman. People will argue about whether this is providing more or less support. Many people would say we are giving less support to them. I am all for supporting them, but supporting them is not killing or destroying the—

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Whilst I respect the contribution by the member for Traeger, I ask, given your guidance previously, whether we are now starting to stray beyond the substance in relation to the disallowance motion and the specific guidance that you gave at the commencement of this debate.


**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Traeger, I have been listening very carefully to what you have been saying. I reiterate the guidance around talking about the specific effects of the clause, the purpose of this disallowance motion and the effects of the disallowance motion. I understand you may have been providing some context for the last couple of minutes. I ask you to come back to the specifics of the disallowance motion.

**Mr KATTER:** I appreciate that. I am almost finished on that matter. To conclude that point, I was building up to say that relaxing the standard to make this more accessible does not fix the problem of whatever might have caused those issues in the first place. You do not fix domestic violence by killing off the husband who might have beaten his wife. That is not the way to solve the problem. You go back to the source of the problem. That is often an issue that comes up in this space when people advocate that we need to relax the standards to make those pills more accessible. That is only tinkering with the subject, but I have been set these tight guidelines. I would love to tease that out more. I am sure there will be people who will try to attack our position. I am trying to operate within the guidelines you have given me, Mr Deputy Speaker, to address the point that is thoroughly relevant to the position the government is advocating for through this regulation change.

We cannot talk about MS-2 Step without having a discussion about whether it is health care or life-ending treatment. Unfortunately, we have been drawn into that space again because a change is proposed to be made to this regulation. I would love to know today the reason provided for that change given that the uptake—and again I stress this—was more than double what would have been expected in Queensland. That would say to me that the uptake has been much stronger than anyone would have anticipated and stronger than in any other state, but here we are.

We will constantly come in here to defend those rights. We have been given a very restricted platform on which to do that in this parliament. We are respecting that in this debate tonight. It is very unfortunate, but we are here. We stand for pro life and we will continue to do that. We feel this disallowance motion is a continual encroachment, an incremental creep, on these values and that will continue to occur. There is no finish line on this subject; it will keep going and going. People can talk about being against it, but we will be pulling it up in the parliament at every available opportunity.

We do not want to showcase this; I prefer it is not in the media. It is a terribly macabre subject for most people involved. We in the KAP will continue to raise it and block it when we can in this parliament. With that, I commend the motion to the House.

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (5.17 pm): Let me start by saying that the government does not support this disallowance motion. It is a misinformed and misconceived motion that wildly, possibly wilfully, misrepresents what these regulatory amendments are about. The member for Traeger's contributions, sadly, are incorrect. I do not doubt the member for Traeger's passion for what he is advocating for, but his passion is misplaced and it is not based on anything in the text in this regulation.

If the member read, and read in detail, the regulation and the explanatory notes and, indeed, the extended practice authority, all of the questions he has asked today would have been answered. Nothing in clause 5 or anywhere else alters the policy on termination of pregnancy. Nothing in this regulation alters the law on the termination of pregnancy. The existing rules, the existing laws and the existing policy remain unchanged, as we said they would. Nothing in the updated extended practice authority introduces, alters or expands such provisions. Nothing in these amendments changes the existing legal or clinical framework in that area.

I would have been happy to explain some of these things to the member for Traeger. He raised concerns in relation to the issue regarding training—that is, the changes that have been made in the extended practice authority regarding training. That is simply a change in style, not a change in form or substance, because it still requires employer approved training under clause 1.10 of the extended practice authority; it still requires compliance with employer guidelines, manuals or protocols in relation to prescribing under clause 1.4 of the extended practice authority; and it still requires that the practitioner have a credentialed defined scope of clinical practice to deal with the medicines—that is, the MS-2 Step medicines that the member for Traeger referred to. So in every step along the way the requirements are unchanged, and I refer the member for Traeger to each of those provisions in relation to the extended practice authority. So practitioners must still practice within an employer approved scope. The employer approves what they can and cannot do. They must still complete the training that is recognised and approved through workplace governance processes. The result of that is all existing training and approval requirements remain unchanged but are now captured consistently within the extended practice authorities and registered nurses and midwives must still work within that approved scope and complete the recognised training. That is exactly the case.

With regard to the removal of the references to prescription for administering and giving treatment doses of medicine, the updated wording makes it explicit that under the registered nurses extended practising agreement they can administer medicines without a prescription only in line with the clinical guidelines, and that was the existing case prior to this regulation and it remains the existing case after this regulation. So it changes nothing in respect of the administration of prescription medicines under this extended practice authority. The updated versions explicitly reinforce this position to improve clarity, and that follows feedback that some practitioners were uncertain about their prescription requirements. So it actually tightens and makes it clear what those practice restrictions are. It does not expand them in any way, shape or form.

Version 7 of the registered nurses extended practice authority uses appendix 3 specified training requirements to clearly set out the required training programs as well as other issues in relation to it. That is in direct response to the matters that the member for Traeger raised. There is no change. There are no hidden changes and there have been no changes to the prescribing, administration or training requirements for MS-2 Step. The facts are since 1 September 2024 registered nurses and midwives have been authorised to administer or give a treatment dose of MS-2 Step in defined circumstances, and this has not changed. Those opposite know it but, shamefully, they have chosen to weaponise that particular circumstance with no hesitation, spreading fear and misinformation in the community up until today, as I pointed out this morning, and I think it is disgraceful that such an issue where we gave an ironclad commitment—and we have stuck to that ironclad commitment—has been weaponised in that way. The member for Murrumba, with no new policies and no new ideas, simply seeks to re-run and reheat and redeploy the things that he tried in October 2024 prior to the election, and at that election those tactics were soundly repudiated by the people of Queensland.

I simply say to the member for Traeger: I have addressed the issues that you have spoken about. I have addressed them in detail with reference to the clauses. With reference to the Leader of the Opposition and the campaign that those opposite have been running, the Leader of the Opposition might say, as he did after the Stafford by-election, that he has wind in his sails. I would simply say that he is an abandoned ship like the *Mary Celeste* without any wind, any crew and any passengers. Under the member for Murrumba, we might have had to rename the Mater Springfield. Under Labor it might have been called the 'Mary Celeste Hospital'—a ghost hospital unfunded with no-one in it.

Let me talk about what this regulation is about. It is about improving access to immunisations for Queenslanders. It makes a minor technical protected title change—nothing more, nothing less. It does two things—improves access to immunisation and makes a technical change to the name of a particular speciality. It is a straightforward, practical reform designed to improve vaccination access, it is designed to support health professionals to work to their full scope and it is designed to deliver better health outcomes for Queenslanders across the entire state. This disallowance motion, if passed, would not fix a problem; it would just create one. All the member for Traeger would achieve with this motion is to disadvantage Queenslanders, particularly those in his own electorate, by winding back access to essential immunisation services. On that basis, I want to highlight those immunisation services that this regulation particularly allows us to deliver and to demonstrate just one way the Crisafulli government is delivering easier access to those health services for Queenslanders, including those in Traeger.

Just a few weeks ago we announced an expansion to our free flu vaccination program with the free nasal spray FluMist, now available for children aged six to 17 who struggle with getting a needle vaccination. This regulation directly supports easier administration of FluMist throughout the state—no tears, no fears, no reason not to get vaccinated. In no surprise, the New South Wales government has recently followed Queensland's lead and done the same. That reform, which is enabled by this regulation, was driven by feedback from health professionals and families, including parents of children with a disability or sensory sensitivities, who said the nasal spray vaccine would make flu vaccination significantly less stressful and more accessible.

We heard some numbers earlier. Here are some more numbers: as at 31 May, more than 38,000 children aged two to five years have been vaccinated and more than 27,000 have been vaccinated with FluMist. That is a fairly significant achievement and it dwarfs what was achieved by Labor in 2024. To date, vaccination for two- to five-year-olds is up by over 10,000 compared to the same time last year and by more than 5,800 at the same time in 2024 under Labor—almost 20 per cent more because of the initiatives we have taken. These regulatory changes were required because we inherited plummeting vaccination rates from the former Labor government. Vaccination rates fell in every single year of Labor's free flu program from 36 per cent coverage in 2022 to 29 per cent in 2024, and is it any wonder?

When we came to office we found that the 2025 vaccination program did not have a source of funding. We had to go and find the money, and the member for Murrumba and the member for Miller had the temerity last week to criticise us for vaccination rates in the two- to five-year cohort when we are at 5,800 more than the last year when Labor was in government. Unbelievable! That shows the sloppiness of this lazy opposition given almost 20 per cent more two- to five-year-olds are vaccinated today than at the same time under those opposite—fast with the figures, loose with the reality. That is the situation with the member for Miller and the advice that he as shadow is giving to his leader, but it is no surprise that we get that from the member for Miller, who can be, let's face it, a little loose with the truth.

We are still waiting but, more importantly, the clinicians and the staff at the Toowoomba Hospital and the Darling Downs Hospital and Health Service are still waiting for a proper apology for his actions—

**Mr BAILEY:** Mr Deputy Speaker—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Pause the clock. Member for Miller, did you have a point of order?

**Mr BAILEY:** Yes. The Minister for Health has strayed a long way from the disallowance motion before the House.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you. I take your point of order on relevance.

**Mr Lee** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Hervey Bay, you are warned under the standing orders. Minister for Health, I bring you back to the specific effects of the clause, the purpose of the disallowance and the effects of the disallowance. I understand you have been providing some context but I give you that guidance to come back, please.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Yes, of course, Mr Deputy Speaker. There have been 20 per cent more flu vaccinations in the superspreader group, the two- to five-year-old group, where we know the greatest contagion occurs, than during Labor's last term, after they presided over four years of declining vaccination rates post COVID. Across the state, about 1.4 million Queenslanders have received a flu vaccination this year. Pleasingly, we have seen half the number of flu cases and half the number of hospitalisations with the flu than last year. That is not to say that we can be complacent or that the work has stopped. I encourage all Queenslanders not to be complacent. As we now enter winter, it is the time—if advised by your doctor and you are comfortable doing it—to get vaccinated. Our free flu vaccination program is the largest and most accessible in the country. That is exactly what these regulatory amendments achieve, yet this is what the member for Traeger seeks to disallow.

Improved access to immunisations means better health outcomes. In the member for Traeger's electorate, across the North West Hospital and Health Service 85.3 per cent of one-year-old children, 80.4 per cent of two-year-old children and 89.9 per cent of five-year-old children are fully vaccinated, and that is below the statewide target of 95 per cent. We are talking about measles, mumps and rubella. For older people we are talking about shingles, HPV, flu and RSV. That is what we are talking about.

Disallowance of this regulation would make it more difficult for immunisations to be provided to people across the state. At a time when we should be strengthening access to vital care like immunisations, this disallowance motion would do the opposite. It would make it harder for families in regional, rural and remote communities to protect their children. It would be especially problematic in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities.

The purpose of this amendment regulation is simple: ensure equitable access to immunisation services for Queenslanders regardless of age or location—from Cape York to Coolangatta, from Brisbane to Barcaldine, from Mount Isa to Millmerran and anywhere in-between. To pass this motion would disproportionately disadvantage regional and remote communities. To achieve better equitable access, the amendment regulation authorises appropriately trained Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners, midwives, registered nurses and pharmacists to administer schedule 4 immunisation medicines without a script and to give a purchase order for a stock of schedule 4 immunisation medicines where it is needed. Importantly, this is immunisation medicine. It also enables those practitioners to manage common side effects when clinically required, including by giving people paracetamol or adrenaline.

As I have indicated, it strengthens the arrangements for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health workers. It enables them, under approved practice plans—and I go back to what the EPA says—to administer schedule 4 immunisation medicines listed in their extended practice authority under a standing order, rather than only on a script. It also broadens the range of health professionals who can provide direct supervision.

The only other thing in this regulation that disallowance would change is the updated protected title of podiatric surgeon to 'surgical podiatrist' to align with the change of the protected title under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law. For those who are interested, there is only one of those practitioners in Queensland. That is the full scope of the amendment regulation: improved immunisation access and a technical title change—nothing else.

The member for Traeger wants to disallow clause 5 of the amendment regulation but it is unclear—and the member for Traeger said it himself earlier in the day—whether he understands what the amendment regulation does or the impacts of disallowing clause 5. It is unclear. He said himself that he does not understand it—that he cannot understand it and he is not sure what it does. Clause 5 simply updates the version numbers of the extended practice authorities for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health practitioners, registered nurses, midwives, pharmacists and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health workers. The extended practice authorities were revised to remove duplicate requirements for practitioners already trained in administering immunisations and to maintain current authorisations for registered nurses and midwives without immunisation training. The changes do not expand the scope of the amendments beyond immunisations and they do not in any way relate to termination of pregnancy.

If clause 5 were disallowed, the extended practice authorities would revert to their previous versions. We would go from version 7 back to version 6. This would cause confusion instead of clarity and it would not change access to MS-2 Step, which is in the previous version. It would not change it in any way, shape or form. The member for Traeger is being deliberately obtuse. It would make no change. All it would do is make it more confusing for practitioners to deliver immunisation programs. The impact would fall most heavily on rural, remote and First Nations communities, many of which are within the member for Traeger's electorate.

We want our First Nations health workforce, which is skilled, capable and essential, to be delivering high-quality, culturally appropriate health care in those communities. If this motion were to pass it would undermine this important work. This motion would directly reduce access to health care in the communities that the member for Traeger represents while achieving nothing that he suggests he is seeking to achieve. It would change nothing because it would simply revert to the previous regulation—no change. What would the effect be? In communities like Burketown, which spans approximately 1,700 kilometres and where there is only one nurse-led clinic, the removal of the restrictions would make life almost impossible. The removal of this unnecessary location restriction that we are achieving with this regulation is not optional; it is essential to the delivery of those services.

We have been talking about diphtheria. It is another clear example of why access to vaccinations is essential. While we have only three cases here in Queensland, we know that immunisation is vital to restraining the spread of diphtheria across the state. Vaccination is the best way to protect communities from diphtheria, as it is with those other preventable diseases that I have mentioned. We are delivering those vaccines at community events. The Sunshine Coast Public Health Unit delivered 61 vaccinations at the Gympie Show; the G'day Little Queenslanders event at Whites Hill saw pharmacists deliver 103 vaccinations in three hours to Queenslanders of all ages, helping to improve access to that vaccine.

This disallowance motion would take us backwards by making it more difficult for everyday Queenslanders to access immunisations, particularly those in rural and remote communities. It is not going to change anything in relation to termination of pregnancy. For these reasons we oppose the disallowance motion. I move—

That the question be now put.

*(Time expired)*

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): The minister has closed the debate on this motion before the House. Member for Waterford, I understand you are seeking the call. Do you have a point of order? Manager of Opposition Business, do you have a point of order?

**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I understand that 1½ hours has been allocated in the sessional orders for this debate. I am seeking clarity in respect of the minister rising to provide his contribution in reply, despite the fact that the member for Hill and the member for Waterford intended to speak, which means they are unable to now contribute to this debate.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, I understand your point of order. The minister has closed the debate, as per parliamentary practice in relation to motions, and I am going to put the motion.

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

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will take the point of order but the ruling has been made.

**Mr DICK:** The clock had clearly expired. It was at zero when he sought to move the motion.

**Dr ROWAN:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am not going to take that point of order. I will deal with the point of order of the member for Woodridge. Give me one moment. I think I know the answer, but I will get advice from the Clerk.

**Ms Bush** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Cooper, you are warned under the standing orders. Member for Woodridge, I appreciate your point of order. The motion purported to be moved by the minister at the end of his contribution under standing order 88 is not to be put, but in speaking to the motion the minister has closed the debate and in line with that ruling, made with the advice of the Clerk, the question is that the motion moved by the member for Traeger be agreed to.

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

Resolved in the negative under standing order 106(10).

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I move to the next order of the day, member for Miller, in putting the motion before I understand that you used language which could be considered and is being considered as a reflection on the chair. I would ask you to withdraw, please, and apologise to the House.

**Mr BAILEY:** I withdraw and apologise.

## TRANSPORT LEGISLATION AMENDMENT REGULATION

### Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



**Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (5.48 pm): I move—

That Part 2 of the Transport Legislation Amendment Regulation 2026, Subordinate Legislation No. 7 of 2026, tabled in the House on 10 February 2026, be disallowed.

Here we are talking about pilotage fees because the Premier clearly does not want to talk about abortion. We have seen another gag just now which means we have moved on to—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Aspley, that is not relevant to the motion that you have moved. I will bring you back to the motion. If you do that again you will be warned.

**Mr MELLISH:** Here we are talking about the pilotage industry. The Queensland Labor opposition is backing the shipping industry. We share their serious concerns over the Crisafulli LNP government's increase in pilotage fees as laid out in the Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Regulation 2016. Pilotage fees, payable to Maritime Safety Queensland, are incurred when a ship is navigated within a pilotage area using the services of a marine pilot. This means ships coming into any of Queensland's ports. Ports support local trade in the regions, supporting mineral and agricultural trade. Port marine and shipping services are crucial. They move cargo from all across our state to the sea, connecting Queensland to our regional neighbours. The Port of Brisbane is Queensland's largest multicargo port and the third largest container port in the country. In 2025, it handled about \$73.5 billion in international trade. Gladstone Port, a crucial regional port, posted a net profit of more than \$148 million for the last financial year.

We know that in 2024-25, more than \$160 billion in imports and exports moved through Queensland's ports, with 9,572 trading vessel visits. It is this industry that was hit with a whopping nine per cent increase effective from 1 February 2026. This is on top of the 3.4 per cent increase already applied in July 2025. This means that since the LNP came to government it has increased fees by more than 12 per cent. The hits just do not stop coming. We know there is another 3.4 per cent increase on its way this year. The ships being slugged with these fee hikes are cruise ships supporting domestic and international tourism and container ships bringing goods into our state. This government is adding further pressure to an already strained supply chain and industries have no choice but to pass on these cost pressures. They simply cannot afford not to.


As family budgets have never been tighter, the LNP is increasing the cost of household goods, and it is Queenslanders who will suffer. For all the LNP's talk about backing Queensland's economy, it is shocking how little respect this government has shown this industry. The transport minister shrugged off all responsibility for the decision to hike these fees. He blamed it on a decision made by the government—a government in which he is a minister. This minister cannot be serious!

We have seen how other levels of government have acted to support industry. In March, in response to rising fuel prices, the Albanese Labor federal government moved quickly to support the transportation industry, freezing the national heavy vehicle road user charge until 1 January 2027. The federal government recognises the rising cost pressures facing the transport industry. That is how responsible governments act. Responsible governments—unlike the Crisafulli LNP government—actually consult and engage with the very people their decisions will affect.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads confirmed that shipping agents and industry bodies were not consulted about the decision to deliver another increase until very late in the piece. Whilst this government has classed the increase as ‘minimal’, it has also acknowledged the significant cost impacts facing the industry. Queensland Labor knows that the shipping industry is already under pressure from rising costs across the board. We know that this government’s decision to impose a serious price increase of 12 per cent within the last year, without proper consultation or warning, hurts business. These increased fees place an unfair burden on shipping lines, agents, importers, exporters and ultimately Queensland businesses and consumers. Aside from the real financial pain that these increases are causing, we know that port users are frustrated by this government’s failure to warn them of the incoming fee changes.

The minister signed off on the changes less than two weeks before they became effective. A number of members across the industry say that this government never even notified them about the surging costs. The government said there was simply no time and, as a result, this industry was given no time to evaluate their businesses and assess the impacts of these increases. No time was allowed for businesses to adjust and make necessary changes to their practices.

The Premier has talked about bringing more business in through our state’s ports, but when his government jacks up fees by over 10 per cent on business you know that he is not serious. When the Premier spruiks his plan to support the Queensland economy and then leads a government that passes on higher fees to the very businesses he is trying to lure in then you know he is not serious. When the price of goods goes up, Queenslanders know who to blame.

 **Hon. BA MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (5.52 pm): As an island nation, most of Australia’s import and export trade is by sea and through Australia’s designated ports and coastal shipping lanes. Pilotage is a primary risk control for the safe movement of shipping within designated Queensland ports, safeguarding against serious marine incidents that can have far-reaching public safety, environmental and economic consequences. Pilotage directly contributes to the safety of life and the protection of critical infrastructure, the state’s freight supply chains and the marine environment. The pilotage service is also directly connected to the economic viability and financial sustainability of our ports.

It is compulsory for all ships greater than 50 metres in length that are visiting 18 of Queensland’s trading and community ports to use the services of a licensed port marine pilot who operates under the regulation and standards set by Maritime Safety Queensland as the state’s maritime regulator. In the last year, Queensland ports recorded over 9,000 trading ship visits, conducted over 15,900 piloted movements and facilitated throughput of 348 million tonnes of commodities valued at \$164 billion.

A marine pilot is a highly skilled and experienced mariner with extensive local knowledge and ship-handling skills who provides assistance to the master of a ship to operate safely within a designated compulsory pilotage area. In particular, this involves manoeuvring large ships in confined port channels or weather-affected offshore berths. It extends to port entry and departure, including the safe and effective use of tugs and other critical port resources to assist with these manoeuvres.

Within my department, amongst a host of other marine, regulatory and operational roles, MSQ is responsible for regulating marine pilotage standards and service delivery. MSQ sets and collects pilotage fees statewide and, from this revenue, compensates pilotage service providers as a fee for service. Pilotage service providers have incurred increasing costs over the years. MSQ has worked closely with the pilotage service providers to understand both the cost increases and the options each pilotage service provider has considered to determine the most cost-efficient outcome for pilotage service providers and their customers.

Governments of both colours have long adhered to the principle that the fee for pilotage should cover the cost of providing the service. Therefore, it is baffling that the Labor opposition would abandon that principle now that they are no longer in government but are in opposition. Do they now think it is okay for Queensland taxpayers to subsidise multinational shipping companies for pilotage costs? If that is the case, it is a dramatic U-turn from a party that has railed against multinational companies and purported to advocate for decent wages and conditions for mariners.

As far back as 2016 we had the member for Woodridge criticising 'tax breaks for multinational corporations'. In 2022 he also spoke about making 'large multinational companies pay their fair share to Queensland'. I ask the member for Woodridge: what has changed? Does he now think it is okay for Queensland taxpayers to subsidise multinational shipping companies? The member for Springwood has also done a complete 180 on multinational companies. In 2024 in this place he said—

We are making multinational companies pay their fair share.

It was not a qualified statement. He did not say that Labor believed that multinational companies should pay their fair share until they were next in opposition or that large multinational shipping companies were excluded.

What about the current Leader of the Opposition? In November last year he claimed that the Premier 'prefers to give his money to multinational companies instead of helping people through the cost-of-living crisis'. There are many things to unpack in that statement. I will not point out the irony that the member for Murrumba was happy to spend nearly 10 years sitting on ministerial leather as part of the government that created the cost-of-living crisis. Instead, I will focus on his new-found love for multinational companies.

By supporting this disallowance motion, the Leader of the Opposition and his party, for now, are firmly on the side of the multinational companies and not on the side of Queenslanders. If the Leader of the Opposition wants Queensland taxpayers to subsidise multinational shipping companies then he has a responsibility to nominate where the additional money will come from. Does the current Leader of the Opposition want subsidies paid through higher taxes?

**Mr Janetzki:** Yes.

**Mr MICKELBERG:** I take the interjection from the Treasurer. Does he want to defund the police, does he want to close schools or does he want to mothball hospital wards? I say to the current Leader of the Opposition that his days of magic pudding economics are over and Queenslanders have a right to know how he would pay for this.

I admit that maybe this analysis of Labor is a little bit unfair. Maybe their plan is just to reduce the cost of delivering this service. I know that it is not the ethos of the Labor Party to spend less, but maybe they have seen the light. Let us think about what Labor may be planning to do to reduce costs. Maybe Labor want to reduce the wages of pilots. I acknowledge that there have been a number of EBAs recently negotiated with pilots that have seen their wages and allowances increase. I would think that is fair, but maybe the current Leader of the Opposition does not agree. I challenge him to go down to the docks and to gather the pilots around. I can see him down there right now saying, 'Look, I know you have families to feed but we really need to look after these multinational shipping companies so your pay packets are going to have to take a haircut.'

**Mr Janetzki:** That is exactly what would happen.

**Mr MICKELBERG:** I take the interjection from the Treasurer; that is exactly what would happen. I can see it now. Maybe he just wants to cut back on their training or reduce the standards that currently require two pilots to manage larger ships. Maybe he wants to force pilots to use less safe and less efficient transfers to reach ships.

We have seen recently significant cost increases transferring pilots to ships, and the ships used for the same task are also expensive pieces of kit. Maybe the current Leader of the Opposition thinks we should jump on Facebook Marketplace and see what is available. He thinks a Stessco 3.9 metre tinnie with a 25 horsepower Mercury on the back might do the job for three grand. In fairness, you can pick up one of those, with a trailer, for three grand on Facebook, but it is hardly suitable for marine pilot transfers.

Whatever option Labor is pursuing, they want either the taxpayer or pilots to pick up the tab for multinational shipping companies. Let's be clear, that is what they are moving in this disallowance motion.

**Mr Janetzki:** Unbelievable!

**Mr MICKELBERG:** I take the interjection again from the Treasurer—it is unbelievable. I think it is safe to say that everyone on this side of the chamber believe that pilotage services are an important part of maritime safety and that our pilots deserve good wages, appropriate training and suitable equipment to do their job.

**Mr Bennett:** It is safety.

**Mr MICKELBERG:** I take the interjection from the member for Burnett—it is about safety. Absolutely! How do our services in Queensland compare to other states? MSQ have advised me that even with an increase Queensland remains one of the cheapest states in relation to pilotage costs which will keep Queensland competitive. Each jurisdiction in Australia has a different service delivery model and a different charging regime for pilotage services and pilotage fees. For example, some jurisdictions charge a fixed amount regardless of ship type, while others charge based on the gross registered tonnage of the vessel.

Pilotage fees in Queensland are, however, on average, between \$1,650 and \$10,243 lower than in other Australian ports facilitating the same cargo type. As an example, a 258.9-metre oil tanker visiting Brisbane would pay \$12,453. The same ship visiting Sydney would pay \$25,372. That particular ship would carry around 480,000 barrels of crude oil with a cargo value of around \$48 million if we work on a conservative price of \$100 a barrel. So, the cost-of-living argument of those opposite is tenuous at best.

There are 105 ships greater than 50 metres and 89 cargo barges on the Australian shipping register. Only 26 of those vessels have a home port in Queensland which are required to use pilotage services. However—and this is important—24 of those vessels have been granted an exemption from using pilotage services by MSQ. Between January and December last year, there were 3,026 visits by foreign owned ships to Queensland ports. That is 3,026 versus four. It is important to note that of those 3,026 vessels, many conducted multiple visits. If we look at the comparison, during the period, only two Australian registered ships—both passenger cruise ships—were required to use a pilot in Queensland ports.

The reality is that those opposite are mounting a tenuous argument that is based on tenuous logic at best, a fundamentally different approach to that which they took in government. One might suggest this is only cheap politics from those opposite, but we are used to it because that is all they have. They do not have a policy platform, hence they need to rely on pathetic political gains.

The reality is that pilotage service provider cost increases needed to be addressed, and our government has done so in a way that keeps Queensland open for business through highly competitive pilotage fees. The alternative proposed by Labor would either see standards lowered, the wages and conditions of pilots reduced or Queensland taxpayers subsidising multinational shipping companies.

The government will be opposing this disallowance motion moved by the member for Aspley. I would call on all members, including those Labor members opposite, to stand with Queenslanders rather than on the side of multinational shipping companies.

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

**AYES, 32:**

**ALP, 32—**Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Grace, Healy, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahan, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O’Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

**NOES, 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.


Resolved in the negative.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

### **Second Reading**

Resumed from p. 1597, on motion of Mr Powell—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (6.09 pm), continuing: I will take up where I left off just before the break, talking about stewards in the agriculture environment. It is exactly the same for those in environment and tourism operations and also those on the waterways where they are stewards of the waterways, national parks and beautiful environmental places. I have been listening to my colleagues

and the wonderful contributions they have made regarding some of the most beautiful areas of the state. I have had the opportunity to go to many of those areas. I want to ensure we continue to see those pristine environments enjoyed for many generations to come.

As I said before, it is hard to be green if you are in the red. That is one of the things that I can tell you our community and business leaders are very focused on—to ensure we get the balance right. When I listened to some of this inquiry—I was here in the parliament at the time—I paid a lot of attention to the Property Council and others talking about the impact this bill will have on their activities, as well as a lot of the resources industry. Again, I compliment the minister on the balanced approach that he has taken with this bill.

The bill seeks to modernise Queensland's environmental regulation and comprises seven key parts: reforming the regulation of environmentally relevant activities; defining Queensland's environmental priorities; improving mine rehabilitation and closure; strengthening compliance and enforcement; having timeframes for investigating offences; streamlining underground water management; and reducing red tape for ecotourism. Underground water management is something our agricultural communities know about all too well. Before my community gets too worried about this, this is about ensuring resource businesses or others who have tenure over land manage the underground water resource responsibly to ensure the landholders have adequate water resources. These are very sensible changes from the Crisafulli government which I appreciate.


The other issue I wanted to bring attention to was that of rehabilitation. I listened to the member for Callide. He was a geologist and worked in the mining industry. He likes to refer to himself as a former coalminer, which I appreciate. I have also had the opportunity to tour the New Hope facility in the electorate of Condamine, and I recognise the wonderful work that the New Hope Group have done there with regard to rehabilitation.

I also want to associate myself with the efforts of the resources minister in relation to drilling, refining and storing our fuel. Whilst this bill is about the environment, reducing red tape and ensuring we get the balance of economic activity right, this is another example of what this government is doing to achieve all of the things that our very rich state deserves to have.

Chapter 3 of the Water Act establishes the underground water management framework, which provides for monitoring, assessing and 'making good' associated impacts to underground water that result from resource operations. I wanted to stress that again because, when I talk about water, my community is very keen to ensure we have appropriate water licences and water controls to ensure the resource will be there for many years to come. I am pleased to advise the House that the Lockyer electorate has great aquifers that are still as good as they were centuries ago. When we get a flood the water table rises again and we have between four and seven years worth of water in that underground reservoir. The farmers, who are stewards for the land, manage it well to ensure it will be there for future generations. It is something our community talks about all the time.

The economic benefits of tourism to our state is something we have been very focused on. This bill reinforces the commitment to seeing Destination 2045 realised. I remember that when we were in opposition the now Premier was talking about ensuring there is a runway into the Olympics so we can have 10 years of tourism both before and after it. Destination 2045 will build on that legacy to ensure we have an enhanced tourism product. It is already a great product, and I know that with the support of the Crisafulli government and the minister, who is doing a great job, the tourism industry will continue to have the confidence to provide the world's best opportunities.

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr DALTON** (Mackay—LNP) (6.15 pm): I rise today to support the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. As the member for Mackay, I represent a region that understands better than most that a strong economy and a healthy environment are not competing priorities—they go hand in hand. Mackay is built on industries that rely on both. We are proud of our resources sector, our agriculture sector, our tourism sector and our unique natural environment. We have world-class beaches, rainforests, islands and waterways. We are also home to thousands of hardworking Queenslanders who rely on mining, manufacturing and small business for their livelihoods. That is why this bill is important.

Queenslanders expect strong environmental protections, but they also expect government processes to be practical, efficient and fit for purpose. Too often businesses, community organisations and landholders have found themselves caught in a maze of duplication, unnecessary paperwork and delays that do little to improve environmental outcomes. This bill delivers a commonsense approach. It streamlines approvals, reduces unnecessary red tape and provides greater certainty while maintaining

strong environmental standards. Importantly, this legislation has been developed following extensive consultation with industry, environmental stakeholders and community representatives. The feedback was clear: Queensland's environmental framework needed modernisation. It needed to be more responsive, more effective, more efficient and more focused on outcomes rather than processes.

For my electorate, one of the most important aspects of this bill is the work to improve mine rehabilitation and closure planning. Mining remains a critical part of the economy in that part of Queensland. Thousands of local families rely on the resources sector for employment, and our region provides essential services and support to mining operations across the Bowen Basin. Our communities rightly expect mining companies to rehabilitate the land responsibly and leave sites safe, stable and suitable for future use.

The progressive rehabilitation and closure framework introduced several years ago was designed to achieve that outcome; however, stakeholders have identified several administrative challenges and unnecessary layers of bureaucracy that have slowed progress and created uncertainty. This bill addresses those issues by providing greater clarity, removing duplication and creating a more practical pathway for existing environmental authority holders to transition into the framework. Importantly, it maintains the objective of ensuring rehabilitation occurs throughout the life of a project rather than being deferred until its closure. That is good for industry, good for regulators and good for the environment.

The bill also strengthens compliance and enforcement powers. As representatives of our communities, we know how frustrating it is when repeat offenders continue to ignore the rules. Whether it is illegal dumping, unlawful waste transportation or other environmental offences, communities expect strong enforcement action. The amendments contained in this bill will provide courts with greater powers to order the forfeiture of vehicles and equipment used in the commission of environmental offences. This is a practical reform that will prevent repeat offending and better protect our communities and environment.

The bill also improves the timeframes available for investigating environmental offences. Environmental investigations are complex. They require scientific analysis, technical reports and detailed evidence gathering. Extending investigation timeframes will ensure regulators have sufficient opportunity to properly investigate serious environmental harm and bring appropriate proceedings where necessary. This is not about creating new offences; it is about ensuring the existing law can be enforced efficiently.


Another important reform for regional Queensland is the streamlining of underground water management. Groundwater is a critical resource for our agricultural sector, regional communities and landholders. The amendments provide greater certainty while ensuring landholders retain protections and access to assessment processes when concerns arise regarding water impacts. The introduction of a formal process allowing bore owners to request assessments provides additional transparency and accountability. For many regional landholders, that is an important safeguard.

The tourism reforms contained within the bill are particularly relevant for Mackay and the broader Whitsunday region. Tourism operators have consistently told the government that they face unnecessary administrative burdens when operating across multiple land tenures. The current system can require operators to obtain multiple permits and approvals for essentially the same activity. That does not make sense. Under these reforms, operators will be able to access single integrated permission covering activities across national parks, state forests, recreation areas and marine parks. For regions like Mackay, where tourism operators often showcase a combination of rainforest experiences, island adventures, marine activities and nature-based tourism, this will significantly reduce the complexity and improve efficiency. Importantly, environmental protections remain unchanged. The natural assets that attract visitors in the first place will continue to be protected. The difference is that government processes will become easier to navigate.

I also welcome the reforms aimed at creating a more risk-based approach for environmentally relevant activities. Not every activity poses the same environmental risk. A smarter regulatory framework recognises that reality. By allowing low-risk activities to operate under clear environmental codes, rather than requiring lengthy approval processes, government can focus on resources where they are most needed while still maintaining appropriate safeguards. This is a sensible and modern approach to regulation.

The bill reflects the Crisafulli government's commitment to delivering practical environmental reform. It demonstrates that environmental protection and economic growth can work together. It supports jobs, investment and regional development while maintaining strong environmental standards. For communities like Mackay, that balance is critically important.

Our region depends on industries that create employment, drive economic activity and support families. At the same time, we value our natural environment and understand the importance of protecting it for future generations. This bill achieves both objectives. It reduces duplication, it improves certainty, it strengthens enforcement, it streamlines approvals and it maintains strong environmental protections. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (6.23 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. This bill is about striking the right balance. It is about maintaining strong environmental protections for Queensland while also ensuring our regulatory system is practical, modern, efficient and easier to navigate.

Queenslanders expect high environmental standards. They expect governments to protect our rivers, forests, national parks, wildlife, waterways and natural landscapes. They also expect government systems to make sense. They expect regulation to be targeted, timely and fair. They do not expect responsible operators, small businesses, tourism providers, landholders or local councils to be caught in unnecessary duplication or administrative delay where there is no additional environmental benefit. That is the sensible balance that this bill seeks to achieve.

For my electorate of Nicklin, the importance of protecting the environment is not theoretical; it is something we live with every day. We are fortunate to have some of the most beautiful natural areas in Queensland. Mapleton National Park, the Blackall Range, Petrie Creek, our local waterways, our walking trails, our bushland, our hinterland villages and our green spaces are part of who we are. They are part of our lifestyle, part of our identity and part of the reason people choose to live, work and raise families in our region.

When I think about this bill, I think about the responsibility we have to protect places like Mapleton National Park. I think about the importance of healthy creeks and catchments like Petrie Creek, the home to local platypuses. I think about the small tourism operators, nature-based businesses, community groups, families, walkers, riders and volunteers who all have a stake in looking after the natural environment in our community. Good environmental regulation should protect those values, but good regulation should also be clear and practical. It should not be so complex that it delays good outcomes or discourages responsible activity. The goal should be better environmental outcomes, not simply more paperwork and administration.

One of the key reforms in this bill is the modernisation of how environmentally relevant activities are regulated. At present, environmentally relevant activities are regulated in different ways and, in some cases, the framework has become inconsistent, complex and less responsive than it should be. This bill provides for a more targeted, risk-based approach. It recognises that not all activities carry the same level of environmental risk and that low-risk activities should not always be subject to the same level of regulatory burden as high-risk activities. This is a commonsense approach.

The bill allows suitable low-risk environmentally relevant activities to be managed through an ERA code rather than requiring a full environmental authority. That does not mean abandoning environmental safeguards. It is quite the opposite. ERA codes will still establish the environmental conditions that must be met. They will apply only where the risk is known and where environmental harm can be effectively prevented, minimised, rehabilitated or remediated through compliance with the code. That is exactly the sort of reform Queensland needs. It reduces unnecessary red tape and cost for low-risk activities, while maintaining clear obligations and environmental safeguards.

The bill also provides greater clarity around Queensland's significant environmental values. The Environmental Protection Act already seeks to protect Queensland's environment while allowing for ecologically sustainable development. However, the current framework does not always provide up-front clarity about the environmental values that are priorities for protection.

This bill allows significant environmental values to be declared through an environmental protection policy or regulation. That will help consolidate and clarify existing priorities. Importantly, this is not about creating a new layer of regulatory burden. It is about making the framework clearer, more certain and easier to understand.

Another important area of reform is mine rehabilitation and closure, which other members have spoken about. The bill addresses those issues by removing duplication processes, clarifying historical considerations, improving audit timeframes and providing a clearer pathway for environmental authority holders to transition. This is not about weakening rehabilitation obligations. It is about making the framework work as intended. It is about ensuring rehabilitation is planned and undertaken progressively rather than deferring until the end. It is also about recognising the practical realities of existing approvals and legacy projects while still maintaining the objective of effective rehabilitation.

The bill strengthens compliance and enforcement. It will allow a court, upon conviction, to order forfeiture not only of property seized as evidence but also of property used in the commission of the offence. It improves timeframes for investigative environmental offences.

This bill supports the Crisafulli government's Destination 2045 commitment to reduce red tape and make it easier for tourism operators to do business. It maintains protection of the natural and cultural values on which businesses rely.


For Queensland, and for communities like mine in Nicklin, protecting the environment is a responsibility we take very seriously, but strong protection also requires a regulatory system that works. This bill helps deliver that system. I thank the minister for the work he has done on this bill. I thank the committee for their work on the bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hunt, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.

## DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

 **Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Members, before I call the member for Waterford in relation to the debate on the dissent motion, I remind honourable members that debate on the dissent motion must be strictly relevant to the question of dissent to the ruling of the Speaker; that is, why was the ruling incorrect or correct. Members must not digress into the topic of the ruling. In this instance, members cannot digress into the context of the bill except where it is relevant to the ruling.

## MOTION

### Dissent from Speaker's Ruling

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (7.30 pm): I move—

That Mr Speaker's ruling on 13 May 2026 in relation to discharging the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill 2026 from the *Notice Paper* be dissented from.

The Queensland Labor opposition believes that the ruling of the Speaker on 13 May 2026 was incorrect, and that is why we are bringing a dissent motion before the House. It is submitted that there was an error made in that ruling. This is not a reflection on the current Speaker by any means but an appeal of the decision about how the same question rule applies to the bill that I introduced to this chamber. The bill I introduced, the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill 2026, does exactly what the title suggests. It seeks to strengthen protections for Queensland workers, particularly Queensland women. To understand the purpose of the dissent motion I want to remind the House of the history of this matter, which I note has been referenced in the current Speaker's ruling on 13 May 2026.

The Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024 was passed by the former Miles Labor government. Upon commencement, which was supposed to have been 1 July 2025, the bill would have seen greater protections for Queenslanders in the workplace. It appears these strengthened protections made the current LNP government uncomfortable, because, rather than allowing them to commence, the Attorney-General came into this chamber to rush through an amendment that delayed them indefinitely. The amendment moved by the Attorney-General in consideration in detail, without putting it through a committee process, changed the commencement to a date to be fixed by proclamation. This amendment, plus some other minor associated amendments, took up about 2½ pages. It was a minor amendment specifically about the commencement date of these laws.

That is the only matter the 58th Parliament has been asked to consider when it comes to respect at work laws. When the Attorney-General moved that amendment, this parliament did not consider the substantive policy matters that would protect Queensland workers, in particular Queensland women, only a date change. That is the only thing this parliament was asked to consider: a date change. However, that simple amendment from the Attorney-General and the LNP government to change the date has prevented pages and pages of protections from becoming law. There has been no meaningful progress since those amendments, which are referenced in the current Speaker's ruling, being considered by this chamber, despite the Attorney-General outlining that they would be under 'further consultation and policy work'.

The failure of the Crisafulli LNP government to progress strengthened protections for Queensland workers and Queensland women is shocking, but it is not surprising. Time and again this government has shown that issues affecting the safety, security and equality of Queensland women are not a priority. With that in mind I turn to the private member's bill which is the subject of the ruling, the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill. The current Speaker's ruling refers to past Speakers' rulings; however, I do note that it may contain an error as it refers to a ruling from former Speaker Simpson on 2 May 2015. I presume that was an error because, as we all know, the member for Maroochydore was no longer the Speaker at that point. I leave that for the Speaker to consider.

I refer to the ruling, in which three possible outcomes are referenced where a bill contains provisions dealing with the same issue. The current ruling relies on the (b) element of that previous ruling, which states—

If the Bill is substantially the same, in that it predominantly deals with the issues contained in another Bill that has been passed, the second Bill cannot proceed further;

However, I submit that is not the case in this situation because my private member's bill contains provisions from the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024 but with some amendments and subtractions to deal with elements the government took issue with. The bill deals with substantive matters, including amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act, to deal with things such as stronger protections against discrimination and sexual harassment at work; protections against racial and religious vilification; safeguards against hostile workplace environments; a positive duty to prevent sexual harassment; and enhanced compliance and enforcement powers—all of these issues the 58th Parliament has not had a chance to consider.

There are new members of this parliament who were not here when we passed these laws in 2024. Those members have not had the opportunity to participate in the debate and make clear their stance on very important workplace protections around sexual harassment. All that members of this parliament were asked to do previously by the Attorney-General was vote on a commencement provision—a timing matter, a procedural matter—not the substantive issues.

While I note that the current Speaker's ruling outlines that the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill is substantially the same, I respectfully disagree. The Attorney-General's eleventh-hour amendments dealt with the specific issue of commencement, while the private member's bill I introduced deals with substantive policy matters that members of this parliament have not had the chance to have their say on. To not allow the bill to proceed would be to deny certain members of this House the right to consider, debate and vote on these important protection matters. It would deny members the right to represent their constituents in this place, many of whom I am sure, given the numbers, have experienced sexual harassment or discrimination at work. Considering the Premier has failed to take a strong position on this matter, it would seem there are probably many of those opposite who do not support these strong protections—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Krause): Member for Waterford, this matter is about the Speaker's ruling, not anything else.

**Ms FENTIMAN:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I note that previous Speakers' rulings have stated it is about substance, not form. I submit that the private member's bill I introduced has been amended to take in feedback from the Crisafulli LNP government. When the Attorney-General moved her amendments around the timing of the commencement of provisions, she stated that she was worried about a particular part of that bill which related to a person's irrelevant criminal history. She said at the time—and it is in her media release—there were some concerns from police around weapons licensing. We have removed those provisions from the private member's bill.

Members of this parliament should now have an opportunity to have their say on the substantive nature of that bill. The 58th Parliament and its members should not be restricted in their ability to consider, debate and vote on laws that will strengthen protections for workers. While the Labor opposition is flattered that the current Speaker stated—

Although cleverly disguised, it appears to me that the clear reason (or purpose, or substance) of the PMB is to reconsider the commencement of provisions ...

I respectfully submit that is not the case.


The private member's bill is not the same as the 2025 legislation, because it deals with big substantive issues. In fact, the private member's bill does not even contain a commencement date. While I note that means it will commence on assent, strictly speaking the matter of commencement is

not contained within the bill at all, and that is the only issue that the Attorney-General's amendment dealt with. I note that the current Speaker's ruling states—

The rationale for the same question rule is to prevent the wastage of parliamentary time by reconsidering the same issue.

I respectfully submit that this private member's bill is not a waste of the parliament's time and it is not a reconsideration of the same issues. In fact, if you take that logic, then the Leader of the House should be prevented from moving suspension of standing orders to allow ministers to come in here and put amendment after amendment to change areas of law that this chamber has already considered, and that happens all the time.

If this dissent motion is not successful tonight, then I call on the Leader of the House to allow me to move a motion to suspend the same question rule for this bill—just like he has done countless times for government bills. If the Crisafulli LNP government members do not support this dissent motion and if they do not allow the motion to suspend the same question rule to occur, then the Crisafulli LNP government has failed again to stand up for enhanced strong protections for Queensland workers and in particular Queensland women, who disproportionately experience sexual harassment in the workplace. Please just allow the bill to go to committee so that Queensland women and Queensland workers can have their say about the protections they deserve at work.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to oppose the motion of dissent as moved by the member for Waterford and to support the Speaker's ruling. At the outset, I wish to emphasise the same point that has been made by leaders of the House, managers of government business and Speakers over many years—that a motion dissenting from a Speaker's ruling is a serious matter. It is not an ordinary debate and it is not simply another opportunity to revisit a political disagreement; nor is it a mechanism through which members can seek to relitigate an outcome because they are dissatisfied with the result.

A motion of dissent goes directly to the authority of the Speaker and to the orderly conduct of proceedings in this House. It asks the House to determine whether the Speaker has incorrectly interpreted and applied the standing orders that govern every member in this chamber. For that reason, such motions have traditionally been rare and should only be pursued where there is a clear and compelling basis to conclude that the Speaker has made an error of principle, misapplied a standing order or departed from established parliamentary practice. I submit that this is not what has occurred in this instance.

The question before the House today is not whether members support or oppose the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill 2026. Members are entitled to hold differing views on that question. Equally, the question before the House is not whether members hold strong views regarding workplace protections or the policy objectives contained within that bill. Indeed, members opposite are perfectly entitled to advocate for those matters and they are entitled to argue for them both inside and outside this chamber.

However, the strength of a member's conviction about a policy outcome cannot be the measure by which a Speaker's ruling is judged. The standing orders do not bend according to the popularity of a proposal. Similarly, they do not change according to the intensity with which a member argues a particular cause. Parliamentary procedure exists precisely so that questions of process are determined by established rules and precedent rather than political preference. The sole question before the House today is whether the Speaker correctly applied standing order 87 and the established same question rule. For the reasons I will outline, I submit that the Speaker plainly did.

It is important when considering this motion to carefully examine the legislative history which formed the basis of the Speaker's ruling on 13 May 2026. The Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024 contained provisions that were originally intended to commence on 1 July 2025. Subsequently, this parliament considered and passed the Crime and Corruption (Restoring Reporting Powers) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025 which amended the commencement provision of the Respect at Work and Other Matters Amendment Act 2024 to replace '1 July 2025' with 'a day to be fixed by proclamation'. In doing so, the Queensland parliament altered the commencement arrangements for those provisions. It determined whether those provisions should commence on a fixed date or whether commencement should occur on a future date determined by proclamation. Ultimately, parliament resolved that question through legislation. It further resolved that the automatic commencement provisions ordinarily available under the Acts Interpretation Act would not apply. In other words, the Queensland parliament had already spoken on the issue. That legislative decision formed the foundation of the Speaker's reasoning.

The Speaker then considered the purpose and effect of the private member's bill introduced by the Labor opposition. In doing so, he correctly looked beyond the title of the bill and beyond its drafting form. As parliamentary authorities consistently make clear, the same question rule is concerned with substance rather than appearance. The issue is not whether a proposal has been drafted differently; the issue is whether the Queensland parliament is being asked to reconsider substantially the same question. The Speaker concluded that it was.

The provisions contained within the private member's bill as introduced by the member for Waterford were already part of Queensland law, although uncommenced. The practical effect of Labor's bill would be to overturn the commencement decision made by the Queensland parliament in 2025 and replace it with immediate commencement upon assent. That is why the Speaker observed that the bill could be described as an attempt to reverse the 2025 decision or, alternatively, an indirect attempt to circumvent it. With respect, the conclusion was entirely open to the Speaker and entirely consistent with the authorities he cited.

In reaching that conclusion, Mr Speaker did exactly what Speakers are expected to do. He examined the relevant legislation, he considered the practical effect of the bill before the House, he identified the question previously determined by the parliament and he then assessed whether the House was being asked to revisit the same substantive issue. Importantly, the Speaker's ruling was firmly grounded in the rationale underpinning the same question rule itself.

As Speaker Reynolds observed in his ruling on 9 September 2008, the rationale of the rule is to prevent the wastage of parliamentary time by reconsidering the same issue. That authority is important because it reminds us that the rule exists to protect the integrity and finality of decisions made by the parliament. If parliament could simply revisit a question immediately after it had been determined, merely by repackaging the proposal in a different legislative form, the same question rule would become meaningless. The standing orders would provide no certainty and parliamentary decisions would never truly be settled. Instead, the House could be drawn repeatedly into debating substantially the same matter over and over again. This is precisely what standing order 87 is designed to prevent.

The Speaker also correctly identified the authorities are clear that the matters in question do not need to be identical; they need only be the same in substance. Indeed, Speaker Reynolds expressly stated that it is a question of substance, not form. That principle sits at the very heart of this matter. Members opposite seek to focus upon the form of the private member's bill. The Speaker quite properly focused upon its substance. The substance of the 2025 legislative decision was that the provisions in question would not commence immediately and would instead commence on a day fixed by proclamation. The Speaker's conclusion was also strongly supported by precedent. In his ruling, Mr Speaker referred to the ruling delivered by Speaker Simpson. That ruling identified three potential outcomes where a bill contains provisions dealing with issues already considered by another bill.

The second category identified by Speaker Simpson is particularly relevant. It concerns circumstances where a bill is substantially the same as legislation already passed and predominantly deals with issues contained within that legislation. In those circumstances, the second bill cannot proceed further. The Speaker expressly concluded that the private member's bill fell squarely within that category. Again, with respect, he was correct.


This was not a case where a bill sought to achieve a different objective through a different legislative mechanism, nor was it a case where only a small number of provisions overlapped with an earlier bill. Rather, the central purpose and practical effect of the bill was to revisit a question already determined by the Queensland parliament in 2025. The Speaker's ruling was, therefore, entirely consistent with the approach adopted by previous Speakers of this House.

It is also important to note that the Speaker did not rely upon a single authority; he referred to multiple precedents, including rulings of Speakers Mickel and Simpson regarding the discharge of bills from the *Notice Paper* where the same question rule had been enlivened. Indeed, one of the strengths of the Speaker's ruling is that it demonstrates consistency with those earlier decisions. Consistency matters. It matters because members are entitled to expect that standing orders will be applied fairly and consistently from one parliament to the next. It matters because the authority of the chair depends upon the impartial application of established principles rather than the personal views of any individual Speaker.

The Speaker's responsibility is to apply the standing orders impartially and consistently, and that is exactly what has occurred in this set of circumstances. Members may disagree with a ruling. Members may prefer a different outcome. Members may even passionately believe that a particular bill should proceed. None of those matters alter the standing orders, nor do they diminish the Speaker's

obligation to apply them. Parliamentary democracy depends not only upon vigorous debate but also upon adherence to agreed rules. Those rules must apply equally to all members regardless of political affiliation and regardless of the issue under consideration.

The standing orders cannot be set aside simply because a member feels strongly about a particular matter. Strength of conviction is not a substitute for parliamentary authority, strength of opinion does not override parliamentary procedure and strength of belief does not invalidate a Speaker's ruling that is otherwise correct in law and practice. Ultimately, this motion asks the House to determine whether the Speaker was correct in finding that the same question rule has been enlivened. Having regard to the legislative history, having regard to standing order 87, having regard to the authorities cited by the Speaker, having regard to the precedents relied upon by the Speaker and having regard to the substance and practical effect of the private member's bill, there is only one conclusion reasonably open to this House: that the Speaker was correct. For those reasons and the above, I and the Queensland government oppose the motion of dissent. I encourage all honourable members to oppose the member for Waterford's motion.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (7.50 pm): I rise tonight to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Waterford that Mr Speaker's ruling on 13 May 2026 in relation to discharging the Strengthening Protections for Queensland Workers Amendment Bill 2026 from the *Notice Paper* be dissented from. At the outset I wish to make it clear, as I have in previous dissent debates, that this motion is not advanced lightly, nor is it advanced with any disrespect to the chair.

The Speaker carries immense responsibility and immense ability in preserving the integrity, order and fairness of this parliament. Every member of this House depends on the impartiality and the authority of the chair. For that reason, dissent motions should always be approached with caution, with respect and only where a genuinely important question of parliamentary principle arises. In my respectful view, this is one of those occasions. The issue before the House today is not merely procedural; it goes to the balance between the authority of precedent, the rights of members and the capacity of this parliament to debate substantive legislative questions that have not yet been determined by this parliament.

We have carefully considered the ruling delivered on 13 May 2026 and we have also considered the earlier ruling from 2013 upon which the decision appears to substantially rely. The 2013 ruling concerned the application of the same question rule. Specifically, it dealt with circumstances where a bill sought to revisit matters already substantially determined by the parliament during the same session. In that ruling the chair identified three broad examples. The first example concerns situations where two bills are simultaneously before the House and only a few clauses overlap. The second concerned a bill that was substantially the same as issues already determined by the parliament. The third concerned circumstances where substantially overlapping bills were concurrently before the House. Respectfully, the present case does not comfortably fit within those examples. That distinction matters because the question before the parliament in 2024 was fundamentally different from the question before the parliament in 2025.

In 2024 the parliament considered the substantive merits of the strengthening protections for Queensland workers reforms, and that debate included consideration of what the laws did, the rights they created—and the member for Waterford touched on that in her contribution—the protections they afforded and when they should commence. In 2025, however, the parliament was not reconsidering the substantive merits of those protections. The question before the House in 2025 was a narrow one. It was about commencement; it was about timing; it was about whether the already enacted provisions should come into force. Those are related questions, but they are not the same question. Now, in 2026, the question proposed to be put before the parliament is again different.

The parliament this session is being asked to consider the substantive merits of the protections themselves, which I am advised contain elements which differ from the bill considered in 2024—and the member for Waterford outlined that based on feedback—not merely when they should commence but whether the protections ought exist, whether Queensland workers should receive those protections and whether this parliament should legislate accordingly. That distinction is critical because the same question rule exists to prevent the parliament from repeatedly relitigating an identical proposition already resolved. It is not intended to unnecessarily extinguish the capacity of members to place substantively new legislative questions before the House merely because one component of a bill overlaps with an earlier decision. That is where, respectfully, I believe the present ruling extends beyond the established examples contained within the 2013 principle.

Example (c) from the 2013 ruling is plainly distinguishable. That example dealt with substantially overlapping bills simultaneously before the House. That is not the situation here. Example (a), however, is instructive because example (a) expressly contemplated that where only a few clauses overlap the bill may proceed and the offending clauses can instead be dealt with during consideration in detail. That is a considerable principle because it recognises that partial overlap does not necessarily contaminate an entire bill. It recognises the importance of preserving the House's ability to debate substantive matters not yet determined. In my respectful submission, that logic has direct application here because the 2026 bill is not substantially the same as the 2025 legislation.

The bill deals with substantive workplace protections; that is, it deals with matters this parliament has not substantively determined. Yes, there is overlap concerning commencement, but overlap alone has never automatically rendered an entire bill incapable of proceeding. Indeed, the 2017 Speaker's ruling regarding the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill reaffirmed that principle. In that ruling the Speaker observed that where a bill contains only a few clauses dealing with issues previously considered the bill may proceed, with offending clauses instead ruled out during consideration in detail. That approach preserved both the integrity of the same question rule and the rights of members to have substantively new matters debated.

I respectfully submit that what confronts the House today is effectively a fourth category, a circumstance not squarely captured by the three examples in 2013; namely, a bill containing only limited overlap with legislation previously passed by the parliament but which otherwise raises substantive legislative questions not yet determined by the current parliament and, indeed, some members of this parliament. If that is so, then the more proportionate course may have been to allow the bill to proceed to preserve the House's right to debate the substantive provisions and to deal with the overlapping commencement provisions during consideration in detail. That approach would preserve the underlying rationale of the same question rule without unnecessarily restricting the legislative rights of members.

Ultimately, this House should be cautious about adopting an interpretation of the same question rule so broad that it prevents substantive policy debates merely because some limited aspect of a bill touches upon a matter previously considered, particularly where the parliament has never—and this parliament has never—determined the substantive merits of those provisions during the current session. Respectfully, I believe that is the central issue before the House today.

I reiterate: this debate is not about questioning or undermining the authority of the chair nor is it about disregarding precedent. It is about carefully applying precedent to materially different facts. It is about ensuring that parliamentary procedure continues to strike a proper balance between consistency, fairness and the rights of members. For those reasons and with the greatest respect to the chair, I support the motion of dissent.

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

**AYES, 32:**

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

**Grn, 1**—Berkman.

**NOES, 51:**

**LNP, 51**—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, 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.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (EFFICIENCY AND STREAMLINING) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1611, on motion of Mr Powell—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr DILLON** (Gregory—LNP) (8.05 pm): Tonight it gives me great pleasure to rise to address the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. At the outset I thank Minister Powell for the terrific work he has done in what has, at times, been viewed

as a dry piece of legislation reforming a sector of our economy that has been a handbrake on so many parts of the economy of Gregory in the Central Queensland region in the central west, and I refer to opportunities around not only ecotourism but also small claims mining and agriculture. At times it really has been viewed as a step too far and too big a challenge both in terms of time, which equals money, but also in the costs that have been associated with elements of the legislation that will be reformed with the passing of this bill.

It would also be remiss of me at the outset of my contribution tonight to overlook passing on my thanks to the chair of the committee, the member for Southport, who was ably supported by government members from Hervey Bay and Redcliffe for their diligent report. Whilst I am sure there has been larger come from them, the report analyses in very clear detail each of the issues that are being amended. For those people who are required to operate in this space, having the surety of a very responsible review and then amendments to the legislation drafted by the minister and reviewed and reported on by this committee means that we can have great confidence in our ability to deliver stable reforms for the people of Queensland.

I want to talk about—and my contribution on this legislation will stop me having to do this in a separate place—the fact that last week in Longreach we attended the bush councils conference. An element of that conference focused on the reforms that this government was required to place around access by small claims miners to a claims area. That bush councils conference in Longreach was ably supported by the presence of the Minister for Local Government, the Minister for Natural Resources and the Minister for Rural and Regional Development, and the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. The Minister for Natural Resources in his contribution was very clear about the support that the Crisafulli government has for opal mining in particular but small claims miners generally. Part of that was the expansion of an area that was required as a result of a deal that, quite frankly, had I been in this place before the last election I would have objected to strenuously because it came with real problems for small claims miners of particularly the boulder opal—the nation's gemstone for the people of Western Queensland.

Through a diligent and good government approach, we have been able to not only put in place an arrangement that protects the sensitive environmental areas in the Vergemont and Tonkoro areas but also set aside those heavy load-bearing streams of opal for not only current miners but also miners to come. That is the link to my contribution tonight—that is, to talk about the fact that small claims miners are, in many cases, undertaking activities with low-impact mining methods to extract boulder opal at shallow depths with low risk to the surrounding environment, as is the case at the centre of my electorate in Rubyvale with rubies and the sapphires that come from Anakie. These gemstones can be extracted with relatively simple mining methods that are relatively low risk under this legislation through significant environmental values. We are not talking about ripping out millions of tonnes of ore a year and moving overburden and diverting creeks—that obviously requires an environmental authority—but for low-impact mining this provides absolute clear direction in terms of what we can expect from people who want to expand their existing operations or what is expected of those who want to come into this low-risk industry.

At that same Bush Councils Convention, mayor after mayor and council after council got to their feet to talk about the legislation and the activities of this government. One theme ran through: thank goodness for the change of government in October 2024, because now they had a government who listened to their concerns around small claims mining; now they had a government who understood what regional development looks like; and now they had a government who was prepared to undertake the regulatory change that was required to not only protect the environment but also streamline their investment and their activities going forward. It was really heartening to hear the full support of 50-odd councils from across Queensland for the actions of our government in not only protecting small claims mining but also undertaking the necessary reform the minister has in this legislation.

One-permit ecotourism is not necessarily a reform that will benefit just those on the coast with our wonderful rainforests. There are a number of tourism operators, especially with the aforementioned acquisitions of Tonkoro and Vergemont and the work that our government is doing under Minister Powell to ensure we invest heavily into those parks—not to just lock them away but to open them up for twitchers. For those who do not know what twitchers are—

**Mr McDonald:** Bird watching.

**Mr DILLON:** I take the interjection from my good friend the member for Lockyer; bird watching. That is exactly right—an old twitcher himself! The add-on to our economy is tenfold when we use national parks for their true intended purpose—not only for their environmental values but also for


tourism. In Longreach, in the immediate vicinity of the recently acquired parks that have removed so much from the agricultural area but offer so much for tourism, we have the mighty Thomson River. There are a number of tour operators who undertake cruises on the river. They undertake water-based activities and they undertake four-wheel drive tours of the wonderful Western Downs landscape right down through the Channel Country and potentially even into the Vergemont and Tonkoro region. This legislation will simplify and streamline the process—almost a one-stop shop—into one permit for those operators who are undertaking low-risk activities that are a low threat to the environment.

**Mr McDonald:** It is sensible.

**Mr DILLON:** it is sensible reform; I take that interjection. It is sensible, stable reform delivered by a government that is pragmatic in its approach to stakeholder concerns—mindful of its environmental stewardship but also very keen to unlock opportunities for small business operators and for tourists who are linked to those small business operators right throughout Western Queensland. It is a fantastic time to visit Western Queensland and to undertake some of those tours. I have never seen the landscape looking better in challenging economic times, so please hitch up the van and come on out.

The other element that is also relevant to the conference we had in Longreach is the potential for this to be of significant benefit for councils undertaking to remove material from quarries or potentially gravel pits, especially if they are existing low-risk gravel pits, where the volumes that are taken are not necessarily of a significant commercial value. I reinforce that this is something councils across the board will be supportive of. Those who live in regional Queensland understand that we rely on local governments for so much, especially making our roadways safe—roadways for us to drive to and from work, to and from hospital or, in the case of the drive tourism market, to and from wonderful national parks.

In summary, this piece of legislation has been developed to ensure we can bring all of the requirements of environmental stewardship and good guardianship of our environment into the 21st century. We need to see that low-risk activities causing minimal disruption to the environment with maximum ability to recover are not causing a high impost on the applicant in terms of red tape, oversight or cost. With already over 9,000 environmental authorities in the state of Queensland, it was time to tune things up a little bit. We had gone too far. Until we came to power, this place did not want to see people investing in regional Queensland. They did not want to see these dollars spent. This bill will allow people to spend money from their pockets on actually investing in the business, rather than just keeping somebody happy by ticking a green credential in a box. I commend the minister, his team and the department for the development of what will be viewed in time as a very pragmatic and responsible piece of legislation. I fully support and commend this legislation to the House.

 **Hon. A LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (8.15 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. Of interest to the constituents in my electorate is the improvements in the small-scale mining financial surety and the streamlining of underground water management. Under Labor's decade of decline, the former Labor government left behind frameworks that stakeholders and regulators identified as administratively complex, duplicative or unclear. We are again cleaning up Labor's mismanagement and cutting their red tape.

The bill proposes amendments to the Environmental Protection Act and the Mineral and Energy Resources (Financial Provisioning) Act 2018 to support the transition of small-scale mining activities to regulation under an ERA code and clarifies that the requirement to give surety does not apply to small-scale mining activities that are undertaken under an ERA code. Additionally, a process will be established for refunding any financial surety that has been previously provided to the government for small-scale mining activity transitioned to the ERA code.

It has been a very long time since opal and gem miners have heard that a state government will refund them. Previous Labor governments have sought to shut down this industry rather than help them with the financial and regulatory burdens which have been placed by previous Labor governments on the industry. The reasoning for such changes is that small-scale mining activities are considered low risk and the financial provisioning is not warranted. Many activities in the small-scale mining industry are done by hand. They are genuinely small-scale and they are genuinely low-risk. There are savings to both the industry and the government in no longer needing to administer financial surety payments; however, operators will remain obliged to complete rehabilitation as a condition of the operation under the ERA code.

Just last week I was sitting—as the member for Gregory was—with the mayor of the Winton Shire Council, Cathy White. She is absolutely passionate about the small-scale mining industry in her shire at Winton. I want to pass on Mayor White's thanks to the minister for his work to ensure small-scale mining continues in her shire. She is absolutely ecstatic about the work the minister has done and the commitment he has given to helping her shire to continue with that industry. You only have to walk down the main street of Winton or Quilpie or attend the Yowah Opal Festival in my electorate to see how small-scale mining supports the economic activity in these communities. It is quite surprising. In fact, it is actually quite international when you go to those particular festivals.

Another aspect of this bill that is relevant to my electorate is the streamlining of underground water management. Chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000 establishes the underground water management framework, which provides for monitoring, assessment and the well-known 'making good' of associated impacts to underground water that result from resource operations. A key part of the underground water management framework is the requirement for the underground water impact report to be prepared. We have seen quite a few of those across the Surat Basin. The independent Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment is responsible for preparing the underground water report for the cumulative management area and assessing the likely cumulative impacts to underground water resources and water bores.

The Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment and the preparation of the framework was an initiative of a former LNP government. It still continues today because it is very successful and it is providing very valuable information to landholders and resource companies. If an immediately affected area or long-term affected area is predicted in an underground water impact report, the tenure holder or the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment for the cumulative management area must review the predictions and maps included in its report each year and submit a summary of this review to the Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation. The report is made publicly available on the department's website, providing important information to bore owners about likely implications for their water resources. The Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment often conduct information sessions in my electorate. I can tell members that they are very well received and people do appreciate that information and explanation.

In recent years, landholders, resource tenure holders, the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment and the department have identified a number of administrative challenges associated with chapter 3 of the Water Act that are limiting achievement of the original intent of the legislation and do not reflect contemporary regulatory practice. Therefore, the bill proposes amendments to the Water Act to extend the timeframe for preparing an underground water impact report from a three-yearly cycle to a five-yearly cycle. Currently, an underground water impact report must be given every third anniversary of the day the first underground water impact report took effect. The experience has been that multiple extensions have been required for the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment to gather necessary data for the report from across the cumulative management area. This, combined with the current wording of the legislation, has led to the need for extensions for each subsequent report. Requiring an underground water impact report to be prepared within five years of the approval of the previous report will allow the more efficient use of resources and provide adequate time to run investigations and fully accommodate the outcomes in predictive modelling to inform the report.


I want to commend the staff in the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment. I have met quite a number of them. They do some extraordinary work. They also foster a number of cadets. I appreciate the work that they do and the engagement they have with landholders. A shorter timeframe may still be triggered through the annual revision process where the information or predictions in the underground water impact report have materially changed and require an amendment. The Queensland government will maintain adequate oversight of the underground water management framework through the existing powers of the chief executive to request preparation of the report earlier—within two, three or four years from the previous report—and powers to direct an amendment to an approved report.

The bill proposes to amend chapter 3 of the Water Act to create a process for bore owners to seek a direction from the chief executive for a bore assessment to be completed by a resource tenure holder. Owners of water bores will be able to apply, with evidence, to the chief executive to have a bore assessment notice issued to the relevant tenure holder. This actually happens quite regularly where impacts are identified. The chief executive must then decide within 60 business days, or an agreed later date, whether or not to issue a direction notice to the relevant tenure holder. Evidence that a bore is impacted that is provided by the bore owner must be linked to the capacity of the bore. Evidence can be related to the bore's pumps or other infrastructure, health and safety risks or information that shows an impact on the bore's ability to provide water for its purpose.

There are varying purposes of bores—some are used for stock and domestic uses, some are used for irrigation—but they are certainly important to landholders, in particular in the Surat Basin where we see much of this work underway. The decision about whether or not to issue a bore assessment notice to the tenure holder will be considered an original decision, with associated internal and external review and appeal processes. It is very important to have that because quite often the initial information may not yield enough information and additional information comes along. The owner will be able to undertake those appeal processes when new information becomes available.

The existing provisions for a direction to undertake a bore assessment under section 418 of the Water Act means that the tenure holder must undertake the bore assessment or make a submission about why they should not be required to undertake the bore assessment. This process is retained in the bill, ensuring procedural fairness for the tenure holder. These are key improvements and will streamline the processes for landholders. They will also give landholders confidence that they will be able to continue to have water into the future, particularly where they are sharing that water with resource tenure holders. It is particularly important that they have those streamlined processes and that ability to make appeals to the chief executive office and that the department is undertaking its role as the regulator.

I commend the bill to the House. I thank the minister for bringing forward these streamlining amendments in the bill, ensuring that they are well set up to serve landholders and also tenure holders into the future.

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (8.24 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill is about something Queenslanders understand very well: strong environmental protections, practical regulation and getting rid of unnecessary bureaucracy. Protecting the environment should not mean creating layers of duplication that add cost, confusion and delay without improving environmental outcomes. This legislation delivers a modern environmental framework that maintains strong safeguards while making the system more efficient, responsive and easier to navigate.


As Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, I want to focus on what these reforms mean for Queensland's resources sector, particularly our small-scale mining operators. Across regional Queensland there are hundreds of small-scale miners working opal fields and gemstone deposits and working under exploration permits. These are often family-run operations. They are, in fact, small businesses. They are a crucial part of the regional Queensland fabric and, like every other Queensland, they deserve a regulatory system that is practical and makes sense.

One of the most important outcomes flowing from this bill is the introduction of a new risk-based approach to regulating low-risk activities. Under these reforms low-risk activities will be managed through environmentally relevant activity codes known as ERA codes. These codes will establish clear environmental requirements while reducing any unnecessary administrative burden. Importantly, this does not weaken environmental protections. In fact, the environmental obligations remain in place. What changes is the number of duplications operators are forced to navigate. Currently, small-scale miners are regulated through the small-scale mining code. Under the reforms contained in this bill, new ERA codes will be introduced for small-scale mining claims and exploration permits. Once those codes are in place, the existing small-scale mining code becomes redundant.

Without these reforms operators could effectively be required to comply with two separate codes covering the same activities—that is, two sets of requirements, two sets of processes—which creates unnecessary confusion for small-scale operators. That is not good regulation. That is the very definition of bureaucratic red tape. This bill fixes that. It delivers a simpler and more streamlined framework while maintaining environmental standards. It means one code, one set of requirements and greater certainty for small-scale miners across Queensland.

Importantly, industry supports this approach. The Queensland Sapphire Miners Association, the Queensland Small Miners Council and the Queensland Boulder Opal Association have all been engaged in these reforms and support the move towards a single code framework. They understand these reforms are not about reducing standards, they are about reducing duplication. The bill also delivers important reforms to mine rehabilitation and closure requirements. Queenslanders rightly expect resource proponents to rehabilitate land and meet their environmental responsibilities. That expectation does not change. What this bill does do is improve a framework that stakeholders have identified as administratively complex and difficult to implement.

The reforms create clear pathways for environmental authority holders, improve certainty and ensure rehabilitation obligations can be delivered more effectively. At the same time, this bill strengthens compliance and enforcement powers. It provides stronger tools to deal with environmental offenders, and that is an important point. While we are cutting red tape for those doing the right thing, we are strengthening consequences for those who do the wrong thing because that is the balance Queenslanders expect. This bill reflects the Crisafulli government's belief that environmental protection and environmental growth can go hand in hand. We can protect Queensland's unique environment while supporting jobs, we can maintain strong standards while reducing duplication and we can back regional Queensland while ensuring responsible stewardship of our natural resources. For small-scale miners across Western Queensland, for regional communities that rely on the resources sector and for businesses seeking certainty, these reforms are practical, sensible and long overdue. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (8.29 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025. At the outset, I would like to thank the minister for all of the work that has been put into this bill. I commend the committee for all of the work they have put into the bill. I note that the Labor members of the committee failed to provide a dissenting report in relation to this bill.

As the member for Mundingburra and Assistant Minister for North Queensland, I know that Queenslanders want strong environmental protections. They want our unique environment protected for future generations, but they also expect government regulation to make sense. They expect a system that is practical, efficient and focused on achieving real environmental outcomes, not simply creating layers of paperwork and delay. That is exactly what this bill delivers. This legislation modernises Queensland's environmental framework by removing duplication, reducing unnecessary administrative burdens and providing greater certainty for industry, regulators and communities whilst maintaining strong environmental safeguards. Importantly, the bill demonstrates that environmental protections and economic development are not mutually exclusive. We can have both. We can protect our environment while supporting jobs, investment and regional growth.

For North Queensland, that balance is critically important. North Queensland is home to the world renowned Great Barrier Reef, the Wet Tropics of Queensland, beautiful Magnetic Island and countless natural attractions that draw visitors from all around the world. It is also home to major mining operations from Mount Isa to the Bowen Basin, productive agricultural regions such as the Burdekin and Hinchinbrook, the internationally significant Port of Townsville, advanced manufacturing industries and unique environmental assets that support both our economy and our way of life. While our communities rely on a healthy environment, they also rely on employment and economic opportunity. Queenslanders deserve a regulatory framework that supports both.

One of the most significant reforms contained in this bill is the move towards a more risk-based approach to regulating environmentally relevant activities, ERAs. The current system has become unnecessarily complex. We have listened to stakeholders and they have consistently told the government that many low-risk activities are subject to cumbersome approval processes that add cost and delay without delivering additional environmental benefits. Through this bill, we have listened to that feedback and responded. The bill allows low-risk environmentally relevant activities to operate under approved codes rather than requiring a full environmental authority process. Importantly, it does not remove environmental safeguards. Operators will still be required to comply with strict environmental conditions. What changes is the amount of bureaucracy. That means regulators can spend more time focusing on high-risk activities and less time processing paperwork for activities where environmental risks are already well understood and can be effectively managed. That is commonsense regulation.

These reforms will also provide greater clarity around Queensland's environmental priorities. For too long, important environmental values have been scattered across multiple pieces of legislation, policies and regulatory instruments. This bill consolidates those priorities and provides greater certainty for industry, government and communities about what environmental values are most important and how they are protected. I reiterate: this is not about weakening protections; it is about providing clarity. Certainty benefits everyone. It benefits investors making decisions, it benefits communities seeking confidence in environmental outcomes and it benefits regulators tasked with enforcing the law.

Another important component of this bill relates to mine rehabilitation and closure. Mining is an important contributor to North Queensland's economy. Many communities across our region depend on mining jobs and mining investment. However, Queenslanders rightly expect that mine sites are rehabilitated appropriately and left safe, stable and nonpolluting. The progressive rehabilitation and


closure plan framework, introduced in 2019, was intended to improve rehabilitation outcomes. Unfortunately, its implementation has been plagued by administrative complexity and uncertainty. This bill addresses those issues.

The bill removes unnecessary duplication, it provides clearer transition arrangements and it ensures historical considerations can be appropriately taken into account for existing environmental authority holders. Importantly, it maintains the objective of ensuring mine rehabilitation occurs progressively throughout the life of the project. This is about improving how the framework operates in practice while preserving its intent.

The bill also strengthens compliance and enforcement powers, because laws must be enforceable if they are to be effective. There is little point having strong environmental laws if regulators are unable to prevent repeat offenders from continuing their harmful activities. The bill addresses a practical gap that has been identified through compliance and enforcement experience. It allows the courts to order the forfeiture of property used in the commission of environmental offences in appropriate circumstances. That means that individuals who repeatedly use vehicles, machinery or equipment to unlawfully dump waste or cause environmental harm can be prevented from continuing to offend. Importantly, safeguards remain in place. Courts must consider the seriousness of the offence, the use of the property and any hardship that may result before making such orders.

This is a balanced reform. It strengthens enforcement while maintaining fairness. The bill also extends timeframes for investigating and prosecuting environmental offences. Environmental investigations are often highly complex. They frequently involve scientific evidence, technical reports and extensive environmental assessments. In some cases, the full impacts of environmental harm may not become apparent for months or even years. The current time limitations have created situations where matters that are clearly in the public interest to prosecute cannot proceed because of insufficient time to complete the investigations. This bill addresses that problem. By extending the investigation timeframes, regulators will have adequate opportunity to gather the evidence, undertake proper investigations and bring the matters before the courts. That is good for environmental protection. It is also good for public confidence in the integrity of our regulatory system.

I wish to highlight the reforms relating to underground water management. Water security is critically important to regional Queensland. Landholders rightly expect that impacts on groundwater resources will be properly monitored and managed. This bill improves the existing framework by providing more practical reporting arrangements while maintaining strong oversight.

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (8.39 pm), in reply: I start by acknowledging that wonderful contribution from the member for Mundingburra. It was very comprehensive, so much so I wonder whether I even need to do a summing-up speech, but I will give it a crack. I add my thanks to all honourable members in this chamber for their participation in the debate on the Environmental Protection (Efficiency and Streamlining) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2025.

I do at the outset want to point out that we heard a lot of protest and a lot of scaremongering from those opposite around this bill, yet we have discovered that they are going to support it which, I suggest, given they did not provide a statement of reservation, they did not provide a dissenting report, they are now not voting against it yet gave these very passionate explanations as to why they probably should, that their speeches were more about handing over to their Greens' mates to ensure they get their preference deals at the next election than it was about actually contributing in a meaningful way to this debate. I want to address some of the matters raised by members, particularly by those opposite.

This bill seeks to deliver a range of regulatory efficiencies and pragmatic changes to improve the administration of environmental legislation, whilst maintaining strong environmental safeguards. The member for Nudgee asked how the bill improves protection of the environment. I thank the member for her question. It is quite simple: by reducing administrative requirements, it means more time and effort will be focused by my officers on the things that really matter. The fundamental purpose of the Environmental Protection Act is retained by the bill and, indeed, is strengthened by identifying the priorities for protection through significant environmental values.

I note a number of members have raised concerns around ERA codes, and a number of submitters made comments to the Health, Environment and Innovation Committee about them. I want to clarify a few things in response. The ERA codes will not reduce environmental safeguards. ERA codes will contain essentially the same conditions as would apply to an environmental authority. Compliance and enforcement powers are also maintained under the bill for those activities. There is no

change and no reduction in regulatory scrutiny for these activities. The benefit from the codes is reduced red tape for industry and reduced administrative burden for government. This will ensure Queenslanders can spend more time running their businesses and less time on unnecessary paperwork.

It is important to remember that ERA codes will only be established for low-risk activities—that is, the kinds of activities where the potential for environmental harm is well-known to be unlikely and where effective measures for preventing, minimising and remediating environmental impacts are readily available and industry accepted. For example—and a number of members have mentioned this—an ERA code may be made for hand mining gems or other precious stones as the disturbance associated with these activities is constrained to a small tenure area.

I want to assure the member for Bundamba, the member for Jordan, the member for Ipswich and the member for Maiwar that activities requiring a high level of scrutiny will not be transitioned to being regulated by an ERA code. Organic material processing and waste disposal operations—prescribed environmentally relevant activities 53 and 60—such as those within the Swanbank and New Chum industrial area, will continue to be regulated through a site-specific environmental authority application process. These ERAs are considered not suitable—let me repeat that—not suitable for regulation through an ERA code. The bill maintains the requirement to obtain an environmental authority for these and most other environmentally relevant activities. Any suggestion otherwise is classic Labor scaremongering, and I give that commitment to the residents surrounding Swanbank and New Chum.

Contrary to some of the submitters' summaries referenced in the debate, ERA codes will be subject to a statutory public consultation process as an essential part of their development and any proposed amendment. Further, they will need to be made by regulation and, therefore, as all members know, they will be subject to parliamentary scrutiny.

I would also like to take the opportunity to make clear that the provisions the bill provides for include registration of operators under an ERA code. The ability to require registration of operators has been enabled by this bill. Where registration is required, information such as contact details and the nature of the activity will be available to not only the Department of the Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation but also to the public. Records will be made available on the department's website. Registration will generally not be required for activities which provide the same relevant information through other means. For example, the details of exploration companies are already required to be registered under resources legislation. This information is already publicly available on the Queensland government website.

I want to reflect on the statements made about removing the need to provide surety for certain low-risk environmentally relevant activities that are being transitioned to ERA codes. Requiring financial provisioning for low-risk activities is not warranted. The amount of surety currently required for small-scale mining ERAs is generally very little and sometimes as little as \$200. The impact of not requiring this amount of surety is negligible in terms of reducing funding available to government should a resource operator fail to meet their rehabilitation obligations. In fact, often it costs more to administer that surety than it does actually in receiving the surety in the first place. So, by doing this, there are savings to both industry and government in no longer needing to administer these small payments, savings that can be better directed at managing environmental impacts from higher-risk activities.

I want to now turn to significant environmental values. These values will only be declared if the value is of significance to the state and should be protected as a priority. They will be set out in one place, providing a clear and consolidated list of environmental values which are currently spread across different legislative documents. They will not introduce new regulatory requirements, they will not apply retrospectively, nor will they provide a new burden as they are a subset of the environmental values already protected in the legislation. In other words, significant environmental values will have already been identified for application processes.

Despite some of the claims made around the lack of detail provided on significant environmental values, a draft list was actually released as part of the consultation and committee processes for the bill. Again, to suggest that we were not forthcoming with that information is completely and utterly false. They are outlined in draft amendments to the Environmental Protection Regulation 2019. As an example, they include matters such as environmental values in protected areas under the Nature Conservation Act 1992, or wetlands of high ecological significance, as well as threatened species. Further, consultation will be undertaken to support effective implementation of significant environmental values via the regulation-making process.

Environmental impact statement terms of reference set out the content requirements of an environmental impact statement—an EIS. The department has made an approved form for draft terms of reference, available since around 2020. This is referred to as the generic terms of reference. Since the introduction of generic terms of reference, there has been a reduction in the number and extent of changes required to draft terms of reference following public notification.

Despite the member for Maiwar's and the member for Ipswich's comments that all draft terms of reference are amended following public notification, the amendments are generally minor in nature and are typically made to ensure project-specific matters are covered rather than address fundamental deficiencies raised through submissions. Additionally, the draft terms of reference rely on the generic terms of reference in its first instance and therefore always needs to be changed to ensure it captures all necessary matters and is customised to the project. Any matters of deficiency can be readily addressed during the later stage consultation, seeing the overall intent of environmental impact statement public notification process remains the same. Let me say that again: the EIS public notification process remains the same. This ensures environmental, social and economic impacts are comprehensively assessed and interested parties have meaningful opportunities to provide input. The bill is not making any changes to this more substantial stage of public consultation.

With regard to activities that have been the subject of an impact assessment report under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971, I want to assure the member for Maiwar that the bill provides no short cuts where environmental impacts are concerned. While the impact assessment report will be able to be recognised under the amended Environmental Protection Act, environmental impacts will still need to be assessed and an environmental authority obtained for relevant activities. If impacts are not addressed by the impact assessment report, they will need to be addressed through the assessment process for obtaining the environmental authority.

I turn now to public interest consideration. Again, public interest consideration is not being removed for progressive rehabilitation and closure plans. Rather, the standalone public interest evaluation process is. This is intended to reduce duplication in administrative processes and streamline assessment. Specifically, the bill retains key elements of the former public interest evaluation process by including public interest considerations within the application and assessment requirements for progressive rehabilitation and closure plan schedules. It is also worth noting that, despite the claims of some members around importance, there has not been a separate public interest evaluation process finalised to date.

I also want to respond to matters raised by members regarding the underground water management framework, and I acknowledge the fine contribution by my cabinet colleague the member for Warrego. Experience has been that multiple extensions have been required for the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment to gather necessary data for preparing an underground water impact report from across the Surat cumulative management area. Despite what some members have been claiming, an extension beyond the three-year timeframe will be beneficial, especially with the added clarity around timing since the previous report was approved.

A five-year timeframe will allow more efficient use of resources and adequate time to run investigations and fully accommodate the outcomes in predictive modelling. It should be noted that the provisions provide for a shorter timeframe trigger through the annual report process. This means that where an annual review identifies that there are material changes that should be reflected in an underground water impact report and an amendment is required, an amendment can be undertaken and the report updated without waiting for the next five-yearly report.

Extending the role of the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment to report on contaminated bores is not needed as this matter is managed and addressed through the environmental authority under the Environmental Protection Act. If gas intrusion or contamination of a water bore is found through the underground water management framework, measures may be taken under the Environmental Protection Act to mitigate impacts or achieve compliance.

Importantly, this bill includes amendments to streamline tourism permitting. It is rather fitting that we are debating and potentially passing this bill on the one-year anniversary of Destination 2045, because this demonstrates our commitment to that 20-year plan to provide a single integrated permission for tourism businesses operating on protected areas without reducing environmental protection. This initiative will allow operators to make an application for and receive a single permission for tourism activities across protected areas such as national parks, state forests, state marine parks and recreation areas. These permissions will now have a single fee and a single expiry date, further simplifying processes for operators.

It is important that the features of Queensland's parks and forests are protected. As well as conserving important habitats and wildlife, these areas support the state's healthy nature-based tourism industry. Although the tourism amendments enable streamlining of permitting processes, there is no lessening of environmental protection under the scheme. The current assessment criteria and considerations continue to be applied for each portion of the permission.

The bill proposes a wide range of changes to reduce red tape, improving industry and community experience with processes under Queensland's environmental legislation. However, I would like to drive home that these reductions in regulatory burden and gains in administrative efficiency are not at the cost of environmental outcomes as strong safeguards will be maintained. As has been touched on, one way this will be achieved is through streamlining the ERA framework, listing activities in a more consistent manner and allowing operators to undertake certain activities without having to go through an application process for an authority.

Greater clarity and direction will be provided around the environmental values that are a priority for protection, and those struggling to transition into the progressive rehabilitation and closure plan framework will find it much easier to do so. Bore owners will be empowered with a more efficient and formal process to request a bore assessment notice be issued to a relevant tenure holder, ensuring workability and procedural fairness for landholders. Last but not least, passing the bill and the subsequent associated regulation amendments will help deliver the Queensland government's commitment to have a single integrated permission for tourism activities via a single online application process across protected areas such as national parks, state forests, state marine parks and recreation areas.

In conclusion, I would like to acknowledge and thank staff from the Department of Environment, Tourism, Science and Innovation for their work and collaboration in progressing this bill, as well as the efforts of my own staff. I particularly acknowledge Kahil Lloyd and his team for all they have done. Again, I thank the committee for their consideration of this bill and all of the stakeholders that have been involved in providing feedback on it. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10).

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

**Mr SPEAKER:** Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions.

Question put—That clauses 1 to 214, as read, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 214, as read, agreed to.

Question put—That schedule 1, as read, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

### Third Reading

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.01 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation and Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.01 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## ADJOURNMENT



**Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.01 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### Centenary Highway



**Ms MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (9.02 pm): The Centenary Highway deserves the attention of the Crisafulli LNP government. That is the clear message from my community and from those represented by the members for Bundamba, Ipswich, Ipswich West, Mount Ommaney and Inala. Between 2020 and 2024, our state Labor government committed over \$320 million towards projects for the Centenary Highway. This included the completion of the Centenary Highway-Logan Motorway interchange upgrade, the Sumners Road interchange upgrade and the Centenary Highway exit 32 upgrade.

We made the investment in the Centenary Bridge upgrade, which included \$150 million from the federal Labor government. We also made an investment in significant planning and funding for future upgrades of the Centenary Highway. This included the section from Darra to Toowong and from Darra to Yamanto. This section of the highway is particularly critical for our Ipswich communities including Greater Springfield, Redbank Plains, White Rock, Ripley Valley, Deebing Heights and Yamanto. The funding allocated was aimed at providing a master plan of priority projects along this corridor—for future lane duplication, interchanges, on- and off-ramps, and active travel such as the Centenary Cycleway.

Since the LNP government came into power, we have seen no progress on this planning and no funding at all for the Centenary in the LNP's first budget last year. We had momentum building on future upgrades for the Centenary. We had a plan to move forward, and now we have nothing but silence from this government.

Greater Springfield has become synonymous with highway congestion, and this is not the legacy our community deserves. The entire section between exits 31 and 33 needs to be urgently duplicated and the on- and off-ramps reviewed. The Ripley roundabout needs to be urgently addressed given increasing safety concerns.

Where are we with the \$3.2 million Darra to Yamanto planning study that Labor funded? According to TMR's own webpage, there has been no update since 1 October 2024 when Labor was in power. What is the plan once the Centenary Bridge at Jindalee is completed? We do not know that either because, despite a \$10 million planning study for the Darra to Toowong section, again, the last update on TMR's website was 19 September 2024.

We have given the LNP government more than 18 months to progress the works that Labor started in government. It is why there are six Labor MPs on this side of the House who have launched a petition calling on the Crisafulli LNP government to progress a plan for the Centenary. We want to see money allocated in this year's budget for the Centenary, and we will not stop advocating for motorists in our area. We welcome the member for Moggill to join us, as his constituents have started reaching out to us looking for support. The roads minister needs to step up. We are seeing multiple failures under his stewardship, including significant rail fails, because Queensland has been dragged backwards by this government paralysed by—

*(Time expired)*

**Dr ROWAN:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the member for Miller, I draw your attention to dress standards, subsection 14, and whether you need to consider that matter.


**Mr de BRENNI:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Miller returned to the chamber to participate in a division. Conventions in relation to dress standards do not apply to that period. I think leniency should be applied.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): Take your seat while I take some advice. Can I just have some quiet, please.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, there is only one opinion here that is relevant to this issue, thank you. Member for Miller, I think the urgency is now over. You can go and put on either a tie or jacket as required by the standing orders, please.


### Mulgrave Electorate, Sugar Industry

 **Mr JAMES** (Mulgrave—LNP) (9.06 pm): If we lose cane on the Wet Topics coast, we lose far more than a crop. After 130 years, sugar cane remains the only crop to have delivered sustained commercial success in this region. Other crops, including bananas, have made gains, but none can replace cane at scale, yet cane growing and the milling operations that depend on it have been in decline since the early 1980s. Our local mills at Tableland, Mulgrave and South Johnstone are owned by Mitr Phol through its Australian subsidiary MSF. The Tully mill is owned by COFCO. MSF has invested approximately \$700 million during its ownership, yet caneland continues to be fragmented and lost to urban expansion. Older growers are under pressure to cash in; it is their superannuation policy. Younger people are choosing other careers. Once this land is lost it will be almost impossible to get it back. We cannot allow Mulgrave to go the way of Mossman. It is not simply about one industry; it is about stewardship, regional jobs and confidence in our future.

That is why Canegrowers organisations in Cairns and Innisfail have joined with MSF to help shape the future planning of our region, including the next planning scheme for the city of Cairns. Canegrowers Cairns region has also stepped up through Project 25, a practical initiative to protect water quality, strengthen sustainable farming and reduce nitrogen run-off into the Great Barrier Reef, but the pressure is intensifying. Costs are rising faster than returns, particularly after six of the worst weather years in living memory. The choice before us is clear: drift on, or act together now to unlock and diversify the full value of the cane plant and the industries it can sustain.

The time for hesitation has passed. MSF and Canegrowers are now coming together in a working group supported by me, local councillors and the broader community to confront this challenge directly. The stakes are too high for delay. We must lift the value of cane growing. Let us protect this land, back this industry and secure the future of cane growing in our region before the future slips away. This will require strong and effective collaboration between government and industry.

### Centenary Highway


 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (9.09 pm): We need a real plan for the future of the Centenary Motorway. This is the clear message that has been delivered to me by my community over a number of years and from the communities represented by the members for Jordan, Bundamba, Ipswich, Inala and Ipswich West. As my esteemed colleague the member for Jordan mentioned, between 2020 and 2024 our state Labor government committed over \$320 million towards various projects on the Centenary Motorway.

I could not have been prouder of what our Labor government was able to deliver for my community locally: an upgrade of the Sumners Road overpass, now known as the Len Waters Overpass, and the upgrade of the Centenary Bridge at Jindalee, which is a well-known bottleneck and black spot that plagues the entire south-west corridor causing congestion and havoc daily. This advocacy was underpinned by my community who were incredibly vocal in fighting alongside me for these upgrades. My colleagues were also hard at work delivering for their communities, including the Centenary Highway and Logan Motorway interchange upgrade, which has been absolutely vital for those communities, and the Centenary Highway exit 32 upgrade.

We knew that when the Centenary Bridge at Jindalee in my electorate was finished—a project that was supported by my colleagues here tonight—we would need to look at the next stage, so our government also made an investment in significant planning and funding for future upgrades of the Centenary Highway. This includes the sections from Darra to Toowong, which runs through the heart of my electorate, and from Darra to Yamanto. So far, unfortunately, we have heard precious little from this LNP government on what the plan is once the Centenary Bridge is completed.

It is important to highlight that, with the ongoing changes to rail timetables, I am sadly hearing more and more anecdotal reports from my community about increasing difficulty accessing reliable public transport, especially train services. Commuters are having to get up earlier, park further and further from the train station, sometimes in unsafe ways, or drive to a different train station out of their way just to get to work. Many people are not making it on time, and some people are giving up and reverting to driving. All of the good work done by Labor's 50-cent fares is at risk of coming undone. I ask the minister to keep commuters foremost in his thoughts. He needs to get a fair deal done for the workers so we can get rail back on track. Catching public transport should not be this hard. That is one of the reasons our Centenary Motorway needs a real plan for the future. Under the LNP government, Queensland is being dragged backwards. It is a government paralysed by its own failures.


### Queensland Day, Best of the Redlands Awards

 **Mrs YOUNG** (Redlands—LNP) (9.12 pm): Queensland Day marks the anniversary of 6 June 1859 when Queensland officially separated from New South Wales. I do not like to speak ill of our southern neighbours, but history shows this as one of Australia's most successful break-ups. Queensland got the beaches, the sunshine, the lifestyle and the State of Origin dominance and New South Wales got, well, New South Wales. More than 160 years later, I think it is fair to say that Queensland came out of the separation doing just fine.

Queensland's success has never been about geography alone; it has always been about our people—the volunteers, the small business owners, the coaches, the teachers, the community leaders and the quiet achievers who make our communities stronger every single day. That is exactly why, on this Queensland Day, Redlands is celebrating in its own way. Together with my colleagues the member for Oodgeroo and the member for Capalaba we launched the inaugural Best of the Redlands Awards—a community-led celebration recognising the people who make our corner of Queensland such an incredible place to live. What started as a simple idea quickly became something much larger. Hundreds of nominations poured in, and now we have almost 4,000 votes from across Redlands. Residents took the opportunity to shine a spotlight on the people they admire the most: the sporting coach who never misses a training session, the volunteer who always puts their hand up, the teacher who changes lives, the local business owner who gives back to the community and the community groups that bring people together.

Every nomination told a story—a story of service, a story of generosity and a story of people making a difference without expecting recognition in return. In a world where we often hear about what is going wrong, the Best of the Redlands Awards reminds us of everything that is going right. It reminds us that strong communities are built by ordinary people doing extraordinary things. This Saturday will bring our finalists together and celebrate the very best our community has to offer. While there will be winners announced on the day, I believe that every nominee is already a winner because someone in their community took the time to say, 'You make Redlands a better place.' That is what Queensland Day is all about. It is about celebrating the people who make our state the best place to live in Australia. In Redlands we know that our greatest strength has always been our people, and I am incredibly proud to be able to celebrate them. If Redlanders have not cast their vote yet they only have two more days, so they should get voting.

### Centenary Highway

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (9.15 pm): If you ever needed proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government we are going backwards, look no further than the Centenary Highway. Labor committed \$3.2 million towards planning for the Darra to Yamanto section, which is absolutely vital. That work has now been completed and we are ready for the next stage of funding. Both the federal and the former state Labor governments committed to progressing a plan for future upgrades. That was backed by \$10 million in federal funding. Despite all of this work—it is ready to go—there have been no public updates on the project since late 2024 under the Crisafulli LNP government. Under the LNP, funding for the Centenary Highway disappeared from the 2026 infrastructure priority list last year. David Crisafulli is costing our local families precious time with their kids and their loved ones as well as more money at the bowser just to get home safely.


It is also really important for our local community to have a safe pedestrian crossing at the Ripley roundabout between Ripley and South Ripley. There has been crickets from this government on that. All of this lack of investment means that locals are paying the price through longer commuting times, especially given the rapid residential growth from Springfield to Ripley.

Labor started planning work because we recognise that we desperately need action on the Centenary Highway. We need this LNP government to commit to keeping things moving because we cannot afford to fall further behind as growth across the western corridor continues to accelerate. Families across Ipswich and the west of Brisbane are paying the price every single day for congestion and chronic underinvestment in the Centenary Highway. We are calling on the Crisafulli LNP government to commit to progressing these upgrades urgently. The state budget must deliver meaningful investment in the Centenary Highway. We cannot afford to take our foot off the pedal and be dragged backwards by an LNP government that is paying the price for its own failure. Our community is paying the price.

We are looking at a government that is imploding. We have a cabinet that is leaking against itself and we all know that the reshuffle is coming. Seeing as though the transport minister is not doing a great job with this, maybe he would like the member for Moggill to be—

*(Time expired)*


### **Mermaid Beach Electorate, Development**

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (9.18 pm): I rise to clarify the position of the Gold Coast City council owned Miami depot that has been considered for development in the heart of the Mermaid Beach electorate. The site is four hectares and expressions of interest have been called for by the council, citing 6,000 square metres for the Baz Luhrmann creative industry space, which I am supportive of; 3,500 square metres of retail, presumably on the ground floor of any high-rise buildings; and, most concerningly, 80,000 square metres of residential accommodation for approximately 780 dwellings. That is a very high density development, with 75 per cent of the site earmarked for residential development. I also share the concerns of the Gold Coast Gymnastics folk, whose current building is proposed to be demolished along with the Burleigh Bears training shed. They are complaining that no relocation plans have been put in place to their knowledge.

I have surveyed residents around the area and, of the 200 respondents, 96 per cent were opposed to the development of high rise on the site. Aunty Pat, a very respected elder on the Gold Coast, phoned me directly to tell me she lived in the vicinity and was adamant that high-rise residential development on the site should not go ahead. From a planning perspective, if 20 or 30 storeys are approved on the western side of the highway on this site there is no way the Planning and Environment Court would say no to any further applications for high rise on neighbouring properties. This development would be the thin end of the wedge that would see high-rise development across these low-rise suburbs, with the resultant traffic chaos and social upheaval ruining beautiful, peaceful low-rise suburbs.

I urge the council to be directly up-front with its proposal for publicly owned land, with residents being told exactly what is planned for the site rather than a Trojan Horse sales pitch for feel-good usage of the site as a fabulous entertainment precinct, which most residents agreed to and which would provide jobs and still maintain livability in the area. The entertainment part of the precinct is only 6,000 square metres, which is minimal on four hectares—only 15 per cent of the site. It is a Gold Coast City council block of land owned in freehold, so the council is entitled to do with it what it wants. However, councillors should be aware of the demand for more playing fields and facilities from the thousands of young children moving to the Gold Coast every year and should therefore treat existing public lands in already under-pressure residential areas as land bank jewels that need to be protected for future generations. I do hope sanity prevails.

### **Ipswich West Electorate, Traffic Congestion**

 **Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.21 pm): My community of Ipswich West continues to suffer through dangerous and lengthy commutes just to get to and from work. As Queensland's fastest growing region, pressure is mounting on the Centenary as a critical gateway to Ipswich and yet we are long overdue for basic upgrades to this critical thoroughfare. Too many people have lost hours in traffic on the Centenary, drip-feeding through to the western suburbs on a mere two-lane highway. And do not even think about doing this at night, when you will be driving in complete darkness. We are talking basics here—lane widening and safe lighting. This is basic infrastructure that our community is calling for.


The former Labor government proudly committed \$3.2 million towards planning for the Darra to Yamanto section. That work is now complete and ready for the next stage of funding. My constituents use this highway every single day. That is people who live in communities such as Yamanto or who need to get to the RAAF base in Amberley. Those going to Amberley know only too well about a lack of clarity and progress when it comes to infrastructure like the Amberley interchange. I can only assume this government has an institutional and ideological contempt for the people of Ipswich West, with a complete disregard for the Amberley interchange, the Mount Crosby interchange, the Bremer River bridge and of course the Centenary Highway.

This is proof that under the Crisafulli LNP government Queensland is being dragged backwards—backwards by a government paralysed by its own failures. This LNP government continues to spend millions of dollars on blue-branded advertising and yet it is incapable of delivering

something that has actually been committed to. I ask: where is the member for Scenic Rim, whose constituents sit in traffic on the Centenary? He is as quiet as a church mouse. I am proud to stand with all of my Labor colleagues in the western corridor as well as all of the people who have signed our petition to call out this flagrant disregard for our community and fight for better. Ipswich's population is growing at an exponential rate of more than 3.5 per cent annually and my community of Ipswich West deserves a safe and secure commute to and from their place of work. It is clear the LNP is all talk and no action. The money is there. The need is there. It is time to deliver.

### Lennie, Mr ND

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Kempton): Before I call the member for Coomera, I acknowledge Maria and Ben Lennie in the gallery. I would ask that for the next three minutes the House remains silent.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (9.24 pm): I rise tonight to speak about a friend—my friend and a friend to so many others on the northern Gold Coast. Sadly, Neil Douglas Lennie passed away unexpectedly on 13 March 2026. It was a shock to all of us because Neil was a vibrant soul—someone who loved life as much as he loved the people around him. As honourable members have heard, Neil's loving wife, Maria, and his son Ben join us in the gallery tonight. Neil was an extraordinary man in so many ways, made obvious by the way he helped others. To him, it was just the right thing to do. To others, what he did helped change their lives.

Neil Lennie was born on 12 January 1952 in Koo Wee Rup, Victoria and grew up in Grantville, Victoria—the second youngest of five siblings. He met Maria in 1974. They married in 1977 and then they saw the light and moved to Queensland in 1982. I am told that Neil was a proud Brisbane Lions supporter. Clearly, he and Maria had left Victoria well and truly behind. Neil, with Maria by his side, commenced a landscaping business that same year and later a wholesale and retail nursery, which they ran for 35 years. Neil took worker safety seriously in what was a dangerous environment and he invested in his people, teaching both life and business skills. Indeed, in recent times one of his employees took over the nursery business when Neil and Maria retired, and two others have gone on to become managers at local nurseries.

Neil had a passion for passing on life lessons to his children and his grandchildren. In fact, perhaps the best description of him are in the words of a grandchild: 'A legend and a fantastic role model'. The family have asked that I provide their heartfelt thanks to the amazing team at Prince Charles Hospital, led by Dr Habibian, for all they did. Neil was determined to live life. Indeed, Maria shared with me that Neil had their caravan hooked up for a trip to Tasmania, only to receive a call from Dr Habibian to advise that he needed to come in urgently to receive life-saving treatment for the heart condition Neil had lived with for more than 17 years. Neil was active and strong outside of his heart condition and his doctors aimed to maximise—in his family's words—'the performance of his heart so it would keep up with him'. The family also shared with me how Dr Habibian and his team ensured Neil got the care within our health system when he needed it in those last days. Neil was laid to rest at Pimpama Cemetery and I table a copy of the order of service.

*Tabled paper:* Order of Service for Mr Neil Douglas Lennie [834].

His loving wife, Maria; children Sandra, Andrea, Ben and Matthew; and five grandchildren were joined by many others to farewell a wonderful husband, father, grandfather, brother and friend. The poem *Success* by Ralph Waldo Emerson comes to mind. It states—

To laugh often and much;

To win the respect of intelligent people and the affection of children;

To earn the appreciation of honest critics

And endure the betrayal of false friends;

To appreciate the beauty;

To find the best in others;


To leave the world a bit better, whether by a healthy child,

A garden patch or a redeemed social condition;

To know even one life has breathed easier because you have lived. This is to have succeeded.

Rest in peace, my friend. Vale, Neil Douglas Lennie.


### Airtrain

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (9.27 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, if you will indulge me, just picture this. You have finally managed to save up for that trip to Cairns. You have booked your flights and the accommodation is all booked for the September school holidays. Now, how are you going to get to the airport? You saved fastidiously so, of course, you do the mental maths. Petrol is expensive and parking is a rort. Surely we will have to take the train, right? For me, that is two adults and three kids. We have 50-cent fares, right? Bargain! No, you have got it all wrong. There are no 50-cent fares on the Airtrain. It will be, in fact, \$95.70 one way. It is a weekend and the trains only run every half hour, so we are just going to sit in the traffic. It should surprise no-one here that 95 per cent of people make this exact calculation. Members do not have to rely on me. It is in the Brisbane Airport Corporation's own master plan for the airport. Just five per cent of passengers take the Airtrain. That explains precisely why we are all so used to spending 20 minutes sitting in traffic to get to the pick-up and drop-off zone. Make no mistake: this will be exponentially worse during the Olympics.

Years ago I said that I did not know anyone who catches the Airtrain. It was true then and it is still true now. One of the key reasons for that—the expense—has been even further embedded. These days the Airtrain is almost 50 times the cost of a standard train fare. This is all because it is owned by a private offshore corporation which controls fares to the airport. The reason for that is that the state government signed Queensland up to a shockingly bad deal. Whether it is through privatisation, sale of assets or ever-increasing reliance on PPPs, we have given, in this case, an exclusive deal that gives Airtrain's corporate owners a 35-year monopoly on public transport services to the airport and total control over fares until 2036. Both parties have their fingerprints on this. Labor opened up the tenders and the LNP signed the contract.

There are 10 years left on the contract—10 years of a private offshore company holding our airport train to ransom. Very simply, it is time to buy it back. If they do not want to sell we can force them, by legislation if necessary, because exceptionally bad deals call for exceptional measures. The last thing people need right now in Queensland is more traffic and more fuel costs on top of everything else. I am petitioning the state government to buy back the Airtrain and make the fare 50 cents. Given the vocal support of the entire House for the Greens' 2017 and 2020 public transport fares plan, I am sure everyone will support it.

### Police Service, Retirees; SES Regional Awards

 **Mrs KIRKLAND** (Rockhampton—LNP) (9.30 pm): Last week I was privileged to speak at a Queensland Police Service retiree celebration for three amazing Queensland police retirees. I would like to put on record tonight our gratitude to them. I will repeat the words that I shared there: for the times that you were pressed and felt you could not go any further but you still showed up, thank you; for the times that you were called out to the worst incident you ever thought you would be called to and could not do it anymore but still showed up, thank you; and for the times that you positively changed the trajectory of someone's life, thank you. Thank you to Sergeant Allan Fleming, who served 31 years and two months with the Rockhampton police, and thank you to Sergeant David Authurs, who also served 29 years of dedicated service to the Queensland community. David served at the Rockhampton and Innisfail stations. Thank you also to Sergeant Robert Harris, who served 25 years and 11 months. Sergeant Robert Harris also served at Woorabinda, Hervey Bay, Duaringa and North Rockhampton stations.

I also had the privilege of speaking at the SES regional awards and I would like to put on the *Hansard* record tonight the outstanding awards that were handed out that evening. Central Region SES has approximately 783 members across 68 groups. Between 1 July 2025 and 30 April 2026, SES volunteers in the Central Region conducted over 13,660 hours in operational tasking and 35,000 hours in training, administration, group exercises, courses, public education, recruitment, fundraising and equipment maintenance. Volunteers are the lifeblood of our state and I want to pay homage to those who were awardees and who will go on to represent our region in the state awards.

One final shout-out has to go to the amazing Mr Robert Jeacock. Mr Robert Jeacock was awarded his 50-year SES meritorious service clasp. Robert has been in the SES since its inception in Queensland in 1975—51 years ago. I extend my sincere congratulations to all awardees and retirees with whom I have had the privilege of celebrating this last week in Rockhampton and Gracemere.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.33 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, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, 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, Richmond, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young