



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 24 June 2026

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	1927
Visitors to Gallery	1927
PETITIONS	1927
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	1927
Budget	1927
Budget	1928
Budget, Infrastructure	1929
Budget	1930
Budget, Resources Industries	1930
Budget, Health System	1931
Budget, Roads and Transport Infrastructure	1932
Budget, Education and the Arts	1933
Budget, Water Infrastructure	1933
NOTICE OF MOTION	1934
Energy	1934
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	1934
Budget, Business Sector	1934
Budget, Cost of Living	1935
Budget, Infrastructure	1936
Budget, Health System	1937
Budget	1937
Budget, Waste Levy	1938
Budget, Infrastructure	1939
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, undated, from the Instagram account of the member for Woodridge, Hon. Cameron Dick MP, in relation to the State Budget	1939
Budget, TAFE Teachers	1939

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 24 June 2026

Budget, Health Services.....	1941
Budget, Specialist Outpatient Services	1941
Budget, Road and Rail Infrastructure.....	1942
Shark Control Program	1943
Budget, Justice System	1944
Budget, Hospital Emergency Departments.....	1944
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Queensland Budget 2026-27 Service Delivery Statements, undated, titled 'Emergency Care'	1944
Budget, Community Safety.....	1945
EDUCATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	1946
Second Reading	1946
Consideration in Detail.....	1961
Clauses 1 to 218, as read, agreed to.	1961
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.	1961
Third Reading	1961
Long Title.....	1961
REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1962
Second Reading	1962
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 19, 58th Parliament— Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, government response.	1962
SPEAKER'S RULING.....	1966
Same Question Rule.....	1966
MOTION	1966
Suspension of Standing Orders	1966
REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1966
Second Reading	1966
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting a billboard with people holding signs.	1967
MOTION	1994
Energy.....	1994
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	1997
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1997
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	1997
Resolved in the affirmative.....	1997
REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	1997
Second Reading	1997
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting the words 'No Gas' marked on rural land.....	1998
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	2017
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2017
Consideration in Detail.....	2018
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.	2018
Clause 3—.....	2018
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to the Deputy Premier's amendments.	2018
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in the Deputy Premier's amendments.	2018
Amendment agreed to.....	2020
Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.	2020
Division: Question put—That leave be granted.	2021
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2021
Division: Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendments Nos 2 to 18, as circulated, be agreed to.	2021
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2021
Amendments agreed to.....	2021
Division: Question put—That clauses 4 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill. ..	2024
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2024
Clauses 4 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.	2024
Third Reading	2024
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.....	2024
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2024
Long Title.....	2024
Division: Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 19 be agreed to.	2024
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2024
Amendment agreed to.	2024
Division: Question put—That the long title of the bill, as amended, be agreed to.	2025
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2025
ADJOURNMENT	2025
Budget, Education.....	2025
Community Cabinet; South Burnett Community Orchestra; Dandabah Picnic Area	2026
Public Transport, Fares.....	2026
Stuart, Lt Gen. S	2027

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 24 June 2026

Budget, Waste Levy	2028
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 20 March 2018, by the former premier and minister for trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the former minister for environment and the Great Barrier Reef, minister for science and minister for the Arts, Hon. Leeanne Enoch MP, regarding waste strategy for Queensland.....	
White, Mr A; Buderim Electorate	2028
Gold Coast, Transport Infrastructure.....	2029
Premier's Reading Challenge.....	2030
Stafford By-Election.....	2030
Drummond Range Cup	2031
ATTENDANCE	2032

WEDNESDAY, 24 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to 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 Flagstone State Community College in the electorate of Jordan, Brisbane Adventist College in the electorate of Mansfield and New Farm State School in the electorate of McConnel.

PETITIONS

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

Schools, Bathroom Replacements

Hon. Bailey, from 1,375 petitioners, requesting the House to do all within its power to ensure the installation of full bathroom replacements at Graceville State School and Sherwood State School in 2026 [\[1078\]](#).

Goodna Creek

Mr McCallum, from 368 petitioners, requesting the House to accelerate plans to connect Eagle St across Goodna Creek [\[1079\]](#).

Dittmer Project, Environmental Impact Statement

Mr Berkman, from 411 petitioners, requesting the House to make the referral under section 69 of the EPBC Act for MLA100351 Dittmer Project, so potential impacts on MNES, Water Resources and WHA Great Barrier Reef, are assessed through a rigorous EIS [\[1080\]](#).

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Budget



Hon. DF CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Premier and Minister for Veterans) (9.33 am): The 2026-27 budget strengthens the foundation for a fresh start. It delivers on the commitments we made to Queenslanders when they elected our government. It is a budget that backs safer communities, provides cost-of-living relief and delivers the infrastructure that will prepare Queensland for the future.

This budget also continues our work to make Queensland safer. Queensland voted for stronger action on crime, and the budget continues to make our communities safer with a \$7.2 billion investment into the things that make Queensland safer. It invests in the frontline services that keep Queensland safe. It supports the police officers who put themselves in harm's way every day to protect our communities. It strengthens our courts and justice system and provides greater support for victims of crime.

The budget includes \$37.1 million over four years to clear the DNA backlog and deliver access to justice for victims for crime. It continues the work of restoring consequences for actions through our Making Queensland Safer Laws. Importantly, following the *In plain sight* report, this budget establishes the Queensland Protection Commission to reform our child protection system.

Queenslanders expect to have access to quality health care when they need it. This budget continues the work of restoring health services after years of neglect. We are investing in new and upgraded hospitals, expanding frontline services and ensuring Queenslanders can access the care they need closer to home. Over 200 new beds will be delivered this financial year. At the same time we are investing in the workforce that powers these critical health services.

This budget also lays the foundations for Queensland's future prosperity. Funding for our Fuel Security Plan will fast-track development of the Taroom Trough and investment to unlock our critical minerals sector will help drive new investment. Record funding for the Great Barrier Reef will help protect it for future generations. Investment in generational infrastructure will support our growing state for decades to come. That includes investment in road and rail projects like the Wave, the new GC Surfer, the Bruce Highway and Country Roads Connect.

New schools and TAFE centres of excellence will also continue to receive funding in the 2026-27 budget. Funding for 22 new schools, including nine special schools, is included in this budget. We have also increased the Back to School Boost to \$150 to help ease national cost-of-living pressures. We will continue adding new teachers and teacher aides and investing in safer classrooms with our Behaviour Boost.

We are activating housing supply, supporting home ownership opportunities and unlocking the infrastructure needed to accommodate Queensland's growth. Delivery is underway on new and upgraded sport venues across the state to ensure we have world-class facilities that can host major events well beyond 2032.

This budget reflects the priorities of Queenslanders. It focuses on safer communities. It focuses on better health and education services. It focuses on cost-of-living relief that can be relied on in the long term. It focuses on building the infrastructure and economic foundations that our state needs for the future. This is a budget that delivers for Queensland.

Budget



Hon. DC JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership) (9.36 am): Our first budget laid the foundation for the fresh start that Queenslanders voted for. Yesterday we strengthened those foundations. We are delivering on our commitments. We are doing our bit to help Queenslanders through tough times and making responsible decisions now and for the future.

Last year we laid the foundation for budget repair; now we are laying a pathway to surplus. These are challenging times both here and abroad: the war in the Middle East leading to another major price shock, the chaos and uncertainty out of Canberra and the decade of debt, deficit and deception we inherited from those opposite. Debt at the end of the forwards is forecast to be \$73.5 billion lower than the \$290 billion forecast under those opposite. We are lowering debt and improving deficits with a surplus, and that is with no new or increased taxes.

Just as we promised, we are doing our bit to help Queenslanders through tough times. Our budget delivers the biggest ongoing cost-of-living relief package in Queensland's history with nearly \$9.3 billion supporting Queenslanders in 2026-27. It is targeted and timely, recurrent and responsible. The Back to School Boost will be increased to \$150. The Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme will be boosted. The vulnerable household electricity rebate scheme will be increased after those opposite froze it. Fifty-cent fares will be legislated, which those opposite never wanted to do. Bulk water prices will be frozen. Free kindy health checks will be expanded. The boosted first home owner grant will be extended. Power price savings will be passed on through Ergon. This is real, tangible cost-of-living relief.

The public sector report showed an irrefutable increase of 8,693 additional FTE staff, and only 0.4 per cent of them were corporate. Again, this is the polar opposite of what happened under those opposite. The front line is forecast to continue to grow this year by 4½ thousand.

This budget makes targeted investments in the services and support Queenslanders need: a record \$119.2 billion capital program; a record \$35.5 billion health budget to heal Labor's health crisis; \$7.2 billion to make Queensland safer with stronger laws, more police and early intervention and rehabilitation; \$12.3 billion to deliver a place to call home for more Queenslanders; a doubling of round 2 of the Residential Activation Fund to \$1 billion to unlock more land; a record \$5.7 billion over four years to work towards 53½ thousand social and community homes by 2044; \$23.1 billion for new schools, safer classrooms and more teachers; \$50 million to help grow the agriculture sector to \$30 billion by

2030; and strengthened water security. We are showing respect for taxpayer money, helping Queenslanders through the tough times and strengthening the foundations we have laid to deliver the fresh start Queenslanders voted for.

Budget, Infrastructure

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.39 am): The Crisafulli government's second budget sets out the largest ever infrastructure spend in Queensland's history, with over \$119 billion in public capital works over the forward estimates. These projects will transform the state not only in South-East Queensland but in rural and regional Queensland, particularly in the run-up to the 2032 games, with early site works having kicked off already at the new 63,000-seat Brisbane Stadium at Victoria Park at the beginning of this month.

This budget outlines a total games spend of \$765 million in 2026-27, with strategic investments in generational infrastructure right across Queensland—that is, \$417 million in 2026-27 for games venues for which Queenslanders are starting to see early works beginning, as well as \$348 million for athletes villages, which will not only house thousands of athletes during the games but deliver a significant housing legacy in what will be a world-class precinct in Brisbane's inner north.

Who could forget the former Labor government's record, with the member for Woodridge as treasurer, failing to fund their athletes village in their budgets. He announced it with great fanfare: Hamilton Northshore athletes village. He announced it. He just forgot to put a budget line item in there to fund the athletes village. We are funding it and it is in the budget. It is in black and white. You can read all about it.

Mr Miles interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the laughing interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. He is not one to laugh about games infrastructure spends. This is from a guy who was going to spend over \$2 billion at QSAC for temporary seating.

Mr Crisafulli: Good on you, genius!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Premier: genius!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, get back to your ministerial statement, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I had a script to stick to, but now I have been diverted to other territory I did not intend to go to. I did speak this morning at the Infrastructure Association of Queensland conference, with over 350 people in the room. My God, the excitement in the room about the \$119.2 billion! I spoke about QSAC and the former minister's—the Leader of the Opposition's—abysmal record on QSAC—\$2.25 billion on temporary seating. That is what your legacy was: temporary seating of over \$2 billion.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, direct your comments through the chair, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. He laughs. It is a big mirror, I would say, because he is laughing at himself and his laughable legacy.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, get back to your ministerial statement.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, you do not just have to take my word for it. I am pleased to advise the House of the overwhelming support from industry that our budget has received, sending clear signals to the market of a stable, achievable and fully funded capital works program that will be delivered. Queensland Major Contractors Association CEO Andrew Chapman said of the Crisafulli government's second budget yesterday—

The state government should be commended for taking the lead on implementing these new investments that will not only support the Games in 2032 but support economic and community growth for the next decade and beyond.

The size of Queensland's infrastructure pipeline means we cannot continue doing things—

and this is for the member for McConnel's benefit. Are you ready for this? He said—

The size of Queensland's infrastructure pipeline means we cannot continue doing things the way we always have ... Managing industrial relations effectively will be critical if we are to maximise the value of this investment and deliver price and time certainty.

Industry knows that, unlike the former Labor government, we will never threaten them or threaten their contracts for failing to do the bidding of the CFMEU. I would also like to welcome comments by Master Builders Deputy CEO Michael Hopkins, who said—

We ... celebrated an early win of the doubling of the investment in the Residential Activation Fund, unlocking land for new housing via essential infrastructure.

These programs not only help consumers but also provide industry greater certainty at a time when Federal Budget tax changes and global events are dialling up the pressure on construction businesses and impacting the bottom line.

This Crisafulli state government understands the importance of partnering with industry to get infrastructure off the ground, and out of the ground, particularly ahead of the 2032 games, when the eyes of the world will be on Queensland. That is why our second budget is getting on with the job of delivering to build in every corner of this great state.

Budget



Hon. RM BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (9.44 am): This budget is about strengthening the foundations we have laid for a fresh start. In my portfolio this means backing Queensland's industries, delivering the skills and training Queenslanders need and making sure Queenslanders are ready for the jobs that come with it.

This budget delivers no new or increased taxes, just like we promised. It puts Queensland on a lower debt path than Labor left behind and it returns the budget to surplus in 2029-30. Budget discipline matters, because when governments manage money properly it helps build confidence, businesses can invest, employers can hire, industries can grow and Queenslanders get a better lifestyle through a stronger economy.

One of the clearest examples is critical minerals. Queensland has the resources that the world wants. We need to unlock those minerals, process them here and export them to the world. The budget provides an additional \$100 million to the Queensland Critical Minerals Fund, taking the fund managed by Queensland Investment Corporation to \$250 million. This is about turning Queensland's natural advantage into jobs, investment and exports.

It is why Trade and Investment Queensland matters. This budget supports TIQ with \$79.5 million in funding for 2026-27 to help Queensland businesses find new markets and attract investment. It also helps small, family and regional businesses take what they make here in Queensland to the world, thanks to the additional \$18 million we delivered for TIQ from our first budget.

This budget provides \$2.8 million to continue support for Queensland's international education and training sector, backing Queensland to be Australia's premier study destination. The other side is workers. This is why the \$1.6 billion allocated to trade, employment and training is so important. It includes \$68.9 million in 2026-27 to continue delivering our four new TAFE centres of excellence in Rockhampton, Caloundra, Petrie and the Southern Moreton Bay Islands. It sees \$104.8 million committed to strengthening the role of TAFE Queensland and CQUniversity in delivering skills in demand including in regional communities. These investments connect training with the jobs Queensland actually needs. This budget also provides an extra \$44.2 million to meet demand for skills across the economy including apprenticeships and traineeships. Free nursing will continue in 2027. We will continue to support Queenslanders who want to become enrolled nurses and support our health front line.

It continues support for businesses training apprentices by helping to cover wage costs while apprentices are away from the workplace for training. Skilling Queenslanders for Work remains backed by \$80 million, giving jobseekers practical pathways into work. This matters because we inherited a skills shortage. Thanks to the former Labor government, Queensland was left facing a predicted peak shortfall of 50,000 workers. Now the Albanese Labor government is proposing a new free TAFE agreement that leaves Queensland \$208 million worse off. Queenslanders deserve better. This budget strengthens the foundations for Queensland's fresh start, it delivers a better lifestyle through a stronger economy and it shows Queenslanders the Crisafulli LNP government is doing exactly what we said we would do.

Budget, Resources Industries



Hon. DR LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (9.48 am): This year's state budget is about restoring Queensland's sovereign capabilities. It is about strengthening the very foundations that Queensland was built on and backing the industries that our regional communities rely on. Since I

was sworn in as resources minister, there is one issue that rings loud and clear with each junior miner and explorer: the former Labor government's Financial Provisioning Scheme—a scheme we inherited that at its very core is intended to pull the handbrake on small and junior miners and explorers.

The Crisafulli government supports new investment, new exploration and a strong resources industry. Without those junior miners and explorers the exploration industry disappears, and without new exploration there is no new production. That is why we have committed to a review of the financial provisioning scheme. The review has been welcomed by the Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, with CEO Warren Pearce highlighting—

Junior and mid-tier companies are often the ones taking the early risk in developing new mineral projects which in-turn creates opportunities in regional Queensland.

As Warren said—

The Financial Provisioning Scheme must work for all parts of the industry ...

Let me be clear: the Crisafulli government supports the intent of the scheme, but through this review we want to understand whether the policy settings strike the right balance between financial protection and promoting resource investment.

Our support for the resources sector does not stop there. Critical minerals are the words on everyone's lips in this budget. We heard it yesterday and I will say it again: the Crisafulli government is unlocking Queensland's critical minerals. We are accelerating the extraction, processing and exporting of our highly sought after critical minerals because the question is not whether trading partners want our critical minerals. The question is how we can get them to our trading partners sooner. I have seen through my trade missions and industry meetings that there is major international investor interest in what lays under our feet here in Queensland. The new critical minerals fund will drive investment into new projects to prepare Queensland to lead the next wave of this rapidly growing global industry. We are not just talking about rocks in the ground. Critical minerals are used in defence, new technologies and advanced medical equipment.

We must mine critical minerals here in Queensland if we are to take control of our own future. We know there are plenty of opportunities to mine critical minerals here in Queensland, and that includes abandoned mine sites. We are investing in the recommercialisation of abandoned mine sites to extract high-value critical minerals and rare earths from tailings to unlock the emerging sector. We want to make the most of this critical resource and restore Queensland's sovereign capabilities, but we know that restoring sovereign capabilities does not stop there.

The Crisafulli government is determined to restore fuel security to our state. We have enacted the Taroom Trough Development Plan, giving the Queensland Coordinator-General the powers to drive whole-of-government planning and stakeholder engagement. We are closely monitoring developments in the Denison Trough. This budget also allows us to accelerate and optimise production in existing basins such as Cooper and Eromanga and continue our focus on expanding local refining capacity. We are pulling policy levers to deliver real, practical solutions for the petroleum and gas industry that go to the route of the issue. More supply into the markets is the only way to restore fuel security to Queensland. This budget delivers practical measures to increase supply, because never again do we want to be at the end of a global supply chain.

Budget, Health System



Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (9.52 am): The Crisafulli government's record \$35.5 billion health budget is continuing to deliver health services when you need them after a decade of Labor decline. The Crisafulli government's first budget marked the first time in history over \$30 billion was invested in Queensland's health system, and we delivered this without increasing taxes. In our first 100 days we axed Labor's patients tax, which would have put additional financial pressure on our GPs and ultimately hit the hip pockets of Queenslanders.

Our second budget yesterday was welcomed by Dr Cath Hester and the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners who specifically said that payroll tax and land tax being stable and sustainable is critical to private GP practices, which are small businesses in this state. They welcomed the investment of \$37.5 million into kindy kids, they welcomed our ongoing investment in free flu vaccinations at \$31 million, and they supported our Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme record uplift of 30 per cent from 34 cents to 45 cents. This was all welcomed by those people who deliver primary health care in our community.

The good news continues. The State of the Sector report 2026, released yesterday, shows that our health workforce grew by over 4,800 FTE, an almost 4½ per cent increase, putting to rest the mistruths peddled by those on that side in their scare campaign. In our record 2026-27 health budget

we have locked in further growth in the health workforce. This budget will see an increase of over 10,000 health workers since the Crisafulli LNP government came to office in October 2024. I contrast that with those opposite, because when I became health minister I was advised Labor had ever so quietly accounted for cutting 1,700 staff in 2025-26 alone.

Government members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: There was no money! I thank those tireless health staff across the state who have contributed to the lowest ramping in half a decade. It is now down from Labor's record high of 45 per cent—45.5 per cent, lest I mislead the House—to 34.5 per cent in the month of April, the lowest since January 2021.

We are delivering more elective surgeries. Another of our government's commitments is to stabilise the elective surgery waitlist, which is now down 8,136 from Labor's 2024 peak, and that is despite increased demand. We are doing more, and more people are going on the list, but we have reduced the list by over 8,000. Our 2026-27 budget delivers a further 25,000 elective surgeries through our successful Surgery Connect program.

The good news continues because even more health services are coming. Our Hospital Rescue Plan is getting Labor's failed capacity expansion program back on track after the independent review found that 'continuing with' that program 'is an exercise in futility'. The government continues to get on with the job with this budget, bringing over 200 more beds online this year at Hervey Bay, Cairns and the Gold Coast. As I mentioned, for Queenslanders in remote and rural Queensland we are boosting the Patient Travel Subsidy Scheme, investing a record \$140 million into the PTSS, \$20 million more than was included in Labor's last budget.

The 2026-27 budget is delivering what the Crisafulli LNP government committed to: more health workers, more hospital beds and more health services for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

Budget, Roads and Transport Infrastructure



Hon. BA MICKELBERG (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.56 pm): The Crisafulli government is delivering a record-breaking level of investment for new and upgraded road and transport projects right across this state. As the Treasurer announced yesterday, there is a record \$55.9 billion spend, all with the aim of getting Queenslanders home sooner and safer no matter where they live.

QTRIP delivers the road and transport infrastructure Queensland needs after 10 years of decay and decline saw blowout after blowout and delay after delay under the former Labor state government. Our program consists of transformative infrastructure projects that will shape Queensland's future, prepare us to host the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games and cater for our growing population. Importantly, it also contains many local projects which may be small relative to projects like the Wave but are still significant to the community and deliver important outcomes. We are delivering safe and connected transport infrastructure around Queensland so Queenslanders can spend more time at home with their families and less time commuting.

I am most pleased that we have been able to accelerate the delivery of key projects and programs such as our \$9 billion Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program. As I mentioned yesterday, 65 projects are already underway or complete, with another 52 tenders to be released over the coming financial year, meaning even more work to upgrade the Bruce. Rail is being turbocharged as well, with the Wave stage 1 between Beerwah and Caloundra seeing \$460 million spent in the coming financial year as part of our \$5.5 billion investment. The \$651 million to progress work on the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail will ensure we keep momentum after Labor failed to even get the project started. This year's program builds on the work of last year so we can continue in that same vein.

Works will continue on various Country Roads Connect projects across Queensland, and the beef roadworks will progress in the member for Mirani's electorate and the member for Gregory's electorate. Work will continue on the Rockhampton Ring Road and the Coomera Connector. Queenslanders on the Gold Coast will now see a new light rail line connecting the hospital to Harbour Town as well as the GC Surfer connection between Coolangatta and Robina.

All of this delivery does not just get done overnight, and it does not happen all on our own. Our strong partnerships with industry and businesses are key to maintaining the momentum on this record infrastructure task, with shared goals of reducing commute times and building a better future for Queenslanders. We are keeping our foot on the accelerator to deliver a transport network that meets the needs of our growing state and delivers for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

Budget, Education and the Arts



Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (9.59 am): After a decade of decline under Labor, Queenslanders can see that the Crisafulli government is investing in Queensland's future when it comes to education, early childhood and the arts by strengthening the foundations for a fresh start. The 2026-27 state budget invests a record \$23.5 billion, including \$1.487 billion in capital expenditure, to deliver a high-performing education system, a quality early childhood sector and support for a vibrant arts and cultural sector across Queensland. The Crisafulli government's objectives are clear, with investments across the board that will see every child starting strong, every student achieving and realising their full potential, and vibrant arts and culture across the state.

In education, the budget is delivering families relief that they can rely on, with a \$150 Back to School Boost for school essentials—a 50 per cent increase—for every Queensland primary school student to help ease national cost-of-living pressures. We have an ambitious new schools build program with 22 new schools, with nine of these being new special schools. This includes the announcement in this budget for increased funding of \$700 million over five years, including \$254.1 million held centrally for the planning and construction of a new secondary school in Ripley Valley, a new primary school in Greater Flagstone, two new special schools in Townsville and Wynnum Manly and stage 2 of the new secondary school in Gracemere.

There is also \$28.7 million for the Fixing the Foundations program in this budget to help fix Labor's generational neglect of state schools by revitalising schools across the state, including millions in increased funding for school security fencing. Capital grant funding of \$144.1 million for the non-state-schooling sector and student hostels will also support students across Queensland. Making classrooms safer is a key focus of the Crisafulli government, so we are investing \$304.72 million over four years to continue delivering our commitment to a zero-tolerance approach to violence and aggression. Labor failed to support students' literacy and numeracy results, with over a decade of decline. That is why the Crisafulli government is committed to ensuring Queensland kids catch up, keep up and stay in school, with more support for our teachers and school staff in our growing state.

I am also delighted to share highlights from the Crisafulli government's 2026-27 arts budget. With a total arts portfolio budget of \$391.9 million, we are continuing our strong support for Queensland's creative industries, which play a vital role in our cultural, social and economic life. Cameras will continue to roll for Queensland's film industry through a continuation of funding over the next two years in the Screen Industry Attraction and Development Fund, amplifying our state's position as Australia's leading destination for screen production while supporting local job growth.

In addition, we are continuing our funding for festivals and events and will be investing more than \$9 million in 2026-27 through Arts Queensland for festivals and events across the state, shaping the cultural calendar, activating regional and rural communities and boosting cultural tourism across Queensland. Brisbane Festival is one of Australia's biggest multi-arts festivals and it will activate our capital city across September. Other returning favourites include the Woodford Folk Festival, the Gympie Music Muster, the Festival of Outback Opera, QMF's Queensland Music Trails, the Cairns Indigenous Art Fair and the Australian Festival of Chamber Music, which is moving further north to Cairns this year.

We are also investing more than \$19.3 million in 2026-27 to deliver QPAC's new flexible performance space, creating new opportunities for Queensland artists, attracting more audiences and ensuring our flagship performing arts venue continues to grow ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The Crisafulli government is continuing to deliver on our promises, and we are committed to strengthening the foundations for a fresh start in the education and arts sectors across Queensland.

Budget, Water Infrastructure



Hon. A LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (10.04 am): When Queenslanders voted for the Crisafulli government, they voted for a fresh start after a decade of Labor decline, broken promises and botched projects. Let's have a look at Labor's legacy: \$6.5 billion in water infrastructure blowouts; water projects like Emu Swamp Dam and Big Rocks Weir cancelled after being smothered in Labor's red tape; one weir delivered in a decade, over time and over budget; the most expensive water bills in the nation; only 3,000 megalitres of water made available in their final year of government, enough for one medium-sized farm; and no new dams—in fact, the dam storage in Queensland decreased by half a million megalitres over Labor's decade due to mismanagement and a lack of infrastructure maintenance.

Queenslanders were desperate for a fresh start, and that is what we are delivering. Let's look at this budget and how it reverses Labor's decade of decline. We are building new water infrastructure: \$10 million to progress a new dam in South-East Queensland, and we have ruled it out of the Mary Valley as per our election commitment; over \$10 million to progress the Barlil and Cooranga weirs and the weirs on the Thomson River; \$59 million to progress Paradise Dam, the great Labor infrastructure fail; and \$3 million to progress Emu Swamp Dam. We are also investing hundreds of millions in funding to deliver upgrades to existing dams that will restore additional water storage equivalent to a new dam in the south-east corner.

We are also reducing water bills across the state—\$22 million for the Cloncurry Shire Council to minimise their water bill shock and \$10 million for Gladstone urban customers to minimise the impact from Labor's Fitzroy to Gladstone pipeline, which Labor referred to the QCA—and we have frozen bulk water prices for Seqwater, meaning savings of approximately \$130 per household and up to \$300 for small and family businesses. We are calling on the utility providers to pass on those savings. This is a government that will continue delivering water for all Queenslanders.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Energy



Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (10.07 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

1. notes the vast resources of uranium in Queensland;
2. notes that world demand for uranium is forecast to triple by 2040;
3. calls on the government to end the policy of no mining or exporting of uranium in Queensland, opening an economic windfall for Queensland and potential future nuclear energy industry;
4. notes the rapid expansion of wind energy developments across Queensland and the absence of legislated requirements to guarantee the full rehabilitation, decommissioning and restoration of affected land at the end of a project's operational life; and
5. calls on the government to introduce legislation establishing a rigorous approval, financial assurance, rehabilitation, and decommissioning framework for wind energy developments, including enforceable obligations to remove infrastructure, rehabilitate sites and restore land to an agreed condition upon project closure.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time today will conclude at 11.08 am.

Budget, Business Sector



Mr MILES (10.08 am): My question is to the Treasurer. Business Chamber Queensland said, 'Queensland businesses are telling us they want real relief,' and 'This budget doesn't provide that relief.' Does the Treasurer accept Business Chamber Queensland's position on the budget?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. I have been looking forward to budget week because I am looking forward to a range of questions from those opposite. I love it when they want to talk about business confidence. I love it when the opposition wants to talk about business confidence because I reckon there has never been a government like the Palaszczuk and Miles government that has been worse for business confidence—ever.

A government member: What about the Albanese government?

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection. There is one worse government for business confidence and it is the Albanese-Chalmers government—

Mr Bleijie: But they are all Labor.

Mr JANETZKI:—and they are all Labor. I am going to come to the question. There are so many measures that the federal government has applied to the state, and do honourable members know what those opposite have said? Nothing—absolutely nothing! They want to come in and talk about business confidence, but the first thing they could do is actually take a stand for Queensland—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I know the Treasurer is saying he is coming to the question, but he needs to come to the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Treasurer, you said you were coming to the question, so I suggest you do.

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, I am talking about business confidence. I am going to talk a lot more about it. Those opposite have never said anything about anything that Canberra has done. Whether it be stranded patients, the NDIS cost shift, natural disasters, gas or GST, they are not interested in business confidence. They are just not interested. In fact, I do not think the Leader of the Opposition in his budget reply last year even said the words 'small business'.

Mr Minnikin: He didn't.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the Minister for Small and Family Business. It is good to know that the Leader of the Opposition has now shown an interest in business confidence because he could not even mention business confidence last year. Let me say this about business confidence: the best thing we can do to deliver business confidence in Queensland—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The standing orders are quite clear about debating the subject to which a question refers. The Treasurer has not been relevant, either. The question was specifically about responding to comments of the business chamber.

Mr SPEAKER: It is on relevance. I believe the Treasurer was addressing that point you raised. Treasurer, I will be listening.

Mr JANETZKI: Do honourable members know the best thing any government can do for business confidence? It is to have no new or increased taxes and regulatory certainty and stability. That is—

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Waterford.

Mr JANETZKI: That is the best thing governments can do: offer certainty and stability—and that is what this government has done. Moreover—and the health minister has alluded to it this morning—in our first year in government we abolished two taxes. How is that for confidence and stability? We will continue to work with the business community.

Budget, Cost of Living

Mr MILES: My next question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer accept the Queensland Council of Social Service's view on the budget that there is not a cost-of-living and housing package that will make a difference to families now?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: You have started before I have even called the Treasurer.

Mr JANETZKI: I will walk the House through the cost-of-living package, the greatest continuous cost-of-living package in Queensland history. It is not a hoax, like those opposite would do. Let's never forget that those opposite froze the indexation for the electricity rebate for vulnerable households. That is their record. It was a hoax. The electricity rebates that they talk about were a hoax. Their cost-of-living measures were an election eve con. That was their cost-of-living relief. Yesterday we talked about cost of living, and that relief is permanent. Queenslanders can rely upon it. They know it is not a cynical, political move to try to win votes at an election. They know that when the Crisafulli government delivers cost-of-living relief they can take it to the bank.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lytton.

Mr JANETZKI: When we talk about cost-of-living measures, we lock them in. We do not leave Play On! vouchers unfunded; we fund them.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lytton, you are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: When we talk about Play On! vouchers, we do not leave them unfunded like those opposite; we fund them. Unlike those opposite, we do not freeze electricity rebates for vulnerable households; we lift them. That is what we do. When we introduce—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the Treasurer wants to debate the budget, he can leave that until later in the week. The standing orders—

Mr SPEAKER: Is your point of order—

Mr de BRENNI: The standing orders are clear that in answering a question, a minister shall not debate the subject. That is exactly what he is doing.

Mr SPEAKER: Is your point of order relevance?

Mr de BRENNI: No. My point of order is about whether or not it is in order to debate the subject to which a question refers. I submit that is what the Treasurer is doing. The question was about—

Mr SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Manager of Opposition Business, I am not convinced he was debating the issue. The question, as the Treasurer is well aware, was around cost-of-living measures. Treasurer, I will ask you to address that.

Mr JANETZKI: Let me continue. I have a lot more to go. When we introduce a measure like the Back to School Boost, we fund it in the forwards permanently so Queenslanders can rely on it. We are not cynical like those opposite who try to win elections off the back of it and have not a single dollar in the budget. That is their record.

Mr Dick: You supported my budget. You supported every dollar in it in 2024—all of it, for four years.

Mr JANETZKI: That is the record of those opposite and they come in here and talk about cost-of-living relief when their entire cost-of-living package in 2024—and the member for Woodridge knows it—was a hoax.

Let me say this about what we are investing into the social services sector, and I look again towards the record \$5.7 billion into social and community housing. Under those opposite, 509 social and community homes were being built each year. We are on the way to quadrupling that. We are funding \$5.7 billion for the 6½ thousand homes that are underway.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Waterford is warned.

Mr JANETZKI: We are investing \$400 million into homelessness services and frontline support for homelessness and we did the 20 per cent uplift last year. Those opposite never did it. We are also providing \$83 million in private rental support. Across the board, whether it is structural or whether it is targeted, we are delivering cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders.

Budget, Infrastructure

Mr BOOTHMAN: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Veterans. How is the Crisafulli government's second budget delivering the investment our growing state needs, and is the Premier aware of any approaches that failed to appropriately invest in Queensland's future during a decade of decline?

Mr CRISAFULLI: I want to thank the honourable member for the question. He asks about what we are doing. It is the greatest infrastructure package in the history of this state and it is focused and targeted. I want to make an observation for the honourable member.

The honourable member asks about the infrastructure because he knows how important it is for the people of the northern Gold Coast whom he represents. We have all been in this chamber and we have listened to the member as well as the member for Coomera advocate for their fair share of funding and it has not come. It is time for it to flow. When we announced the Gold Coast transport plan the other day with the members for Southport, Bonney, Currumbin and Burleigh, we mentioned a generational transport plan for the Gold Coast. I can confirm to the House that it is going to be the kind of transport plan that delivers for the state's second largest city. I can reveal today in this House that on 31 July I will be attending Future Gold Coast where we will be outlining the next step of that plan. It will be road, rail and public transport. It will be a proud city getting what it deserves. It is because of the advocacy of members like the member for Theodore and others that that will happen.

The member asked what the budget does generationally. It is about fixing a decade of decline in health. It is about delivering educational opportunities, including building special schools again—and I am really proud of that. It is about ensuring that housing begins to flow, and I look at the programs like the Residential Activation Fund, which has really energised the delivery of opportunities for people to own a home and afford their rent. I think about social and community housing. I think about a decade of decline when barely 500 homes per year were built. I know this budget does put things so they are pointing in the right direction.

I also want to talk about what this budget does for tourism, because today is an important day: in news out today, nearly 2½ million international visitors have come to Queensland, injecting over \$8 billion into the economy—that is 17 per cent higher than predicted—and it is because we are open for business and it is because of Destination 2045. I say this to you, Mr Speaker: watch this space, because there are more big events coming to this state because we are going to be the events capital of the country. We are determined to ensure that when people look to this state they see a state with optimism, with aspiration, with a vision to make sure that people can come and invest and enjoy themselves and know that this is a state whose best days lie ahead of it. I say to you, Mr Speaker: no matter where you live in Queensland, this is a budget that delivers generational infrastructure, no new or increased taxes, services you can rely on and respect for your money, because that is what delivering for Queensland looks like.

(Time expired)

Budget, Health System

Mr SMITH: My question is to the Treasurer. AMA Queensland said on ABC News—

Doctors will be disappointed that the government's spend on health this year—
in its budget—

has not kept pace with ... demand or inflation ...

Has the Treasurer spoken with AMA Queensland about its comments on the budget?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. I am not sure, but I do not think the member for Bundaberg was particularly listening to the ministerial statement of the health minister, because chapter and verse the health minister has already answered it in particularity. The member for Bundaberg clearly was not paying attention, so let me run through it again. This is a record health budget. It is a record health budget of \$35.5 billion, which is up 7.3 per cent on last year's record health budget of \$33.1 billion. That is the investment into the health system that this government is making—that we have had to make because of the health crisis caused by those opposite when we saw record ramping and ballooning waitlists. That is the record that we and the health minister had to address coming into government, and that was just the start of it. We have seen some green shoots, as the health minister has already said, with declining ambulance ramping and stabilising and declining patient waitlists. They are the investments that are being made to put downward pressure and heal Labor's health crisis. The honourable member opposite asks about the AMAQ.

Mrs Gerber: Do you want the quotes from Maria Boulton?

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member. I remember that I had a lot to do with the RACGP and the AMAQ about the patients tax. Those opposite wanted to introduce a patients tax that would drive down bulk-billing and drive up presentations in emergency departments across our state. That is what they wanted to do. That was their patients tax—Labor's patients tax. Maria Boulton, the past president of the AMAQ, said that the patients tax was a problematic tax and she said that it was an immoral tax. That was Labor's record. I reflect on what the health minister has said: whether it be the RACGP or the AMAQ, they have made it clear—our ending of the patients tax is good news for Queenslanders. That is the AMAQ and the RACGP message to Queenslanders. Ending the patients tax—ending Labor's patients tax—is good news for patients in Queensland, just like our record health budget is good news for Queenslanders in healing Labor's health crisis.

Budget

Mr DALTON: My question is to the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership. How is the Crisafulli LNP government's second budget delivering the right balance of investment and fiscal management, and is the Treasurer aware of any approaches that did not show respect for taxpayers' money during a decade of decline?

Mr JANETZKI: I thank the honourable member for the question. I will start off with a couple of remarks about our budget before I turn to the alternative approaches that the honourable member has asked me about, because I have a lot to work with in terms of alternative approaches. Firstly, let me say this about our budget: as I said last year, our first budget laid the foundations and this budget was about strengthening them, and we are doing that through a variety of measures. We are investing more in strengthening the front line—and didn't we see in the State of the Sector report yesterday what it means to be a government that is dedicated to strengthening the front line? We are strengthening the front line—99.6 per cent strengthening the front line. We said that we are doing our bit to help

Queenslanders struggling in the middle of a national affordability crisis, and that is what the budget has done. We are doing our bit to support Queenslanders struggling in the middle of a national affordability crisis. We said that the budget will build Queensland's future and we have seen, as the Deputy Premier has said, that \$119.2 billion—a record infrastructure spend in Queensland. That is our focus. That is our strategic direction.

To turn to the alternative approach part of the honourable member's question, we have so much to work with after 10 years of those opposite. I do not even know where to start, but as good a place as any is probably the last election campaign. Today those opposite can get up and talk about what one stakeholder might have said and misquote or selectively quote what some stakeholders might be saying. They can do that all day—that is fine; I will address all of those questions—but members know that the one thing they cannot run away from is the *Financial Review's* assessment of their final budget, and I have never seen such a scathing response to any budget. Bearing in mind their unfunded promises, they borrowed \$33 billion in three weeks to go and build Pioneer-Burdekin. They just decided in a speech that they were going to overturn people's lives and their livelihoods. That is that. However, do members remember that the *Financial Review* called their last budget a 'clown show'? A 'clown show'! That is the honourable member—

Mr Bleijie: They're all still there.

Mr JANETZKI: Yes, they are all still there, especially the member for Woodridge—the 'clown show' budget. There was the honourable Leader of the Opposition's service stations. I would not trust the honourable member for Murrumba to warm up a sausage roll let alone run a service station! I would not trust them, and that is their legacy.

(Time expired)

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! We will have silence while we hear the next question.

Budget, Waste Levy

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for the Environment. The Local Government Association has said that millions of Queenslanders living within the levy zone will now continue wearing an increasing state government bin tax on their rates bill. Can the minister guarantee that the LNP's waste levy bin tax will not be passed on to ratepayers?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The question was asked to the minister.

Mr POWELL: It was, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for the question, but one would have thought it came from one of my own, given the nature of the question. Turning to the question, I remind those opposite: the waste levy was Labor legislation. Those opposite introduced the levy into this House. It was their levy imposed in both metropolitan councils and regional councils alike. It was their levy that increased year on year on year to ensure—

Mr Bleijie: Her mentor Jackie gave her the question.

Mr POWELL: I know; she handed her this one. They should remember that because there is almost a basketball team of former environment ministers sitting on that side of the House. There is the member for Murrumba, there is the member for Nudgee, there is the member for Algeester and there is the member for Gaven—all of whom were instrumental in developing the waste levy legislation in the first place.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Pine Rivers, you are warned.

Mr POWER: I want to address something. Yesterday in the budget there was reference made to the fact that there is increased waste levy revenue over the forwards of more than \$500 million. Can I explain why that is happening? There are two reasons. One is population increase. Queensland's population is booming. Do we want to say to the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Housing, 'Stop doing what you are doing. We do not want new Queenslanders to come here'? Bring it on. Continue to build the houses that Queenslanders need as more people move to this great state.

As the population increases, so does the amount of waste going to landfill, particularly because of what those opposite achieved. They created a waste levy that was designed to do one thing—bring in revenue. Not at any point did they stop and say, 'We actually do not want people to pay this levy.'

That is the difference between those opposite and us. We are making investments with councils to ensure they do not pay the levy. That is what our waste strategy launched last week delivers—less landfill, more recovery, more recycling. We will work with councils, as we did last week, to roll out 26 different projects across the state—

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Algeester, you are also warned.

Mr POWELL:—all of which prevent waste going into landfill. Guess what, members opposite? You do not pay the levy when waste does not go to landfill. Back in our contribution to local governments across this state to ensure Queenslanders no longer need to pay the levy by diverting it to recycling instead.

Budget, Infrastructure

Ms HATCHER: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. Can the Deputy Premier advise how the Crisafulli LNP government's second budget will continue to invest in generational infrastructure, and is he aware of any alternative approaches during the decade of decline?

Mr BLEIJIE: I have to say to the honourable member for Caloundra: what a pocket rocket delivering for Caloundra you are. I would need 10 hours to explain to the House the things the member for Caloundra, Ms Kendall Hatcher, has been delivering for the people of Caloundra and on the Sunshine Coast. What did the former member, Jason Hunt, deliver? A tax bill because he failed to pay for his mail when he sent out distribution letters. This member for Caloundra has rebuilt. I said there is not enough time to say all the things he did not do. We did not want the jail. She stopped the jail when we were in opposition. The member for Caloundra is delivering the biggest infrastructure spend—not only in Caloundra but on the Sunshine Coast—that we have ever seen.

Tomorrow is a test for the Leader of the Opposition. He is going to deliver his budget reply.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: They turned up today. Remember last year that they did not show up on the Wednesday, they just forgot parliament sat, so a point for showing up to do your job this year—that is great. They did not turn up for question time yesterday. They are here for question time today—two marks—but tomorrow is the test. We had a 1½ years under the opposition leader. There has not been a policy announcement—nothing. All he has done is regurgitate bad Labor policies.

Who could forget the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who spent a fair amount of time on the Treasury bench? You would remember the Deputy Leader of the Opposition would always do these weird photos. In fact, he was trying to be JFK's brother in his black and white photo. He even did one in the rose garden out the front, but what he forgot to tell people is the rose garden is the front driveway of Queensland parliament. He stood there like he was going for a tour through this two-metre rose garden. Here we go, he has done his black and white photo again! Look at him looking out. He is not even the shadow treasurer anymore. I table a copy of the photo.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Instagram account of the member for Woodridge, Hon. Cameron Dick MP, in relation to the State Budget [1081].

This is the Deputy Leader of the Opposition who introduced a renter's tax on Queenslanders when in government. The question tomorrow for the opposition leader is: what are his policies? Will he regurgitate failed policies like Stevo's servos? If we taxed the waste on the opposition front bench, the state debt would be repaid overnight. It is a wasteland over there, and we are all looking forward to his big policy announcements tomorrow. How is he going to pay for it? That is what we want to know.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: When the clock hits zero, time has expired.

Budget, TAFE Teachers

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Finance. The minister's charter letter says: 'Undertake a \$2 million recruitment drive to employ the next generation of TAFE teachers.' The budget shows the variation since last year of TAFE teachers and tutors is down 4.5 per cent. Has the minister failed to fulfil her KPI to recruit new TAFE teachers?

Ms BATES: I thank the member for the question. It has been 398 days since I have received a question in my portfolio. So 24 June 2026—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Let's try again.

Ms BATES: It has been over a year since my last question, and it comes from one of the laziest members in this House. This is the laziest, most well-resourced opposition ever and these are the sorts of questions he asks.

Mr HEALY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence and I would like the member to withdraw.

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

Ms BATES: I withdraw. I am sure the people of Cairns take offence as well. You should be getting up early, working harder, doing better. Between Ali King—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, when you withdraw, it is unqualified—no buts, no maybes. I will ask you to do that again.

Ms BATES: I withdraw, thank you. Between Ali King and Jackie Trad still writing your questions, it is no wonder all of your questions—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. None of this response to the question is at all relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! There are two parts to that. There have been a lot of interjections. Minister, you have waited a long time to have an opportunity to give an answer, so you have your opportunity now. You have two minutes.

Ms BATES: I am more than happy to say what we have done. We are out recruiting the next tranche of new teachers right now. We saved Back to Work from Labor. We saved Skilling Queenslanders for Work from Labor. We saved 336 TAFE staff from being sacked by Labor. We have a \$1.68 billion DETET budget; \$201.1 million funding for four TAFE centres of excellence. I noticed the member for Kurwongbah was claiming on his Facebook last night that federal Labor are actually building our four TAFE centres of excellence. I need to let you know that there is no funding from the federal government for the four TAFE centres of excellence. They are all coming from the Crisafulli budget.

We have delivered 2,000 new free diplomas for nursing—and they were obviously taught by somebody. We delivered free apprenticeships for under-25s. We secured \$50 million under the National Skills Agreement. Under the Crisafulli LNP government, TAFE—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was about a reduction in TAFE teachers. There has been no response that is relevant to that question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The minister is being absolutely relevant to the question as asked in relation to TAFE. We know that the Labor Party hates TAFE.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the House, there is no need for that language in a point of order.

Dr ROWAN: The point of order is that the minister is being responsive to the question as asked. She is referencing TAFE. She is providing extensive information in relation to what this government is doing to support TAFE here in Queensland. The point of order as raised by the Manager of Opposition Business is not relevant.

Mr SPEAKER: As I heard it, the minister was speaking directly to investments in TAFE. Minister, you have 43 seconds.

Ms BATES: I even gave you numbers. I told you what we have done. We saved 336 full-time equivalents from being sacked by the Labor Party. That is Labor's record after a decade of decline. After 398 days I get a question—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, both sides! Members to my right, it is your minister who is trying to answer the question so let her speak. Members to my left, the minister is being relevant. Minister, you have 20 seconds left.

Ms BATES: Again, after 398 days all I get is a shambles—whingeing and whining from the member for Cairns. We on this side are calm and methodical and you are all about chaos. We are delivering for TAFE—unlike the Labor Party, who were going to sack teachers in TAFE.

Budget, Health Services

Mrs KIRKLAND: My question is to the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. How is the Crisafulli government's second budget delivering a record investment in health services, especially for those in regional Queensland, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches during a decade of decline?

Mr NICHOLLS: I want to thank the member for Rockhampton for her question. I think it is important that we set the record straight on Labor's decade of decline, especially in terms of delivering services in Central Queensland. The member for Rockhampton has been a fierce advocate for improving those services and delivering those services—and with some success, can I say. It is always a pleasure to be able to highlight those successes and highlight the successes in this year's budget, because this year's budget represents a record spend on health infrastructure. Some \$4.040 billion in 2026-27 will go towards delivering better health facilities, and that includes part of our 2,600 new beds, three new hospitals and 10 expanded hospitals.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: Despite the scare campaign from those opposite, we are getting on with the job and delivering more than ever before. As I said yesterday, in Wide Bay the piling rigs have arrived at the new Bundaberg Hospital and work will start on those on Friday, delivering those on top of the other works that are continuing. Thanks to axing Labor's CFMEU tax we are delivering projects faster and earlier.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: Only two weeks ago I stood at the PA Hospital, where we have topped out on the delivery of the Crisafulli government's expansion of the PA Hospital.

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

Mr NICHOLLS: In the electorate of Rockhampton, much closer to the member's heart, as it is to the member for Mirani and the member for capital—Keppel! I have capital on the mind, we are spending so much of it!

Mr Crisafulli: We've got lots of it!

Mr NICHOLLS: Absolutely, Premier. I take that interjection. We are delivering a \$19.2 million, six-bed, new step-up step-down facility. In fact, I was there only two weeks ago at the location at Berserker. We are also in the final stages of a state-of-the-art 32-bed mental health unit and a new cardiac hybrid theatre—a project Labor failed to fund properly and which would not have been delivered without the \$8.8 million that we have made an uplift for in our budget.

We are expanding the Rocky ED to 58 emergency treatment spaces, including a new fast-track centre. We are expanding the transit lounge: we are going from 12 to 20 spaces. And here is some good news: emergency department ramping in Rockhampton, the first one the Premier and I visited, which was at 56.1 per cent under those opposite, for the month of April was 30.7 per cent. That is delivering services. Thank you, member for Rockhampton.

We are also investing in the new modular hospital expansion in Gladstone, which was on birthing bypass for 339 days. We are putting more regional dialysis into Emerald—we have not forgotten about our regional areas—and more beds at the Moura multipurpose centre. We are delivering for rural Queensland and Central Queensland.

Budget, Specialist Outpatient Services

Mr BAILEY: My question is to the Treasurer. The budget estimates lower specialist outpatient activity for next year, with weighted activity units down 3,710. Did the Treasurer receive advice from the health minister or the Public Service that Queenslanders will be requiring fewer specialist appointments next year?

Mr JANETZKI: I am not sure if the member for Miller has been paying attention this morning.

Mr Nicholls: He hasn't been listening: a 10.8 per cent increase in elective surgery numbers in 12 months.

Mr JANETZKI: Has he been paying attention? A 10.8 per cent increase that you are looking for. That is the number. Have you been paying attention? The health budget has been significantly invested into. The health minister can address these issues. The worry I have is that at the moment those opposite appear to have no strategy for what should be a serious moment.

Mr Healy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Cairns, you are warned.

Mr JANETZKI: The member for Miller must be paying attention, because we have just today again confirmed yesterday's record investment into the health system—\$35.5 billion into the health system.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Miller asked a question about a reduction in weighted activity units for specialist outpatients as reported in the SDS. The Treasurer was asked about whether he had received advice. He has not been relevant to that. That is the question we are asking.

Mr SPEAKER: So it is relevance.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. When the Manager of Opposition Business rises on a point of order he debates it before coming to what the actual point of order is. It is not an opportunity to make a statement. Come to the point of order. If he wants to raise it on relevance that is fine, but the preamble is an abuse of the standing orders.

Mr SPEAKER: You are well aware of the question.

Mr JANETZKI: Record surgeries, stabilising waitlists and a 7.3 per cent increase to the health budget in this budget—that is the kind of investment we are seeing. I contrast that with the record of those opposite. Under Labor, the ready-for-surgery long waitlist grew 17.5 times higher from when they inherited it. That is their record. That is the basis from which the member for Miller comes in here and seeks to ask this question. We have said all along that we will continue to do the work and we will continue to make the investments into healing Labor's health crisis. The health minister has already identified how that is happening: again, record surgeries, stabilising waitlists and—

Mr Mellish: Dodgy data.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member for Aspley. These guys would know all about dodgy data and the member for Miller would know all about dodgy data—the overrun overlord.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The answer is—

Mr SPEAKER: Hold on a moment.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Treasurer was responding to an interjection from the member for Aspley.

Mr SPEAKER: That is exactly what I was going to say, Leader of the House. There was an interjection from that side of the chamber and the Treasurer was responding to the interjection.

Mr JANETZKI: We should all know about dodgy data and dodgy information from the overrun overlord, as the member for Buderim—

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

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not hear the Treasurer name any member of the House. It is self-identification by the member for Miller and I ask that you rule as such.

Mr SPEAKER: I did not hear anybody named. Treasurer, if you are speaking about any individual then you will use correct titles.

Mr JANETZKI: Take your pick, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr JANETZKI: I can see the Clerk's eyes upon me so for the good order of the House I will withdraw. I could have been talking about anybody but he self-identified. Talking about dodgy data, I remember the dodgy data when the member for Miller stood up at the Toowoomba Hospital, for instance, and had to go and correct the record, so they do not need to give us any lectures about dodgy data. We will continue investing in the health system to restore it after their health crisis.

(Time expired)

Budget, Road and Rail Infrastructure

Mr BAROUNIS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. How is the Crisafulli LNP government's second budget delivering the investment in the road and rail projects that our growing state needs and is the minister aware of any approaches that neglected road and rail projects during a decade of decline?

Mr MICKELBERG: I thank the member for Maryborough for his question. He is a tireless advocate for his community. As a consequence of the advocacy of local members such as the member for Maryborough, yesterday we announced a record \$55.9 billion QTRIP program that will deliver the road

and rail infrastructure that Queenslanders need like the \$9 billion Bruce Highway Targeted Safety Program. At the end of the next financial year, \$4½ billion of that program will be contracted. Works are already finished at Bauple, near the electorate of the member for Maryborough, and recently I was at the car rest area in the Gympie electorate. We are already delivering for regional Queensland and we will get on with the job through this budget.

We saw the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project blow out under the overrun overlord—that is you, member for Miller—from \$2.6 billion to \$5.75 billion. Out of an abundance of clarity for the House, the overrun overlord is the member for Miller. His apprentice is the member for Aspley.

Mr SPEAKER: No. We will use correct titles.

Mr MICKELBERG: Indeed; I withdraw, Mr Speaker. So that we are clear, the Logan and Gold Coast Faster Rail project will now cost \$5.75 billion because of their mismanagement but we are getting on with the job. A sum of \$650 million has been allocated and is expected to be spent in the next financial year. The Country Roads Connect program is worth \$100 million. That is a great program connecting local rural roads. Approximately one-third of that funding will be spent in this financial year. We are focusing on the projects needed to grow our state and deliver the infrastructure required.

We have seen some selective quoting from the opposition in relation to stakeholder feedback so I thought I would inform the House of some of the feedback that has been issued publicly by stakeholders in my portfolio. Let us start with the RACQ. Yesterday, the executive manager of road safety, Joshua Cooney, said the level of investment should give Queenslanders confidence and is a significant step forward to keeping the state moving. He said—

Queensland's been playing catch-up, but today's Budget helps us tackle the enormous pressures we have on the transport system.

He said the standout measure was a boost to road maintenance funding that will increase from \$5.6 billion to \$6.6 billion over the next four years. What did we inherit from those opposite? An \$8 billion backlog in road maintenance and we are tackling it.

The Queensland Major Contractors Association said—

Whilst there are many other projects in planning and/or awaiting commitments from the Federal Government, the state government should be commended for taking the lead on implementing these new investments that will not only support the Games in 2032 but support economic and community growth for the next decade and beyond.

The CCF said—

I congratulate the Queensland Government on delivering the productive investment in infrastructure that will support 33,000 jobs and grow our economy now and into the future.

This is the kind of investment our state has been crying out for for years ...

That is what stakeholders are saying about this budget. They want to see an end to the overrun overlord legacy of budget blowouts, and his apprentice as well.

(Time expired)

Shark Control Program

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Given reports of increased shark numbers, lost catches and growing safety concerns and noting that Queensland's shark fishery helped manage shark populations before major restrictions were introduced, will the minister consult with industry and consider reducing restrictions on commercial and recreational shark fishing to assist in managing shark numbers?

Mr PERRETT: I thank the member for Hill for his ongoing interest in shark management in the state. I recall the member for Hill asked a very similar question in the last sitting following the tragic death of a spearfisherman in North Queensland. I again acknowledge the impact that that has had on not only the family of that gentleman but also broadly across the state. We continue to see some of those issues interstate as well, which is a great tragedy.

As I indicated to the member last time, we have invested a record amount in the shark management program in Queensland. We have invested \$88 million of new funding in shark control in this state. There is a number of areas that we cover and that I touched on in the last sitting and we will continue that work. To answer the member's question specifically, yes, we are conducting stock assessments. That is a critical component of our shark management strategy going forward. We said we would make decisions based on science and we will do that. I do not step away from that commitment.

However, we work across the state to protect Queensland swimmers and particularly the valuable tourism industry that is supported by our great ocean beaches. We work with Surf Life Saving Queensland. We have not only made permanent the 10 trial drone sites across the state but also increased the number to 20 and we will continue that program. We will also continue to work on non-lethal methods to make certain that, with shark nets, we use the best available technologies for whale deterrence and interaction. We also back in our marine animal rescue team to make certain that, where there are encounters with shark control equipment, we can release the whales or other vulnerable species that are encountered. We have been very successful. It has been many years since we have lost a whale.

However, I re-emphasise that the purpose of the Shark Control Program in Queensland is to protect human life, as it has been under previous governments for many decades and I acknowledged that at the time. I also hear the views that come forward, particularly from commercial fishers and recreational fishermen, about shark numbers in this state. That is why I re-emphasise to the member that we are conducting stock assessments across the state, particularly for those target species. I do hear a lot particularly about bull sharks and others. We want to make certain that when we make decisions they are based on science. I am always happy to keep the member updated. I thank him for his ongoing interest and the spirit in which he asks those questions.

Budget, Justice System

Mr CRANDON: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How is the Crisafulli LNP government's second budget delivering easier access to justice and protecting Queenslanders most vulnerable, and is the minister aware of any budgets that failed to deliver consequences for actions during a decade of decline?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for Coomera—such a hardworking local member. I will get to the 10 budgets that did not support victims or people suffering in this state in a moment, but, excitingly, the second Crisafulli budget is strengthening the foundations to support victims in this great state and to protect our most vulnerable—the children who should be protected. Over \$2 billion is being invested into the justice portfolio to establish the nation-leading Queensland Protection Commission and to continue to build and grow forensic testing at FSQ. We will talk about the failures under those opposite in a moment. Importantly, we are investing in our prosecution services—that is something I am very proud of—to support the courts and to support victims in this great state.

Just last week I announced the Queensland Protection Commission—a commission that is anchored by an intelligence hub to be proactive, not reactive, in protecting our most vulnerable in this state. It is being established following the *In plain sight* report by the chair of the Child Death Review Board under the QFCC. The Queensland Protection Commission will co-locate those areas that protect our most vulnerable—blue cards and working with children checks, disability worker screening checks, the Reportable Conduct Scheme and the Child Safe Standards.

To my mind, the greatest failure of the former Palaszczuk and Miles governments was the DNA testing failure. They let down victims and left children unprotected from predators in this state. The Crisafulli government is investing heavily in FSQ to make sure the samples are retested and results can be placed before the courts. We are also investing in the ODPP to provide over 25 additional prosecutors and, importantly, an additional two deputy DPPs across the regions so we can focus on victims, get their matters to court faster and support them through the process.

Those two things were never focused on by those opposite. They did not focus on victims. In stark contrast, we have a minister for victim support. We are putting victims at the heart of every matter that comes before our courts. Whilst we are getting on with the job, those opposite continually have their head in the sand over the failures of the past that have left victims unprotected in this state.

Budget, Hospital Emergency Departments

Mr J KELLY: My question is to the Treasurer. The budget estimates lower emergency department activity for next year, with weighted activity units down 3,411. I table the specific reference from the budget paper to assist the Treasurer in his answer.

Tabled paper: Extract from Queensland Budget 2026-27 Service Delivery Statements, undated, titled 'Emergency Care' [[1082](#)].

Did the Treasurer receive advice from the health minister or the Public Service that emergency departments will be in less demand next year?

Mr JANETZKI: Mr Speaker—

Mr Nicholls: We overdelivered last year.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the health minister; we overdelivered last year. We are going to keep delivering. We are going to keep driving down Labor's health crisis legacy. We are going to keep investing into it. Those opposite do not want to hear about it—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes!

Mr JANETZKI: They do not want to hear about it, but we are continuing to invest into the health system in the way that we have already described this morning—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, you are warned. I just cautioned you.

Mr JANETZKI:—a record investment of \$35.5 billion. Across the health budget, we are investing \$297 million into Surgery Connect. We are rebuilding maternity services after those opposite shut them. They shut 37 maternity services in 25 years. We are working to bring them back after all those cuts that those opposite delivered.

A government member: Mater Springfield.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection on Mater Springfield. Last year I was using that as the example. They go and build a hospital but then they do not put a single dollar in the budget to operationalise it.

Mr Nicholls: They call that efficiency.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection; they call that efficiency. Those opposite never properly funded the health budget when in government. We know it. We are delivering that investment that is now so desperately needed.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. A document was tabled to assist the Treasurer. The question goes to that document. I ask that the Treasurer be relevant to the matter.

Mr SPEAKER: Did the Treasurer receive that document?

Mr JANETZKI: We know that ambulance ramping has moved under our watch. We have seen the improvements already. We know that the investments we are making are working. That is why this budget delivers another 7.3 per cent to deliver \$35.5 billion into the health budget. Those opposite may complain, but they are the ones who left the health system unfunded. They are the ones who let surgical waitlists blow out. They are the ones whose hospital capacity expansion program nearly doubled. The former health minister now sits as shadow treasurer. She was at CBRC watching all these blowouts for all that time. She never fronted up to the Queensland people—never!

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order which remains on relevance. The Treasurer has seen the document. He should be able to respond.

Mr SPEAKER: The question was asked of the Treasurer about waitlists. If you want to talk about waitlists you should probably ask the health minister, but the Treasurer is talking about funding going towards the health system so I find that is relevant. Treasurer, you have 36 seconds left to answer.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the member for Waterford, who I happen to note was on a warning, as I understood, Mr Speaker, but I will leave that in your hands. I want to note a couple more of the green shoots we are seeing after a decade of their health crisis—not just around the investment needed but also real improvements on the ground, as the health minister has described, including on ramping. I want to note that in April there was a reduction of 100 ambulances on the ramp compared to the same time last year.

(Time expired)

Budget, Community Safety

Mr FIELD: My question is of the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government's second budget making Queenslanders safer by investing in correctional and detention facilities as well as early intervention and rehabilitation, and is the minister aware of any examples where crime spiralled out of control during a decade of decline?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute.

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Capalaba for the question. He stands shoulder to shoulder with victims of crime, not only in his community but also across the state. Tragically, he knows firsthand the devastating effects of Labor's youth crime crisis, and he has worked tirelessly every day to turn the tide on that.

We are delivering stronger laws, early intervention and rehabilitation, but that is not all. After a decade of the previous Labor government failing to invest in the infrastructure needed, both in our correctional centres and our youth detention centres, we are delivering the infrastructure needed. We are delivering an additional 600 beds in QCS, in addition to the 800 beds we have already funded in the budget being delivered in Townsville and Brisbane.

Contrast that with Labor, who failed to even deliver the prison they promised. They promised the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre—the first prison to be built in Queensland in a decade—but it took the Crisafulli government to come in, get it on track and deliver it. We are also delivering the Woodford youth detention centre. We are delivering the infrastructure needed to keep Queenslanders safe.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

EDUCATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 23 June (see p. 1926), on motion of Mr Langbroek—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (11.09 am): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the education bill. I acknowledge the work of the committee in examining the bill, and I am proud to say I was a member of the education committee in the last parliament and am quite familiar with the purpose of this bill. The Education (General Provisions) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024 was referred to us but went no further. It was not debated when it got back to the House.

I note that the Labor Party have been very critical of this bill, in spite of the fact they have said they will support it and have made no statement of reservation in the report. I remind them that we have this bill now because their bill was a dud. It fixes a number of the things the last bill incorporated.

Some of the criticisms could be attributed to being nothing less than an attack or a broadside on homeschooling. I acknowledge Free2Homeschool, particularly their two leaders Amanda Bartle and the irrepressible Patricia Fitzgerald. They taught me and other members of the committee a great deal about homeschooling. I make it clear that those who choose to homeschool their kids are making a very valid choice, and the results speak for themselves. I have come across many students who are being homeschooled in my own electorate of Southern Downs and they seem to do awfully well academically. I put that down to the ability of the parents to ensure the learning is adapted to their needs.

The reasons parents decide to homeschool their children are manifold and various. I can tell the House with absolute certainty that a large proportion of them first decided to undertake homeschooling because of the state school system under the previous government. That is a fact. I am sure that there would be members on both sides of the House who, when being honest, would say that is what homeschooling parents have told them. A lot of parents found their kids were afraid to go to school because of things like bad behaviour more generally, the use of drugs, violence and bullying. That is a tragedy and will require ongoing work. The Crisafulli government is genuinely working to make that happen.

Under the previous bill, the homeschooling community vehemently objected to the insistence they strictly adhere to the national curriculum. I am glad to say that has been omitted from this bill. That brings me to another point of concern for many parents: the national curriculum does not reflect the way they feel their kids should be learning, besides much else. To its great credit, this bill has recognised the deficiency in the bill which Labor brought before this parliament in 2024 but never brought on to debate. That bill would have forced parents to adopt the national curriculum or suffer punitive consequences.

Also, the bill did nothing to enshrine the equality of students undergoing homeschooling and those attending a regular school in the sense that an 18-year-old can maintain their student status until 31 December in the year they turn 18. That was not the case before. This bill provides that, which I know the homeschooling community will welcome.

I note that in my electorate of Southern Downs I have quite a few independent schools. They, like state schools, are subject to the capriciousness of the environment—floods, fires et cetera—and it is important that this bill clarify the maintenance of accreditation for non-state schools which have to shift their site, which is usually in response to something like a natural disaster. That may sound like a small thing, but it makes a big difference. Many of these smaller independent schools are not flush with funds to comply or have lawyers to work on their cases and so forth. They need an act which supports them, and this one certainly will do that.

This bill is important to me not just because of my history in dealing with the previous bill and this one—and I acknowledge the committee for the work they have done on it this time—but also because education is important to me. I am sure I speak for every member in this House too.

Mrs Kirkland: Hear, hear!

Mr LISTER: Thank you. The member for Rockhampton knows what I am on about. There are 45 schools in my electorate of Southern Downs. In order to emphasise the point, I want every one of those schools to understand that I know them and appreciate them and that this bill is to support them. In the Southern Downs Regional Council area, there is: Allora P-10 state school; Amiens State School; and Applethorpe State School, which is also known as ‘the coolest school’ in Queensland quite literally because it has the coolest temperatures in Queensland. I know that they rejoice in that title. We have: Ballandean State School; Broadwater State School; Dalveen State School; Freestone State School; Glen Aplin State School; Glennie Heights State School, which is actually based in Warwick; Greenlands State School; Karara State School; Killarney P-10 State School, a great school; Leyburn State School; Maryvale State School; and Murray’s Bridge State School. I went there to cast my vote and was a scrutineer at the last election. Murray’s Bridge State School, which is on the way to Killarney, usually has about 15 or 20 kids enrolled—so good on you.

There is Pozieres State School and Severnlea State School, which my two boys went to when they were in primary school. It is another fine little school with a couple of teachers, a few dozen kids and a wonderful history steeped in the apples and grapes of the area. It is on their shirt. We have: Stanthorpe State High School; Stanthorpe State School; Thulimbah State School; Warwick Central State School; Warwick East State School; Warwick State High School; Warwick West State School; Wheatvale State School; and Yangan State School.

In the Goondiwindi part of my electorate, there is: Goondiwindi State High School; Goondiwindi State Primary School; Inglewood State School, which is a great P-10 school that has served the community well for a long time; Kindon State School; Kioma State School; Talwood State School; Texas P-10 State School; and Yelarbon State School. In the Toowoomba Regional Council part of my electorate, we have the Cecil Plains State School, which is a P-9 school, and Millmerran State School. I was in Cecil Plains on the weekend with the Lions Club and that school is an integral part of the community, as all of these schools are for their respective communities.

In the way of Catholic schools, we have: Assumption College in Warwick; St Maria Goretti School in Inglewood, which is a little Catholic primary school which I have attended on a few occasions and enjoyed consorting with the leadership, students and parents there; St Joseph’s School in Stanthorpe, where my own two boys go and my four-year-old daughter will be going for prep next year; St Mary’s School in Goondiwindi; St Mary’s School in Warwick; and St Patrick’s School in Allora, which is another small Catholic school.

We have independent schools in Southern Downs as well, including Border Rivers Christian College and The School of Total Education, where I went last Thursday to watch their school play called *Aristocats*. It involved every grade from prep through to the end of primary school, and I congratulate them on a fantastic and really humorous presentation. There is The SCOTS College, which is a fine school with a long history in the area, and Warwick Christian College.

The importance of this bill is not lost on me. The importance of education is not lost on me. The importance of administering education, particularly in those small independent schools and Catholic schools, is to enable them to focus on what they do best: educating the kids. Lastly, I refer to the students in the gallery. Welcome to Parliament House. It is always great to see students in the gallery. We are talking about an education bill, which will be great for you when you go back to your class. Thank you.

 **Hon. FS SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism) (11.18 am): Seeing as the member for Southern Downs has given his schools a shout-out, I will briefly do the same. I will reference the fact that I am a proud graduate of Nambour State High School. Some might remember that a former Labor prime minister went there too. He was a lot older than me; I did not go to school with him. I was delighted to have great experiences in the state school system—starting out at Cooroy primary school and then going on to Yandina primary school before going on to Nambour High, which is today called Nambour State College.

I strongly support the right of parents to consider where best they can enrol their child in a nurturing environment and have a great opportunity to match educational needs with the needs of the child, whether it is in the state school system or in the private school system. That regulatory framework sits with state government, recognising the first and primary principle of involving parents. We appreciate their role in nurturing the child and making those choices but within that regulatory framework so that great standards are maintained and supported.

I want to thank the Minister for Education for his outstanding work in this portfolio. It is a big portfolio. We all have a lot of schools in our electorates and we are passionate about them. He has the overarching responsibility for schools across Queensland as well as the regulatory framework for the private school sector and, as we have also heard, for homeschooling.

This bill is particularly focused on the reduction of red tape as well as a number of other measures given that for some time there has been a substantial piece of education legislation under the previous Labor government. However, under this minister we are seeing these matters being advanced to ensure education has more timely and up-to-date regulatory oversight.

We believe in strengthening governance, improving educational outcomes, supporting the re-engagement of students and continuity of education, and improving the efficiency of operations for arts and education statutory bodies. There is a real focus, as I have said, on the reduction of red tape. This has been outlined quite a bit. As we have seen, Labor had a habit of frustrating teachers and suffocating them with red tape. We will continue to listen to our educators to address these areas—to back them, to remove unnecessary regulation and to help students who, under Labor, were falling behind. The Crisafulli government is committed to reducing red tape for teachers by 25 per cent to free up teachers to spend more time in the classroom supporting students and less time on admin.

This legislation also addresses the issue of continuity of education. It has a particular focus on disengaged youth. It ensures that for children and young people who are at risk of entrenched disengagement—they are more likely to have complex needs and behaviours and backgrounds—there is a framework that supports them to continue to have appropriate access to education. This is vitally important. It is something we see across portfolios. If a child does not have access to education or is disengaged from education, they are so much more likely to be at risk of some other unfortunate circumstances, be it poverty, be it a potential pathway to crime or be it disadvantage. It is vitally important that we do all we can to keep children engaged in education and, if they are in the youth justice system, ensure they have access to and are able to take part in education. This is an area we need to continue to focus on and give particular attention to.

There is a move to alternative methods of delivery, for example flexischools, and it is great to see adaptive ways of providing education, but it should never be about dumbing down opportunity or doing a tick-and-flick, saying, 'If you have attended for a couple of hours, you have attended.' That is not doing the job. I think it is appropriate that there is a focus on ensuring there are real educational engagement opportunities, and for those who are involved in dealing with some very difficult engagement issues two hours a day does not cut it. There needs to be real engagement with and integration into education, because that is how people thrive and can have self-determination in the future, safely and legally. It also provides the opportunity for people to reach their full potential. Once again, I thank the Minister for Education and his staff in the department for the work they have done on this bill.

 **Mrs KIRKLAND** (Rockhampton—LNP) (11.24 am): I rise today to speak in support of the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. It is time for us to get serious on reducing regulatory burden and deliver measures for our teachers that are practical and supportive of the wonderful role they play in the lives of our children. We need reforms that will improve educational outcomes for our children right across Queensland, and that is what this bill delivers. After a decade of drift from those opposite, this bill represents clearer legislative reforms across a number of objectives.

I cannot continue without first reflecting on how we arrived at such a problematic educational system. Under the previous Labor government, Queensland classrooms were under continued and growing pressure. Teachers were weighed down with administrative burden placed on them by those opposite, schools were facing significant maintenance backlogs to the tune of almost \$400 million, and unacceptable numbers of students were falling behind in literacy and numeracy benchmarks. At the same time, behaviour issues in classrooms intensified, and teacher attrition reached concerning record levels. These systemic problems directly affected the quality of education that our children were receiving. For too long those issues were met with complete inaction from those opposite.

The Rockhampton-Gracemere electorate contains 32 schools, comprising 18 state, eight Catholic and six independent schools. To those schools this bill speaks in its deliverance of a number of key administrative reforms. The Crisafulli government is focused on supporting teachers, engaging students and restoring confidence in our education system—confidence that seriously eroded under the previous Labor government.

One of its key strengths is cutting unnecessary red tape. For too long teachers have been forced to spend excessive time on administration instead of doing what matters most—that is, teaching. This bill continues the work of reducing regulatory burden and moving towards a risk-based, proportionate system including for the non-state-school sector. For example, when a school seeks to make a straightforward change, such as adding a year level, it should not be subjected to a full-scale regulatory process designed for much higher risk changes. The bill introduces a more sensible and targeted approach. That is considered a measured reform—reducing workload without reducing standards.

The bill also ensures continuity of education, particularly during times of disruption. Under the current arrangements, schools can face uncertainty when forced to relocate—for example, due to natural disasters. This legislation provides clarity and flexibility, allowing schools to operate from temporary sites while maintaining their accreditation. This means that students can stay connected to their learning, even when circumstances are challenging—and that matters. We have seen during times such as COVID how every day out of the classroom is a lost opportunity, particularly for vulnerable students.

That brings me to another critical component of the bill: supporting disengaged young people. Not every student can thrive in a traditional classroom immediately. Some need additional support, structure and time to reconnect with education. This bill formally recognises re-engagement programs, ensuring that young people who have fallen out of the system are not left behind but instead supported back into education, training or employment pathways. It also enables appropriate information sharing between agencies. This is vital to ensure young people do not fall through the cracks.

Re-engagement ultimately reduces long-term disadvantage and strengthens our communities. In Rockhampton, under the initiative of the Crisafulli government, we have the Regional Reset program and we will soon see the commencement of one of our crime prevention schools. These re-engagement schools remove disruption to existing mainstream classrooms and provide options that meet educational needs alongside of critical support needs. The bill ensures continuity of education and improves legislative clarity for them.

The bill also removes the ambiguity for education in youth detention settings by formally recognising education and training centres as state education institutions. We provide that clarity and ensure that young people in detention continue to receive structured, legitimate educational programs. No longer will children in detention languish and fall behind in their education, as happened under the previous government, because we believe and know that rehabilitation begins with opportunity and that education is central to that.

Also contained in the bill is a measure to expand the international delivery of the Queensland Certificate of Education. This is about showcasing Queensland's high-quality education system on the global stage. By allowing non-state schools to partner with international institutions—of course under strong oversight—we open new pathways for students, strengthen the educational brand and create economic opportunities for our state. This is Queensland looking outward, not inward. The bill includes improvements to governance and efficiency within bodies such as the Queensland College of Teachers and Non-State Schools Accreditation Board. It introduces clearer accountability mechanisms, modern governance practices and more efficient administrative processes. This bill is about producing good governance, as sound governance underpins a strong educational system.

Importantly, this bill also delivers meaningful reforms in the arts sector. Queensland's arts institutions play a vital role not only culturally but also economically and socially. By modernising governance arrangements, strengthening integrity requirements and reducing unnecessary

administrative complexity, we enable these organisations to focus on what they do best: creating, performing and engaging our audiences. The bill also takes practical steps to protect consumers, including measures to deter ticket scalping, ensuring Queenslanders can access events fairly and with confidence.

This legislation sits alongside broader reforms already underway, including increased investment in teachers, behavioural support initiatives and measures to lift literacy and numeracy outcomes. We are seeing real progress with more teachers in classrooms, higher participation in national assessments and targeted support for student wellbeing among the improvements already being seen under this Crisafulli-led government. Legislation such as today's matters because it sets the framework supports these improvements will need into the future. This is balanced, practical reform focused not on ideology but outcomes.

The 32 schools across my electorate lived the struggle under the previous Labor government. They have been calling for these practical measures and a government that not only listens but also is willing to step up and deliver. Queensland students deserve a system that works for them. Teachers deserve support, not burden. Communities deserve confidence that their education is strong, responsive and ready for the future. That is why we are delivering Gracemere high school to a community calling out for two decades to say they require a high school in order to achieve that responsive, future-ready approach to education. This bill helps deliver that to them as well.

I thank the Minister for Education and his team for putting together a bill which builds that responsive, foundational requirement in order for us to continue to deliver the great initiatives already underway in our state schools right across the state, including our independent schools and special schools. I also thank all of those involved in the committee for their hard work—and the secretariat, as always—in bringing these community responses together to contribute to this bill. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr VORSTER (Burleigh—LNP) (11.33 am): When I had the opportunity to rise in this House and deliver my first speech I spoke very passionately, I thought, about not only the role education played in shaping my life and giving me opportunities but also reflecting on how education is the very mechanism by which our state could realise its potential not only to create a generation of ambitious, energetic Queenslanders who could create for themselves the future they hope for but also to create opportunities for their fellow Queenslanders by getting the skills, values and being shaped in their character in a way that allowed them to look optimistically to the future.

I believe in education. My wife is a teacher, a lecturer at Bond University. For over 15 years she has welcomed students who are embarking on further education into that campus. She has taught pathway programs to connect more kids with tertiary education. We often talk about education policy. I am really proud of the work we are doing as a government to ensure there is a pipeline of Queensland kids who are more hopeful, ready to seize the future and receiving a better education in schools and classrooms that are better maintained. That has not always been the case in this state.

In preparing to speak on this bill I reflected on my time as a Gold Coast City councillor, when I had the opportunity to speak to every corner of my council division about the issues affecting them and keeping them up at night. I did not just hear from parents who were worried about the former Labor government's neglect of teaching resources and facilities in our patch; I also spoke with teachers on the front line as well. In 2022 that prompted me to write to the then education minister, the member for McConnel, pleading on behalf of my community for her to take some action to restore safety in the classroom. I had heard from my community that teachers were perpetually under pressure from kids who received no consequences for their actions and were abusing them in the classroom, the playground and off campus. It was a real discouragement to those teachers.

Of course, it was not just happening in my community because, as we know now, under Labor's watch between 2020 and 2024, when the member for McConnel was the responsible minister, 12,000 teachers exited the profession. That is not just 12,000 public servants on the front line; that is 12,000 people who have invested years of their lives in professional tertiary education in practical placements. The state made an investment in them so they could make an investment in the next generation. Those 12,000 teachers walking away squandered 12,000 separate investments in their professional development. That is not only squandering taxpayer resources; it is squandering the opportunity to do anything—

Mr McDonald: They had 10 years to fix it.

Mr VORSTER: I will take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. He quite rightly points out they had 10 years to do something about it. He is precisely right.

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. This has nothing to do with the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Thank you, member for McConnel. I will take some advice about that point of order. Member for Burleigh, I have sought some advice. I have also been listening to much of this debate during the time it has gone on. There have been some very wideranging contributions to the bill. You can give some context to your contribution, but I would ask you to come back to the bill. I think you have given that context already.

Mr VORSTER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I appreciate your guidance and I will learn my lesson, as those opposite learned in October 2024. During the debate, those opposite have talked about what they view is a missed opportunity to do something with this legislation. Those opposite last attempted reform in 2016. I must admit that they had another crack but it was so poorly crafted that there were 2,000 submissions against that bill. I totally appreciate, Deputy Speaker, that I am straying a bit but it is only to address a point that was made by the member for Algester. I think that is important to put on the record here, because those opposite have maintained that this was a missed opportunity. Well, 2016 was the last time they embarked on reform and in 2024 they botched it, but I will move on.

I would like to associate my contribution very closely with the contribution made by the member for Mundingburra. She talked about the role of the teaching profession and the impact that individual teachers have on lives. With your indulgence, Deputy Speaker, I want to very quickly run through some of those teachers who have had an impact on my life. I begin with Mrs Stanley, my standard 4 teacher at Browns Bay School. She had a great impact on my desire to explore the sciences at a very formative age. The Reverend Harold Clark at Kristin School provided an incredible amount of pastoral care during some very low times. Sadly, he passed in 2013 but I will forever carry the memory of his pastoral care. Mrs Sonia White ran the Future Problem Solving and Community Projects program at Kristin School. She worked with me and some fellow students on a social impact project that saw us travel to the United States representing our country. Mrs White, thank you for that. Ms Elizabeth Baff taught me at Kristin School in Auckland, New Zealand, and I have only just recently learned that she has now found herself teaching at Fraser Coast Anglican College—

Ms GRACE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. While it is nice to hear the history of the member's schooling life, this is not relevant to the bill and I ask that he be brought back to the long title.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just one moment and I will seek some advice about that point of order. Member for Burleigh, I am going to give you some very firm guidance. You can give context to the bill, which you have been doing, but now I think you should come back and address the specific provisions of the bill in your remaining three minutes and one second.

Mr VORSTER: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and I meant to show no disrespect to you or the ruling. I was merely availing myself of the same opportunity that the member for Mundingburra had, but I will move on.

One of the best features of this bill, I believe, is the ability for the non-state-school sector to deliver the QCE curriculum program internationally for the first time. For the longest time, the state has had a monopoly on the ability to do the same. I want to acknowledge the work of Steve McLuckie, a principal at Varsity College. He is a fantastic administrator and teacher, and I had the opportunity to work with him closely at Varsity College while a councillor. He now delivers the Queensland curriculum internationally. I think his work is remarkable because it is demonstrating to the international market that a Queensland education is a wonderful product and creates real opportunities, not just for students in this state but also for those who might be looking at this state for opportunity.

The reforms progressed by our very fine education minister will now unlock that opportunity for more students internationally through many more providers. I believe this is an idea whose moment has come, because as we march towards the 2032 Olympic Games the state name that will be on the lips of so many people is Queensland. They will be looking for ways to connect with opportunity in Queensland, and what better way than receiving a Queensland education wherever they may live? I want to commend the education minister for these reforms, for unlocking more opportunity and for supporting the non-state-school sector to deliver fine education abroad alongside our state counterparts.

One of the other phenomenal aspects of this bill is that it continues on our reform agenda to ease the red-tape burden on teachers. There is absolutely more to be done—our government acknowledges that—and we are working towards that, but we are not doing it with a deaf ear or with market research done in the mirror; we are doing it in consultation with the sector.

In closing, I thank the QTU representatives whom I have worked with: Suzee Dearlove and Mark Simpson. They are two fine Palm Beach locals who are very invested in their community. They have given me fair, frank and fearless advice and they are certainly leaving an impression on me. I am looking forward to working with the education minister to make sure our teachers are properly supported, because they were not under the former rotten Labor government.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (11.45 am): I appreciate being able to speak, and commiserations on the game earlier. I wanted to speak on this legislation because I think of it in the context of being a former high school teacher who worked in the state and Catholic sector as well as internationally. I always think of how legislation makes a difference at the chalkface, where you have students from difficult and diverse backgrounds and you are trying to make a difference in their lives.

There are some positive things in the bill, like information sharing between the department and others as well as the re-engagement of young people, which we also had initiatives about because that can be useful. However, I had a group of teachers come to my office and we sat down and spoke about the challenges that teachers face. They feel unsupported by this government; indeed, they feel like they are in combat with this government. They feel like they are in classrooms alone facing difficult circumstances.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr POWER: One of the specifics we spoke about—and this is different from the period when I was a teacher—is that they feel like there is much more violence in the classroom and there are many more young people—

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Southport and member for Coomera, the member is not taking your interjections.

Mr POWER: Thank you. I was speaking about those teachers who came forward to me to express their concerns. I do not need to hear those interjections where they are undermining those teachers who value what they do and are trying to make it better. I am also trying to make my speech quickly.

I feel like this bill is in some ways a distraction. It is a bill that does not get to the nub and the core of the difficulties we have in classrooms. I want to specifically talk about the growing areas in Queensland where new families are moving in but they do not have that connection to the community. The schools begin to provide that connection, but that puts an extra burden on teachers. I am pleased that this government is building the school that we put in place in Logan Reserve with the Logan Reserve special school, but we need to have the backing of the teachers who will be in that school because it is a brand new community. I think this is a missed opportunity.

I note there is rhetoric about the reduction in red tape, but there is no way to measure how that will make an impact on teachers. I asked the Logan teachers whether they were seeing that in their everyday life, but they said they were not so there is much to be done. There are some positive things in this bill, but we want to back our teachers who feel like they are under siege because of a changing community, pressure from parents and especially pressure from this government because they feel the government does not support them.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (11.48 am): It is interesting to hear the member for Logan talk about the teachers feeling like they are not getting the things they needed after him being in government for 10 years. I have had many meetings with the QTU who have come into my office complaining about the previous administration and the various things that happened under them. Let me add my contribution to the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

I want to be clear: education changes lives. It opens doors, it creates opportunities, it strengthens communities and it gives young Queenslanders the skills and the confidence to build better futures. That is why I support this bill put forward by the minister. This bill is not about headlines; it is a bill about practical improvement. It is about making systems work better for students, teachers, families and communities. Some of the most important reforms considered by this House are not the largest reforms; they are reforms that remove barriers, improve governance and help good people do their jobs more effectively. That is exactly what this bill does.

As the member for Toowoomba North, I can say that education is one of the issues often raised with me in my electorate. Toowoomba is one of Queensland's great education cities. Families move to our region because of our schools, businesses invest in our region because of our schools, students

travel from across regional Queensland because of our schools. I moved to Toowoomba because of the education system there. We are home to excellent state schools, Catholic schools and independent schools and we also have the University of Southern Queensland, one of Australia's leading regional universities as an important contributor to teacher education.

Education is one of the foundations of our economy, our community and our future. That is why legislation affecting education matters so greatly to regional centres like Toowoomba. Recently I met with principals and school leaders across my electorate—I have done so on multiple occasions—and what struck me was how similar their priorities were. They want not more bureaucracy, not more forms, not more administration. They want flexibility, support and the ability to focus on student outcomes. The best teachers I know did not join the profession to become administrators. They joined because they want to change lives. Every unnecessary form, every duplicated process and every hour spent on avoidable administration is time taken away from teaching students. That is why I welcome the government's broader commitment to reducing unnecessary red tape and why I support the practical reforms contained within this bill.

One important reform concerns Queensland's non-state schools accreditation framework. This is particularly relevant to Toowoomba where schools such as Toowoomba Grammar, Glennie, Fairholme, Downlands and St Ursula's make substantial contributions to education in our region. The bill introduces a more proportionate risk-based approach when schools seek to make changes to accreditation attributes. Standards remain high, accountability remains strong but unnecessary burden is reduced. That is sensible regulation. Good regulation should focus effort where risk exists rather than treating every change as though it carries the same level of concern. The bill also introduces a contemporary statement of expectations framework for the Non-State Schools Accreditation Board. Queenslanders rightly expect accountability, transparency and effective governance from statutory bodies. These reforms help achieve those objectives.

The bill also improves information sharing between schools, service providers, regulators and government agencies. At first glance this appears administrative. In reality, it is about improving outcomes for students. Too often systems fail because information does not move with the student. Too often agencies understand only part of the picture. Better communication means better support. Better support means better outcomes. The legislation also provides certainty regarding temporary school sites. Regional Queensland understands floods, storms, natural disasters; and when these disruptions occur, schools need flexibility and certainty. The focus should remain on continuing education, supporting families and keeping children learning.

Perhaps the most important reform relates to students who have become disengaged from education. Not every young person follows a straight path. Some experience trauma. Some face family instability. Some face disadvantage. Some lose connection with learning altogether. The true test of an education system is not how it supports students who are already succeeding. The true test is how it supports those who are struggling. I have spoken with educators in Toowoomba frequently who work tirelessly to reconnect young people with education. Their message is simple: when we reconnect a young person with learning, we reconnect them with opportunity. These reforms strengthen re-engagement pathways and provide greater certainty around programs designed to help young Queenslanders return to education, training and employment. For some young people, these reforms could change the direction of their entire life.

The bill also provides legislative certainty for education and training centres operating within youth detention facilities. Education does not stop because a young person enters detention. If we are serious about rehabilitation, reducing reoffending and creating better futures, education must remain part of that solution. These reforms provide certainty for educators and institutions while reinforcing the importance of education in creating positive pathways forward.

The legislation also strengthens Queensland's international education reputation through reforms supporting offshore delivery of the Queensland Certificate of Education. This is really important in my electorate as state, independent and Catholic schools all educate international students. As a city that welcomes those international students and hosts one of Queensland's largest regional universities, Toowoomba understands the value of educational reputation. Queensland education is respected around the world. The QCE is highly regarded. These reforms strengthen Queensland's reputation, create opportunities to showcase Queensland's education internationally while maintaining appropriate oversight and quality assurance. It also creates a matriculation pathway into further education in Queensland, which is to be commended. The bill also modernises governance arrangements for the Queensland College of Teachers. Professional standards matter. Good governance matters. Efficient, professional regulation matters. These reforms support those objectives.

I welcome the arts reforms contained within this legislation. The arts is a matter that is enormously important to regional Queensland and is particularly enormously important to Toowoomba. Our city proudly hosts the Toowoomba Carnival of Flowers and has one of the best regional theatres—the Empire Theatre—in Australia. We have galleries, musicians, performers, writers, theatres and creative businesses that contribute significantly to our cultural and economic life. I will also disclose that my son is one of those people, although he is not in Queensland much at the moment.

The governance reforms in this bill strengthen accountability and operationalise efficiency across Queensland's arts institutions. Strong governance allows organisations to focus on delivering cultural outcomes rather than navigating outdated administrative processes. I particularly welcome the measures addressing ticket scalping as my son does not earn enough money as a singer, so we need to ensure that the full price of the ticket flows through. Queenslanders deserve confidence when purchasing tickets. Families should not be forced to pay inflated prices through unauthorised resale practices. These reforms strengthen consumer protections and support confidence in Queensland's arts sector.

The bill reflects a broader philosophy: less bureaucracy, more common sense, strong governance, better supports for teachers, better supports for students, better support for families. The committee carefully examined the legislation and recommended that it be passed. Importantly, there was no statement of reservation from the opposition. These are practical reforms, measured reforms and necessary reforms. Principals leading schools across Queensland will be happy to see this legislation and I thank the minister for it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): You have about a minute.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (11.58 am): I rise to also discuss and support the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This bill is practical in its nature. It puts forward important reforms when it comes to education and the arts in Queensland. At its heart, this bill is about modernising legislation, reducing unnecessary red tape, improving governance, and ensuring that systems are clear and responsive to the needs of Queenslanders.

Before I get into the detail of the bill, like many other members, I would also like to give a big shout-out to our teachers, principals and staff in our schools for the absolutely fantastic job they do for their communities and their school communities. It can sometimes be a very difficult job, but it is bills like this which actually make differences to the red-tape burden they suffer under.

Sitting suspended from 12.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN**: I had just started my contribution before the lunch break. As there are a few other members who also want to speak to this very important piece of legislation, I will reduce my contribution.

Government members: Oh!

Mr BOOTHMAN: As a team player. These amendments will make a huge difference, especially when it comes to improving legislative clarity and strengthening governance arrangements for non-state schools. Just to highlight the importance of the non-state-school sector, it does a huge amount of work in taking a lot of the population of students away from the state school sector, making it easier for state schools to manage their populations. Therefore, it is crucial to ensure they have legislation in place which makes a difference to how they run their affairs, and reducing red tape is very important for that sector. These reforms are practical, targeted and necessary. Many families take the option of non-state schooling. In the electorate of Theodore and across the northern Gold Coast, many parents take up the option of this very important sector. Therefore, it is important to ensure that regulatory requirements and red tape are reduced in order to reduce the burden and make it easier for these facilities to work.

This bill also covers other very important elements such as disengaged youths in youth detention centres. We need to break the cycle when it comes to these individuals—these kids. This is something that I and my colleagues have been very passionate about for quite some time. We need a circuit breaker. We need to break that cycle, and that is what this bill does. This bill empowers that sector to get some education outcomes for disengaged youths, because with educational opportunities some of these disengaged youths will get their lives back on the straight and narrow, and that is critically important. We do not want these people going through the revolving door of our youth justice system, so it is incredibly important that we go down this pathway. As there are quite a few other members who wish to speak on this very important piece of legislation, I will limit my comments to that.

 **Hon. A LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (2.03 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I want to thank the members of the committee from both sides of the

House for their consideration of this legislation. The bill supports the Crisafulli government's commitment to cutting red tape and regulatory burden, strengthening governance and improving education outcomes. Improving those education outcomes pays huge dividends later on for those students who have been able to get that better education. The Crisafulli government is committed to our students and our school communities—a commitment to schools that we never saw under Labor's decade of decline. Under Labor we saw chronic underinvestment in maintenance and no new schools opening in 2026.

The education related amendments in this bill reduce the regulatory burden, deliver risk-based regulation, improve legislative clarity and enhance governance for the Non-State Schools Accreditation Board and the non-state-schooling sector. They also provide the opportunity for temporary schools, and this is particularly important for those special assistance schools. All other non-state schools are currently not able to operate from a temporary site, even when there are emergency events such as natural disasters. I met with state school students from the Wujal Wujal school who had to be relocated to Cooktown. There have also been issues with non-state schools in Winton after recent disasters. The AB Paterson school had significant damage to it from water egress during that area's season of disasters and there may have been a need to relocate that particular cohort of students. These are very important amendments to ensure that temporary schools can be given the opportunity, when faced with ongoing disaster complications, to temporarily relocate.

The bill clarifies the legislative status of education and training centres in youth detention centres and working with children authority requirements for the approval of teachers working in those education and training centres. It also clarifies and facilitates the delivery of re-engagement supports for children and young people who are disengaged or at risk of disengagement from education. This is so important for schools in any area but particularly in my electorate to ensure we have that really good engagement of students. Some principals have raised with me the problems they have in terms of getting some of their students to school and the disengagement they are experiencing. Therefore, it is really important that we clarify and facilitate those supports to re-engage those students.

The bill also expands the model for international delivery of the Queensland Certificate of Education, including allowing eligible Queensland non-state schools to partner with overseas schools under Queensland Curriculum and Assessment Authority oversight and quality assurance arrangements. It also implements operational and governance improvements for the Queensland teachers college and makes minor and technical amendments across the package to ensure currency, update cross-references and provides contemporary legislative mechanisms for particular education purposes.

Under Labor's decade of decline we saw a Labor government that tended to ignore the pleas of school communities, particularly those that were split across three campuses. The Roma State College is one of those schools that was ignored for 10 years. I personally know that former Labor ministers visited and walked through those campuses of the Roma State College but still did nothing, despite the requests from the school community to merge the junior and the middle school. There are still real safety concerns around for the students, the parents, the teachers and the school crossing supervisors at the Roma junior school. In fact, there are some exclusion zones around the junior school because of traffic safety concerns. I know that these issues were well known by previous Labor governments and its ministers, yet we never saw any progress on that issue. This is about ensuring that those youngest students are engaged and that we get good education outcomes for those students.

I am very pleased to see that within 18 months of the Crisafulli government coming to office and with one visit from the Minister for Education and the Arts, the Hon. John-Paul Langbroek, the Roma State College is on track to merge both the junior school and the Roma middle school. I want to thank the Minister for Education, who has been out visiting regional schools in my electorate. He has been to places like Teelba, St George, Cunnamulla and Charleville. I think he visited the School of Distance Education in Charleville, which is one of my favourite schools, and also visited the Roma middle school.

I have no doubt that this is a product of what the Labor government did not do in 10 years. I congratulate the minister on the deal that he did with the federal government to ensure they fully fund our Queensland schools. Not only have we put forward legislation to improve those student outcomes but we also listen, act and support the requests of our rural and regional schools that want to improve those student outcomes. The bill speaks to how we might improve those student outcomes.

The Crisafulli government is certainly delivering a plan for a world-class education system for all Queenslanders, wherever they might live in this state. The major infrastructure that will combine those campuses will create a centralised hub for prep to year 6 students. That will enable a lot more

engagement, for families—particularly siblings—to be together and it will help with educational outcomes. The plan will include relocating the prep to year 2 junior school currently located on Bowen Street to the middle school campus at Cottell Street—the minister and I visited last week—which already accommodates students from middle school years 3 to 6. It is quite an anomaly to have three separate campuses, and it does not give you the best educational outcomes. That is the really important thing—that we are striving, in response to requests from the community, to consolidate the junior and the middle campuses. The project will create a junior school precinct. It is important for those very young children to have their own precinct on the northern side of the middle school campus. It will help ensure they have good education outcomes. The early years are particularly important for laying down the foundational educational principles of reading, writing and arithmetic.

I am quite surprised how quickly the Minister for Education was able to get this new project moving. We believe that tenders will go out in August this year. The new precinct is set to open at the start of term 3, 2027. It will include the refurbishment of existing buildings—and I have already spoken to the minister about ensuring they are air-conditioned because, when you are in 40 degree heat, it is particularly important for those littlies to have those air-conditioned spaces. We are going to extend the playground and upgrade the undercover area that connects the two classroom blocks. We are hoping that construction will be awarded—

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The bill is not about state schools, but it is also not about infrastructure improvements at state schools.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): I will seek some advice. The debate on this bill has been very broad ranging from all sides of the parliament. I was listening to the member. She was giving context to parts of the bill. I would ask you to please come back to the bill.

Ms LEAHY: The infrastructure does also link to educational outcomes. I acknowledge Labor's failed education ministers failed to act even after visiting these schools. We are committed to delivering a particularly good educational outcome for those students. The bill contains a lot of changes for the non-state school system. It is particularly important. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (2.13 pm): I am pleased to rise to speak on the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I do so because of the great affiliation I have with my local teachers and principals. Many in the House may not know, but I actually was accepted to go to the Kelvin Grove Teachers' College.

Mrs Poole: Good afternoon, Mr McDonald.

Mr McDONALD: Good afternoon! I also got accepted into the Police Service and, as those in the House know, I became a police officer and did not follow down the path of an educator in that context. As leaders in our community we often find ourselves having to educate our community—sometimes that is from behind the scenes and sometimes that is out front. We always support our communities. Teachers do a wonderful job in all of our schools and communities, not only enhancing the lives of our children but also training the next generation of leaders.

I will touch on my role as an officer in charge of police. I knew the difficulty we were having with some of our 15- and 16-year-olds. I said to Chris Muir, who was the principal of the Laidley District State School, 'Can you tell me your 10- and 11-year-olds who will become my 15- and 16-year-old problems?' He said, 'I can do better than that, Jim. We can tell you the five- and six-year-olds who are going to be your 15- and 16-year-old problems.' That stuck with me for a long time. I was very pleased to be able to support the Together 4341 initiative, which became Together4Lockyer and is now Thriving Lockyer Kids. When this bill included some temporary sites, offshore training as well as the education training centres in youth detention centres, I wanted to commend Minister Langbroek and his team for the work they have done on this bill and the department for the work they have done in supporting our teachers across Queensland.

It is a very challenging job. I am pleased to meet with teachers from my local community on a regular basis. I have met with many of my principals. I have 36 schools in my community. I really respect each of those schools, teachers and principals. While I am talking about schools, it would be remiss of me not to say thank you to all of my former teachers and principals at the Rangeville State School and the Toowoomba Grammar School, that I was very proud to attend. I was able to go to sixth form, it was called—that is grade 12—

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr McDONALD: Sixth form, not grade 6, member for Mermaid Beach. I do not want to take that interjection. I am sure they had that where he was raised out at Richmond.

This bill is about reducing red tape. Minister Langbroek has been charged in his ministerial portfolio to achieve a number of outcomes. Although some members opposite are saying that this is an administrative bill, it is about governance and regulatory change, which is very much at the centre of achieving improved systems. Our commitment to reducing red tape by up to 25 per cent is very important. That is in stark contrast to those opposite who, over 10 years, saw a lack of investment. Between 2020 and 2024, 12,000 teachers left the Education Department. We have seen a change, and it is great to know people are confident to go back into the schooling system.

This bill enables a number of the education training centres in youth detention centres to be properly validated. When I was on the Youth Justice Reform Select Committee we looked at the whole of the youth justice system which included training in our detention centres. I was aghast at the low number of hours that the youth needed to attend to actually get a tick for attendance. I am pleased that Minister Gerber has been able to change that and that kids in youth detention are now getting a meaningful education. It is a really important change to have that structure within our youth detention centres. We all need structure; we all need consistency. If you had a difficult upbringing and you find yourself in youth detention, it is great to have that sensible structure to be able to create dignity.

Mrs Poole: It breaks the cycle.

Mr McDONALD: I will take that interjection from the member for Mundingburra; it does break the cycle. When kids used to go through the revolving door of detention it was not the right thing to support them and give them the right to training, coaching and mentoring because, once they came out, they were sent straight back into the same system. This breaks the cycle. It teaches them other things. One of my principals in Lockyer was talking about the need for alternative pathways and being able to identify sites. This is very welcome in my community because we do have a spread out community and those temporary sites will be useful for a couple of our growing communities. We are seeing an enormous amount of growth, as I know the Scenic Rim electorate is as well. It is one of the biggest challenges we have.

I have not turned my mind to the arts section of this bill but I believe that if kids are not involved in sport then they should be involved in the arts. The changes being made to the arts portfolio—

Mr Mander: Why can't you do both?

Mr McDONALD: Some can do both, member for Everton, which is a great thing.

The bill covers off on the issue of ticket scalping, which went through our committee in the last parliament. It is great to see that those changes are being made. We want to ensure that when people pay for tickets they get the tickets and they are not scalped out from under them. With that contribution, Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you and I am very pleased to be able to support the minister and the bill.

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (2.20 pm), in reply: I want to thank all members who have contributed to the debate on the Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. As we have heard, the bill sets out important reforms that will continue the work that the Crisafulli government committed to do in the election campaign with our \$221 million More Teachers, Better Education plan. This bill is an important part of the Crisafulli government's commitment to deliver practical reforms that improve educational outcomes, strengthen governance, reduce administrative burden and support a vibrant arts sector. It is a bill that focuses on improving systems so that educators, schools, students and arts organisations can focus on what matters most: delivering outcomes for Queenslanders. The bill builds on previous reforms and aligns with our Brighter Futures strategy, which is focused on delivering excellence in every state school for every student so they catch up, keep up and stay in school.

Throughout this debate members have spoken about the importance of maintaining high standards in education while ensuring our legislative framework remains contemporary, responsive and fit for purpose. That is precisely what this bill achieves. The reforms before the House are about removing unnecessary obstacles, improving clarity and ensuring legislation supports the real-world needs of schools, students, teachers and statutory bodies.

The member for Bulimba, along with a number of other opposition members, considers that the bill is a housekeeping bill. I completely reject the assertion by opposition members that this is nothing more than a housekeeping bill. Housekeeping means that you get things in order. The Vardon review was conducted and released on 21 August 2023. The former government did not think it was necessary to undertake any housekeeping for years. This bill is necessary to address that.

I also heard a number of opposition members disparage the work in this bill as unimportant administrative work. This bill does deliver administrative and governance reforms. These are reforms that are essential to supporting an effective framework—that effective framework that supports our

students, our teachers and our schools, both state and non-state. Without a strong administrative framework that works constantly to reduce the regulatory burden, that support does not follow. Housekeeping might seem unimportant to a Labor government that did nothing for years, but it is not.

The member for Bulimba and the member for Mansfield had a lot to say about education that was not related to the bill. In response, I would like to point out that the Labor government had 10 years to stamp out behavioural issues and provide teachers with the support they deserve, but remarkably they failed at both. Under the former Labor government, behaviour incidents and bullying in Queensland classrooms soared and incidents of occupational violence affecting teachers skyrocketed—and members will be interested to hear this—more than 200 per cent from 2022 to 2024. Do not let those opposite try to tell you that this is a problem that has only been a problem since I have been the minister and we have been the government. It is clear the behavioural issues we are seeing in Queensland classrooms are a direct result of Labor's failure to provide teachers with the support and critical resources they need.

The member for McConnel, a former education minister, also had a lot to say. According to the member, as we have only been in government for a short time everything positive in education is down to them but everything bad in education is my fault, although we have only been in for a short time. I would like to say to the member for McConnel that she cannot have it both ways. I would like to take a moment to point out that the senior leadership of the Queensland Teachers' Union have welcomed the improvement in behaviour data, especially the reduction in major incidents.

I do not know where to start with the incoherent contribution from the member for Pine Rivers, who did not seem to know which bill she was speaking about. It carried on in the style that we have become used to from the member for Pine Rivers. She got as good as she gave from the member for Bonney and the member for Currumbin. I thank them for the support.

I am encouraged that members support the proposed reforms in this bill. The member for Bulimba also commented that reforms in the bill about the non-state schools accreditation framework need clarity and guidance. I repeat what I said in my second reading speech: my department will work closely with both the Non-State Schools Accreditation Board and stakeholders to ensure these reforms are effectively and efficiently implemented.

I will take a moment again to be very clear about what these amendments do and what they do not do. They do not diminish the independence of the board. They do not allow the delegation of the board's most important regulatory decisions but instead provide the board with flexibility to delegate routine administrative functions where appropriate. Importantly, the decision to delegate remains entirely with the board. Accountability remains with the board. Transparency remains in place. The reforms strike the appropriate balance between efficiency and independence. A ministerial statement of expectations aligns the board with arrangements that already exist for other statutory bodies. It provides a transparent mechanism through which strategic priorities and performance expectations can be communicated. Importantly, it operates separately from existing direction powers and does not compromise the board's independence over regulatory actions or decisions.

The bill also further improves information sharing between the board and the Department of Education. At present, there are circumstances where significant regulatory actions may affect school operations, funding arrangements or continuity of education yet the department may not receive timely information. The amendments address that gap by allowing the board to share relevant information with the department in clearly defined circumstances. This will support coordinated responses, effective risk management and the administration of government funding programs.

Good governance requires clarity. These amendments support that objective. These reforms are consistent with contemporary governance practice and reflect arrangements that exist for other statutory bodies. These reforms are about ensuring that agencies responsible for supporting Queensland students can work together effectively when issues arise. As the member for Keppel and chair of the parliamentary committee said, good systems should support people, not frustrate them. That is what this bill is about.

A number of members spoke to the reforms in relation to the use of temporary sites by non-state schools. Whilst I am pleased to see the support, I was surprised that a number of opposition members thought the bill provides for special assistance schools to access temporary sites. For the benefit of the House I clarify that these schools can already apply for temporary site use. The bill does not change in any way the current arrangements that can be used by special assistance schools. The members opposite who referred to this incorrectly were the member for Mansfield, the member for Mount

Ommaney, a former minister and member for McConnel, the member for Algester, the member for Ipswich, the member for Ipswich West and the member for Toohey. In fact, what the bill does is the complete opposite to what they claimed in their debate: it extends the ability to apply to use temporary sites to all other non-state schools in addition to special assistance schools, supporting continuity of education and removing administrative barriers to support schools following emergency events. Extending this beyond just special assistance schools to all non-state schools means that when an emergency event affects a school site students can continue learning whilst the damage is fixed or longer term arrangements are put in place. It is a practical reform that strengthens resilience across the education system and ensures continuity of learning for students.

I would also like to take a moment to respond to comments about reforms adding many responsibilities to the Non-State Schools Accreditation Board. I think it is important to point out that providing the board with the power to delegate certain functions, which is supported by a rigorous framework in the bill, will reduce the administrative burden on the board. It does this by enabling the board to delegate to board members or the chief executive, thereby lessening the board's demands.

Providing legislative clarity for information sharing also reduces red tape and regulatory burden. Clear legislative frameworks are recognised as a tool for minimising regulatory burden. Equally, the amendments that will enable me to provide the board with a statement of expectations will assist the board by providing clear, transparent information for the board. These reforms do not add new responsibilities for the board; they support the board to delegate certain functions, reducing the board's workload and providing for clear guidance on information sharing.

I thank the member for Stafford for his support for the international delivery of the QCE, the Queensland Certificate of Education. As he is new to the parliament, the member may be unaware that ISQ, Independent Schools Queensland, had been fighting for these reforms for many years under the former Labor government so we are very happy to deliver these much sought after changes that Labor were unable and unwilling to deliver.

Whilst noting support for the proposal, I do want to respond to points raised during the debate on this reform in relation to information sharing. The bill does not change the applicability of existing information-sharing confidentiality and privacy requirements. The bill provides for a guideline that will be about QCAA approval processes in relation to partnering agreements between Queensland non-state schools, the Department of Education and offshore schools. This guideline will not be about the sharing of personal information. Therefore, it is not necessary to have further legislative amendments that would create additional regulatory requirements and increase the regulatory burden.

Independent Schools Queensland has advocated strongly for opportunities for non-state schools to participate in these arrangements. The Crisafulli government has listened and brought forward the regulatory changes necessary. In a highly competitive global education environment, these reforms position Queensland strongly for a bright future.

Another significant aspect of the bill relates to the re-engagement of children and young people who are disengaged or at risk of disengagement from education. Every child deserves the opportunity to succeed. Every young person deserves the opportunity to reconnect with education, training or employment pathways. Queensland already delivers a range of programs designed to support young people experiencing significant barriers to engagement. These include department-led initiatives and programs delivered by specialist non-government organisations. However, the legislative framework has not always clearly recognised these important programs and this bill changes that. The bill also provides clear information-sharing arrangements to support referral into programs and successful transitions out of them.

I acknowledge that some submissions and the explanatory notes identify privacy considerations associated with these provisions. The Crisafulli government has carefully balanced those considerations. Information sharing is proportionate and is limited to what is relevant and necessary. Confidentiality safeguards are included. Penalties apply for inappropriate disclosure. These protections are important because they support both the rights of individual students and the broader objective of continuity of education. The reforms are also consistent with the findings and recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse regarding the importance of information sharing to support student wellbeing and successful transitions. This is about helping vulnerable young people reconnect with education and creating the best possible conditions for long-term success.

The member for Ipswich West suggested that young people will not be able to provide consent with regard to the reforms that clarify how information can be shared for the purposes of re-engagement programs. Best practice will continue to be providing consent and the amendments do not prevent this. The member also inferred that the prescription of organisations through regulation will somehow lead to minimal safeguards with no parliamentary oversight. The organisations will be published in regulation. As members would know, regulations must be tabled in this very parliament and are subject to disallowance should a member consider this necessary so parliament and every member has the opportunity to consider matters prescribed by regulation. The process of prescribing the entities goes through executive council, ensuring high rigour and review by government of the organisations listed.

Further, the amendments include penalties for anyone misusing the information, which will apply to those within the organisations prescribed in the regulation. The amendments also require providers to have an executed service agreement that further stipulates expectations and performance requirements for those providers, including the management of information, and provides avenues for the management of those organisations through strong contract management and performance reporting.

The bill provides legislative recognition of education and training centres operating in youth detention centres. Those centres deliver important educational programs to young people in detention. I note the Minister for Youth Justice is present. Whilst they have operated successfully for many years, the legislation has not clearly recognised their status within the education framework so this bill removes that uncertainty. It explicitly recognises ETCs as educational institutions and provides clear legislative authority for their operation and provision of education. The reforms also remove unnecessary duplication by aligning blue card and exemption card requirements for approved teachers working in those settings with arrangements that already apply in other state educational institutions. These amendments provide clarity, support continuity of education and reduce unnecessary administrative burden.

ETCs are located within youth detention centre facilities owned and operated by the Department of Youth Justice and Victim Support. The Department of Education employs teaching staff to work in ETCs that include purpose-built classrooms and vocational training facilities. In practice, ETC operations are documented administratively through a memorandum of understanding between the two departments. While the Education (General Provisions) Act provides for the establishment of state schools and other state educational institutions, it is not clear that ETCs fall within the current legislative framework. This legislative ambiguity has caused uncertainty about the authority for the delivery of education programs in youth detention centres by the Department of Education and exemption card requirements under the working with children legislation. The bill amends the E(GP) Act to explicitly recognise ETCs as 'other educational institutions' under section 15.

The bill clarifies that teachers working in ETCs who are registered with the Queensland College of Teachers do not require a blue card or exemption card, consistent with the requirements for teachers working in other educational settings in Queensland, again reducing red tape and regulatory burden for teachers. The bill establishes power for ETCs to be established as educational institutions, which overcomes administrative complexities and recognises teachers in a standing comparable to other education settings to avoid the requirement for a blue card exemption notice. The amendments will support registered teachers working in ETCs by removing regulatory and administrative duplication in relation to requirements under the Working with Children Check Act and provide clarity for the government agencies responsible for delivering and supporting education services in youth detention centres.

In terms of the day-to-day operation of ETCs, the existing delivery arrangements will not change and the MOU will continue to be in operation. This will simply give a legislative standing for the operation of ETCs. To be very clear, the bill does not impact or alter the operations of the ETCs. The teams within detention centres collaborate on a daily basis. I thank them for the work they do to maximise education access within and around any safety management concerns.

Safety is paramount within detention settings and our teaching staff operate in a highly dynamic way in those settings to respond to any risks to youth or staff safety. As an example, on the day of the youth detention strike action mentioned by the shadow minister, education packs were delivered to accommodation blocks by the Brisbane and Townsville centres. In the Cleveland ETC in Townsville, education was also scheduled for lesson 1 on that day, concluding prior to 11 am. This ensured young people were able to access education despite the strike action. During this non-contact time, ETC teaching staff complete individual student planning and curriculum development to prepare for the highly dynamic and individualised education delivery in those settings.

To assist those members opposite who do not understand how these reforms reduce regulatory burden, I will explain. First, the amendment removes the requirement to continuously monitor working with children check status or exemption in the case of approved teachers as a consequence of the commencement of the Reportable Conduct Scheme as it clarifies the status of ETCs in the legislation. Secondly, the amendment removes the requirement for teachers in ETCs from having to apply for a working with children check when they are exempt in other settings such as schools, noting that the Queensland College of Teachers runs similar comprehensive checks on all approved teachers.

The bill supports the Queensland College of Teachers. It modernises governance arrangements by replacing the title of 'director' with 'chief executive officer'. It changes the college's financial year from a calendar year basis to the standard government financial year. These may appear to be modest reforms but they contribute to stronger governance and more efficient administration.

I conclude by talking about the important reforms across arts statutory bodies. The Crisafulli government is committed to delivering a vibrant and thriving arts sector. This bill supports that commitment. Our arts sector makes a profound contribution to our economy, our communities and our cultural identity. The bill modernises governance arrangements across the Queensland Art Gallery, the State Library of Queensland, the Queensland Museum, the Queensland Performing Arts Trust and the Queensland Theatre Company. They support continuity and leadership arrangements, improve governance processes, strengthen integrity measures and reduce unnecessary regulatory requirements.

One important reform that members referred to relates to ticket scalping, which can cause significant consumer harm. The bill introduces protections consistent with arrangements already in place for major sporting facilities and major events. Several members rose in support of these amendments. We are improving governance in that regard, ensuring our arts bodies are supported through their enabling acts. We will assist those bodies to continue in their roles as leading cultural institutions.

I welcome the comments from the member for Mount Ommaney and the member for Algeester and their support for the reforms that respond to ticket scalping. I note that the member for Algeester did criticise many reforms in the bill. I point out that the member was unable to pass any legislative reform during her term in government, which is why Queensland's arts sector endured a decade of decline under Labor. It is a practical and considered bill that reduces unnecessary administrative burdens and creates pathways to re-engagement. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 218, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading



Hon. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (2.41 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. JH LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (2.41 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.

**REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER
LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**

Resumed from 25 March (see p. 796).

Second Reading

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.41 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Crisafulli government is delivering on our commitment to the people of Queensland to require gas companies to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects will not have a detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium. The bill provides a coordinated and comprehensive approach to deliver this election commitment and protect this important aquifer by amending the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 while strengthening the regulation of coexistence in the Condamine Alluvium between agricultural and coal seam gas—CSG—activities.

The bill addresses the concerns at the core of the Condamine Alluvium—CSG induced subsidence and strengthening the environmental safeguards—to protect water quality of the aquifer, a precious resource for the local community and the generations of farming families who have called it home. The bill delivers on the Crisafulli government's election commitment to protect the aquifer by introducing a new deemed condition for environmental authorities issued for new CSG wells in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. Prescribing the deemed condition in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 will ensure that water quality objectives are consistently applied and embedded as a mandatory condition for all new CSG wells within the Condamine Alluvium CSG area.

The bill goes beyond delivering on our election commitment to protect the aquifer by including a holistic government response to landowner concerns about their farm activities and productivity being impacted by CSG induced subsidence. The bill clarifies and expands landholder rights in relation to CSG induced subsidence impacts in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. Landholders with 'advanced activities' being carried out on and under their land will be able to seek compensation through the existing conduct and compensation agreement framework and use related dispute resolution processes if needed. This is achieved by deeming directional drilling as an advanced activity in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area.

The amendments to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 make it clear that gas companies must compensate landholders for CSG induced subsidence impacts they have caused to agricultural activities or productivity. This clarity does not exist under the current legislation and is therefore an important change in boosting landholder rights.

I introduced the bill on 25 March 2026, and I referred it to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for review. I thank the committee for its inquiry into and report on the bill, which was tabled on 8 May 2026. I also extend my thanks to all those who made a submission to the committee about the bill and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the inquiry, which included a regional hearing in Dalby. I want to thank Mr Speaker, the member for Condamine, for his advocacy on this particular issue. I know it is dear to his heart and the hearts of his community. The committee's report makes seven recommendations, the first being that the bill be passed. We absolutely accept that recommendation. I am pleased to table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Primary Industries and Resources Committee: Report No. 19, 58th Parliament—Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, government response [\[1083\]](#).

I also inform the House that the government will move amendments to the bill during consideration in detail to address stakeholder feedback and the committee's recommendations.

The committee process provided additional opportunities for consultation, and the government has listened to the feedback from landholders, the community and the agricultural industry on the importance of the regional planning interests approval process, known as the regional interests development approval—RIDA. Stakeholders have advised they rely heavily on the RIDA process to manage relationships between landowners and resource companies, particularly where a resource company is seeking an exemption to a RIDA application. The Queensland Farmers' Federation CEO said—

The RIDA is a critical, front-end mechanism that ensures impacts on agricultural land, water assets and production are properly considered before development occurs.

They also said it provides farmers with an important negotiation tool when resource development is proposed. While the RIDA is not required often—and I gave the statistics of how little it is used—we have heard that stakeholders consider the RIDA to be an essential safeguard tool, in these rare cases, to assess and manage potential impacts from CSG activity on agricultural land and priority living areas and that the RIDA has been working as intended when needed.

We have heard what stakeholders are saying, and the Crisafulli government listens. Unlike the former Labor government, which rode roughshod over regional communities during their decade of decline, our government is committed to listening and acting in the best interests of regional Queensland. That is what has happened in the committee process. I want to thank the chair, the member for Burnett, who is in the chamber today, and all the committee members for listening to the community and working with the government throughout the committee process. I think they have achieved great outcomes and have made recommendations which the government has accepted. That is what listening to community is all about. The Crisafulli government's response supports recommendation 2 of the committee's report to retain the RIDA process for the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. I will be moving amendments in consideration in detail to omit the provisions in the bill that proposed the removal of the RIDA process for CSG activity in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. These amendments recognise the importance of the RIDA to our stakeholders and support landholders in negotiating an appropriate outcome for their land.

I will also move amendments to ensure that, in retaining the RIDA framework, there is no duplication of water quality conditioning between a RIDA and the proposed new deemed condition under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. It is important to note we will be keeping the new deemed condition under the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and it further safeguards landowners. This amendment will provide greater clarification and certainty to stakeholders about the precedence of conditions where the same or similar matters are regulated in both a RIDA and an environmental authority.

I will also be moving two amendments to the bill to clarify the scope of the CSG induced subsidence compensation liability framework being delivered through the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014. Firstly, the amendments will confine application of compensation liability to CSG resource authorities that are wholly or partly in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. Secondly, they clarify that a landholder can be both within the authorised area of a resource authority and within five kilometres from a boundary of another resource authority for the purposes of seeking compensation for CSG induced subsidence impacts. These amendments—and the original bill—give landowners a right that they have not had before. These amendments are made in direct response to further feedback from stakeholders after introduction of the bill.

The Queensland Farmers' Federation and its members have since said that they valued the opportunity to participate in the committee hearing process and appreciate the Queensland government considering the key concerns raised by the agriculture sector and look forward to continuing to work with the government to ensure the appropriate protection of the Condamine Alluvium for future generations. Finally, during the consideration in detail stage, I will be moving an amendment to make changes to the South Bank Corporation Act 1989 to give power to the Governor in Council to remove members of the South Bank Corporation board and the manager at any time and for any reason, replacing the need to state specific reasons such as misconduct or incapacity.

Ms Fentiman: Shame.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. It is like most other boards across the state, and we are aligning this board with every other board across the state. These amendments seek to increase administrative efficiency and bring board operations in line with other boards to ensure the corporation and its board work effectively and efficiently towards government commitments.

I note that the opposition has a statement of reservation in the committee report. I was blown away when the Labor Party were trying to convince people during the committee process that they are for regional Queensland and for—

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: As regional members on this side of the House would know—because this party represents regional Queensland—for the Labor Party to put a flag in the ground and say they are advocating for regional Queensland is nothing but a joke. For the better part of 10 years we saw the Labor Party ride roughshod over regional Queensland, particularly in the planning framework with wind and solar farms across the state. They did not give communities a say.

We have introduced a bill. We have completed the committee process. The committee have made recommendations and given further feedback and we have listened and accepted those recommendations. That is what the committee process is for, and that shows it is working. I was quite amazed to hear the Labor Party MPs say they were representing regional Queensland. They gave up on regional Queensland a long time ago. It was many years ago that the Labor Party gave up on regional Queensland.

Mr Nicholls: Regional Queensland gave up on them.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable health minister, who took the words out of my mouth: regional Queensland gave up on the Labor Party at the October 2024 election. That is why the Liberal National Party has so many great regional members in this parliament.

It is no wonder regional Queensland endorsed the members in regional and rural Queensland in this parliament. We just have to look at what they have delivered in a year and a half. I was in Central Queensland to see what is happening on the ground there and it is nothing short of amazing because of our members. I was also in the Wide Bay area with the member for Burnett turning sods for thousands of houses. I was with the member for Hervey Bay. I was with the member for Maryborough. Now I have made the mistake of naming one, I will have to name them all.

I was in Far North Queensland with the members for Cook, Mulgrave and Barron River. I was in Townsville and I was with the members for Burdekin and Cook. I am going to Mackay next week, the honourable member tells me. I was with the member for Mirani in his electorate. I have been everywhere, man! I have been everywhere.

Welcome, Mr Speaker—the biggest advocate for the Condamine Alluvium and protecting landowner rights and opportunities in the Condamine Alluvium. You may have missed it, but I am glad that I filibustered sufficiently for you to come into the chamber, Mr Speaker. I have given you, as the member for Condamine, great credit in advocating for our election commitment to protect the Condamine Alluvium aquifer in your community. I know how dear it is to your heart and that of your community members, and concerns were raised about the process.

Even though the RIDAs were not often utilised to the extent necessary when they were introduced over 10 years ago, we understand that your community wants to hold onto that hope in the RIDA. That is why we are now moving amendments to retain those RIDA provisions on top of keeping the extra protections we put in place such as the additional compensation for CSG induced subsidence. That compensatory framework did not exist before this legislation was introduced, but it will allow landowners to be compensated if a well goes under their property. If a property is not impacted on the surface or on the edge but it goes under the property, there is now a compensatory regime in place, which never was the case. That is putting the rights of regional landowners first, which is what this is about.

I was saying that the Labor Party have done a lot of whingeing in the statement of reservation. It is as the education minister just said: everything good going on in education is apparently because of Labor reforms and the odd thing that has gone haywire has happened in the last year and a half. They are trying to say that assaults on teachers are up in the last year and a half. No, it was during the decade of decline. We are turning this enormous ship around in the state, and the great budget we handed down yesterday is part of that.

Again, the Labor Party were in government for 10 years. They did not do anything to this legislation. They did not edit the legislation. They did not increase the compensation regime for CSG induced subsidence. They did not compensate farmers any more. Now they have put in a statement of reservation saying that the Labor Party is protecting regional Queensland. No, they are not.

Mr Minnikin: Crocodile tears.

Mr BLEIJIE: They are crocodile tears; I take the interjection from the honourable Minister for Small and Family Business. We cannot take them seriously. We cannot take the Labor Party opposition seriously. They had 10 years to do all of this, and now all of a sudden they are saying they would have done everything in the last year and a half. They are claiming credit for everything we have done in a year and a half. 'We would have got to that.' When? Woulda, coulda, shoulda, maybe, gonna. When? They had 10 years.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection of the housing minister; maybe in the second decade. God help us if they ever got a second decade in office. Thankfully regional Queensland gave up on the Labor Party, just as the Labor Party gave up on regional Queensland.

These amendments are important. I suspect we are going to hear from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in a few short moments and he will have his black-and-white photo. He is not the shadow treasurer anymore; it is someone else's responsibility, but who would know with their contributions being pretty lacklustre. He will jump up and whinge and whine, as he always does. Queenslanders are over the whingeing and whining from the Labor Party. They hear it every day. On the odd occasion those opposite get on the telly at night and they whinge and whine.

There is real positivity in Queensland, in particular in regional Queensland. I was in regional and rural Queensland for three weeks, and there is real positivity about what is happening in the state at the moment. We know that we have some challenges—challenges born out by federal Labor budgets and an opposition that is continually depressed and whingeing and whining.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask you to ensure the minister is relevant to the debate. He has strayed a long way from it. I think everybody has noticed that.

Mr SPEAKER: That is a fair point. You were straying a long way from the bill, Deputy Premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: The point I make is regional Queensland is important to the Crisafulli government. It is not important to the Labor Party. Is it the case now that the opposition are trying to say we should not be talking about regional Queensland and we cannot say there is a positiveness in regional Queensland? As soon as I said there is positivity in regional Queensland, he jumped up, took offence and took a point of order to say, 'Get back to the bill.' This bill is creating a positive effect in regional and rural Queensland, in the Condamine area. We will talk about the positive attitude in regional Queensland and the good things the Crisafulli government is doing.

When we introduce a bill, it goes to a committee. When the committee makes recommendations, we listen to them, to the community and to the stakeholders and we act on them, as we have done in this case, and as we always will. We are a government that listens. We are a government that will act. The former Labor government did not act. If we need to further refine it, we will, and we have done that in this case.

We look forward to the debate. I look forward to hearing all of the excuses of the honourable Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is the shadow minister for this bill, as to why he did not do anything in 10 years to increase the compensation regulation for CSG induced subsidence in the Condamine Alluvium. If he says that everyone knew there were issues for a long time, I wonder why he did nothing about it. He was the treasurer. He was the deputy premier of the state. He could have done something about it. Again, it falls on the Crisafulli government to fix it, and we will. We will do it. We will put the rights and interests of regional Queenslanders, landowners and farmers first.

We know that there is a balance to find in these areas with gas companies, economic development, CSG and rural landowners. There is a balance to find. There will always be those at each end of the spectrum—some in your community, some in regional Queensland—who do not want the gas, and they have written to me about it. We need it. Landowners have the opportunity and a right to be compensated for it. It is important. We do not talk about gas in Queensland like Victorians talk about fossil gas. They have reclassified gas now: it is fossil gas.

Mr Head: They're scared of it.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Callide; they are scared of it. In Victoria they talk about fossil gas. Maybe that is the new position of the Labor Party. We will see.

We have to get the balance right between landowners and economic development and prosperity. That is what this bill was all about because guess what? These RIDA provisions were introduced by the former LNP government. Jeff Seeney was the deputy premier.

Mr Head: Former deputy premier.

Mr BLEIJIE: From one good deputy premier to the next deputy premier—there has been a lacklustre series of deputies in the last 10 years, member for Callide. From one good one to another 10 years later, here we are.

We are putting regional Queensland first. These recommendations will result in the RIDA process being retained in the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014. I know that was important to you and your community, Mr Speaker. This responds to the further consultation with stakeholders throughout the committee process and prior to moving these amendments. I am pleased to advise that the government supports all of the committee's recommendations and additional guidance, and implementation support will be available for stakeholders upon commencement of the bill.

We will also make sure we work with the environment minister and his department to ensure there is no duplication of the new environmental provisions and approval processes and also to reinstate the RIDA provisions, as we have accepted the committee recommendations to keep them. We will omit the provisions in the bill that proposed the removal of the RIDA process and we will keep those RIDA provisions going forward. Overall, the committee were satisfied that the proposed amendments in the bill were appropriate and reasonable and recommended that the bill be passed, and I thank them for that.

It is clear that this government is doing what is needed to protect the Condamine Alluvium. It is listening and acting on stakeholder feedback to ensure any reforms deliver on the needs of the community. I want to thank the stakeholders. I know that my office and department have worked with Cotton Australia, the Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce on concerns about the removal of the RIDA process. As I said, we have listened to those concerns and we will be reinstating the RIDA provisions going forward, so we will have not only more compensation payable to landowners but also more availability for compensation to be paid to landowners because of the drilling under land which was not previously compensated for but will be now. We will also have a compensatory regime for CSG induced subsidence which did not exist and has not existed for 10 years. Again, we are doing what the former government could have done and should have done but did not do in 10 years. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bleijie, adjourned.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Same Question Rule

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, the Deputy Premier has circulated amendments proposed to be moved to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Government amendment No. 8 seeks to omit clause 11 of the bill which inserts new section 5A in the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014, the RPI Act. Government amendment No. 9 seeks to insert a new clause 11 of the bill which inserts a replacement section 5A in the RPI Act.

If the omission and insertion had been undertaken in the same amendment, as is customary, there would be no difficulty. However, standing order 87 provides that once the House has resolved a matter in the affirmative or negative the same question shall not again be proposed in the same session. Standing order 150 provides that no amendment shall be moved which is inconsistent with one already agreed to by the House.

Due to the drafting of the amendments, amendment No. 8, which omits clause 11 of the bill, is inconsistent with amendment No. 9, which inserts a different clause 11 of the bill. The House will have already considered and agreed to amendment No. 8 during consideration in detail of the bill. Amendment No. 9 is therefore contrary to standing orders 87 and 150. Accordingly, I rule that the same question rule is enlivened by government amendment No. 9. A motion to suspend standing orders 87 and 150 would be required for this amendment to be considered.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (3.04 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—
That, with respect to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow the bill and any amendments circulated by the Deputy Premier to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.04 pm): I am very pleased to rise in the House this afternoon to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the associated amendments tabled just a few minutes ago by the member for Kawana. The member for Kawana must be auditioning for the Olympic Games with all of the backflips he is performing on this bill. Tabled amendments at the last minute means that hardworking primary producers and other interested Queenslanders have had no opportunity and no ability to see these amendments and are given no chance to give feedback on the proposed changes.

Given how this shabby legislative process has played out, the member for Kawana continues to show his complete arrogance and disregard for Queenslanders. The member for Kawana simply cannot be trusted with power. His dismissal, derision and denigration of stakeholders is evident, and the shockingly late tabling of these amendments demonstrates that.

In his introductory speech on this bill the member for Kawana had the temerity to claim that the Crisafulli LNP government was committed to ‘addressing community concerns and providing certainty’. Once again we see the member for Kawana ignoring the voices of Queenslanders and abusing his power to unilaterally change the bill with no consultation. The tabling of these amendments today is not a triumph of the parliamentary process; it is a complete and utter humiliation of the Deputy Premier and the LNP Crisafulli government.

It is often said that a picture paints a thousand words. There is a picture in Dalby. In fact, it is a billboard that tells you everything you need to know about the Crisafulli LNP government, the member for Kawana and this bill. It is a picture of local farmers on the Western Downs with a caption that says, ‘LNP keep your promise.’ It is a remarkable statement. This from LNP heartland—a plea, a cry, a declaration, a demand from LNP heartland: ‘LNP keep your promise.’ It is a picture of farmers who felt compelled to spend their hard-earned money on a billboard.

Mr SPEAKER: No props.

Mr DICK: I will table that for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a billboard with people holding signs [\[1084\]](#).

It is a picture of farmers who knew they would have to apply pressure to make the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the LNP simply honour their promise. Even in the LNP heartland they know that this government cannot be taken at its word and that this Premier and this government cannot be trusted.

While this bill is ostensibly about protecting prime agricultural land, it also speaks volumes about the LNP government and how it operates. This bill speaks to a failure of trust. It speaks to a failure to be honest. It is about a Premier and a Deputy Premier and an LNP government that simply cannot be trusted. It is deeply embarrassing. It is humiliating for the member for Kawana and the LNP to know that people from their own heartland do not trust them. That is what this bill has revealed.

The whole process surrounding the development, design and introduction of this bill has revealed the deep level of distrust in this LNP government by its heartland—a government that Queenslanders must plead with just so the LNP might keep their promise. That billboard is a roadside monument to the duplicity and untrustworthiness of a fake Premier and his poney government—a bleak picture that is testimony to a minister, and not just a minister but the Deputy Premier, who has once again brought LNP legislation before the parliament that did the opposite of what it was supposed to do.

Farmers on the Western Downs would be outraged to hear the member for Kawana compare himself to hardworking regional Queenslanders. We know that the member for Kawana is a fan of cosplay, whether it be his tired portrayal of Elvis or his more recent foray as a ‘master of the universe’. The advent of AI has only assisted the member for Kawana in his obsession with being cast as the lead in his one-man pantomime. Most unbelievable of all was the claim by the member for Kawana to have the calloused hands of a real worker from regional Queensland, a proposition so comical that even the Speaker could not contain himself in the House. However comical, we know regionally that Queenslanders would not take kindly to being compared to the member for Kawana. In fact, we know that Queensland farmers have not been impressed by the antics of the member for Kawana when it comes to this bill. Have a listen to the words of Jo Sheppard, CEO of Queensland Farmers’ Federation, talking about the level of consultation on the bill. She said—

We had such a great opportunity to work together and ground-truth some of the reforms that really would have made a difference. That opportunity I think has been missed. Also, releasing the bill and saying that consultation had occurred with QFF and Cotton Australia and implying that we were happy with the bill has also created some confusion. QFF certainly did not appreciate that.

I reckon it will be a while before the member for Condamine wants anything to do with any legislation this planning minister puts forward. It is clear that this legislation as drafted did not look after the farmers it was supposed to protect.

In the member for Kawana's introductory speech he claimed that the Crisafulli government was committed to addressing community concerns and providing certainty. That was an empty promise. Instead of the consultation and certainty the member for Kawana promised, the bill only created confusion and deep concern. When asked about the bill put forward, one of the impacted farmers said—

... pretty knocked on our backs and shocked when the legislation was presented.

Clearly, they did not feel properly consulted or respected by the bill put forward by the LNP government.

This is what Central Downs Irrigators had to say when asked whether the bill fulfils the commitment made by the member for Condamine—

No. It is, I would say, the opposite. The commitment made by—
the member for Condamine—

before the election talked to strengthening the Regional Planning Interests Act to ensure that more RIDA assessments would be done for any coal seam gas activity occurring over the Condamine Alluvium. Instead, this bill takes away those critical impact assessment provisions. No, it definitely does not comply with the commitment.

This bill was supposed to be about the LNP delivering on an election promise. Instead, what we see in this bill is a monument on the Western Downs that speaks to the level of betrayal felt by those very constituents and other hardworking Queenslanders. Here is what the Queensland Farmers' Federation had to say during the hearings—

However, in its current form, the Bill creates a significant gap in the protection of agricultural production across the Condamine Alluvium by removing the RIDA framework.

A departure from the RIDA framework leaves landholders with fewer protections and reduces the safeguards currently in place to protect the Condamine Alluvium's long-term agricultural productivity.

To quote Jo Sheppard again, the CEO of Queensland Farmers' Federation—

... QFF cannot support the passage of the Bill.

That is pretty unequivocal.

It is clear that the member for Kawana did not listen to Queenslanders when drafting this bill. That is absolutely true; the member for Kawana did not listen to Queenslanders when drafting this bill. Instead, it appears—to me, anyway—that he went out of his way to exclude affected landholders from early consultation, including the Queensland Farmers' Federation, because if they had been properly consulted then the bill in its current form would never have been introduced in the House. It shows that, had the member for Kawana even attempted to listen to landowners, he would have known the bill repealing the RIDA amounted to a broken promise.

The Queensland Farmers' Federation could not have been clearer about the importance of the RIDA as a protection for landholders. In its submission the QFF said—

... it is important to understand how the RIDA framework operates in practice.

For many landholders, RIDA is seen as a front-end assessment process that comes into play when CSG development reaches the farm gate. It is the point at which they can engage in a structured process to ensure the impacts on their farming operations, including water access, land condition and overall productivity are identified and properly considered before development proceeds ... It is a legislated approval framework that compels resource companies to examine and account for these impacts as a condition of development.

The QFF urged the parliamentary committee examining the bill to understand why landholders place significant value on RIDA as a practical tool available to them when development is proposed in their immediate region. I know that the member for Bundaberg and the member for Stretton both understood that and fought hard for those primary producers on the committee, and I thank them for their work. The QFF further stated—

It provides a level of structure, transparency and leverage in discussions with resource proponents that would otherwise be absent, ensuring agricultural production is considered upfront rather than after impacts have occurred.

The QFF went on to say—

It is also important ... to understand that the RIDA framework and the Environmental Authority (EA) process serve distinctly different yet complementary functions within Queensland's regulatory system.

The EA process, administered under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, is focused on environmental management and compliance, including matters such as water quality and environmental harm. In contrast, the RIDA framework is specifically designed to assess and protect impacts on agricultural land and the productive capacity of Priority Agricultural Areas and places a priority on preventative measures to avoid impact.

These are not duplicative processes. Rather, they operate together to ensure both environmental values and agricultural production are appropriately considered. The removal of RIDA would leave a clear gap in the assessment of impacts to prime agricultural land that is not addressed through the EA process alone.

The QFF also talked about unintended gas migration and groundwater protection and stated—

In particular, there are ongoing concerns regarding the risk of unintended gas migration associated with CSG development, sometimes referred to as fugitive contamination. This pathway of impact, involving the movement of hydrocarbons into groundwater systems, is not explicitly addressed within the current drafting of the Bill—

before the House. They continued—

QFF considers that the Bill should be amended to ensure this risk is clearly recognised and appropriately regulated through environmental approval conditions, monitoring and compliance frameworks under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. Addressing this gap would strengthen the overall framework and provide greater confidence that groundwater resources are protected from all relevant risks.

QFF notes that the bill does not address a critical gap relating to the protection of existing volumetric water entitlements in the Condamine Alluvium.

Agricultural production in the region relies not only on water quality, but on the availability and reliability of water volumes over time. Any reduction in accessible groundwater directly impacts the ability of landholders to maintain production.

The QFF also raised concerns about higher than expected water extraction by mining companies. The QFF said—

There is currently no mechanism to ensure that existing volumetric water entitlements, which underpin agricultural production, are protected where actual water take from CSG activities exceeds initial assumptions.

In the absence of stronger protections, there is a risk that agricultural water users and the community reliant on this water, bear the consequences of underestimated extraction, with limited ability to prevent or mitigate these impacts upfront.

This risk reinforces the importance of maintaining strong front-end assessment mechanisms, such as the RIDA framework.

The QFF also said that the removal of the RIDA framework—

... removes a key legal tool that enables early structured engagement before development proceeds.

For the Condamine Alluvium, it introduces the risk that:

- Impacts on water availability are not fully understood
- Groundwater and surface water interactions are not adequately considered
- Cumulative impacts are not properly assessed
- Long-term agricultural productive capacity is reduced over time.

The QFF further stated—

The Bill, as currently drafted, represents a departure from the established framework under the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*. This departure reduces the level of protection afforded to the Condamine Alluvium and diminishes the rights currently available to landholders.

QFF's position—

along with so many other stakeholders—

is that the Bill requires substantial amendment ...

Now we get the amendments at one minute to midnight. I note that the explanatory notes to the amendment state—

Amendment 8 removes the provisions associated with the RIDA process.

They then go on to say—

... the policy intent to remove the RIDA was generally supported during targeted consultation undertaken in the development of the Bill—

Of the 56 submitters, I do not think I could find one who said the policy intent to remove the RIDA was supported. Answer me the question—through you, Mr Deputy Speaker to the planning minister, the member for Kawana—who did generally support the intent to remove? You would need to get out a magnifying glass and crawl all over the Western Downs to find somebody who did.

The QFF's position, along with that of so many other stakeholders, is that the bill requires substantial amendment. Do we know if these are the substantial amendments that are needed and that landowners want? They do not know because they have never been asked and these had never been published publicly until about 40 minutes ago.

Mr J Kelly: Bring them in, rush them through.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection. It is another example of legislation and amendments being rushed through without proper scrutiny. There are serious flaws in the proposed bill.

Mr Bleijie: Jo Sheppard's happy, mate. You wait until you see what she says now.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from the member for Kawana. Jo Sheppard, the CEO of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, had to beg and plead with this arrogant planning minister to listen to her organisation, to listen to her and to listen to the people whom she represents to get the bill changed. Queenslanders should not have to beg and plead with the government. This should happen up-front, at the start, when bills are properly consulted on, but none of that happened with this legislation.

The Queensland Farmers' Federation's logic is impeccable and was from the get-go—if only they had been spoken to and listened to. It would have served the member for Kawana well to listen and take notice of what the QFF would have said at the beginning if they had been asked. The Western Downs Regional Council were also critical of the bill. They said—

Council also wishes to draw attention to what appears to be an unintended consequence of the current drafting.

On its reading of the Bill, the removal of the RIDA requirement may have the effect of enabling certain coal seam gas activities, including drilling, to occur within Priority Living Areas without a dedicated regional interest assessment.

Council assumes this outcome is not intended, given the established purpose of Priority Living Areas to protect existing and planned residential communities from incompatible land uses.

Council therefore recommends that this aspect of the Bill be reviewed and clarified to ensure that Priority Living Areas continue to receive appropriate protection consistent with the policy intent of the RPI framework.

Then there was the contribution from AgForce. They stated—

AgForce's primary concerns with the Bill include

- Removal of the Regional Interest Development Application ('RIDA') requirement without an equivalent replacement safeguard;
- Failure to give statutory effect to the State Interest—Agriculture;
- Absence of mechanisms ensuring consistency with the Darling Downs Regional Plan;
- Reliance on a compensation-based framework rather than prevention of impacts;
- Limitations in the proposed subsidence compensation provisions, including the 5 km spatial restriction;
- Inconsistent application of groundwater protection measures under the *Environmental Protection Act (Qld) 1994*; and
- Lack of practical mechanisms to ensure the compensation framework is accessible, equitable, and effective for landholders.

Imagine being an LNP government and having your core stakeholder groups—that is, the farmers who work so hard for this state—beg you to change legislation that you never listened to them on in the first instance. That is AgForce, QFF and the Western Downs Regional Council, to name a few. The Central Downs Irrigators Ltd said—

CDIL strongly opposes the proposed changes to the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014* which seek to remove the application of the RPI Act provisions to CSG resource activities on the Condamine Alluvium.

It was in fact the Condamine Alluvial Floodplain and the need to protect its highly productive prime agricultural land and the water sources that support it, from potentially harmful resource activities, that the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014* and the associated Regional Plans came into being. CDIL and other agricultural and community stakeholders gave up countless hours and considerable effort to ensure its establishment in order to protect the agricultural interests of the State. To have the RPI Act provisions removed for the very area of the state for which they were created, in one fell swoop and absent of any community consultation, is a true affront to the farmers, irrigators and community members of this region.

This proposal would remove all protections in place for *areas of regional interest* in the specified area ...

No other Act or Regulation replaces the protections provided by the RPI Act which seek to prevent resource activities causing material and permanent impacts, including those which may be widespread and irreversible, on the priority agricultural land use and/or the water sources that underpin its production, which include the Condamine Alluvium, floodplain function, and overland flow.

The submission of the Central Downs Irrigators went on to state that it was 'intended through the Act that agriculture takes priority over resource development' where risks may arise. Their submission said that the act is there to ensure that 'the agricultural industry and the resources industry can co-exist as much as possible'. They then said—

It also seeks to ensure the long-term sustainability of ... significant water sources like the Condamine Alluvium that are relied on for ... agricultural land uses.

They went on to state—

... no other Qld law has this proactive and preventative approach which seeks to protect and safeguard the ongoing sustainability and productive capacity of the agricultural land and/or the water sources that underpin the agricultural land uses.

Neither the Environmental Protection Act, the Water Act nor the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act, have the capacity to achieve the ... objectives.

Therefore, the protections are being taken away with no replacement, resulting in a wipe-out of agricultural land and productive capacity protections, as well as an unacceptable diminishment of landholder rights.

Let's reflect on those words for a minute: the protections that are being taken away with no replacement result in a wipe-out of agricultural land and productive capacity protections as well as an unacceptable diminishment of landowner rights. Again, this is a plea from the LNP heartland to an LNP government: keep your promise.

Clearly, the Central Downs Irrigators are not fans of the member for Kawana's legislative abilities either. The Toowoomba Regional Council also felt compelled to make a submission. Mayor Geoff McDonald wrote to the member for Kawana to state—

Council expresses the following expectations in our Region:

- i. That there will continue to be ongoing and meaningful engagement with landholders and consideration of their concerns.
- ii. That priority agricultural land is not negatively affected as a result of CSG extraction.
- iii. That research-based decisions are made in regard to the subsidence issues caused by CSG extraction.
- iv. That concerns about the potential negative impact on the Condamine Alluvium will be considered and mitigated.

Again, this is a cry from the LNP heartland: LNP, keep your promise. Those are the sorts of matters and concerns that the government would have been aware of if it had properly consulted the community, but clearly that did not happen. The government did not listen to the genuine concern of landowners, so today we have the member for Kawana coming back to the parliament with his tail between his legs, chastened once again, humiliated once more, let down by a toxic combination of his own lack of competency and his own unbridled arrogance. What a toxic combination Queenslanders are seeing.

The member for Kawana has come back with new amendments to this legislation. When I say 'new amendments', I do not mean to the original acts that were being amended in the original amending bill; I mean to the South Bank Corporation Act 1989. I can tell you, Speaker: they talk about nothing else on the Western Downs, the Darling Downs and all over the Condamine Alluvium than the South Bank Corporation Act. That is all primary producers talk about! This planning minister—this state development minister, this LNP Deputy Premier—and this LNP government want the power to remove members of the South Bank board, deputies of members and the corporation manager at any time for any reason or none, thereby not being restricted to specific reasons such as misconduct or incapacity.

Why is the Deputy Premier doing this? Why is he ramming this amendment through? Which members of the South Bank board are on the chopping block to be sacked? Why is the corporation manager being put on the chopping block, with the corporation manager's job able to be terminated at any time for any reason or none, with no restrictions on the government? Why is this being done? I can assure members of the government that no member on this side of the House in the opposition or on the crossbenches has any understanding or awareness of this.

As I said at the beginning of my contribution, the Deputy Premier is not a man to be trusted with power. He has demonstrated that again by wanting to ram through an amendment that gives him the unilateral power to sack members of the board, the corporation manager and deputies of members of the board without reason or cause, and nobody knows why. There would be one reason: that the Deputy Premier wanted to put an LNP mate, crony or donor onto the South Bank board. That is probably what he wants. Again, we see the abuse of the legislative process by this government to ram a totally unrelated amendment to a totally unrelated act through the parliament tonight with limited scrutiny—in fact, no real scrutiny at all.

What a mess this entire bill has been. What an indictment of the government's lack of capacity to make good laws for the benefit of Queenslanders. There would be no dog on the Western Downs that would want to come and eat this legislative breakfast, I can assure honourable members. This bill, this process, these amendments have been an absolute dog's breakfast. It would not have been fixed if it had not been for hardworking landowners speaking up and taking a stand against the LNP's ham-fisted legislation and the shocking abuse of power by the Deputy Premier to ram a bill that no-one

wanted, no-one loved and no-one called for through this parliament. It is not delivering on an LNP promise, which was the ostensible reason for the amending bill and it is not about what Labor should or should not have done for the last 10 years—and I heard that dishonesty from the planning minister, the member for Kawana. This bill arose out of an LNP election commitment and they still could not get it right. In fact, the bill as drafted was the complete opposite of what they promised to do. If it had not been for real Queenslanders with real callouses on real hands, not like the Deputy Premier's soft hands—

Mr Head interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, if I have to caution you again you will be warned.

Mr DICK:—these amendments would have never come through. Now the member for Kawana has to come in at the last minute with changes that have not been provided to the parliament or to landholders. This is no way for the business of government to be conducted. The Crisafulli LNP government has a rare talent for introducing legislation that achieves the exact opposite of what was allegedly intended. This bill, which was supposed to protect the interests of primary producers, was going to place them at greater risk of harm. The bunch of duds sitting opposite sat for a decade in opposition figuring and complaining that they had been duded—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask you to comment on the unparliamentary language just used by the member for Woodridge.

Mr SPEAKER: I will ask you to withdraw that unparliamentary language.

Mr DICK: I will withdraw. All of those members opposite sat there for 10 years and said they had been robbed. Then when they got a chance to change the law, they completely failed and they left their heartland behind. For a decade in opposition those opposite thought they were born to rule—and don't we see it every day—and that they should be given their due and returned to government and this bill, this debacle, is the reality.

Under the LNP, the Legislative Assembly has come to resemble a legislative crash repair shop so often have the government's laws had to come back to the workshop for urgent repairs. It is not just the incompetence, it is the lack of trustworthiness. Not only are they incompetent, but the Premier, the deputy and his LNP government cannot be trusted including by their heartland. Even the LNP's own heartland knows that this government cannot be trusted. That billboard stands by the Warrego Highway in Dalby. There it stands in LNP heartland, a bleak portrait of the LNP's lack of trustworthiness. The words on that billboard read, 'LNP, keep your promise'—a desperate plea from LNP heartland, true believers who just wanted to be able to believe what they were told by their LNP government only to realise they could not. Incompetent and untrustworthy: that is what this LNP government is—and promises have been broken, by this bill.

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (3.34 pm): I rise to support the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. After sitting here listening to that rant from the deputy opposition leader I really started to question what he has to say when he talks about trust. We on this side remember the last 10 years under their regime and how they sold out farmers in this state, and he has the audacity to come in here now and talk about trust and a lack of consultation.

This bill delivers on an important commitment of the Crisafulli government to protect the Condamine Alluvium, strengthen property rights and ensure the long-term coexistence of agriculture and resource development in one of Queensland's most productive regions. The Condamine Alluvium is not simply a geological formation and it is not simply a mapped area in legislation; for the farming families who rely on it, it is their livelihood. It is the water that sustains crops, supports agricultural production and underpins local economies. It is an asset that generations of Queenslanders have depended upon and one that future generations will rely upon as well. That is why this bill matters.

When landholders raise concerns about the future of the Condamine Alluvium they are not talking about an abstract policy issue; they are talking about their farms, their businesses, their communities and, in many cases, their family's future. This government understands that. We understand that Queenslanders expect us to protect important agricultural assets while also supporting the industries that create jobs and investment across regional Queensland, and that is why this bill is so important. It recognises that the role of government is not to choose one over the other. Our role is to get the balance right.

For too long debate around these issues has been characterised by a false choice. Some would have Queenslanders believe that agriculture and resources cannot coexist, yet across regional Queensland we see examples every day that prove otherwise. Farmers and resource companies have worked alongside one another for decades. Regional communities have benefited from both industries. Jobs have been created, businesses have grown and communities have prospered. Successful coexistence requires confidence, it requires trust and it requires a regulatory framework that is fair, practical and transparent.

This bill strengthens protections of the Condamine Alluvium. It introduces a deemed condition that will apply to environmental authorities for all new coal seam gas wells in the area. Importantly, this condition prohibits the release of contaminants into the aquifer. These are important protections. They provide certainty for landholders, certainty for industry and confidence for communities that the long-term health of the Condamine Alluvium is being safeguarded.

This bill also delivers strong protections for landholders. One of the key reforms relates to compensation arrangements for coal seam gas induced subsidence. The bill makes it clear that resource authority holders are responsible for compensating landholders for impacts caused by coal seam gas induced subsidence. Importantly, it recognises that impacts do not always stop neatly at the edge of a tenure boundary. That is why this bill expands compensation liability to include landholders located within five kilometres of a coal seam gas resource authority where impacts can be attributed to those activities.

The bill also strengthens landholder rights in relation to directional drilling activities within the Condamine Alluvium area. Before new directional wells can be drilled, resource authority holders will be required to enter into conduct and compensation agreements. The bill further establishes a dispute resolution pathway for landholders who may be affected by subsidence impacts but fall outside the existing conduct and compensation framework. This includes access to an authorised conference process and, where necessary, determination by the Land Court. These reforms provide practical pathways for resolving disputes and ensuring fair outcomes.

Recently I had the opportunity to travel to the Denison Trough region to spend some time speaking with people from both sides of the coin: a resource company and a landholder. As legislators, we often spend a great deal of time discussing frameworks, regulations and statutory provisions. Sometimes the most valuable insights come from the people living this experience every day, and one interaction has stayed with me as a consequence of that recent visit.

Just last week I met with Rick Whitton, whose property coexists with resource development activity, and what struck me was that he did not spend our discussion talking about conflict. He did not speak about opposition. He did not speak about agriculture and resources being incompatible. Instead, he spoke about the positive relationship he had developed with the company operating in the area. Rick and Leanne Whitton run a 1,800-head cattle herd on their 15,000-hectare property, Myrtleville, near Injune. The first gas activities on their property were in 1976 and Rick worked a drilling rig on a neighbouring property around that time. They have nine gas wells on their property as well as Denison Gas's Springvale gas plant and pipelines. Rick moved to Myrtleville in 1956 as a four-year-old with his family. He has been on that property since he finished school. While I acknowledge there are differences in the Whittons' operation to those in the Condamine, for me this conversation speaks to the fact that when people engage in good faith and understand one another's responsibilities then coexistence is not just a concept discussed here in parliament; it becomes something that works in practice. That conversation reinforced something that I have long believed: good policy should support good relationships, it should establish clear expectations and it should ensure that where impacts occur there are fair and transparent mechanisms to address them.

The legislation before the House is also an example of the government listening. The committee received extensive submissions and heard a range of views throughout its consideration of the bill. Stakeholders raised issues. Landholders raised issues. Industry provided feedback. This government listened and, as a result, as alluded to by the Deputy Premier, amendments are being made to address stakeholder feedback and recommendations from the committee process. Queensland Farmers' Federation, AgForce and Cotton Australia have supported changes to the bill and the proposed amended regulatory framework. That support is important because these organisations understand the significance of the Condamine Alluvium, they understand the importance of protecting agricultural productivity, and they understand the need to provide certainty for landholders while maintaining a workable framework for resource development.

The bill also includes sensible transitional arrangements. Existing conduct and compensation agreements and voluntary agreements will not be distributed by these reforms. Similarly, the requirements to enter into conduct and compensation agreements before drilling directional wells will apply to new wells and not retrospectively to existing operations. The bill also recognises financial arrangements that have already been settled between parties. We are getting the balance right. We are strengthening protections and improving the framework while providing certainty for existing parties and established arrangements, because good legislation should not create unnecessary uncertainty; it should provide confidence and it should provide clarity.

There has been much discussion about what previous governments did or did not do in relation to the Condamine Alluvium, and I would like to remind all stakeholders that those opposite did absolutely nothing for the past 10 years. The reality is that concerns have existed for many years. These concerns have, understandably, led to a lot of emotion. The community wanted answers, landholders wanted certainty and resource companies wanted clarity. This government has acknowledged the emotion. We have listened to the stakeholders. We have consulted. We have refined the framework accordingly.

At its core, the bill is about protecting the future of the Condamine Alluvium, it is about ensuring landholders have access to fair compensation where impacts occur, it is about providing certainty through clear dispute resolution pathways and it is about ensuring that agriculture and resource development can continue to coexist in a way that benefits regional Queensland. This is about getting the balance right, because property rights matter, agriculture matters and the resource sector matters. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (3.43 pm): I think it is important when reviewing this bill in its current form and the embarrassing behaviour of the Deputy Premier putting forward his embarrassing amendments that we look at the key point in the explanatory notes when it comes to the RIDA. For those opposite, the explanatory notes state—

The primary object of the Bill is to amend the planning, environment and resources legislative frameworks to ensure that new coal seam gas ... projects in the Condamine Alluvium are balanced with strong protections and to meet the Queensland Government commitment to require gas companies to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects would not have a detrimental, long-term impact on the Condamine Alluvium ...

The Deputy Premier made two very critical points in his speech when introducing the bill. He said—

During the 2024 state election we made a commitment to the people of Queensland to require gas companies to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects would not have a detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium ...

He went on to say—

The Crisafulli government has heard landholder and industry concerns and, after working with key stakeholders, we have developed a bill that provides a coordinated approach to deliver this election commitment ...

Somebody has led the Deputy Premier astray—or maybe he got distracted looking at himself in the mirror while he was doing his Elvis hairdo—because on consultation and hearing the concerns of landholders and industry this is what landowners have said. Glenn Ogden, landowner and farmer, said—

It goes without saying that we were pretty knocked on our backs and shocked when the legislation was presented.

He went on to say—

Instead of correcting the loopholes in the act as per the commitments prior to the election, the RIDA assessment process over the Condamine Alluvium will be removed altogether.

Michael Murray, the General Manager of Cotton Australia, said—

... it is very disappointing that CDIL—

Central Downs Irrigators Ltd—

was not included in what I would have to say was the very limited consultation on this bill during its development. They are the landholders most closely on the ground and it would have been very valuable, before this bill got to this stage, for their opinion to be taken into account.

Jo Sheppard, the then CEO of the Queensland Farmers' Federation at the time of the hearing, said—

From my perspective, I think the consultation has been inadequate.

She went on to say—

QFF, Cotton Australia and AgForce, I believe, were invited to a couple of Teams meetings ...

She further said—

... there was no opportunity for discussion and no opportunity to involve other stakeholders.

That is how this piece of legislation was brought about through consultation and close hard work. In fact, Jo Sheppard went on to say—

From my perspective, I expected a much more fulsome process, but it did not take place.

When the CEO of the QFF is going against the LNP, you know that the LNP is in trouble. In fact, Liza Balmain from Central Downs Irrigators said—

Central Downs Irrigators is a major stakeholder in the Condamine Alluvium area, one with considerable assets at stake in the face of expanding coal seam gas development and its inherent risks. Despite this, we have been excluded from all consultation in the lead-up to this bill.

Imagine being one of the core stakeholders in the Condamine Alluvium and not even getting a phone call from the Deputy Premier saying, 'Hey, what do you reckon? Should we keep the RIDA or should we get rid of it?' Liza went on to say—

The consultation on this reform has been a shocking failure of democratic due process, and the submissions to this inquiry loudly demonstrate that failure and the strong opposition to its outcomes.

This is not someone from the union movement. This is not someone from the QNMU or the United Workers Union or the AWU. This is a farmer representing the Central Downs Irrigators who is saying that it has been an attack on the democratic process.

Mr McDonald interjected.

Mr SMITH: I hear the member for Lockyer saying that they have listened now, so let's have some consideration of this election commitment. The Deputy Premier said that the Crisafulli government has heard landholder and industry concerns about the election commitment. This was the election commitment delivered by the member for Condamine—

... it is our intention to make an amendment to the Regional Planning Interests Act where a resource company would have to go through a full RIDA process before any drilling could be done ... Obviously this applies to new drilling ...

The member for Condamine made the election commitment that every new drilling project would have to undergo a full RIDA process. What is under 'Achievement of policy objectives' in the bill? 'Remove the need for a RIDA in the Condamine Alluvium'. So we have gone from a complete commitment that every new project will undergo a RIDA to the Deputy Premier creating a piece of legislation that removes that very election commitment! How well is the government doing? How well are those opposite going? Their own election commitment is the very thing they wiped out of the legislation. They got rid of their own election commitment in legislation.

Again, let us go back to Central Downs Irrigators. They said—

The outcomes of the bill do not align with the intent of the election commitment.

Government members interjected.

Mr SMITH: I can hear those opposite interjecting because they do not want to listen to me and they do not want to listen to the key stakeholders. That is why they failed in this bill.

Liza Balmain went on to say that, with regard to the member for Condamine, the bill 'weakens protections for the alluvium and its overlying priority agriculture area by removing the provisions of the RIDA'. Bev Newton said—

...pulling out the RIDA application process is a huge change to what is going to happen to our industry in the future.

Graham Clapman—who actually worked with Jeff Seeney back in 2014 to bring in the RIDA—said—

It is just ridiculous and completely contrary to what our local member—

the member for Condamine—

has supported and what we thought the LNP was supporting—completely contrary.

Glen went on to say that instead of correcting the loopholes, they are pulling out the RIDA. He said, 'We feel betrayed.'

How is that? A farmer in the Condamine Alluvium region says the LNP have absolutely betrayed farmers. That is what we heard. I will go back to Jo Sheppard—Jo is getting a lot of shout-outs—who said—

Whilst not perfect, the RIDA is a valuable negotiation tool for landholders and must be retained.

...

At this point, agriculture does not have confidence in the proposed amendments.

Agriculture—a key industry that underpins our state—does not have confidence in the Crisafulli government.

We have heard the Deputy Premier say, 'Don't worry, we have listened.' We heard the second speaker from the LNP say, 'Don't worry, we have listened. We are going to keep the election commitment.' No, no, no. The election commitment was that every new drilling project would undergo a full RIDA application. That is why the billboard in Dalby says, 'Keep your promise LNP'. The promise was that every new drilling project would be subject to a full RIDA process.

The amendments to this botched bill do not provide that commitment. All they do is maintain the status quo. It is a broken promise. We have the self-proclaimed farmers opposite who were on the committee speaking against farmers and failing farmers when it comes to their election promises. I know that when the member for Mackay makes an election commitment he does not actually back it because he crosses the floor and votes with us. When it comes to election commitments, they never actually believe in what they commit to. We have seen that with this piece of legislation.

How embarrassed were the LNP government committee members out in Dalby when they had 60 farmers shouting and screaming at them because they have betrayed them. The poor old member for Burnett's whole career has now come down to living in my shadow. Once again, it is me, the member for Logan, the member for Stretton, the member for Ferny Grove and the member for Woodridge who, on behalf of farmers, have to correct this bad piece of legislation. Farmers are working people and there is no other political party in this country who stands up for working people like the Australian Labor Party. If they really want to stand up for farmers, if they really want to stand up for their election commitment, move a further amendment and apply a full RIDA process to every single new drilling project.

Member for Burnett, step out of my shadow and move the amendment. Come on, you can be a champion! For once in your life you can actually achieve something. Maybe the member for Mirani, who is a proud farmer, will stand up for proud farmers and move the further amendment. Right now all we have is a broken promise. In fact, this is so bad that this amendment says that before the bill was created there was general support. Not even Arrow Energy said that they supported the removal of the RIDA. Not even the actual CSG company that would benefit most said that they wanted the RIDA removed. The poor old Deputy Premier is sitting back in his office, eating humble pie and, boy, it tastes bitter.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (3.53 pm): We can take the time to have a look at this bill tonight because it is an important piece of legislation. The way we went about consideration of this bill as a committee was quite productive. I do not recall anyone yelling at us, to be honest. I remember the mature, professional way we conducted the hearing. I did not yell at you, member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr J Kelly): Order! Direct your comments through the chair.

Mr BENNETT: It is important that we have a targeted suite of amendments to Queensland's planning, environment and resources legislation.

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Theodore, cease your quarrelling across the chamber.

Mr BENNETT: These measures aim to balance the continued development of coal seam gas—CSG—resources with enhanced safeguards—

Mr Boothman interjected.

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

Mr BENNETT:—for groundwater and landholder interests in the Condamine Alluvium area. This is extremely important.

During its inquiry, the committee heard from a variety of stakeholders representing agricultural producers, landowners, community groups, local government and the resources industry. I thank all of them for their thoughtful, constructive and respectful engagement with the inquiry. Their contributions assisted the committee to better understand the real-world impacts of the bill on landowners, regional communities and industry.

While stakeholders expressed varied views on specific aspects of the bill, there was broad recognition of the importance of protecting the Condamine Alluvium as a critical groundwater resource that underpins agricultural production and regional livelihoods. The committee carefully considered these perspectives in forming its views. Many stakeholders gave generously of their time and effort. I acknowledge the Queensland Farmers' Federation, which support elements of the bill that strengthen

the management of impacts associated with coal seam gas development and activities, particularly those that recognise subsidence as a compensable impact, clarify obligations associated with deviated drilling and strengthen pathways for landholder compensation.

As with many submissions, QFF voiced concerns that, in its current form, the bill introduces a significant policy and regulatory gap through the proposed removal of the regional interests development approval, the RIDA, framework under the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014. The overwhelming issue that stakeholders raised was that RIDA is a critical, front-end mechanism that ensures impacts on agricultural production are properly considered before development occurs. Its removal significantly weakens the existing framework, reduces protections for the Condamine Alluvium and leaves landholders with fewer rights when resource development is proposed.

As outlined in the committee report, the committee ultimately recommended that the bill be passed. However, the committee also recommended that the bill be amended to retain the regional interests development approval process within the Condamine Alluvium area. The evidence before the committee demonstrated that this process has provided an important safeguard for agricultural productivity and an avenue for stakeholder input, even where it has been infrequently used.

For the committee, it was important to understand how the RIDA framework operates in practice. Again, my thanks to all those with a passion and interest in the Condamine Alluvium for providing detailed evidence. Many landowners, QFF and others provided information that RIDA is seen as a front-end assessment process that comes into play when CSG development reaches the farm gate. It is at this point we can engage in a structured process to ensure the impacts on farming operations, including water access, land condition and overall productivity, are identified and properly considered before development proceeds. This is exactly what we promised and it will apply to every new gas well that goes forward.

Importantly, RIDA is not optional. It is a legislated approval framework that compels resource companies to examine and account for these impacts as a condition of their development. Throughout the inquiry the committee began to understand why landholders place significant value on RIDA as a practical tool available to them when development is proposed in their immediate region. It provides a level of structure, transparency and leverage in discussions with resource proponents that would otherwise be absent, ensuring agricultural production is considered upfront rather than after impacts have occurred.

It was also important for the committee to understand that the RIDA framework and the environmental authority process serve distinctly different yet complementary functions within the Queensland regulatory system. The EA process, administered under the Environmental Protection Act 1994, is focused on environmental management and compliance, including matters such as water quality and environmental harm. In contrast, the RIDA framework is specifically designed to assess and protect impacts on agricultural land and the productive capacity of priority agricultural areas and places a priority on preventative measures to avoid impact. These are not duplicative processes. Rather, they operate together to ensure both environmental values and agricultural production are appropriately considered. The removal of RIDA would have left a clear gap in the assessment of impacts to prime agricultural land that is not addressed through the EA process alone.

I normally do not waste any time on talking about those opposite, but listening to their attempts to rewrite history deserves clarity. During their decade of decline, Labor repeatedly ignored local community and landowner concerns over the Condamine Alluvium and took no action to ensure protection of the water aquifer. The previous Labor government introduced the Mineral and Energy Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024, which included a management framework for CSG induced subsidence. The committee report recommended further consultation on this framework and, as such, the subsidence management provisions were removed from the bill. It was all just too hard and, of course, we will hear from them how great they are tonight, but again they could not get this right before they were kicked out of office.

The committee process plays a vital role in Queensland's parliamentary system. It provides an important opportunity for proposed legislation to be examined in detail and for the voices of those affected by new laws to be heard. This inquiry highlighted the value of committee scrutiny in identifying both the strengths of legislative proposals and the areas where refinement or additional safeguards may be warranted. I thank my fellow committee members for their diligent work throughout this inquiry. I also thank the departmental officers who contributed to the inquiry and the committee secretariat for their professionalism and support. I thank the people in Dalby for their hospitality. I hope this report will assist the parliament in its consideration of the bill.

In conclusion, I want to give a shout-out to Pat Weir, the member for Condamine, for his advocacy for his area. I think it is incredibly important that his professionalism and motivations for this bill were genuine—they still are. I have not worked much with Pat over the years but I got to know him over this particular case. He is a true gentleman, a true man of his word honouring his election commitment.

I want to reiterate in the time left to me that these amendments to the bill are what was promised, backing in Pat and all he said about this bill. It retains the requirement for the regional interests development approval, the RIDA, under the RPI Act for new CSG projects—exactly what was promised. This amends the RPI Act to clarify that the new deemed condition in an environmental authority for CSG activity in the Condamine Alluvium under the EP Act will prevail over any RIDA conditions to the extent of any inconsistency. A big one, which is new and was what Pat promised, is to clarify that landowners can be eligible to claim compensation under the act if affected by the subsidence issue. This is now within five kilometres of an authorised area. That is huge going forward, considering after 10 years no-one did anything with this issue. Pat fought for years to get these protections for landowners.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I remind you to use correct titles.

Mr BENNETT: Good point. It is not like me to do that, Mr Deputy Speaker. Mr Speaker fought hard for these issues.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: ‘Member for Condamine’ is fine, but you were using a first name. I ask you to use correct titles.

Mr BENNETT: These amendments clarify under the act that CSG induced subsidence impacts only apply if the CSG resource authority is wholly or partly in the Condamine Alluvium area.

We cannot let this bill progress through the House tonight without addressing the allegations against the member for Condamine. I commend him and appreciate the work that was done through not only Minister Last’s office but also the Deputy Premier’s office in navigating this complex bill. It is important that we continue to represent those important stakeholders. The trips to Dalby certainly opened my eyes. I had been through there a number of times in a private capacity, but to see the significance of the cotton industry, the significance of the impacts on stakeholders, that passion that we saw on the ground, was really important.

I think the contrast between the people who welcome the coal seam gas industry and the people who have some concerns and some issues around what that may mean for them has well and truly been dealt with in this bill. More importantly, one can see on the ground the benefits from the coal seam industry and the concerns of the people who live there. Having travelled and seen people with subsidence issues, we respect their wishes. This is not retrospective, but they have been listened to and are now eligible for compensation going forward.

Arrow Energy’s attempts to be a good corporate citizen were acknowledged. The local council is a beneficiary of the industry. Dalby is a better place for legislation that now protects not only them and their surrounding towns but also the opportunity for compensation agreements and other agreements to be entered into. I hope this bill can progress tonight in the right form. Again I acknowledge the amendments and look forward to the passage of a good bill that will back up an election commitment made by the member for Condamine. Going forward, we look forward to continuing to work with those key stakeholders who provide so much to this great state.

 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (4.03 pm): What a clanger! What an own goal! How embarrassing from this LNP government. We have heard from other members on this side what a disaster this bill has been and, I have to say, as an opposition member of the committee, it was a little bit like watching a slow-motion train crash. In the train windows you could see the little faces of the LNP members when they realised the train was coming off the rails. ‘Oh, no, what have we done?’, they were saying to each other. It was extraordinary.

Taking a step back and looking at the introduction of this bill, there was an amazing reaction from the LNP heartland—a feeling of absolute betrayal. Then there were the recommendations from the committee and the government members who stood up to the Deputy Premier. I acknowledge the member for Mackay for continuing to vote against the government. That was good to see. He is forming a little bit of a habit there. With the subsequent backflip that we saw today from the Deputy Premier, one really has to ask how the heck this one got through the Deputy Premier’s office.

Queenslanders are right to ask, ‘What is going on here? This is all very strange. What is happening?’ There are a few options. Let us have a look at what could be going on. Firstly, was it the result of some kind of deal with big multinational gas companies? Was there some kind of backroom

promise made before the election to get rid of that pesky RIDA process? There certainly is suspicion out there amongst the community. I note the denials from Arrow Energy, but Queenslanders are right to ask and right to be suspicious. If it is not this, then how did this one get through? Somebody from the Deputy Premier's office obviously wrote the bill—a bill that no-one wanted, that no-one apparently asked for, that LNP backbenchers did not support. We can only assume that the reason it got through was incompetence from the Deputy Premier. Perhaps he did not read the bill. This whole mess is a great lesson for some of those future ministers up the back who are about to get promoted in the upcoming reshuffle. Guys, always read the bill!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr J Kelly): Direct your comments through the chair.

Mr MARTIN: When those new ministers walk into their new office and sit down behind the desk and someone comes up and hands them a bill to be introduced, they should make sure they give it a close read.

I have a second tip for them. I do not like giving the LNP too much advice; I do not really want to help that side, but I will give it to them anyway as I can see they are clamouring for it—the member for Gregory is pretty keen. When the new minister reads that bill and it expressly contradicts one of their own election commitments, they should reject it. They should get the rejection stamp and go, 'No, thanks. We'll reject that one.' If the new ministers do not do that, it is going to be very embarrassing. It is going to be a little bit like being the Deputy Premier today. They are going to have to do a massive backflip in front of everyone. Then they are going to have to try to get the bill debated at a time when they think the media might not care, so during budget week. Then they are going to have to get the Leader of the House to guillotine the debate so they do not have to suffer so much through consideration in detail. Then they are going to have to put the amendments through at the last minute. Here is a top tip—and we saw this today: do not stuff up the amendments. When it comes to their last-minute amendments, for goodness sake try to make them within standing orders. It is embarrassing. It is humiliating for this government.

Perhaps it was not incompetence. Perhaps it was just more arrogance. If anyone is capable of arrogance, I dare say it is the Deputy Premier. He does not seem like the kind of person who questions his own ability. We have seen that with his question time dancing. He is certainly a big fan of himself. In terms of not bothering to check with regional MPs, not bothering to check with his backbench, I am not sure how that affects him internally when it comes to his standing within the LNP, but I imagine it does not help. The Deputy Premier has really created a nightmare for his current members, especially the members for Condamine and Southern Downs.

Those opposite are staring down the barrel of a challenge from One Nation. What does the Deputy Premier think is going to happen in Condamine? What does he think is going to happen in Southern Downs at the next election? It certainly looks like the LNP is more interested in looking after multinational resource companies than local farmers. They have basically written One Nation's campaign for them. I suspect the Deputy Premier is going to be on the flyers.

Mr DILLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. Member, I have given you some latitude. I would ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mr MARTIN: Thank you for your guidance, Deputy Speaker. I will move on. The concern in the community is real but it is not just with this bill. We have now seen the Deputy Premier introduce his critical minerals bill. I will not foreshadow that debate, but it raises the exact same issues as this bill and could make their amendments to this bill totally redundant. Again, the Deputy Premier has essentially written One Nation's attack ads for them.

This bill was supposed to deliver on a promise made by the LNP to landholders before the 2024 state election. Instead, the Deputy Premier brought into this House a bill that did the exact opposite. It is an incredible betrayal of farmers and landholders in the regions to the exclusive benefit of resource companies. He promised to strengthen protections for landholders and then introduced legislation to remove one of their most important protections. He promised resource companies would face greater scrutiny and then attempted to give those companies a way around the RIDA process. He promised farmers that the LNP would stand with them and then he pulled the rug out from underneath them.

This bill represents a clear and deliberate breach of faith with the people of the Condamine region. Before addressing those failures, I thank the individuals and organisations that made submissions to the inquiry and appeared before the committee. Landholders, agricultural organisations,

irrigators, community representatives, local governments and industry stakeholders all contributed important evidence. Their participation allowed the committee to move beyond the government's carefully scripted talking points and examine what this legislation would actually mean on the ground.

The Condamine Alluvium is not merely another line on a departmental map. It is a vital groundwater resource that supports some of Queensland's most productive agricultural land. It supports family farms, regional employment, food production and communities that have worked that land for generations. It is also an area where coal seam gas activity has produced longstanding concerns about groundwater subsidence, agricultural productivity and the power imbalance between resource companies and individual landholders. Those concerns are not theoretical; they are concerns about whether land can continue to produce crops. They are concerns about whether underground water resources will remain safe. They are concerns about who will pay if coal seam gas activity damages productive agricultural land. They are concerns about whether farmers have any meaningful ability to stand up to resource companies with vastly greater financial and legal resources.

Labor supports genuine measures to protect the Condamine Alluvium. We support the proposed deemed conditions under the Environmental Protection Act that seek to prevent new CSG activities from releasing contaminants into the waters of the Condamine Alluvium. We also support clearer rights for landholders to seek compensation for coal seam gas subsidence. Those are worthwhile reforms. However, they do not replace the protection provided by the regional interests development approval process, the RIDA.

The central failure of this bill is the Crisafulli government's attempt to remove the RIDA process for new coal seam gas activities in the Condamine Alluvium. The Deputy Premier claimed that its removal would eliminate duplication. That excuse is pathetic and it does not withstand even slight scrutiny. It is the most pathetic excuse I have heard since the election of the Crisafulli government—on any bill. I ask those opposite to not insult the intelligence of Queensland farmers and landholders in the regions. The government knows that. The LNP knew it before the election. In fact, the member for Condamine could not have been clearer when he addressed this matter before polling day. He said that it was the LNP's intention to make an amendment to the Regional Planning Interests Act where resource companies would have to go through a full RIDA process before any drilling could be done on the Condamine Alluvium—

Mr Power: Every time.

Mr MARTIN: I take that interjection from the member for Logan—every time. They did not deliver on the first bill. They also have not delivered with the amendments to this bill. Where are they delivering their election promise? They are not delivering their election promise. They have introduced a bill that specifically goes against it. It is either total incompetence from the Deputy Premier or it is something worse. Queenslanders deserve better.

 **Mr DALTON** (Mackay—LNP) (4.13 pm): I rise to support the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, but I am not sure if those opposite do or do not. This bill delivers on a clear commitment made by the Crisafulli government to protect one of Queensland's most important agricultural water resources while also strengthening the rights of landholders and supporting sensible coexistence between agriculture and the resources sector. As the member for Mackay and a member of the Primary Industries and Resources Committee, I understand just how important it is to get the balance right between protecting our natural resources, supporting agriculture and ensuring our resources sector can continue to contribute to Queensland's prosperity. As a new member of this House, I am impressed by the committee process. I want to thank all the individuals and organisations that kindly shared their points of view with regard to this bill. Each input was made with courtesy and politeness, which made my job of examining the bill so much easier. Again, I thank those stakeholders.

In regional Queensland, our livelihoods depend on getting the balance right. Whether it is sugarcane farming in the Mackay region, cattle production across Central Queensland or the agricultural industry supported by the Condamine Alluvium, Queensland primary producers deserve confidence that their water resources will be protected. They also deserve confidence that when resources activities impact their land they will be treated fairly. That is exactly what this bill delivers. For far too long, landholders and communities in the Condamine region have raised concerns about the protection of the aquifer and the impacts of coal seam gas activities. Despite a decade of government, Labor failed to act. They ignored the concerns of the local communities and failed to deliver the protections that landlords had been calling for. The Crisafulli government promised to protect the Condamine Alluvium and we are delivering on that commitment.

The centrepiece of the bill is the introduction of stronger protections for the Condamine Alluvium aquifer. The legislation requires proponents of new coal seam gas developments to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that their activities will not result in detrimental long-term impacts on the aquifer. Noncompliance with the Environmental Protection Act will risk serious penalties: a maximum of 6,250 penalty points, equating to approximately a \$1 million fine, or up to five years imprisonment, multiplied by five for corporations. That is a significant safeguard. It sends a clear message that protecting Queensland's valuable water resources is not negotiable. Water is the lifeblood of regional communities. It underpins agricultural production, supports local economies, and sustains families and businesses across regional Queensland. Protecting that resource is essential.

The bill also introduces a deemed environmental condition that prohibits contaminants being released into the aquifer where they could cause long-term damage. Again, this is about providing certainty to local communities and ensuring that the environmental protections are strong, enforceable and effective.

One of the aspects of this bill that I particularly welcome is the strengthening of the property rights of landholders. The agricultural sector and the resources sector have coexisted across Queensland for many years. Most landholders understand that coexistence is possible but they expect fairness. When impacts occur, they deserve appropriate compensation. The bill expands compensation arrangements for coal seam gas induced subsidence and creates new protections for affected landholders. Importantly, it recognises that impacts can extend beyond the immediate resource authority boundary.

The most significant reform is the creation of the off-tenure compensation liability. This means a CSG company may be required to compensate landholders whose land is outside the authorised resource tenure area. The prescribed distance is five kilometres from the CSG project boundary unless changed by regulation. That is a practical response to concerns raised by landholders and demonstrates that the government has again listened. The committee process also highlighted concerns regarding the regional planning interests framework. I welcome the government's decision to listen carefully to stakeholders' feedback and retain the regional interests development approval process within the Condamine Alluvium area. This demonstrates a government that is willing to consult, listen and refine legislation where appropriate.

Queensland Farmers' Federation, AgForce and Cotton Australia also supported the framework. That support speaks volumes. These organisations represent the people who live with the outcomes of this legislation every day. Their support reflects confidence that the bill strikes the right balance between protecting agricultural interests and providing certainty for investment.

While the bill focuses on the Condamine Alluvium, the principles underpinning it are relevant right across Queensland. In Mackay, we understand the importance of balancing economic development and environmental stewardship. Our region relies on both agriculture and resources. Sugar remains one of the most important industries, while mining and resources continue to provide thousands of jobs and support families throughout the Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday region. Queenslanders do not want to choose between jobs and environmental protection. They expect governments to deliver both. They expect sensible regulation, strong environmental safeguards and the fair treatment of landholders. That is exactly what this bill seeks to achieve.

This bill is about protecting vital water resources. It is about standing up for landholders. It is about providing certainty for regional communities and it is about delivering on commitments made to Queenslanders. After a decade of inaction under Labor, the Crisafulli government is taking practical steps to protect the Condamine Alluvium, strengthen property rights and support the long-term coexistence of agriculture and resources. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferry Grove—ALP) (4.20 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I want to commence by declaring a perceived conflict of interest with one of the witnesses, Stuart Armitage. In his period of time as president of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, he and I, as the former minister for agriculture, enjoyed a strong relationship. I would go so far as to say he is a friend of mine, and also of the Labor government at that particular time, and that, no doubt, is where I received the title of 'Furner, the farmers' friend'. We felt that fondly of him we appointed him as a board member of Sunwater. He served his time on that board with distinction and served that board extremely well. I visited his farm on many occasions and have actually seen his expressed concerns of subsidence on his property.

I also want to place on record my appreciation and respect for the ALP members on the committee—the members for Bundaberg, Logan and Stretton—who demonstrated their commitment and understanding of the importance of this bill. They are fine members who will serve this alternative government well into the future.

I thank the farmers who have been fighting against the LNP's bill before the House today, particularly those who have spent their money on that billboard asking the LNP to keep their promise. It is money well spent. During my time as minister, there was never a billboard asking me or any minister of the then Labor government to keep our promises because we kept our promises time and time again, demonstrating our commitment and our trustworthiness as Labor ministers and as a Labor government. Never have I seen this in my life.

This bill was meant to be about the LNP delivering on an election promise. It is clear the Deputy Premier did not listen to Queenslanders when drafting this bill. Stakeholders have been clear that the RIDA is a very important negotiating tool for farmers and must be kept. The LNP was prepared to—and was about to—pull the rug out from under Queensland farmers. Labor does support the addition of a deeming condition to the Environmental Protection Act and a clarified avenue for compensation for landholders affected by subsidence. However, these do not replace the protection that RIDA offers.

Some of the hallmarks—certainly we on this side understand this—of being a member of parliament and in government are openness, trustworthiness and transparency. You only need to look at *Hansard* of the inquiry into this bill to see that, conversely, the LNP government is quite different and portrays the opposite with regard to those attributes.

I will start with Stuart Armitage's evidence. He outlined to the committee that landholders would be left exposed, with no clear checks or balances for future coal seam gas developments on productive farmland as proposed. He suggested the bill is discriminatory by removing the RPI Act from one of the most vulnerable agricultural regions in Queensland, the Condamine Alluvium, and from that region alone. He questioned why the area where his property is located was being singled out and why the provisions were not applied to PAA land in Queensland. He questioned why the LNP government chose one little area that happens to be under the control of Arrow Energy. I would love to hear the Deputy Premier's explanation of why that is the case.

Another farmer—Mr Ogden, in his private capacity—was far more critical of the LNP's processes. He indicated that the legislation was introduced after a pre-election commitment in October 2024 by the member for Condamine. Mr Ogden claimed that the member for Condamine suggested the proposal was to amend the Regional Planning Interests Act so that any resource company would have to prove beyond reasonable doubt that they would not have a detrimental effect on the land above or below the surface, and that includes the Condamine Alluvium. Like many other witnesses, he identified there was no consultation—that they were not part of the process and were told it would be okay. Later during the hearing, in response to a question from the member for Bundaberg, he said—

I think Pat used something that we used. I think he showed complete trust in the other members of the LNP that they would go ahead and see this legislation through in the manner it was put forward.

He went on to say—

We feel betrayed.

Nothing this LNP government can do—these amendments—or say will wash away that stain of betrayal on Queensland farmers after what the LNP has done to them.

The view of no consultation was further expressed by Jo Sheppard, the then chief executive officer of the Queensland Farmers' Federation. Jo indicated that consultation was inadequate, stating—

They were one-hour Teams meetings with some PowerPoint presentations, which we were not allowed to take copies of. We had a handful of those meetings. We were presented to, which we appreciated, but there was no opportunity for discussion and no opportunity to involve other stakeholders.

Not only was the QFF provided little or no consultation but they were treated with contempt by not being allowed information for consideration.

Liza Balmain, Secretary of Central Downs Irrigators Ltd, summed up the deceit of the LNP government during the Brisbane hearing, stating—

... we have been excluded from all consultation in the lead-up to this bill. This is very different to the experience under the previous Labor government, who consulted with us consistently on any reform they proposed regarding CSG and its implications on agriculture and irrigation water sources in our area.

There are no surprises in that evidence. The Labor government has always conducted consultations with our farmers and landholders in this matter. Liza provided further points in her contribution, explaining—

The consultation on this reform has been a shocking failure of democratic due process, and the submissions to this inquiry loudly demonstrate that failure and the strong opposition to its outcomes. The outcomes of the bill do not align with the intent of the election commitment. In fact, they fly in the face of the commitment of Pat Weir, member for Condamine, as they actually weaken protections for the alluvium and its overlying priority agriculture area by removing the provisions of the Regional Planning Interests Act while not offering any equivalent in their place.

Furthermore, Lisa stated—

... we are confused—greatly confused—as to why a LNP government, the David Crisafulli government, that purports to be for agriculture, farmers and the regions, would strip away protections for prime agriculture lands, agriculture water sources and the rights of landholders.

There we have it. This LNP has shafted our farmers. They were led to believe the Condamine Alluvium would be provided with the RIDA protection farmers in this location have enjoyed for over a decade. They were given commitments by the member for Condamine, only to find those words meant nothing, and provided false expectations by a government whose origins purport to hold the values of representing and supporting farmers. Nothing could be further from the truth. The Deputy Premier stood in this House during his introductory speech and stated—

The Crisafulli government has heard landholder and industry concerns and, after working with key stakeholders, we have developed a bill that provides a coordinated approach to deliver this election commitment and protect this important aquifer as we promised.

Did the Deputy Premier mislead the House in the introduction of this bill? These questions need to be asked and answered. Our Queensland farmers want to know if that is the case. I am sure all members are looking forward to the LNP member's contribution to clarify the truth.

In conclusion, all of us know that the Australian Labor Party have always supported our farmers, our regions and the crops they sow. We always will. That will always be the case. Why did they have to introduce amendments if there was nothing wrong with the bill? They have been caught with their pants down. The reality is that our farmers are not fools and they will not be fooled by this LNP government.

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (4.30 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Before I start, I would like to say to those across the chamber that in August 2023 I was insulted. I am a farmer and I was insulted. We were at Speakers' Corner. There were a lot of LNP members who supported the Queensland farmers that day on the issues we had across the state at the time. That afternoon I met the member for Ferny Grove, who was the agriculture minister at the time. Other concerned farmers and I spoke with him and we were insulted by how we were treated. We were nothing that day. What has been said here—

Mr FURNER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am offended by those comments of the member for Mirani and ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Member for Mirani, do you withdraw?

Mr G KELLY: I withdraw. As farmers that afternoon, we walked away bruised and battered. From what I have just witnessed and heard, I am deeply insulted. I myself am a farmer. I believe in agriculture and we have missed out for 30 years, not 10 years. We have struggled to get back. When it comes to something like this, I am going to talk about agriculture and farmers to get the message across. While this bill focuses on the Condamine Alluvium—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, I draw your attention to standing order 247, I think it is, about quarrelling across the chamber. Please cease doing that.

Mr G KELLY: While this bill focuses on the Condamine Alluvium, the issues it seeks to address are relevant to regional communities across Queensland. As someone who represents a large regional electorate, and coming from a grazing background myself, I understand how important land, water and property rights are to regional Queenslanders.

For many families their land is more than just an asset. It is their livelihood. It is their family history. It is often something that has been passed down through generations and something they hope to pass on to the next generation. Likewise, water is the lifeblood of regional Queensland. Without secure and reliable water resources our agriculture industries cannot thrive, our regional communities cannot grow and our state cannot continue to produce the food and fibre that Queensland and Australia rely upon. That is why it is so important that governments strike the right balance when it comes to resource development.

Queensland has been built on both agriculture and resources. Both industries make enormous contributions to our economy and both support thousands of jobs throughout regional Queensland. Successful coexistence requires trust. Landholders need confidence that their property rights will be respected. Communities need confidence that important water resources will be protected.

Mr Smith interjected.

Mr G KELLY: I never said a word when the member for Bundaberg spoke. Industry needs clear and transparent rules so investment can continue with certainty. While the Condamine Alluvium is not located within my electorate, the principle at stake is one that resonates strongly across Mirani. Whether it is prime agricultural land, groundwater resources or the balance between development and farming, regional Queenslanders expect governments to protect the assets that underpin our communities and regional economies.

This bill seeks to strengthen those protections by requiring gas companies to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that new projects will not have a detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium aquifer. That is an important safeguard for one of Queensland's most significant agricultural water resources. The bill also strengthens protections for landholders by expanding compensation arrangements where coal seam gas activities cause damage or impact land, infrastructure or property. I know that many regional Queenslanders have long expressed concerns about ensuring resource companies are held accountable for any impacts their activities may have on surrounding land and infrastructure. Those concerns deserve to be heard. People who live and work on the land understand it better than anyone. They are not opposed to development, but they rightly expect development to occur responsibly and with appropriate safeguards in place.

I hear regularly from landholders across my electorate that they simply want certainty. They want to know that if development occurs their rights will be protected, their concerns will be listened to and a fair and transparent process will be in place should issues arise. That is not an unreasonable expectation. Regional Queenslanders are practical people. They understand the importance of economic development. They understand the role the resources sector plays in creating jobs and generating prosperity, but they also understand that once productive agricultural land or critical water resources are compromised impacts can be felt for generations. That is why getting the balance right is so important.

As a member of the parliamentary committee that examined this legislation, I saw firsthand how the committee process works when stakeholders take the time to have their say. The committee heard evidence from farmers, industry groups, local governments and community representatives. A consistent concern raised during the inquiry was the proposal to remove the regional interests development approval process from the Condamine Alluvium area. Following that consultation the committee made recommendations to government, and I am pleased to see those concerns have been listened to. The decision to retain the existing RIDA framework demonstrates that the committee process can make a real difference and that stakeholder feedback is taken seriously.

Good legislation is strengthened when it is tested through scrutiny, consultation and debate. This outcome shows the value of Queensland's parliamentary committee system in ensuring practical outcomes that balance the needs of agriculture, industry and local communities. As members of this House, we have a responsibility to ensure Queensland's natural resources are managed responsibly and sustainably. We also have a responsibility to ensure regional Queenslanders have confidence that governments will stand up for their interests when decisions are made about land use, water security and resource development.

Too often, regional communities have felt that decisions were being made about them rather than with them. This bill sends a clear message that landholders, producers and regional communities have a voice and their concerns matter. For those of us who represent regional electorates, that principle is incredibly important. Strong agriculture industries, secure water resources and respect for property rights are not competing priorities; they are complementary priorities. If we want a strong future for regional Queensland, we need all three.

I believe this bill takes important steps towards achieving that balance and strengthening confidence in a framework that governs coexistence between agriculture and resources development. There is one thing that farmers do not respect—and that is people telling them what to do. What end of a cow eats grass! I see it all the time down here. As far as I am concerned, we stand together with the farmers. We hold pitchforks together. We fight together. One thing about the opposition is that they do not get it and they never will.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (4.39 pm): As the opposition's resources spokesman, I recognise there needs to be a balanced coexistence between the landowner, who is often the farmer, and those seeking to use the land for other uses. This is especially the case with coal seam gas extraction. We want farmers and gas companies to be partners—and there are some—each helping each other. However, when a bad government putting forward a bad bill tries to upset this delicate balance, it will hurt both parties—not just the farmers but those investing in our resources as well.

Members do not have to take my word for it that this is a bad bill. They do not have to take into account all of the submitters' views. They all agreed that it was a bad bill. What they should take into account, though, is the unanimous view of the committee that this bill was so bad that at a minimum it required major surgery—that is at a minimum—and that the process should be started again with proper consultation as a preferred option. The committee made seven key recommendations that totally flipped the intent of this bill. We have heard that the RIDA process was vitally important. This government, despite promising that RIDAs would be done on every single property, have failed to fulfil that promise.

I want members to consider that when this bill was first presented to the LNP party room every single LNP member looked at the abolishment of RIDAs and said, 'Yes, that's what we want to do to farmers.' Every single member over there looked at this in their party room and said, 'Yes, I want to upset the investment in coal seam gas in Western Queensland.' They are either indifferent, incompetent or do not care about farmers in Western Queensland, because they let this bill be presented to parliament when it was so bad that a committee had to savage it. It was so bad that farmers had to erect billboards against the LNP. That is how bad this bill was.

Extraordinary in nature, the committee report says that the government got it wrong. What is worse is that this bill clearly and directly breaches the promise that the LNP made to the people of the Condamine Alluvium. We have heard clearly from other speakers how farmers spoke to us through the committee process. I want to emphasise the fact that this government is so incompetent that it has also hurt gas companies in this process. So many former LNP voters on the plains have had their eyes opened about this government. You cannot take what they say seriously as they break promises on a daily basis. What was a former LNP heartland rightfully now has a deep distrust of, and distaste for, the Crisafulli government.

Mr McDonald: That's not correct.

Mr POWER: Every single LNP member, like the member for Lockyer, looked at this in the party room and said, 'Yes, I want to get rid of the RIDAs.' We have heard clearly from other speakers the heartfelt cries of betrayal. I do not use the word 'betrayal' rhetorically; I use it literally. They said that this bill represented betrayal, yet every single LNP member betrayed their constituents in the party room by saying, 'This is what we want to present as law.'

Mr Vorster: Rubbish!

Mr POWER: You did not read it. They are saying it is rubbish. What we are hearing is that the LNP members had not even bothered—

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

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, we are hearing that the LNP members had not even bothered to read this legislation before they presented it to the parliament. They thought taking away RIDAs, breaking LNP promises, was a good thing to do. That is what we are hearing from them over there.

We have heard from other speakers the heartfelt cries of betrayal from farmers and we have seen the objections of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, who clearly said they do not support the bill. These people are the socialist red-raggers they used to complain about it. The Queensland Farmers' Federation said that this government is incompetent. This government is not up to it.

Mr McDonald: That's not what Jo said.

Mr POWER: What did they say, then? The member for Lockyer again is saying that the Queensland Farmers' Federation did not say that. Let me quote the Queensland Farmers' Federation. They said—

We had a great opportunity to work together and ground-truth some of the reforms that really would have made a difference. That opportunity I think has been missed. Also, releasing the bill and saying that consultation had occurred—

remember that was said in the introductory speech—

with QFF and Cotton Australia and implying that we were happy with the bill has also created some confusion.

We have heard other speakers. However, we should note that the gas companies also said they did not want this bill. They did not want the RIDA to be abolished. They had not called for it. They did not want it. It was not on their agenda. Instead, this reckless, cavalier, incompetent government put forward this bill about which every single member in the LNP party room said, 'Yes, we want to abolish the RIDAs. We want to hurt Queensland farmers. Yes, we want to damage gas companies.' They all wanted to do it.

The stated intent of this bill is to 'address landholder concerns'. This bill has done the complete opposite and in the process has made it harder for gas explorers and gas companies to reach good faith agreements to share the land they both want to use. As a committee we went out to a farm where a cotton farmer showed us the deep, sticky, dark soil of the Condamine Alluvium and explained how his farm coexisted with Arrow Energy and their gas wells and how there was mutual benefit from having them there. That is what we want to see, but this reckless government is making that harder to achieve, building distrust into the process.

I want to talk about the way we have been treated. We saw how the people of the Condamine were treated with contempt. We, too, were treated with contempt in this place as these amendments were thrown disdainfully at us when the bill's second reading debate started. How can we see whether these amendments are at the right level to fit the concerns people had and, from my perspective, are also compatible with gas exploration?

What we have heard is that there was some brief consultation. I listened carefully. Nothing was said about the government speaking to Arrow Energy or Australian Energy Producers or any of the other gas companies. They are in desperate retreat after incompetently putting forward a bill that was so damaging and so out of touch that they have no idea of the consequences of these amendments. The people of Condamine should not think they are the only ones treated with contempt; it is everyone in this chamber as well.

No Queenslander, in the minutes given to examine the amendments and in good faith, could possibly vote for these changes after the original bill was so badly received by those affected by the legislation. I do not know how those on the other side could vote for these changes. Did they have them for longer? Did they examine them? Did they go to the party room and look at this bill clause by clause in a way that they did not do when the bill was first introduced?

We cannot have confidence that these amendments are any good. We have already heard that they breach the parliament's same question rule and we are required to have an extra vote to make it legal for the amendments to be moved. They so hurriedly brought in amendments to this legislation, which affects not only our farmers but also our gas companies, that they cannot even make them fit with the protocols of parliament, but they are going to make them law this afternoon. This is a disgrace and an embarrassment.

I have spoken with stakeholders on both sides and they were very diligent and caring. In some cases they had been in this process for so long that they were involved in the drafting of the original legislation 10 years ago. They will rightly be disgusted by the arrogance of the Deputy Premier in throwing these amendments at us and at his lack of understanding of the process.

A billboard was erected with a clear message: 'LNP keep your promises'. A picture of this billboard has already been tabled, so I will not table it again. People should go and have a look at the picture that the member for Woodridge tabled. It should be read by everyone involved in this process. The LNP do not keep their promises and they have let down not only the people of the Condamine but also the resources companies in this state.

 **Hon. PT WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (4.49 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. At the outset, let me say that every time this issue is the subject of proposed legislative change or amendment it raises heightened tensions and strong opinions from landowners, resource companies and lobby groups, both for and against the proposed position.

In my time in this House I have seen a number of attempts to address the complexities of this issue, and there were a number before that. This time was no different. As I just stated, the competing interests of landowners who have farmed the black soil plains of the Central Downs for generations and the gas companies that are looking to extract gas from beneath the farmlands and a shallow aquifer known as the Condamine Alluvium is a very complex issue to solve. This is a highly valued water source for agriculture and regional towns. The value that this resource contributes to grain and cotton crops is what underpins the viability of many properties and regional towns.

Gas has been extracted in Queensland, predominantly Western Queensland, for many years. Let me state here that I am not anti gas and never have been—quite the opposite. Gas has played a very important role in our energy security and will for a long time to come. It has already injected jobs and revenue into many of our region's towns.

For those farming on the Downs, this industry only became an issue around 2006 when activities were approved in the Dalby and Chinchilla areas under then premier Anna Bligh. The behaviour of the resource company, particularly in those early days, left a lot to be desired. During the term of the

Campbell Newman government, ministers Jeff Seeney and Andrew Cripps introduced legislation to address the inequity that landowners were suffering. Central to that suite of legislation was the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014. Not everyone was or is a fan of the regional interest development approval provisions that were included in that act. That was again on display with this bill. Some claim it is complicated, onerous and difficult to navigate during the negotiation process while trying to reach an access agreement, and all of that is correct, but that is the very reason it works. While a number of proposals have been put forward to replace it, as in this case, nothing has stood the test or garnered the support of affected landowners as a suitable replacement.

When this bill was introduced and referred to the Primary Industries and Resources Committee, it quickly became apparent that removing RIDA provisions was not supported by landowners on the Central Downs and many other stakeholders. I followed the committee process closely and attended the public hearing in Dalby. During that hearing we heard from the Western Downs Regional Council that they also held concerns that if the RIDA provisions were removed it would affect the priority living areas included in the RIDA provisions. It was interesting to hear from landowner Ian Hayllor, who has a conduct and compensation agreement with Arrow. He stated it was his belief that if it were not for the RIDA provisions then negotiation of his CCA would have been much more difficult.

At the conclusion of the committee hearings it was clear to me that the RIDA provisions needed to remain in legislation. I conveyed my thoughts to the committee chair, the member for Burnett Stephen Bennett, Deputy Premier Jarrod Bleijie and Premier David Crisafulli that the bill needed to be amended to reflect the concerns raised by many submitters. The Deputy Premier agreed and stated that the bill would be amended to reflect the concerns raised and the section of the bill removing the RIDA provisions would be removed. I thank the Deputy Premier for responding to public feedback and making this amendment. I also thank committee members, particularly the committee chair Stephen Bennett, for the strong recommendations in the committee report.

One of the reasons for removing the RIDA provisions was so that the resource holder Arrow could enter into a CCA with a landowner and not be subject to a RIDA process. They could self-assess that they had met the conditions of a RIDA. They well may have, and indeed probably did. The problem was that, while the landowner where the drilling and wells would be placed had a CCA, the adjoining landowners did not and could well be impacted by the activities next door.

The changes in this bill address that. One of the advancements in drilling and extraction methods is a method called directional drilling. This enables the driller to drill a well that goes laterally for some hundreds of metres. This reduces the need for the number of well heads where the gas is returned, which in turn reduces the footprint the resource holder needs. It is a great advancement, but the adjoining landowners who have these directional wells do not have a CCA, so they are sharing any subsidence risk but are excluded from any compensation agreement. Under this legislation, directional drilling is now an advanced activity and will need agreement and a CCA.

It is recognised and acknowledged by the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment that CSG extraction will cause subsidence on the surface of the land. Included in this legislation is a new CSG induced subsidence framework which clarifies compensation rights for landowners for the first time where CSG subsidence affects agricultural land and productivity. This would establish liability for resource authority holders to compensate landowners located within five kilometres of a petroleum boundary in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area.

There have long been conflicting views about the authenticity of baseline data regarding subsidence, and committee recommendations 4 and 5 go to this point. Recommendation 4 recommends allocating additional resources to OGIA for both water level and quality monitoring and generation of more granular data regarding CSG induced subsidence. It is important to note that this legislation only applies to the mapped area of the Condamine Alluvium included in this legislation. The expanded role of OGIA will come under Minister Ann Leahy, and I will let her address any issues in relation to that. Likewise, Coexistence Queensland will also play an expanded role in the area where conflict between landowners and resource holders arises in attempts to find a resolution before things progress to the Land Court.

As I stated earlier in my contribution, this is an emotive and complicated issue. Everything the LNP has done in government has been to try and correct the failures of those opposite during their terms in government. All of the drilling and wells that we see on the Condamine Alluvium have been approved by those opposite. It has only been the LNP that has tried to restore the balance and give landowners the capacity to have a say about what happens on their own land. I know there are

landowners who do not want gas extraction on their land at all. They would like to see the industry banned on prime agricultural land. Unfortunately, that opportunity has long since passed due to the approvals granted by those opposite.

I have often heard representatives from Arrow bemoan the fact that they have to abide by the strongest provisions of any access regime in the country. I heard those comments again during this process. There is a reason for that. The Condamine Alluvium area is the most high-risk area in the country. I, for one, make no apologies for playing a part in ensuring that any resource authority holder in that area has to abide by the highest standards possible. Once the gas has been extracted the gas company will move on; not so the landowners. This is where they generate their livelihoods, growing the food and fibre that we need. This is their home. In many cases these are generational farms and will continue to be so. This is some of the most valuable farmland in this country, and access to the Condamine Alluvium aquifer makes it even more so.

When a landowner receives notice that a resource company is seeking to extract gas on their property, the first thing that must happen is the negotiation of a conduct and compensation agreement. The resource company will need to access your land, which is the conduct part of the agreement. That could include the number of vehicles on the property at any given time, dust, noise and light, just to name a few. You will need to negotiate an agreement that will minimise that impact.

The landowner will also need to negotiate a compensation agreement, including for the use of land, roads and pipelines that may impact the ability to operate the property as previously. The mere fact that you need to have a CCA means they will have an impact on your life. If that was not the case, you would not need one. I was asked by a journalist if this legislation would please everyone, and I said that is not possible. We can only do the best we can given where the industry is currently at. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr J KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.59 pm): I want to start by congratulating the farmers who put that billboard up in Dalby. How on earth did they find a single billboard left in Queensland that was not covered in the words 'the new Queensland government' as the LNP wasted taxpayers' money on promoting their own incompetence? We have all heard it: 'When the Premier says something, he means it; 'He walks the walk and talks the talk'—blah, blah, blah; we have heard it all—apparently until it comes to keeping the promises he made to the farmers who are impacted by this bill. We know the Premier does not care about the people in the inner city of Brisbane, even though they are his neighbours and he was happy to break his 'no new stadiums' promise, but I thought keeping a promise to one of the core constituencies for his party—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Cease your quarrelling across the chamber, please, Attorney-General and member for McConnel. I will seek some advice. Member for Greenslopes, you are only 48 seconds into your contribution; however, if you could come to the bill that would be good, thank you.

Mr J KELLY: At the core of this bill is the issue of whether promises have been kept, and I would have thought that keeping a promise to one of your core constituencies would be very much at the top of the to-do list for the Premier. Clearly, the Deputy Premier, who has carriage of this bill, did not listen to the farmers—they are supposedly the core of his party—even when they were reminding him of the LNP election commitments. The farmers are now experiencing the full arrogance of this out-of-control Deputy Premier. If he had just listened for a few seconds, the Deputy Premier would have known that this bill's repeal of RIDA was not keeping a promise. Of course, he went beyond not listening and actively excluded the people who were raising concerns from early consultation. I guess when you are the supreme leader you know best.

I want to thank the people who raised concerns and made submissions. The stakeholders made it clear that the RIDA is an important tool for farmers when they are in negotiation with the companies and that this must be kept. It seems the LNP were prepared to promise one thing to get elected but prepared to pull the rug out from under them when it came time to actually deliver for those constituents.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock for a moment, please. Members, there is too much noise in the chamber.

Mr J KELLY: I know they are not interested in listening to the farmers of Queensland, but I hope they are interested in listening to me. Labor supports the addition of a deemed condition to the Environmental Protection Act and a clarified avenue for compensation for landholders affected by

subsidence, but these do not replace the protection the RIDA offers. Before government members go accusing Labor of being all inner-city woke—or one of their many other usual sledges—I think it is important that we hear what some of the locals are saying. The Central Downs Irrigators, when asked whether the bill fulfils the commitment made by the member for Condamine, said—

No. It is, I would say, the opposite. The commitment made by Mr Pat Weir before the election talked to strengthening the Regional Planning Interests Act to ensure that more RIDA assessments would be done for any coal seam gas activity occurring over the Condamine Alluvium. Instead, this bill takes away those critical impact assessment provisions. No, it definitely does not comply with the commitment.

I challenge government members: go out there and call the Central Downs Irrigators a bunch of woke inner-city folks whingeing about something. I am pleased to have put that into the parliamentary record because clearly the Deputy Premier and the LNP do not listen to the Central Downs Irrigators.

The Central Downs Irrigators were not alone in being ignored by the Deputy Premier. Anyone who has had the pleasure of engaging with Jo Sheppard will know that she is definitely one of the sharpest minds in agriculture, and if she and her organisation raise concerns then these are definitely worth listening to. Did that happen here? Absolutely not. We only have to look at what Jo had to say in the public hearing about consultation to know the answer to that. Jo said—

We had such a great opportunity to work together and ground-truth some of the reforms that really would have made a difference. That opportunity I think has been missed. Also, releasing the bill and saying that consultation had occurred with QFF and Cotton Australia and implying that we were happy with the bill has also created some confusion. QFF certainly did not appreciate that.

I want to congratulate the members for Bundaberg, Stretton and Logan for their advocacy and work on this bill. While the farmers will be disgusted by the breaking of a promise, I think they will be equally disgusted by the rushing through of late amendments. This practice demonstrates a pattern of behaviour that displays a contemptuous treatment of this parliament and the people of Queensland, more importantly. It now seems to be standard operating procedure for the LNP. In bill after bill we see amendments rammed through that the community should have had the opportunity to consider and provide feedback on via a full committee process.

The LNP did not keep their promise, they cut their core constituency out of the consultation process on this bill, and then they rammed through amendments that they have no chance to consider to determine if they will even fix the problem the LNP created. No wonder people are abandoning the LNP for One Nation. No amount of labelling inner-city dwellers and their representatives as woke is going to reverse that trend when the LNP continues to misuse the numbers in this chamber to abuse due parliamentary process and, more disgustingly, the people of Queensland.

 **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) (5.05 pm): I rise to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This bill reinforces and enhances environmental water quality safeguards. It also delivers on the Crisafulli government's commitment to prevent long-term detrimental impacts on the water quality of the Condamine Alluvium. The Condamine Alluvium is one of Queensland's most significant aquifers. It underpins some of our most productive agricultural land and supports the livelihoods of regional communities. I note that the member for Logan said he went out there and felt the ground in the Condamine; that would have been his first trip to somewhere like Condamine and certainly anywhere west of the divide.

Protecting this resource is not just an environmental imperative; it is an economic and social imperative too. The Crisafulli government listened. We made a commitment and now we are acting. This bill delivers targeted, practical reforms to strengthen protections, respond to longstanding landholder concerns and improve regulatory certainty for industry. It reflects our government's commitment to sensible resource development and genuine coexistence between resource activities, agriculture and other land uses.

Queensland's resources sector has long operated within a coexistence framework that balances resource development with environmental protection, agricultural productivity and landholder rights. That balance is essential. Economic development cannot come at the expense of our water resources, productive agricultural land or regional communities. Coal seam gas activities are currently regulated through a suite of legislative frameworks—and I was part of developing many of them as the then minister for the environment in the previous LNP government—each with their own objectives and processes. While these frameworks collectively aim to achieve that balance, they have also created complexity. Over time this complexity has led to challenges. Landholders in the Condamine Alluvium have raised concerns about cumulative impacts on groundwater and subsidence risks. At the same

time, industry has faced delays and uncertainty due to duplicative and overlapping approval processes. This has placed strain on all parties and increased tension within regional communities. These reforms respond directly to those challenges.

The bill arises from the Crisafulli government's recognition of the critical importance of the Condamine Alluvium to Queensland's agricultural sector and regional communities. The aquifer supports irrigation, livestock production and domestic water supply. Its long-term integrity is essential to the sustainability of these industries and communities. Stakeholders, including landholders, have expressed clear concerns about the potential impacts of coal seam gas activities on water quality, alongside frustration with the complexity of the current regulatory framework. These concerns are not new. They were raised over many years, but the former Labor government failed to deliver the stronger protections landholders were seeking.

At the last election the Crisafulli government gave Queenslanders a clear commitment on the Condamine Alluvium: require gas companies to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that new coal seam gas projects would not have a long-term detrimental impact on the alluvium. Unlike those opposite, we have not ignored the issue or pushed it into the too-hard basket. This bill delivers on that commitment through a coordinated and targeted set of regulatory reforms that strengthen protections while improving clarity and efficiency. It is the difference between talking about a problem and actually fixing it.

The bill amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to introduce a new deemed condition for coal seam gas activities in the prescribed Condamine Alluvium coal seam gas area, and I hear that even those opposite support this. The deemed condition requires resource companies to ensure water quality remains consistent with the established water quality objectives for the region. Importantly, the environmental values and water quality objectives are already well defined under the Environmental Protection (Water and Wetland Biodiversity) Policy. This reform ensures they are directly and consistently enforced. Embedding this requirement as a deemed condition removes the need for bespoke conditions on individual authorities. The deemed condition cannot be varied or overridden through environmental approval processes, ensuring clarity, consistency and enforceability across all new coal seam activities. The deemed condition will only apply prospectively. It will not apply to coal seam gas wells approved before commencement, including those approved but not yet drilled. This approach maintains fairness and regulatory certainty and aligns with the government's election commitment, which focused on new development. Existing environmental authorities will continue to operate under their current conditions, which remain enforceable and robust. This is a clear, consistent and enforceable safeguard for the Condamine Alluvium.

Landholders have also consistently raised concerns about subsidence impacts associated with coal seam gas activities. This bill responds directly to these concerns by expanding compensation arrangements to include coal seam gas induced subsidence impacts including where those impacts occur off tenure. This is a significant reform being led by my colleague Minister Last and his Department of Natural Resources and Mines, Manufacturing and Regional and Rural Development. It recognises that impacts are not always confined to tenure boundaries and ensures affected landholders are appropriately compensated. Importantly, the changes strengthen fairness within the coexistence framework and provide landholders with greater confidence that impacts will be recognised and addressed.

To help deliver on this government's election commitment, a map will be prescribed under the Regional Planning Interests Regulation 2014 to help define the geographical area that the amendments will apply to. The map covers the majority of the coal seam gas wells in the broader area as well as priority agricultural areas and strategic cropping areas. It will be published on the Queensland government website so landholders, industry and the community can clearly understand the area covered.

I acknowledge that implementing these reforms effectively is just as important as the reforms themselves, and I note the Primary Industries and Resources Committee's recommendations in this regard. In line with the committee's recommendation, I recognise the importance of ensuring practical guidance material is made available to assist landholders and industry to understand how the proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will operate in practice. Accordingly, my department, with the support of Coexistence Queensland, will ensure clear and accessible guidance is developed and made available to support landholders and tenure holders. The guidance must be practical, it must be accessible and it must be easy to understand. The department will also support the resource industry through environmental authority prelodgement meetings for future development needs, ensuring proponents understand their requirements early.

As the administering agency of the underground water management framework in chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000, the department will also work with relevant agencies to consider options to facilitate the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment providing more granular advice within their remit and in line with the committee's recommendations. The Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment is an independent scientific entity that has provided a key role in supporting coexistence between existing petroleum and gas activities and landholders through information and tools to help landholders understand impacts to their water bores and groundwater. We are committed to continuing these efforts to support ongoing coexistence outcomes.

Importantly, again reflecting the committee's recommendation, my department will work with other relevant agencies to undertake a post-implementation review of these reforms. This review will assess whether the regulatory framework is operating effectively and achieving its intended outcomes, ensuring it is doing exactly what we said it would do.

This bill delivers on a clear election commitment to Queenslanders. It strengthens protections for a critical groundwater resource, it responds to the concerns of regional communities, it improves fairness for landholders and it provides greater certainty for future investment decisions. It demonstrates that strong environmental protection and responsible resource development are not competing activities but can be achieved together through targeted, evidence-based regulation.

The contrast could not be clearer. Labor had a decade to act and left these concerns unresolved. The Crisafulli government made a commitment to Queenslanders and is delivering it. I thank the stakeholders and submitters for their feedback on the bill. I also acknowledge the member for Condamine for his longstanding advocacy on behalf of local landholders and communities. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (5.14 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. How could anyone get this so wrong?

Mr Head: You had to withdraw the legislation.

Ms GRACE: I just heard from the member for Condamine and the member for Mirani and I actually respected their contributions. If only they had limited it to those two who know this stuff backwards, we probably would not be in the mess we are in this evening.

Mr Head: You had to withdraw the bill last time. You had to withdraw the whole bill.

Ms GRACE: This was supposed to be the Crisafulli government delivering on an election promise and true to form, they did not listen to Queenslanders when drafting the bill. It has turned into an absolute shemuzzle. I am not taking any of the interjections from those opposite because it would be embarrassing for those opposite, who represent regional Queensland. They ran roughshod over the communities. They cannot blame anybody but themselves. There is a common thread here with this government: blame anybody but themselves. They blame either the Labor government of the past or the federal government, but they never take responsibility for their homework and the work that they bring into this House. This bill wreaks of arrogance, and they bring it to this House after claiming that they are listening. They have got to be kidding.

This was the Deputy Premier's ham-fisted legislation that ignored the concerns of nearly every stakeholder—landholders, farmers, environmentalists and the general community around the state. I could not believe it—and I agree with the member for Greenslopes. You would be hard-pressed to find a billboard these days that does not have some blue advertising on it basically advertising nothing. I say congratulations to those farmers who paid out of their own pockets for a billboard in Dalby that said, 'LNP, keep your promise'. They were so frustrated and so lacking in trust and confidence that this bill would be amended. No wonder they had to take the action they took. No wonder the Deputy Premier, who made the claim this morning, has callouses on his hands. It was from him going around trying to chop down those billboards because that is how the farmers tried to get their message across. It is unbelievable they had to go to that extent. Had the Deputy Premier even tried to engage with and listen to landholders and farmers in regional Queensland, the very people they claim to represent, he would know that early consultation would have revealed that the QFF had major concerns.

Even the LNP member for Condamine, prior to the 2024 election, made a commitment that resources companies would have to go through a full RIDA process before any drilling could be done on the Condamine Alluvium. This was a very emotive and complicated issue for him, but he made that commitment. What did the Deputy Premier do? He literally ignored the words of the member for Condamine. I can tell honourable members that if that had happened on this side of the House, I would not have ignored him and I would not have ignored the member for Mirani.

Stakeholders including the QFF, Cotton Australia and Coexistence Queensland supported the retention of RIDA, but what does this bill do? It removes it entirely. No wonder many individual landholders cried that they felt betrayed. When referring to the LNP's commitment, they stated—

We were very hopeful that because it had been announced at a public forum that moving forward we would strengthen the RPI Act ...

It is just ridiculous and completely contrary—

these are their words, not mine—

to what our local member has supported and what we thought the LNP was supporting—completely contrary.

Pro-CSG landholder Ian Hayllor said—

... RIDAs have worked and given confidence to landholders.

Peak groups, individual landholders and many stakeholders raised serious concerns around the lack of meaningful consultation. For example, the QFF said—

We had such a great opportunity to work together—

fancy missing that—

and ground-truth some of the reforms that really would have made a difference. That opportunity I think has been missed. Also, releasing the bill and saying that consultation had occurred with QFF and Cotton Australia and implying that we were happy with the bill has also created some confusion. QFF certainly did not appreciate that.

That is an extraordinary statement from what is supposed to be the government's heartland. This is a common theme this government is adopting, not only when introducing bills into this House—for example the e-mobility bill, and what a debacle that was—but also when major infrastructure is being undertaken in communities such as the 'no new stadium' in Victoria Park. To date that has been absolutely lacking in any genuine and meaningful community consultation. We see this as a trend in this bill with the arrogance of the Deputy Premier. They say that old habits die hard, and this is so true when referring to the Deputy Premier, who is once again displaying all of the old habits from when he was last in government over 10 years ago of being drunk on power—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member, you are beginning to stray. I would ask you to come back to the bill before the House.

Ms GRACE:—not listening because he knows best and ramming through major changes. Such major changes, like those contained in this bill, require genuine consultation that an open and transparent government would have undertaken. As I said, I would have listened to those members opposite who have spoken passionately and even the member for Burnett, who I think did a very good job in chairing the committee and bringing this bill back to where it should have been in the beginning had consultation occurred. I have even had my constituents write to me regarding this bill. Lauren said—

I was relieved to see that the Primary Industries and Resources Committee have listened to the unanimous voices of agriculture and the community and have recommended that the Regional Planning Interests Act provisions remain in place for the Condamine Alluvium area—a precious aquifer that sits under the best agricultural land in Queensland. That said, it was extremely disappointing to see this proposed by the Crisafulli government in the first place.

She continued—

A failure to address this issue will result in an unacceptable risk to the food and water security of our future generations. Now is the time to Act.

This was from Gayle, who simply requested—

Vote NO or at least, advocate for more amendment to this poorly drafted Bill.

Let me be clear: the RIDA is an important negotiating tool for farmers and landholders and must be kept. We will not let the rug be pulled out from under them with this bill. We support the inclusion of the deemed condition to the Environmental Protection Act and a clarified avenue for compensation for landholders affected by subsidence, but alone these do not address the removal of the protections that the RIDA offers.

Amendments have not been scrutinised because they have only just been circulated in this House. We have been guillotined in the amount of time to consider those amendments in consideration in detail, and this is another trend coming from the government. I think we are going to be restricted to about 10 minutes for consideration in detail on these very important amendments. This is happening in debates for every piece of legislation and we say that, like in this bill, this is restricting the ability for us

to scrutinise amendments that have just been brought into the House at the eleventh hour and is preventing us from having the opportunity to ask questions and clarify these amendments on behalf of all stakeholders who made submissions on the bill.

There is also another amendment, to the South Bank Corporation Act, that has absolutely nothing to do with this legislation and has been brought in at the last minute. It provides that any officer can be removed from the board at any time for no reason—no reason at all, just gone. We wonder why that has been put into the amendments without any scrutiny either. It is important that the processes of parliament allow us to scrutinise these amendments. I cannot remember the last bill before this House where the opposition had an opportunity with enough time to actually scrutinise the amendments. They have been guillotined in every single situation. This bill should have provided an important opportunity to allow that to happen. Congratulations to the farmers in Dalby who stood up to this government. Congratulations to those who would not take this bill lying down, because this bill reeks of a lack of consultation, no transparency and a lack of understanding of the needs of all of the stakeholders who came forward.



Mr HEAD (Callide—LNP) (5.24 pm): It is clear that those opposite need a history lesson. I do not know what to think, actually. They come in here and make out that they care about farmers, but we know that that will not last the second they have control of the reins in Queensland again—and hopefully that does not come for a very long time. Why are we here today? Let us go back to the Beattie and Bligh governments that were pushing this development in the first place and steamrolling landholders. It took an LNP government, under then deputy premier Seeney and then resources minister Andrew Cripps, to fix their mess by bringing in not only the RPI Act—those opposite are suddenly fixated on that tonight, but it was an LNP policy brought to this parliament—but also the GasFields Commission. The GasFields Commission was set up to deal with the coexistence—or complete lack thereof—that was driven by those opposite and which drove a huge wedge through the communities that I now represent. I was in school at the time. There were rallies and protests. There were people crying in the streets over the damage those opposite were doing in our communities. I find it appalling that they come in here and make out that they care about these communities, given their history with this policy.

When it comes to subsidence and the Condamine Alluvium, I note that those opposite are fixated on one part of the bill. Yes, it is an important part of the bill and I appreciate the feedback and the work that the committee has done with regard to the Condamine Alluvium; however, when looking at the great work that has been done, the bill fixes issues with subsidence. I am an ideological property rights purist if I can be, and that is my default. One of the key reasons I am here is my defence of property rights, and time and again I defend property rights. If members want to see some great work in improving property rights when it comes to coexistence issues and the competing property rights between the resource sector and the primary industries sector they should look no further than the changes we are making here to property rights with regard to subsidence on the Condamine Alluvium.

Recognising subsidence as a compensatable effect is one of those changes contained in the bill providing off-tenure compensation and bringing deviated wells as an advanced activity so that those who have gas wells drilled under their properties can negotiate with gas companies before that happens, rather than just getting a notice in the mail and it happening anyway. There is now a process in which those gas companies have to be transparent and work with those landholders. Those are significant changes in principle from the status quo and something that I was proud to be advocating for in the early days of this legislation. It is known that originally fixing subsidence was something that the resources team at large was trying to do and there was a lot of work done, but then of course there was the planning bill to meet the election commitments. The planning team took that forward and there are great parts of this legislation that they have followed through on, and those are some of those key changes. That is why there is a majority of support for many of the changes in this bill, and we are now here to fix the parts of the bill that there were concerns with.

This is important legislation that rights the wrongs of the past. I want to commend the member for Condamine for his advocacy for those communities in making sure that this was followed through and that we are getting the changes the community wants. However, it is incredibly hard to get the balance right, especially when you factor in the history from those opposite when they botched the subsidence bill that they brought in here. We have this bill and, yes, we are making amendments, but we did not have to pull out a whole section of a bill and abandon it. That is what those opposite had to do because of how much they botched the work they did. If those opposite want to talk about a lack of consultation and want to look at bad legislation then they should look no further than that, because this is an incredibly complex issue and it is highly technical.

When it comes to subsidence, when it comes to water quality in the Condamine Alluvium and when it comes to the legislative framework, there is a multitude of rules in terms of the technical experts you need to lean on. I commend OGIA for the work they have done, and I commend the work of all of the department officials—some I worked with early on in the piece. They did great work in respect of this legislation and getting it to where we have today and fixing the wrongs of the past.

One of the reasons this is such a hard issue to navigate is that there are those out there who want to lock the gate—they do not want to see the industry—but, as the member for Condamine said, that horse has bolted. Every well that has been approved out in that region was actually approved by a Labor government. In some ways that surprises me because there is not much economic development those members opposite have supported over time, but when they have in my part of the world—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, I hate to interrupt you but, it being 5.30 pm, I ask that you now move that the debate be adjourned.

Debate, on motion of Mr Head, adjourned.

MOTION

Energy



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

That this House:

1. notes the vast resources of uranium in Queensland;
2. notes that world demand for uranium is forecast to triple by 2040;
3. calls on the government to end the policy of no mining or exporting of uranium in Queensland, opening an economic windfall for Queensland and potential future nuclear energy industry;
4. notes the rapid expansion of wind energy developments across Queensland and the absence of legislated requirements to guarantee the full rehabilitation, decommissioning and restoration of affected land at the end of a project's operational life; and
5. calls on the government to introduce legislation establishing a rigorous approval, financial assurance, rehabilitation, and decommissioning framework for wind energy developments, including enforceable obligations to remove infrastructure, rehabilitate sites and restore land to an agreed condition upon project closure.

I begin tonight by talking about the first part of the motion that revolves around the uranium mining industry and the potential for nuclear to be built off the back of that. Then the motion talks about having things in place for wind farms and proper provisions being made for the decommissioning of wind farms.

Firstly, I would like to talk about uranium mining. Uranium is a \$15 billion to \$19 billion industry that is untapped at the moment—and that is the uranium that we know about in Australia. A great deal of that is in Queensland. Queensland is the only state in Australia with known uranium reserves that does not allow uranium mining. You can do it in Western Australia and you can do it in South Australia at Olympic Dam, but you are not allowed to do it in Queensland. I am yet to hear the rational arguments against uranium mining in Queensland, other than not wanting to mine uranium in Queensland because of the antiquated 'No Nukes' campaign of 30 years ago. That seems to have disappeared, so here we are.

The World Nuclear Association now forecasts a tripling of demand for uranium by 2040. It is an industry that will go ahead. There will be further demand for it. The question is: do we want to participate in it like the rest of the world and like other states in Australia or do we deny the residents and taxpayers of Queensland the ability to benefit from an industry that is there? If we do not, it is really important that we explain the reasons we would deny them that opportunity. That is pretty much the reason we are in this parliament—that is, to air these issues, to see where we all stand and to properly articulate the reasons we would deny people this opportunity.

Data centres are becoming a big thing around the world. It is a fast-growing, emerging industry that is power hungry. It needs high energy density. That has led to the trend globally of asking: what will energy source can provide high base load with a lot of torque and a lot of energy density? That has led everyone to uranium and nuclear power. India has recently been in the media saying that they are looking to Australia to access the uranium to power their data centres. President Modi is visiting Australia in July to seek more Australian uranium so there is a big opportunity for Queensland to engage on that basis. In 2023, 22 world leaders, led by the French leader, said that they would triple nuclear generation by 2050. Twenty-two world leaders think it is a good idea but we do not.

The New South Wales upper house passed a bill May 2026 to lift their uranium mining ban in. That is very interesting because it is the first time in a long time that any such legislation has been passed in Australian parliaments. This gives further evidence of the trend towards nuclear and, by default, uranium mining. Canada announced just yesterday that it will build 10 more reactors. There is further evidence of a growing global demand for the products that we can produce.

In the Mount Isa region we have 80,000 tonnes of contained uranium metal. There are roughly 51,000 tonnes at Valhalla—about 40 kilometres from my house in Mount Isa—and about 20,000 tonnes at Westmoreland, which is a further away up in the gulf. There has been no uranium mining in Queensland since 1982. In 2012 there was—

Mr Stevens: Mary Kathleen.

Mr KATTER: I will take that interjection. Mary Kathleen is right near my home. Thank you, member. In 2012, there was support from the LNP. I am the only MP on the record in this House mentioning it before that. Hats off and full credit to the LNP back in 2012 that they moved to make it lawful to mine uranium but there were still regulations around transport that needed to be made. They were—you might say sat on—worked on for three years and they never came into effect. That change really never had any material effect. It was then wound back by Labor in 2015.

(Time expired)



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

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

- '1. Notes the vast natural resources at Queensland's disposal powering our state's electricity network, delivering economic uplift across regional and rural Queensland and providing vital jobs all over the state.
2. Notes global demand for Queensland's natural resources to be mined and exported, including coal, gas, and critical minerals.
3. Expresses its support for the Crisafulli LNP government Energy Roadmap which is delivering cheaper electricity prices, with reductions of between nearly seven per cent and 10 per cent for households and between eight per cent and 14 per cent for small businesses, through the Energy Roadmap price drop.
4. Notes the practical, pragmatic and credible approach taken by the Crisafulli government through the Energy Roadmap in delivering affordable, reliable and sustainable energy through coal generation for longer, additional dispatchable supply including gas turbines, and a responsible and commonsense uptake of renewable energy.
5. Expresses its support for the legislative changes made through the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025 which has delivered a rigorous impact assessable approval framework to renewable energy projects to ensure communities are consulted and can have their say on renewable energy projects, rather than being taken for granted, in line with the election commitment made by the Crisafulli LNP government.
6. Notes the State Development Assessment Provisions state code 23 outlines processes for the rehabilitation and decommissioning of wind energy developments.'

Future prosperity will not be built on a single technology, a single industry or a single project. It will be built on a balanced approach that harnesses the full breadth of Queensland's natural resources and economic strengths. Around the world, nations are searching for secure and reliable sources of critical minerals. We are blessed in Queensland to have an abundance of critical mineral deposits, particularly in the North West Minerals Province, which is centred on the seat held by the member for Traeger. Vanadium, cobalt, rare earths, graphite and other minerals which are essential to modern manufacturing, advanced technologies, defence industries and global supply chains are not just rocks in the ground; they are the ticket to us strengthening our sovereign capabilities. That is why in the 2026-27 budget, the Crisafulli government is investing \$146 million to unlock these critical minerals. This investment recognises that Queensland has an opportunity not only to mine the commodities that the world needs but also to build the industries, supply chains and regional economies that will support our state for decades to come.

It is why the Crisafulli government, in conjunction with the federal government, saved the Mount Isa copper smelter and the Townsville refinery, protecting more than 600 direct jobs. We recognise that the future of Queensland's critical minerals industry and the future of Mount Isa are intrinsically linked. That is why this government has backed the Mount Isa Transformation Study which is taking place at the time. It is why the Crisafulli government is undertaking one of the most significant geoscience initiatives in regional Queensland with the largest geophysical aerial survey across the North West Minerals Province carried out to map out critical minerals. It is also why the Crisafulli government saved CopperString, despite cost blowouts from the former Labor government, because we understand that you need to put a tick in the two boxes of energy and water when it comes to getting these projects off the ground.

That is why the Crisafulli government saved an Australia-first critical minerals facility in Townsville when we stepped in to right Labor's budget blowouts on the Queensland Resources Common User Facility. The Crisafulli government has delivered nation-leading reforms that ensure renewable energy projects are properly assessed, communities are genuinely consulted and local benefits are secured from the outset. The reality is that the Crisafulli government is delivering a balanced resources agenda that supports jobs, strengthens our regional communities and drives economic growth. It is why we have a Resources Cabinet Committee in this state—to drive that investment, to streamline the approval process, to cut the red tape. Already we are seeing the work of that subcommittee coming to fruition in this state. It has been very well received by our resources sector. We have seen companies like Graphinex, EZ Resources and RZ Resources moving into that critical minerals space, providing those minerals that the world so desperately needs. We will continue to develop the resources sector in this state, particularly in the area of critical minerals.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (5.40 pm): I rise in strong support of the motion moved by the member for Traeger. Australia has the largest uranium deposits in the world. Queensland has not mined uranium since 1982, despite possessing some of the largest uranium deposits in Australia. The Mount Isa region alone contains the third-largest uranium deposits in Australia, with an estimated value of between \$15 billion and \$19 billion. These resources remain buried in the ground because of political ideology. That is a lot of hospitals, roads and schools.

While Queensland refuses to lift an outdated ban on uranium mining, other nations are at full speed ahead and laughing at our stupidity. The World Nuclear Association forecast that global uranium demand will triple by 2040. India is actively seeking Australia's uranium supply to help power its economy, Belgium and South Korea have reversed plans to phase out nuclear power and Canada has just announced plans for additional nuclear reactors. America has deemed uranium as a critical mineral. Even New South Wales has moved legislation through its upper house to lift restrictions on uranium exploration and development. The rest of the world is confronting reality. They realise they need reliable baseload power, energy security and power generation that is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week—not only when the sun comes up or when the wind blows.

In 2026 there was a visit to Brisbane from the USS *Ronald Reagan* battleship. MPs in this House went on that ship and were briefed on its operation. It was discovered from that briefing that this was a nuclear powered battleship which had enough uranium fuel on board to power the ship for the next 20 years with zero emissions. Why is the green movement not onto this? Non-nuclear battleships require constant refuelling, burning enormous amounts of fossil fuel, yet with nuclear powered ships there are zero emissions.

The rapid growth of artificial intelligence is creating an energy demand that unreliable wind and solar cannot deliver. While the government refuse to allow uranium mining, they continue to approve enormous wind farms across regional Queensland with little regard for what happens prior to and at the end of their shelf life. I stood alongside the people of Ravenshoe and the wider Atherton Tablelands in opposition to the proposed Chalumbin wind farm. This project was originally proposed with 200 turbines, with blades the largest in the Southern Hemisphere. What locals could never understand was the double standards. Decades ago the Tully-Millstream hydro-electric scheme was killed because of protesters voicing concerns associated with the Wet Tropics World Heritage area. It would have delivered 600 megawatts of power, saved \$400 million in electricity generation and transmission losses and powered up to 175,000 homes. That was clean energy. They put a stop to that, yet somehow a giant, foreign owned wind farm proposed right next door at the same World Heritage listed rainforest was considered acceptable. Those same protesters that fought Tully hydro were nowhere to be seen. Apparently, if it is called renewable energy in Queensland the normal rules no longer apply.

Chalumbin exposed a much bigger problem: Queensland still has no dedicated statutory rehabilitation scheme for wind farms. There is no framework that guarantees the state, landowners or local communities will not be left holding the bill when these projects reach the end of their lives. Every mining project in Queensland is required to provide financial insurance and rehabilitation obligations, yet some wind farms have been given a free pass.

This motion simply asks the current government to do what the previous government should have done years ago: ensure wind farm developers are held to the same standards of accountability that apply to other major developments by introducing proper approval, rehabilitation, decommissioning and financial insurance requirements. The motion also asks the current government to unlock Queensland's uranium resources and allow regional Queensland to share in the economic benefits of a booming global industry. I commend the motion moved by the member for Traeger to the House.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 37:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

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

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 37:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

1. Notes the vast natural resources at Queensland's disposal powering our state's electricity network, delivering economic uplift across regional and rural Queensland and providing vital jobs all over the state.
2. Notes global demand for Queensland's natural resources to be mined and exported, including coal, gas, and critical minerals.
3. Expresses its support for the Crisafulli LNP government Energy Roadmap which is delivering cheaper electricity prices, with reductions of between nearly seven per cent and 10 per cent for households and between eight per cent and 14 per cent for small businesses, through the Energy Roadmap price drop.
4. Notes the practical, pragmatic and credible approach taken by the Crisafulli government through the Energy Roadmap in delivering affordable, reliable and sustainable energy through coal generation for longer, additional dispatchable supply including gas turbines, and a responsible and commonsense uptake of renewable energy.
5. Expresses its support for the legislative changes made through the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025 which has delivered a rigorous impact assessable approval framework to renewable energy projects to ensure communities are consulted and can have their say on renewable energy projects, rather than being taken for granted, in line with the election commitment made by the Crisafulli LNP government.
6. Notes the State Development Assessment Provisions state code 23 outlines processes for the rehabilitation and decommissioning of wind energy developments.

REGIONAL PLANNING INTERESTS (CONDAMINE ALLUVIUM) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1994, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be now read a second time.



Mr HEAD (Callide—LNP) (5.52 pm), continuing: I have been giving those opposite a bit of a history lesson because it is clear that quite lot of them need it. Another thing those opposite botched has come to mind—that is, the Linc Energy debacle near Chinchilla. That was another matter relating to the resources sector where those opposite were steamrolling communities and it took an LNP

government to fix. There is a very long list of issues in rural and regional Queensland that those opposite made a mess of and that it took an LNP government to fix. Here we are again, fixing another Labor mess.

I proudly support the gas sector. It provides an important contribution to this state and this nation. I think in the realm of 60,000 jobs contribute to the Queensland economy thanks to the gas sector. Some do not support the gas industry. Some want to lock the gate. What I would say is that respect for landholders goes a long way and we have to get the balance right. When it comes to this sort of legislation, there will always be those who oppose everything we do if we do not go so far as to shut the whole industry down. In some of the rallies and protests that those opposite have been referencing, farmers used machinery to spell out the words 'no gas'. I table this photo for the parliamentary record to show what some people in the community were talking about.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the words 'No Gas' marked on rural land [\[1085\]](#).

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): There is way too much chatter. Break it down a bit, thank you.

Mr HEAD: As the member for Condamine very well articulated, that horse has long bolted. If you have a lock-the-gate approach, I am sorry but we cannot deliver on that and we will not because we also need to ensure we continue to develop the economy.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cooper, that was not an invitation for you to keep chattering. I asked for some silence, please.

Mr HEAD: At the end of the day, fixing this was always going to make it harder for the gas industry. Through conversations had as part of this process, those in the gas industry knew that and recognised that. They realised that they had to come on the journey. That shows how seriously we take these issues, the issues of property rights and the issues of protecting prime agricultural land across rural and regional Queensland.

On the surface, subsidence is pretty straightforward but, as I was saying before, the matters that we are dealing with are highly technical from both a scientific perspective and a legal one with regard to the levels, the frameworks and overlapping legislation. You have various different aspects of legislation. I am going to run out of time before I can go into them. I want to thank OGIA for their work. In Queensland, we have some of the best hydrogeologists in the world who have been part of this overall process and have been doing a lot of great work to ensure the Condamine Alluvium is protected for future generations. When it comes to subsidence, you have not only the issue of subsidence but also the noise that comes through black soil, swelling clays, seasonal variations and everything like that. That is all part and parcel of it, which is why we need to draw back to science and data when making these decisions and lean in to the technical expertise that we have in Queensland.

I want to thank all of those who gave their time to the committee process and to the process led by the planning team and the resources team. Historically a lot of time was, frankly, wasted trying to participate in the process when it came to the subsidence legislation that we saw in the parliament in the previous term under those opposite. A lot of voluntary time is given by people such as representatives from Property Rights Australia, the Central Downs Irrigators or some of the other agriculture bodies—some of which have paid representatives but some of them are volunteers—and of course from the resources sector as well. A lot of people have dedicated a lot of time to get to where we are today. This is another step in the journey of genuine coexistence and protecting property rights while also enabling an industry to succeed in this state.

I know in the future there will be more legislation to deal with other issues in this part of the world or across the state when it comes to the competing rights of private landholders and the resource rights owned by Queenslanders at large, which was a decision that was made over 100 years ago. Unfortunately, that is one that will likely stay. This is good legislation and it protects property rights.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (5.58 pm): I was lucky enough to be on the committee that examined this bill. I attended the public hearings and I have had a lot of interaction with stakeholders. In preparation for this debate, I read with interest the explanatory notes, which state that the bill will 'require gas companies to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects would not have a detrimental, long-term impact on the Condamine Alluvium ... used for agricultural purposes'. That is a good message that was well received. However, having looked back through the evidence and from what I have observed through the inquiry, I feel that it is more of a slogan than something that is meaningful. I would like to expand on that in this contribution.

The big focus of all of this was the RIDA process and all agreed that it cannot go. Many said that it is not good enough and that it falls well short of protecting landholders. I align with that and, from the farmers' point of view, would say that this was a missed opportunity, but the RIDA process at least gives us some barrier. As has been said countless times throughout this debate, even the gas companies themselves are saying that they do not want it to go.

While it was curious, I do not really care what the motivations were. I would go so far as to commend the government for backing down, as I would any previous government. If we are landing in the right place then who cares how we got there as long as we are there? Mind you, I do not think it is in the right place. I think it started from a very low baseline in terms of protecting farmers and we have returned to that low baseline. We are still falling well short of what we should be doing to try to repair the power imbalance in the negotiations between the gas companies and the farmers. That was a common comment made by farmers who really do not want the gas companies in their areas.

I agree it is a very complicated mix. I do not agree that the horse has bolted. That is a bit of a defeatist argument or a good way to get out of doing something. It would be very challenging but certainly not impossible legislatively to turn this around or to block places like the Condamine Alluvium.

We heard from many farmers—I particularly mention Bev Newton; we spent time on her place—saying that RIDA needs to be strengthened. We were talking about the Condamine Alluvium. One of the points made was that priority agricultural area is 2.8 per cent of Queensland. The Condamine Alluvium is only 11 per cent of that 2.8 per cent. There is this enormous imperative that we must still get gas out of the ground: 'It is so big for our economy.' I would like to talk more on that later. We are saying that it is so important, but the proposition was put, 'Why couldn't you just leave the Condamine Alluvium alone through this? It is 11 per cent of 2.8 per cent of Queensland. Surely there are other areas they can go to get their gas.' I thought that was a really well-made point.

One of the advocates for the industry, one of the farmers who has embraced it and is doing really well from it, said, 'This is great because it helps prop up our business and we can wear the bad news.' That is not a bad thing and not a reason not to do it, but basing your whole business model around these wells which have an estimated life of 20 to 30 years—those farms are going to be there a hell of a lot longer than those wells. To say this is all great because you get a sugar hit through the 20 or 30 years—you might build the whole farm business around having that income but then, poof, it is gone—is not necessarily a sustainable way to do this. That is worth considering as well.

One of the previous speakers talked about history. I thought it was a pretty generous interpretation to their own political benefit. It is true that Labor rolled this out and made all of the decisions, but I think it is unfair to characterise the LNP as a white knight coming in and pushing back on this. It is quite the opposite, in my experience. It came in in 2012. You could argue that some better things were put in place, like this RIDA process, to help with that interaction, but I do not think it went anywhere near restoring the balance. I strongly maintain that view. We have been consistent on that during our time here.

The other side of the argument, as said by people who were users of gas and used to benefit from our competitive gas advantage, is that the original intention was to have one LNG train in Gladstone. They could not work things out, so they ended up building three. In order to keep all three viable, they had to pump as much gas as they could out of the ground. They became a lot more aggressive in putting this pin cushion of holes right through places like the Condamine Alluvium, trying to extract enough gas out of the ground to keep the volume going through the LNG plants to keep it all viable lest they pay penalties for not supplying as per the overseas offtake agreements.

We did not have a gas reserve policy when this was all being negotiated, which was under Labor, I will grant them. There was nothing negotiated to that point, which was a terrible error in judgement politically and one we will pay the price for until we get a gas reserve policy in Queensland. It meant they had to more aggressively chase after the gas. That is where the tension lies. That is very relevant to this debate. The Newtons are saying, 'Well, we don't want you here. We never wanted you here.' There is a hell of a lot of momentum from government and all of the interested parties, like the commentary I just heard in the latter contribution, saying, 'It is too important. The horse has bolted. This is a big part of our industry.' A big part of our industry? There are arguments the gas industry—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Member for Traeger, a moment ago you used an unparliamentary comment. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr KATTER: Yes, I did. I withdraw. There was an economic report saying that, because we sell off our competitive advantage, for every dollar made from gas exports it costs us \$21. Is it so important that we keep progressing with this? Of course it has had some benefit, but no-one has counted the cost

of what we have gone without in the industry, what has been forgone from not having a competitive gas market. Mount Isa used to have gas at three to four dollars a gigajoule. It jumped up to \$30 a gigajoule, but everyone is patting themselves on the back because it has gone down to \$15. That is still five times more than it used to cost. Multiply that by every business in Australia that was accessing LNG. That is what you have from this industry. Yes, you have some jobs and some royalties but at what cost?

I know I am departing from the actual intention of the farmers with regard to the coal seam gas wells, but that is what this whole industry was predicated on. I think the whole concept from the start was ill-conceived if you are looking at a sovereign government approach on this, but here we are.

The last bit remaining is the onus of proof. This is where I said that part of the explanatory notes is just a slogan. If I am a farmer and I have to prove I am trying to reach an agreement, going through the RIDA process, it is up to me to prove damage has been done.

I applaud the government for including directional drilling—that is good—but the farmers still have to prove what the damage is. They have to spend the money on the underground water. One stakeholder said 200 grand; another said 800 grand. They have to bear that cost to even get to the starting line to argue with the gas companies. Guess who is going to win there? Who is going to take them on? That is where the power imbalance is. I do not know a good way to address that, but you cannot say it is all fixed. I grant you it is tricky, but after we pass this bill there will remain a massive imbalance to the farmers.

There was a lot of talk about OGIA. A lot of people said that the tool used by OGIA is great but not when trying to use it on a farm where damage has been done. One of the contributors, farmer Russell Bennie, said—

On a regional basis it is okay, but on a farm area it is utterly useless.

That came from a number of stakeholders. Russell Bennie went on to say—

It is like trying to write cursive with a Nikko pen: it is not fit for purpose.

It is on the farmers to do all of the studies themselves to prove it, to even get to the starting line to seek adequate compensation, not to mention all of the other impacts of biosecurity with weeds and all that comes along with that. It is hard to measure.

Another interesting point raised was that one of the farmers said, 'It is really great. We benefit from this. We are laser levelling every two to three years and we don't see any subsidence.' Other farmers said they were getting to it every eight or 10 years. Isn't that interesting? The farmers who can afford to do it more often because they are receiving money from the gas are not noticing subsidence, but those who cannot are seeing the subsidence. This bill does not go far enough.

 **Hon. A LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers) (6.08 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Let me first extend my thanks to the members of the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for their consideration of the legislation. I also wish to thank the committee for travelling to Dalby in my electorate to engage with residents and stakeholders as well as taking the opportunity to do site visits to the region. I know that the community greatly appreciate people going on farm to see their properties and to walk in the shoes of those farmers.

I also acknowledge the work that the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment—otherwise known as OGIA—has done for the CSG industry and the ongoing work it does across the Surat Basin. I note that the committee stated it was clear that the data generated by OGIA is widely used despite the recognised limitations on its ability to capture farm-level impacts. OGIA certainly does a power of work, and OGIA was set up by a former LNP government.

This bill delivers more than the LNP's key election commitment. That commitment was to protect the Condamine Alluvium, following the decade of decline under Labor. The bill also strengthens the property rights of and introduces new compensation provisions for landholders, helping underpin genuine coexistence in the area.

It is important to note for the benefit of the House that successive Labor governments failed to implement meaningful legislative protections for the Condamine Alluvium area. They overlooked the concerns of local communities and regional landholders and took no effective action to safeguard this vital water aquifer. The former Labor government did introduce the Mineral and Energy Resources and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2024, which included a proposed management framework for coal

seam gas induced subsidence, but the then committee recommended further consultation on that framework and, as a result, the subsidence management provisions were removed from the bill. Labor put all of the stakeholders, including people in my electorate, through the whole committee consultation process only to withdraw the sections of the bill that were relevant to subsidence. All Labor have done for these stakeholders is waste their time, and that is so disappointing.

Members from the other side of the House come in here and whinge and whine about the debate time. They had the opportunity when they served in government. They had the opportunity to sort this out when they actually had legislation in this House, but they failed to act. Unlike Labor's decade of decline and neglect, the Crisafulli government is acting, and we have listened very carefully to the stakeholders.

The bill before the House amends the Environmental Protection Act, the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act and the Regional Planning Interests Act. It will require gas companies to demonstrate beyond reasonable doubt that new projects will not have any detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium. Importantly, the bill will protect the quality of the water in the Condamine Alluvium—and that is very important—by introducing a deemed condition under the Environmental Protection Act. This new condition will apply to environmental authorities for all new coal seam gas wells in the designated Condamine Alluvium CSG area and will prohibit the release of contaminants into the aquifer where this would result in detrimental long-term impacts.

The bill also directly addresses landholder concerns by expanding the compensation arrangements for the CSG induced subsidence impacts, particularly where there are directional drills. This includes the introduction of a new off-tenure compensation liability. This is a very significant reform. Landholders have not previously had access to the additional compensation provision, and I know it will provide confidence to many who have raised this issue directly with me.

The committee tabled its report on Friday, 8 May 2026 and it included seven recommendations. The amendments that will be proposed during the consideration in detail stage will respond to the stakeholder feedback and the committee's recommendations.

The Crisafulli government has listened carefully to the stakeholders, who have made it clear that the regional interests development approval—RIDA—process is important to providing certainty, transparency and appropriate safeguards for activities within the priority agricultural areas of the Condamine Alluvium, and most of the Condamine Alluvium will be under those priority agricultural areas. Stakeholders consistently emphasise that the RIDA process is a valued mechanism to ensure the impacts of CSG activities on key regional assets, including agricultural land and water resources, are properly assessed.

The feedback that was given to me from constituents is that they were very keen to have those RIDA processes retained. In response to the feedback, the RIDA processes will be retained within the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. This delivers on the community expectations for transparency. It strengthens the confidence in how the cumulative and long-term impacts of CSG activities are assessed.

This is a government that listens to regional communities. We have listened very carefully to them. We have listened to their feedback. I know that the member for Callide has been out there and met with many of the people who have put forward submissions to this bill. I know that he has been out there on the ground. This bill is an example of how we have listened and how we have strengthened the proposals in this legislation. What is proposed in this bill will form a robust, multilayered regulatory system that will work to protect vital natural assets in Queensland communities.

The Queensland government will undertake a post-implementation review to ensure the framework remains effective, responsive and aligned to the commitment to protect the Condamine Alluvium. That is particularly important because it is extremely complex to deal with the water quality, the subsidence issues and the coal seam gas industry in the Condamine Alluvium. There is nothing that is not complicated about this. That is why that post-implementation review is so critically important: it will enable us to ensure we have not missed anything in this legislation.

I note that this is about the third attempt to draft legislation to protect the Condamine Alluvium. I commend the Deputy Premier for the work he has put in along with his office and his department in relation to drafting this legislation and also in relation to the amendments. He has taken considerable steps forward—something that the former Labor government could not do and could not achieve. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (6.15 pm): I rise to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As members opposite have been speaking, including the member for Callide, who apparently did a great job of consulting, I have been getting text messages from irrigators and farmers on the Western Downs who want me to remind them that the EIS for the Arrow Surat gas project was approved in 2013 under a Campbell Newman government. They have asked me to pass on to the members that they should stop misleading the House.

Here we are again being asked to debate a bill that was introduced without proper consultation with the very people it will impact most. It is a bill that was immediately condemned by farmers, irrigators and landholders. It is a bill that was so comprehensively rejected by stakeholders that the government has been forced to rush back in here and again move major amendments at the eleventh hour—amendments that we will not have time to scrutinise and stakeholders will not have time to look at. How inappropriate is this government!

This bill represents a broken promise to the farmers on the Western Downs. This government has introduced legislation that farmers, irrigators and landholders across the Condamine Alluvium immediately recognised was going to weaken the protections they have spent years fighting to secure. Then, after widespread backlash, submissions, public hearings and months of uncertainty and stress for regional communities, the government has had the audacity to come back in here with amendments that will take the legislation back to the very arrangements that existed in the first place. They call that progress. They have botched this bill and they have botched these amendments.

Why put people through this in the first place? Why create such anxiety and uncertainty for farming families? Why force landholders to mobilise, prepare submissions and spend countless hours they do not have to defend protections they thought they already had?

The Condamine Alluvium is not just an aquifer; it underpins one of the most productive agricultural regions in Australia. As the Queensland Farmers' Federation outlined, its ongoing viability depends on the integrity of its groundwater and surface water systems and the highly fertile soils that have supported farming families for generations. It is one of Queensland's most important groundwater systems. What the committee heard through the inquiry was not confidence in the government's approach but alarm. Now we are supposed to trust them and the amendments they have circulated without consulting vital stakeholders.

This bill proposes to remove the RIDA framework. As the committee heard, RIDA is the critical front-end assessment process that ensures impacts on agricultural production are properly considered before major projects are approved. The Queensland Farmers' Federation told the committee—

Its removal significantly weakens the existing framework, reduces protections for the Condamine Alluvium, and leaves landholders with fewer rights ...

Cotton Australia warned—

... if this Bill becomes law, the ability of a landholder to effectively force a Resource Company to seek RIDA, will be removed immediately ...

They made the consequences crystal clear: its retrospective action will leave landholders with fewer rights than before. Cotton Australia said—

Our central concern ... is that it removes or weakens critical protections without replacing them with clear enforceable guardrails.

Perhaps most powerfully they said—

In terms of consideration of protection from risk, this bill takes away much and gives little.

These are respected agricultural stakeholders who understand both farming and resource development. They have raised serious concerns. We have had no time as an opposition team to scrutinise the amendments that have been tabled in this House. Why on earth would we trust the government who introduced this bill in the first place to get the amendments right when we have had no feedback from stakeholders about it? It is absolute lunacy.

Before the election the member for Condamine promised stronger protections for the Condamine Alluvium and a strengthened RIDA framework. The Deputy Premier promised consultation, yet when asked whether consultation had been sufficient Queensland Farmers' Federation Jo Sheppard was unequivocal. She said, 'From my perspective, I think the consultation has been inadequate.' She told the committee that stakeholders were invited to a handful of one-hour Teams meetings where they

were presented PowerPoint slides but given no real opportunity for discussion or involvement. What does that remind you of? It certainly reminds me of the POLA legislation—another brainchild of the member for Kawana, if I recall.

We cannot just blame the member for Kawana because, for all the rhetoric we have heard tonight, every single member of the government has sat in their party room and approved this. All of their hands are on this bill. All of their hands are on the process that we have gone through to get to this point here tonight, to be looking at amendments that significantly change this bill, but no-one has any idea what they are going to do in practice.

The chair of the Central Downs Irrigators, Nic Clapham, was even more direct, describing the consultation process as a 'shocking failure of democratic due process'. He told the committee that the outcomes of the bill do not align with the election commitment and instead 'actually weaken protections for the alluvium'. When stakeholders were asked directly whether this bill delivered on the commitment made before the election, the answer was simple: 'No. It is, I would say, the opposite.' The commitment before the election was to strengthen protections; this bill weakens them. That is why farmers feel betrayed by this LNP government. That is why stakeholders have had to spend months fighting to preserve protections that were already secure. Mr Clapham also made an important point when he told the committee, 'I hope you realise the mental toll this is having and will continue to have on our region.' That is the human cost of poor policymaking—months of uncertainty, months of anxiety, months of fighting a government that should have been listening from the start.

This government is becoming the poster child for the old truism 'poor process, poor product'. The process around this bill has been shameful. Stakeholders told the committee that they were not consulted. Now, after introducing a deeply flawed bill and being forced into an embarrassing retreat, the government has panicked and again rushed through major amendments at the eleventh hour—amendments that have not been subjected to proper consultation. We have no time to assess them and we are being asked to trust them.

Nowhere is this failure more apparent than in the conduct of the local member. The member for Condamine has repeatedly claimed that this issue was one of the reasons he entered politics. If that is true, his constituents would reasonably expect him to be front and centre of this debate. They would expect him to be standing up for local landholders. They would expect him to be advocating for farming communities that he represents.

Mr Head: Did you listen to his speech?

Ms BUSH: I take the interjection; I did listen to his speech. I managed to get through it. It was technical in detail but certainly there was no passion that would have been there if that had been in my electorate. I would have been a lot more passionate about it. I have probably had more consultation with the local stakeholders than he has had on this issue. I have been getting multiple texts tonight about it. During the process, where was the passion? Where was the advocacy? He did not make a submission. He did not publicly campaign against the bill. He did not even put anything on social media when the bill was introduced or when there were public hearings in his electorate—nothing, not a single mention. That is absolutely shameful. I concede that he has given a speech tonight. That is not enough. That is not enough for something like this affecting a community like that. I am sure they will send a message at the next election to the local member.

Leadership is not measured by what you say before an election. It is what is done when your community needs you to stand up. I have not even had an opportunity to look at the amendments in relation to the South Bank Corporation tonight. Again, they have been rushed through—no scrutiny, no explanation. We have had no time to consult. It has been an incredibly botched process that will stuff up an incredibly botched bill and make it even worse. I do not know how they expect us to look at amendments like this with any integrity when Queenslanders are requiring us to heavily scrutinise this. I want to commend the stakeholders who participated in the process and fought for their communities through this. These amendments—we do not know what they will do—are a result of their advocacy.

Labor will always stand with working people. We will stand with farmers, irrigators and regional communities who asked this government to listen before it legislated, not after. We stand with those Queenslanders who simply want governments to keep their promises, to respect consultation and to protect the productive agricultural land that helps feed our state and our nation.



Hon. AJ PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (Minister for Primary Industries) (6.25 pm): I rise to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The purpose of the bill is to ensure that new coal seam gas, CSG, activities in the Condamine Alluvium

are subject to strong protections including prohibiting long-term detrimental impacts on the Condamine Alluvium groundwater resource. It will deal with a number of measures including the environmental authorities process and compensation for landholders for coal seam gas induced subsidence impacts.

In reflection of how complex this issue is, the bill will amend the planning, environmental and resources legislative frameworks. It amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the EP Act, the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2024 and the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014.

The issues in this bill have a long and contentious history. The former Labor government had a history of ignoring and dismissing community and stakeholder concerns when they involved industries it did not respect. Labor has a systemic history of doing nothing about this issue. From the Beattie and Bligh governments it left a legacy of significant issues in the development of the CSG industry. It is clear Queensland landowners and communities have been an afterthought for consecutive Labor governments. There are Labor members of the Bligh government in the opposition today. They sat back and did nothing about landholders' concerns. They did nothing. Their new-found championing of primary producers is purely a performance. It is all for show.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Members, we will not have quarrelling across the House.

Mr PERRETT: The contribution from the member for Bundaberg was enlightening. It would be one of the few times he has even mentioned farmers in this parliament. Labor's problem is that we have listened. Unlike Labor, which treats rural and regional Queenslanders with disdain, we are responding to local community concerns.

The Condamine Alluvium is a large and significant water aquifer. It is a critical resource that underpins agricultural productivity and regional livelihoods. This bill defines and maps the area of the Condamine Alluvium. The region is one of Queensland's most productive areas with prime agricultural land. It is recognised for a wide variety of produce including pork, beef, lamb, wheat, cotton, mung beans, sorghum, millet, chickpeas and barley.

During their decade of decline, Labor repeatedly ignored local community and landholder concerns and took no action to ensure protection of the water aquifer. Under this bill, gas companies will be required to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects will not have a detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium. It is an election commitment we made when in opposition. This bill delivers on that commitment. It introduces a deemed condition for all new CSG wells to prohibit the release of contaminants into the aquifer that would cause harmful long-term impacts. It also has measures to expand compensation for CSG induced subsidence impacts including new off-tenure compensation liability.

When the previous Labor government introduced the MER(CP) Bill, it included a half-baked CSG induced subsidence framework. Labor was forced to pull those measures from parliament and still left a regulatory mess. The explanatory notes to their chaotic amendments noted that 'unintended consequences with the proposed subsidence management framework' had not properly been considered by stakeholders and that insufficient engagement had been undertaken. We are now fixing up Labor's mess.

The Queensland Farmers' Federation said in its submission that it supports the reforms in this bill that strengthen the recognition and management of specific impacts. In particular, it highlighted the classification of deviated drilling as an advanced activity, ensuring appropriate engagement and agreement with landholders. It also highlighted the recognition of subsidence as an effect that can be compensated under the MER(CP) Act. It said—

These measures improve clarity, strengthen compensation pathways, and provide greater certainty for landholders.

My department worked closely with the landholder reference group on the Subsidence Pilot Project—Phase 2 Agronomic Impact Assessment. It has helped inform the work that has gone into the subsidence aspects of this bill.

Sitting suspended from 6.30 pm to 7.30 pm.



Mr PERRETT: Our government is about creating lasting economic opportunities for regional and rural Queensland, delivering jobs and investment certainty for both the agriculture and resource sectors. Most of the opposition to this bill is based on the removal of the regional interests development approval process. The Crisafulli government listens and we value stakeholder feedback. Cotton Australia said—

Cotton Australia remains willing to work with the Queensland Government, regulators, landholders and industry to develop an approach that supports coexistence, maintains agricultural productivity, and provides certainty and fairness for affected growers.

I thank key stakeholders such as Cotton Australia, AgForce, Queensland Farmers' Federation and the Central Downs Irrigators for their forthright advocacy and providing constructive feedback in a calm and methodical way. I thank the many primary producers and their families who have spent many hours on this issue for their advocacy. I have met with a number of them and listened to their concerns. Amendments foreshadowed by the Deputy Premier will address the feedback and issues raised in the statement of reservation. They include queries to clarify eligibility to claim compensation in the MER(CP) Act. It means that, if you are a neighbour off tenure located within five kilometres of the boundary or another resource activity, you will be eligible to claim compensation for subsidence. Our changes and proposed regulatory frameworks are supported by industry stakeholders, including the Queensland Farmers' Federation, AgForce and Cotton Australia.

The Crisafulli government's approach stands in stark contrast to Labor's decade of decline. For 10 years the recurring theme from the previous government was their failure to conduct meaningful consultation. Bills were rushed, Labor avoided conducting any analysis of impacts and financial implications, legislation was confusing and unclear, and where possible it ran from oversight. Unlike Labor, we have listened.

Queensland's future depends on the protection of high-value agricultural land and natural resources such as water which support agricultural industries and the regional and rural communities which rely on them. Policy regulations and legislation must balance support for landholders' rights and the rights of other users. It must not create power imbalances between competing interests. Agreements, protections, rights and obligations must be fair and equitable. This government listens. We have heard landholder and industry concerns and we have worked with them. I urge support for the amendments. I support this bill and I commend it to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (7.33 pm): I rise to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. At its heart this debate should never have become as contentious as it has. The government says this bill is about protecting the Condamine Alluvium, one of Queensland's most important agricultural groundwater resources. It says this bill is about delivering on an election commitment. It says this bill is about strengthening protections for landholders and ensuring coexistence between agriculture and resource developments. These are all worthy objectives, but what this debate has exposed is something entirely different. It has exposed a government that increasingly believes consultation is optional, a government that drafts legislation behind closed doors—perhaps wearing a He-Man costume, I am not really sure—and a government that introduces legislation first and tells stakeholders about it later.

As I have said before, after two years this government still has its training wheels on. If that is how it chooses to operate then go for it, but Queenslanders are beginning to notice. We saw it with the government's chaotic e-mobility legislation and a range of other rushed legislation and poorly consulted on reforms. Now we see it again with this bill. This legislation was meant to keep a promise. Instead, it became another example of a government trying to impose a solution without properly listening to the very people it affected the most.

The most contentious element of this bill was always the proposal to remove the regional interests development approval process, the RIDA. The Deputy Premier, perhaps in his He-Man costume, argued that removing the RIDA would streamline approvals and eliminate duplication, but the people who live and work on the land had a completely different view. As stakeholders made abundantly clear throughout the committee process, the RIDA is not simply another bureaucratic hurdle.

The Condamine Alluvium deserves protection, and farmers and communities deserve certainty and to have their voices heard and promises made by their local members to be honoured. The RIDA is a safeguard. It is not a negotiating tool; it is a mechanism that ensures resource companies properly engage with landholders before development proceeds. As the Queensland Farmers' Federation explained during the committee inquiry, the value of the RIDA is not measured by how often it is used. Its value comes from the fact that it exists and can be used when or if necessary. This is an important distinction. The existence of the RIDA gives landholders leverage and confidence. It ensures that agricultural impacts are properly considered and it helps prevent farmers from being steamrolled by much larger interests. That is why so many stakeholders opposed its removal. Individual landholders opposed it, Cotton Australia opposed it, Coexistence Queensland opposed it, and of course the Queensland Farmers' Federation opposed it. Congratulations to those opposite: you have even managed to annoy the QFF, one of your strongest supporters. Campbell Newman should pin an elephant stamp of approval to the Premier for this jumbo effort.

The committee heard evidence that was remarkably consistent. One landholder told the committee, 'We feel betrayed.' Another described the proposal as being completely contrary to what they believed the LNP had promised. Frankly, it is difficult to disagree with them. Before the election the member for Condamine stated that resource companies would have to go through a full RIDA process before any drilling could be done on the Condamine Alluvium and that proponents would need to prove beyond doubt there would be no negative impacts. That was the commitment. That expectation was created, yet the original bill moved in precisely the opposite direction by removing the very process landholders believed would be strengthened.

What is perhaps most concerning is how we arrived at this point. The committee process revealed significant concerns about consultation. As I have already said, the QFF stated they had an opportunity to work together ground truthing reforms that could have made a real difference, but that opportunity was missed. Lock the Gate raised similar concerns, describing a closed door consultation process that excluded impacted farmers and the wider community. This is a recurring theme. The government consults selectively, listens narrowly and then acts surprised when Queenslanders push back.

Good legislation is not produced by locking stakeholders out of the room. Good legislation is not produced by briefing organisations under confidentiality arrangements and then claiming consultation has occurred. Good legislation is not produced by ignoring the very people who live with the consequences. The reality is that this government got it wrong because it failed to listen. They are using this bill to sneakily introduce amendments that are completely outside of the bill. I will go into that more a bit later. It only started changing course because stakeholders—landholders, farming groups and regional communities—spoke up. That is why I say this would not have happened if it were not for those landholders standing up, holding their ground and demanding to be heard.

The opposition supports stronger protections for the Condamine Alluvium. It supports ensuring that coal seam gas projects do not compromise one of Queensland's most valuable agricultural resources. It supports clearer compensation arrangements for landholders. Those are measures that respond to legitimate concerns raised by the agricultural community. You can support stronger environmental protections and you can support improved compensation rights and at the same time recognise that neither replaces the role of the RIDA as an important planning and negotiation framework.

As I said earlier, these last-minute amendments are not clear, and as usual the government have failed to properly explain whether these amendments adequately address stakeholder concerns. Did they consult stakeholders about these amendments? The overwhelming view of stakeholders was that the RIDA process was vital and the removal of such could lead to serious unintended consequences for landholders, primary producers and local governments. We know that this government is allergic to scrutiny, and it shows. They are affording members just 20 minutes for consideration in detail to properly consider the bill and amendments. As I indicated—

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Order!

Ms PEASE: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your protection. I am obviously upsetting them over there. The peanut gallery is getting a bit annoyed.

What we have seen is another desperate power grab by the member for Kawana in his He-Man costume in moving unrelated amendments to the South Bank Corporation Act—yes, that is correct: the South Bank Corporation Act—allowing the government to remove members, deputies of members and the corporation manager at any time for any reason. If this were so important, why is the government hiding this in an unrelated bill? It begs the question: which issues are they trying to distract from more? Is it their botched bill that stakeholders and residents in the Condamine have heavily criticised, or is it their desperate power grab over the South Bank Corporation? The South Bank Corporation amendments are being rushed through without any proper explanation or scrutiny and badly infect this bill, along with the other botched amendments.

The lesson from this debate extends beyond the Condamine Alluvium. Queenslanders expect governments to listen, they expect governments to be transparent, they expect consultation to be genuine, they expect election commitments to be honoured and they expect legislation to be developed with communities, not imposed upon them. This government would do well to remember that because the pattern is becoming increasingly familiar. Each and every bill that is put forward to this bill is rushed, is guillotined or has strange amendments added at the last minute.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): I call the member for Southern Downs.

Mr Vorster: Hear, hear!



Mr LISTER (Southern Downs—LNP) (7.42 pm): Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I have some fans here, particularly the member for Burleigh.

Mr Vorster: You're a great member.

Mr LISTER: The feeling is mutual. Thank you, member for Burleigh. I rise to make my contribution on the bill before us, the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. This bill introduces unparalleled, landmark protections for landowners facing the impacts of ground subsidence and directional drilling. More importantly, the amendments introduced tonight prove that the LNP government—of which I am proud to be a part—is a government that listens, responds and acts according to the wishes of the community.

To truly understand the magnitude of what we are passing tonight, we must look at what the community was forced to endure before we took office. Under the previous Labor state government, our landowners—and I am talking about the ones in the Southern Downs of course, but they share the plight with many others—were treated as an afterthought. If a gas company set up operations right on your boundary line and those activities caused the ground on your side of the fence to sink or lose its vital level or overland flow, you had no recourse. Under the old Labor framework, off-tenure neighbours had zero statutory recourse. To get a cent of compensation, a local farmer had to engage in a gruelling, financially ruinous legal battle against multibillion dollar resource entities just to prove a gas company had caused an effect to their land.

Labor's legacy was a rigid, top-down system that buried its head in the sand over CSG induced subsidence and forced our farmers to bear the environmental costs alone. They refused to listen to our region. What did Labor do? I have heard the name Liza Balmain bandied around by people who do not know Liza and who probably met her just in the course of this. I have been sitting at Liza Balmain's kitchen table for years, and she did not have a lot of good things to say about the Labor government, I'll give you the drum.

Mr McDonald interjected.

Mr LISTER: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. What they wanted was a framework which enabled them to guard against subsidence and know that they could seek compensation. They did not want to have to pay the whole amount of doing it, and this bill achieves that.

Firstly, this bill codifies a subsidence compensatable effect into law. If CSG activity alters your farm's topography, ruins your irrigation channels or drops your agricultural productivity, it is now legally recognised as a compensable loss. Secondly, we have permanently closed the neighbour loophole left behind by Labor by introducing a five-kilometre off-tenure protection zone. This is important. If a farming property sits within five kilometres of an authorised CSG area, the resource holder is strictly liable for any subsidence damage they cause. The burden of proof shifts and the neighbour is legally protected. Thirdly, we have addressed the hidden threat of advanced activities. For too long, companies—and we are talking about the Arrows of this world—could execute things like directional wells and deviated drilling thousands of metres underneath a farmer's property from a starting point miles and miles away. The owner may not even know where it is coming from and it could be without the owner's explicit consent. However, tonight we mandate that gas resource holders must enter into formal conduct and compensation agreements with these landowners, regardless of whether the drilling ever breaks the surface of their soil.

A good government is not one that just drafts laws from an office in Brisbane; it listens to the people who have to live by them. As the member for Southern Downs, I have no complaints about the responsiveness of this government to the genuine concerns that I have taken to it on behalf of the constituents whom it is my honour to represent in this place. When a government says, 'The community differs with our view on this. We'd better change it,' that government is a good government. I remind the Labor opposition members over there who were around when the vegetation management bill came through in around 2019—and I know the member for Lockyer would remember this—that 90 per cent of the submissions and those who came before the committee were vehemently and virulently opposed to what was being proposed but Labor went ahead and did it anyway. When Labor members walk into this place and say that they are the farmers' friend, it rings hollow, to put it mildly.

When this bill was initially introduced, it proposed a streamlining mechanism which would be the removal of the regional interests development approval provisions. As I understand things, the department's data shows that there have only been four occasions when this specific RIDA process

has actually been enlivened for gas activities in the area we are talking about here, the Condamine Alluvium. From a purely bureaucratic perspective, it looked like a redundant, underutilised trigger. That is certainly the impression I got over the years I have represented the electorate of Southern Downs.

I do not respond to what bureaucrats want; I represent the people of my electorate. When that proposal hit the table, people told me that they did not like it. Liza Balmain told me that she did not like it. Local landowners and our premier farming bodies made their voices loud and clear through the parliamentary committee process, which worked very well. They said that, even if it has only been triggered four times, the RIDA framework represents a vital, front-end structural shield. It is their peace of mind, even if it has only been used four times before. It prevents land use conflicts before they start. The people whom it is my duty to represent have spoken, and that is good enough for me.

I would like to spend the last half of my speech responding to some of the matters that have been enlivened by His Majesty's most loyal opposition on the other side. The Labor Party have been learning all sorts of new words. Their lexicon has been growing faster than my 18-month-old son's. I have heard words like 'farmers', 'irrigators', 'farmers' own money', 'hard work', 'alluvium' and 'landowners' rights'. What does the Labor Party know about landowners' rights? What did they do when they legislated to take away from the people whom I represent the right to have a say on whether or not they have a wind farm next to them? I can see the member for Springwood over there. I remember writing to him when he was a minister and he said, 'No—nothing to see here.' They say that they are the farmers' friend and that they have been out there and listened. They had to get there using a GPS and with a cut lunch because it took them a whole day.

The Labor government is hollow on this, and I hear all these predictions that the LNP has been deserted by a few people who put a sign up. Let me give the Labor Party the drum. When I go to a pub like the Victory pub in Cecil Plains, the Sundowner pub in Millmerran, the Ballandean Tavern or the Criterion in Warwick, there is nobody with a good word for Labor. They are sticking pins in their Albo dolls, and the rump that sits opposite is utterly silent on the things that they are doing like the EPBC Act interventions, which are going to undermine the property rights and the certainty that people I represent have in relation to their vegetation management. That is after all they have been through already and the Labor Party is utterly silent about this.

What about wind farms? I have mentioned previously that the rights of my constituents to object to a wind farm were taken away legislatively.

Mr McDonald: They put family against family.

Mr LISTER: They put family against family. I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. This made the community divided and forced people to endure eyesores when they did not want them. Their right to object was taken away legislatively so that the Labor government could rubberstamp all of this in Brisbane. How is that looking after the interests of country people? How is that looking after the property rights of individuals? They have sinned themselves out of any right to even use that word. They do not know what it means.

What about the blue dots? I remember complaining regarding Adavale for years to environment ministers including the 'farmer's friend', as he called himself, the 'foolish, feckless foe' and the 'friend of the fire ant', but to no avail. Farmers were told that because some greenie, lefty activist in the department thought, 'There might be a cycad here,' they could not clear their land, they could not graze it and they could not cultivate it.

What about Dan McDonald, the farmer who had to clear mulga to feed his starving cattle? He was taken to court and brutally prosecuted at the behest of that Labor government for \$112,000. When it finally got to the Court of Appeal, the judge said that it was an oppressive move by the Labor government. That is to put it mildly.

Mr Chiesa: They're the farmer's friend, aren't they?

Mr LISTER: The farmer's friend—they think so in their head. I say to those constituents of mine who are reading this speech or looking at the video of it that what they have seen is brazen hypocrisy on the part of the Labor Party. For years—for the entire time I have been in this place—they have done nothing but undermine the property rights, the financial viability and the welfare of country communities and landowners like this. I am not in any mood to be lectured to by the Labor Party and I am not at all impressed to hear city Labor MPs saying, 'Sharon sent me an email saying you have to stop this.' Where was Sharon when the Labor Party was legislating to take away the rights of people in my community to object to wind farms?

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

Mr LISTER: Madam Deputy Speaker, may I respond to that point of order before you make your ruling? I am responding to a wide variety of matters that have been enlivened by the Labor opposition tonight. They have been permitted to be said by a succession of speakers and I would ask that you take that into consideration when you make your ruling.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Thank you, member for Southern Downs. I have been listening. I have been in the room this evening. There has been a lot of latitude afforded to each side tonight. I will get you to wrap up in the 34 seconds you have remaining.

Mr LISTER: Last of all, I speak of something very dear to my heart. When it came to looking after people on the land, farmers and communities in the bush, what did Labor do about Emu Swamp Dam? The town that ran out of water had to have water trucked to it and the Labor Party sat on its hands and did it and did not build Emu Swamp Dam. The Labor Party has sinned itself out of having any right to talk about these matters. It is utterly hypocritical. I support this bill. It is good legislation. I am proud to be a part of a government that listens.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (7.53 pm): I rise to speak to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 and the amendments that have been moved this afternoon by the Deputy Premier and member for Kawana. I will have more to say about those amendments later on in my contribution to the debate.

This bill represents a broken promise. Landholders have been forced to fight to preserve protections that should have never been threatened, exposing a government that has stopped listening to Queenslanders. Nowhere is that clearer than in the Crisafulli LNP government's treatment of regional landholders, farmers and communities across the Condamine Alluvium. Before the 2024 election Queenslanders were given assurances. They were told by the LNP, including the member for Condamine himself, that resource companies would have to go through a full regional interests development approval—the RIDA process—before any drilling could be done on the Condamine Alluvium. Yet today those landholders see a government introducing legislation that strips away the very safeguard it promised to strengthen. They did not accept that and neither do we. Mr Clapham told the hearing—

It is just ridiculous and completely contrary to what our local member has supported and what we thought the LNP was supporting—completely contrary.

Another commentator said—

Arrow has made an investment decision based on the RPI Act being in place. The rules were clearly laid out and they made a decision to operate under those rules. What we are seeing now is that they asked for a RIDA over five different properties, sat on them for a few years and put those people through hell, decided they could not meet the very modest requirements of a RIDA and have then withdrawn the RIDA application because they know they cannot meet the requirements of that legislation. Now we are seeing an attempt to completely remove it.

...

We feel betrayed.

Those are the words of landholders who trusted this government and believed the commitments made before the election. Today they are being let down. The Queensland Labor opposition believes those landowners are absolutely right to feel betrayed because this government is trying to pretend the RIDA process is some minor administrative inconvenience, some bureaucratic hurdle that can simply be brushed aside in the name of efficiency. However, the committee heard clearly that the RIDA process is far more important than that. The Queensland Farmers' Federation explained exactly why it matters. They told the committee—

... it is not about how many times it is used; it is actually about it being available to be used when necessary.

I now would like to speak to some of the amendments that have been moved. These amendments are yet another example of this government failing to properly consult with communities. These last-minute amendments are not clear and, as usual, the government has failed to properly explain exactly whether these amendments adequately address stakeholders' concerns. Did they consult stakeholders on these amendments? The overwhelming view of stakeholders was that the RIDA process was vital and the removal of such would lead to serious unintended consequences for landholders, primary producers and local governments. The Crisafulli LNP government have botched this legislation and they have botched these amendments. They are allergic to scrutiny and it shows, affording members just 20 minutes for consideration in detail to properly consider the bill and the amendments.

What we also see is another desperate power grab by the member for Kawana in moving unrelated amendments to the South Bank Corporation Act, allowing the government to remove members, deputies of members and the corporation manager at any time for any reason or none. If this was so important, why is the government hiding this amendment in an unrelated bill? It begs the question: which issue are they trying to distract from more? Is it their botched bill that stakeholders and residents in Condamine have heavily criticised or is it a desperate power grab over the South Bank Corporation? The South Bank Corporation amendments are being rushed through without any proper explanation or scrutiny and badly infect the bill along with the other botched amendments.

Genuine consultation does not exclude the people most affected by legislation. The Queensland Farmers' Federation made another critical point when they said—

At no point during that preliminary consultation was I aware that the RIDA was actually being removed.

This is a government consulting on legislation without clearly revealing one of the most significant changes. Lock the Gate's submission painted an equally troubling picture. They stated—

In spite of the considerable community interest in this issue, this legislation was introduced into Parliament after a closed door consultation process that excluded both impacted farmers and the wider community.

It also noted that participants were told that their briefings were subject to 'strict confidentiality'. If the Deputy Premier had even attempted to listen to landholders, he would have known that repealing the RIDA process was not keeping an election promise; it was breaking one. Rather than working with affected communities, it appears that every effort was made to exclude landholders from early consultation and prevent meaningful discussion about the consequences.

Queenslanders expect transparency from their government, and they expect honesty. They expect robust consultation, particularly when legislation affects regional communities, agricultural industries and groundwater systems. Instead, this government delivered closed-door meetings, confidentiality restrictions and the exclusion of affected stakeholders. What has been the result? A backflip, because now, as we know, there will be amendments moved for the RIDA process to be reintroduced. Let me be very clear about what that means. It means this government got it wrong; it means the legislation as introduced was fundamentally flawed; and it means landholders, farmers and industry stakeholders had to publicly fight, advocate and lobby simply to restore protections that should never have been removed in the first place. This would not have happened if it were not for landholders speaking up and taking a stand against the LNP's ham-fisted legislation. It was the advocacy of farmers, irrigators and regional communities that exposed the flaws in this bill and forced the government to reconsider its position. This is a government being dragged backwards by the people it refused to listen to.

The recommendation to reinstate RIDA is not a victory lap for the Crisafulli LNP government; it is an indictment on the entire process, because if this government had simply listened to Queenslanders from the start—if it had engaged openly with stakeholders instead of shutting them out—this entire debate could have been avoided. Instead, Queenslanders have witnessed a government break a pre-election commitment, ignore regional concerns, conduct inadequate consultation and then scramble to repair the damage after the public backlash. Perhaps most concerning of all is this is beginning to look like a pattern. Queenslanders are seeing a government increasingly willing to sideline consultation, dismiss stakeholder concerns and abandon commitments when it becomes politically convenient.

The Queensland Labor opposition stands with landholders, farmers and communities who spoke up during this process. We thank the many Queenslanders and stakeholders who participated in the inquiry and made their voices heard, because without their advocacy, without their persistence and without their willingness to challenge this government the RIDA process may well have disappeared entirely. Their advocacy forced this government to reconsider and exposed the flaws in this bill. Legislation affecting regional Queensland should not be developed behind closed doors and promises made to landholders should not be discarded after an election. Safeguards that protect agricultural communities should not be removed simply because they are inconvenient to resource proponents.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (8.03 pm): I rise to support the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This debate is about balance, it is about trust, it is about fairness and it is about coexistence. It is about protecting one of Queensland's most important agricultural water resources while also recognising the important contribution that the gas industry makes to our state.

Queensland is an agricultural state. Queensland is also a resources state. Both of those things are true and both of those things matter. Agriculture feeds Queensland; resources help fund Queensland. Our gas industry supports jobs; it supports regional businesses; it supports contractors,

suppliers, transport operators and local communities; and, through royalties and economic activity, the resource sector helps fund hospitals, schools, roads, police, emergency services and government services that Queenslanders rely on every day. This bill is not about being anti gas. It is not about being anti development. It is about making sure development is done responsibly, it is about making sure landholders are treated fairly and it is about making sure the Condamine Alluvium remains productive for generations to come.

The Condamine Alluvium is one of Queensland's greatest agricultural assets. It sits beneath some of the most productive farming land in Australia. It supports irrigation, it supports food production, it supports regional jobs, it supports local business, it supports family farms and it supports the communities that have been built over generations on the Darling Downs. For many Queenslanders, water comes from a tap. For farming communities across the Condamine, water means much more than that. Water means crops, cattle, investment, productivity and confidence, and water means the future. At the same time, the Condamine Alluvium overlays significant coal seam gas resources and that creates opportunity, but that opportunity must come with responsibility.

The question before the House is not whether agriculture matters. The question is not whether gas matters. Both matter. The question is how we ensure they can coexist. Coexistence is not achieved by slogans. Coexistence is not achieved through strong protections. It is achieved through strong property rights, it is achieved through clear rules, it is achieved through fair compensation, it is achieved through regulatory certainty for industry and it is achieved by ensuring productive agricultural land remains productive well into the future. That is what this bill seeks to do. It recognises the gas industry needs certainty to invest, it recognises that landholders need certainty to keep farming, and it recognises that regional communities need confidence that both industries can operate side by side.

One of the strongest messages from landholders and regional stakeholders was that the aquifer must be protected. That is not an unreasonable request; it is a starting point. If we do not protect the water, we do not protect the farms. If we do not protect the farms, we do not protect the jobs, businesses and communities that depend on them. This bill introduces a deemed environmental condition designed to protect water quality in the Condamine Alluvium coal seam gas area. That matters. It places a clear obligation on the CSG activity, it strengthens the framework, it gives community greater confidence that future development must occur with proper safeguards and it gives industry a clear set of rules. That is important. Responsible operators deserve certainty. They deserve a framework that is clear, consistent and workable. When the rules are clear, good operators can get on with the job.

The second major theme of the bill is fairness. Through this process, landholders made it very clear that they wanted certainty—certainty around compensation, certainty around subsidence, certainty around directional drilling, certainty around negotiation and certainty that if impacts occur there will be a fair process to address them. That is entirely reasonable. Property rights matter, the productive use of land matters, the future productive capacity of that land matters and the right to seek fair compensation when authorised activities cause impacts matters. The bill strengthens those rights. It clarifies compensation arrangements for CSG induced subsidence, it strengthens protections relating to directional drilling, it provides clear pathways for resolving disputes and it recognises that impacts do not always stop neatly at a tenure boundary. That is practical, that is fair and it reflects the real-world experience of landholders.

I want to make this point clearly: for a farmer, compensation is not the goal; productivity is the goal. A cheque after the damage is done does not restore a paddock, it does not restore a drainage line, it does not restore an irrigation layout, it does not restore soil structure and it does not always restore the long-term productive capacity of a farm. Compensation is a backup. Productivity is the objective, and that is why this bill matters. It recognises that land is not just an asset on paper; it is a working enterprise. It is the basis of family livelihoods, it is the basis of regional prosperity and it must remain productive for the next season, the next decade and the next generation.

That is why the issues of subsidence and directional drilling matter. They are not abstract technical issues, they can affect how water flows across a property. They can affect drainage, irrigation and infrastructure. They can affect how efficiently the land can be worked and they can affect the future productivity of a farm. When a landholder raises those concerns they are not being difficult; they are protecting their family business, they are protecting their land and they are protecting the capacity of the land to produce into the future.

At the same time, it is important to recognise the gas industry also needs a fair and workable framework. Industry needs to know what the rules are. Investors need certainty, workers need confidence and regional businesses need projects to proceed responsibly. That is what good coexistence looks like. It protects landholders. It gives responsible industry the clarity to operate.

One of the most important lessons from this bill is that consultation matters. The committee process matters and listening to Queenslanders matters. The committee heard from farmers, irrigators, local government, community organisations and agricultural groups and it heard from industry. One issue stood out above all others—the future of the regional interests development approval process, the RIDA process. Stakeholders spoke strongly. The committee listened and recommended that process be retained. The government listened, and that is exactly how parliament should work.

The legislation before the House is stronger because people participated. It is stronger because communities engaged and it is stronger because industry and agriculture both had their say, but, most of all, it is stronger because the Crisafulli government listened and acted. Retaining the RIDA process gives landholders and the community greater confidence. It retains an important safeguard. It recognises the role of regional planning, it recognises the importance of agricultural productivity and it supports fairer coexistence between landholders and resource companies.

At the same time, the bill clarifies the relationship between the RIDA process and the new deemed environmental condition. That is sensible. It avoids confusion. It avoids duplication. It gives industry clarity and it gives landholders confidence. It ensures water quality protections remain strong. The future of Queensland depends on both agriculture and resources continuing to succeed. Neither industry benefits from conflict, neither industry benefits from uncertainty and neither industry benefits from a system that lacks public confidence. The goal must always be responsible development: development that respects landholders; development that protects groundwater; development that protects productivity; development that supports regional communities; and development that helps fund the services that Queenslanders rely on every day.

For the Darling Downs, agricultural production is not simply another land use; it is a strategic asset. It is part of Queensland's economic future. It is part of Australia's food security and it is part of a regional identity. Likewise, the gas industry is not something we should dismiss. It is a major contributor to Queensland and Australia. It provides jobs, investment and energy. It supports regional contractors and small businesses and, through royalties and the broader economic activity, it helps government fund services that Queenslanders rely on every day. This includes our schools, classrooms, hospitals, health services, roads, regional infrastructure, police and emergency services. The task of government is not to set agriculture and resources against each other, it is to take—

(Time expired)

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (8.13 pm): I rise to speak on the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 and I will, no doubt, be guillotined before I finish my contribution so I will make it quick. At the end of 2024 there were over 12,000 coal seam gas wells across inland Queensland in the Surat and Bowen basins. We have all heard of CSG and fracking, but rarely do we pause to think in this place about what it actually involves and what it means for Queenslanders, which is important for an activity this ubiquitous across Queensland.

Coal seam gas extraction involves drilling wells many hundreds of metres deep into the ground through whatever geological strata or aquifers are in its way. These wells are used to extract water which reduces pressure that keeps this coal seam gas safe in place and deep underground where it does not contribute to climate change. With the pressure reduced, that gas migrates upwards through the drilled wells where it can be separated from the groundwater, but this gas—almost entirely methane, which is an incredibly potent greenhouse gas—also leaks outwards through the fissures in the rock into the groundwater networks and into the soil and the atmosphere. This is made even worse by the use of hydraulic fracturing or fracking, which tries to make it sound cute. This is a method of injecting water and sand into the seams at extreme pressure to deliberately fracture rocks and aquifers to cause the fracturing of the rock below.

On top of its climate impacts, the local side effects of this activity are extreme. It changes aquifers and coal seams underground that cause the land to collapse. It is not an exaggeration to say that it is like literally deflating entire landscapes. This subsidence causes permanent damage to the surface of the land. It impacts water flows. It impacts agricultural productivity, local ecologies and infrastructure. The process is also unpredictable and the impacts to groundwater systems are not properly understood. It is little wonder that agriculturalists across the region are concerned for the health of the Condamine Alluvium, clearly a vital groundwater system which sustains their livelihoods and the food security of Queensland.

In that context, it is heartening to see the LNP acknowledging the catastrophic impacts coal seam gas activities can have on land, waters and communities. Why is it then that this bill is confined to CSG activities in the Condamine Alluvium? Are the landholders across the rest of the Surat Basin or the

Bowen Basin less deserving of these protections? Are those environments and vital groundwater resources in the rest of the state less deserving of protection? In fairness, they would not stand to gain much from this bill anyway. It is a pretty half-hearted attempt to appease everyone without making any substantive difference for the people and environments that depend on the health of the Condamine Alluvium.

This bill, as others have said, introduces a deemed condition. That means effectively an environmental authority is taken to include a condition that waters are not released into the Condamine Alluvium CSG area that result in water quality that is inconsistent with the objectives that apply to the waters—in this instance that refers to the objectives in existing subordinate legislation—and the deemed condition will only apply to new CSG wells. The department admits that this simply reinforces and standardises the existing approach to managing water quality in the area. As is currently the case under the existing regime, the difficulty will be in the application of this condition—the monitoring and enforcement of compliance with the deemed condition. Existing water quality objectives are complex and potentially inadequate. Central Downs Irrigators Ltd pointed out in their submission to the inquiry that there are no methane objectives so it would not provide limits in relation to free gas migration into the alluvium. Again, it requires monitoring. The results of that monitoring are not necessarily made public by the resource authority holders. The department apparently seems to think that the current status is adequate.

I will move on now to the proposal that is now being removed in amendments to scrap the need for a regional interests development approval or a RIDA. The committee made the recommendation that the bill be amended to retain the requirement for a RIDA. It is good that appears to have been given effect in the minister's amendments. This is a regime where these areas of regional interest include priority agricultural areas, priority living areas, strategic environmental areas and strategic cropping areas. It is self-explanatory that these are really important areas of great significance to Queenslanders. Resource authority holders in these areas have to make an application for a RIDA that is supported by information about the nature and extent of impacts on the land use or the protected attribute. Some of those are subject to public notification.

The important part comes in where these resources authorities can get an exemption from needing a RIDA if they can get the landholder to enter into an agreement and the activity is not likely to have a significant impact on the area or on land owned by another person. This gives landholders real leverage when they are entering conduct or compensation make-good agreements.

If an agreement cannot be reached to exempt the authority holder, then the chief executive has to go through the process of weighing up all of these impacts. Various of these criteria encourage negotiation between the authority holder and landholders. This is important. Landholders need the leverage that comes through the RIDA process. It is a distinctly different assessment to the one under the EP Act and, importantly, the process itself is different to afford landholders that power.

The bill also clarifies that impacts from CSG induced subsidence may be a compensable effect where that subsidence has affected the ability to undertake agricultural activities or it has caused a reduction in productivity. It extends the eligibility to larger areas closer to the boundary of leases and includes changes so that directional drilling is an advanced activity. These are sensible changes, but all of this is just an attempt to put lipstick on a pig.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BERKMAN: I take my job seriously, and if you are going to put forward weak policy it is going to be criticised.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Marr): Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House, I call the Deputy Premier to reply to the second reading debate.

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (8.21 pm), in reply: I begin by thanking all honourable members, other than the Labor Party members, for their contributions to the debate.

An honourable member: He is thanking the Greens!

Mr BLEIJIE: I am going to get to the Greens in a minute. It is a bit challenging because he said he supported some of it, which makes me wonder. If the Labor Party had made sufficient and worthy contributions I would give them credit for it. I will acknowledge and deal with some of their contributions, however bad they were, in a moment. I thank all government members and some of the crossbench for their contributions to the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

In my opening remarks I emphasised that the bill will deliver on the Crisafulli government's commitment to the people of Queensland to require gas companies to demonstrate beyond any reasonable doubt that new projects will not have a detrimental impact on the Condamine Alluvium. That was the election commitment. It is clear that is what the commitment was and that is what the member for Condamine promised his constituents. This is through the introduction of a new deemed condition to enhance the protection of water quality and the expansion of the compensation framework to coal seam gas induced subsidence, both aspects which have been supported by members from both sides of the House today, most stakeholders and the Primary Industries and Resources Committee review process. We are listening by retaining and clarifying the regional interests development approval, better known as the RIDA process.

The bill has been thoroughly examined through the parliamentary committee process. I again thank the Primary Industries and Resources Committee and the member for Burnett, the chair, all of our honourable colleagues on that committee and all of the stakeholders for their submissions on the bill. I also thank the Speaker of the House, the member for Condamine, for his advocacy on behalf of his community and in articulating the division and complexity of this issue, an issue that the former Labor government failed to address for 10 years.

I would like to address, if I may, some of the specific matters raised by members during the debate. I will start by saying that, en bloc, the Labor opposition spent hours and hours whingeing and whining about the bill and the committee process. I would say to honourable members that the committee process did exactly what it is designed to do. You have a bill, it goes to committee, you consult with community, they recommend changes, government listens, government accepts the changes. What do they want us to do? If we had come in here and said, 'We reject the committee's recommendations,' what would the member for Springwood have said? He would have said, 'It's terrible! The government is not listening to the committee!' He would have forgotten the last 10 years where they came in here and passed whatever they wanted without due diligence, without following the committee process and with constant guillotining of debate and with putting business program motions. Who could forget family-friendly hours? They only allowed us to sit until seven o'clock at night. We are only sitting past eight o'clock at night because of this government. Those opposite were too lazy. They wanted to go home early every night under their watch.

Mr G Kelly: To get their beauty sleep!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mirani: to get their beauty sleep and have dinner. As I said, we heard a lot of whingeing and whining from those opposite. I still do not know whether they are going to back the legislation and whether they will support the amendments. I am not sure. We will work it out. They will have to make a decision, hopefully by the end of this contribution.

Mrs Poole: I don't think they even know!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mundingburra. She is right: I do not think they know, but hopefully by the end of this amazing 16-minute contribution they will have had sufficient time to work out whether they are going to back it or not. They can back it and back the amendments. If they do not, then everything they said about regional Queensland is just out the window.

Mr G Kelly: Hot air.

A government member: Finally support farmers. It is their chance to support farmers.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: hot air. I am getting lots of interjections. I am taking them all, one by one. We have heard a lot from those opposite about what they referred to as not listening to Queenslanders and about how the Crisafulli government has the election commitment wrong. Numerous members said that. I would say to the honourable members: we got it right. Several in the opposition and almost all of the stakeholders supported the new deemed condition and extended compensation arrangements. We are extending the compensation arrangements for landowners and farmers and we are retaining the RIDA after we listened to the community, the member for Condamine, his constituents, all of the stakeholder groups and the committee process. We have retained the RIDA—a concept, let us not forget, introduced by the LNP in 2014.

As the member for Condamine said, it has always been a very divisive and complex matter. The Labor government did not resolve it, but the Crisafulli government is listening and acting. If memory serves me correctly, the Labor Party introduced legislation in 2024, completely botched it up and withdrew the legislation and we never even debated it. It was so complex, so complicated and so disastrous that they withdrew it and it was never debated. They threw it out the window.

Mr Chiesa: Too hard.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. It was too hard for the Labor Party. Our commitment to the community was to protect the Condamine Alluvium aquifer, and we are doing that. Not only are we retaining the existing protections but we are going further by strengthening these through the introduction of the deemed condition to protect the water quality of the aquifer that is so critical to the region and the community. We are going even further by strengthening the existing compensation framework and clarifying that subsidence impacts are subject to compensation and improving how landholders can access compensation where their land or agricultural activities are affected.

In drafting the bill we heard clearly and consistently from stakeholders that the current multistep approvals process for resource activities is cumbersome and leads to fragmented and stalled approvals, creating uncertainty for both gas companies and landholders until every approval is secured. Landholders have been equally clear about the impact of CSG induced subsidence on farming operations. The bill responds by clarifying and expanding compensation rights within the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. It does so by deeming directional drilling an advanced activity and extending compensation rights beyond the boundaries of a resource tenure where impacts occur.

Throughout the committee process we engaged with stakeholders, landowners, Central Downs Irrigators Ltd, AgForce, Cotton Australia and the Queensland Farmers' Federation. These discussions were critical in testing the bill and understanding their concerns. To be clear, the agriculture sector stakeholders were always supportive of the introduction of the subsidence compensation framework and deemed condition to protect the water quality of the Condamine Alluvium. Stakeholders were unequivocal: the RIDA process is a key safeguard. It supports coexistence between resource development, landowners and the agricultural sector. The government is committed to listening to those stakeholders. We have listened and we have responded with these amendments. We have got the balance right. We heard that stakeholders were concerned with the loss of protection for agricultural and township uses as well as the potential weakening of landowner rights and leverage when negotiating with resource companies regarding impacts to their land. The bill retains the requirement under the RPI Act for a RIDA to be obtained for CSG activities in areas of regional interest within the Condamine Alluvium CSG area.

Retaining the RIDA process meets community expectations, ensuring protections for the priority living area and the township of Dalby. It ensures transparency and maintains confidence that the cumulative and long-term impacts of CSG development are properly assessed. As I stated in my opening remarks, the amendments I am proposing to move today are supported by the agricultural sector. We have listened to what the Condamine community, the agricultural sector and industry has told us is best for the Condamine Alluvium. I must say, however, the sheer gall of those opposite to lecture anyone about consultation is nothing short of baffling. After a decade of riding roughshod over regional Queensland communities, ignoring local voices and imposing top-down planning decisions from Brisbane, Labor now wants to feign concern about regional community engagement.

A government member: They're not convincing.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. I did not hear the first one but I heard the second one. I take the honourable member's interjection.

Labor is feigning concern about regional community engagement. Members opposite are so out of touch with regional Queensland that the member for McConnell could not speak to any details on the bill and, in fact, called it the Condamine 'Aluminum'. The member for McConnell was debating the Condamine 'Aluminum'. Let me help those opposite: we are debating the Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. There is quite a substantial difference between 'aluminum' and the Condamine Alluvium, which is the water aquifer. However, it came from the member for McConnell so is it any surprise?

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjections from the honourable housing minister and the transport and main roads minister. She is literally making up stories. We are not dealing with an aluminum smelter, workshops, sheet metal or anything like that. We are dealing with a water aquifer that farmers use to irrigate their farms and water their stock. We are not dealing with anything aluminum. The member for McConnell gets up and starts talking about the Condamine 'aluminum' as if she knows what she is talking about. I do not know if she has ever been to that part of Queensland. It is a beautiful part of Queensland, which is why we are protecting it and why this bill is so strong.

The lack of understanding is not surprising. Time and again, regional councils, residents and stakeholders were treated as an afterthought by the former Labor government while it pushed ahead with policies that failed to reflect the needs and aspirations of the very communities they impacted. Under Labor's watch, communities were expected to simply accept decisions made behind closed doors with little regard for local knowledge or local priorities. Regional Queenslanders were told what was best for them rather than being invited into the conversation. Whether it was planning, infrastructure or housing, Labor's approach was characterised by arrogance and neglect, leaving many communities feeling ignored and disenfranchised.

If I may sidestep for two minutes, I think that we saw that arrogance in their contributions to this debate. I do not think that they have accepted that they lost the election and are in opposition. I think that they are struggling with opposition. They think that they are the government still or they think that they are a government in exile that is just waiting to come back. I literally think that they are not coping well with opposition. Maybe R U OK? Day is coming up, health minister? We may need to help them and check in on them.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. You funded them and continue the funding. That shows the arrogance of the Labor Party. They did not accept the election result in October 2024.

The member for Woodridge cannot even bring himself to call me 'the Deputy Premier'. He cannot bring himself to do it. Hey, I love being the member for Kawana. That is my priority. I am the member for Kawana. I love Kawana and that I live rent free in his head. He cannot utter the words 'the Deputy Premier' because he cannot fathom the fact that he ain't over here and he is not the Deputy Premier.

Mr O'Connor: It's the car that gets him.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is the car. It is the Lexus. It triggers him. I am scared every time I drive past him. He gets triggered. He waves. He tries to jump in my car because he wants it. I suspect he wants the driver more than the company in the car.

A government member: How many cameras are in it?

Mr BLEIJIE: There are a few cameras, honourable member. As I have said, it was the previous Labor government that introduced legislative amendments in 2024 that included a framework for CSG induced subsidence following the committee report recommending further consultation. Rather than proactively addressing the concerns, they avoided the issue and abandoned the provisions, thus failing regional Queensland. It all got too hard for them. It was too hard because their own committee said to go to consultation. We are not afraid of hard work. We introduced a bill. The committee did its job. The community wanted feedback. They wanted the RIDA retained. We have listened, we have acted and we have done it. We have done exactly what the Labor Party said should be happening. If they are saying the opposite, then they are saying that we ought to not listen to Queenslanders, but we do not feel that way. We believe we should listen. The committee process did exactly what it was meant to do. The bill was introduced. It spent six weeks before a committee. There was a Dalby public hearing and we made amendments.

They talked a lot about stakeholders. I say to the member for Woodridge: watch the press release that will be issued tonight. He kept quoting the QFF, but I bet he will not be commenting on what they say in our press release tonight. They say how wonderful it is that they worked with the government and they got the amendments and this will now benefit regional Queensland. I bet the member for Woodridge will not quote the new press release that will come out tonight or in the morning. I bet he only selectively quotes certain things.

What makes Labor's criticism even more extraordinary is that this government has gone further than they ever did to rebuild trust with councils and communities. We have sought feedback and worked collaboratively with local governments and opened the door. I will say this: the member for Woodridge and a few other members mentioned another power grab for the Deputy Premier. He is referring to a comment that he made to the *Courier-Mail* the other day when he called me the 'supreme leader'. Unfortunately for the member for Woodridge, he had to sit a metre in front of me when I delivered an infrastructure address and responded to those accusations.

Mrs Frecklington: How did that go?

Mr BLEIJIE: He was not happy. He was not comfortable. I made sure I eyeballed him throughout nearly all of my speech as I talked about Labor's record. He was not a happy man that day. He was not comfortable, particularly when I refused to shake his hand. He did not like that. He was very embarrassed by that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Order, members!

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Woodridge was quoted calling me the 'supreme leader'.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: They all laugh. We know a supreme leader is a dictator of Iran, which is a regime that throws women and children off buildings and homosexuals off buildings and that is—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. He is denying it: these dictatorships do not throw homosexuals off buildings. That is the basis of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's name calling. Names have meanings. He calls someone 'supreme leader'—a dictator such as in an Iranian regime that kills women and children and throws gay people off buildings—and he laughs about it. He thinks it is funny.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Woodridge. I think those comments were disgraceful. They were disgraceful for the people who live under those dictatorship regimes.

Mr Dick: I think I am living rent free in your head.

Mr BLEIJIE: No. I think it is the opposite, member for Woodridge.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! There is one minute and 55 to go. We will stop the interjections. Deputy Premier, you have the call.

Mr BLEIJIE: I respond to the honourable member for Woodridge by saying that I think it is the opposite to that. I just hope that one morning he wakes up and recognises the fact that they lost the election and they are in opposition. Once he does that maybe I will stop living rent free in his head. I think he needs to accept the election result because God knows the Leader of the Opposition did not accept the election result.

I think it is a disgraceful comment he made. I simply made the point again today because a lot of them mentioned the same thing and power grabs. I think it is a disrespectful, disgusting and disgraceful comment. He jokes about supreme leaders. Many people get killed under regimes of supreme leaders. That shows the leadership style of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. That is why Queenslanders rejected him in October 2024.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable member. It is the Crisafulli government that is listening to regional Queensland, not the Labor Party. It is the Crisafulli government who listened to the committee process and accepted the recommendations from the committee, not the Labor Party. It is the Crisafulli government that is protecting the Condamine Alluvium, not the Condamine 'aluminum', as the member for McConnel thinks we are protecting and debating. I seriously thought she was going to start talking about cutting aluminum and making weird things out of aluminum—trailers and alfoil and things. No! This is the aquifer we are protecting.

I want to thank my departmental officials for all of the drafting. It is complex law. They did a wonderful job. Finally, I want to thank the member for Condamine and all of our regional members for getting this right. We are delivering for regional Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—



Mr BLEIJIE (8.46 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 3 (Amendment of s 206 (Environmental authorities for particular resource activities includes particular conditions))

Page 7, line 10, '11A'—

omit, insert—

5A(2)

I table the explanatory notes to the amendments and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to the Deputy Premier's amendments [1086].

Tabled paper: Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in the Deputy Premier's amendments [1087].

Amendment No. 1 is very important. I want to read into the record what amendment No. 1 does. Amendment 1 amends clause 3 to replace the reference to new section 11A of the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014 with a new section 5A(2) to reflect the new section 11A omitted by amendment 10. This ensures—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Logan, if you interrupt again you will be warned.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Logan. I will address the interjection, if I may, having the time now to address the interjection about why this amendment is so important.

Mr Power: You are wasting time when—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Logan because I do not think talking about regional Queensland is wasting anyone's time in parliament, actually. We have lots of members from regional Queensland represented here in the chamber. Regional Queensland gave up on the Labor Party at the October election because the Labor Party gave up on regional Queensland years ago. The member's interjection is testament to the arrogance of the Labor Party that we saw not only in this debate this evening but also, when we are now moving important amendments to this bill which are exactly pursuant to the committee's recommendations, as he interjects by saying, 'You are wasting everyone's time.' We have had a good debate; it has been about a five-hour debate. The member for Murrumbidgee can shake his head all he wants, but he gave up on regional Queensland, too, years ago. He can do that, but these amendments—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the honourable the Premier; the member for Murrumbidgee got an eight per cent vote in Hinchinbrook. What a great result that was for the member for Murrumbidgee!

Mrs Frecklington: He's probably only got an eight per cent vote of his party room.

Mr BLEIJIE: I think it is less than that.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, speak to the amendment, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Attorney; he has less than eight per cent support in his party room. I said I think it is less than that. Amendment No. 1 ensures the definition of the Condamine Alluvium CSG area in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 under the new section 206(4) refers to the corresponding definition in the Regional Planning Interests Act. Let me explain to the House why that is important. The Condamine Alluvium, Mr Speaker, which you know very much about, is now a mapped area. This is the Condamine Alluvium—

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: No, the member for McConnel said it is the Condamine 'Aluminum' and, as you know, Mr Speaker, it is the alluvium. There is nothing aluminum about the alluvium.

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have the green proof. That is not true. I take offence. I ask that he withdraw.

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

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. Mr Speaker, you know all too well, as the member for Condamine, that the mapping of the Condamine Alluvium is important. We believe these new provisions containing the deemed condition put in by my honourable colleague the environment minister and me are going above and beyond the election commitment given, and it supports regional Queensland even further. It is important because the definitions under the Environmental Protection Act need to be the same as in the legislation that I oversee so as to not cause confusion. Also, if there is a dispute as to definition—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This amendment is technical in nature. It does not provide the member for Kawana the opportunity to traverse other matters of the bill. His contribution is irrelevant and designed to be tedious to wind down the clock.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Deputy Premier is providing some comprehensive information which is of benefit to the House in relation to this amendment. He should be allowed to continue because it is important to the nature of the amendment related to the clause in the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier is entitled to speak to the amendment and whatever details he likes. You would help yourself by not interjecting.

Mr BLEIJIE: I would have finished five minutes ago but I took all of their interjections. With the constant interruption and a quick lapse in judgement, I had to get back to what I was talking about. They say it is technical in nature. The two pieces of legislation are not technical in nature. If we get it wrong, it will have consequences for regional Queenslanders and landowners. If we get the definitions wrong, it will have unintended consequences. That is why it is important.

I listened to the debate and the misinformation the Labor Party was spinning during the debate. Facts are important. It is important to explain these amendments to the honourable members opposite because the facts matter. If we were not to align the definitions in the corresponding Environmental Protection Act—

Mr Power interjected.

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

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe his terminology was unparliamentary. It has been deemed unparliamentary to call someone that.

Mr POWER: I am happy to withdraw, Mr Speaker.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, you know as well as I do—and so does every other member in this chamber—that the Labor Party introduced legislation about the Condamine Alluvium and CSG in 2024. It is complex legislation, as honourable members have stated in this House. It is important to get it right. When the Labor Party were in government and introduced their 2024 amendments, their own committee recommended they go back and do more consultation, but they did not. They just withdrew it and never debated it.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection; it is all too hard for them. We could have taken that same approach—it is all too hard, it is complex—but we did not. We had an election commitment. The election commitment was to protect the Condamine Alluvium beyond reasonable doubt and there would be no adverse impacts on the Condamine Alluvium. That was the election commitment.

We introduced this bill and, as we have debated, it went through the committee process. The committee made recommendations. The amendments that we are debating right now are based on the feedback from regional Queensland. If those opposite do not think that we should align the newly mapped Condamine Alluvium CSG area to the Environmental Protection Act under the environment minister's portfolio, then there will be serious unintended consequences. How is the environment department meant to oversee and—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I submit to you that you should consider using your authority under standing order 236 to bring the Deputy Premier to a conclusion.

Mr SPEAKER: The amendment both omits and inserts clauses, which makes it broader. If the member is speaking to the piece that was omitted or the piece that was inserted, he is being relevant.

Mr BLEIJIE: When matters are disputed and go to court, the court and judges look at the interpretation of legislation. If I do not align the reference points with the CSG—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Greenslopes.

Mr BLEIJIE: If I do not align the provisions of this legislation with the environmental protection legislation, it will have dire unintended consequences for the agriculture sector—

Mr J Kelly interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Greenslopes, you are warned.

Mr BLEIJIE: It will have unintended consequences. Having just listened to four hours of the Labor Party talking about botched legislation and botched amendments, one would want to ensure we get the amendments right; right? They should be saying, 'Yes, we support them. Explain it to us so when it does need to be interpreted later by the environment minister's department it is akin and in tune with what we are doing.'

Amendment No. 1 seeks to replace clause 3 and talks about the Condamine Alluvium CSG area. The definition of the area is under our legislation, not the Labor Party's. We have defined the area of the Condamine Alluvium. The context of why we need the defined area for the Condamine Alluvium is important because further amendments deal with compensation: the five-kilometre radius from the wells and who can be compensated. If we do not have the mapped area of the Condamine Alluvium and we do not have it aligning with the Environmental Protection Act we will be back in here amending the definitions and the legislation again because the parliament did not get it right. If that is the game those opposite want to play with landowners and landholders we do not want to be part of it.

Mr G Kelly interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mirani; they do not care and we do not want to play that game. This is complex, serious legislation. We are dealing with people's livelihoods on the land. When we are dealing with people's livelihoods on the land, it is important to get it right. If they want to spend so much time arguing against the mapped area of the Condamine Alluvium and saying that it ought not be the same definition as the environment minister's they might as well not even be here. This is what we are doing with these amendments, and they are vitally important.

I would say to you, Mr Speaker, in responding to the accusations thrown around before, that this amendment is just as important as any of the other amendments I will be moving tonight. We are going to get to those other amendments. We are going to vote on those amendments and we will see if they back the amendments or they—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: What did he say? I did not hear what he said.

Mr O'Connor: Something, something CFMEU.

Mr BLEIJIE: Something about the Lexus? I do not know. I did not hear anything about Lexus. Was it the CFMEU?

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I was going to take the interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, it is nine o'clock.

Mr BLEIJIE: I had so much more to say.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I will now put the question on the amendment.

Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Amendment agreed to.

Question put—That clause 3, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Motion agreed to.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House and the time limit for this stage of the bill having expired, I will now put all remaining questions necessary to complete consideration of the bill including clauses en bloc and any amendments to be moved by the minister in charge of the bill without further amendment or debate. I note that the Deputy Premier's amendments Nos 2 and 18 are outside the long title of the bill and therefore require leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 36:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Division: Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendments Nos 2 to 18, as circulated, be agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

2 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 9)

Page 10, lines 8 to 13—

omit, insert—

CSG resource authority means a resource authority—

(a) that is—

- (i) an authority to prospect under the P&G Act that authorises exploring and testing for coal seam gas; or
- (ii) a petroleum lease under the P&G Act that authorises the production of coal seam gas; and

(b) whose authorised area is wholly or partly in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area.

3 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 9)

Page 12, line 7, after 'applies'—

insert—

to a CSG resource authority holder

4 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 9)

Page 12, line 9, 'a'—

omit, insert—

the

5 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 9)

Page 13, lines 10 to 16—

omit, insert—

(1) This section applies to a CSG resource authority holder in relation to affected land—

(a) that is—

- (i) within the prescribed distance outside the authorised area of the CSG resource authority; and
- (ii) not access land for the CSG resource authority; and

(b) whether or not the land is in the authorised area of, or access land for, another CSG resource authority.

6 Clause 7 (Insertion of new ch 3, pt 9)

Page 13, line 17, 'A'—

omit, insert—

The

7 Clause 9 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 20, line 5, '11A'—

omit, insert—

5A(2)

8 Clause 11 (Insertion of new s 5A)

Page 21, lines 5 to 18—

*omit.***9 Before clause 12**

Page 21, before line 19—

*insert—***11 Insertion of new s 5A**

After section 5—

*insert—***5A Application of Act to Condamine Alluvium CSG area**

(1) This Act applies to a resource activity or regulated activity in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area subject to section 59(3).

(2) The **Condamine Alluvium CSG area** is an area that—

(a) includes all or part of the aquifer known as the Condamine Alluvium; and

(b) is shown as the Condamine Alluvium CSG area on a map approved by regulation and published on the department's website.

10 Clause 12 (Insertion of new s 11 A)

Page 21, lines 19 to 29—

*omit.***11 Clause 13 (Amendment of pt 2 (Restrictions on resource and regulated activities in areas of regional interest))**

Page 22, lines 1 to 7—

*omit.***12 Before clause 14**

Page 22, before line 8—

*insert—***13 Amendment of s 59 (Regional interests conditions paramount)**

(1) Section 59, heading, after 'conditions'—

*insert—***generally**

(2) Section 59—

insert—

(2A) However, if the authority is an environmental authority issued for a CSG activity in the Condamine Alluvium CSG area—

(a) subsection (2) does not apply to a condition, applying in relation to a well, that is imposed on the authority under the Environmental Protection Act, section 206(3); and

(b) the condition mentioned in paragraph (a) prevails to the extent of any inconsistency with a condition of the approval.

(3) Section 59(3), 'subsection (2)'—

omit, insert—

subsections (2) and (3)

(4) Section 59(2A) and (3)—

renumber as section 59(3) and (4).

(5) Section 59—

insert—

(5) In this section—

CSG activity see the Environmental Protection Act, schedule 4.

13 Clause 14 (Insertion of new pt 11)

Page 22, line 8 to page 24, line 7—

*omit.***14 Clause 15 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))**

Page 24, line 11, '11A'—

omit, insert—

5A(2)

15 Clause 15 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 24, lines 12 and 13—

*omit.***16 Clause 17 (Insertion of new pt 3A)**

Page 25, line 1, '11A'—

omit, insert—

5A

17 Clause 17 (Insertion of new pt 3A)

Page 25, line 2, '11A(b)'—

omit, insert—

5A(2)(b)

18 After clause 17

Page 25, after line 6—

*insert—***Part 5A Amendment of South Bank Corporation Act 1989****17A Act amended**This part amends the *South Bank Corporation Act 1989*.**17B Amendment of s 12 (Deputies of members)**

Section 12—

insert—

(4) The Governor in Council may, at any time, remove a deputy of a member from office for any reason or none.

17C Amendment of a 13 (Corporation manager)

Section 13—

insert—

(4) The Governor in Council may, at any time, remove a corporation manager from office for any reason or none.

17D Insertion of new pt 11, div 11

Part 11—

*insert—***Division 11 Transitional provisions for Regional Planning Interests (Condamine Alluvium) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2026****145 Removal of deputy member from office**

Section 12(4) applies to a deputy of a member whether the deputy is appointed before or after the commencement.

146 Removal of corporation manager from office

Section 13(4) applies to a corporation manager whether the manager is appointed before or after the commencement.

147 Removal of board member from office

Schedule 1, clause 3 as in force from the commencement applies to a board member whether the member is appointed before or after the commencement.

17E Amendment of sch 1, cl 3 (Ceasing to be member)

- (1) Schedule 1, clause 3(1)(c), after 'subclause (2)'—
insert—
or (3)
- (2) Schedule 1, clause 3—
insert—
- (3) Also, the Governor in Council may, at any time, remove a member from office for any reason or none.

Division: Question put—That clauses 4 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 4 to 18 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Division: Question put—That the Deputy Premier's amendment No. 19 be agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment, as circulated—

19 Long title

Long title, before 'and the'—

insert—

, the South Bank Corporation Act 1989

Division: Question put—That the long title of the bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, 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, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

ADJOURNMENT



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.16 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Budget, Education



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (9.16 pm): Our teachers are some of the most important people in our universe. Every day we hand over our kids to them and ask them to ensure our kids lead good and happy lives. That is what we ask of our teacher aides, school admin staff and cleaners because they are our school communities. It is a pretty tough job for them, but they do it because they care.

That is why I am gobsmacked by how tone-deaf this Premier and minister are about how important it is for them to feel valued. This week's budget was an opportunity to show them that they really do value our school staff, but it was an opportunity that they knocked back. They have in fact shown that they do not value our school staff at all. Teachers have not had a pay rise for two years. The minister forced them to an arbitration process, which could take another two years in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis. He knocked back an application from the QTU for an interim wage rise of three per cent even though he had the money set aside to pay them, which is just spiteful, and he tells teachers to their faces it is their fault they did not get a pay rise and they deserve what has happened.

When school staff are going to work every day in fear of possible physical or psychological violence, he patronises them by saying there has been an eight per cent decline in behaviour issues. Everybody knows the numbers are down because he is not counting minor offences in his stats anymore and a decline is absolutely not what they are experiencing. He tells teachers to their faces that the occupational violence issue is overdone and he is sick to death of hearing about it anyway. What about the red tape he keeps telling us he is reducing? Last year's School Opinion Survey figures showed only 42 per cent of school staff feel like any red-tape initiatives are making a difference, and the minister cannot give us an example of any reductions anyway. The workforce is in a desperate situation. Our schools are bowed by the pressure of not having enough staff, particularly in our regional areas. As Cresta Richardson, QTU president, said today, 'Thanks for the 22 new schools.' What about the teachers?

When the education minister tells everybody how amazing he is and that there are 1,000 new teachers in the system because of him, if you do not personally know or speak to any teachers and you want to know what they think, just go to the minister's Facebook page, which explodes every time he says things like that. If you want to talk about staffing in special schools, those principals are worried sick about it. This minister does not even admit it is a problem. What about those temporary positions he is getting rid of in the department like at the Education Futures Institute, like the social workers, youth workers or other staff in regional offices all over the state? You can sound good by saying you

are only keeping frontline staff, but what he fails to tell anybody is what impact that has on the people who are left behind struggling to still do their job. This minister needs to show school staff he values them because they are really important people in our universe.

Community Cabinet; South Burnett Community Orchestra; Dandabah Picnic Area

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (9.19 pm): I was so proud to host the Crisafulli government's community cabinet in South Burnett and Cherbourg a few weeks ago. In Kingaroy my cabinet colleagues and I met with dozens of residents, business owners and community leaders from across the broader region to hear directly from them and understand the issues that are closest to their hearts.

I particularly want to acknowledge the Premier for his dedication to our state and in particular to regional Queensland. It is refreshing to see a government returned to this state that gives regional areas the respect that they deserve. It was very impressive to see over 100 formal meetings held between our community members and ministers and directors-general from across all departments. Thank you to everyone who took the time to attend on that Sunday afternoon, share their views and meet directly with my ministerial colleagues. Opportunities like this are incredibly valuable, giving residents direct access to decision-makers across the state and ensuring our regional voices from the broader South Burnett area are heard where it counts.

While visiting my region, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon. Dale Last, joined with me to announce the extension of the operational life of Meandu Mine through to 2040. This extension guarantees the long-term security of more than 500 workers at the mine and supports reliable base load power for Queensland homes and industry. This announcement is vitally important to the future of Kingaroy and the South Burnett.

I want to give a massive shout-out to Chris Sarquis and the Kingaroy Golf Club for accommodating our evening event. The golf club was packed to the rafters with local supporters who were able to mingle and have a chat with my cabinet colleagues. It was fantastic to see such strong engagement from the community at that event. There was certainly no room to practise the golf swing for some of my colleagues. To Chris and his team, it was fabulous.

In the 35 seconds I have left, I want to give a massive shout-out to the South Burnett Community Orchestra who celebrated 20 years. It was an incredible evening with over 60 performers. I congratulate the South Burnett Community Orchestra for their amazing achievement. I had the pleasure of representing the Minister for the Environment with the member for Callide at the Bunya Mountains to officially open the Dandabah picnic area. It is something that Noel and Meg Noack and Carol Weekes have been advocating for for many years.

(Time expired)

Public Transport, Fares

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (9.22 pm): I congratulate the LNP for adopting Labor policy and continuing not only Labor's 50-cent public transport fares but Labor's plan to enshrine 50-cent fares into law. This is a huge win for Queenslanders who rely on Labor's 50-cent public transport fares to get around their communities. The Treasurer said that they will legislate 50-cent fares because, as he said, 'Those opposite never wanted to.' That is simply misleading and the member should correct the record. We introduced the Locking in Cost of Living Support (50 Cent Fares Forever) Amendment Bill last year, which was designed to restrict the relevant—

Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am seeking your guidance on whether the member is anticipating debate on his own bill which is currently before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): I will get some advice. Member, I remind you of the rules about anticipation, but carry on and I will listen closely to your contribution.

Mr MELLISH: If the minister was listening he would know that I was not talking about the private member's bill but the one from last year.

We have heard murmurings that the LNP want to run a scare campaign about this important issue, and it is prudent to put the facts on the table. We worked with the Office of Parliamentary Counsel on the drafting with the policy intent that all public transport options—buses, trams, trains and ferries—would be captured to limit the fares to 50 cents. The legislation we introduced referred to 'general route

service provided under an integrated mass transit service contract' and 'service contract'. When we look back at the legislation we see that refers to a number of service areas and also a service contract between the chief executive and an operator under which the operator is required to provide a public passenger service for an area or route. The policy intent of that bill was that all modes of transport would be locked in at 50 cents.

While the LNP may have drafted their bill differently to ours, we are now all working towards the same goal: to enshrine Labor's 50-cent fares in legislation. Let me be clear: Labor's policy is 50-cent fares for all public transport for Queenslanders and that is what we did. Anyone who claims that Labor does not support or want 50-cent fares for buses, trains, trams and ferries—even pretend trains like on the Sunshine Coast and on the Gold Coast—will be running a false and misleading scare campaign. It is laughable. Queenslanders are not fools. They know exactly who introduced revolutionary 50-cent fares in Queensland, and that is the Labor Party under the strong leadership of the member for Murrumba. Queenslanders are also not fools when it comes to locking in 50-cent fares forever. It was Labor that called for this. We congratulate the LNP for finally legislating it, even if they have done so after being dragged to the table.

It is now time for the LNP to adopt another Labor policy and that is to implement fuel affordability, which will drive down fuel prices in Queensland. We have heard that up to 20 cents a litre can be saved just by passing our bill. It is time that the LNP actually used the resources of government for good, to work with the opposition in a bipartisan manner and implement legislation that will help Queenslanders drive down fuel prices, not as the minister has done and hidden his cuts and hidden his project bump-offs. He has a QTRIP that does not show what projects are coming on and does not show what projects have been cut. They are scared of scrutiny. There is no budget. It is easy to be on time and on budget when you do not have a budget and you do not have a timeframe.

Stuart, Lt Gen. S



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (9.26 pm): I rise to acknowledge the distinguished service of Lieutenant General Simon Stuart AO, DSC, who is about to conclude his tenure as Chief of the Australian Army. Lieutenant General Simon Stuart's career is one of dedication, leadership and service at the highest level, having provided almost four decades of military service to our nation. Beginning his career in 1987 with the Royal Australian Corps of Signals, Lieutenant General Simon Stuart rose through the ranks to become Chief of Army in July 2022.

Over the course of his military career, Lieutenant General Simon Stuart has commanded Australian soldiers on operations in East Timor, Afghanistan and the Sinai. His leadership in Afghanistan earned him the Distinguished Service Cross, recognising his exceptional command and distinguished service in combat operations. Importantly, Lieutenant General Simon Stuart's service has also had a strong connection to our state of Queensland. He commanded the 8th/9th Battalion at Royal Australian Regiment, one of the Australian Army's most distinguished Queensland-based battalions, which is headquartered at the Gallipoli Barracks at Enoggera. Under his leadership, the 8th/9th Battalion was prepared for deployments to Afghanistan, demonstrating the professionalism, readiness and resilience that have become hallmarks of his career.

As Chief of Army, Lieutenant General Simon Stuart has overseen one of the most significant periods of transformation in the Army's modern history including during a period of significant strategic change and geopolitical instability. He has guided the Australian Army's adaptation to an increasingly complex strategic environment, helping to reshape capabilities, strengthen readiness and ensure the Australian Army remains prepared to meet future challenges.

Lieutenant General Simon Stuart's legacy is one of outstanding service, dedication and professionalism. Throughout his tenure Lieutenant General Simon Stuart consistently emphasised the importance of leadership, character and strength. He championed the values that underpin military service—trust, integrity, teamwork and stewardship—whilst maintaining a steadfast commitment to the welfare and development of the men and women who serve our nation. Those who have worked alongside Lieutenant General Simon Stuart speak not only of his strategic vision but also of his genuine care for his soldiers and their families. That commitment is a defining feature of effective leadership and one that has earned him widespread respect across the Australian Defence Force. His service has been recognised through his appointment as an Officer of the Order of Australia and through numerous Australian and international honours. However, his greatest achievement is the enduring contribution he has made to strengthening the Australian Army and preparing it for future challenges.

On behalf of the Queensland government, I extend our sincere appreciation to Lieutenant General Simon Stuart for his outstanding service to our state and nation. I also acknowledge the support and sacrifices of his family including his wife, Katy, and two adult children, Charlie and Evelyn (Evie) throughout his military career. I know that all in this House wish him every success for the next chapter of his life. We thank him for his extraordinary contribution to our nation.

Finally, I want to congratulate Lieutenant General Susan Coyle AM, CSC, DSM on her appointment as Australia's next Chief of Army.

Budget, Waste Levy

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (9.29 pm): The LNP likes to claim that there are no new or increased taxes in this blue state budget of bad news and blowouts. If that is the case, why is the state's local government sector calling foul, having a state bin tax imposed upon them? Today's LGAQ media release details how this budget fails to protect households from paying the waste levy on household waste. The cut is clear. Cutting the up-front waste levy payments that are annual to Queensland's councils will cause a bin tax to households, so if you are a resident seeing a waste charge increase on your council rates you can thank the LNP state government. When asked today if the environment minister could guarantee that the LNP's waste levy bin tax would not be passed on to taxpayers, he would not. Millions of Queenslanders will be paying more under this bin tax by this bad LNP government.

Regional mayors tell me that they have spoken to their local LNP members to let them know that their towns and cities simply do not have the critical mass to create a viable recycling industry but at the same time it is cost prohibitive to transport that waste away, so the operating reality for many regional local governments is a perverse circumstance—one where they will just have to cop a levy to put it into landfill and pass on the cost to ratepayers despite it being an expense because it is the lesser of the two. The response that these hardworking councils get from this out-of-touch environment minister is just, 'Recycle it.' He is out of touch with the reality of so many Queensland communities. Queensland became a dumping ground under the watch of the previous and now current environment minister. When a framework to stop that was introduced by Labor, it was staged. Its primary purpose was to stop Queensland from becoming an interstate dumping ground while not having a knock-on impact on Queensland households. Under the LNP, all of that changed.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Order, member for Glass House.

Ms BOYD: The top-up payments to councils under Labor were not by accident.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House!

Ms BOYD: They were to allow local governments the time and the space to get the right recycling mixes in place for them, and councils are now suffering—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, your interjections are not being taken. You are warned. Member, you have 33 seconds left. There will be no more interjections, members.

Ms BOYD: Councils are now suffering a financial cost on the LNP's watch. In response to the environment minister's dumpster-fire comments from today where he said that they created a waste levy that was designed to do one thing—bring in revenue—not at any point did they stop and say, 'We actually want people to pay this levy.' Wrong! I table the media releases in which then premier Palaszczuk stated—

While this strategy will be underpinned by a waste levy, I can assure Queenslanders that it will incorporate measures to avoid costs for households.

I made the commitment that my Government would not increase taxes for Queensland households—and I stand by that.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 20 March 2018, by the former premier and minister for trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the former minister for environment and the Great Barrier Reef, minister for science and minister for the Arts, Hon. Leeanne Enoch MP, regarding waste strategy for Queensland [\[1088\]](#).

This is a bad budget full of mistruths.

(Time expired)

White, Mr A; Buderim Electorate



Hon. BA MICKELBERG (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.32 pm): I begin tonight on a sombre note by placing on the record my condolences on the death of Mr Arthur William 'Bill' White. Bill was a Sunshine Coast champion and active participant in our community and a veteran. I was fortunate enough to meet Bill in 2022 on the occasion of his 100th birthday. Bill was an active and respected member of our local RSL and he was the last surviving veteran of the Battle of the Coral Sea anywhere in Australia, or the USA for that matter.

Bill first joined the Royal Australian Navy at just 17 years of age in 1939 at the outset of the Second World War. He served for seven years across the Coral Sea, Burma, Japan and Europe. A proud family man, Bill married his wife, Rita, in 1944 and together they welcomed their son, Peter. After leaving the Navy, Bill went on to become a major construction manager, contributing to significant projects across the Sunshine Coast, including the development of hotels in Mooloolaba and the Sunshine Plaza. Bill served both his country and his community with humility and quiet dignity. He often said that the key to a long life was a beer and I am sure all of those who knew him will raise one in his honour this week as they share stories and celebrate a life well lived.

Just as we celebrate Bill's contribution to the Sunshine Coast, tonight I also want to celebrate our Buderim community coming together over the past weekend for two fantastic volunteer-run events right in the heart of Buderim. On Saturday evening the Buderim Mountain State School P&C delivered the school's biggest ever school fair called Pinefest. We had rides, show bags, food, market stalls and live entertainment. Families from across our community came together in droves to join in the fun. There was an outstanding art show, with art on display from talented students right from P-6, along with musical, callisthenic and theatre performances. The amazing talents of our young Buderim Mountain State School students, fostered by dedicated teachers and led by principal Neil Jenkins, were on display. I have four of my own kids at Buderim Mountain State School who take full advantage of the extracurricular opportunities on offer. On behalf of all parents, I want to thank the school leadership, the teachers, the support staff and the P&C volunteers for their commitment to learning and for going above and beyond to provide opportunities for Buderim Mountain State School students.

I also want to acknowledge the support of local businesses and community groups like the Buderim Foundation and the Buderim Lions, both of whom were there on Saturday manning stalls with toffee apples and cooking dinner for the hordes. I would like to specifically acknowledge a local Lion and the secretary of the Lions, Stewart Schofield, who was recently recognised for his contribution to our community with the honour of being awarded an International President's Medal for his efforts.

Rounding out a big weekend in Buderim, the BWMCA hosted its third annual Dogs Day Out event in Buderim Village Park, giving our furry friends a special day of their own. We had lots of community partners: 4 Paws Animal Rescue, SCARS, Story Dogs and Guide Dogs Queensland. The event was a great success and a testament to the sense of community that we have in Buderim.

Gold Coast, Transport Infrastructure



Hon. MAJ SCANLON (Gaven—ALP) (9.35 pm): The Gold Coast has 10 LNP MPs. Five of them sit around the cabinet table. It is enough for a netball team or even a decent pub trivia table. Apparently, though, it is not enough to build a tram, a new hospital or a road. Queensland's second biggest city—almost twice the size of the Sunshine Coast and growing—has been left with three times less infrastructure investment. Whoever crowned the Deputy Premier as the 'supreme leader' maybe onto something because, clearly, he has more sway than the so-called Premier who is from the Gold Coast—although I do not think he actually spends very much time there, does he?

At least one person who does spend a little bit of time on the Gold Coast is the member for Surfers Paradise, so much time that he ended up paying for a hotel room despite actually living there. He did admit when he was last in government that the Newman government should have actually done something for the Gold Coast and by something he meant anything because they did not do anything.

Clearly, they have taken that as a blueprint for what to do now that they are in government again. The question is: what has the LNP actually ever done for the Gold Coast? Light rail to the airport? No. Well, we get the GC Surfer, but no dedicated lane, so it is less 'Parko' and more someone who is trying to find a car park at Pacific Fair on Boxing Day. You would be forgiven for thinking if they did not like the tram that maybe they are building the next stage of the second M1. Well, no. They have delayed the second stage of the Coomera Connector as well. Did they tell anyone? No, not so much. They quickly took it out of the budget papers. It was not until we had leaked cabinet papers that we actually found out that they are trying to delay that critical project and now they are just trying to blame Canberra like they always do.

Apart from a bus in traffic and a motorway delay hidden from the public, what have the 10 Gold Coast LNP MPs ever done for us? What about a new public hospital? Well, no, they have decided to delay that until 2031. In fact, the LNP's big innovation in health policy seems to be adding nearly half a decade of delays to the Coomera Hospital and hoping it is a problem for whoever gets elected at the next election. All we have now is a handful of lift shafts standing in a paddock basically as a monument to delayed decision-making. Surely you would think they would want to build affordable housing? No—again—they have killed those projects as well in Varsity Lakes, Arundel and Robina. We have 10 LNP MPs on the Gold Coast, five cabinet ministers, one Premier and the Gold Coast gets a very slow bus stuck in traffic, a motorway delayed in secret, hospital lift shafts sitting idle and affordable homes sent to the chopping block. If that is political muscle, well, I would hate to see weakness.

Premier's Reading Challenge

 **Ms MARR** (Thuringowa—LNP) (9.38 pm): Today I want to speak about something that gives me joy—my happy place, and I am sure many in this room will know this exact feeling. There is nothing quite like sitting down with a group of bright-eyed little humans, cracking open a book and watching their faces light up as the story comes alive. Last week I had the absolute pleasure of reading to some wonderful school students to help kick off the Premier's Reading Challenge. I visited two fantastic schools in our community, Heatley primary school and Willows State School, and I left both places with a full heart and a big smile I could not wipe off my face.

At Heatley primary, the excitement was infectious as we dived into stories together, even making the animal sounds in the book. I saw future leaders, storytellers, scientists, artists and dreamers hanging on every word. The laughter, the gasps and the little hands shooting up for high fives at the end of the day was very rewarding. Then it was over to Willows State School, where the welcome was just as warm and the enthusiasm just as bright. The students there showed such curiosity and kindness. I have been welcomed back to read more and I promise them all I will absolutely take them up on that offer.

As a mother I read to my daughter every night, and I have seen firsthand how the love of reading begins at such an early age. She remains an avid reader today, and the benefits have been wonderful. It has sparked her imagination, deepened her empathy, strengthened her confidence and opened doors to a lifetime of learning and curiosity. I give a big shout-out to her across the other side of the nation tonight.

To the incredible teachers, support staff and principals at both Heatley primary and Willows State School, thank you. You always welcome visitors with open arms and open hearts. Your dedication to nurturing a love of reading in our children is something truly special. You create environments where learning feels joyful, where every child feels seen and valued. That matters more than you know.

The Premier's Reading Challenge is such a wonderful initiative because it celebrates exactly this: the simple, powerful joy of reading that starts in those precious early years and lasts a lifetime. When we invest in our children's love of books, we invest in brighter, richer futures for them all. Mr Speaker, if you ever need a reminder of what hope looks like, I highly recommend spending half an hour reading to a classroom full of primary school students. It will restore your faith in humanity faster than anything else I know. I thank every one of those beautiful students for a wonderful time at their school which I thoroughly enjoyed.

Stafford By-Election

 **Mr RICHMOND** (Stafford—ALP) (9.41 pm): Those of us on this side of the House know that the LNP's campaign in Stafford was one of great deceit and duplicity. They have not provided to this House or the people of Queensland any detail about the dodgy deal they have cut with One Nation. They want to talk a big game about the Prince Charles Hospital, but they cannot front up with even basic details to justify their campaign materials. They cannot say what the budget is and cannot say when it will be delivered—no details, just dodginess. They said they were for affordable housing, but they have ripped it away from northsiders and opened the door for big developer donations. Possibly the biggest deception was the Mickelberg masquerade on the Gympie Road tunnel. Those of us on this side of the House listened to those opposite insist up hill and down dale that they were delivering the tunnel. The one thing those opposite were not counting on was that their Brisbane City Council partners in the coalition of cuts would tell the truth. Enter stage far right the Lord Mayor, who let the cat out of the bag by telling council chambers that the Gympie Road tunnel would only kick off after the 2032 Olympic Games.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): Pause the clock. There are a number of members interjecting who are not in their seat. Member for Burleigh and member for Hinchinbrook. I will ask you all to cease interjecting if you are not in your seat.

Mr RICHMOND: The Lord Mayor said that the Gympie Road tunnel would only kick off after the 2032 Olympic Games. What was the minister's response? It was to say that they were progressing the Gympie Road tunnel calmly and methodically. It is more comatose than calm. That means northside locals are locked in for more than a decade of worsening gridlock and congestion. What are their alternatives? If the minister has anything to do with it, they will not be able to access a reliable train. God forbid they contemplate trying to use an e-bike.

Worsening congestion and gridlock have real human consequences. It means people spend longer in traffic and less time with the people they love. It means arriving home exhausted and frustrated, with nothing left in the tank. It cuts people off from economic opportunity and the dignity of work. These failures go beyond one family; they strike at the heart of a productive economy because every hour stuck in gridlock is an hour stolen—stolen from a worker who could be earning money, stolen from a business that could be growing, stolen from a tradie on Gympie Road who could be finishing their job.

This LNP government is squeezing Queensland from both ends. By ripping away affordable housing, they are pushing workers further and further from where the work is. This LNP's budget blowouts have lit a debt bomb under this state and the only way to defuse it is to grow our economy. This budget shows that the commitments of the LNP to the people of Queensland were not worth the glossy billboards they were written on.

Drummond Range Cup

 **Mr DILLON** (Gregory—LNP) (9.44 pm): Tonight it gives me great pleasure to rise to recognise the terrific community rugby league initiative that restarted this year known as the Drummond Range Cup. Played between the Central West Rugby League and the Central Highlands representative sides, it is a great opportunity for players from right across Gregory to come together for a day and an evening of fantastic footy and it provides a pathway for new and emerging players who aspire to further their opportunities.

The concept first kicked off in 2007 when Brett Harvey and Graham Campbell had a friendly wager and the open men's sides played for the princely sum of a keg of beer. After a few years, the last event was held in 2012 when it had a spell until Storky Campbell returned as CH president and worked closely with Central West President Nadia Hoad to revitalise the concept.

This year it all happened in the mighty township of Alpha, and this time it was a whole-of-game carnival with under-13s, under-20s and open women's and men's representative features, along with an under-15 and under-17 club fixture between Central West and Blackwater. It was a terrific celebration of rugby league that required some players and supporters to travel over 850 kilometres in a return journey but was thoroughly enjoyed by all. To quote the QRL—

Beyond the results, however, the success of the day was measured in something far greater.

The return of the Drummond Range Cup reinforced the strength of Rugby League in regional Queensland—bringing communities together, providing meaningful representative opportunities, and celebrating the people who continue to drive the game forward in the bush.

Mrs Poole: Kicking goals.

Mr DILLON: I take that interjection; kicking goals. There were lots of goals kicked.

The day also honoured the memory of Phillip Rooney, known to all as 'Flop', who recently passed. Flop was a player and an administrator with a long history in both the Central West and the Central Highlands. Flop was known and loved by all but especially by his two clubs, the Blackall Magpies in the Central West and the Emerald Tigers in the Central Highlands. Player of the Match awards in all games were awarded the Flop Rooney memorial award, ensuring his legacy in bush footy will endure for generations.

As a former referee in both competitions, it would be remiss of me not to mention the terrific locally trained and developed match officials who control all the fixtures. Often officiating is a thankless task. Nevertheless, like all sports, the game of rugby league could not occur without referees.

Whilst rugby league is but one of the many community sporting, social and cultural activities that are vital for our community's wellbeing, the Drummond Range Cup has revitalised an event for both men and women that includes people across the length and breadth of the greatest electorate of all, Gregory.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.47 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Asif, Bailey, Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, de Brenni, Dick, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Field, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Grace, Hatcher, Head, Healy, Howard, Hunt, Hutton, James B, James T, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly G, Kelly J, Kempton, King, Kirkland, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Linard, Lister, Mander, Marr, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, Nightingale, O'Connor, O'Shea, Pease, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richmond, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Simpson, Smith, Stevens, Stoker, Vorster, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Young