



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS (PROOF)

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

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-EIGHTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 26 August 2026

Subject	Page
PRIVILEGE	2505
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2505
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for McConnell and the member for Waterford.	2505
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2506
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership,	2506
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2507
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the member for Waterford.	2507
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2507
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Minister for Finance, Trade and Employment.	2508
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Contempt of Parliament	2508
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Minister for Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation, Leader of the House, Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Minister for Police and Emergency Services Minister for Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training.	2509
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2510
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.	2510
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2511
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.	2511
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2512

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 26 August 2026

<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.....	2513
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2513
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.....	2513
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2514
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.....	2514
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2515
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lytton.	2515
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2516
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.....	2516
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	2517
Visitors to Public Gallery	2517
PETITIONS	2517
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2518
Federal Government, Data Centres	2518
High Court, Decision; Queensland Protection Commission	2519
Child Protection.....	2520
Crime, Bail Laws.....	2520
Crime, Bail Laws.....	2521
Training and Skills.....	2521
Health System, Workforce	2522
Schools, Bullying	2523
Science and Innovation Strategy.....	2523
Play On! Sports Vouchers	2524
ABSENCE OF PREMIER	2525
NOTICE OF MOTION	2525
Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, Progress Report	2525
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2525
Residential Care, Alleged Sexual Assault.....	2525
Speaker's Ruling, Tabled Paper Out of Order	2526
Residential Care, Alleged Sexual Assault.....	2526
Crime, Bail Laws.....	2527
Child Safety, Data Reporting	2528
Victims of Crime	2528
Speaker's Ruling, Tabled Paper Out of Order	2529
Child Safety, Data Reporting	2529
Youth Crime	2530
Child Safety, Census.....	2530
Youth Crime	2531
Child Safety, Survey.....	2531
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Image depicting a Queensland Government sign with a QR code and the wording 'Share your experience for a chance to win a prize pack valued at \$350'.	2531
Small and Family Business, Crime.....	2532
Disability Housing	2533
Women's Safety.....	2533
Child Safety	2534
Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure.....	2535
Child Safety Commission of Inquiry, Report	2535
MOTIONS	2536
Suspension of Standing Orders	2536
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2536
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2536
Age of Criminal Responsibility; Bail Laws	2536
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>The Canberra Times</i> , dated 23 February 2023, titled 'Queensland backs criminal age rise, youth crackdown'.	2541
Amendment negatived.	2542
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2542
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2542
BRISBANE AIRPORT RAIL LINK (AIRTRAIN) BUY BACK AMENDMENT BILL.....	2542
Introduction	2542
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026.	2542
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes.....	2542
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.	2542
First Reading	2544
Referral to State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee.....	2544
QUEENSLAND PROTECTION COMMISSION BILL	2544
Message from Governor	2544

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 26 August 2026

<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 26 August 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor recommending the Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026.	2545
Introduction	2545
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026.	2545
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026, explanatory notes.	2545
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.	2545
First Reading	2548
Referral to Education, Arts and Communities Committee	2548
STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION (CRITICAL MINERALS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2548
Second Reading	2548
MOTION	2552
Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, Progress Report	2552
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from a research brief prepared by the Queensland Parliamentary Library and Research Service, undated, including data regarding counts and rates of offences in Queensland.	2556
Division: Question put—That amendment be agreed to.	2563
Resolved in the negative.	2563
Non-government amendment (Ms Bush) negated.	2563
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	2563
Resolved in the affirmative.	2563
Amendment agreed to.	2563
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	2563
Resolved in the affirmative.	2563
STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION (CRITICAL MINERALS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2563
Second Reading	2563
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from document, dated 22 June 2026, titled 'Public Briefing-Inquiry into the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026'.	2584
PRIVILEGE	2592
Parliamentary Procedure	2592
STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION (CRITICAL MINERALS) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2592
Second Reading	2592
Division: Question put—That bill be now read a second time.	2592
Resolved in the affirmative.	2593
Consideration in Detail	2593
Clause 1—	2593
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments.	2593
Division: Question put—That the member for Maiwar's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.	2593
Resolved in the negative.	2594
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.	2594
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.	2594
Division: Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 1 to 12, as circulated, be agreed to.	2594
Resolved in the affirmative.	2594
Amendments agreed to.	2594
Amendments, as circulated—	2594
Division: Question put—That clauses 1 to 64 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.	2596
Resolved in the affirmative.	2596
Clauses 1 to 64 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.	2596
Third Reading	2596
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.	2596
Resolved in the affirmative.	2596
Long Title	2597
Resolved in the affirmative.	2597
MOTIONS	2597
Suspension of Standing Orders	2597
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders	2597
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2597
Resolved in the affirmative.	2597
Greyhound Racing	2597
Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2603
Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10).	2603
ADJOURNMENT	2603
Domestic and Family Violence Services, Funding; Housing	2603
Transport Infrastructure	2604
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Gold Coast Transport Plan—Road and Active Transport'.	2604

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 26 August 2026

Volunteers; Haigslea State School.....	2605
Barron River Electorate.....	2605
National Meals on Wheels Day; Narangba Valley State High School.....	2606
Book Week; Burleigh Heads, Library	2607
Tzu Chi Integrative Community Health and Wellness Centre	2607
Hendy, Mr L; Hooker, Ms A	2608
Energy, Infrastructure	2608
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, amendments circulated by Mr Robbie Katter.....	2608
Rotary Youth Driver Awareness Program.....	2609
ATTENDANCE	2609

WEDNESDAY, 26 AUGUST 2026

001

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 16 June 2026 the Deputy Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Tourism, Minister for Science and Innovation, Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Acting Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition, member for McConnel and member for Waterford deliberately misled the House on 3 June 2026. The matter relates to statements by the members during question time regarding train stations and the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games. The members made a number of statements and attributed tabled paper 5826TO846 as the source document.

This is a matter where both sides have relied on the same document to support their positions. It is of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 when he stated—

The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints of different options, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.

The matter is both technical and trivial.

I would like to make two observations. First, it is incumbent on all members to accurately reflect in the House what is in the tabled papers they rely on. Second, matters such as these that occur during question time could and should be easily dealt with by the minister at that time rather than raising a matter of privilege. Accordingly, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition, the member for McConnel and the member for Waterford.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 16 June 2026, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for the Environment and Tourism, Minister for Science and Innovation, Acting Minister for Sport and Racing and Acting Minister for Olympic and Paralympic Games wrote to me alleging that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, member for McConnel and member for Waterford deliberately misled the House on 3 June 2026.

The matter relates to statements made during Questions without Notice.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

The Games Leadership Group has been briefed that platforms at the newly completed Exhibition station will be impacted because the Crisafulli LNP government has placed the athletes village too close to the station. Can the minister advise how many new platforms will have to be demolished and rebuilt?

And

When deciding on the location of the athletes village, was the Games Leadership Group briefed that the new Exhibition station platforms would need to be demolished and rebuilt?

The member for McConnel said:

...the Games Leadership Group was advised that out of Fortitude Valley and Exhibition train stations only one could be open during the games. Has the minister been briefed on the impact on tourism and inner-city businesses of closing the Fortitude Valley train station for a month during the games?

And the member for Waterford said:

: ...has the Games Leadership Group been briefed on whether the cost of demolishing and rebuilding Exhibition station platforms and the connections to the Victoria Park precinct would be funded by the \$3.8 billion funding allocation for Victoria Park stadium or the \$7.1 billion venues funding bucket?

The Deputy Premier and Minister argued that the members asserted that Tabled Paper 5826TO846, which is a copy of meeting minutes from a Games Leadership Group (GLG) meeting dated 17 March 2026, was the source of their statements. However, he submits that nowhere in that document does it state that the athletes village was built too close to Exhibition station, that Exhibition station platforms would have to be demolished or that the Fortitude Valley and Exhibition stations could not open simultaneously during the 2032 Games.

I sought further information from the members about the allegations that have been made against them, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The members submitted that Tabled Paper 5826TO846 was the basis for their questions and submitted that there was material in those papers that suggested some platforms may need to be demolished, the proximity of the athlete's village was a consideration and that some stations may need to be closed during the Olympic Games. The members also submitted that the Minister had the opportunity to answer the question immediately, and reject, refute or deny the questions or their preambles.

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

In this matter, both the Deputy Premier and Minister, and the members, are relying on the same document, albeit drawing differing conclusions. Both sides have provided persuasive interpretations of the tabled paper to me.

This is a matter of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 when he stated: *'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'*

I consider the matter is both technical and trivial.

I further note the Minister was in a position to immediately rebut the premise of the questions if he was of the belief that they were misleading and put the Government's position on the record. This matter would have been better dealt with immediately during Question Time, rather than raised as a matter of privilege after the fact.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 2 July 2026 the member for Waterford wrote to me alleging that the Treasurer deliberately misled the House on 26 June 2026. The Treasurer stated that the shadow treasurer had not asked the Treasurer of the day a question during budget week. I reviewed the question put forward by the member for Waterford and consider that it was asked in the Treasurer's capacity as Minister for Energy. It related to energy regulation. I consider the Treasurer has made an adequate explanation, and I also consider the matter is trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Treasurer, Minister for Energy and Minister for Home Ownership,

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 2 July 2026, the member for Waterford wrote to me alleging that the Treasurer deliberately misled the House on 26 June 2026.

The matter relates to an answer to a Question without Notice.

Specifically, the Treasurer said:

'Let me start with one plan that failed—it must be the first budget week in a very long time where the shadow treasurer has not asked a single question of the treasurer of the day. That is one plan that has gone awry: the shadow treasurer forgot to ask a question of the Treasurer in budget week. Can you believe it.'

The member argued that this was false and provided the reference from the Record of Proceedings to evidence that she, as Shadow Treasurer, had asked the Treasurer a question approximately 25 minutes before he made the allegedly misleading statement in the House.

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

The Treasurer submitted that the member asked him a question in his capacity as Minister for Energy. There was no question that related to the budget or his role as Treasurer.

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

I have reviewed the Administrative Arrangements and consider the question related to the Energy portfolio. The letter that was tabled with the question was from the Australian Energy Regulator to the Manager Regulatory Affairs in Energy Queensland.

I consider the Treasurer has made an adequate explanation and I also consider the matter is trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 14 July 2026 the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation wrote to me alleging that the member for Waterford deliberately misled the House on 24 June 2026. The alleged misleading statement was a question by the member to the minister during question time. The minister answered the question. I consider the matter was dealt with at the time in the House. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the member for Waterford.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 14 July 2026, the Minister for Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation wrote to me alleging that the member for Waterford deliberately misled the House on 24 June 2026.

The matter relates to a question by the member for Waterford to the Minister during Question Time.

Specifically, the member for Waterford asked:

'Can the minister guarantee that the LNP's waste levy bin tax will not be passed on to ratepayers?'

The Minister submitted that this question was deliberately misleading and provided evidence that the bin tax, or waste levy, was introduced by the former government and cannot be considered a new tax. He advised that he had alerted the House to this earlier in the day and that as a member of the government that introduced the levy, she would have been aware of the origins of the levy.

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

I reviewed the Record of Proceedings and note that the Minister answered the question at pages 1938-39 on the 24 June 2026. The Minister had the opportunity to rebut any assertions in the question that he disagreed with. I consider the matter was dealt with in the House at the time. It does not warrant the further attention of the House.

Accordingly, I did not seek a submission from the member for Waterford and I **will not** be referring the matter to the Ethics Committee.

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, in correspondence dated 2 July 2026 and received 3 July 2026, the member for Kurwongbah wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Finance, Trade,

Employment and Training deliberately misled the House on 24 June 2026. The minister made comments about the contents of the member's social media post and said—

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.

The member said that he was not referring to building the new TAFEs but to the \$36.9 million funding from the federal government that had been referred to in a media statement and in the House. The minister said she was referring to the capital works of constructing the TAFEs which is from state government funding only. It is a political dispute using essentially the same material to argue the same point but in an opposing way. Accordingly, I consider this is trivial and I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Minister for Finance, Trade and Employment.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 2 July 2026, the member for Kurwongbah wrote to me alleging that the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training deliberately misled the House on 24 June 2026.

The matter relates to statements made during Question Time.

Specifically, the Minister said:

'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.'

The member noted that what he said in his social media post was:

'And funny ... the LNP also forgot to credit Federal Labor for the significant \$\$ contributions to: New TAFEs—including one in my electorate'

The member provided material that the Minister's statement was factually misleading and that she knew it was misleading at the time she made it, in the form of a statement she made in the House and a media release noting there was a joint funding initiative with the Federal Government regarding Queensland TAFEs.

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

The Minister submitted that the Federal Government funding was for the Construction Tech TAFE initiative that is to be at multiple TAFE campuses, but that capital funding to build new TAFEs is coming from the Queensland Government.

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

I considered the material put forward by both members. It is clear that the Federal Government has contributed funding to TAFE campuses in Queensland, including within the member's electorate. It is also clear that that funding is to go towards a Construction Tech facility within the TAFE, rather than the building of the new TAFE.

The member said he was not referring to building the new TAFE, but to the \$36.9 million funding from the Federal Government that had been referred to in a media statement and in the House. The Minister said she was referring to the capital works of constructing the new TAFE campuses which is from state government funding only.

I consider this to be a political dispute, rather than a matter of privilege. The member and the Minister are essentially using the same material, and arguing the same point, but in an opposing way. It is trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Contempt of Parliament



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 26 June 2026 the Manager of Opposition Business and Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that multiple contempts had occurred during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech on 25 June 2026. First, they alleged that the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation; the Leader of the House; the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers; the

Minister for Transport and Main Roads; the Minister for Police and Emergency Services; the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services; and the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training misconducted themselves in the presence of the House, disrupted the orderly business of the House and involved themselves in planning or executing a disruption of a proceeding of the Legislative Assembly by repeatedly raising points of order during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech. Related to this matter is a complaint I received from the Treasurer on 20 July 2026 raising concerns with the disorderly behaviour of opposition members during the introduction of the budget. I dealt with both matters with my statement on 26 June 2026. Therefore, I will not be referring either matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

Second, the Manager of Opposition Business and the Leader of the Opposition allege that the members for Theodore, Burnett, Callide, Capalaba, Coomera, Gregory, Hervey Bay, Mermaid Beach, Mirani, Oodgeroo, Townsville and Mulgrave and the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth misconducted themselves in the presence of the House, disrupted the orderly business of the House and involved themselves in planning or executing a disruption of a proceeding of the Legislative Assembly by deliberately obstructing the media pool cameras in the chamber during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech.

I have reviewed the overwatch footage and considered the members' responses. The members advised that it is common practice to seek permission from the whips to leave the chamber. I also considered whether any obstruction, whether intentional or otherwise, of the media pool cameras disrupts the business of the House. I do not believe it does. The proceedings of the House can continue, whether those cameras are obstructed or not. However, I would like to remind all members to observe the longstanding courtesy of being mindful when walking in front of cameras and to avoid obstructing the view. Accordingly, I consider the members have made an adequate explanation and I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Minister for Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation, Leader of the House, Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Minister for Police and Emergency Services Minister for Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 26 June 2026, the Manager of Opposition Business and Leader of the Opposition wrote to me alleging that multiple contempts had occurred during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech on 25 June 2026.

First they alleged that the Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation, Leader of the House, Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers, Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Minister for Police and Emergency Services, Minister for Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training misconducted themselves in the presence of the House, disrupted the orderly business of the House and involved themselves in planning or executing a disruption of a proceeding of the Legislative Assembly by repeatedly raising points of order during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech.

Second, they alleged that the members for Theodore, Burnett, Callide, Capalaba, Coomera, Gregory, Hervey Bay, Mermaid Beach, Mirani, Oodgeroo, Townsville, Mulgrave and the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth misconducted themselves in the presence of the House, disrupted the orderly business of the House and involved themselves in planning or executing a disruption of a proceeding of the Legislative Assembly by deliberately obstructing the media pool cameras in the Chamber during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech.

I sought further information from each of the members about the allegations that have been made against them, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

With respect to the allegation of repeatedly raising points of order, the Leader of the House, Minister for Environment, Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training, Minister for Health, Minister for Police and Minister for Local Government all responded in largely the same way. They disputed the accusation, stating that they rose on a matter of privilege believing the Leader of the Opposition was being misleading. They each subsequently wrote to me as they said they would and in accordance with previous Speaker's Rulings and the Standing Orders.

The Minister for Transport said he felt it necessary to rise on points of order to ensure factual information was being presented to Members and Queenslanders. He claims he did not interject to be disorderly, but rose on a point of order as is permitted.

With respect to the allegation of blocking the media pool cameras, the members all largely responded with the same explanation. The asserted there is no Standing Order that prevents members from moving about the Chamber. With respect to the

reasonableness for members to leave the Chamber for short periods, the members noted that the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech came after Preliminary Business, Ministerial Statements and Question Time and that it would have been over three and a half hours in the Chamber if they were not permitted to leave.

Several members highlighted that it was common practice to seek permission from a whip when a member wished to leave the Chamber. The Deputy Government Whip confirmed that permitting members to leave the Chamber for short periods was part of his role.

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

I dealt with the allegations relating to repeated points of order during both the Treasurer's budget speech and the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech in my statement to the House on 26 June 2026 in which I noted my disappointment with the behaviour of members from both sides of the House. I will not be considering the matter further.

I consider the alleged contempts of disrupting the orderly business of the House (SO 266(22)) and planning or executing a disruption of a proceeding of the Legislative Assembly (SO 266(25)) by obstructing the media pool cameras cannot be substantiated to the threshold required to refer the matter to the Ethics Committee. Even if the members deliberately stood in front of the media cameras, which they deny, the proceedings of the Assembly could continue. These were not the official broadcast cameras, and it did not interfere with the Leader of the Opposition speaking in the House. There was no disruption to a proceeding or the House generally.

Similarly with respect to the allegation that the members misconducted themselves, to be a contempt the conduct, or misconduct, in question must also have amounted to, or was intended or likely to amount to, an improper interference with the free exercise by the Assembly of its authority or functions in accordance with section 37 of the Parliament of Queensland Act. Again, any interference with the media pool cameras does not restrain the business of the House.

Finally I accepted the evidence put forward by the members, and indeed know from my own experience, that it is common practice for members to seek the permission of a whip before leaving the Chamber, as well as for members to leave the Chamber after they have been in there for some time. The Overwatch footage alone does not provide conclusive evidence that there was a concerted effort to block the media pool cameras.

I also wish to note that the member for Capalaba did not leave his seat during the Leader of the Opposition's budget reply speech as alleged.

With respect to the repeated points of order, I find that the matter was dealt with by my statement to the House on 26 June 2026 and does not warrant the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

With respect to the allegations of blocking the media pool cameras, I find that the members have made an adequate explanation and I will not be referring the matter for the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee.

002

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 3 July 2026 the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026. The statements made by the Leader of the Opposition related to the Budget Measures for Queensland Health. This matter is clearly a political dispute on health policy contained in the budget. It is not a matter of privilege. It is trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 3 July 2026, the Minister for Health and Ambulance wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'It short-changes the health and hospital services and asks sick Queenslanders to wait even longer. The budget completely ignores the demand and growth in pressures on our hospital systems.'

And

'The only thing that is going backwards is the investment in direct service delivery.'

The Minister submitted that these statements were deliberately misleading and outlined the measures in the budget related to the health portfolio, advising that \$35.5b was provided in the budget for health services.

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

The Leader of the Opposition submitted that the Opposition believe that the budget does ignore demand and growth in pressures on the hospital system. He provided a quote from the AMA Queensland President, Dr Erica Gannon where she states 'Doctors will be disappointed that the government's spend on health this year has not kept pace with either demand or inflation', as evidence of this.

With respect to the statement that "The only thing that is going backwards is the investment in direct service delivery", the Leader of the Opposition submitted that is a reference to the fact that the government has predicted that the number and complexity of services to be provided related to outpatient and emergency care are being reduced, and therefore the estimated funding required for said services is not being kept at pace with either demand or actual activity.

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

This is a clearly a political dispute on health policy contained in the budget and is of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation.'

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

This is not a matter of privilege. It is trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 3 July 2026 the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026. There were three statements made by the Leader of the Opposition relating to the government's budget and trade apprentices. The first is clear puffery.

The second and third statements are of the kind where both sides have relied on different statistics or opinions to support their positions. They are of the kind originally described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 and expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 when he stated, 'The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.' This matter is entirely trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 3 July 2026, the Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'The LNP's \$500 million savings plan will be built one highlighter at a time...'

And

'... under the LNP the latest data shows that trade apprentices and trainees in training in

Queensland is down about five per cent compared to 2024.'

And

'It starts by reversing the LNP's short-sighted end to the successful \$1,000 cashback for first-year apprentices in the housing construction sector next year. The training minister knew that free tools for tradie funding was due for renewal. She could have pushed for this program to be locked in over the full forwards. Instead, it wraps up next year which, by the LNP's own measure, is a cut.'

The Minister submitted that these statements were deliberately misleading. For the first statement the Minister provided evidence of the initiatives that form part of the government's \$500 million budget improvement as evidence that the statement was misleading. With respect to the second statement, the Minister advised that numbers of apprentice completions is at a record high for 2025-26. She also noted that apprenticeship commences increased from the December 2024 to December 2025 by 12.5%. With respect to the third statement, the Minister argues that the fact the qualification and timeframe eligibility had to be expanded due to initial low take-up means the program was not successful. She also argues that it was a program implemented by the former government and that it was only available until that funding was exhausted.

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

With respect to the first statement, LOTO submitted that his statement was clearly political puffery used to indicate scepticism in the government's savings plan. He provided an excerpt from the Courier Mail on 24 June 2026 citing the Treasurer saying that reducing expenditure on stationery will form part of the cost saving measures.

With respect to the second statement, the Leader of the Opposition provided figures from the National Centre for Vocational Education Research to show that apprentices and trainees 'in-training' has fallen by 4.8%. He notes the Minister referred to figures regarding commencements and completions, rather than 'in-training' figures.

With respect to the Free Tools for First Years program, he submits that he agrees the funding was due to be exhausted which is why he referenced that the 'funding was due for renewal'. He also submitted that whether the program was successful or not was a matter of opinion.

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

With respect to the first statement, it would be obvious to a reasonable person that the government is doing more than reducing stationery to improve the budget position. It is clear puffery as per the ruling by Speaker Pitt on 11 September 2024 where he stated:

'It is my view that the member was making general statements of his opinion rather than specific allegations of misconduct, and the matter is akin to puffery, hyperbole or political exaggeration. It is not a matter that can be objectively determined, as it is a subjective opinion.'

With respect to the second and third statements, this is a policy dispute of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation'.

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

For the second statement, the Minister and Leader of the Opposition have relied on different statistics to support their position. The third statement is an entirely subjective assessment as to would be considered a 'successful' policy.

I consider this entire matter trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 29 June 2026 the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, Disaster Recovery and Volunteers wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 26 June 2026. I note that the alleged statement was actually made on 25 June 2026. The statement by the Leader of the Opposition related to the minister defending increases to water and sewerage charges by utility providers. The minister alleged that the use of the word 'defend' implied she supported water increases. The Leader of the Opposition submitted that he meant the minister had to defend the government's policy position. Based on the submission, I consider the Leader of the Opposition has made an adequate explanation. The matter is bordering on trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 30 June 2026, the Minister for Local Government and Water and Minister for Fire, disaster Recovery and Volunteers wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 26 June 2026. I note the alleged statement was actually made on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'Most embarrassingly, just as the water minister announced a freeze on bulk water charges she had to come out and defend water and sewerage price increases—increases that make the government's announced savings essentially moot.'

The Minister took issue with the word 'defend', submitting that it implied that she supported the increases by utility providers. She provided comments to the media made on 24 June 2026 and a statement in the House from 25 June 2026 as evidence that the government did not support the position of the utility providers. During Ministerial Statements on 25 June 2026, she said:

'This week the Crisafulli government announced that we will freeze bulk water prices for two years, and we have indicated to Urban Utilities and Unitywater that we expect them to pass on these savings. Shockingly, we heard yesterday that they intend to continue hiking their prices. This is utterly unacceptable and we will not allow it'

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

The Leader of the Opposition submitted that the final part of his statement 'increases that make the government's announced savings essentially moot' contextualises his reference to the Minister needing to 'defend' the increases, stating the Minister had to immediately defend the government's position and their purported cost of living relief that had been undercut by Urban Utilities.

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

The Minister has submitted that the use of the word 'defend' implies that she supports the Urban Utilities increases. She provided evidence that this is not the case.

The Leader of the Opposition explained that he was not implying the Minister supported the increases by Urban Utilities by using the word defend, but that the Minister had to defend the government policy that may not result in any cost of living relief due to Urban utilities increases. I consider this to be an adequate explanation.

I also consider this matter is bordering on trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 7 July 2026 the Minister for Police and Emergency Services wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026. The matter related to comments by the Leader of the Opposition that jobs in the Queensland Police Service would be lost. I consider this is a political dispute based on semantics and interpretation of policy. The minister has asserted there will be no redundancies on the front line and the Leader of the Opposition has referred to comments made by the acting commissioner that administrative and support positions that become vacant may not be filled. They are different arguments and the matter is technical in nature. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 7 July 2026, the Minister for Police and Emergency Services wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'Even the front line is victim, as the Queensland police is about to be gutted of administrative and support personnel. It is understood as many as 400—

The Acting Police Commissioner confirmed these cuts himself. The fact is that not continuing to employ up to 400 police jobs will only increase the pressure and workload on frontline police.'

The Minister submitted that these statements were deliberately misleading and provided a plethora of evidence showing that there was to be no redundancies or job losses to the frontline of the Queensland Police Service. He also evidenced that the number of FTE's has increased in the Queensland Police Service for frontline and frontline support roles.

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

The Leader of the Opposition submitted that he was relying on statements from the Acting Police Commissioner who stated the QPS was over budget by 400 administrative and support personnel and that the QPS were working through every temporary position.

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

This is clearly a political dispute and is of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation'.

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

The Minister is arguing there will be no redundancies and focuses on frontline staff, whereas the Leader of the Opposition provided evidence that the Acting Police Commissioner had stated that the QPS were over budget by 400 administrative and support personnel and they would be looking at not renewing positions that become vacant. I note this was also publicly reported in the Courier Mail on 18 June 2026.

Accordingly this is a political dispute based on semantics and interpretation of policy. The Minister has asserted there will be no redundancies to the frontline and the Leader of the Opposition has referred to comments by the Acting Commissioner that administrative and support positions that become vacant may not be filled.

I consider this matter is technical in nature.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 7 July 2026 the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026. The statements made by the Leader of the Opposition related to crime statistics in Cairns. In this matter, the Leader of the Opposition has provided statistics to support his statement in the House in the same way the Attorney-General has provided statistics to refute the Leader of the Opposition's statement in the House. It is a dispute using different statistics, not a matter of privilege. It is trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 7 July 2026, the Attorney-General wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to a statement made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'In Cairns, unlawful entry is up more than 27 per cent compared to last year and car theft is up 23 per cent.'

The Attorney-General submitted that this statement was factually incorrect and provided the Queensland Police Service data published on the Queensland Crime Statistics website claiming it contradicts the Leader of the Opposition's statement as the number of offences for unlawful use of a motor vehicle increased by 10.5% from March 2025 to March 2026, and for motor vehicle theft increased by 9% during the same period.

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

The Leader of the Opposition provided the government dataset that he based his statements on in the House showing that victim numbers for unlawful entry had increased 27.6% from May 2025 to May 2026 and for unlawful use of a motor vehicle had increased 23.3% from May 2025 to May 2026.

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

This is clearly a political dispute of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation'.

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, the Leader of the Opposition has provided statistics to support his statement in the House, in the same way the Attorney-General has provided statistics to refute the Leader of the Opposition's statement in the House. It is a dispute using different statistics, not a matter of privilege. It is trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 27 July 2026 the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lytton deliberately misled the House on 25 and 26 June 2026 respectively. The statements made by the members related to business confidence levels. In this matter, the members have provided material to support their statements in the House in the same way the minister has provided material to refute their statements in the House. It is a dispute using different statistics or methods of calculation. It is not a matter of privilege. It is trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lytton.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 27 July 2026, the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lytton deliberately misled the House on 25 and 26 June 2026 respectively.

The matter relates to statements made by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech and the member for Lytton in her contribution to debate on the Appropriation bills.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

'At the same time, business confidence is in the toilet and fallen to a 20-year low.'

And the member for Lytton said:

'Our Queensland economy relies heavily on the very livelihoods of these 508,000 small business owners and, sadly, their current outlook is at a 20-year low.'

The Minister submitted that these statements were deliberately misleading and provided the Pulse Survey of Business Conditions for the March quarter by the Business Chamber Queensland (the Report), as evidence of this. He submitted the Report shows confidence at a 27.4 index score, above previous business confidence in 2020 and 2008.

I sought further information from the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Lytton about the allegations that have been made against them, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The members submitted that the media release by the Business Chamber of Queensland directly supported their statements in the House. It read:

'Business confidence in the Queensland economy has slumped by the biggest margin in 20 years of data, according to the state's peak business body.'

'Business Chamber Queensland's Pulse Report for the March quarter, released today, shows confidence has plummeted below levels recorded in 2008 during the height of the Global Financial Crisis.'

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

This is clearly a political dispute of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation'.

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, the members have provided material to support their statements in the House, in the same way the Minister has provided material to refute their statement in the House. It is a dispute using differing statistics or methods of calculation, not a matter of privilege. It is trivial.

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

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 6 July 2026 the Minister for Education and the Arts and the Leader of the House jointly wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026. The minister and the Leader of the House alleged that the Leader of the Opposition made deliberately misleading comments relating to the uptake of the Back to School Boost. The Leader of the Opposition has provided statistics to support his statement in the House in the same way the minister has provided statistics to refute the Leader of the Opposition's statement in the House. It is a dispute using different statistics, not a matter of privilege. It is trivial. Therefore, I will not be referring the matter for further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to an alleged contempt of Parliament by the Leader of the Opposition.

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

Leave granted.

(For Incorporation)

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED CONTEMPT OF PARLIAMENT

MR SPEAKER Honourable members,

On 6 July 2026, the Minister for Education and the Arts and Leader of the House jointly wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition deliberately misled the House on 25 June 2026.

The matter relates to a statement by the Leader of the Opposition during his budget reply speech.

Specifically, the Leader of the Opposition said:

"In fact, the LNP's signature cost-of-living relief measures all but vanished as soon as they were announced. The \$150 Back to School Boost vouchers were the headliner, but data provided by the minister in April reveals that only a third of families had fully cashed them in.

...

...with parents saying they cannot even put them towards uniforms or stationery, like the government promised."

The Minister argued that this was deliberately false and misleading. He stated that the Leader of the Opposition was relying on figures at a point in time, early in the year, when the funding does not have an expiry date and can be used throughout the school

year. The Minister submitted that the Leader of the Opposition was aware of this because it had been the subject of three Questions without Notice earlier in the day, and a Question on Notice from April 2026. The Minister also noted the speech was pre-prepared, being a budget reply speech, and this evidenced an intention to mislead.

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

The Leader of the Opposition submitted that he used the answer to Question on Notice 280, and that he had referenced the data being from April in his speech in the House. He also explained that the amount expended in April, out of the total allocation for the Back to School Boost in the budget papers, equated to approximately one third.

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

This is clearly a political dispute of the kind first described by Speaker Simpson on 16 October 2014 where she stated:

'the nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different statistics or methods of calculation.'

This ruling was expanded on by Speaker Pitt on 6 April 2022 where he stated:

'It is reminiscent of an observation by Speaker Simpson in a ruling on 16 October 2014 about a complaint against the then Leader of the Opposition alleging that there had been 'massive budget cuts' in relation to Education. The nature of political debate is that members engage in argument by discussing opposing viewpoints or different opinions, oftentimes using different expressions, statistics or methods of calculation.'

In this matter, the Leader of the Opposition has provided statistics to support his statement in the House, in the same way the Minister has provided statistics to refute the Leader of the Opposition's statement in the House. It is a dispute using different statistics, not a matter of privilege. It is trivial.

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

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to Public Gallery



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this afternoon by students and teachers from Varsity College in the electorate of Mermaid Beach and members from the Gold Coast and Northern Rivers Probus Club in the electorate of Bonney.

PETITIONS

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

Industrial Hemp

580 petitioners, requesting the House to commission an independent parliamentary inquiry to establish a standalone Industrial Hemp Act.

Fires, Wood and Coal

259 petitioners, requesting the House to identify who is responsible for regulating wood and coal burning fires in towns and cities throughout Queensland.

Cats, Litter Disposal

147 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce measures to reduce environmental harm from improper cat litter disposal and work with manufacturers to improve environmental safety of cat litter products.

Anti-Semitism, Legislation

458 petitioners, requesting the House to adjust the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns Out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Act 2026 so that it complies with Federal Law and doesn't restrict freedom of political expression in any way.

Ormiston College, Ministerial Infrastructure Designation

2,200 petitioners, requesting the House to call on the Queensland Government to identify the authority responsible for MID-0425-0938, investigate the compliance concerns raised at the Ormiston College site, and amend the Planning Act 2016 so future MID process clearly identifies the agency responsible for compliance.

Local Government, Ministerial Action

717 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that the Minister for Local Government carries out remedial action under Section 120 of the Local Government Act 2009, and if this is unsuccessful then under Section 122 of the same act.

Anti-Semitism, Legislation

356 petitioners, requesting the House to include a definition for the Acts amended by the Fighting Antisemitism and Keeping Guns out of the Hands of Terrorists and Criminals Amendment Bill 2026 regarding antisemitism.

Halls Creek, Residential Development

565 petitioners, requesting the House to uphold the environmental integrity of the South-East Queensland Regional Plan by halting residential expansion into the Halls Creek catchment area and mandate that independent sub-surface archaeological testing be conducted in direct partnership with the Kabi Kabi Traditional Owners.

Medicinal Cannabis

6,026 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995 (QLD) to replace the presence-based offence for THC with an impairment-based standard aligning with Tasmania and Victoria, and consider a statutory medical defence for drivers using prescribed THC as directed, where there is no evidence of functional impairment.

Residential Real Estate, Sales Process

618 petitioners, requesting the House to introduce legislation to ban the use of third-party online bidding and offer escalation platforms in residential real estate.

Eating Disorder Patients

565 petitioners, requesting the House to launch an independent investigation and audit with the final report made public, into the human rights and treatment of eating disorder patients in Queensland facilities.

Road Use Management

391 petitioners, requesting the House to replace Stop Signs with Give Way Signs in Queensland.

Petitions received.

003

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Federal Government, Data Centres

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (2.19 pm): I can advise the House and honourable members that our wonderful Premier is in Sydney fighting the good fight on behalf of all Queenslanders, taking it up to the Albanese government, who are distracted and fighting particularly regional Queenslanders.

I would say to 'Bowen the bully' from Canberra: we will not buckle to your bullying, particularly as far as it relates to data centres and the federal government and 'Bowen the bully' saying that data centres will only be powered by renewable energy. We have in Queensland an Energy Roadmap. Our Energy Roadmap means coal for longer, small and more manageable pumped hydro, and renewable energy. It is that mix, and taking into consideration the regional communities and listening to regional communities particularly, that our policy platform will be based on for data centres, not the bullying behaviour we are seeing from the Albanese government. The Premier would love to be here, but he needs to be at National Cabinet. He needs to be fighting this outrageous bullying from the federal Albanese government. As I said, we are putting regional Queensland first.

Whether it is housing or infrastructure, it is the Crisafulli government that is getting on with the job of ending the embarrassment that was the Olympic and Paralympic Games under the Labor government and their regime. Who could forget? Before the election, what was Labor's legacy? What was their plan? QSAC—\$2.25 billion on a temporary stadium. They were also going to do a drop-in pool at an arena they were going to build above a railway station. There were three different locations.

I can advise honourable colleagues that the Crisafulli government is working more than nine to five to deliver the generational infrastructure we promised in our 2032 Delivery Plan for all Queensland including 17 new and upgraded sporting venues, major road projects and new public transport connections right across the state. Since the last sitting, we have released the draft Victoria Park Precinct Legacy Plan for public consultation, showcasing the legacy vision for what will be an iconic lifestyle and entertainment precinct, anchored by a new 63,000-seat Brisbane stadium. The master plan secures the future of Victoria Park, with over two-thirds to remain greenspace for generations of Queenslanders to enjoy, with new connections from the city and public transport to the stadium.

We have also unveiled the design of the new National Aquatic Centre, being undertaken by ARM Architecture and NH Architecture. It is disgraceful that the Labor opposition continue to call the National Aquatic Centre a 'vanity project', with the member for Woodridge saying 'nobody asked for' the National

Aquatic Centre, despite contrary comments from peak swimming bodies. Under Labor's plan for a drop-in pool, 'We heard confusion and disappointment from the swimming community ... that Brisbane 2032 would not deliver a venue legacy outcome for swimming.' That was from Grant Hackett OAM, Chair of Swimming Australia 2032 legacy committee. Under the LNP, 'This is the place where dreams will be realised and history made.' That was from Cate Campbell OAM, eight-times Olympic gold medallist. I would take the advice from Grant Hackett and Cate Campbell every day of the week over the member for Woodridge. I say to the member for Woodridge: here you come again! Member for Woodridge—no plan, more chaos. Did you get it?

Mr Mickelberg: Yes.

Mr BLEIJIE: Well done, Minister for Transport. I will build a road in your honour for getting that one!

I am pleased to announce that just this week, as this year's Ekka concludes—our wonderful royal show—construction has started on the new 20,000-seat main arena at the showgrounds, ensuring the future of the Ekka is secured. We are making these investments so that all Queenslanders, including future generations of young women, will be able to participate in the 2032 games.

This government wants to ensure that all women and girls feel safe, which is why we are working through the commission of inquiry recommendations after a decade of underinvestment under Labor. Today our government will deliver core recommendations of *In plain sight: review of systems responses to child sex abuse* by establishing the Queensland Protection Commission—Queensland's first, nation-leading centralised child and vulnerable person safeguarding entity, which the Attorney-General will speak on in a moment. For too long, children have been left vulnerable without the oversight and protection necessary. This commission is vital to protect our state's most vulnerable, combining the Queensland Worker Screening Services and the current Queensland Family and Child Commission into a single entity. It will reflect the Crisafulli government's commitment to delivering the strongest child protection system in the nation.

In conclusion, may I join millions of people around the world honouring and paying tribute to a wonderful Dolly Parton and say how sad we are on her passing.

High Court, Decision; Queensland Protection Commission

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (2.25 pm): The Crisafulli government is restoring justice to victims after the weak laws of Labor's decade of decline. Nothing will return Emma Lovell to her family. Her two girls are without their mum. It will never give Lee Lovell his wife back. But preserving the small amount of justice afforded to the Lovell family does make a difference.

On Boxing Day 2022, Emma was fatally stabbed defending her North Lakes family home from a 17-year-old home invader. The original sentence was for 14 years detention, with 70 per cent to be served before release eligibility. However, the Queensland Court of Appeal reduced the minimum period of detention to 60 per cent. This was not a decision I could abide. I was compelled to pursue all legal avenues of review because victims matter, justice matters, Lee and the children matter, and Emma Lovell mattered. Earlier this month the High Court unanimously agreed, reinstating the original sentence. It was the first criminal appeal taken to the High Court by a Queensland Attorney-General in over two decades. We did this with Emma Lovell in our hearts, while honouring the courage of Lee and those two beautiful girls.

In prioritising victims, today I will also introduce legislation establishing the Queensland Protection Commission, a nation-leading entity to prevent the horror of harmful conduct against children, particularly sexual abuse. It comes after a string of child protection and safety failures during Labor's decade of decline including the serial offending of paedophile Ashley Paul Griffith. The case was the basis upon which we ordered the Child Death Review Board to examine systemic child protection issues, with a 10-month review resulting in the historic *In plain sight* report. A single leadership authority, the Queensland Protection Commission will close identified interagency gaps and turn the focus to prevention by bringing the Reportable Conduct Scheme, Child Safe Standards and working with children checks all under one roof and overseeing a specialised intelligence and investigative hub.

Unlike Labor, the Crisafulli government is not standing by in the face of crime and its traumatic impacts. With proactive measures such as the Queensland Protection Commission and the relentless pursuit of justice when harm is done, we are standing up for victims. We will not let them down.

Child Protection



Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.28 pm): I was privileged to stand with the Attorney-General and the police minister today as the Attorney-General announced the introduction of the Queensland Protection Commission. I thank her for the way in which she has led this reform and the opportunity for our departments to work collaboratively together to break down silos and prepare and share information. It will only be strengthened through the establishment of this commission. For a decade Queensland's child safety system deteriorated under those opposite. As a parent, trusting someone with your child is difficult enough. To think that former ministers did not act on recommendations to expose predators in schools, kindies and sports clubs is nothing short of disgraceful.

004 The royal commission recommended a Reportable Conduct Scheme back in 2017. Over many years there was a failure to deliver. In stark contrast, the Crisafulli government fast-tracked its implementation by 12 months and we are already seeing why this reform is so important. Beyond Ashley Paul Griffith and the *In plain sight* report, it was also noted that within the first three weeks more than 200 notifications of reportable conduct were received and that information sharing under the scheme has contributed to the suspension of 15 blue cards. This is in addition to the almost 550 blue card exemption cards suspended after we strengthened Blue Card Services' power. Those reforms are being felt right across the community.

Now we are taking the next step in strengthening Queensland's child safeguarding framework. The Queensland Protection Commission will bring key safeguarding functions together under one roof. That includes Blue Card Services, the Reportable Conduct Scheme, Child Safe Standards and working with children and disability worker screening checks. This is all about building a more connected child protection framework so that information does not sit in silos and children do not fall through the cracks. It is also about ensuring that the system is designed to protect Queensland children and our most vulnerable and that we as a government work together. It forms part of our broader reforms and sits alongside strengthening the blue card system, delivering Daniel's Law and implementing the recommendations of the commission of inquiry. When it comes to children inside and outside of the child safety system, we want to ensure we have the strongest, most robust and safest system.

The commission of inquiry also uncovered: warning signs that were ignored; exploding residential care numbers; a reliance on residential care; a growing number of unlicensed providers; a lack of regulation and oversight; foster carers not being given the respect or support they deserved; and long-overdue child protection reforms that were left sitting on the shelf.

Along with the Queensland Protection Commission, it is my responsibility, together with the Attorney-General and all other members of government, to ensure we deliver on the recommendations of the commission of inquiry. That work is well underway. We do not have a minute to waste. Most disturbing was the commission's finding that approximately 67 per cent of the reported incidents of sexual abuse of children in care involved children placed in residential care. We have commenced reform; it is underway. That reform will be delivered and implemented within the next six months.

Crime, Bail Laws



Hon. LJ GERBER (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.32 pm): The Crisafulli government is introducing the strongest bail laws in the nation. We are embarking on the most significant bail reform this state has ever seen. Queenslanders are fed up with Labor's weak bail laws, which have seen serious repeat offenders given the privilege of bail only to offend again and leave more victims in their wake. Breach Bail, Go to Jail builds on the success of our Adult Crime, Adult Time laws, which we know are working because police data shows a 9.6 per cent reduction in victim numbers.

Bail is a privilege; it is not a right. If an offender commits a serious offence while on bail they should, and will, go to jail for a minimum period of 12 months. Not only are we ensuring there are consequences for bail breakers; we are creating a new test. Courts must have a high degree of confidence they will not offend in the first place before they give them bail.

The Crisafulli government listens to Queenslanders. We are a government that will always put the rights of victims before the rights of offenders. I have spoken to countless victims of Labor's youth crime crisis. I have spoken to them in their homes, at their place of work and in their businesses. They are calling for these bail reforms. I want to update the House about what some of the victims across

Queensland are saying about these bail reforms. Cindy Micallef, whose mother, Vyleen White, was murdered by a repeat youth offender out on bail, said—

... had there been stronger bail laws ... my mother would still be alive.

Home invasion survivor Lynette Cullen from Townsville, whose attackers were on bail, said that keeping repeat violent offenders behind bars is about 'preventing the next tragedy and giving victims the peace of mind they deserve'. Ben Cannon, who put his own safety on the line to tackle a youth offender following a violent home invasion, said, 'People are sick of the revolving door of the justice system.' This is what he also had to say about our stronger bail laws—

We're confident the government is moving in the right direction. It's a big wheel to turn and there's lots of changes that need to happen along the way, but what we are starting to see and feel is that there is a change. There is a change in the tide and there is a change for the future.

Victims should not have to pay the price for Labor's weak bail laws. This government has made a choice to stand on the side of victims—unlike those opposite, who have dismissed calls for stronger laws, ignored victims of crime and want to go back to the same failed policies that created the youth crime crisis in the first place. The Crisafulli government is restoring safety to Queensland homes with stronger laws, more police, early intervention, and rehabilitation programs, and there is lots more to come.

Crime, Bail Laws

 **Hon. DG PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (2.35 pm): The Crisafulli government is delivering for Queensland. We are delivering what Queenslanders voted for: more police, stronger laws and fewer victims. We now have a record number of officers on the front line. Our landmark Adult Crime, Adult Time laws are having an impact. Victim numbers have dropped 9.6 per cent, but there is still more to be done and we are doing it. It is what the community expects. Our Breach Bail, Go to Jail laws will be the toughest in the country. There must be consequences for actions, a concept that went missing during Labor's decade of decline. The Crisafulli government is putting the rights of victims ahead of the rights of offenders—victims like Shane Kensett, who was set upon by a group of teenagers outside his IGA store in Dicky Beach. Shane said—

I have seen firsthand how repeat offenders' actions affect so many ... It is time to prioritise the victim over the offender.

Shane Prior, president of the Queensland Police Union of Employees, supports it too. When asked about Breach Bail, Go to Jail on ABC Radio Shane said—

The broader community is supportive as well. There's got to be a standard in the community and frankly the community is pretty fed up.

The police union president is not wrong. Police are fed up and the community is fed up, including Elena Parolin, a woman from Rochedale who was targeted by teen thieves twice in a week. She said—

As a victim of a violent home invasion who is still traumatised by the event, Breach Bail, Go to Jail can only be a very positive move in addressing the whole repeated crime situations Queensland citizens are facing on a daily basis. Minimum mandatory sentences are a 'no-brainer'.

It is a sentiment echoed by Belinda and Brett Beasley from the Jack Beasley Foundation. They are tireless campaigners whose aim is to make sure no other family endures the same heartbreak they did. They say—

Bail is a privilege and if you continue to commit crimes there must be strong consequences.

Samara Laverty also lost her son to knife crime. She successfully campaigned for bail reform in the Northern Territory and now lives in Queensland. She says—

My hope is that this stronger legislation will prevent offences such as what my family has been through. Currently, I am too scared to put my son's ashes in an urn because I cannot take the risk of being broken into and having them flushed or thrown out. That would be losing him all over again. From Declan's Legacy and myself, thank you for listening on bail reform.

We are listening and we are delivering with more police, stronger laws and fewer victims.

Training and Skills

 **Hon. RM BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (Minister for Finance, Trade, Employment and Training) (2.38 pm): This week marks National Skills Week. It is a chance to recognise something that happens every day across Queensland, because skills change lives. Imagine how different the lives of those opposite might have been if they had some skills before coming into this place.

This year's theme, 'Life Changing', could not be more fitting for a school leaver starting an apprenticeship, for someone changing careers, or for a woman deciding that a trade usually dominated by men is absolutely a career for her. In fact, because of the Crisafulli government's work to stamp out misogyny, sexual harassment, bullying and intimidation on worksites from Labor's CFMEU mates, we now have a record number of female apprentices and newly qualified female tradies.

005 Around one million Queenslanders take part in vocational education and training each year, and they matter hugely to Queensland's future because Labor's decade of decline left Queensland with dire skills shortages across the state. For 10 years they failed to build the workforce Queensland needed. The Crisafulli LNP government is turning that around. Our 2026-27 budget provides \$1.6 billion for trade, employment and training. Our Right Skills Strategy is about delivering the right skills, in the right place, at the right time.

We are opening more pathways for Queensland women who want to pursue a skilled career. When industry needs thousands more skilled workers, we cannot afford to leave that talent on the sidelines. That is why our new program TradieStart offers extra support to businesses employing apprentices from priority groups, including women. It is why government funded mentoring and initiatives are supporting female apprentices in traditionally male dominated industries, and it is why we have a plan that is delivering results, with Queensland now achieving a record number of new female tradie apprentices and a record number of women finishing their construction apprenticeships.

Across QBuild, women now make up more than one in four apprentices. Take 24-year-old Maryborough local Layla Youngberry. Layla started as an apprentice auto-electrician because she loved cars and wanted a hands-on career. She finished her certificate III, kept studying and today is business development manager at Allweld Manufacturing. Now, she is encouraging other young women to consider trades and technical careers.

We saw more of Queensland's training talent at parliament yesterday, with TAFE Queensland joining us on the Speaker's Green for our skills showcase across construction, health and hospitality. Next month, five Queenslanders will represent Australia as skillaroos at the international WorldSkills Competition in Shanghai—Dylan Wondal, Zack Budai, Lachlan Wright, Tasman Henry and Ella Taylor. I wish them all the very best.

Labor left Queensland with a dire skills crisis. We are turning the tide, with more apprenticeships, more support for employers and more women building careers in industries that need them. That is how skills change lives, and it is how we are delivering a better lifestyle through a stronger economy.

Mr SPEAKER: There is too much chatter in the chamber.

Health System, Workforce

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Minister for Health and Ambulance Services) (2.41 pm): At the core of Queensland's public health system is our health workforce—those who provide care to Queenslanders no matter where they live. On behalf of the Crisafulli government, I want to say thank you to them all. I am pleased to advise the House that in our first 20 months in government the Crisafulli government has grown Queensland Health's workforce by more than 10,000 professionals—more nurses, midwives, doctors, allied health professionals and clinical support workers across Queensland.

I can advise the House that as at Monday we have received a 91.5 per cent vote in support of the government's offer to resolve the visiting medical officers' enterprise bargaining agreement. I am told that is the single largest affirmative vote we have received in relation to our VMOs—another sign of the success of our engagement with our workforce.

The Crisafulli government has set an ambitious target to boost the health workforce by 46,000 additional workers by 2032. Our 10,000 additional health workers is a milestone on the way to meeting this commitment and is supported by our record \$35.5 billion health budget. I contrast this to Labor, who, for over a decade, failed to deliver the health workforce that Queenslanders needed. While there is still more to be done to heal Labor's health crisis, we are already starting to see results. Our efforts in workforce growth and retention are easing pressure across our health system, alongside our other initiatives, such as the Hospital Rescue Plan and Surgery Connect.

Today, I also want to say a big thank you to two remarkable parents—Monica and Fergus—who I met this morning at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital. They have been advocating for the rollout of cuddle cots to hospitals across Queensland after they sadly lost their baby boy Liam. The loss of a baby is a heartbreaking tragedy, and no family should ever feel alone or be rushed in their grief. Monica wrote to me a while ago to tell me her story and to ask for support for more cuddle cots in

Queensland. That is why today I can say that we have now delivered another 22 new cuddle cots to 17 hospitals across the state as well as upgrades to existing cots. From Thursday Island in the north to Redland in the south and out to St George, Dalby and places in between, these cuddle cots are now in place. This will boost the total number of cuddle cots to 70 across the state's public maternity services. A cuddle cot at the hospital meant Monica and Fergus could spend precious additional time with their baby Liam. Their advocacy will give other families across Queensland the same opportunity, and it is an ongoing and fitting tribute to the passing of little Liam.

Schools, Bullying

 **Hon. JH LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Minister for Education and the Arts) (2.45 pm): Safe schools are not only about protecting staff; they are also about supporting students. On 4 August 2026 I joined educators, parents, community representatives and students in Caloundra for the third antibullying roundtable being held across Queensland. I was pleased to be joined by the member for Caloundra.

The roundtable forms part of the Crisafulli government's \$33 million five-point plan to tackle bullying, which is delivering rapid support teams, a dedicated parent helpline, additional chaplains, staff training and expert advice to strengthen bullying prevention and response in Queensland schools. Participants highlighted the importance of early intervention, belonging and connectedness, community awareness, and supporting students to build respectful relationships.

The challenges of online bullying and the impact of social media on student wellbeing were also raised, alongside practical ideas from students themselves about how schools can continue to foster safe and supportive environments. These discussions reinforce that bullying is a complex issue and that supporting students and supporting staff go hand in hand. The Crisafulli government is listening carefully to the voices of students, families, educators and communities as we consider our next steps.

Occupational violence and aggression skyrocketed under those opposite. Reported workplace health and safety incidents involving teachers and teacher aides increased by 60 per cent between 2022 and 2023 and by a further 32 per cent between 2023 and 2024 under the former Labor government. We saw during estimates that those opposite clearly do not understand the government's data systems—the same systems Labor relied upon whilst in government. Those opposite should understand the difference between MyHR and OneSchool.

To ensure the record is clear when it comes to workplace health and safety incidents, I would like to correct the record for the benefit of the House. For workplace health and safety incidents against teachers, under Labor in 2022 there were 10,335 incidents, going up 63 per cent in 2023 to 16,834. In 2024, incidents continued going up—this time by 33 per cent to 22,443. However, in 2025, whilst incidents were at 24,546, we have seen this rate drop to a nine per cent increase. Figures for 2026 do not contain the full year of data for comparison but were at 15,270. When it came to workplace health and safety incidents against teacher aides, in 2022 there were 6,044 incidents, going up 54 per cent in 2023 to 9,314. In 2024, incidents continued going up—this time by 30 per cent to 12,124. However, in 2025, whilst incidents were at 13,224, we have seen this rate drop to a nine per cent increase. Figures for 2026 do not contain the full year of data for comparison but were at 8,303.

It is clear that numbers exploded under Labor, with rates increasing by double digits each year. In contrast, under the Crisafulli government we are making progress, fixing Labor's mess and taking action to address occupational violence and aggression in our schools. This year, dedicated workplace health and safety coordinators commenced in all 46 special schools across Queensland, and additional coordinator positions are now being rolled out across school clusters where they are needed most. We have also recruited principal consultant workplace health and safety officers in every region to strengthen support for schools and staff. Our focus remains clear: ensuring Queensland schools are safe, respectful and supportive places where every student can learn and every staff member can work safely.

Science and Innovation Strategy

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for the Environment and Tourism and Minister for Science and Innovation) (2.49 pm): We have world-class scientists and researchers, great universities, entrepreneurs prepared to have a crack, and Queenslanders with a talent and ambition to take on the world. For too long too many great ideas have not made it out of laboratories. Too many have not attracted the investment they need. Too many talented Queenslanders have looked elsewhere

for opportunity and too many chances to build businesses and create jobs here have been missed. After a decade of decline we are changing that.

The Crisafulli government has launched Ideas into Impact: From Discovery to Delivery, Queensland's new 15-year science and innovation strategy. It is focused on a simple outcome: more Queensland ideas becoming Queensland businesses, attracting investment and creating jobs. There are four priorities to get us there.

Firstly, we will build a stronger pipeline of ideas and talent. That starts with backing the researchers, the innovators and the entrepreneurs who create new ideas. We want to build entrepreneurial skills, encourage more Queenslanders to pursue commercial opportunities and make it easier for talented people to take the first step because a stronger innovation economy starts with people who are prepared to have a go.

Second, we will get better at commercialisation. Queensland already produces outstanding research. The challenge has been turning more of it into something that reaches the market. That means better connecting researchers with entrepreneurs, businesses with investors, and new technologies with customers. Our new Science and Innovation Connector Service will help Queenslanders navigate that system and find the expertise, investment and support they need. A new Office of Commercialisation will put a much stronger focus inside government on turning Queensland discoveries into commercial outcomes.

Third, we will strengthen collaboration. Good ideas do not become successful businesses in isolation. Universities, researchers, start-ups, established businesses, investors and government all have a role to play. Our Q Futures Conference will bring those groups together around Queensland's opportunities. A new Ministerial Science and Innovation Advisory Council will ensure government has direct access to the experience of people working across science, industry, quantum, investment and commercialisation. It is a 'Team Queensland' approach.

Fourth, we will focus on the industries where Queensland can compete and win. We want innovation supporting the industries that will drive Queensland's economy in the decades ahead. That includes areas like defence, biomedical technology, advanced manufacturing, agriculture, resources, digital technology and sports tech. It also means using innovation to make our great traditional industries more productive and competitive. A chief innovator embedded within the department will help drive that focus and stronger commercial outcomes across the strategy.

We have committed \$22 million over four years to start delivering this work. We will measure success by outcomes: more investment attracted to Queensland, more ideas commercialised, more Queensland businesses growing and more good jobs created for Queensland. Science and innovation are not ends in themselves. They should make Queensland stronger. They should create opportunities for people to build a career, start a business and invest in their future in this state. This is what Ideas into Impact is about: turning Queensland ideas into investment, turning them into businesses and turning them into jobs for Queenslanders. That is what the Crisafulli government is getting on with delivering.

Play On! Sports Vouchers



Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (2.52 pm): The Deputy Premier spoke earlier about the infrastructure build for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. His responsibility is to build the stage. My responsibility for the games is to put on the show. You cannot have a show if you do not have a pipeline of players.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr MANDER: It is a bit unusual that I am the showman this time and not the Deputy Premier. You cannot have a show if you do not have players and you need to have a pipeline of players. That is why I am so excited to talk about the Play On! Sports Vouchers program and what has happened over the last two rounds. Over two rounds 294,000 vouchers have now been redeemed. The growth on the previous voucher system is extraordinary. Rugby league redemptions are up 78 per cent, netball is up 50 per cent, football is up 49 per cent—an additional 17,000 redemptions, the largest lift of any sport in the state. Cricket, tennis, gymnastics and basketball are all up as well. That is government investment flowing directly into community clubs and directly back into the pockets of Queensland families.

Two of the results I am particularly proud of are the increase in female participation and in young Queenslanders with a disability. More than 3,700 Queensland sporting clubs are now accepting Play On! vouchers, with almost 2½ thousand clubs offering disability programs, which has led to a 33 per

cent increase in the number of kids with disability who receive vouchers. We want Queensland to be a world leader in para-sport. To do that we need to continue to create more opportunities for people with a disability to participate in sport at all levels. Meanwhile, total female Play On! redemptions are up 30 per cent. We are backing more girls than ever to get involved in sport, which is a key priority for our government: to keep girls engaged in sport.

The growth in female participation in rugby league has more than doubled. Redemptions for young girls in soccer are up 57 per cent, netball is up 50 per cent with an additional 9,000 girls on the court and more than 26,000 in total, the largest female cohort of any sport in Queensland. Tennis, basketball, gymnastics and swimming have all recorded strong growth in girls playing as well.

With six years until the Brisbane 2032 games, this government is not waiting for the legacy to arrive. We are building it now via targeted and ongoing investment. Do not just take my word for it; this is coming from our state's sporting organisations. Netball Queensland CEO, Kate Davies, has written to me confirming more than 27,300 vouchers redeemed for netball, almost \$5.5 million in relief for netball families. Basketball Queensland Chief Executive, Josh Pascoe, has written confirming more than 21,000 redemptions and more than \$4.2 million redeemed through basketball. Tennis Queensland CEO, Cameron Pearson, has written confirming more than 12,600 redemptions and 29 per cent growth in girls playing tennis. The head of AFL Queensland, Richie Lyons, has written to me confirming a record 1,087 junior teams this season, 49 of them brand new and he credits Play On! for it. QRL acting Chief Executive, Glenn Ottaway, says they have recorded almost 34,000 Play On! sports voucher redemptions, making rugby league the second highest redeemed sport under the program. This represents more than \$6.7 million in direct cost-of-living relief provided to rugby league families across the state.

Play On! is proof that we have already been delivering for families. Play On! is now ongoing, providing meaningful cost-of-living relief for Queensland families and Queensland clubs in the years ahead. Those opposite had a decade to take action and help Queenslanders get involved in sport and present a vision for the sector. Instead, they left Queensland families paying more and playing less. This government backs Queensland clubs. We back Queensland families and, most of all, we back the almost 300,000 Queensland kids who are now out there involved in sport because this government gave them the opportunity to play on.

ABSENCE OF PREMIER

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (2.57 pm): I advise the House that the Premier and Minister for Veterans will be absent for question time today. I advise that the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations will answer questions for the Premier in question time.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, Progress Report

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.57 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House calls on the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to table in the House the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce progress report by 5 pm on Thursday, 27 August 2026.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 3.57 pm.

Residential Care, Alleged Sexual Assault

 **Mr MILES** (2.57 pm): I table an article from the *Courier-Mail* about the violent rape of a child in care at a state funded residential care home. My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. Can the minister guarantee that neither she or her office nor her department were provided with any allegations or information related to this child or the service provider prior to the alleged harm?

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to take some advice on that. This is a very recent occurrence.

Mr MILES: If it assists, I am advised that no charges have been laid.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order not only in relation to standing order 233 in relation to sub judice—and I understand what the Leader of the Opposition said—but also the fact that the question relates to a child in care. I seek your guidance in relation to matters that may prejudice any of the investigations or other matters with respect to legislative requirements that the minister could inadvertently have to address.

007

Speaker's Ruling, Tabled Paper Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I will make a couple of points. We will not be allowing the tabling of that document as it identifies the actual location. Minister, you can answer the question, but be conscious of the issues.

Ms CAMM: I am not sure which report the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. I spoke to the media at length earlier today with regard to this matter. I am not sure if this was last night or this morning.

I can update the House that the police confirmed at a press conference that the Attorney-General, the police minister and I were a part of today that there is an active investigation underway around an alleged sexual assault of a young woman in residential care. I spoke to the media at length more broadly, so I can speak in broad terms in the House but I cannot speak to the specific case. It would not be appropriate to do that while there is a police investigation underway.

First and foremost, I expressed to the media how horrified I was to see the allegations of the alleged sexual abuse of a child in care. Since taking on this role, I have been horrified at the level of child sexual abuse that has occurred in the child safety system and outside the child safety system in Queensland. The commission of inquiry uncovered that 67 per cent of reported alleged sexual abuse, sexual exploitation or sexual assault of children occurred in residential care. Those opposite would know that because they were the ministers during that period of time.

The question that the Leader of the Opposition is asking me is with regard to the system that they created and that we inherited. What I updated the media on today—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. For an answer to this question to be relevant it must address whether or not allegations were brought to the minister before this incident of harm was reported in the paper. That is the substance of the question. The answer must be relevant to that question.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the point of order raised by the Manager of Opposition Business. In terms of your guidance earlier, the minister is being very careful in relation to her obligations under standing order 233 and sub judice, which may or may not be a result of this, as well as obligations under the standing orders and other legislation in relation to identifying a child. I would submit to you that her response to this point has been careful and deliberate, and she is complying with your rulings and directives and being sensitive to the matters that are still under active investigation as articulated by the police.

Mr SPEAKER: I instructed the minister to be careful as this is the subject of an active investigation. The minister is talking about media conferences she has had on this issue so far. There is no point of order.

Ms CAMM: What I will say to the opposition, to members of the House and to Queenslanders is that we take any allegations of sexual assault, sexual exploitation or sexual abuse or reports thereof exceptionally seriously. That is exactly why we have heard from the Attorney-General today that she will introduce legislation creating the Queensland Protection Commission. It is why we called a commission of inquiry. It is why information sharing provisions are critical.

What we saw with the case of Ashley Paul Griffith and the *In plain sight* report is that perpetrators know how to find gaps within the system. By undertaking our reform we are ensuring information provisions are very clear. Any complaint or any allegation will be dealt with by the Queensland Police Service and Blue Card Services under the Reportable Conduct Scheme.

Residential Care, Alleged Sexual Assault

Mr MILES: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. The *Courier-Mail* reports that the residential care provider has refused to say whether the accused staff member has been stood down. What steps will the minister take to ensure the alleged offender is not still working at this facility?

Ms CAMM: Firstly, I reinforce that there is an active police investigation underway. The other steps we take I updated the media on earlier today. When there is an allegation of sexual assault, harm or sexual exploitation made by a child in care, a carer, a residential care provider, a youth worker or in

fact any other person that child comes into contact with, it is incumbent on people to report that allegation to the Queensland Police Service for investigation and to the QFCC. It is also incumbent upon the provider to report that as part of the Reportable Conduct Scheme.

My department undertakes the critical incident and briefing process. Of the five previous ministers for child safety, four are sitting opposite and they are fully aware of that process. I understand that the Leader of the Opposition is perhaps not aware of the process as he was not a former child safety minister, but the person sitting next to him was and others opposite were. They understand—and if they did not then they were negligent in their role as minister—exactly what I am trying to traverse right now without disclosing any confidential information that will impact that investigation.

I, through my department, ensure the placement is reviewed, that the interests of the child are paramount and that specialised service supports are deployed for that child where there has been an allegation of sexual abuse. I can confirm for the House that that has absolutely occurred. I can confirm that we review that placement. We also review the contracts under which that provider operates. We also ensure they are complying with the reportable conduct requirements—which those opposite failed to bring in. With regard to referrals to Blue Card Services, we on this side of the House changed the law and processes to ensure blue cards can be cancelled based on an allegation while a police investigation is underway.

I urge the Leader of the Opposition to go and have a conversation with the four former ministers who sit over there and understand the complexity and seriousness of these allegations and the way in which we must conduct ourselves.

(Time expired)

Crime, Bail Laws

Mrs POOLE: My question is the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government taking strong actions against criminals who breach their bail and is the Deputy Premier aware of any approaches that failed to take action against serious recidivist offenders during a decade of decline?

008

Mr BLEIJIE: I thank the member for Mundingburra for the question. First I want to give her and all of the North Queensland MPs a shout-out—in fact, all of the Liberal National Party MPs—for raising the issue of the crime crisis we inherited from the Labor government. It is no secret that when we lost office in 2015 the new Labor government started changing all of the youth justice laws. They got rid of breach-of-bail laws. They got rid of the youth justice laws. They got rid of all of the intervention programs and all of the detention programs. They went soft on crime. Over 10 years, they kept bringing legislation into this place which was softer, softer, softer. For 10 years the Labor Party put the rights of offenders before the rights of victims every single day in this place. We saw the chaos.

Since our election in October 2024 we have been turning the tide on the youth crime crisis. As the Premier often says, it is not yet enough; we have to do more. Under Labor, victim numbers increased by 193 per cent across the state during their decade of decline. We have seen a reduction in victim numbers of 9.6 per cent in the last year and a half. It is a good start but it is certainly not enough.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment. There is way too much chatter in this chamber.

Mr BLEIJIE: Since this government has been elected we now have 45 offences in Adult Crime, Adult Time. When we go out into our communities they say, 'Adult Crime, Adult Time is great, but what are you doing with the kids and the adults who are breaching bail?' Well, if you breach bail in Queensland you are going to go to jail—whether you are a young offender or an adult offender. That is what our communities have been saying. That is the feedback our members have been giving to the cabinet and the government is acting. This parliament will act. This week members will see the strongest bail laws in the country introduced. Here is the question, though: the laws we introduce will bring in a minimum mandatory 12-month sentence in prison; what is the Labor opposition's view on mandatory minimum sentencing? We know that the member for Woodridge never supported mandatory minimum sentences. He said that they do not work. Maybe they do not work in Tuvalu, where he was the attorney-general.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. He is fake-talking to the member for McConnel. Maybe they are talking about rowing in Rocky or Olympic stadiums or something; I do not know. They are moving their mouths but not much is coming out, because he does not want to be reminded of his record. Look

at the chaos we had when they were voting on Adult Crime, Adult Time. There were reports on Channel 9 in December 2024 that the member for Cooper accused the member for McConnell of lying to her about the party's direction and proceeded to tell her, 'Do not touch me. Do not come near me.' This was what was quoted in Channel 9. This is the absolute chaos. The question is now a test of leadership: does the opposition leader support minimum mandatory sentencing? Will he finally put the rights of victims ahead of offenders, like the LNP is doing?

(Time expired)

Child Safety, Data Reporting

Ms McMILLAN: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. During estimates, the minister was asked about the number of children harmed while in care but was unable to provide that number. Given the minister has now had almost a month to review this data, can the minister advise us of the total number of cases of substantiated harm while in care, including rape, in the last 12 months?

Ms CAMM: I wonder if this afternoon I will get a question from the former child safety ministers who sit on the front benches opposite. I thank the shadow minister for her question. I know that she is very passionate about children, and from her previous career she would be fully aware of the importance of bringing the Reportable Conduct Scheme online and the role of blue cards.

I was very transparent in estimates with regard to the information that has been brought back online with Unify, just as I was transparent with Queenslanders about the issues around that system. I know that transparency sounds odd to those opposite, particularly in respect of the broken child safety system we inherited. Any child who suffers harm—both outside of the system before they enter the child safety system and within the system—is something we take very seriously. It is why we have an enormous reform agenda underway.

It is quite interesting because the shadow minister has criticised the government in this House for bringing forward the commission of inquiry, claiming that we curtailed it. In fact, we brought it forward because the findings were so damning of the system we inherited—particularly the finding that 67 per cent of all children who experienced sexual exploitation, alleged sexual harm or abuse were in residential care, under the former government.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order as to relevance. The question was precisely around asking for a number.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister was speaking directly to that point you raised in your point of order, so I will listen to the minister.

Ms CAMM: We know they do not like the number. Of the number of children in the child protection system who alleged sexual abuse or harm, 67 per cent were in residential care. These are the same residential care providers that this government inherited, some of whose contracts we cancelled. Four former ministers allowed those contracts to be let, for hundreds of millions of dollars, when children were being failed, there was no regulation and there were not even checks of whether carers had blue cards. The fact that not one, two or three but four former ministers oversaw it but then come into this House to try to rewrite history is, frankly, appalling.

(Time expired)

Victims of Crime

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity. How has the Crisafulli LNP government remained steadfast in its commitment to put victims before offenders, and is the Attorney-General aware of any examples where offenders have been put above victims of crime in Queensland?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I thank the member for Scenic Rim for his hard work and advocacy on behalf of his constituents, who very clearly sent a message to the former Labor government that enough is enough and that things had to change. In fact, when you cast your mind back to the election in October 2024—it was only a few days later that the former premier, now the Leader of the Opposition, was grappling with, 'Oh my goodness, what went wrong?'—at the time he actually said that he did not expect Labor to oppose David Crisafulli's new LNP government's Adult Crime, Adult Time laws. He then went on ABC Radio Brisbane and said that we 'clearly have a mandate'. He then conceded—this is the one that I find fascinating—that, after 10 years in government, 'Obviously we were too slow to respond to crimes in 2021 and 2022, particularly in Townsville.' He went on—

We got things wrong in Townsville and people made up their minds to tell us that.

He continued—

We've got four years to tell Townsville locals that we've got the message.

That was straight after the election. Then what happened? Before Christmas 2024, they were brought kicking and screaming and faced a crisis in the caucus. After however many caucus meetings they had, they eventually decided to support Adult Crime, Adult Time. Then what happened? They were brought kicking and screaming once again for tranche 2. Then for tranche 3 they said, 'Enough is enough. We're on the side of offenders once again.' They drew a line in the sand. This is the former Labor government that did not listen to the opposition leader, who said, 'We've got four years.' He actually just went, 'No, we are back on the side of offenders.' Where is the Leader of the Opposition now? Is he going to be on the side of victims of crime, like the LNP Crisafulli government is, or will he go back to the same old decade of decline—10 years, standing on the side of offenders. I say for the benefit of new members of the House that the former Labor government watered down and weakened the laws 16 times. They cannot stand being on the side of victims. It is only the LNP Crisafulli government that is standing for the rights of victims in Queensland.

009

Speaker's Ruling, Tabled Paper Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, standing order 35 prohibits the tabling of documents that may identify a child subject to the Child Protection Act or the Youth Justice Act. The document sought to be tabled included the name of an out-of-home residential care provider. I am unaware of how many children are in the care of this provider. I am concerned that identification of the provider may go some way to identifying the child so the document will not be tabled.

Child Safety, Data Reporting

Mr DICK: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. At the minister's estimates hearing, the minister's director-general said corporate data for children with substantiated harm was not available but was being prioritised now. Why was substantiated harm data not prioritised when corporate data first went offline in June 2025?

Ms CAMM: We prioritised all of the child safety data that was going to be brought back online. In fact, there had been no plan by the former government with regard to the rollout of Unify to bring back corporate data online.

A government member interjected.

Ms CAMM: Thank you, I will take that interjection. They descoped it.

Mr Bleijie: Was he on CBRC?

Ms CAMM: I do thank the Deputy Premier, because the very member in this House who asked the question was not just on CBRC, he was the Treasurer of the day and would fully understand and be privy to the information pertaining to Unify, including the descoping of corporate data, which I have prosecuted in this House many times. The reason we know there was descoped data is, one, we undertook an independent third-party consultant conduct a review; and, two, we undertook an internal audit. Through all of that it uncovered that the former government descoped corporate data and reporting. Worse still, in caretaker mode the former government's director-general of child safety, who was the director-general under multiple child safety ministers, wrote to third parties, including Luke Twyford, the Family and Child Commissioner, to say there would be no corporate data—it is going, it will be offline, with no plan to bring it back online.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms CAMM: It is interesting, Deputy Premier. They did take the data offline. My department has worked diligently to bring that corporate data back online. It is very important. This side of the House undertook a commission of inquiry. We saw data of children in residential care balloon to over 3,000. One could surmise that under the former government's policies potentially there was the risk of harm to those more than 3,000 children in residential care, under providers that were not regulated and were not licensed. The complaints of sexual abuse of children in residential care were 67 per cent. The number of sexual abuse complaints under their watch would have grown exponentially. We have taken the recommendations of the commission of inquiry and we are implementing them. In bringing back corporate data, this government will be judged on the number of children in residential care, the number of children adopted and the number of children found permanent family homes.

(Time expired)

Youth Crime

Mrs YOUNG: My question is to the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. How has the Crisafulli LNP government put community at the forefront of our fight against youth crime, and is the minister aware of any policies where vested interests have been placed above community safety?

A government member: Great question!

Mr PURDIE: It was a great question and I appreciate the member's fierce support for her local police. Unfortunately, her electorate was not immune to Labor's youth crime crisis. There is a stark contrast that we need to highlight here. It is the LNP's policy of more police, tougher laws and fewer victims which is in stark contrast to the Labor Party's 10 years of fewer police and soft laws resulting in the number of victims of crime exploding across Queensland. Everything they did in government prioritised perpetrators over victims. It is funny that those opposite are coming in here talking about victims of domestic and family violence when everything they did in government watered down the laws allowing police to protect victims. Today we are talking about child sexual and physical abuse. In everything they did they prioritised the rights of perpetrators over victims.

One only has to look at the Labor Party's policy platform, which we know was written by the member for Stafford. It was only recently brought to my attention that there is nothing in it about youth crime. This shows what their priorities are. At 8.130: 'Labor will ensure that the option of allowing an accused in criminal cases to sit at the bar table, removing the stigma of the dock.' That is what their priority is: not young serious repeat offenders in your living room, but removing the stigma of criminals in the dock. This weekend we are coming up to their conference, which is advertised as the highest decision-making forum. What will they do this weekend? Do they now appreciate that their soft-on-crime approach, whether it came to holding perpetrators of domestic and family violence to account, holding child sexual offenders and child abusers to account or serious young repeat offenders to account—everything they did—prioritised perpetrators over victims.

I might be able to provide some information to the Attorney-General. She was just unpacking the chronology of Adult Crime, Adult Time. We know they were dragged in here kicking and screaming before Christmas. They did not want to support it. We had a member over there with headphones in rocking backwards and forwards wanting to be in a happy place. Then on the third occasion they did not support it. What were the machinations around that? I was reminded of a strongly worded letter that was made public from the Young Labor movement to senior members over there telling them to stand up for Labor Left values. When are they going to drop their left-wing ideology that was soft on crime and protect victims in this state?

Child Safety, Census

Ms PUGH: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. Results of the 2024 child safety census were released in May last year. Will the minister advise if the 2025 child safety census was conducted and when it will be released to Queenslanders?

Ms CAMM: The child safety census was also one of the factors that alarmed me when I was first sworn in as the child safety minister because it was in stark contrast to the My Life in Care survey that was commissioned under the former government. The child safety census data talked about the number of children entering care that had interactions of three or more harm types. It also talked about the number of children who had attempted or had thought about suicide. That was in stark contrast to the former Labor government's children in care survey for which those opposite chose to pay children for through gift vouchers. It is something that I took action on as minister when it was presented to me by the department as I felt it was unacceptable. It was unacceptable because it was not independent and it was unacceptable because it was not a true reflection of what the commission of inquiry uncovered.

I will say it again: it was uncovered by the commission of inquiry that 67 per cent of children in residential care experienced alleged sexual abuse or harm—residential care designed, funded and, frankly, grew out of control under the former Labor government. All I can surmise is they had an ideological opposition to family-based care because nothing else makes sense to me. In fact, the commission of inquiry pointed to a failure in governance and oversight and, frankly, a lack of care and accountability.

A government member: And a revolving door of child safety ministers.

Ms CAMM: I will take that interjection: a revolving door of child safety ministers. Now all of a sudden all the questions come out of the care and concern of those opposite around children in the child protection system.

Mr Bleijie: They didn't care for 10 years.

Ms CAMM: I take that interjection from the Deputy Premier: when there was no care for 10 years. That is evidenced by the child safety census data that the member is referring to that is an abysmal indictment on her former government.

The fact that they have even raised that in the House demonstrates how out of touch they really were with their own policy settings that were failing children each and every day. Just as we have brought data online and we will continue to do that, we will also engage with the QFCC and the Queensland Protection Commission given their important oversight roles, their level of independence and the children's lived experience framework that they bring to the system.

010

Youth Crime

Mr KEMPTON: My question is to the Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services. How is the Crisafulli LNP government tackling the youth crime crisis, and is the minister aware of any policies that ignored its very existence?

Mrs GERBER: I thank the member for Cook, who asks about a youth crime crisis. His community in Far North Queensland was at the epicentre of Labor's youth crime crisis. Day after day, he stood up for his community and called for change. He is part of a government that has implemented the change that Queenslanders called for. He is part of a government that has implemented our strong Adult Crime, Adult Time laws and is building on those Adult Crime, Adult Time laws with Breach Bail, Go to Jail.

Police data has shown a 9.6 per cent reduction in victim numbers off the back of our strong laws. However, we know that there is more work to be done. Why is there more work to be done? It is because the previous Labor government saw victim numbers rise 193 per cent. What was Labor's response? Labor's response could not be more different from that of the Crisafulli government. They weakened the law and now they want to take us backwards. The police minister referred to the Labor Party policy platform of 2025. That policy platform promised to raise the age of criminal responsibility and remove minimum mandatory sentencing.

Let us look at what those opposite have said in this House about minimum mandatory sentencing. The member for McConnel is quoted in *Hansard* saying, 'I reject a one-size-fits-all mandatory sentencing'. When the member for Woodridge was the attorney-general, he is quoted in *Hansard* saying that their government did not support minimum mandatory sentences. They are on the record saying they do not support it. Is it any wonder that the Leader of the Opposition had to gag his caucus and their policy document from talking about youth crime? That is from the *Australian*. Do not believe me, member for Miller; it is quoted right here. The *Australian* says the Labor Party's Policy Coordination Council got a stern warning from the Leader of the Opposition to give youth justice a wide berth. A source said, 'We don't want to touch anything to do with youth justice or anything really controversial'. That was the message from the Leader of the Opposition.

What will he do now? Will he stand on the side of victims or will he continue to gag the caucus? We know the Young Labor Left want him to stand up for their left Labor values. Will he vote against mandatory minimum sentencing again? Will he support the member for Woodridge and the member for McConnel, who are on the record saying that they do not support mandatory minimum sentencing, and their own policy document that is binding? They say they are going to raise the age of criminal responsibility so youth are no longer held accountable for their offences. He needs to come clean with Queenslanders because right now his own caucus and his own members do not support our strong laws.

Child Safety, Survey

Ms FENTIMAN: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The minister has claimed the My Life in Care Survey was scrapped because children were 'bribed' to complete it. I table an ad for a government survey from the Ekka that offers prizes for completing it.

Tabled paper: Image depicting a Queensland Government sign with a QR code and the wording 'Share your experience for a chance to win a prize pack valued at \$350'.

Was the minister aware that the government would offer incentives to show-going families for filling out an Ekka survey at the same time that she scrapped an important child safety survey for also offering incentives?

Ms CAMM: I thank the former child safety minister for her question.

Mr SPEAKER: Use correct titles, please.

Ms CAMM: The member for Waterford is trying to compare a survey undertaken at a public event enjoyed by Queensland families with one involving vulnerable children in the child safety system. Those vulnerable children, some of whom were eight years old, were helped to fill out a survey. Those children were given gift vouchers if they completed the survey.

For context, because I was just asked a question about the census survey that was undertaken, I refer to the findings of that survey that talk about the failings of the former child safety system. A survey was undertaken by children who received gift vouchers if they did the survey and said their life in care was so very fabulous and happy. Sixty-nine of them said they were happy, which is about the same figure for the number of girls in residential care who had been sexually assaulted.

The member has just demonstrated how out of touch she truly is in regards to child protection and the way in which we should engage with children within the system. The member refers to the department undertaking a survey into its own services versus the child census data undertaken by the QFCC, with the level of independence that brings. Quite frankly, the member thinking that they are two comparative things demonstrates how out of touch they are, why they are in opposition and why she begged to get out of the portfolio.

We are not shying away from the challenges that we have inherited from those opposite. I am not shying away from the failures of the former child safety system that was overseen by that very member and three others who sit on their front bench. We will do the work that has been outlined by the commission of inquiry. We will deliver the reforms and we will be judged on how we fix the broken child safety system—the system that they destroyed.

Small and Family Business, Crime

Mr MOLHOEK: My question is to the Minister for Customer Services and Open Data and Minister for Small and Family Business. How is the Crisafulli government delivering targeted support to protect small and family businesses from various forms of crime, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to keep small and family businesses safe during a decade of decline?

Mr MINNIKIN: I thank the member for Southport for the question. I have spent time with him and his chamber of commerce. He is absolutely dedicated to small and family businesses in his electorate. I acknowledge that and thank him for it.

I will compare and contrast this side of the chamber, which is united as one team, and that side, which is a disjointed rabble. I will highlight how we work together as one. I will talk through the lens of the impact that crime has had on small and family businesses throughout the state. To answer the member's question, one of our signature programs is our Secure Communities Partnership Program, which works in concert with an increase in police numbers on the ground and our strong laws, including Breach Bail, Go to Jail.

I want to highlight some of the work I have done with members in this chamber. I met Steve, the director of Cardzilla, with the member for Barron River, Bree James. She is doing a great job with the small businesses in her community. She is an absolute champion. Steve told us that he saw the same repeat offenders coming into his store time and time again. He is a beneficiary. Just south of there, Terry James, the member for Mulgrave, and I visited the local Australia Post office where a great couple are having a real red-hot crack in their small and family business. They too are beneficiaries. Terry absolutely gets small and family business.

011 Also, I have been to Mundingburra with Janelle Poole. We know that she is breathing, sleeping and absolutely immersed in small and family business throughout her electorate. I want to congratulate her on the small businesses she took me to. There is more. When I visited Nigel Hutton's electorate of Keppel, we visited small and family businesses there with Mayor Belot, and he was getting on with the small business facet there with the community benefit program. But there is more! I also visited the other end of Queensland, the electorate of Cook, with the state member, David Kempton. I went to Mareeba and visited a small business there as well. In fact, with the Secure Communities Partnership Program, we have delivered small and family business security improvements throughout the state.

We know that there has been a decrease of 9.6 per cent in victim numbers when it comes to Adult Crime, Adult Time. We also know that under those opposite crime went up 193 per cent. We have more work to do—we know that—but we will do everything possible to protect small and family businesses throughout this great state.

(Time expired)

Disability Housing

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Minister for Housing. Ten purpose-built residences at Cootharinga Gardens in Babinda have been sitting vacant for nearly two years during a housing crisis, despite Cootharinga identifying willing community housing providers to take over the facility. Will the minister direct his department to immediately sit down with Cootharinga and the Cairns Regional Council and get these residences reopened and get people housed?

Mr O'CONNOR: I want to thank the member for the question and for raising this matter with me in correspondence and in a meeting that we had last year. Cootharinga Gardens in Babinda, for the benefit of other members in the chamber, is a wheelchair accessible aged-care facility that, as the member outlined, has 10 en suite studio rooms, a caretaker's unit and a caretaker's bedroom. The property was originally funded in 1999 under a long-term community housing program, and it is subject to a capital funding agreement and a deed of covenant with the Cairns Regional Council and with the department.

Under the surviving terms of the contract of sale, which is the transfer-back provisions, council is responsible for determining the future use of the property, including whether it is to be transferred back to council or to another provider. We have been actively engaging with the council. We have, in fact, met with the council and we are seeking their view on the future use of Cootharinga Gardens. We have been doing that since early last year. We have not yet had a decision confirmed. Most recently, in June, through Crown Law, we issued a response to council's due diligence and the transfer-back matters to council's representatives. We are still awaiting that response. Like you, member for Hill, we want to see Cootharinga Gardens back delivering services for the Babinda community as soon as possible. The state is ready to go, but, once again, we are waiting for the Cairns Regional Council to make a decision about the future of the property. We have checked in as recently as this month and we still have not received a direction from the Cairns Regional Council on a pathway forward.

We need to know, through a decision by the Cairns council, whether they intend to exercise their transfer-back rights over the property. Once they determine that, we are ready to move. I would strongly encourage the Cairns Regional Council to make that decision as soon as possible so we can get on with resolving this issue. I cannot disclose or prejudice the ongoing discussions that are occurring, but we are ready to progress this and we await that action from the council.

In general, the No. 1 thing we can do to address the housing crisis right across Queensland is to turn around the supply crisis we inherited. After just 509 social homes were added, on average, to the system over the last decade, I can inform the member that across Far North Queensland we now have 824 social and affordable homes under contract or construction—824 right now versus an annual average of just 509 social homes delivered by the former Labor government.

Women's Safety

Ms HATCHER: My question is to the Minister for Women and Women's Economic Security, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Multiculturalism. How is the Crisafulli LNP government's relentless focus on driving down crime delivering safer communities for Queensland women, and is the minister aware of any approaches that failed to keep Queensland women safe during a decade of decline?

Ms SIMPSON: I want to thank the member for Caloundra for her question and also for her great work representing her community, particularly advocating for safety and backing tougher laws and more police on the beat. The Crisafulli LNP government has a relentless focus on driving down crime as women in particular have borne the brunt of Labor's crime crisis, which saw a 193 per cent increase in victim numbers. Under the Crisafulli LNP government there has been a 9.6 per cent reduction in the number of victims. But more has to be done, and that is why we continue to fix Labor's weak laws and bad management.

Under Labor, more than 600 rape kits were left untested. This meant offenders were left to roam the streets. We have cleared this backlog. Under Labor, less than 50 per cent of DVConnect calls were

answered. Now under the LNP, 82 per cent are answered. Under the Labor Party, DV funding was far less. We have increased it by \$100 million.

Women make choices about their safety—others may not—by asking themselves questions such as: can I work a night shift or not? Can I park my car and walk to meet my friends or to my house? Can I jog or exercise at this time of day or in this location? Can I let my kids play in the front yard? Can I travel alone? Can I walk my dog through bushland? Can I find an exit from a bad relationship? Each of these decisions impacts a woman's life and her economic and physical security. For a decade, Labor preferenced offenders over victims, and this negatively impacted women's safety and choices. In contrast, the Crisafulli government is preferencing victims over offenders. We are backing Queensland women. Under our government, bail for offenders is a privilege, not a right. If an offender breaches bail by committing a serious offence, they will be subject to the Breach Bail, Go to Jail legislation that we are introducing as there should be, and there must be, consequences.

Queensland women need to know that their government cares more about their safety than about the feelings of an offender making poor choices. Justice should favour the victim. Reducing crime reduces the negative impact on women. This Crisafulli LNP government will continue to drive down crime, return safety where you live and increase economic security for women. I call on the opposition to back Queensland women and support the Breach Bail, Go to Jail laws. Back our tougher laws. Back the change where we are working for Queenslanders, backing Queenslanders and particularly backing the safety of Queensland women.

Child Safety

Ms GRACE: My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. Can the minister advise how many incidents are on the child safety assessment backlog?

Ms CAMM: I thank the member for the question. What I would say more broadly to the member and to Queenslanders is that we have seen enormous demand on the system. That was expressed both through the estimates hearing bringing data online and, more broadly, demand that we have seen particularly with the cost-of-living crisis, the housing crisis, a youth crime crisis—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Ms CAMM: I take that interjection from the youth justice minister. When we talk about the systems and the data and what we inherited on this side of the House, that was uncovered in the commission of inquiry. We saw an increased demand on the child safety system and also how that demand translated to other systems like the youth justice system, frankly, the health system, the housing system, the education system and the issues that the minister is dealing with there, particularly behavioural issues, and the complex needs of families, and those families are at risk.

012 More broadly, we have seen an increase in demand in investigations, in assessments, in inquiries and in reportable conduct. Part of the growth that we have seen in assessments has come on the back of our government's proactive approach to bring forward the Reportable Conduct Scheme. We have seen early childhood, child protection and other agencies as well as sporting organisations embark upon the child protection safeguard of the reportable conduct—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question sought a number.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not have the question in front of me. It was about the backlog.

Ms Grace: How many incidents are on the child safety assessment backlog?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have heard the question.

Ms CAMM: We are working through the backlog that was left by the broken systems we inherited from those opposite.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms CAMM: Mr Speaker, I am not going to take the interjections because they do not like the answer. As we have outlined, we have taken targeted responses to child safety—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms McMillan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mansfield, I just called for order and you interjected. You are warned.

Ms CAMM: Significant demand on a system results in a backlog. What are we doing? In this year's budget we have secured a 20 per cent uplift in child safety officers. That is an extra 100 FTE. Those opposite were going to cut 96 jobs. I sat in front of those staff just before Christmas after we were elected and they were crying because of what those opposite were going to do.

(Time expired)

Olympic and Paralympic Games, Infrastructure

Mrs KIRKLAND: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations. How is the Crisafulli LNP government continuing the delivery of generational infrastructure for regional Queensland ahead of the 2032 Olympic and Paralympic Games, and is he aware of any alternative approaches that failed to back in regional Queensland?

Mr BLEIJIE: What a wonderful question from the member for Rockhampton in Central Queensland. We love Central Queensland. The Crisafulli government loves regional Queensland. Look at Glen Kelly up there. We back it by investing in infrastructure, particularly for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. We have a plan. It is called the 2032 Delivery Plan.

What is the plan of those opposite? Do they back rowing on the mighty Fitzroy River in Rockhampton? Do the Labor Party back whitewater rafting in the Redlands? Do they back the 63,000-seat Brisbane Stadium? Do they back equestrian in Toowoomba? Do they back surfing in North Queensland and the Whitsundays? Do they back the Barlow Park upgrade? Do they back Maryborough—or Olympic-borough—with our Greek god up the back there? Do they back it? We do not know because they are all over the shop.

Concerningly, a couple of weeks ago when we announced \$287.5 million for the big Ekka upgrades in the budget the shadow treasurer said on the news, 'Where's the money coming from?' It is coming from our budget. We actually put money in the budget. I can understand the shadow treasurer is a little confused because when they were in government they did not put money in the budget. They did not put money in for the athletes village or any of this. All the shadow treasurer has to do is open the budget books to see it all there in black and white.

More concerningly, the shadow minister for Olympic and Paralympic games is the member for McConnel. The member for McConnel has just released a newsletter in her electorate. I need to read from it. She says about the Olympic and Paralympic Games infrastructure, 'The Premier wanted to pursue these vanity projects.' Does the shadow minister for the games support the delivery plan? Does the shadow minister for Olympic and Paralympic games support Victoria Park? She says on the front of the newsletter, 'It's pretty disappointing behaviour from the government, including converting Victoria Park to freehold.' What is their plan?

We heard the member for Woodridge say that no-one called for the National Aquatic Centre, despite the fact that Olympic gold medallists have been saying they wanted the National Aquatic Centre. This is a man so obsessed with me I am living rent free in his head. He has to spend less time on me and more time on policy development. What is the alternative government's plan for the games? Surely it is not the failed QSAC.

(Time expired)

Child Safety Commission of Inquiry, Report

Ms SCANLON: My question is to the Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The Child Safety Commission of Inquiry report noted the My Life in Care survey provides 'important foundations upon which a feedback and learning system can be built'. Why did the minister scrap the survey, despite the commission of inquiry describing it as important?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have two minutes.

Ms CAMM: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I scrapped the survey because I do not believe that children in care should be encouraged to participate in a survey by being offered vouchers. I also scrapped the survey because it was not reflective of the experiences of children in care, as evidenced by the QFCC, the child census and the commission of inquiry with regard to sexual abuse.

Also, those opposite used to love to release documents with colourful emojis on the front of them at estimates. They would say, 'Here's our good news story. There's nothing to see here in child safety. Listen to these voices of happy children who got their gift vouchers.'

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms CAMM: I do not apologise for it. We will rely upon the voices of Create Foundation, because that is whom the attorney, Minister Simpson and I listened to on the back of the commission of inquiry. I will rely upon the voices of children and young people whom the commissioner, Luke Twyford, brings together each and every year. As part of community cabinet, the Premier, the Attorney and I, and others, will listen to the children who are in care with their foster parents who come and speak to me. We will listen to that young man from the Attorney's community who has come out of the child protection system. I have heard firsthand how broken residential care is for his five siblings, who are stuck because the former government's failed policies keep kids in resi-care instead of with families.

I do not apologise for cutting a survey that was buying the opinions of children to make them look good. We will get on and listen to the voices of children, foster carers and kinship carers, not the voices of those opposite.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MOTIONS

Suspension of Standing Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (3.58 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders:

1. The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity be allowed to immediately move a motion without notice with the following time limits to apply to the debate of the motion:
 - 3 minutes for each member;
 - total time before question put—30 minutes.
 2. That following debate of the motion the order of business recommence with introduction of private members' bills.
- Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

AYES, 52:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 1—Knuth.

NOES, 37:

ALP, 36—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Age of Criminal Responsibility; Bail Laws



Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (4.03 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. rejects any move to raise the age of criminal responsibility; and
2. supports a minimum mandatory sentence of one year for criminals who commit a serious offence whilst on bail.

This week is a very important week as we will be introducing the next tranche of the Crisafulli government putting victims before the rights of offenders. This week we also have the Labor Party conference that is binding on those members. We also have the Leader of the Opposition, who is under an enormous amount of pressure from all the little people on the frontbench over there who are

pressuring him to go one way or the other. I will say very clearly in this House that the Crisafulli LNP government will not raise the age of criminal responsibility. The Labor Party state platform—I refer the member for Stafford, if he is following his document, to 8.71, where it says—

Labor will increase the age of criminal responsibility from 10 years old to 14 years old in line with international best practice.

The former attorney-general has talked about raising the age of criminal responsibility or not in this House. It is a bit confusing. I went back and read her speech. She talks about the time she had to go to SCAG, the Standing Council of Attorneys-General, where they discussed this. In stark contrast, when the Standing Council of Attorneys-General discuss this when I sit at the table, I say, 'Queensland will not raise the age of criminal responsibility.' The former attorney-general, the wannabe leader of the opposition, the member for Waterford, said in this House that SCAG was considering, and all agreed, to raise it to the age of 12. We certainly do not agree with that either.

I will tell you why we do not agree. Under the former Labor government, victims increased by 193 per cent. If they did not learn then they actually want to make it worse. In stark contrast, what we are doing is putting the rights of victims before the rights of offenders. It is really quite simple. Whether it is local business owners, whether it is local mums and dads or whether it is our hardworking members of parliament who are listening to their communities day in day out, they know that there is a government in the Crisafulli LNP government that is standing on their side, whether it is for minimum mandatories, whether it is to make sure that the age of criminal responsibility will not be increased—but who knows where the Labor opposition are going.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (4.06 pm): I rise to respond to this stunt of a motion from the Attorney-General. I will come to why it is just another desperate stunt from this government. Let me first of all respond specifically on behalf of the Labor opposition to the two elements in the Attorney's motion. The first is that we will continue to reject any attempt to raise the age of criminal responsibility, as we did for 10 years. Those opposite are very fond of talking about what we did and did not do for 10 years. The Attorney-General should note that we never did make any changes to age of criminal responsibility over those 10 years. That is the first element of the motion.

The second element of the motion relates to a bill that they have not even brought into the House yet, a bill that they are going to introduce tomorrow. We will, as we always do, look at the bill, consider it, go through the committee process and come to a position, as we have done all six times they have had to admit that their crime laws were failing. Every time they come back in here and say, 'Oh, the last one didn't work. We need to try a new one,' is an admission that their laws have failed. They failed to fix crime two Christmases ago like the Minister for Police promised they would. This motion tells us everything we need to know about this government and their approach to this and, indeed, every single issue: they care a lot more about stunts than they do about safety. They care a lot more about spin, about their slick photo-ops, about their press conferences and about their announcements than they do about safety or delivery or services.

This is a government obsessed with stunts because they cannot deliver on any of the things that they promised Queenslanders. We see it day in day out. What we have today is the supreme leader is in charge and he has realised what a tough question time the child safety minister has had and he said, 'Let's bring in a motion. We need a stunt. Bring in the clown.' That is all this motion amounts to. It speaks to this government's inability to govern and their obsession with themselves and the daily news cycle.

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (4.09 pm): You simply cannot trust the Leader of the Opposition. He comes into this House and says one thing, but his own policy document says they are going to raise the age of criminal responsibility—his own policy forum happening this weekend. Is he going to gag his members again from talking about it like he did last time? Is he going to gag the Labor caucus from talking about youth crime for fear of what his party will put forward, for fear of what is binding on his party as policy?

Ms Grace interjected.

014

Mrs GERBER: I hear the member for McConnel interjecting. The member for McConnel is on the record saying that she does not support minimum mandatory sentencing. If the member for McConnel and the member for Woodridge do not support minimum mandatory sentencing—as their policy document says and as they are recorded in *Hansard* as saying—that is not just about our Breach Bail, Go to Jail policy. Do you know who else gets minimum mandatory sentencing? Murderers and repeat child sex offenders get minimum mandatory sentencing. Those opposite have always been soft

on crime. In case you have forgotten, member for McConnel, I will read out what you said: 'I reject minimum mandatory sentencing.' The member for Woodridge said, 'The government does not support minimum mandatory sentencing.'

Those opposite have always been on the side of offenders, and if given the chance they will go back to their failed policies. They were dragged kicking and screaming to support Adult Crime, Adult Time, and then they got a strongly worded letter from their Young Labor caucus that said, 'We implore you to support our Labor left values' and they voted against Adult Crime, Adult Time. Labor removed consequences for actions; we are restoring them. Where Labor weakened Queensland's bail laws, we are introducing some of the strongest bail laws this nation has ever seen. Not only are we ensuring there will be consequences for offenders who breach their bail with serious offences; we are introducing a new test to make it harder for offenders to get bail in the first place.

The Crisafulli government is on the side of victims; those opposite continue to peddle policies that support offenders over victims. They cannot walk away from their own policy platform. I ask the Leader of the Opposition how he is going to vote when it comes to minimum mandatory sentencing. Does he support minimum mandatory sentencing? The member for McConnel is on the record as saying that she does not. The member for Woodridge is on the record as saying that he does not. Their own policy platform says that they do not support it and they will remove it. The Leader of the Opposition comes into this House and says one thing when his own Labor caucus and his own policy document say another thing to Queenslanders. You simply cannot trust him.



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (4.12 pm): I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Attorney-General. I move—

That all words after '2' be omitted and the following inserted:

2. 'calls on the Crisafulli LNP government to immediately introduce their breach of bail legislation so Queenslanders can review these proposed laws.'

Once upon a time, the attorney-general in this state took that office seriously. Imagine being the first law officer of this state, the person with a really solemn responsibility to serve the people not in a partisan way over the criminal justice system but in a way that balanced all competing interests in the criminal justice system. Imagine having an Attorney-General now who is forced by the Acting Premier, the member for Kawana, to come in and read from the Queensland Labor Party's platform. Imagine having that office reduced and debased and you having to do that as the first law officer.

The Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right: this has nothing to do with community safety and it has nothing to do with criminal justice. It has everything to do with attacking the Labor Party. This is the modus operandi of the LNP. This is not a political party that waited 10 years to secure the treasury benches to do good things for Queensland; it is a political party that cannot get out of governing from opposition. Queenslanders are the losers out of all of this. Imagine another 30 minutes of this parliament's time wasted on a political stunt engineered by the member for Kawana when there is so much this state needs to debate and resolve, including—

An honourable member: Including this bill.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection. Where is the substance? Where is the bill? We know the government has the bill drafted. It has been to cabinet. It has been through the process, but they thought they would just sit on it and use it as another political tool to attack the Labor Party. This is a political party that is not fit to fill the government benches in this state. They cannot escape their partisan, divisive approach to politics. Certainly the member for Kawana is not capable of demonstrating leadership. This was a moment of leadership and all we got was 30 minutes of nonstop criticism of the Labor Party. What about those children who are being raped in care? The Minister for Child Safety could not be bothered either expressing sympathy or saying anything about that. That says everything you need to know about this government.



Hon. DG PURDIE (Ninderry—LNP) (Minister for Police and Emergency Services) (4.15 pm): The contribution of the member for Woodridge says everything you need to know about those in opposition. They have learned nothing. In one breath he says this is not a priority and asks why we are not focusing on things that are a priority, and then he finishes with a victim of crime. They turned their back on victims for a decade, but it is time.

I support the motion moved by the Attorney-General. I do not support the amendment moved by the member for Woodridge, who is asking to delay this debate. That is what they are trying to do because they are all at sea when it comes to accepting that they broke the justice system in Queensland by tipping the balance in favour of offenders over police. I was on the front line, as were others here,

and I saw that firsthand. They continue to come in here and refuse to accept they got it wrong. Now is the time. Today is the day to right those wrongs with this motion.

If they do not do it today, they have to do it on the weekend. As I started to say before, Queensland Labor's 61st state conference, held this weekend, is their highest decision-making forum. It goes on to say that this is where they shape and set the direction of the movement, so this weekend there is a binding conference. They do not want to debate this today; they want to delay it. They have to decide by this weekend. I want to know who over there is making the decisions. Who over there is refusing to accept they got it wrong and that our tough-on-crime approach with more police is starting to work? Is it the Young Labor movement I referred to before who wrote this strongly worded letter to leaders over there leading up to the Adult Crime, Adult Time debate? They said—

How can we continue to encourage young activists to join our movement when they have seen Labor members vote in a way that does not align with our values?

Is it the Young Labor movement that has the courage of its convictions to put it on paper? Maybe it is members of the far left over there. There are some that are on the record: 'Join the Labor Party to water down youth justice laws.' Maybe they are using the Young Labor movement as their stalking horse. Are those opposite such as the former attorney-general, who ran for Labor to water down youth justice laws, behind this letter? Or is it the Young Labor movement they are beholden to? If they are going to try and delay a decision today, if they do not want to right the wrongs today, they have until this weekend at their conference to talk down some of the policy motions in their last report, like removing the stigma of making criminals sit in the dock. It is time to right the wrongs.

(Time expired)

015



Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (4.18 pm): This is an LNP government that went to the last election saying that they want to put victims first, and they have said pretty much the same thing every day since. They talk about putting victims first but then they come in here and pull a stunt like this—rather than actually answering questions about children being allegedly brutally raped at the hands of a child safety residential care worker, or talking about four women in 45 days who have been killed at the hands of a partner or former partner, or answering questions about DV prevention funding cuts. The police minister of Queensland had three minutes to talk about victims of crime, but what did he talk about? Young Labor. He talked about us.

Mr Purdie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ninderry, you have had your turn.

Ms FENTIMAN: Their entire front bench is obsessed with trawling through motions from Young Labor. If we are going to trawl through motions from party conferences whilst we are talking about victims, should we talk about a motion that was not just proposed but passed by the LNP state party to cancel paid domestic and family violence leave for DV victims? I did not see the youth justice minister talk for three minutes about how her own party conference voted to support getting rid of paid domestic and family violence leave. How is that putting victims first?

This is such a stunt and a waste of time. I would have hoped the youth justice minister, the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, the police minister and the first law officer had more important things to do—like meet with victim-survivors, table the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce report or talk about why there is less funding this financial year than last financial year for domestic and family violence prevention.

Mr Miles: Or count the kids harmed.

Ms FENTIMAN: Or count the kids who are being harmed in the child safety system. Maybe that would be a better use of time, rather than coming in here and talking about Young Labor. Shame on this government for talking and talking about victims but doing very little. Victims of domestic and family violence, victims of sexual violence and children who are victims of sexual violence deserve better than this. This government are obsessed with stunts, they are obsessed with spin and they are obsessed with their own blue ads. It is about time they actually stood up for victim-survivors and made sure there was funding, resources and proper scrutiny to deliver for victims, not just talk about it.



Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.21 pm): Those opposite on the front bench are obsessed with rewriting history. A former attorney-general just stood in this House and criticised our current first law officer, who is Queensland's first first law officer in 20 years to seek special leave to appeal to the High Court—in a case involving the death of Lee Lovell's treasured

wife. Those opposite stand up in here and talk about spin. My goodness! Who oversaw the biggest DNA lab debacle in national history? Victims of crime were failed time and time again by those opposite.

It does not really matter what we say in this House because Queenslanders voted for it. Queenslanders voted for change. Today's motion is taking a principled approach. We do not need to consult because we have consulted. We spent the first 18 months consulting with Queenslanders and we have heard them loud and clear. The member for Hinchinbrook heard it loud and clear because he was elected by his local community off the back of Breach Bail, Go to Jail. Members on this side of the House have all heard it in their communities. We have government members now who replaced former Labor members who used to sit in here. The opposition talk about being out of touch, but Labor members are still out of touch with Queenslanders and they are still out of touch with the crime crisis that is rampant in this state.

We have continued to introduce Adult Crime, Adult Time—and we saw how bored the opposition were getting with that. They ignored the advocacy of their local communities when they did not support the third tranche of Adult Crime, Adult Time. All we are asking for today is a demonstration of the principles that we took to the election and that others have now advocated for as government members in this House. The question will be asked of both the factional leaders and the Labor deliberations they have to undertake with their—

Mr O'Connor: Blocker.

Ms CAMM: I will take that interjection. They have to deliberate with Blocker and their other union leaders. That is who they answer to—their masters. Our masters on this side of the House are the people of Queensland, who voted for change. We are driving down victim numbers. Those opposite do not want to recognise the laws and the way in which this government has been driving down numbers and righting the wrongs of those opposite. It will be telling to see how they vote and who is not in the chamber when we vote.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (4.25 pm): I would have thought the Minister for Child Safety would have had other work to do—rather than wasting time in this place debating nothing more than a political stunt instead of talking about what their government is doing. It must be very embarrassing that instead of having policies you can put your stamp on you have to get up in this place and talk about Young Labor. That is embarrassing. In today's question time, serious questions were asked about numbers and backlogs. We did not get one answer to one question from the minister, yet in this motion which is a political stunt she has time to get up and talk about things that we are about to debate in this House.

How embarrassing for the first law officer in the state that she has a bill ready to go that is so important but they are keeping it in the drawer because they want to pull this stunt. All I can say is that we know who the Acting Premier is at the moment and this is his brainstorm: 'I've got something in my drawer. Let's delay the bill and then we can get Labor in the paper about whether or not they are going to vote for this'—and this is something we have not even seen.

They are over there yelling, 'Are you going to gag your conference again?'—like they did not gag every member in this House from talking about abortion. The member for Mackay had to cross the floor because they were gagged. People in Queensland are not very happy with a lot of those members over there, but are the LNP listening to them? The LNP are so desperate that they keep coming in this House with more and more laws because—guess what?—nothing has worked. Your regional members are up and down, screaming and crying in Cairns, Townsville, Maryborough, Mackay, everywhere—because you have not delivered what you said you would. You are desperate. It is not working.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, member for McConnel!

Ms GRACE: The only thing that you can point to are dodgy figures.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms GRACE: If we are talking about victims—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, if you were addressing your comments through the chair instead of focusing on arguing and quarrelling across the chamber, you would have known that I was trying to call you to order.

Ms GRACE: I am sorry, Speaker. I did not hear you.

Mr SPEAKER: You have the call, with 18 seconds left.

Ms GRACE: In the dodgy figures they put forward, guess what? They are not counting children of domestic violence. Those victims count. That is the only reason their figures are down. We caught them out and they know it. How weak for the police minister to come in here and talk about Young Labor. I thought you had better things to do.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (4.28 pm): The opposition leader said that Labor were never going to raise the age of criminal responsibility. That is simply not true. There is an article from the *Canberra Times* dated 23 February 2023 titled 'Queensland backs criminal age rise'. It states—

The Queensland government continues to back a national push to raise the age of criminal responsibility ...

Attorney-General Shannon Fentiman says Queensland supports efforts to raise the age from 10 ...

"We would like a nationally consistent approach when it comes to young people," ...

In 2021 Australian states and territories agreed to develop a plan to raise the age of criminal responsibility ...

The opposition leader says it was never their plan. I table a copy of the newspaper article.

Tabled paper: Article from *The Canberra Times*, dated 23 February 2023, titled 'Queensland backs criminal age rise, youth crackdown'.

It quoted the former Labor attorney-general Shannon Fentiman saying they were going to do it. Did they have a secret plan? No, it is a public plan and it is in the media. The opposition leader keeps coming in here with absolute mistruths.

016 We also saw the former failed child safety minister the member for Waterford. She cannot lecture anyone about child safety. She was the worst child safety minister. When there was a child safety crisis engulfing her as minister she was shuffled out of that position and into another cabinet position. A *Courier-Mail* article said—

CHILD Safety Minister Shannon Fentiman yesterday escaped the growing scandal engulfing her department by chilling out with fans at a music festival.

The minister was spotted at Splendour in the Grass hours after the latest revelations about the brutal deaths of youngsters known to the department.

She wants to lecture people about child safety when she was hanging out at the Splendour in the Grass music festival when kids were dying on her watch and we called it out. The opposition leader at the time, Tim Nicholls, called it out.

This is an opportunity for the Labor Party to say they back victims of crime and they support minimum mandatory sentencing. They say, 'We want to see the bill.' They do not need to see the bill. They either support the principle of minimum mandatory sentencing for those who breach bail, children or adults, or they do not. We know it is in their DNA not to support it; it is in the DNA of the Labor Party not to support minimum mandatory sentencing. They have been on the record forever as not supporting minimum mandatory sentencing. Today is an opportunity for them to say that for 10 years in office Labor got it wrong. They can say, 'We are going to right the wrong today and we are going to put victims before offenders. We are going to support and back in minimum mandatory sentencing for 12 months.' That is all the motion asks: back it in, support victims and stop putting offenders before victims, as has too often been the case in the Labor Party. Show leadership on it for once.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, you have two minutes.

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (4.31 pm): Criminal justice reform is serious. This motion is not calm and methodical, like this government said they would be, and victims deserve better than a vibe. Survivors deserve better than a slogan. That is all this is though. If those opposite were serious they would introduce their bill, the sixth bill that they have talked about around youth justice reform. As has been mentioned, those opposite are not interested in serious reform; they are interested in stunts. That has been evidenced by the fact there are multiple other areas that this government could act on to protect victims that they have failed on. They delayed good-character reference reforms. They have failed to close the loophole that would hold institutions accountable for child sexual abuse. They have sat on the Queensland Law Reform Commission reports—multiple reports—that look at non-fatal strangulation despite the fact they we have had multiple women in this state die and they have sat on a piece of work around particular criminal defences. I am not going to be lectured to by those opposite

about how they care about victims. If they did, they would actually introduce real laws, not come in here with motions that they know are not real criminal justice reform; it is merely a motion. If those opposite were serious, they would act so.

I want to respond to some of the accusations about the Labor conference. Let's remember what is in the LNP convention platform: a whole range of changes that would repeal the respect-at-work law, which protects women in the workplace. They wanted to remove paid domestic and family violence leave. They want to allow free speech, which is the opposite of what those opposite did earlier in the year. Clearly, they do not listen to their LNP convention but somehow there is a different standard for us.

(Time expired)

Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.

Amendment negated.

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

AYES, 53:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 37:

ALP, 36—Asif, Bailey, Bourne, Boyd, Bush, Butcher, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Grace, Healy, Howard, J. Kelly, King, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O'Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richmond, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Resolved in the affirmative.

BRISBANE AIRPORT RAIL LINK (AIRTRAIN) BUY BACK AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (4.38 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026.

Tabled paper: Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Brisbane Airport Rail Link (Airtrain) Buy Back Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.

Mr SPEAKER: I encourage those leaving the chamber to please do so quietly. Take your conversations outside. Show a bit of courtesy.

Mr BERKMAN: Today I am introducing a bill that requires the government to finally ditch the terrible Airtrain deal and bring it into public hands. For as long as I can remember, the major parties have tried to pitch privatisation as a good deal for us. It is presented as though it is some kind of economic common sense, built on claims that getting the government out of the way, fostering competition and freeing up the market will somehow innately deliver more benefits for consumers. When has that ever really been true? Look at Qantas, Telstra, the Commonwealth Bank, toll roads and power companies; it is always the corporations who benefit, not us.

Here in Brisbane we have another really clear example: the Airtrain. It has been an absolute rort from the start and it is albatross around our necks as we limp towards the 2032 Olympics in Brisbane. This might actually be the easiest case of infrastructure privatisation to reverse, precisely as this bill lays out. To look at the history of this deed, the Brisbane Airport rail link deed as it is called in the bill, we have to go back to the mid-nineties when former Labor premier Wayne Goss commenced a process of inviting private tenders for this piece of infrastructure. Then in 1998 the Liberal-National coalition government under Rob Borbidge negotiated and signed the Airtrain build, own, operate and transfer deal.

017

It has been run by British pension fund USS Axle since that company acquired Airtrain in 2013 for \$110 million. The overall deal is, of course, a secret. We are not allowed to know the finer details of it because of the veil of commercial confidentiality that blocks so much visibility of our government's dealings. What we do know is that it provides for a private corporation to build the Airtrain link and own and operate it for 35 years—that is, from 2001 through to 2036.

The deal provides exclusive rights for the holder of that deed to provide scheduled public transport services to the airport. We know that deal also provides for Airtrain to set and keep the fares for that service, even though they are subcontracting their operations almost entirely to QR, as we understand it. As a result of that deal, we have this absolutely shoddy and overpriced service.

Just how bad is it though? Fares for a one-way trip can cost up to \$23.80. When we compare that to the rest of the Translink network it is almost 50 times the standard 50-cent fare for an equivalent trip on other parts of the network. The trains do not run from the airport after 10.04 pm or before 5 am on weekdays or 6 am on weekends. There is more than a hint of irony in the fact that an airport without a curfew does not run any trains outside of those hours. The trains generally only run every half hour and it is only during peak times that they run every 15 minutes.

To make a comparison, Perth provides 60 per cent more train services to and from their airport than Brisbane at about one-tenth of the price. It is little surprise then that just five per cent of passengers in Brisbane take the Airtrain compared to 20 to 25 per cent in Sydney. Anyone who is left wondering why we often find ourselves sitting in bumper to bumper traffic for 20 minutes just to get to the pick-up and drop-off lane can directly blame that terrible privatised Airtrain deal.

Let us be clear: it is going to be 10 times worse when we get to the Olympics. In the context of the Olympics, I would say to members that we simply cannot wait. This agreement does not expire until 2036. Just in case anyone is unclear on the timelines, we are supposed to be hosting the Olympics four years earlier in 2032. Just imagine the traffic at that point in time. Imagine the embarrassment of being a city with such a lame duck bit of infrastructure to the airport and no alternative services.

There is still time to fix the Airtrain debacle now, but not if the state keeps kowtowing to the corporate owners. If we bought back Airtrain now we could save ourselves another unnecessary decade of rip-offs and poor services. So far it appears Airtrain's corporate owners have blocked any alternative services to the airport, but buying it would mean we could start improving the network.

Some of the fundamental improvements that I say we could and should make would be to increase the frequency to every 15 minutes all day, with trains starting earlier and finishing later. We want the existing peak frequencies. To be honest, given that the trains are running every 15 minutes—it can already accommodate that frequency—we can only assume that Airtrain are simply too stingy to operate services at higher frequency.

We would suggest that we could build a new station at Skygate for the thousands of workers at Skygate and DFO. We could finally see the long delayed Gold CityGlider funded and extended to the airport, which is not possible now under the exclusive use term. We could ensure any other Metro or bus service that runs to the airport will not rip up the Doomben line.

The corporate foreign owners are simply sitting on Airtrain, it appears, hoping to milk as much out of Queenslanders as possible without actually giving back and without improving the services as they could. This owner has had it for the last 13 years. Over the last decade we know that they took \$193 million in fares and paid zero dollars in corporate tax. We know that there have been some attempts, but they have refused, to have them come to the table and negotiate with the government on a fair buyout price. They are clearly trying to squeeze Queenslanders for every cent they can get out of us. On top of that, they are actually suing the Queensland government, as we understand it, over what they claim to be lost revenue because of 50-cent fares, as if them charging us 50 times as much as the 50-cent fares on their section of line is not bad enough.

Some will ask: is it really possible to take on Airtrain's corporate owners if they are so dogged in their opposition to a fair deal? Is it possible to tell them that enough is enough and to end the contract early? In simple terms, yes, of course it is. It is possible. In 2025-26, the corporate owners own financial statements valued the Airtrain contract at just under \$47 million. The value of that intangible asset falls by approximately \$5 million a year, with that value due to fall to zero in 2036 when the contract ends and when their exclusive provision of public transport to the airport finishes. This means that the state government could buy back Airtrain for just under \$47 million in 2026. Sure, \$47 million sounds like a lot for you or me, but it is simply not a lot of money in the context of government spending. I will offer some comparisons to make this clear.

The cost of a single major road upgrade could pay for 50-cent fares on the Airtrain line five times over. In one year alone this current government will spend \$200 million on handouts to the racing industry and more than \$600 million on propping up old, dirty coal-fired power stations. If the government taxed gas properly by raising the royalties even a modest amount, we could cover the cost of buying this back hundreds of times over.

Can the government really ditch the contract is another question that is asked. Absolutely. There are several options. If we look to Victoria, before the Victorian government reached a settlement deal with the East West Link project in 2015 they were openly considering legislation to extinguish that contract. There is no legal or constitutional reason we cannot pass a law to buy back Airtrain as proposed in this bill.

No doubt some will claim that they are worried about the message it sends to investors or potential investors in Queensland. To those people I would say: what message do you want to send? Do we want Queensland to have a reputation as a state of suckers who are waiting to be shafted by the next snake oil salesman who rocks up? I do not think so. The Greens' message with this bill is that Queensland is not open for raw deals. I say that the message that we should be sending is: if you come to Queensland wanting to control our public infrastructure, demanding exclusive rights that stymie progress and boost your profits, if you charge Queenslanders through the nose while dodging tax and then try to sue the government to recover even more, you are not welcome here.

In closing, it should not be a wild proposition that public transport should be publicly owned, but we all know that the major parties are completely wedded to this idea of neo-liberalism, addicted to privatisation and terrified of standing up to big corporations. It is up to the Greens to put this on the table. Airtrain's corporate owners are trying to squeeze us and we in this House have the power to stop them by legislating to end that dodgy contract.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Member for Maiwar, you have used unparliamentary language in your contribution and I would ask you to withdraw.

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw.

First Reading

Mr BERKMAN (Maiwar—Grn) (4.49 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Works Committee.

018

QUEENSLAND PROTECTION COMMISSION BILL

Message from Governor



Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (4.50 pm): I present a message from Her Excellency the Governor.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): The message from Her Excellency the Governor recommends the Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

QUEENSLAND PROTECTION COMMISSION BILL 2026

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, DR JEANNETTE ROSITA YOUNG AC PSM, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—

A Bill for an Act to establish the Queensland Protection Commissioner to protect the safety and wellbeing of children, young people and other vulnerable persons and for related purposes, to repeal the *Family and Child Commission Act 2014*, and to

amend this Act, the *Child Safe Organisations Act 2024*, the *Disability Services Act 2006*, the *Working with Children Check Act 2000* and the legislation mentioned in schedule 2 for particular purposes

GOVERNOR

Date: 26 August 2026

Tabled paper: Message, dated 26 August 2026, from Her Excellency the Governor recommending the Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026.

Introduction

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (4.50 pm): I present a bill for an act to establish the Queensland Protection Commissioner to protect the safety and wellbeing of children, young people and other vulnerable persons and for related purposes, to repeal the Family and Child Commission Act 2014, and to amend this act, the Child Safe Organisations Act 2024, the Disability Services Act 2006, the Working with Children Check Act 2000 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 2 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Education, Arts and Communities Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026.

Tabled paper: Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026, explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Queensland Protection Commission Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights.

Every child's internationally sanctioned right to special safeguards and care is a shared responsibility, but the state's role and reach is paramount: making laws, setting safeguarding strategies and, moreover, holding delivery responsibility for a wide range of child safety measures and services. When that system is suspected of failing, it is the government's duty to seek answers. That is why, just 10 days after taking office, the Crisafulli government ordered a review into the state's child protection system. We asked the Child Death Review Board to take on this wide-ranging investigation based on the offending of Ashley Paul Griffith, who managed to evade detection for two decades while committing more than 300 sexual abuse related offences at early childhood education and care services across Queensland.

At this juncture I would like to thank the QFCC commissioner, Luke Twyford, who I understand is in the gallery today, and the Child Death Review Board for taking on this vitally important piece of work. In fact, at the time of Ashley Paul Griffith's arrest in August 2022, Griffith had no pending investigations, no charges and no convictions and satisfied all working with children and blue card requirements. Families have been shattered by the horrendous harm Griffith inflicted. They will never be the same. How could this have occurred? The Child Death Review Board looked for answers by examining the events in the context of the state's early childhood education and care sector framework and how it interacted with police services and the blue card regime. The board's 10-month review identified a litany of failure: siloed information, fragmented responsibilities, insufficient thresholds for actions against offenders, poor record keeping and enormous sector and interagency gaps.

Today, the Crisafulli government responds to such glaring and costly oversights with a bill to establish Queensland's first centralised child safeguarding office—a nation-leading agency to be known as the Queensland Protection Commission. The Queensland Protection Commission will provide a single point of leadership, coordination and accountability for child safety and wellbeing throughout the state. In another first, the commission will host an intelligence hub targeted at proactive investigations. The hub will collect, analyse, connect and act on vital pieces of intelligence across agencies and sectors to eliminate the risk of child offending before it becomes harm. With these measures the Crisafulli government fulfils two flagship recommendations of the *In plain sight* review while tackling head-on the child safety system's identified major flaws: disaggregated information sharing and the heavy reliance on threshold-based interventions.

The board's *In plain sight* report clearly required that the new safeguarding entity bring the Reportable Conduct Scheme, Child Safe Standards and blue card scheme together under one roof. The bill delivers on that recommendation, with these agencies now to operate together—and cooperatively—within the single organisational structure of the Queensland Protection Commission. The bill repeals the Family and Child Commission Act 2014, with the Queensland Protection Commission replacing the Queensland Family and Child Commission from 1 February 2027. The Queensland Protection Commission will be a statutory authority, administratively attached to the Department of Justice to ensure appropriate oversight of child safeguarding functions.

The bill also establishes the Queensland Protection Commissioner, an independent statutory head responsible for a range of critical child safeguarding and oversight functions. The bill gives the Queensland Protection Commissioner responsibility for administering the Reportable Conduct Scheme, the Child Safe Standards, the blue card scheme under the Working with Children Check Act 2000 and the Disability Worker Screening scheme under the Disability Services Act 2006. The commissioner will perform these regulatory functions independently and free from ministerial direction. The effect is that these regulatory functions will be administered within the Queensland Protection Commission, enabling their operational integration, the breaking down of silos and supporting consistent decision-making towards the safety of children.

The commissioner will be appointed by the Governor in Council for a term of at least three years but no longer than five years. The Queensland Protection Commissioner will continue the core functions of the Queensland Family and Child Commission, including systemic oversight of the child protection system and the Child Death Register.

To complement these functions and strengthen the focus on child safety and wellbeing, the bill also provides the commissioner will several new functions. These include, as recommended: exchanging information relevant to the proactive identification of, and protection from, threats to the safety and wellbeing of children, young people and other vulnerable persons—this function will form the foundation of the future intelligence hub, which the government proposes to deliver in 2028; and carrying out and supporting activities that promote child safety and wellbeing. To ensure the Queensland Protection Commission undertakes activities that benefit children and to meet community expectations, the bill allows the minister to give the commissioner a written statement of expectations about the performance of the latter new function, including the nature and scope of the activities to be performed.

019 Because of the breadth of the functions the commissioner will deliver, the commissioner will be supported by two deputy commissioners, also appointed by Governor in Council for a term of three years and up to five years. The bill includes a requirement that one deputy commissioner be an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person or have demonstrated ability or experience in working with Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children. The appointment of the deputy commissioners will support robust and effective leadership of these safeguarding and oversight functions. The three commissioners will be supported by staff of the commission, consisting of former QFCC staff and existing staff from Queensland Worker Screening Services within the Department of Justice.

The independent Child Death Review Board is also continued under the bill. This will ensure the current board continues its vital systems reviews of child deaths connected to the child protection system. The establishment of the Queensland Protection Commission and the commissioner will be a significant step forward toward achieving the centralised, integrated approach to child safeguarding and oversight envisaged by the *In plain sight* report.

As I outlined, the *In plain sight* report found that siloed information in individual agencies and regulators was a weakness resulting in the failure to connect critical pieces of intelligence about Griffith's offending. In direct response, the bill enhances proactive information sharing by expanding the ability of the commissioner's regulatory functions—the Reportable Conduct Scheme, Child Safe Standards, the blue card scheme and the Disability Worker Screening scheme—to share information with each other. This is achieved by amending the confidentiality provisions in the Child Safe Organisations Act 2024, the Working with Children Check Act and part 5 of the Disability Services Act. Information held by one of these regulatory functions can be used by one or more of the other functions where the commissioner is satisfied the information: is relevant to whether a person poses a risk to the safety of children or a person with disability; and is relevant to the performance of the regulatory function. Existing confidentiality requirements restricting the further sharing of that information under these acts will continue to apply. These amendments will ensure there are no legislative barriers to proactive sharing of intelligence between the regulatory functions of the commissioner that are critical to protecting children and persons with disability from harm.

The bill also increases the maximum penalties for certain offences under the Working with Children Check Act and the Child Safe Organisations Act. The *In plain sight* report recommended increasing penalties for employers and employees in child related work who knowingly make false statements or fail to provide information when requested. Accordingly, the bill amends the Working with Children Check Act to increase the maximum penalty for knowingly providing false or misleading information or documents. The maximum penalty has been increased from 100 penalty units, or two years imprisonment, to 200 penalty units, or two years imprisonment. The bill also doubles the

maximum penalty for failing to comply with requests for information for the purposes of auditing or monitoring compliance with blue card requirements, from 50 to 100 penalty units.

The bill increases the maximum penalties for two offences under the Child Safe Organisations Act which apply to the head of a reporting entity under the Reportable Conduct Scheme. The maximum penalty for failing to notify the commission of a reportable allegation or reportable conviction relating to a worker of the reporting entity will increase from 100 penalty units to 150 penalty units. The maximum penalty for failing to provide the commission with an interim or final report about the reportable allegation or conviction within the relevant timeframe will also increase from 100 to 150 penalty units. These penalties will start from 1 February 2027. Increasing penalties recognises the seriousness of this conduct as a risk to the safety of children and will encourage individuals and entities to provide all necessary information to support the regulatory functions.

To implement national working with children check reforms as agreed by all jurisdictions through the Standing Council of Attorneys-General, the bill also strengthens the blue card system by: making amendments to the Working with Children Check Act to bolster Queensland's disqualifying and serious offence framework; and facilitating Queensland's participation in a pilot of the National Continuous Checking Capability, more commonly referred to as the NCCC.

Like all working with children check schemes, Queensland's blue card system includes an offence framework which classifies certain criminal offences as disqualifying offences or serious offences. If a person is convicted of a disqualifying offence, they cannot obtain a blue card or, if they are a cardholder, continue to hold a blue card. If a person is convicted of a serious offence, they are presumed to pose a risk to the safety of children and are not issued a blue card unless they can demonstrate they have an exceptional case. The purpose of this framework is to ensure that individuals who have been convicted of engaging in conduct which presents a safety risk to children are kept out of the blue card system.

To support national consistency in working with children check schemes, in July this year the Standing Council of Attorneys-General agreed to a baseline of offence categories which every jurisdiction must include in its disqualifying and serious offence framework. To implement those reforms in Queensland, the bill amends the Working with Children Check Act to include more offences as either disqualifying offences or serious offences. Under the bill, the new disqualifying offences include: acts intended to cause grievous bodily harm and other malicious acts if committed against a child; female genital mutilation if committed against a child; accessory after the fact to murder; serious animal cruelty; and terrorist acts causing death. The new serious offences include: distributing intimate images if committed against a child; failure to inform the commission of a child sexual offence; aiding suicide; unlawful striking causing death; dangerous operation of a motor vehicle causing death or grievous bodily harm; and fraud if committed against a child.

Queensland is leading the way as the first jurisdiction to uplift its disqualifying and serious offence framework in line with agreed national working with children check reforms. These amendments will close the gaps and prevent even more people who may pose a risk to the safety of children from obtaining a blue card. This is a really important point. As soon as the Crisafulli government was elected we consulted with the other jurisdictions to ensure that everyone was on the same page because of the failures that had occurred and that were discovered in the *In plain sight* report resulting from that heinous paedophile Ashley Paul Griffith. The Crisafulli government is proud of this fact because we will always put the safety of children first in this state. We must ensure that only suitable people are allowed to work with children. That is essential to keeping Queensland's children safe.

020

The bill also amends the Working with Children Check Act to support Queensland's participation in a pilot of the NCCC. When fully operational, the NCCC will close a critical child safety gap by immediately notifying the blue card scheme when there is a change in a blue card applicant's or cardholder's criminal history anywhere in the country. The Australian federal government have committed to delivering the fully operational NCCC by mid-2028 and I support them in their endeavours. They must do it. The pilot of this technology, released by the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, ACIC, will monitor both Commonwealth and Australian Capital Territory offences. All states and territories, including Queensland, have committed to connecting to the pilot by the end of this year. To ensure Queensland can participate, the bill authorises the disclosure to ACIC of information about a blue card applicant. It also authorises the blue card scheme to request that ACIC conduct a nationally coordinated criminal history check on a blue card applicant. These checks are currently requested by the Queensland Police Service on behalf of the blue card scheme, and this parallel arrangement will continue during the pilot to ensure all technical and operational requirements are met. Together, these amendments will ensure Queensland can connect to the pilot of the NCCC,

which is a critical component of the move towards mutual recognition of working with children checks across jurisdictions.

This bill delivers nation-leading reforms to Queensland's child protection system in response to the *In plain sight* report. It delivers Queensland's first-ever centralised child and vulnerable person safeguarding entity, the Queensland Protection Commission, led by the Queensland Protection Commissioner—a dedicated role to deliver critical safeguarding and oversight functions. It co-locates critical regulatory functions, including, as I have said, the Reportable Conduct Scheme, Child Safe Standards, the blue card scheme and the Disability Worker Screening scheme. It expands information-sharing capability between those regulatory functions to remove legislative barriers and support a culture of proactive information sharing about risks to the safety of children or a person with disability. It delivers strengthened penalties that reflect the seriousness of failing to comply with information disclosure requirements under the blue card and reportable conduct schemes, and it fast-tracks Queensland's implementation of national working with children check reforms agreed to through the Standing Council of Attorneys-General, which will further strengthen Queensland's blue card scheme.

Queensland children must be protected. They have not been, cannot be and will not be by a system that responds only after harm occurs. That is why the Crisafulli government is being proactive in our approach. That is why the Crisafulli government is launching the Queensland Protection Commission to remove threats, prevent abuse and restore confidence to every Queensland family. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (5.12 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Education, Arts and Communities Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Martin): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Education, Arts and Communities Committee.

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

Resumed from 2 June (see p. 1557).

Second Reading

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (5.13 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Primary Industries and Resources Committee for its consideration of the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. The committee has made one recommendation about the bill, that it be passed. I thank the committee for its efforts in examining the bill and I thank them for that recommendation. I also thank the public, communities, organisations, industry bodies and local councils that made written submissions to the committee to assist it in its consideration of the bill.

The bill is a proposal to reform the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. The nation-leading reforms proposed in this bill are part of the Crisafulli government's ongoing efforts to grow our invaluable resources sector, including seizing the once-in-a-generation opportunity offered by our abundance of critical minerals. In late July, the government launched Delivering Queensland's Critical Minerals Future 2026-30, which outlines the significant global investment being deployed to secure resilient critical minerals global supply chains.

Governments across North America, Europe and Asia are deploying hundreds of billions of dollars to secure access to raw materials, processing capability and manufacturing capacity needed to support their economic growth. Both proponents and government influence the speed of development. There are some things we cannot control. However, when the ball is in our court, the intention is to have the ability to drive job-creating development, especially to position the state to meet the global demand for critical minerals extraction, processing and manufacturing, and secure the economic benefits of this growth across north-west regional Queensland. The bill directly supports this ambition by giving us the tools we need to respond to the opportunities and challenges of the emerging critical minerals sector.

However, rather than limiting our ambition to a single sector, the bill ensures that the government can respond to all manner of economic opportunities, putting us in a position to capitalise on our economic and geological strengths in a rapidly shifting world. The bill has the ability to facilitate state-shaping projects across critical minerals and the resources sectors. In fact, the Queensland Farmers' Federation recognises that critical minerals projects offer a tremendous opportunity for the regions in terms of job creation and investment attraction. Equally, however, the bill can be used for ecotourism projects and across the agriculture sector to enable feedlots, meatworks, cotton gins and other major projects. I acknowledge today advocacy from the Australian Sugar Manufacturers about the importance of domestic biofuel opportunities and how farmers can be front and centre in the development of this emerging sector. We are a government that believes the resources and agriculture sectors can coexist. We need to be able to move quickly and effectively to secure Queensland's position at the front of the pack, on all fronts.

The State Development and Public Works Organisation Act is not an act for everyday use on everyday development. Its powers are unique and are used sparingly but purposefully. Many of them have been in existence since the act was passed in 1971. Others have been added in the decades since that time. However, we cannot let the legislation stand still and be overtaken by other states or territories. That is something that the former Labor government did and it is why Queensland was missing out on job-creating projects to the other states and territories. The powers in the act are for use on a case-by-case basis, where they will deliver outcomes that improve the lives of Queenslanders by facilitating the major projects that bring major investment and major opportunities, particularly in rural and regional Queensland.

The committee's examination of the bill demonstrated that members of the community have an interest in this bill and the impact it may have on them and the parts of Queensland they care about. There have been a lot of mistruths and misinformation about what is and is not in the bill, from a desperate and dangerous opposition and a Labor leadership clinging onto their political survival. It is clear the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition will do and say anything. Unfortunately, in the debate on this bill and in the public domain, they have had no regard for the truth or facts—just misinformation and name-calling. When I introduced this bill, I predicted the mother of all scare campaigns from Labor because that is what they know. Upon introduction, I said that the bill would not allow mining in a national park or carrying out greenhouse gas storage activities in the Great Artesian Basin because acts regulating those places clearly prohibit them, but it did not stop there. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was more obsessed with me—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is true. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition seemed more obsessed with me and with not being the deputy premier of this state than securing job-creating investment in Queensland and backing our regions. This bill is not about me or him. It is about securing our state's economic future, so let's get some facts on the table.

This bill does not remove key safeguards or reform the important regulatory systems and criteria established under other acts. These systems remain in place to protect Queensland's environmental, social, cultural, economic and natural values. The focus here is not on changes to environmental or resources policy, and it is not on making bad projects work or on backing projects that do not stack up. The focus is on targeted, meaningful intervention to support significant projects as they progress through approvals and to attract job-creating investment to Queensland. It is on delivering outcomes for industrial land use and infrastructure planning, which will unlock land for development of crucial value-adding activities like resources processing, cutting-edge manufacturing or advanced agriculture.

These amendments represent the government's approach to ensuring that it competes for investment with neighbouring jurisdictions on an even footing. Unlike some others, we have taken steps to make sure that what these powers can and cannot do is clear. We have clearly set out what is off

limits. The bill is plain: yes, these powers are to further development but not at the expense of the environment, not at the expense of our agriculture sector and not at the expense of rural and regional communities by ensuring the tools continue the act's role of facilitating development while protecting the environment and communities through appropriate regulation.

021 I will take the opportunity to address some of the matters raised by the community and stakeholders as part of this bill's examination by the committee. Firstly, in respect of coordinated projects, the bill proposes new interactions for the existing coordinated projects framework with the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014 and Transport Infrastructure Act 1994. This will enable outcomes for managing impacts on regional interests and transport networks as part of the whole-of-government assessment of a major project. It does not mean that a regional interests development approval or a transport approval is not required. It does not mean that those approvals come from the Coordinator-General or that other decision-makers have no say in the outcome, and it does not change the criteria for evaluating and approving applications. What it does mean is that assessment can be brought forward into the coordinated impact assessment process to ensure any impacts can be considered holistically while the project is being evaluated.

Take a major resources project, for example: it needs tenure, it needs an environmental authority and, if it might impact on a regional interest, it could need a RIDA. If a project gets its environmental authority and its tenure but does not get a RIDA, it cannot proceed. It only makes sense that a whole-of-government assessment should consider all three of those things at the same time. That is a real, commonsense streamlining outcome.

When the proponent applies for a RIDA, both they and the assessing agency can rely on the Coordinator-General's evaluation. There are no steps removed from the usual RIDA process by this bill. The application will not have to be referred to other agencies because this can occur during the coordinated project process where the Coordinator-General seeks agency advice, discusses impacts and drafts conditions in concert with that agency. The application will not have to be publicly notified again because the assessment of impacts was notified as part of the coordinated project process. In short, if proponents put in the work they will be supported through a streamlined arrangement. If they do not, there will be no benefits.

Another key area is the government's intention to uplift the significant project facilitation framework. I acknowledge concerns raised during the committee process about the ability to prioritise projects by declaring them state strategic projects. However, the government has a role to play in facilitating important projects. That is how we achieve real outcomes for Queensland.

The ability to designate and facilitate state-shaping projects is common across Australian jurisdictions. This concept is not new. Queensland has had that ability since the introduction of prescribed projects into the State Development Act in 2006. In the same way the existing declarations operate, certain criteria need to be satisfied. State strategic projects need to have real potential to achieve the government's objectives, which are reflections of community expectations. These new powers can apply just as much to public projects as private ones. It is important to note that declaration as a prescribed project or state strategic project has no immediate impact on a project's regulatory status. It does not result in immediate approvals and it does not put the project on a different approval pathway. The same laws and rules that applied to the project on the day before the declaration is made continue to apply after, but we will have a full set of tools available to help move that project towards delivery.

Another part of that toolkit is the modification order. I want to reiterate what I have previously said: these are not about removing protections or allowing projects to proceed without being regulated. The modification order cannot remove the need for key approvals such as environmental authorities, resource tenures, development permits, cultural heritage management plans or landowner's consent. Nor can it affect federal processes, interfere with the cultural rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples or modify liability for taxes and royalties. A modification order can only be made to reduce or prevent duplication, or to modify or exclude a process or requirement that does not provide for a project of that kind. They are a potential solution to ensure innovative projects can proceed with appropriate regulation when they might not otherwise be able to because the statute book has not caught up with them. Modification orders are not a general power that allows for wholesale rewrites of the statute book. This ensures the power is facilitative, not deregulatory in a way that undermines core safeguards. The committee process demonstrated that stakeholders have concerns about broad application, but, in reality, a modification order will only be possible and appropriate in limited

circumstances and is built to protect the people and places that make Queensland the great state that it is.

Another key initiative is the reform of land and tenure management tools. I acknowledge concerns raised during the committee process about the ability to use compulsory acquisition powers, and I want to be absolutely clear about what this bill does and what it does not do. A landholder cannot simply have their land acquired because a proponent wants it. There is nothing new about compulsory acquisition powers in Queensland. These powers have existed under Queensland law for decades, including within the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act framework. Indeed, Queensland has previously used these powers in connection with private infrastructure projects. The Adani Carmichael rail corridor is one example of a private project for which the previous Labor government used compulsory acquisition powers.

There is nothing new about the principle that, in exceptional circumstances, land may be acquired to facilitate a significant private project. Indeed, this is the same process applied under the Acquisition of Land Act, which continues to apply. What is important is the framework around the use of that power, and this government has made that framework clearer. Under this bill, a proponent must first demonstrate that it has genuinely attempted to reach a negotiated outcome with the landholder. Before the Coordinator-General can endorse the use of the acquisition pathway, the proponent must have negotiated for at least six months with each registered owner and taken reasonable steps to purchase the land by agreement. The Coordinator-General must also consult with the registered owner about those negotiations before deciding whether to endorse the acquisition pathway. Even then, endorsement does not itself mean that the land will be acquired. A further final unconditional offer must be made to the landholder. Only after those steps have been satisfied can the process move towards compulsory acquisition. This is not a process that shuts landholders out. It is a process that puts negotiation first.

Crucially, the bill provides greater transparency around when compulsory acquisition powers could apply. The acquisition pathway is restricted to projects that have been declared state strategic projects, and the power cannot simply be switched on administratively. A regulation must be made before the acquisition purpose can be enlivened. That regulation is subject to parliamentary scrutiny. This is an important distinction and additional safeguards, oversight, accountability and scrutiny. Under the previous private infrastructure facility framework, the relevant approval was made by gazette notice. This bill lifts the level of authority required to a regulation, providing a clearer statement of policy intent and an additional opportunity for parliamentary scrutiny.

I want to put on the record that this government reached out to Property Rights Australia on not one but two occasions to offer them a briefing on the bill. We had no response. So, to those suggesting that this government has somehow created a new power to seize private land at will, I say this: that is simply not true. It is another Labor scare campaign. The underlying compulsory acquisition power is not new. It is another Labor scare campaign. As I said, the compulsory acquisition powers of the Coordinator-General have existed since 1999 and utilised on many occasions under governments led by those opposite and their predecessors. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition was a senior minister in a Labor government that utilised the same powers.

I want to highlight a few examples to illustrate this point. The first is the Galilee Basin Infrastructure Corridor SDA. In 2017, land was acquired to facilitate an infrastructure corridor for rail for the purposes of construction and operation of the Adani Carmichael Rail Network. The Townsville SDA: in 2008, the Coordinator-General acquired land from XStrata, bought by Glencore, for the establishment of industry. As part of the Cleveland Bay Industrial Park, the Coordinator-General signed an agreement to transfer land once development milestones were met. These were transferred directly to private parties once development of the land was completed. Native title was also acquired to facilitate road construction and supporting infrastructure which benefited the development.

The Gladstone SDA: in 2010 the Coordinator-General acquired land on Southern Curtis Island, vesting large lots in the minister for industrial development, who onsold to LNG companies. The Callide Infrastructure Corridor SDA: in 2010 the Coordinator-General acquired infrastructure corridor easements. Parts of the easement areas have been licensed to LNG companies for pipelines by the Department of Transport and Main Roads. The Queensland Children's Hospital SDA: in 2009, land was acquired by compulsory acquisition which is now being used by private allied health or medical facilities, for example, Ronald McDonald House.

The Labor party have been whingeing for weeks about private acquisition powers of government. They have existed. Not only have they existed; they have been utilised by the Labor government time

and time again. That is why we must dispel the mistruths that have been orchestrated by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition about this bill.

Let me be clear: these powers are not new. The safeguards are not being thrown out. The environmental approval processes are not being removed. Landholders are not being stripped of their rights. Landholders will continue to have rights to consultation and objection, and they remain entitled to compensation under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967. This government believes compulsory acquisition should remain a last resort. That is why the bill requires genuine negotiations, a final unconditional offer and a clear public interest test before the acquisition pathway can proceed. In fact, the practical protections around the acquisition process remain substantially consistent with the existing framework, while the bill provides greater clarity and transparency about when the power can be used.

022 I say to the Labor Party: if you support Queensland's critical minerals and resources sector, say so. If you support the private investment, the jobs and the regional economic opportunities that will come from the projects as a result of this bill, say so. Scare campaigns about land acquisition do not change the facts. We will clarify the misinformation every time it is put into the public domain by the Labor Party. The Labor Party has used these powers previously for various private project purposes, not just public ones.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bleijie, adjourned.

Mr SPEAKER: I remind the House that there is only one name on the warning list and it is the mover, the member for Mansfield.

MOTION

Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, Progress Report



Ms McMILLAN (Mansfield—ALP) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House calls on the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to table in the House the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce progress report by 5 pm on Thursday, 27 August 2026.

Four women have died in 45 days as a result of domestic and family violence in Queensland, and Queenslanders cannot be convinced that this government is doing everything in its power to protect women and children from domestic and family violence. We are in the middle of a domestic and family violence crisis. Women continue to lose their lives at the hands of domestic partners, yet we have an LNP government that has reduced funding by almost \$40 million. In turn, it is asking organisations and frontline supports in this time of crisis to do more with less. As reported by the ABC, the government allocated \$340.7 million for DFV prevention in 2026-27. The 2025-26 budget had \$379.2 million allocated, but only \$356.5 million was spent. Subsequently, the director-general at the estimates hearing confirmed that \$10.56 million was reallocated from domestic and family violence services to other departmental initiatives.

Prior to the estimates hearing, the Premier promised that Minister Camm would update the committee on the exact status of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce's 355 recommendations, but she failed to do so. The government received a progress report in June but chose not to release the full document, which is now collecting dust. We call on the minister to immediately release that report in the interests of transparency for Queenslanders and victim-survivors—namely, women and children.

What are they hiding? It is time the Premier and the minister came clean and told Queenslanders the truth. What is concerning is that this minister abolished the Office of the Independent Implementation Supervisor, leaving no mechanism for independent oversight of these critical reforms. That is a transparency problem.

Then there is the government's own victim-survivor working group. The government promised to give victims a voice. Victim-survivors participated. They provided their experiences, they made recommendations and then they were silenced. Their report was critical of aspects of the police response to domestic violence and called for significant reform. It has even been reported that one participant was told she could no longer contact the minister's office and that calls would be terminated. What is the point of asking victim-survivors to speak of their experiences if the government is not prepared to listen to what they say?

After almost two years, the minister cannot continue to point the finger at Labor. She is the minister responsible. The minister has been in this role for almost two years and the buck stops with

her. Victim-survivors are waiting for the minister to do her job. Frontline organisations are waiting for the minister to do her job. Queenslanders are waiting for the transparency, the accountability and the results that this LNP government purports to care about. They deserve better.

The final biennial report was issued by the Independent Implementation Supervisor in 2024, before this role was scrapped by this government. Of the recommendations relevant to the taskforce, more than 150 were assessed as completed. This showed that progress was being made on these critical reforms. Since that final report Queenslanders have been left in the dark. Obfuscation is all we get. There is no transparency. There is no oversight. There is no accountability. Queenslanders have been left wondering how many have even started, how many boxes have been ticked and passed off as completed with no substantive work done and how many have been scrapped or even reversed. We may never know.

Worse yet, Queenslanders are being gaslit. Why would the Premier make a promise that the minister would provide the updates at the estimates hearing only to have the minister filibuster in the opposition's time? Again, what is this minister and this Crisafulli LNP government trying to hide by delaying this update? The minister continues to avoid accountability by pointing the finger. That is why we are here today debating the motion: to shine a light on the work that the minister has not done after nearly two years.



Hon. AJ CAMM (Whitsunday—LNP) (Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (5.35 pm): I move—

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

1. Calls on the Opposition to release all documents regarding the Women Safety and Justice Taskforce, including all Cabinet and CBRC documents, briefing notes, attachments, and any other related material, by 5:00pm on Thursday, 27 August 2026.
2. Notes the Women Safety and Justice Taskforce first report was handed down in 2021 and that significant number of taskforce recommendations were left unfulfilled when the former government lost office in October 2024.
3. Notes the record funding provided by the Crisafulli LNP Government for the prevention of domestic and family violence, which represents an increase of 45.5% compared to Labor last budget in 2024-25, and includes funding to deliver Women Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations.

We said that we would progress the implementation of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce's recommendations—and we prosecuted that strongly from opposition—and that is exactly what we are doing. That is not all that we are doing, though. The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce is one piece—a very important piece—of the response to domestic and family violence.

We are investing 45.5 per cent more into domestic and family violence funding than Labor did in their final budget. I note that those opposite stood in front of the media when it came to time-limited funding attached to recommendations that have been completed. In fact, we have taken the initiative to increase the budget and expand the recommendations, and I am referring to recommendation 37 in report No. 1 where we have extended the funding for the Cairns DFV co-responder trial. I stood with the members for Cairns and Mulgrave when we expanded that. The former Labor government had planned to end that—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms CAMM: Next time I am in Cairns, I will be sure to notify the member for Cairns and his community that we extended the funding which they were going to cut because it was a time-limited project. As we have extended that for the next 12 months, when we evaluate that project and that recommendation we will assess the impact that it has had on the Cairns community. We will not leave the Cairns community high and dry with time-limited funding, which the member for Cairns was part of as a former cabinet minister.

We talk a lot about ticking boxes, but on this side of the House we care about phones being answered. That is why we went to work with DVConnect to ensure their crisis line answer rate in this state improved. Under those opposite, it was 41.9 per cent. Now, it is sitting stable at 84 per cent. We have made a commitment to double that. That is why we have announced a 24/7 North Queensland hub. It was not a recommendation of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce, but it is a policy of this government.

023

We know those opposite do not care about regional Queensland, and they do not care about phones being answered either. Partnering with the leadership of this specialised sector, we have designed and developed a 24/7 crisis line that will support Cairns, Hinchinbrook, the Burdekin and Palm Island. Those opposite oversaw a crisis call line where less than half of the calls were being answered

and people were asking, 'Where's Palm Island?' and 'Can you catch a train from there to Brisbane?' It was absolutely ludicrous that those opposite think that their record demonstrated putting victims first.

We have rolled out GPS tracking devices. We have delivered PPDs and there will be more reforms to come. We have rolled out 2,000 new police recruits; a sexual violence peak; a strategy and commissioning framework so that we respect taxpayers' money and make sure the investment is going where it needs to; three new hope hubs; remote shelter network funding—we actually delivered gas to remote shelters in the Torres Strait that those opposite failed to deliver; fast-tracked the DFVP; and delivered grassroots Safe Futures Grants. We are putting victims first. We will continue to work with the sector and work with victim-survivors in an effort to combat domestic and family violence.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs NIGHTINGALE** (Inala—ALP) (5.40 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Mansfield. I think Queenslanders are entitled to ask the minister a very simple question: what is in the report that she does not want Queenslanders to see? The final whole-of-government reporting round on the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations was delivered to the minister in June. It is now the end of August. This report has been sitting with the minister for months. At estimates, when the minister had the opportunity to tell Queenslanders exactly where those 355 recommendations stand, she did not. This is difficult to reconcile, particularly because the majority of those recommendations were due for completion this year.

That was the moment when Queenslanders should be able to ask the government: what has actually been done? We are talking about reforms that came from years of evidence and, importantly, from the experiences of victim-survivors. While the government is refusing to give us a clear picture of progress, it has also reduced funding for prevention. All totalled, there is almost \$40 million less than what was originally allocated last year. At estimates the director-general also confirmed that over \$10 million was reallocated from domestic and family violence services to initiatives elsewhere in the department. At the same time we are asking whether the reforms are being delivered, the resources available for prevention are going backwards.

Then there is the other piece of this: independent oversight. The Independent Implementation Supervisor existed because this was a huge and complex reform package and someone needed to independently examine whether the recommendations were actually being delivered. The final report from the Independent Implementation Supervisor issued in November 2024 showed just how much work remained across this reform program. Importantly, these recommendations had scheduled implementation timeframes. For report 1, 32 recommendations were scheduled for completion in 2026. For report 2, 78 were scheduled for completion this year. For *A call for change*, another 19 were scheduled for completion this year. That is 129 recommendations with scheduled completion in 2026. We are getting close to the end of 2026. This is a substantial body of work to track, deliver and report on. This is exactly why independent oversight matters. Yet this government chose to wind up the Independent Implementation Supervisor's work. Now, with all of these recommendations scheduled for completion, Queenslanders are being asked to rely on the government's own account of what has been delivered. I have a problem with that because we do not know what is important to this government.

We know that these recommendations are important to Queenslanders. Has recommendation 89 of report 2 even commenced? It was due to commence in April last year. It called for an independent review of victim-survivors' experiences in youth justice cases involving sexual offences. What has happened to it? Another recommendation, 92, calling for a pilot program addressing sexual and domestic violence offences was due. Has that commenced? These recommendations were made because something was going wrong. We need to know whether this government has actually fixed those problems. They go directly to whether the reforms promised to victim-survivors are actually happening.

Without the independent supervisor, how do Queenslanders know what 'completed' actually means? Has it been done or has a box just been ticked? That is why I want this report tabled. I think Queenslanders should be asking the same questions. Why has the minister had this report since June and she could not provide answers at estimates? Why has independent oversight been abolished when so many recommendations are still outstanding? Why are we having to move a motion in parliament just to get the answers that Queenslanders deserve? I do not want suspect assurances; I want the report. If the government has made real progress, show us. If recommendations have been delayed, tell us. If the work has not commenced, explain why. If the government has decided to shelve or change any of these reforms, Queenslanders have the right to know.

Women are losing their lives. While this is happening, this report could quite literally have implications that could save them. This government is sitting on it and not sharing it and not letting Queenslanders know what they deserve to know. We have the right to see what work is being done and whether this government is playing political games. I heard the minister talking about the importance of acting on recommendations. It is about time they showed us what they are doing and, more importantly, what they are not doing.

 **Hon. LJ GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Youth Justice and Victim Support and Minister for Corrective Services) (5.45 pm): I rise to support the amendment moved by Minister for Families, Seniors and Disability Services and Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. We said we would progress the implementation of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations, and that is what we are doing. I heard the member for Inala talk about how the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence has had the report since June. Guess when the first report was delivered to the previous Labor government? The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce handed its first report to the former Labor government in 2021.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs GERBER: Labor had three years. They had the report for three years.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Currumbin, just hold on a moment. I am going to start naming members very soon. Be warned.

Mrs GERBER: They had the report for three years—three years! Yet by the time Queenslanders threw them out of office, guess how many recommendations had been implemented? They had implemented less than three-quarters of all of the recommendations. There were 277 recommendations and more than 200 remained outstanding by the previous Labor government. They come into this House and they talk about how this minister has had a report since June, yet they had a report for three years and failed to implement 200 recommendations—more than 200 recommendations left to be implemented.

Labor has failed victim-survivors. They failed to deliver these critical reforms themselves. Now they are refusing to come clean on why. Their record speaks for itself. During Labor's decade of decline domestic and family violence incidents increased by 218 per cent. I am going to say that again: DV increased by 218 per cent under the previous Labor government. Under Labor, more than half of the calls to DVConnect's 24-hour crisis line went unanswered—more than half! Under this LNP Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, guess what that call rate has come up to? Eighty per cent. Consistently, 80 per cent of those calls are now answered. That is our record. They cannot stand on their record—half went unanswered. Those were women in crisis, women in need, and they let those calls go unanswered. Women were reaching out in one of the most frightening moments of their lives and they could not even get someone on the other end of the phone.

While Labor failed to act, more than 600 rape kits and 11,000 major crime samples were left untested because of Labor's DNA laboratory debacle—the biggest maladministration in the history of Queensland. More than 6,000 rape kits were left untested. That is Labor's legacy—reports without delivery, promises without actions and victim-survivors left waiting. The Crisafulli government will always stand up for the rights of victims and victim-survivors. Our government is restoring a simple but fundamental principle that those opposite failed to grasp for a decade—that is, the rights of victims must come before the rights of offenders. That is why the Crisafulli government is investing more than 45.5 per cent more in domestic and family violence services than Labor did in its final budget.

024 I heard the member for Inala say there is less, but that is factually untrue. Our budget delivers 45.5 per cent more into domestic and family violence and domestic and family violence prevention than Labor's last budget. We have delivered police protection directions. We have delivered GPS monitoring for high-risk perpetrators. We have delivered \$40 million to embed specialist domestic and family violence practitioners in police stations across Queensland. We have also delivered \$3.3 million to improve triage and referral out of the five biggest DV services. We also rescued the FTEs that were going to be cut under the youth co-responder model and made those police permanent because Labor did not fund them. On top of that, we put child safety workers in there so we can make sure we are keeping Queensland communities safe.

That is the difference between a Labor government and the Crisafulli government. Labor failed to deliver the recommendations of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce when they had three

years to do so. We are putting victims first and getting on with the job of delivering those recommendations.



Ms BUSH (Cooper—ALP) (5.50 pm): Mr Speaker, I move—

That all words after 'Calls on' be removed and the following inserted:

1. the Crisafulli LNP Government to release all Women Safety and Justice Taskforce Cabinet and CBRC documents, briefing notes, attachments and any other related material by 5.00pm on Thursday 27 August 2026;
2. Notes reports of \$40 million in funding cuts from the domestic and family violence budget which could have delivered almost 240,000 hours of counselling for DVvictim-survivors.

In recent weeks four Queensland women have lost their lives in circumstances of alleged domestic and family violence: Mallorie Roberts, 23 years old, is remembered by those who loved her as kind, loving and gentle; Jana Armstrong, 30 years old, was a new mum whose four-month-old baby boy was her entire world; Julia Brunsdon, 23 years old, was pregnant and the mother of an 18-month-old girl; and Djuarn Baker-Adams, 27 years old, was a much loved daughter, sister and friend who, it is reported, contacted police about domestic violence concerns just days before she died. I say their names because they were people. They had loved ones. They had stories, hopes and futures. Every time we lose another woman through domestic and family violence we owe her something greater than condolences: we owe her change. The evidence tells us that change is desperately needed.

The latest official Queensland Government Statistician's Office figures show that recorded sexual offences have increased by 7.2 per cent in a single year, breaches of domestic violence orders have increased by 8.6 per cent and Weapons Act offences have increased by 9.5 per cent. I am happy to table those stats which come from the Queensland Government Statistician's Office.

Tabled paper: Extract from a research brief prepared by the Queensland Parliamentary Library and Research Service, undated, including data regarding counts and rates of offences in Queensland.

We do not need any more evidence, data or research to tell us what needs to be done. Queensland already has a substantial road map for reform. The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce made 355 recommendations informed by hundreds of Queensland women who told government where systems had failed and what needed to change. The majority of those recommendations were due for completion in 2026, so at estimates the opposition asked a straightforward question: where are we at? Before estimates the Premier promised that Queenslanders would receive an update via the minister, but during estimates the minister could not provide the committee with the status of those 355 recommendations. That is particularly concerning because the Office of the Independent Implementation Supervisor has now been abolished under this government. We know the minister received the final whole-of-government reporting round on the outstanding recommendations in June this year. Today we are simply asking the minister to release that report and let Queenslanders see what recommendations have been completed, what remains outstanding and what has been delayed.

Transparency is particularly important given that the government's own budget papers show that \$379 million was allocated for domestic and family violence prevention in 2025-26 but just \$356 million was spent. That is a deficit. At estimates the director-general also confirmed that \$10 million was reallocated from domestic and family violence prevention services into other initiatives within the department. Every single dollar budgeted towards the prevention of domestic and family violence should be spent on that cause.

There is plenty that we disagree about in this chamber. That is part of politics, but surely women's safety can be an area where we can work differently. I believe that members on both sides of this House came here because we genuinely want to make our communities better and safer. While there are disagreements about policy, funding and implementation, there are hundreds of victim-survivors who have given their time, their experiences and their insight and relived their trauma to help government build a better system. We have a responsibility to follow that work through. These women did not give their evidence to Labor and they did not give their evidence to the LNP: they gave it to Queensland. Their recommendations should not disappear between political cycles. In 2023 the now minister, the member for Whitsunday, told this parliament—

... we in the LNP do not talk in announcements; we talk in outcomes.

Minister, where are the outcomes? Provide Queenslanders with an update, release the report and let this parliament understand where the implementation stands, where the gaps remain and where our collective efforts are still required. Mallorie, Jana, Julia and Djuarn—remembering those names matters, but what matters most is what we do next.



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) (5.55 pm): I rise to speak to the motion as moved by my colleague with regard to the vitally important matter of domestic and family violence. It must be acknowledged that after a decade of decline under the previous Labor government the resulting 218 per cent increase in domestic and family violence calls, mainly by women, has had a huge impact and lives have been sadly changed forever.

When the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce report was first received by Labor in 2021 they had many years to work through the 277 recommendations. By time they left office three years later they had only delivered 72 of the 277 recommendations. While we have only been in government under two years, we are committed to methodically and calmly working through and delivering the remaining recommendations. In addition to that, we are spending more money than Labor did in the last budget while also standing up services and delivering things that Labor either never committed to or ignored.

We will never know the names of the women who tried to ring DVConnect. We will never know how many potentially suffered further significant harm because no-one picked up their DVConnect call. Less than half of the calls were being answered, which is a terrible tragedy of unknown proportions. In the time that my colleague Minister Camm has been responsible for domestic and family violence policy and implementation on behalf of our government just over 80 per cent of calls are answered and now link women predominantly, but other domestic and family violence sufferers as well, to potentially lifesaving help.

025

We acknowledge that more still needs to be done as long as anyone suffers tragedy—particularly the fatal impacts the community is witnessing—as a result of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce recommendations not being fulfilled in the three years Labor had to act. We have acted on the DNA lab debacle—where more than 600 rape kits were backlogged and 11,000 major crime samples were untested. We are still working through that debacle that Labor created. That means that, while hundreds of rape kits were not tested—sometimes for more than a year—the offenders were still on the streets, out in the community and not facing justice. That is why we are standing up the three new hope hubs to provide wraparound healing and recovery services for victim-survivors, including in Ipswich and on the Sunshine Coast. We are also funding other services and standing up powers for our police with 2,000 extra police on the beat.

(Time expired)



Ms McMAHON (Macalister—ALP) (6.00 pm): I rise to speak to the motion originally moved by the shadow minister. Openness and transparency is what that motion was calling for, not for political points but because it was actually a requirement of the taskforce. Women are dying in this state, too often at the hands of those who profess to love and care for them. This is a scourge, it is a complex and wicked problem, and it affects people from all walks of life. That does not mean we resile from it; it is incumbent upon us to do all that we can as legislators, and that means listening to those who are tasked to examine the issues, engaging with the stakeholders and providing us a path forward. This has been the role of successive DFV taskforces. Their work is not a box-ticking exercise. To view it as that is to demean the work of the practitioners, the victims, those with lived experience and those who engage with the process so that hopefully we might see a reduction in lives lost.

The recommendations of the taskforce and the inquiries that followed—over 350 of them—represent practical steps forward. They were not written to be an inconvenience to government. They are what is needed to keep women and children alive. The recommendations need to be completed. The *Hear her voice* report specifically stated—

... the Taskforce recommends the appointment of an independent implementation supervisor so that the public will know the progress of the implementation of its proposed reforms.

The previous Labor government established the Independent Implementation Supervisor to track the recommendations and where possible to evaluate the implementation. That first word gives it away: 'independent', not tucked away in a minister's department but an independent office that released its report and made it public so that stakeholders and the community could have confidence that the recommendations were not being ignored. The role of this supervisor and their office was crucial. In fact in the then opposition leader's budget reply speech in 2023 the now Premier stated—

This role is crucial to the effective rollout of all of the recommendations to ensure this is not just a box-ticking exercise.

The fifth progress report was submitted to this new government in November 2024. It was not meant to be the final report by any stretch of the imagination, considering there were dozens and

dozens of recommendations still to be completed, but it turned out to be the last report that the Independent Implementation Supervisor would complete. Unbeknownst to the supervisor and the entire DFV sector, it was a priority of this LNP government to scrap the Independent Implementation Supervisor and their office. It was gone by February 2025. I do not recall them spruiking that on their list of things to do in their first 100 days. They kept that rather quiet.

The report that was submitted and completed in November 2024 was not even acknowledged by this government. It was the shadow minister who referred to it and tabled it. That progress report identified 49 recommendations that were due but still in progress. That was 2024. There were those recommendations from report 1 and additional recommendations from the *A call for change* report that were due to be completed by 2025-26—another 32 of them. That is 81 recommendations that were due to be completed by this year. The progress report stated—

... transparent and regular reporting on the reforms in a way that is accessible to the community and key DFSV system stakeholders should feature as a routine part of understanding the effects of the reforms and shaping responses going forward. It is imperative that we understand the differences being made to the lives of women and girls and whether we are effecting enduring change for persons using violence.

They said it is imperative. Where are we now? We have a Reform Implementation Office that sits inside a department. It is not independent and it is not providing publicly accessible information on the recommendations being achieved. In estimates, the minister stated that there were only a small number of recommendations remaining, yet yesterday when asked we heard that her office was working on 'many, many'. Which is it? Are they almost done, or is it still 'many, many'?

For those who clearly have not read any of the progress reports, there is actually a timeline for implementation. They were not all meant to be done by the time of the 2024 election. They were actually timelined out to 2026, so guess what: 'problem belong-em you' because you had two years. On top of that, there are further recommendations that go out beyond 2030. That is on the government's watch. Where are they being done? Tell people and be up-front about it.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (6.05 pm): I rise to speak on the motion as moved by my colleague. Domestic and family violence is the No. 1 call for service for our hardworking Queensland police officers across the state and, sadly, my hometown of Townsville is no exception to that. It is an absolute scourge on our society. It tears families apart, shatters lives, destroys the very place where people should feel safe and causes harm that can carry from one generation to the next. Too often it is some of the most vulnerable people in our community who are the victims. Our homes should be our safe place where we find security, love and support, not fear, intimidation or violence.

We need to remember that behind every statistic is a real person—a friend, a neighbour, a family member, a child who deserves to grow up feeling safe. That is why it matters how we respond to domestic and family violence. We cannot simply just talk about change; we have a responsibility to deliver it. I approach this debate with respect for every victim-survivor, the frontline workers who support them and the police who respond.

Respect also means being honest about what governments have done, what they have failed to do and what still needs to be done. The Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce handed down its first report in 2021, yet when the former Labor government left office in October 2024 only 72 of the 277 recommendations were delivered. Our government said we would progress those recommendations, and that is exactly what we are doing. Importantly, we recognise that implementing those recommendations is only one part of the work required to prevent domestic and family violence, protect victim-survivors, hold perpetrators to account and support people to rebuild their lives.

That is why our government is investing 45.5 per cent more in domestic and family violence funding than Labor did in its final budget. We are delivering police protection directions, giving police stronger powers to provide immediate protection to victim-survivors. We are rolling out GPS monitoring. We are investing \$40 million over four years to embed specialist domestic and family violence practitioners in police stations across Queensland. We are investing \$10 million to embed specialist mental health clinicians in women's health and wellbeing services and \$3.3 million to improve triage and referral at five of Queensland's largest domestic and family violence services.

Importantly, for the people I represent, we are delivering in North Queensland. Just last week I stood with our minister as our government launched 1800NQSAFE, a dedicated 24-hour, seven days a week domestic and family violence crisis support service for North Queenslanders, backed by a \$21 million commitment over two years to establish the North Queensland DFV networked hub to support people in regional Queensland.

026

It is about connecting victim-survivors to police, hospitals, housing services and specialist domestic and family violence providers when they need them, because domestic and family violence does not operate on business hours. It is not Monday to Friday, nine to five. It takes, on average, seven to eight attempts to leave before a victim-survivor of domestic and family violence permanently separates from an abusive relationship. When someone makes the incredibly difficult decision to reach out for help, somebody needs to answer.

Under Labor, the DVConnect crisis line answer rate fell to 41.9 per cent. Our government has worked with DVConnect to improve that response and it is now consistently sitting at close to 80 per cent. These are not simply percentages. Every unanswered call potentially represents somebody who found the courage to ask for help but was not answered, and that is Labor's legacy.

Our government continues to deliver for victim-survivors. We will always be on the side of victim-survivors. We have fast-tracked the Queensland Domestic and Family Violence Alliance and established a standalone sexual violence peak body. We know there is more work to do and our government will keep doing that work. We will keep listening to victim-survivors, to the sectors, to the police and to the frontline services to get the tools they need to hold perpetrators to account but, above all, make sure that help is there when somebody reaches out for it. It is about reform, not reports; protection, not promises; actions, not words. I support the amendment to the motion.

(Time expired)

 **Ms ASIF** (Sandgate—ALP) (6.10 pm): I rise to speak to the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. I call on the Minister for Child Safety and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence to release the progress report to let Queenslanders know what progress has been made on those recommendations. Let's talk about why the taskforce was set up. It was set up under the former Labor government so that victims of domestic and family violence could share their experiences and the recommendations could make a difference in the lives of women across the criminal justice system. That was the purpose of it being set up. There deserves to be answers about the progress that has been made for women in Queensland.

Those recommendations from the taskforce outlined key reforms to ensure that victims are kept safe and perpetrators are held accountable. The government needs to release the progress report to give us a clear update. From where I am sitting, from the amount of defensiveness that the government has come into this chamber with tonight it is pretty clear that the government has taken no action on that. If they had, they would be standing up in the media to talk about all of the progress they have made on those recommendations. The fact that they cannot point to one recommendation they have completed tonight is shameful and they should hang their heads in shame.

So far this year 48 women and 19 children have been killed in Australia and four of them within 45 days in Queensland. These are tragic numbers and these women's lives should not have been lost. A really important part we need to talk about is the prevention of domestic and family violence. We need to be taking preventative measures and investing in those measures to teach our young people that it is wrong to hurt another human being, it is wrong to treat someone with such disrespect and contempt that they choose to take their life, cutting their life short. That comes from investment and funding in prevention. What we have seen from this government is a cut of nearly \$40 million from those prevention programs. Twelve of those women were in Queensland.

There are recommendations of that taskforce that needed to be completed in a certain timeframe which included recommendation 92 of report 2, which called for a pilot program addressing sexual and domestic violence offences. I ask: has that started? Mere hours ago there was a news report of a 16-year-old girl who has lost her life overnight because she was strangled during a sexual act. This was in New South Wales but I think it highlights the importance of the need to take action on these recommendations so it does not happen in Queensland—so it does not happen anywhere—because no 16-year-old should lose their life in that way. No woman, no person, should lose their life because another person has decided that their life is less worthy and they choose to do that.

If the minister chooses not to release this report, if those opposite want to continue to not be transparent with the people of Queensland, we have to ask: what is the Premier and the minister hiding? Why are they not releasing the progress report? We have seen a weak government that does not want to take strong action on domestic and family violence. They do not want to take strong action on the prevention and they do not want to fund it.

During estimates we found that over \$10 million that was supposed to be for domestic and family violence was reallocated. That funding was supposed to be for crisis accommodation for women who were leaving their homes in these types of situations and they needed a roof over their head. They

needed safety and they looked to the government. There are women who lost out on that accommodation because the government chose to reallocate \$10 million of that funding.

People deserve to be safe in this state—people affected by domestic violence. That progress report needs to be released so people can know what action is being taken by this government, because there is seemingly none. How many more women have to lose their lives in Queensland before the government decides that enough is enough and they are going to take more action and not just stand up in the media and talk about the work they were doing.

In my community a woman lost her life. This week marks one year since Carra Luke in my community was allegedly murdered by her former partner. She was a beloved nurse and a proud member of our community. I was very fortunate to meet her two years ago when she talked about the contribution she made as a nurse and the people she cared for. She deserved to live but her life was brutally cut short.

I do not know how many women need to lose their life before the government takes this matter seriously, before they take action and say enough is enough. Women deserve to live. Take action. Release the progress report.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (6.15 pm): This motion moved by the opposition is yet another example of a disgraceful scare campaign put forward by the Labor government in Queensland. The member calls for us to take action.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr O'CONNOR: Tonight I am going to run through some of the actions—

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, did you just hear me? I called for order.

Mr O'CONNOR: The member calls for us to take action tonight. In line with our amendment to the motion, I am going to run through some of the actions this government is taking through our record funding that we are providing to domestic and family violence support and in particular to our housing portfolio. Those opposite had their chance. They failed and what we are seeing tonight is that they have learnt nothing. We are doing exactly what we said we would do to fix those failures.

In relation to the Crisis Accommodation Program that the member opposite just referred to, the former government funded that program across their last three budgets—\$200 million over three budgets. In just our first two budgets we have lifted that funding to \$300 million. There is more money going into that Crisis Accommodation Program than there was under the former government. On our homelessness services, which I had the opportunity to outline to the House just yesterday, in our first three years we locked in \$1.389 billion in funding compared to Labor's last three where they funded those services to just \$822 million. Under Labor, those services had to wait for the Treasurer to stand up and deliver the budget speech to know whether they would have funding in the new financial year. That is because unlike under the former government when far too many vulnerable Queenslanders were waiting for housing and the support they deserve, we are delivering that practical assistance; we are delivering those secure long-term housing pathways. We are doing it for those experiencing domestic and family violence in particular.

Between 1 July 2025 and 30 June 2026 we assisted 1,665 households which identified as experiencing domestic and family violence into social housing. We are going to have more opportunities to do that with our record build program. In our first full financial year in government we tripled the annual number of social homes delivered by the former government. We delivered 1,711 social and community homes in that first full financial year that we were in government in Queensland. On top of that, in that financial year we assisted more than 6,500 households with private market assistance. They were households which identified as experiencing domestic and family violence. We also deliver many different packages of support in partnership with Minister Camm's department for relocation, establishment costs, essential goods and services, and tailored housing responses to help victim-survivors re-establish their safety and their stability.

027 In the last financial year, 348 department owned or department secured crisis accommodation properties were provided to domestic and family violence specialist homelessness services for accommodation or office space. There is more to do. We are playing catch-up. There has been a decade where nowhere near enough homes were delivered and we need those homes to give more

opportunities to those experiencing domestic and family violence. With our record \$5.725 billion capital investment over the next four years alone we are getting those homes out of ground at scale.

I also give a shout-out to our public works division of the department, our QBuild teams, that the Attorney reminded me are doing a great job with the DFV courthouse critical safety upgrades which the former government failed to adequately fund. We are very proud to be working with the Attorney's department to deliver those.

The record of those opposite is clear. They had a decade to deliver and they failed. They talk a lot about social and affordable housing. They talk a lot about failed mandates. They talk a lot about the approaches that failed, but they did not deliver. We are getting on with the job. We have more social and affordable homes under contract or construction to deliver across our state than any government has had in Queensland's history. That is nearly 7,000 homes that are underway right now across this state. I cannot wait to get to more of them to welcome our residents, to tell them that they are safe and to tell them that they have an opportunity that would never had under those opposite.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (6.21 pm): There are almost 300 recommendations in the two reports of the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and the taskforce went right across Queensland and spoke to hundreds and hundreds of victim-survivors. The introduction to the taskforce report states—

The Taskforce has been overwhelmed by the generosity of victims who have shared their stories with us ... It is an immense privilege to be trusted to tell these stories to the people of Queensland.

These stories are often confronting. It is shocking to read of the painful physical and emotional abuse inflicted on so many victims. It is equally shocking to learn that many of their perpetrators are yet to be held to account.

But these are stories that must be told. The resilience and courage of these women is inspirational.

These are women who are asking this LNP government to please tell them where these recommendations are up to. Those brave, courageous victim-survivors shared their stories—many for the first time—and they are the ones who are asking for this update. They are the ones who deserve to know where this work is up to. I heard almost every speaker from the government tonight say, 'We didn't get it done in time so why are we even bothering complaining about the fact that they have not completed these recommendations.'

If anyone from the government had actually read this report—and I acknowledge that it is a lot, but it is so important—they would know that one of the taskforce's first recommendations was that not all of this could be done at once. There is a phased approach recommended. They actually wrote an implementation guideline for the government, which we adopted. We then published an immense implementation guide. Most of the recommendations were due to be delivered this year. As the member for Macalister pointed out, some of the recommendations were due—recommended by the taskforce itself—to be implemented past 2030 because these are big, transformational system reforms, putting victims' voices at the centre of our criminal justice system.

The victim-survivors who bravely shared their stories knew where every recommendation was up to. I admit that some of the ones that we said should have been completed in 2023-24 were for reasons not quite ready. Do members know why we all knew that? We had an independent implementation supervisor supported by an office that provided six monthly detailed reports that were tabled in this House.

All of the government speakers tonight said, 'We're doing what we promised.' They did not promise Queenslanders they were going to sack an independent implementation supervisor recommended by the very taskforce who heard these victim-survivors' stories.

Mr Miles: The one they called for.

Ms FENTIMAN: The one that David Crisafulli said was 'crucial'. The Premier said it was crucial and one of the first things they did was sack the independent implementation supervisor. I have heard none of the speakers opposite talk about why that was critical.

We have also heard from the member for Bonney who is the minister responsible for overseeing \$42 million in cuts to crisis accommodation for people, many of whom are women and children escaping violence. We have heard from the minister who, to be honest, has a report sitting on her desk that could tell victim-survivors and all of us right now where the recommendations are up to.

Why are they hiding it? When the Premier was asked about this in a press conference—we know he does not like getting all these hard questions—said, 'I will leave that to the minister. She will provide an update at estimates.' There are a lot of recommendations. What did we get from the minister when

we asked for her to table an update? We got 10 minutes where she addressed perhaps three recommendations. She was deliberately, let's be honest, wasting time. There were victim-survivors in the gallery wanting to hear an update, desperate to know whether their bravery and courage in coming forward is actually changing the state of Queensland.

It is absolutely not good enough that this government continues to sit on an implementation report, that this government cuts funding to domestic and family violence prevention, that this government hides reports from victims-survivors because they do not like the outcomes. The Premier has promised the people of Queensland and victim-survivors an update and this minister has failed to deliver it, so deliver it.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. DK FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Integrity) (6.26 pm): It is always great to follow the member for Waterford who loves to rewrite history in this state. I agree with so many of the speakers from both sides of the House who have spoken tonight. I have been here long enough to remember the *Not now, not ever* report.

Mr Krause: Who started it?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: We did. Domestic and family violence is a scourge on our society, no matter who is in government. Every government will come to government with a goal to reduce domestic and family violence.

An opposition member: Show us what you've done.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: They are saying, 'Show us.' There has been a 48 per cent increase in the funding for domestic and family violence prevention from your last budget. The shadow treasurer sits there and dares to ask what are we doing. There has been a 48 per cent increase in funding for domestic and family violence prevention. There are more houses. We are acting.

If they want to talk about WSJT, what about the fact, shadow treasurer, that you did not fund the domestic and family violence courthouse upgrades. When we came into government that was unfunded by \$68 million. That is what I found in our first budget to ensure women had safe rooms in courthouses. That is what WSJT called for. A woman in Cairns was punched in face just last week while we are waiting on the safe room to be completed. What would have happened if they had had a safe room under the Palaszczuk-Miles government? That is what listening and acting means. It is not about sitting there, reading and pretending that you are talking to advocates. What about acting.

There are a few other things. I have heard sniggers and laughter about the DV hotline. If you in are in the middle of a crisis it is very important that someone picks up the phone. I remember that distinctly. That is why when we were last in government the then attorney-general funded the Women's Legal Services first ever hotline for rural and regional women. I was on the other end of calls as a practitioner in Kingaroy helping those women.

Mr McDonald: Real action

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Real action. We did that. When we discovered that the DV hotline was not being answered because of underfunding by the Palaszczuk-Miles government, the minister got to work and now 80 per cent of those calls are being picked up. That is real action and that is delivering. You have to ask why. The member for Waterford talks about the victims and what a privilege it is for them to tell their stories. Absolutely, I agree, but it is also a privilege to hear it. It is a privilege to hear it and say help—

028

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Waterford, there was silence when you made your contribution. I ask for the same.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: When you have a hotline, it is having someone on the other end who can direct you to the correct place. It is having enough police officers on the beat to turn up and help. It is enough safe rooms in your courthouses—that is what it is. It is also the little things that the Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce and victims recommended. A great example is the DFV media guide, which we released that on 26 May 2025 to support the responsible and evidence-based reporting of domestic and family violence incidents in Queensland. We did not wait—we just did that. We took opportunities to better protect victims' rights—yes, new arrangements.

Honestly, so much has been done because the Crisafulli government increased funding by 48 per cent. Those opposite can talk about a reduction because of a closed recommendation or a bit of work that has completed, but what about the fact that we increased funding by 48 per cent? The

former Palaszczuk-Miles government did not prioritise it. As soon as we formed government, the Premier prioritised domestic and family violence because ‘not now, not ever’. It is never okay. It is a scourge on our community. We all know that. More always needs to be done. That is exactly why we are prioritising the rights of the victims of domestic and family violence.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The time for the debate has expired.

Division: Question put—That amendment be agreed to.

AYES, 35:

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

NOES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Ms Bush) negatived.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, 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, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O’Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, 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, Linard, Martin, McCallum, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Nightingale, O’Shea, Pease, Power, Pugh, Russo, Ryan, Scanlon, Smith, Whiting.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.40 pm.

029

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

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2552, on motion of Mr Bleijie—

That the bill be read a second time.



Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and Minister for Industrial Relations) (7.40 pm), continuing: Queenslanders deserve a straight answer: does Labor support critical minerals and the resources sector or does it want

to play politics with the jobs and investment the sector can deliver? The government will not be distracted. We will back Queensland's resources sector while upholding the rights of landholders and protecting the environment.

I also want to be clear about the government's approach to protecting Queensland's agricultural interests. I will move an amendment to ensure that a regional interests development approval—a RIDA—is a protected instrument. That means that where a project is subject to the RIDA process that protection remains in place. This is important because the RIDA framework exists to protect regional interests, including strategic cropping land and priority agricultural land. The Crisafulli government is not prepared to sacrifice Queensland's agricultural productivity in the pursuit of development. We can and must do both: facilitate investment and development while protecting the agricultural land and regional interests that underpin our state.

Similarly, the government has acted to give effect to its election promise to ensure that renewable energy projects are impact assessable and generate benefits for the communities they are in. To preserve the integrity of that reform and put to bed another scare campaign, I will move an amendment that will prevent renewable energy projects—including solar, wind and battery projects—from being eligible for declaration as state strategic projects. This means there is no back door for renewable projects into the state strategic project framework. I know the community was concerned that if Labor ever got back into government they would use these powers to support renewable energy projects in communities that did not want them.

The government is also taking proactive action to assure the community that we are taking the challenge posed by data centres seriously. In addition, the amendment will prohibit declaration of data centres to be state strategic projects whilst the government develops the right settings for managing these projects under the Planning Act, like we did with other renewable energy projects. These amendments are about clarity and certainty. They are about drawing a line around where these powers can and cannot be used. They are about giving Queenslanders confidence that the government is listening to legitimate concerns while still delivering the investment and jobs the state needs.

Similarly, the access authority proposal adopts existing protections for landowners from the investigator's authority regime but strengthens those protections by reserving the potential use to only those projects that meet the criteria for declaration as a prescribed project and, in the case of access authorities seeking temporary enabling work, have been declared a state strategic project. Like acquisition, this is a last-resort power. They are only for projects with the relevant declarations and where other options have been exhausted.

Something that is not a last resort is the infrastructure coordination plan. I was pleased to see support for this proposal during the committee's examination of the bill. It is clear that, whilst the private sector are very capable of delivering development infrastructure under their own steam, there is a role—and an expectation—for the state as a strategic planner, coordinator and facilitator. Local governments and infrastructure providers are key to the framework, with their local knowledge of issues and their responsibility for planning and provision of infrastructure. Their input is incorporated throughout the process, along with opportunities for public views to be considered as part of a development investigation where sought by the government—in addition to usual application, consultation and submission processes.

Hand in hand with development of the state's resources in the ground is development of the state's industrial capability in our regional centres. This bill is an expression of this government's commitment to facilitating growth through state development areas. SDAs are the beating heart of Queensland's industrial development capacity. Over the last financial year, SDAs were home to \$607 million worth of investment through construction and operational commencements. Whether it is by establishing infrastructure corridors, facilitating particular projects or bringing serviced industrial land to market, SDAs are part of delivering major economic development that makes Queensland a better place to live, work and invest. I thank submitters for their comments during the committee process about SDAs, particularly local governments that assist with SDA assessments and advice. Consultation, local government decision-making and appeals were common themes.

The proposals related to SDAs, particularly SDA related development, are intended to preserve the longstanding operation of part 6 of the act and achieve the objective of planning for and servicing industrial and infrastructure development. This sometimes means a different approach from what we see elsewhere in the state. Nonetheless, local governments and the public will continue to be engaged in the declaration of SDAs and preparation of development schemes. Local governments are essential partners in the development of our state as representatives of our communities, providers of essential

services and infrastructure and stewards of our planning system. This government remains committed to empowering councils and working with them, rather than against them, to deliver the outcomes Queenslanders demand from their government.

Ensuring these amendments work the way we need requires effective implementation. I hear the committee's call for clarity and consistency in the exercise of functions under the state development act. The Office of the Coordinator-General will be actively updating existing guidance and supporting material to reflect new and amended processes under the state development act following passage of the bill. In addition, I propose a select number of amendments during consideration in detail of the bill. The first amendment relates to the SDA related development mechanism. It details how SDA related development declared by the Coordinator-General will be regulated for development assessment activities. It also ensures that the mechanism has the intended effect of allowing regulation of SDA related development solely by the Coordinator-General. The second amendment will guarantee that a regional interests development approval will always be required where triggered.

I want to thank the Queensland Farmers' Federation and Cotton Australia for their advocacy in protecting prime agricultural land and agricultural development interests for landholders. They welcome this legislation, which they say 'maintains critical landholders' protections for the state's primary producers'. They go on to say—

By retaining the RIDA as a protected instrument for our state's strategic cropping and prime agricultural land, the Queensland Government has listened to farmers and shown that it will not be sacrificing our state's best farming land for other uses.

Queenslanders are proud of the produce we grow in our state and understand that prime agricultural land is a finite resource that must be protected to ensure our future generations enjoy continued access to high-quality, locally grown food, fibre, and foliage.

We thank the Queensland Government for its engagement throughout this process and QFF and our peak body members will continue to work with the government to ensure prime agricultural land is appropriately protected for future generations of Queenslanders.

By enshrining a RIDA as a key authorisation under the new part 5A, division 3B, a modification order cannot preclude the need for certain development to hold a RIDA, because protecting prime agricultural land through the Regional Planning Interests Act is enshrined through the amendments we make in this bill and also under the Condamine Alluvium bill that was passed by the parliament in June. Further, the government has acted to give effect to its election commitment to ensure that renewable energy projects are impact assessable. To preserve the integrity of that reform, I will move an amendment that will prevent any perception that renewables projects could be put on another track or certain projects given different treatment by prohibiting them from being declared state strategic projects. We are taking proactive action to assure the community that we are taking the challenge posed by data centres seriously. An additional amendment will prohibit declaration of data centres to be state strategic projects.

This government is delivering a plan for Queensland, including our ambition to become a global leader in critical minerals supply. This bill ensures Queensland remains ready to facilitate and achieve the twin goals of regulation: to drive development whilst responsibly managing impacts. This bill is also about something broader: it is about whether Queensland is prepared and ready to compete; whether we are prepared to back our regions; whether we are prepared to back our resources sector; whether we are prepared to attract the investment that will create jobs, build industries and deliver opportunities for Queenslanders; and whether we can do all of that while upholding the rights of landholders and protecting the environment. The answer from the Crisafulli government is absolutely yes, we can. We will not allow misinformation or scare campaigns by the Labor Party to stand in the way of Queensland's future. We will not shy away from difficult decisions. We will not apologise for having the ambition to make Queensland a global leader in critical minerals, advanced manufacturing and major development across the state.

030

Queensland is a proud resource state. According to industry reports, the industry directly employs over 71,000 workers, pays over \$8.6 billion in wages, supports 17,600 Queensland businesses through the supply chain and supports over 1,700 community organisations. More broadly, the direct and indirect economic contribution is over \$115 billion to the Queensland economy, supporting one in every five jobs in Queensland. When in government, members opposite turned their back on the resources industry and this bill will be a test for Labor in opposition. If they vote against the changes in the bill, Labor is voting against the resources sector, resources communities and mining workers all over the state but particularly in rural and regional Queensland.

I was proud to stand in Mount Isa recently with the Minister for Natural Resources to announce the establishment of a miners memorial to be built in partnership with industry and council as well as

many of the workers, former workers and mining families associated with the local mine. After almost 30 years of advocacy, a multimillion dollar memorial honouring 151 fallen mineworkers who died at the historic mine will be built in the iconic outback region. Former Mount Isa resident Steve Trevor, who lost his brother Tony in a mining accident in 1995, has spent over three decades waiting for a formal memorial site. He said—

The memories are still sharp in my mind.

He said the memorial—

... will bring recognition of a life lost. What they gave to their community is the ultimate sacrifice. They didn't come home. There's only a few people who can understand what that feels like.

As ABC North West Queensland recently reported—

Despite plans and costings being drawn up in 2023, support for the project ultimately stalled without the backing of the previous state government.

Mr Dick: That's not true. That is completely false.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order, members!

Mr Dick: He is making it up again. Apologies.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I accept your apology but I was on my feet and you continued your interjections. You are warned under the standing orders.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. He said it was not true and that we are making stuff up. Where was the money for the miners memorial? We gave \$2 million, Glencore have given \$2 million and the council have given \$700,000. That is \$4.7 million for the miners memorial. He is upset that the AWU mineworkers joined me at a press conference and not him. He was on his lonesome at his press conference. The Crisafulli government is delivering the miners memorial that for decades was requested of the Labor Party when they were in office. He just cannot front up and tell the truth. He did not fund it—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. None of this is relevant to this bill, its purposes or its outcomes.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This bill is about critical minerals and mining and the Deputy Premier is making a contribution that is relevant to those matters contained within the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, you have the call. Come back to the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: This bill is about the resources sector. Honouring the memory of 151 mineworkers who died in a mine is pretty important to the Crisafulli government. Clearly, it is not relevant and not important to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who makes an interjection—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 246, quarrelling. Also, I take personal offence at the words used by the Deputy Premier and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. I am proud to be part of the Crisafulli government that is funding the miners memorial for the 151 miners who died in Mount Isa and its region, which the Labor Party had been asked to fund for many years but rejected every single time.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find that personally offensive. As a member of the former Labor government, that was clearly directed at me and I ask—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you will not use a point of order to prosecute an argument. Was your point of order on relevance or personal offence?

Mr DICK: Personal offence.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not name the member. I referred to the former Labor government. He cannot take personal offence when I had not named the member.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. I take the point of order of the Deputy Premier. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe that you were referred to personally. As such, I cannot ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a further point of order. I submit to you that the point of order just raised by the member for Woodridge was frivolous and vexatious because he was not named.

He is a longstanding member of the House. He is already on a warning at this stage. I ask you to consider that matter and rule accordingly.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice. On the point of order, I note what you have said, Leader of the House. I note that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition is about to reply on behalf of the opposition. Taking that into account, I will give some latitude, Deputy Leader of the Opposition. However, I remind you that you are on a warning.

Mr BLEIJIE: When the Deputy Leader of the Opposition speaks in a minute and a half, I hope he apologises to the families of the 151 mineworkers who lost their lives because when he was treasurer he did not fund the miners memorial in Mount Isa, but the Crisafulli government has done it.

A government member: A fact is a fact.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection: those are the facts. It is in our Mount Isa Transition Fund: \$4.7 million. Labor might want to talk about critical minerals projects, but if you do not have the companies that want to invest in Queensland then you will not have the jobs and the opportunities that flow from that. As the father of a fly-in fly-out mineworker, I pay tribute to the men and women who work tirelessly day in, day out at the literal coalface of Queensland's biggest industries to drive the sector forward.

This is part of our pursuit of excellence to maintain Queensland's position as an investment destination of choice as well as a state that recognises, protects and enhances our environments, our communities, our agricultural interests and our way of life. That is why this bill is so important. We are protecting prime agricultural land, protecting and enhancing the resources sector, backing the resources sector, backing regional Queensland, backing our miners in the regional sector and backing our farmers every day of the week. Whether it is the resources sector, primary industries, the agricultural sector, feedlots—whatever it is—that want to use this legislation, the Crisafulli government backs them. What is the opposition going to do? They should apologise for the scare campaign they have been running in our farming communities for the past six weeks.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7.56 pm): I rise to speak to the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Queensland's critical minerals matter. They matter to our regional economies, to our sovereign capability, to renewable energy technologies and to the manufacturing industries this state wants to build. The Queensland Labor opposition supported the critical minerals industry in this state and supports it today. The former Labor government's critical minerals strategy oversaw more than a quarter of a billion dollars invested in the critical minerals industry in this state. Therefore, we will not be lectured to by the member for Kawana on our government's and Labor's support for critical minerals in this state.

As the world decarbonises, what sits under Queensland's ground will only grow in importance and value. The Crisafulli LNP government will not find an argument from this side of the House about critical minerals. What it will find from the opposition is an argument about this bill because this bill is not, in substance, a critical minerals bill and it never has been. Didn't the veil fall down tonight? Didn't the Deputy Premier put up a facade about critical minerals? In the introductory speech, he went on and on about critical minerals. Then we see amendments rushed into the House tonight, without any proper public consultation, that speak to everything other than critical minerals. From the start it was a farce. The Deputy Premier put up a facade that this is about critical minerals when it is about everything other than critical minerals, including his grab for power. The title says 'critical minerals' but the powers in the bill do not. They do not speak to critical minerals alone and the amendments demonstrate that conclusively.

Under this bill, powers attach to any project that this minister, of all ministers, declares to be a state strategic project, that is, not a critical minerals project but any project—a mine, energy infrastructure, a dam, a cable car, a waste-to-energy plant, an abattoir, landfill, a quarry. That is the first thing Queenslanders should know about the 227-page bill that this government brought into the House, giving Queenslanders only three weeks to consult on it.

New section 76EB(1) allows the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning to declare a project to be a state strategic project if the minister—this minister, of all ministers—considers it critical or essential for the state for economic, environmental or social reasons or a high priority because it will or is likely to significantly contribute to the achievements of the government's—this government's—economic, environmental or social objectives for the state or a region. These are

categories broad enough to hold almost any proposal this minister wishes to place inside them. The only threshold that must be crossed is the member for Kawana's own satisfaction. Once that decision is made, the bill takes away the rights of Queenslanders.

The declaration is expressly excluded from review under the Judicial Review Act. The landholder, a councillor or a community group cannot seek a statutory review of it. That is what this bill says. The declaration is the gateway. Once a project passes through it, the bill unlocks state significant notices, compulsory acquisition of land, entry rights for enabling works, expanded strategic infrastructure easements and, most significantly of all, modification orders. A modification order is a regulation that switches off the provision of an act of parliament for a single project or changes the way that provision applies to it. A regulation is made by the government of the day, and the person making the regulation will be the minister, the member for Kawana. It is not necessarily debated in this chamber and it is not passed by the parliament.

The greater the level of potential interference with individuals' rights or liberties, or the institution of parliament—something that the member for Kawana says he holds so dearly—the greater the need for that power to be prescribed in an act of parliament and not delegated below parliament. The member for Kawana may be obsessed with the monarchy, but he is not the King of the Legislative Assembly. The Queensland Environmental Law Association submitted that the declaration criterion 'lacks any real objective limit on the exercise of the Minister's power' and that 'it is not appropriate to use subordinate legislation to change the operation of Acts of Parliament'. The Queensland Renewable Energy Council, an organisation with every commercial reason to want faster approvals, warned that the mechanism—

... sets a concerning precedent which provides power for the Minister to not apply a law, or to modify the application of laws, for the benefit of an individual project.

We got five minutes on the workers memorial that the Labor Party believes in and supports, but we did not get five minutes—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order, members to my right!

Mr DICK:—on slipping away acts of parliament by a ministerial regulation.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Everton is warned under the standing orders.

Mr DICK: When a government asks a parliament for powers—powers of this particular order, of this particular magnitude—the least the parliament can ask in return is for the problem the government wants these extraordinary powers to address. What is the explanation? Queensland has had a coordinator-general with statutory powers since 1938. The existing State Development and Public Works Organisation Act already permits the government to expedite or take control of decision-making processes for major projects and to enter agreements managing the effects of projects. Those powers sit largely unused. The step-in powers have been used three times in 90 years. Part 5 of the act has not been used since 1982—44 years ago. The private infrastructure facility acquisition power has never been used at all. Mr Peter Jolly, President of the Queensland Law Society, told the hearing—

A lot of what is now being proposed in this new bill is perhaps there already but is not being utilised to the full extent.

What is the problem sought to be addressed by this government? The government's own impact analysis statement does not identify a Queensland project that has been delayed or lost as a result of existing legislation.

The costs of the bill, though, are clear. The impact analysis statement lists six costs for the modification order power alone. It interferes with the primacy of parliament. It is inconsistent with fundamental legislative principles. It carries reputational risk for the government and the minister. It exposes the orders to legal challenge. It affects appeal and consultation rights, and it can advantage one proponent over another. That is not the Queensland Labor opposition's list of concerns about this bill; that is the government's own accounting for what this bill does. Lock the Gate Alliance put it more succinctly and bluntly, submitting that 'there is no evidence base to support the need for such authoritarian measures'. Extraordinary powers demand extraordinary justification, and we got none of it from the member for Kawana.

The bill removes rights of appeal, review and notification from Queenslanders. A state strategic project declaration cannot be reviewed under the Judicial Review Act. A decision subject to a state significance notice can be appealed by the proponent and by the proponent alone. Ministerial decisions on planning applications made under infrastructure coordination plans, under sections 58K and 58L,

are excluded from merits appeal. A modification order can itself exclude or modify appeal and review rights that sit in other acts. The company gets to appeal. The farmer or family next door does not. What is left for that family or that farmer is judicial review in the Supreme Court, which asks only whether a decision was lawfully made, not whether it was right, and which carries a cost that is beyond the capacity of most Queenslanders.

The Crisafulli government's briefing material on this bill explains the reasoning. Excluding merits review, the government says—

... ensures that the interests of the State in respect of economically significant resources sector development are not prejudiced by litigation.

That is the last thing we would want. Consider what that sentence assumes. It treats a citizen's access to a court as prejudice to the state. The Queensland Law Society submitted—

The complete removal of merit-based appeals to the Planning and Environment Court systematically disenfranchises regional and remote residents, who this legislation will impact most. As stated, these communities lack the financial resources to bring matters in the Supreme Court, making the removal of standard third-party objector rights a functional denial of natural justice.

No wonder the member for Kawana was the attorney-general in the Newman government that sought to strip rights away from Queenslanders as well.

Ms Kristen Hodge, co-chair of the Queensland Law Society's First Nations Legal Policy Committee—or someone the member for Kawana would never listen to—told the hearing—

Now the only mechanism for our regional, remote and community landholders and community members is the Supreme Court. There is nothing really there that gives anybody any relief except going to that higher level of court.

It is not only landholders who are exposed. The Association of Mining and Exploration Companies, which represents explorers and emerging producers, warned that these reforms will lead to 'a fast track for larger companies and a slow track for smaller companies'. The Queensland Renewable Energy Council made the point that should be obvious to a government that says it wants projects to be delivered, telling the committee—

Procedural fairness is a key element of having a strong social licence.

That was not a change that stakeholders, as far as I can tell, asked for.

The Crisafulli government could not produce a single example of the litigation it says it fears during the committee process. What this bill and the Crisafulli government calls an impediment is what everyday Queenslanders call access to justice.

I turn to the provisions that should worry every member of this House, just as they worry every Queenslanders who has taken the time to read the member for Kawana's bill. Compulsory acquisition in this state has generally been tethered to public purposes—land acquired for a road, a hospital, a school, a public utility, a railway. The justification for the most intrusive power a state holds over a citizen's property has been that the citizen's loss buys something the public owns and uses—private loss for public benefit. This bill loosens that tether even further.

Acquisition may be authorised by regulation under section 143 for any state strategic project. The Crisafulli government's own written briefing material on this bill concedes that 'acquisition becomes available to a wider class of activities' than under the existing regime. The requirement for a completed environmental impact statement before land is taken is removed. The final unconditional offer to the owner may remain open for as little as 10 business days.

At the public hearing, the member for Bundaberg asked Coordinator-General Gerard Coggan whether land could be taken on compulsion from a private owner and vested in a private company for a project that is not of a public nature. Mr Coggan replied, 'In short, the answer is yes.' Five words: that is this bill. Mr Coggan also described the existing requirement for a completed environmental impact statement as 'quite a constraining power'. What the Office of the Coordinator-General experiences as a constraint is, for the family whose land is being taken, the only assurance that somebody has worked out the environmental consequences before the land changes hands.

Mr Gerard Timbs, a member of the Queensland Law Society's Planning and Environmental Law Committee, told the hearing—

That is a fundamental departure from the traditional justification in the traditional process for compulsory acquisition ... Is it the private company that is benefiting from that acquisition, or will it be the state that is ultimately responsible for the compensation payable?

On the offer period, the Queensland Law Society submitted that 10 business days is wholly inadequate for a landowner and community group, particularly in regional and remote areas. Let's have

none of this nonsense that the LNP wants to stand up for regional and rural Queenslanders. That is 10 business days—two working weeks—to obtain independent valuation advice, engage a solicitor and decide whether to accept an offer on a property that in many cases has been in the same family for generations in a part of Queensland where the nearest specialist valuer may be hours and hundreds of kilometres away.

The Crisafulli LNP government says protections around acquisition are unchanged. Six months of negotiation, a final offer, a disallowable regulation, objection rights and compensation under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967—every one of those is a rule about how land is taken. None of them goes to the question this bill reopens, which is whether the land should be taken at all, especially when the beneficiary is a private company or a private interest.

We have seen some of this legislative movie before. We saw it with the Condamine Alluvium bill. The Deputy Premier was humiliated by his backbench and by Queenslanders who spoke out, and he was forced to do a humiliating backflip in the parliament. We have seen this before.

The Crisafulli government does not lack voices for regional Queensland. It has a minister for regional development. It has an assistant minister for regional and rural development. It has six assistant ministers in whose title is a region of Queensland.

Beyond the ministry, of course, it has the special commissioner, who worked for four months and got paid \$100,000. He has been silent on this bill. He got the pay-off for not running in Hinchinbrook, and he has been silent ever since. We do not expect to see anything from Mr Cripps on this bill. A special commissioner's entire remit is to be the link between regional communities and the people making decisions. With all of that in place—with all of those ministers, assistant ministers and the special commissioner—this is what happened to regional Queensland when the bill was written: the department conceded in its response to submissions—

Targeted consultation was undertaken with key resource, planning and infrastructure representative organisations, government owned corporations and peak bodies ...

That description does not name a single agricultural body, First Nations organisation, environmental or community group or landholder representative. On the face of it, the organisations consulted before this bill was finalised were the organisations that stand to gain the most from it, not those set to lose, including many regional stakeholders.

Once the bill was introduced, the public was given three weeks to respond to 227 pages of complex legislation. The Queensland Farmers' Federation submitted—

The Bill is broad and legally complex, yet the time allowed to scrutinise it has been short ...

The Local Government Association told the committee—

... the three-week ... period ... has limited the ability to fully engage with Queensland councils.

So much for being partners in government. They asked for four weeks. They had the temerity to ask for another seven days so they could consider the bill further, and that was rejected by the member for Kawana. That four-week period is consistent with the Equal Partners in Government agreement, but that was ignored because it did not suit the purposes of the member for Kawana.

Regional Queenslanders then did what people do when they have not been consulted: they organised, they agitated, they wrote submissions and they travelled all the way to Mackay for public hearings. Shane McCarthy, the General President of AgForce, said—

As it stands, the Bill makes the interests of primary producers secondary to those of major project proponents.

...

In practical terms, the imbalance would leave landholders powerless.

Imagine that. That is from AgForce, one of the heartland groups of the LNP, but they are no-one's heartland. They stand up for their members because they cannot trust the LNP. Ms Niki Ford, the chief executive officer of AgForce Queensland, said—

We will not accept a framework that shifts the risk and cost of major project development onto the State's farmers.

On 19 August farmers and regional residents gathered outside the Premier's office to ask for this bill to be withdrawn. Caitlin Wood, a Springbrook farmer, said—

It's terrifying to think that under these new laws, the government of the day could rip away our ability to protect and manage our own land.

Maggie McKeown, the Queensland coordinator of Lock the Gate Alliance, said—

This government has refused to listen to the concerns of a wide range of stakeholders—

Government members interjected.

Mr DICK: No wonder they are laughing and deriding people—they do not want to listen to any voice other than their own. She said—

This government has refused to listen to the concerns of a wide range of stakeholders critical of this Bill, including Property Rights Australia, AgForce, the Queensland Farmers' Federation, the Queensland Law Society, Cotton Australia, local government, and conservationists.

What a group. That is a big group of Queenslanders who would not be silent. The test of whether a regional voice is real is not how many titles of ministers and assistant ministers carry the words 'regional' or 'rural' or how many fake jobs are created for so-called special commissioners who happen to be high-profile LNP identities and close, personal friends of the Premier, like Mr Cripps. If the LNP want to show that they are listening to regional Queensland they should open their ears and start listening.

Listening is something that the member for Kawana is not renowned for. Regional Queenslanders have been raising concerns in submissions, at public hearings, in open letters and on the footpaths outside the offices of their local members of parliament. What started as a chorus of concern has now turned into a deafening alarm siren. Unfortunately, the concerns of the bush and regional Queenslanders have fallen on deaf ears when it comes to the member for Kawana.

The Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Act 2003 and the Torres Strait Islander Cultural Heritage Act 2003 require a cultural heritage management plan for high-impact projects. That requirement is triggered through the environmental impact statement process. The explanatory notes for this bill state that modification orders cannot affect Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander rights and interests, yet neither act is exempt from modification orders and neither act was included in the amendments that came into the House a few hours ago. The processes, the criteria and the timeframes for investigating a cultural heritage management plan could, therefore, be altered by regulation. The department conceded as much, offering in its defence only the prediction that any modification is 'anticipated to be extremely low'.

An Indigenous land use agreement is a negotiated agreement between a proponent and traditional owners about how land will be used. Kristen Hodge, the co-chair of the Queensland Law Society's First Nations Legal Policy Committee, explained to the committee—

... an environmental impact statement ... is the only thing that mandatorily requires the proponent to meet with the group and speak about how they deal with native title and cultural heritage in the area.

Because this bill removes the requirement for a completed environmental impact statement before land is taken, and because compulsory acquisition proceeds as a future act under Commonwealth law without an Indigenous land use agreement, the consequence is the one Ms Hodge described—

The only mechanism that allows people to sit down with the group is being removed for compulsory acquisition processes.

The North Queensland Land Council, writing on behalf of Queensland South Native Title Services, the Cape York Land Council and the Gur A Baradharaw Kod Torres Strait Sea and Land Council, submitted that the bill—

... widens the door for land to be taken for the benefit of private actors for commercial developments ...

It is not as if First Nations people have had to experience that in the last 250 years. Mr Jonathon Captain-Webb, director of the First Nations Program at the Environmental Defenders Office, told the committee at the public hearing that legislation affecting First Nations people—

... should be developed through genuine partnership and consistent with the well-recognised principles of free, prior and informed consent.

As First Nations people say again and again: nothing about us without us. Then we get to the amendments. They were rushed into the House with no public consultation and tabled a couple of hours ago so the Deputy Premier can grandstand. There are 12 amendments and not one of them answers the key questions Queenslanders raised. No appeal rights are being restored, no land is being protected from acquisition for private benefit and no limit is being placed on the power of the member for Kawana to declare any project he chooses.

The Crisafulli government is amending its own bill before it has even passed. That is a concession this bill was not ready. Nothing in these amendments changes our position on this bill because nothing in these amendments changes what this bill does to Queenslanders, particularly those living in regional and rural parts of our state.

Of the 12 amendments, two correct typographical errors and three are consequential definitional changes. Stakeholders asked for the restoration of appeal rights, the protection of land from acquisition for private benefit, limits on the declaration power, exemption of the cultural heritage acts and a sunset clause. None of that appears anywhere in the amendments.

After 91 submissions, a public briefing, a public hearing in Mackay and statewide backlash, the Crisafulli government has fixed its typos, protected one act and used the rest of its amendments to switch off more laws, not fewer. The amendments leave untouched the declaration powers in proposed section 76EB and its exclusion from the Judicial Review Act, proponent-only appeals under state significant notices, the removal of merits appeals under sections 58K and 58L, compulsory acquisition without a completed environmental impact statement, the 10-business-day final offer and the modification order power itself—all untouched.

033 These were the central concerns of the Queensland Law Society, Property Rights Australia, AgForce Queensland, the Queensland Farmers' Federation, Lock the Gate Alliance and the North Queensland Land Council. Property Rights Australia said, 'Protections for landholders must be written in the legislation itself.' They still are not. Every landholder, every council and every community group that raised these concerns gets the same answer from these amendments—nothing.

For months the Crisafulli government insisted this bill did not touch the Regional Planning Interests Act—that is what they said for months, over and over—while its own department conceded there was no express prohibition on a modification order over that act. Legislating a prohibition now concedes the back door the Queensland Farmers' Federation warned about was real all along.

One act is now protected. The cultural heritage acts, the Environmental Protection Act and every other act of this parliament can still be switched off by modification order, and the power of the Coordinator-General to direct the outcome of a regional interests development approval, confirmed by the department at the public hearing, is untouched. The approval must be obtained, but Brisbane can still direct what it says.

New section 76EB prohibits declaring solar farms, wind farms and battery storage facilities that require social impact assessment and commercial or research data centres as state strategic projects. The definitions hang off the Planning Regulation 2017 and the data centre prohibition can be expanded by regulation, which the explanatory notes concede gives a regulation operative control over the application of the act—the same failing stakeholders criticised in the bill itself. The result is a two-tier framework. Renewable energy projects requiring social impact assessment are locked out of the pathway entirely, while any mines, dams, cable cars—you name it—remain eligible. The explanatory notes confirm renewable energy projects that do not trigger social impact assessment can still be declared.

In question time yesterday, when answering a question from the member for Gregory, the Premier told the House, 'We are putting communities at the forefront of decision-making when it comes to data centres.' He called data centres 'a sliding doors moment' and 'a golden opportunity'—more hollow rhetoric from the Premier—'for economic development for regional Queensland' and asked 'why on earth any government would want to make it more difficult for a community to get this if it is not done'.

The very next day—it could not even last 48 hours—amendment 2 prohibits data centres from ever being declared state strategic projects. The framework that the Crisafulli government says it needs to deliver the key economic drivers for Queensland now excludes the sector the Premier calls the new frontier. They have their own JFK sitting on the other side. Doesn't he love looking in the mirror and seeing that! If these powers were safe for communities, the government would not be shielding its favourite new industries from them.

The explanatory notes for these amendments say consultation on the amendments was again confined to state government departments, peak bodies and government owned corporations. The Queensland Farmers' Federation and the Local Government Association of Queensland criticised a three-week window to scrutinise the bill. Members of this House are now asked to vote on amendments the day they first see them, and the groups shut out of consultation on the bill were shut out again on the amendments. Amending your own bill on the floor of parliament is an admission it was not ready. Doing it in this way ensures nobody can scrutinise it.

Every substantial amendment tracks a concern regional Queenslanders forced onto the agenda. The credit for any amendments belongs to AgForce Queensland, the Queensland Farmers' Federation, Cotton Australia, Lock the Gate Alliance, the Queensland Law Society, local governments, conservation groups and First Nations organisations, and to the farmers and residents who wrote submissions,

travelled to Mackay for the public hearing, delivered an open letter to the Premier and stood outside the Premier's office and their local members' offices across the state. That pressure reached the government's own ranks of regional assistant ministers who, in a panic, raised this with the Deputy Premier and said, 'You better fix this because they're coming after us.' The one group that is coming after all of those members—the members for Mirani, Condamine, Warrego, Southern Downs, both Toowoomba seats, Burdekin, Lockyer and Gympie—is One Nation. They know who is coming for them.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Lister): Order!

Government members interjected.

Mr DICK: No wonder they are so animated!

Mr Barounis interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Maryborough, you are warned under the standing orders. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you have strayed significantly from the core concepts of the bill. I ask you to come back to the bill. That will assist the House greatly.

Mr DICK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I apologise to the member for Maryborough for not including him in that list.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, that was not an opportunity for levity. I remind you that you are on a warning. In fact, you are only on your feet able to deliver this speech now because of the latitude I afforded you on your last transgression. I will not give you any further warnings. Stick to the bill. Thank you.

Mr DICK: I appreciate your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The bill also introduces infrastructure coordination plans and a framework for planning the infrastructure that resources development in a region requires, but there is no money to fund the plans—none at all.

In the end, this bill asks Queenslanders for more than a legislative change. It asks the minister to accept that the power to declare a project, override an act, take land and remove appeal rights will be exercised sparingly and only where genuinely warranted, not because the minister says so. It follows the pattern established by the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025, which concentrated decisions in the same office and with the same minister—the member for Kawana. The assurance offered by the member for Kawana is this—

We believe there's enough protections in there, the power can't be abused ... there's consultation with the ministers and there will be fairness with landowners.

Then he had to produce the amendments. Queenslanders are entitled to weigh that assurance against the conduct of the minister giving it. When Queenslanders raised concerns about a major project—Brisbane Stadium—in January this year, the response from the Deputy Premier was, 'Loopy, next question,' and the critics were dismissed as 'a bunch of nimbys' who do not want anything to happen. The member for Kawana has also been clear about the reach of what he is saying, saying that 'these amendments will create pathways and powers applicable for any project of state significance to the state' and that 'if there are issues with land ownership and tenure, we can utilise acquisition powers a lot quicker now under this new legislation'.

So the government's own description of the bill matches the opposition's understanding: any project, with land acquired faster, including for private purposes. The difference between the opposition and the government, however, is that the government—the LNP—regards that as an achievement, while, under this Deputy Premier in particular, Labor regards that as danger. As a matter of practice and principle, an act of this parliament should be amended by another act of this parliament—not by regulation, not one project at a time, not by a minister and certainly not by this Deputy Premier.

Let me close where I began. The Queensland Labor opposition supports critical minerals. In fact, it seems like we were the only ones talking about critical minerals in this debate.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members to my right!

Mr DICK: We support the jobs they bring to Mount Isa, to Townsville, to Gladstone and across Central and North-West Queensland. We invested in that industry in government and we want to see it succeed, but the Crisafulli government has not made the case for the extraordinary powers it seeks to enforce through this bill. Its own impact assessment sets out the six costs.

Regional Queenslanders have told this government in submissions, at a public hearing, in open letters, on the doorstep of electorate offices of LNP members that it is a bad bill that would become bad law. Regional Queenslanders are letting their views be known, and loudly, but the Crisafulli government has gone out of its way not to listen. The Queensland Labor opposition backs critical minerals and the jobs they bring to Queensland, but we do not back this bill in its current form.

 **Hon. DR LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Minister for Manufacturing and Minister for Regional and Rural Development) (8.27 pm): I rise in support of the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 and the amendments as proposed by the Deputy Premier. I want to start by putting this bill into its proper context. Don't you just love the change of heart from those opposite when it comes to critical minerals! Isn't it a welcome change! I recall that pile of approvals that were sitting on my desk when I started. They had been sitting there since 2019 gathering dust.

Mrs Stoker: They weren't a priority.

Mr LAST: They were not a priority. Resources were somewhere way down the bottom of the ladder. There has been plenty said about the individual provisions of this legislation. There has been plenty of commentary. There has been plenty of fear mongering. However, there has been far less discussion about why Queensland needs these reforms in the first place. This bill is about preparing Queensland for the next generation of economic development. It is about resources. It is about critical minerals. It is about major projects. It is about attracting investment into this state. It is about making sure that when an investor is prepared to back Queensland our legislative framework is capable of getting a project from an idea on a page to jobs on the ground. That matters enormously to the resources portfolio because Queensland is standing at the beginning of an extraordinary opportunity.

Earlier this month, our government released Delivering Queensland's Critical Minerals Future 2026-30. That strategy was not written simply to sit on a shelf. It sets out what this government intends to achieve. We want to get critical mineral projects moving. We want to drive exploration. We want to attract global capital. We want to expand processing and value adding right here in Queensland.

034 We want to build stronger and more secure supply chains with our international partners. Above all, we want regional Queenslanders to benefit from the jobs and economic opportunities that will flow from this new generation of resources development. This legislation is part of the machinery that helps us get there.

Critical minerals are first and foremost a resources story. Before we can refine them, somebody has to find them. Before we can export them, somebody has to develop the resources. That is why getting the investment settings right matters. The global environment around critical minerals has changed significantly. They are no longer simply another commodity class; they are an economic issue, they are an industrial issue and they are increasingly a strategic issue. Countries around the world are asking where their critical minerals come from, who controls those supply chains and whether those supply chains can be relied upon.

Last October Australia and the United States executed the critical minerals framework. That was another clear sign that the race to develop a secure critical minerals supply chain is accelerating. Queensland has an enormous opportunity to be part of it but we are competing with Western Australia, we are competing with the Northern Territory and we are competing internationally. The companies looking to develop the next mine, processing plant or refining facility can invest in Queensland or they can invest somewhere else. They want to know whether a government understands their industry, whether it wants development, whether its regulatory system can make decisions, whether a project can get from proposal to production. Queensland has world-class geology. We have generations of resources expertise. We have regional communities that understand the resources industry. We have the ports and the infrastructure and we have the skilled workers, but we also need a regulatory and legislative framework that is fit for the projects we are trying to attract. That is where this bill becomes so important.

The State Development and Public Works Organisation Act dates back to 1971. Queensland's economy has changed considerably since then. Our resources industry has changed, the scale and complexity of projects has changed, and the strategic importance of certain resources has changed. This bill modernises that framework. It strengthens the government's ability to evaluate, plan, enable and facilitate economic development. It creates a framework for state strategic projects and it improves coordination. It provides mechanisms for addressing regulatory duplication.

The bill also allows assessments to be brought forward into the coordinated impact assessment process. That means that impacts can be considered holistically while a project is being evaluated.

Again, the purpose is not to avoid assessment; it is to avoid duplication. If an issue has already been properly assessed through a comprehensive process, we should ask whether repeating substantially the same process across different agencies produces a better outcome, because every unnecessary duplication has a cost. It costs proponents money, it costs government resources, it costs time, and eventually it costs Queensland investment. Good regulation is essential; duplicating regulation is not. A good approval system should be rigorous and predictable. It should protect Queensland's interests, but it should also deliver a decision. That balance sits at the heart of this bill.

I will deal directly with one of the loudest claims being made against this legislation: this bill is not a land grab. That phrase might make a convenient political slogan but it does not accurately describe the legislation before this House. Compulsory acquisition powers are not some new invention of this government. Private land acquisition powers have existed in Queensland for decades. The established acquisitions process under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967 remains. This legislation provides a clearer framework around when those processes may be available for a state strategic project and there are substantial checks and balances. A project must first qualify to be declared a state strategic project. The acquisition pathway is only considered where negotiations have failed. The proponent must make a final unconditional offer. A regulation is then required to authorise commencement of the acquisition process. That brings the decision into a transparent process subject to parliamentary scrutiny. The established rights to object and receive compensation remain. This, as I said before, is not a land grab. It is a structured process, it is a transparent process, and it is a process containing safeguards for landholders.

In fact, private land acquisition powers have existed since 1999. What this government is doing is putting greater clarity and transparency around when those powers can be used. Let me be very clear about what this legislation does not do: it does not remove landholders' rights to consultation, objection or compensation. It does not give government a blank cheque to acquire private land and it does not remove environmental approvals. It does not remove RIDA requirements where they are triggered. It does not automatically approve a state strategic project and modified orders cannot remove the requirement to hold key authorisations such as an environmental authority, mining lease, cultural heritage management plan or developmental approval. Modification orders are made by regulation. They are subject to parliament scrutiny and disallowance and they are subject to judicial review. Those facts matter because Queenslanders deserve a debate based on what the legislation actually says, not what somebody wants them to fear it says.

This government has also listened through the committee process. There were 1,303 submissions received by the committee, including 1,220 pro forma submissions. Stakeholders put forward a range of views, and those views were considered and amendments have been proposed in response. That includes an additional restriction, ensuring a modification order cannot preclude the requirement to hold a RIDA. That provides further certainty around the protection of prime agricultural land and responds directly to concerns raised by stakeholders, including Cotton Australia, Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce. The Primary Industries and Resources Committee ultimately recommended that the bill be passed.

The opposition now wants Queenslanders to believe that these powers are unprecedented. They are not. They want Queenslanders to believe compulsory acquisition connected with private projects suddenly appeared with this government. It did not. Indeed, Labor governments themselves have previously used compulsory acquisition powers in connection with private project purposes. In 2017 under the former Labor government private land was acquired for the Adani rail corridor—remember that—after the project was declared a state development area. Labor cannot have it both ways here. It cannot use the mechanisms when it is in government and then describe the very concept as outrageous when it moves to the opposition benches.

There is a broader question that Labor needs to answer. Does it support the development of Queensland's critical minerals industry? Does it support new resources projects? Does it support private investment? Does it support regional jobs and communities? You cannot say yes to all of those things and then oppose every practical measure designed to make them happen. For years we heard about Queensland's critical minerals potential. We heard about the North West Minerals Province—there was announcement after announcement—but this government's approach is all about delivery. Queensland is serious about resources and serious about attracting investment, and we will not allow Queensland's critical minerals opportunity to pass us by. This is about taking potential and turning it into projects, taking projects and turning them into investment, taking investment and turning it into jobs, and taking the resources Queenslanders have been blessed with and using them to build a strong future for this state.

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (8.37 pm): I noticed that, when the member for Woodridge commented about the threat of One Nation, in the backbench of the LNP seats there was nervous laughter.

Government members: Ha, ha!

Mr SMITH: There it is! You know when they laugh just that little bit too much because this is how it begins. They go, 'Oh, we're on a nice big margin. We're going to be fine. We've never been threatened before. Maybe we lost a seat in 1998, but that was ages ago.' They think they are safe, but then the Deputy Premier puts together the Condamine Alluvium bill and all of a sudden the regional MPs get nervous because they wonder why their Deputy Premier has betrayed their base. They get nervous and they say, 'Thank goodness the farmers and the Labor Party were able to change the mind of the Deputy Premier. Phew, that's gone. We won't have to deal with it again.' But then the pesky RIDA issue comes back. The Deputy Premier brings in a new piece of legislation that enables a modification order to bypass the RIDA altogether once more and then they get nervous again. But they do not start to laugh; they start to have quiet conversations. After committee meetings have finished, after public briefings have finished, they quietly chatter as they walk away from opposition members.

035 We see the member for Condamine starting to look nervous again. The backbench wonders how the member for Warrego allowed it to go through cabinet and the party room again. They start to wonder: why are the farmers gathering in Toowoomba to rally against the LNP, and why are the farmers rallying against the member for Lockyer and the member for Toowoomba North? Why did the member for Mirani look so nervous during the member for Woodridge's speech? Why has the member for Gregory not stopped leaning over, salivating on his own hand every time we speak? He knows that there—

Mr DILLON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Bundaberg?

Mr SMITH: I withdraw. What we know is that the members of the LNP—

Mr McDonald: Are listening to Queenslanders and doing what they need.

Mr SMITH:—have twice now been betrayed by the Deputy Premier. Listening to Queenslanders as they rally against them in Toowoomba? You are a genius. No wonder you are not a minister.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bundaberg, please direct your comments through the chair.

Mr SMITH: No wonder the member for Lockyer has been bumped back time and time again. He said he has listened to Queenslanders, as they literally rally against him. What an absolute fool. This bill says that the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning can declare a project to be a state strategic project. Did we notice that the Deputy Premier quoted QFF after he put in his amendments but he did not quote some other key groups? He did not quote the Central Downs Irrigators, he did not quote AgForce and he did not quote Property Rights Australia.

Mr Field: He didn't quote you.

Mr SMITH: I tell you what: I am glad I am not quoted by a bloke who sings Dolly Parton in the parliament and talks about *The Little Mermaid*. I am very happy that *The Little Mermaid* does not quote me.

Mr WATTS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think *The Little Mermaid* is relevant to the bill. Also, the member needs to make sure he uses appropriate titles in the chamber.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member.

Mr SMITH: I note that those key agricultural groups were not quoted by the Deputy Premier when he tried to save the bill with amendment No. 3. I note that he did not talk about a letter he received today from the Central Downs Irrigators expressing their concern about this bill. I note that he did not make any phone calls tonight to these key stakeholders who have told the opposition that they are still a firm no when it comes to supporting this bill. The regional LNP members sitting on the backbench might get some angry phone calls tomorrow. Will they pick up that phone or not? They know that the Deputy Premier has now twice betrayed them.

When it comes to a provision such as the RIDA, as we said, we know through the committee process that this bill was never called for by stakeholders. No key stakeholder group lobbied the Deputy Premier for this bill. No witnesses before the committee stated that they had lobbied or campaigned to change this bill. The question is: what illness did this bill seek to cure? There was no illness to be cured;

instead, it created its own illness that the members of the LNP had to try to cure as they had to come together and roll the decision-making of their leadership.

In the committee hearing, Michael Murray, chair of a Queensland Farmers' Federation committee, said—

... even if this bill is only used in very limited circumstances, it is a backdoor way to get around the rights that were actually restored when the previous law was amended—

No wonder the regional members of the LNP started to shake. AgForce Queensland openly opposed the bill in its current form. I note that the Deputy Premier still does not have a quote to read out about AgForce after moving his amendments. Where is the support there? In fact AgForce said—

Unlike most sectors, agricultural production cannot be relocated if land is fragmented, sterilised or permanently impacted.

I want to look at amendment No. 3 to clause 22 which goes to section 76RJ. I am going to read from the bill. Members of the LNP never look at the bill; they just read out their talking points. The amendment is around the modification order. However, key stakeholders are concerned about subsection (2) of 76RJ, where it says—

Subsection (1)—

which is including the RIDA back into the modification order—

does not prevent a modification order from excluding or modifying the application of a provision of an Act that provides for—

...

criteria ... that must be satisfied for the grant of the authorisation ...

The LNP must address this because stakeholders have contacted the opposition as late as tonight to say that, despite amendment No. 3, they still believe that section 76RJ may allow for a RIDA to undergo its process, however the Deputy Premier can change the application. The criteria for the RIDA can actually be modified in itself. They are saying, 'We're going to put the RIDA back,' but under 76RJ the criteria can actually be changed. They are shifting the goalposts while they are saying, 'There's nothing to see here.' How is that open and transparent?

We notice that nervous laughter about One Nation has gone away all of a sudden. They have gone very quiet now. The fundamental problem is that they do not read the bill before them and they only find out they have betrayed their base when their base is at their office rallying against them, when their base is in the heartland of the LNP in Toowoomba rallying against them, when a One Nation candidate from Wide Bay is being asked to come down as a keynote speaker or when the member for Traegar is being asked to be a keynote speaker in Toowoomba. The LNP members of the backbench are not being asked because they have been betraying their base. That is a key question to ask. The other key component is that ultimately under this bill—

Mr McDonald: Bring on 2028, mate.

Mr SMITH:—and the member for Lockyer needs to know this—the Coordinator-General makes the decision on the RIDA. They are going to keep the RIDA in but we are going to have the ability to change the assessment criteria, and then ultimately the Coordinator-General is going to knock it out anyway. No wonder the stakeholders are turning to One Nation in the bush, including QFF, Central Downs Irrigators and AgForce. No wonder the LNP are being outflanked by their own right. They do not even know that, by trying to save the very thing they rallied against, they are actually changing the assessment criteria and it can all be wiped out by the Coordinator-General anyway. What does the member for Chatsworth always say? Genius. One Nation is coming for this mob and nothing can save them except for the great Australian Labor Party.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: There has been too much background noise in the chamber. When a member on the opposite side of the chamber is speaking and they are not taking interjections, I ask members to not make interjections, otherwise we will need to have warnings.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (8.48 pm): I will bring the tone down with a sensible contribution about critical minerals and how important they are for the state. Queensland is a state with enormous natural advantages. We have a strong resources sector, world-class agricultural industries, major regional centres, a skilled workforce and access to some of the most significant mineral resources in the country. The challenge before us is to make the most of those opportunities, while ensuring that development delivers lasting benefits for Queenslanders.

That is why the focus on state development and critical minerals is important. Critical minerals are becoming so important to the global economy. They are essential to modern technologies,

advanced manufacturing, renewable energy, batteries, defence industries and many other products that Australians rely on every day. However, we should not simply be content with digging minerals out of the ground; we must be doing advanced manufacturing and looking at opportunities here in Queensland. This is about more jobs. This is about regional communities. This is about more investment and this is about the careers of the Queenslanders who come after us. Importantly, development must be responsible. Queenslanders expect strong environmental protections, proper consultation with communities and landholders, and appropriate regulatory oversight. Responsible development and environmental protection should not be treated as competing objectives. With good planning, strong regulation and modern technology we can achieve both.

Investment requires confidence. Businesses need confidence that projects can be developed through a clear and efficient regulatory framework. Communities need confidence that development will be properly managed. Workers need confidence that new industries will create secure and meaningful employment. We should also recognise that state development is not just about major projects; it is about the infrastructure that supports communities: roads, electricity, water, ports, housing, telecommunications and essential services. When we invest in infrastructure, we are investing in the capacity of Queensland to grow. When we encourage responsible investment, we create opportunities for future generations, as I said before.

When we develop our critical minerals sector, we position Queensland to participate in some of the most important industries of the future. We have seen some wonderful advancements, and of course we talk about 41 critical minerals that are now available to us and contracts have been signed. I particularly welcome the potential for critical minerals development to create opportunities beyond the traditional mining sector. There are opportunities in exploration, processing, engineering, transport, research, technology and advanced manufacturing. Queensland universities, research institutions, regional businesses and skilled workers can all play a part.

This is about creating a stronger and more diversified economy. It is also about making sure that Queensland remains competitive. Other states and countries are actively seeking investment in critical minerals and advanced industries and Queensland cannot afford to stand still. We have the resources. We have the people. We have the infrastructure and the industrial capability. What we need is the ambition to grow and bring these strengths together. The legislation before the House should, therefore, be considered in the broader context of Queensland's future. We want a state where regional communities continue to grow. We want Queenslanders to have access to good jobs. We want local businesses to win contracts and participate in major projects. We want investment to come to Queensland. We want our natural resources to be developed in a responsible way that provides benefits for us all.

I want to add this, and members will hear it from many of the speakers on this side of the House. We do need to deal with the scare campaign that talks about the removal of the landowners' rights to consultation, objection or compensation. I also want to make sure we talk about what this bill does not do. It does not remove landholders' rights to consultation, objection or compensation. It does not give the government a blank cheque to acquire private property. It does not remove environmental approvals. It does not remove RIDA requirements where they are triggered—and clause 22 will attest to that. It does not automatically approve a state strategic project. It does not allow renewable energy projects—including solar, wind and battery projects—to be declared state strategic projects.

Mr Power: You approved them without that.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Logan.

Mr BENNETT: It does not allow data centres to be declared state strategic projects, and that is covered in clause 17, if members opposite would like to read that clause. These powers have existed previously. These safeguards remain and are enhanced. It is about making the rules clearer and more transparent. These are new powers. I commend the work being undertaken to support investment, strengthen Queensland industries and unlock new opportunities. We should support regional Queensland. We should not talk down our state. I think the big problem tonight is that we see one side of politics continuing to play down our state. There is so much to be proud of in this place and there are so many reasons to be proud of the Crisafulli LNP government. More importantly, we can be really proud of this critical minerals bill driving real reforms that are needed. We have the resources, we have the people and we have the opportunity. It is time to get on with the job.

 **Mr MARTIN** (Stretton—ALP) (8.53 pm): Well, well, well, what an extraordinary saga! The Deputy Premier has done it again: another backflip. He loves a bit of gymnastics because, after all the criticism, all the submissions, all the farmers, all the landholders, all the councils and the environmental groups

and regional Queenslanders all raising concerns and, importantly, after pressure from his own backbench, the Deputy Premier has come into this House at the last minute with amendments that claim to protect the RIDA, although we do not really know. There is not enough time. They have been so tricky, so deceptive and so dismissive of stakeholders and ordinary Queenslanders, how can we even trust that the amendments they propose will even do what they say? Is the RIDA protected? There is still concern amongst stakeholders that these amendments do not cut it. They do not go far enough. They could still be overridden. They are window-dressing on an absolute stinker of a bill.

I welcome any protection for Queensland's agricultural land, but let's be clear about what this amendment actually tells us. It tells us the concerns were real. It tells us the concerns were serious. It tells us the Deputy Premier's consultation was rubbish. It tells us the Deputy Premier once again tried to railroad regional interests. I think he must be getting a bit of a reputation in the bush and maybe a bit of a reputation in his backbench and it certainly is not a good one. It tells us that if those so-called protections were always completely safe under this bill then the Deputy Premier would not have needed to rush in at the last minute and put in those amendments.

This is the Deputy Premier's third backflip on the issue. First, we all remember the Condamine Alluvium debacle—how embarrassing. The Deputy Premier fought to weaken protections for farmers and landholders, he forced his party room to back it—or snuck it through or they did not read it; I am not sure—shut down debate and then under pressure was forced into a humiliating backflip. It was very embarrassing for him. It was cringe-worthy to watch. After that backflip though, he clearly did not accept defeat, so he decided to pull another one, another swiftie. Before you knew it there was another bill that did exactly the same thing as the first one except it went further. He introduced the critical minerals bill. That was his double backflip and now he has come back again for his third backflip—the triple, the treble, the trifecta—to back down on the backflip of the original backflip. Well done, Deputy Premier! Perhaps members opposite should ask themselves: how many backflips does it take before you admit the original bill was wrong? How many backflips does it take before regional MPs start having second thoughts about this Deputy Premier? Who does he stand for? After the last two bills, it is clearly not the bush.

The reason this matters is that Labor supports Queensland's critical minerals industry. We know the jobs it can create. We know its importance to sovereign capability. We know the opportunities in advanced manufacturing and energy transition. The former Labor government backed that commitment with \$245 million through the Queensland Critical Minerals Strategy. We support investment. We support jobs. We support getting projects moving. That is why this whole process has been such a joke, such an embarrassment for Queensland. The critical minerals industry deserves to be taken seriously. This whole saga feels more like student politics than state significance. That is because this is not really a critical minerals bill. The title is camouflage because these powers, until these last-minute amendments, could apply to virtually any project the Deputy Premier declared strategically significant. I note these extraordinary powers do not apply to wind turbines, data centres or batteries, but that does not give Queenslanders much comfort because they apply to pretty much everything else: a mine, a quarry, landfill, an abattoir, a stadium, a cable car, a waste to energy plant—take your pick. This bill concentrates extraordinary powers in the executive, particularly at the hands of the Deputy Premier, and the late amendment on the RIDA does not change that fundamental problem. It simply proves that the government has been forced to accept some of the concerns it spent weeks dismissing.

We have heard from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bundaberg just how poor the consultation on this bill was. I agree with their submissions and I feel I should give those opposite a few tips on consultation. Next time if they see a bill that comes through from the Deputy Premier, they should make sure they give it a close read. It probably has something in it that means it will be a little bit of a stinker or maybe something their voters do not like. They should give it a close read or at least get their electorate officer to read it. They should get them to send a text message if the bill includes giving farmers' land to big multinational corporations—or maybe a phone call.

037 **Mr Crandon** interjected.

Mr MARTIN: The other thing you could do, member for Coomera, is type out a survey in the party room.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): One moment, member for Stretton. The member is not taking interjections. I remind the member for Coomera and the member for Scenic Rim that their interjections are not being taken.

Mr MARTIN: Maybe those opposite could ask for a survey. When they are in the party room and see this bill, they could say, 'Deputy Premier, can we please include a survey in this one.' Here is an

example of some of the questions you might want to ask. Question 1: are you a property owner who would be concerned about having your land compulsorily taken off you by the Deputy Premier and given to a company like Rio Tinto or BHP? Yes or no. They can circle whichever answer they want. Question 2: would the idea of a quarry next to your suburb having its operating hours extended to 24/7 keep you up at night? Yes or no. Again, they can circle yes or no. Question 3: generally, do you think laws debated and passed by the Queensland parliament should be overridden by the Deputy Premier? Yes or no. Finally, and this is a good one—this is actually not for the stakeholders; it is for those opposite: are you a confused backbench LNP MP who signed up to represent the bush, but now find yourself representing big multinational corporations? Yes or no. If you answered yes to any of the above, this bill is not for you. You should also include a warning about the side effects of passing a bill like this. The No. 1 side effect: losing your seat to One Nation. What about the member for Hill becoming the member for Hinchinbrook or—and this probably the most likely side effect of a bill like this—the Deputy Premier getting rolled again by his backbench.

It was a total insult to stakeholders. It was a total insult to stakeholders because this bill is 227 pages of complex legislation. It was introduced on 2 June and submissions closed on 25 June. Queenslanders were given just three weeks to respond to massive changes to our legal system. This is legislation that affects farmers, councils, traditional owners, landholders and communities across Queensland. The government allowed just one public hearing, and it was not even in Brisbane. It was in Mackay. There was nothing in Toowoomba, nothing in the Western Downs and nothing in Townsville. That is not proper consultation. The LNP is certainly not listening. This is a government trying to sneak a controversial bill through the parliament before Queenslanders can properly scrutinise it.

At the eleventh hour, we again have amendments from the Deputy Premier to address only a few of the multiple concerns raised by stakeholders. What else would have been fixed if Queenslanders had been given more time? What other problems would have been exposed? What other amendments would have been necessary? That is exactly why proper parliamentary scrutiny matters.

The second problem is even more basic. The government has not established that these extraordinary powers are necessary. Queensland has a Coordinator-General with significant statutory powers. The existing State Development and Public Works Organisation Act already provides the government with powers to compulsorily acquire land, expedite decision-making, coordinate major projects and intervene in certain processes. Yet some of those existing powers are barely used. Step-in powers have been used only three times since 1982. The private infrastructure facility acquisition power has never been used. We have been told this bill is necessary to remove vexatious litigation.

As the deputy chair of the committee, I asked the Coordinator-General for evidence that vexatious or unmeritorious litigation had delayed comparable projects and justified these extraordinary new powers. No example was identified. So who exactly are these so-called vexatious litigants? To the LNP they are clearly landholders, property holders, farmers, neighbours—they are ordinary Queenslanders. Queenslanders deserve better. Queenslanders deserve respect. Queenslanders deserved to be consulted about changes this significant.

 **Mr G KELLY** (Mirani—LNP) (9.03 pm): What an entertaining speech from the member for Stretton. Honestly, I have never heard anything like it. We have a person from the city telling people from regional Queensland how regional Queensland works. I have noticed when it comes to the opposition in this House that they are pretty good at that, but they are not real. We are real. I am from the bush and I get it. We will see what he has to say moving forward.

I rise in support of the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. Queensland has always been its strongest when we have had the confidence to develop what lies beneath our feet, while backing the people who work the land above it. As a sixth generation grazier, I come to this debate with a very clear view: resources and agriculture should not have to compete with each other. Queensland can have both. We can develop the resources that create jobs, royalties and investment while protecting the productive farming land that feeds our state and supports generations of regional families.

This bill gives government better tools to plan and deliver major projects that are important to Queensland. It creates a new strategic project process and improves the way major infrastructure is planned and cuts unnecessary duplication. Making the process simpler does not mean removing protections.

There has been plenty said about this bill, particularly when it comes to private property rights. As a landholder myself, I understand why people are asking questions. Regional Queensland has already seen what can happen when development gets ahead of proper government oversight. In my

electorate, the people of the Pioneer Valley faced the prospect of their homes, farms and communities being flooded by Labor's Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro project.

Where was the Mackay Conservation Group? Where was the Queensland Conservation Council, under the helm of Mr Copeman, the then director of QCC? Where were they? Across regional Queensland we watched large-scale renewal projects BESS projects pushed into communities that too often felt that decisions were being made around them rather than with them. It was called state code 23 under the previous government. That is what destroyed communities. Those experiences then damaged trust. When landholders hear the words 'compulsory acquisition' I understand their concern.

We need to deal with the facts. Compulsory acquisition powers for private projects are not new in Queensland. They have existed under Queensland law since 1999. Under this bill there are clear checks before those powers can be used. The project must first be declared a state strategic project. The developer must show they genuinely tried for at least six months to reach an agreement with the landholder. The Coordinator-General must consult the landholder and a final unconditional offer must be made. The minister must consider whether taking the land is in the state's interest and a regulation must be made before the acquisition power can be used. Importantly, the existing rights to object and receive compensation remain. That is not a blank cheque to take private property.

The amendments being moved by the government strengthen those protections further. A modification order will not be able to remove the need for regional interests development approval, RIDA, where one is required. In simple terms, that gives greater certainty that productive agricultural land remains protected. The amendments also make it clear that renewable energy projects including wind, solar and battery projects and data centres cannot be declared state strategic projects.

Agricultural groups have raised concerns about this bill, particularly around productive agricultural land and property rights. Those concerns deserve to be heard and the government has listened. The amendments before the House strengthen those protections. As a grazier, my position is simple: property rights matter regardless of the government of the day or the type of project being proposed.

This bill does not remove environmental approvals. It does not remove RIDA requirements where they apply. It does not remove a landholder's right to consultation, objection or compensation. What it does is give Queensland a better way of dealing with major projects that can bring real benefits to our state.

Queensland is competing with the rest of Australia and the world for investment. Critical minerals are a huge opportunity for regional Queensland. We have copper, cobalt, nickel and many other minerals that the world needs. Having those resources in the ground means very little if the investment, processing and jobs go somewhere else. In Mirani, I can already see what this opportunity can mean. At Mount Morgan, Heritage Minerals is working through historic mine tailings and moving towards something that the community has waited decades to see—the first pour of gold since the mine closed. The project is about more than gold. It is also an opportunity to recover value for historic mine waste while supporting better environmental outcomes at the Mount Morgan site. We can take what was once considered waste, create economic value from it and support new jobs for the region.

038 Further north in my electorate, the Flexi-Lab at the Resources Centre of Excellence is opening doors for research, testing and new business opportunities across Central Queensland. We have the resources. We have the mining knowledge. We have the skilled workers. We have the engineering skills. Now we need to make sure as much as of that opportunity as possible stays in regional Queensland. Investment is not just a number of a balance sheet; it means apprenticeships, it means jobs, it means local contractors getting work and it means young people having a reason to stay in their home town. The government has listened to the concerns raised and has strengthened the bill. That is how good governments should work: listen to people, deal with genuine concerns and strengthen protections where they need strengthening but do not allow the fear of misinformation to shut the door on opportunity.

I want to invest back into regional Queensland, I want our farmers producing more food and fibre, I want our resources industry competing for investment, I want our critical minerals processed and developed in Queensland, and I want landholders to know their property rights and that productive agricultural land matters. We can do all of those things. Our job is to get the balance right, develop the resources beneath our feet, protect the productive agricultural land above them, respect landholders and bring investment and jobs back into our regional communities. The future of the Queensland is in the regions. It is in the communities that grow our food, mine our resources, generate our energy, make our products and export them to the world. That is the Queensland I want my daughters to inherit: a

Queensland that produces things, grows things and makes things and a Queensland that once again has the confidence to build things. I support the bill and commend it to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (9.11 pm): It is important that I read the title of the bill: the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026. It is important I read the title of the bill because, in its 220-plus pages, the title is the only place you will see the words 'critical minerals'. I am trying to interpret what the government are trying to achieve with this. When I first heard that they were removing red tape and pushing developments through, I thought, 'You beauty. I'll vote for this. This sounds great. I'm on board.' Then they said, 'It's critical minerals. We're going to go out to Mackay.' I thought that was a bit weird because all of the critical minerals are in my electorate, but that is fine; we will go to Mackay. When people were making submissions I was even more confused, because there were quarry operators and the QRC saying, 'We're not really sure what this is about. It sounds all right.' Then the ag people came in and said, 'We're already having problems. Coexistence for some of us is a myth. With the settings we've been left with'—coal seam gas is still in operation alongside this new front of renewable energy—'we're not satisfied with how things are now.'

It seems to me that this provides even more empowerment and enabling of the proponents of these developments, regardless of whether they are having an impact. Sure, you could resume land and reappropriate it before, but this only puts more power in the hands of proponents where a large imbalance already exists. People are celebrating the RIDA process, but it is insufficient. It is better than nothing, but people should not act as though it is a silver bullet that nullifies all of that impact. There is already an imbalance in that space.

I heard the comment, 'Drill, baby, drill.' If you think that comment was well thought out, you really need to apply more rigor to the debate. The rollout was flawed in the first place, making the extraction of coal seam gas much more aggressive which created a lot of tension. There should have only ever been one LNG train at Gladstone but they built three, so now an aggressive onslaught into that area has created all of this tension. You already had an imbalance in that space, so this can only exacerbate an existing issue—at the least. You are only doing it because you say we need to provide more impetus for development. It is the development of these areas that is creating the tension. You have not properly addressed that now, but you are saying that we need to produce a better tool for those developments to go ahead. It has to be one or the other—you have to choose. In helping development, you will have to provide impetus to the gas fields for them to go harder there. Do not pretend it will not have an impact. It does, because there already is an impact. You are going to exacerbate that or not.

Mr Dillon: Which one do you want?

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr O'Shea): Member for Gregory, your interjections are not being taken.

Mr KATTER: No, I will take that interjection. You can have the gas. You are saying, 'Drill, baby, drill.' We produce six per cent of the global output of gas. You could double gas production in this state—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Traeger, could you address your comments through the chair.

Mr KATTER: We could double gas production in this state. Guess what that will do to the global price? Not too much. Our price is around \$13, while our global competitors have it at \$6. What are you trying to achieve? You might get the price down to \$12. You beauty. Pat yourself on the back. That will not help where we need to be competitive on gas, so why are we doing this? There are some royalties out of it—\$2 billion—but look at the loss to the industrial output. Prices used to be \$3 or \$4, they jumped to \$30 and now we are celebrating that they have dropped to \$13. That is not a good outcome. You are saying, 'We need these gas fields out there. It's fantastic.' I will grant you there are people out there who have benefited from it and think it is okay but, if we are taking a long-term vision of Australia, we want protections and we want the prime agricultural land of the farmers to be in the driving seat on this.

I hear a lot about how this works. The government says people are entitled to compensation, but when a big mining company or gas company knocks on your door and says, 'We can do this the easy way or we can do it the hard way,' most people will tap out and say, 'I'll take the easy way. I'll take 50 grand or 100 grand.' Meanwhile, people with deep pockets spend three years in court just to reach the starting line against these companies. That is why in the Condamine Basin nothing activates because none of them get to that point. If they did get you wanted to take them on, other people would watch you and say, 'Crikey, I don't think I have the drive to do that.'

There are many intangible parts to this that do not come up. It is easy to sell this to the public and say it does not hurt. I am sorry, but I just do not trust government enough. If I do not know what this is about, you cannot ask me to support it. Tell us why you are doing this. These things come in because you are trying to address a specific problem. Where will this apply? If you say you want to develop that sounds great, but tell us what you are doing here because it really feels like you are trying to hide something. You used the term 'critical minerals' in the title. I talk to mines in my area and they say that does not even rate in their top priorities. It is 'energy costs, energy costs, energy costs and CopperString' in the north-west. It is not land access or approvals. It is not critical minerals. We can play around with the titles of things—

Government members interjected.

Mr KATTER: I would like to take the interjections one by one, but I will have to keep going or I will run out of time. It was silly to call the bill 'critical minerals' in the first place, but I get that. It is done all the time when a bill is dealing with something else, but we do not know what that is.

AgForce and other ag groups are not buying it. I am not buying it. I have had landholders be quite surprised. If anything, I was trying to talk them down or at least say, 'I'm not sure there is anything insidious in this bill,' but they are saying, 'No way, mate. I'm already having trouble with these people.' They have bolted on this issue already. That has nothing to do with my influence or anyone else's influence. If this bill did set out to address critical minerals you have probably made matters worse in the north-west, because landholders who were probably okay before are now going to be paranoid about what this bill creates. In the next few weeks, discussions between mining companies and these same people will be a lot different to what they would have been before this bill came in because they are paranoid about what the government is doing with this legislation.

039

These farmers are copping it from both ends. They have the EPBC Act coming out of Canberra and now they have the unknown quantity of this legislation. They are saying, 'What the hell is this? We are facing gas companies. We are facing renewable companies. What does this mean?' They are being told by members not to worry about it, that it will not harm them. How can you blame these people for being overwhelmed and not having trust in government? It has very much an intangible impact on the security and wellbeing of these people and their future decision-making.

Another interesting point was brought up in the committee hearings about councils. The state could say, 'There's a mine coming out to Mount Isa. It will be great. The state will make a lot of money.' I or the mayor of Mount Isa, Peta MacRae, might ask, 'Are you basing any workforce locally?' We would be told, 'No, it will all be FIFO. We will be using all your facilities in town.' We would say, 'That is not in our best interests', but they would say, 'It is in the state's best interest, though. We are all going to win out of this.' We would say, 'No, we're not. You're going to spend all that money on the Olympics.' It will be, 'Too bad. It's in the state interest. We're rolling it out.' Councillors have said to me that they are concerned about this because the things the state says are not in their best interest.

The big priorities in this state are the Olympics, renewable energy development, which seems to be a big thing, and gas—drill, baby, drill! Go for the oil, but coal seam gas seems to disrupt a bit. As I said, it was done on a flawed commercial basis in the first place. What is not going ahead is coal. The minerals out in my area are not going ahead without CopperString and there is no start date for that. The government can chant all it wants and come up with more slogans, but that is not helping anyone. We should be pushing the big champions of industry in our state: the minerals and the coal. They are going down. Whatever this bill is aiming for seems to be going up.



Mr DALTON (Mackay—LNP) (9.22 pm): I rise today to support the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) Amendment Bill 2026. This bill is fundamentally about ensuring Queensland is ready to seize the opportunities in front of us. Following the execution of the Critical Minerals Framework between Australia and the United States in October 2025, there is renewed momentum to accelerate critical minerals projects. Queensland needs to be ready for that opportunity. This bill modernises the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and gives government better tools to evaluate, plan, enable and facilitate economic projects that can help drive Queensland forward.

There has been a great deal said about this bill, and unfortunately some of it simply does not reflect what the legislation actually does. The bill creates a framework for state strategic projects. There is a process that must be followed before a project receives that declaration. The minister must be satisfied that the relevant criteria are met and only prescribed projects can be declared. Importantly, renewable energy projects and data centres are specifically prohibited from being declared state strategic projects. The bill also creates modification orders. These are designed to deal with

circumstances where an important project encounters a regulatory problem because existing laws simply did not contemplate the technology or project involved.

Consider a new critical minerals refining technology that has never previously been used in Queensland. There may not be an established regulatory pathway specifically designed for it. Do we tell that investor to come back in three or four years time once government catches up or do we create a responsible mechanism that allows government to deal with that regulatory issue while maintaining necessary safeguards? That is what this bill seeks to do. Environmental authorities remain. Mining leases remain. Cultural heritage requirements remain. Development approvals remain.

This bill has also been subject to significant consultation. The parliamentary committee process received 1,303 submissions, including 1,220 pro forma submissions. After considering the evidence before it, the Primary Industries and Resources Committee recommended that the bill be passed with no further recommendations.

Mr Power: With no recommendations?

Mr DALTON: With no further recommendations. Importantly, stakeholders raised concerns and changes have been made in response. As a result, a further restriction has been proposed to make clear that a modification order cannot remove the requirement to obtain a regional interests development approval where one is required.

The Coordinator-General consulted with a significant range of organisations, industry representatives, agricultural groups and other stakeholders throughout the development of this bill. To summarise, the Coordinator-General spoke to five internal government key players and had nine external engagements, making a total of 14 different agencies. I table the list of groups and organisations consulted by the Coordinator-General in the development of this bill as outlined during the public briefing of the Primary Industries and Resources Committee on 22 June 2026.

Tabled paper: Extract from document, dated 22 June 2026, titled 'Public Briefing-Inquiry into the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026'.

Consultation matters. Good government means listening to the people who will be affected by legislation and, where appropriate, making changes. That is exactly what has happened here.

I also want to address one of the biggest scare campaigns around this bill. Let's deal with the facts. Compulsory acquisition powers involving private projects are not new to Queensland. They have existed since 1999, and the established acquisition process under the Acquisition of Land Act 1967 remains. What this bill does create is clearer rules, greater transparency and additional safeguards around access to that process for state strategic projects. Before compulsory acquisition can even be considered, a project must first be declared a state strategic project. The proponent must demonstrate at least six months of genuine negotiations with the landholder. The Coordinator-General must consult with the landholder. The proponent must make a final unconditional offer. The minister must consider whether acquisition is in the state interest. A regulation must then be made before the acquisition process can commence, bringing that decision under parliamentary scrutiny. The existing rights of landholders to object and receive compensation remain. That is not a blank cheque. That is a process with multiple checks and balances. This bill does not remove a landholder's right to consultation, objection or compensation.

Those opposite cannot have it both ways. Labor wants Queenslanders to believe these types of powers have suddenly appeared out of nowhere. They have not. Compulsory acquisition powers for private projects have existed since 1999. In 2017, when the member for Woodridge was a senior minister, private land was acquired in connection with the Adani rail corridor because the project was located within a declared state development area. Apparently these mechanisms were acceptable when Labor was in government, but now that this government wants to provide clearer rules, stronger transparency and better opportunities for investment, Labor wants Queenslanders to believe the sky is falling. Scare campaigns do not create jobs or attract investment. If Labor votes against this bill it needs to explain that decision to the workers and businesses of regional Queensland.

The choice before the House is straightforward. We can have a modern development framework that encourages investment while maintaining appropriate safeguards or we can allow unnecessary duplication and outdated regulatory processes to hold Queensland back. I commend the bill to the House.

040  **Hon. LM LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (9.29 pm): Queensland is a state of extraordinary natural wealth. We have world-class mineral resources, the most productive agricultural land in the country and ecosystems that underpin our regional economies. It is no surprise that critical minerals will continue to

underpin the next stage of technological development as we transition towards net zero—if we transition to net zero under this LNP climate-avoiding government. However, let us be clear: this bill is not about critical minerals. This is an unprecedented concentration of power that overrides every reasonable safeguard essential to maintaining public confidence in objective decision-making.

Despite its title, the proposed legislation could apply to any large-scale development project, not just critical minerals. It creates new state strategic project powers, including modification orders, expanded land access and a radical compulsory acquisition pathway. Large-scale projects simply deemed to be strategically significant by the Minister for State Development opens a gateway to unprecedented ministerial power, which fundamentally restructures Queensland's approach to major project approvals. Since when is it acceptable for legislation to be at the whim of a minister's satisfaction?

The word 'declaration' is the key that unlocks the new powers under the bill and paves the way to compulsory acquisition. Once a project has been declared, the bill gives effect to a modification order—a regulation that turns off a provision of an act or changes how it applies. This all takes effect through subordinate legislation, outside the scrutiny of parliament and behind the closed doors of the LNP. As the Queensland Environmental Law Association put it—

... it is not appropriate to use subordinate legislation to change the operation of Acts of Parliament.

The fact that this is a sentiment that needs to be spelt out to this government is disappointing but hardly surprising, because it is simply continuing the pattern we last saw in the Planning (Social Impact and Community Benefit) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2025.

This bill removes judicial review, appeal rights and public notification from the community, including landholders, while concentrating decisions in one minister's office. In their submission, the Environmental Defenders Office highlighted that this bill departs from the fundamental legislative principles on 12 separate occasions and there is no rhyme, reason or evidence base to support the need for such authoritarian measures. What exactly is the problem this government is trying to solve? Extraordinary powers deserve—no, they demand—extraordinary justification yet we have seen none.

This is not some abstract debate about fundamental legislative principles, as important as those principles are. This bill affects real Queenslanders. Consider Matt and Caitlin Wood, regenerative farmers in the Gold Coast hinterland, whose story was exposed by the *Guardian* earlier this month. Under this legislation, they face the threat of compulsory acquisition for a proposed cableway project. Under this bill, the government is granting itself the power to forcibly acquire private land to hand over to private developers for private profit. Compulsory acquisition was meant for public roads and other public benefits, not to line the pockets of corporate proponents.

One of the most concerning aspects of this bill is the removal of basic human rights for people who are directly affected by these projects. By removing third-party merit appeals, the notice can only be appealed by the proponent. In other words, a family's or farmer's only option to protect their land is to go to the Supreme Court, which is an incredibly costly exercise—prohibitively so for most people. As the Queensland Law Society stated, this 'systematically disenfranchises regional and remote residents, who this legislation will impact most' with these removals serving as a 'functional denial of natural justice'. That is an incredibly damning statement from a highly respected stakeholder group that has never shown any fear or favour in this place, although I do not expect this government to show the least bit of respect or apportion any weight to their evidence or anyone else's. As we saw through the consultation process, they only consult with those they do not think will oppose what they are trying to do. No agricultural body, no First Nations organisation, no environmental or community group and no landholder representatives were consulted, despite arguably being the stakeholders with the most to lose from this bill. A little like when overturning the flying fox regulations, they just talk to the people who want it.

From productive agricultural land to the environment, all stand to lose. The bill removes the requirement for an environmental impact statement from the compulsory acquisition process, instead vesting discretionary power in the minister, and of all ministers we know this minister has form and it has never been to prioritise the environment.

To recap: this bill has little to do with critical minerals; it represents an unprecedented concentration of power that allows, via regulation, the overriding of other acts of parliament and, in so doing, transparency and scrutiny in this House; it systematically disenfranchises regional and remote residents; it subverts environmental protections; and it erodes the only mandatory requirement trigger to negotiate with traditional owners by removing the EIS requirement and the associated need for

Indigenous cultural heritage identification and all for no reason other than an apparent power grab by a minister who, as I said, has form for it.

When previously in government, this minister stripped away broad community rights to object to mining lease applications and environmental authorities. He oversaw changes to planning and environmental litigation rules, specifically altering how legal costs were awarded in the land and environment courts. He was criticised for being aggressive and pushing pro-development legislation through Queensland's unicameral parliament with minimal public scrutiny. Sound familiar? It would be egregious to leave Queensland's precious ecosystems in his hands. This is a bad bill and it will be bad law, all in the name of apparent economic development and red tape reduction—or whatever is the actual reason for bringing the bill before the House.

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (9.35 pm): As the shadow minister for mines and resources, like the member for Traeger I was interested to hear that there would be legislation that defined and dealt with the specific challenges for new projects aimed at developing our critical minerals resources. If that is what this bill was really aimed at, it would be a worthwhile goal. I do not have that much confidence that the Deputy Premier would do that well, but at least it would be a worthwhile goal. However, this bill does not even mention critical minerals except in its title. As some have already said, it should be called the 'more powers to the supreme leader bill'.

This bill is all about delivering to Deputy Premier Bleijie the powers that he wants to override those Queenslanders he does not like. Miners are rightfully bewildered as to why they are being used in a bill that has little to do with their work. They also wonder why they were not mentioned in the minister's speech until just before the last paragraph. The bill does not define critical minerals. It does not mention lithium, cobalt, nickel, graphite, vanadium, tungsten, gallium, germanium, rare earth elements or any of the numerous others. It does not address the specific needs of any critical mineral mines nor critical minerals processing, marketing, export or transport.

We know that this government cut critical minerals exploration. Tonight, if you were to search the Queensland government website for their critical minerals strategy, you would end up on a page that says 'page not found'. At least until 13 June 2024, that link connected to a critical minerals strategy. When the strategy was on the website, it strangely started at page 4. I had to ask: why would a document start on page 4? I looked back and found the old document, which is identical to the document that the Crisafulli LNP government purports to be their own critical minerals strategy.

Mr DILLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I bring your attention to the use of props by the speaker on his feet.

Mr POWER: I did briefly hold it up.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Just wait a moment. I did not see the props—

Mr POWER: He is correct.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Let me speak, if you would not mind. You know the rules about props. You have the call.

Mr POWER: I was hoping to get through this quickly to give another member a chance to speak, but if people want to take points of order then that is fine.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, we can do without that commentary, thank you. I have made a ruling. Proceed with your speech, thank you.

Mr POWER: I knew time was tight and I wanted to quickly get on with my speech. That is the point that I was making.

The document contains a message from the Premier that states that the Queensland critical minerals strategy is developed to unlock the next resources boom in critical minerals. This was the government's critical minerals strategy for almost two years. I looked at the picture of the premier. Hold on! That does not look like the current Premier. Indeed, this government's strategy of two years was signed off by Anastacia Palaszczuk MP. All they did was strip out two pages and then pretend it was their own document. We know that this government is fake on critical minerals. This government's bill is falsely called a critical minerals bill but we know it has nothing to do with critical minerals and, indeed, does not mention critical minerals.

If it was a real critical minerals bill, it would support building community support over projects instead of overriding them to facilitate rather than dictate. Instead, it has caused chaos and conflict and, of course, protests, as we saw in Toowoomba. This is not the way to support the really good proponents of critical minerals projects. I want to assure Queenslanders that critical minerals proponents do not

want to override Queenslanders. They want to support community. They want to show the benefits that the minerals they are seeking to mine bring to Australian industry and Australian products. This bill simply undermines this.

Instead, we see the words in the title—and words alone—‘critical minerals’ as a Trojan horse for the pet projects that the Deputy Premier wants for his own reasons, not for Queenslanders or for communities. In fact, the amendments make clear that the bill as introduced was really about overriding Queenslanders’ legitimate concerns over everything but critical minerals. The amendments make clear that it was about anything but critical minerals, but, because there were community protests in Toowoomba, the Deputy Premier has once again been caught out and his backbenchers have once again correctly, with such a bad bill, threatened to join the community in Toowoomba and right across the bush and cross the floor. We know they did not.

What was disappointing is that the three LNP members of the committee said the bill would be passed with no further amendments. They should stand with their words and vote against the amendments because when they did the report they said there should be no more amendments. They were caught out as well. That is why the statements of reservation—from the member for Traeger and from the members for Bundaberg and Stretton—held a blowtorch to this government and the wrong priorities they have and the fake critical minerals bill.

The amendments admit that this bill as it was introduced in this parliament—as those three members said it should be passed with no amendments—was all about overriding communities on data centres and wind farms until the minister was caught out. Community protests meant he was forced to backtrack to stop members from crossing the floor. However, the amendments, in excluding a select group of ideological projects, make it clear that this is not about critical minerals at all but about the pet projects of the Deputy Premier. He will not talk about what they are with Queenslanders until the very moment when he overrides the capacity for Queenslanders to have a proper say.

I know that critical minerals proponents are often providing for and interested in renewable energy. They must be totally confused that many of the minerals they are searching for are for new energy and the renewable energy economy, but the new clause 4(a) seems to be that if a proponent includes some sort of production of energy as part of their project through a solar farm or a wind farm or maintains energy security and reliability through battery storage then this government says, ‘Anything like that and we will exclude support from this government,’ solely because they do not fit in with the government’s hard-right ideological anti-renewable position on energy.

I want to alert the House to a project in Queensland where they want to take mined quartz and develop it. I quote—

Northern Quartz Campus is a fully integrated, sovereign, low-carbon solar and semiconductor supply chain solution ... The production facilities will be powered by nearby solar farms firmed by co-located long duration battery energy storage systems.

This is the project that this government—

Mr DILLON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I direct your attention to the member on his feet using a prop.

Mr POWER: My apologies again, Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kempton): Was that something you were quoting from or is it actually a prop?

Mr POWER: It is something I am quoting from. I am happy to table it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take a seat for a moment. Member, I raised this issue a few moments ago and I think that is a prop. Therefore, you are warned. You have one minute left.

Mr POWER: As I said, my apologies. Everyone should go to the Northern Quartz Campus on the website of Solquartz and look up the picture which shows a major investment to provide jobs but also features batteries and solar panels in the picture.

This government says, ‘We do not want to develop critical minerals for key European markets that value the fact that there is renewable energy, low-carbon energy used in their production. We want to say we have no interest in these projects. We want to stamp a flag to say those types of projects are not the ideological fit for this government.’ That is why I think there will be investors who say, ‘Hold on, maybe we should go to New Zealand or New South Wales or WA’—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, please take a seat. Under the provisions of the order agreed to by the House, I call the minister 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) (9.45 pm), in reply: I thank all honourable members for their contribution tonight. I think honourable members would be fascinated to learn that all of a sudden the Labor Party are the farmer's friend. If you listen to their contributions, they have travelled the state and being the farmer's friend. They are listening.

Government members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, and not only the farmer's friend but also critical minerals, the resource industry—all the industries they have tried to shut down over the years, all the farms they have tried to shut down and curtail and turn into wind farms.

I heard a lot tonight and I could not help but be joked about the presentation that we saw. This is the hypocrisy of the Labor Party. In 2016, who can forget the vegetation management laws they introduced? It was 2016. We were in opposition and we managed to get those laws opposed because one Billy Gordon voted with the opposition to oppose the vegetation management laws. What happened in 2018? The Labor Party, with their majority, rushed back the vegetation management laws. I wonder how much consultation they did at that time with the farmers and the agriculture and the primary industries sector. They are all lecturing everybody, as the member for Logan did today, about the farming community and the resource sector, yet they are the very political party that brought in the vegetation management laws, denying farmers the right to manage their own land.

Who can forget the Labor Party with the reef regulations they brought in and blamed farmers for the demise of the Barrier Reef and said that everything the farmers are doing is bad and it is all going to the Barrier Reef? Those are the lectures the Labor Party gave for 10 years to the farming community and to the primary industries, agriculture and horticulture sectors. No-one believes the Labor Party because Cameron Dick, the deputy opposition leader, goes on a tour of Mount Isa after I went there. I had a great time at the Mount Isa rodeo, which we saved by the way—\$2 million from the Crisafulli government.

Mrs Poole: You got a nice belt buckle.

Mr BLEIJIE: I got the belt buckle. I got lots of belt buckles from Buckalo Bill, I think his name was, or Buckle Bill, or Bill the Buckalo. I don't know—something like that. Anyway, his name was Bill and I bought some buckles from Bill at the Mount Isa rodeo. Incidentally, he was from Victoria, but he was up here selling his buckles because he loves Queensland and he sees Queensland as an opportunity state. I told Bill to move his business up here and stay here because—

A government member: Buckle up, Bill!

Mr BLEIJIE: Indeed! We heard from the Labor Party and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that he went to Mount Isa. Interestingly, out of the contribution from the member for Woodridge—I am going to call him the member for Woodridge because he refuses to call me Deputy Premier. He refers to me only as the member for Kawana because he just cannot get over the fact that he is not the Deputy Premier of the state anymore. He calls me the member for Kawana. That is fine. The member for Woodridge followed me to Mount Isa. He did a 30-minute contribution after my contribution. It was not until the 27th minute of my contribution that he got really triggered. Do honourable members remember what triggered him?

Mrs Frecklington: The miners.

Mr BLEIJIE: It was when I said that the miners, members of the AWU, joined a press conference with me and the resources minister where we announced an investment between Glencore, the council and the Crisafulli government of \$4.7 million into the miners memorial to honour the sacrifice of 151 lives that have been lost in Mount Isa and the wider community. That is what triggered the member for Woodridge, not the miners. He did not want me to talk about the miners. He even had the audacity and the spitefulness to say that talking about miners who have lost their lives has nothing to do with the critical minerals bill in this state. How disrespectful to the 151 miners who lost their lives.

042 For him, it was not about the lives lost; it was about his union standing up and supporting an LNP government because we backed the miners' memorial. Not only did we stand there with family members who have lost loved ones; in fact, the Minister for Natural Resources and I stood there with a former Labor member. Tony McGrady was there backing us and supporting the press conference for the miners' memorial. It is the Crisafulli government that backs regional Queensland.

The member for Logan just talked about the critical minerals policy. The photo is not of the current Premier; it is of Anastacia Palaszczuk. Everyone would be forgiven for not remembering they had a critical minerals policy. Why did they not introduce this type of legislation if they backed the industry

and they backed critical minerals? Tonight they have said they are backing farmers. They were quoting the Farmers' Federation. They were not quoting the Farmers' Federation that I quoted who are backing our legislation with a couple of tweaks—with RIDA amendments and getting rid of wind, solar and renewable energies.

Mr Last interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: He quoted the Lock the Gate Alliance. I must say as well to the member for Traeger that I was slightly disappointed. I saw him in the news recently doing a press conference. I get it—he was there backing regional communities. I was in his wonderful electorate of Mount Isa backing regional communities at the Isa rodeo. The landowner he put up to speak on behalf of farmers in Queensland was Drew Hutton, the co-founder of the Greens political party and past president of the Lock the Gate Alliance which want to shut down this sort of industry. I admire the representation for regional Queensland, but it is a bit of a joke to stand up with the co-founder of the Greens political movement in Queensland and then Australia and say that you are backing the landowners in the state. The irony of that was not lost on me.

The reality is: this bill is not only about the resource sector and critical minerals. Our Premier will be traveling on a trade mission next week to the United States of America. There are billions of dollars on the table from a deal struck on critical minerals between the Trump administration and the Albanese Labor federal government. We want to be at the forefront of that. We want the critical minerals to come out of Queensland, not Western Australia, not the Northern Territory. We want them to come out of Queensland. We want to generate Queensland jobs.

As the member for Gregory has often said to me, so many opportunities in his electorate over the years have been missed because objectionists have said no to everything. Delayed projects have denied his community the opportunity to make a buck, to make a quid and to employ locals. Young people want to stay in the communities, buy a home and continue their farming expedition or be owners of local mines or owners in the resource and critical minerals sector. Why are we denying them that opportunity? We should not be. The Crisafulli government is not doing that. They were denied that opportunity by the former Labor government for 10 years and the Greens political movement. We want to open up this state. We want to open up the opportunity.

We acknowledge the concerns raised by some landowners of the Queensland Farmers' Federation, and that is why we have included the RIDA. We have kept the RIDA, which protects prime agricultural land and strategic cropping land.

There is one thing that I did not anticipate which came up in the committee feedback—and I thank the chair and all of the honourable members of the committee. If the Labor Party are elected again—God help Queensland—they will use this legislation to fast track putting wind, solar and renewables onto prime agricultural land across the state. We are not going to have a bar of that. We have put in place a planning framework to make sure that cannot happen, to make sure regional communities have a say, finally, in renewable energy projects.

I know that there are regional communities and councils that want the investment when it is not on prime agricultural land and not on strategic property land. That is great. Let them do that. If the communities agree with that through the SIA—the social impact assessment—and the community benefit agreements, that is great. If communities do not want it, they will now have a say. They now have appeal rights because of the planning reforms we have put in place for wind, solar and battery energy storage systems. We have also announced that we are looking at that for data centres now and the impact they will have on regional communities. Regional communities now have a say.

I have been lectured by the member for Woodridge because he is some sort of expert farmer now. The only greenery I have seen him in was a faked staged photo during the fires when he came out carrying the Binna Burra bell. It was a polished bell from the Binna Burra National Park, I think. It had already been saved by the firefighters, I might add, but the member for Woodridge staged the photo as if he was in the bushfire himself and saved the Binna Burra bell. He came out with this polished bell like he was the saviour. He did not give credit to the firefighters or the SES—the real firefighters. He made out that, as a senior minister, he pulled this bell out. He came out in his tuxedo and there was no ash on him from the fires. He pretended that he was the real firefighter who saved the Binna Burra bell.

He has lectured us tonight about resources in the farming community. He had 10 years. The member for Woodridge cannot say that he was just a backbencher sitting on the crossbench. He was the state development minister. He could have done this. He was the deputy premier. He was the treasurer. He was the health minister. He was the attorney-general in the Bligh government in 2009. It was not that he was not in—

Mrs Poole: He was the Binna Burra bell saver.

Mr BLEIJIE: Make sure you get your interjection out. If I stop in all suspense of your interjection, you have to get it right! Think about it and I will give you a second crack. I take the interjection from the honourable member.

When the member for Woodridge was in Mount Isa, he did a video to say it was great to be in Mount Isa. He actually filmed it on the very spot the Minister for Natural Resources and I stood a week earlier announcing the miners' memorial. He is obsessed with stalking me. He follows me around the state. He goes everywhere I go. He posts video about me every day. He is obsessed with my vehicle, what car I am driving. It is an obsession. It is getting concerningly freaky, member for Woodridge.

No-one believes that the member for Woodridge is a friend of the farmer or the resource sector. Who could forget the attacks on the resource sector? Who could forget the green tape that he put in place when he was the minister for state development, the treasurer and the deputy premier? Only members of the Liberal National government, particularly our regional and rural members, have fought for this type of legislation to benefit their communities.

The government has listened to their concerns. That is why we kept the RIDA. That is why we put the provision with the amendments. We are keeping the wind farms, the solar farms and the battery energy storage systems. We are legislating them out of this bill to make sure a future Labor government cannot override regional communities and not listen to them as they did in the past.

The member for Woodridge cannot be believed that he has had a road to Damascus experience, that he has now changed and will not do anymore vegetation management laws or reef regulations. It is part of their ideology in the Labor Party. They are a far-left ideologue government and opposition. They have not changed. A leopard will not change its spots. The Labor Party will not change.

043 The only way the resources sector will get the critical minerals out of the ground, exporting them and creating hundreds of jobs across the state, is with legislation like this. We have built in the protections. Members will remember that when I introduced this legislation I said, 'You're going to see the mother of all scare campaigns by the Labor Party and the Greens,' and that is exactly what happened.

The member for Woodridge went around regional Queensland and did all these little press conferences. He attacked the regional commissioner tonight again. He is obsessed with Mr Cripps, the regional commissioner. He is obsessed with me. He is obsessed with the vehicle I drive—the Lexus. I say to the member for Woodridge: if you need to get this obsession with me and the vehicle I drive out of your system, here are the keys to the Lexus. If you want to take it for a spin just to get it out of your system, go and do it. If you need to smell a bit of ministerial leather just to remember what it was like a year and half ago just to get it out of your system, please do. I will give you the Lexus for a night just so you stop annoying me and stalking me everywhere I go. He is chasing me around the state. I go to Mount Isa. Oh, here we go! Here are the keys to the Lexus. Please, just go. I will unlock it here. I will press the button. Go and smell the ministerial leather just to get it out of your system. Take it for a lap. Sleep in it. I don't care!

The point is this: he is obsessed. He just cannot get over the fact that they lost the election. He cannot get over the fact that he does not have the resources of government now and he has to drive himself. That is his problem. Unfortunately, they are the priorities of the opposition. They are not a real opposition. Look what they have done today. Look at this week. All day I sat there expecting a question as acting boss for the day. I just sat there and did not get one question. I waited two years for a question. I have not got anything—

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Deputy Premier, would you pause for a moment please? Take a breath. Manager of Opposition Business, do you have a point of order?

Mr de BRENNI: I draw your attention to the continued use of props and the continued relevance of the subject matter to this debate.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier. I cannot hear the Manager of Opposition Business. Could you start your point of order again, please?

Mr de BRENNI: I draw your attention to the continued use of props and I submit that this contribution is no longer relevant to the debate. I urge you to bring the Deputy Premier back to relevant content.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, I urge you to please refrain from using any props that are being referred to and keep your contribution relevant to the bill and the summing-up of the second reading.

Mr BLEIJIE: The good news for you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and for the member for Woodridge is that I have already unlocked the Lexus. It is ready for him to go and have a little rest in tonight.

This bill is about backing regional Queensland. No-one in the Labor Party who spoke tonight can be believed that all of a sudden they are the party for regional Queensland. This bill not only protects farmers but also protects landowners. We listened and we made a couple of amendments. That is what good governments do. We listen. I listen to the regional members in our communities and who sit on the government bench. If we were the Labor Party, there would be no amendments. If we were the Labor Party, they would have been told, 'No. We're riding roughshod over regional communities. You're not going to have a say'—just like vegetation management, just like reef regulations.

As I said—and I will repeat now because I have the undivided attention of the member for Woodridge—in 2016 when the Labor Party rushed in—

Government members interjected.

Mr Hunt: He's going to take the Lexus!

Mr BLEIJIE: He is going to go for a spin in the Lexus! He is going to smell the leather—sniff the leather in the Lexus. Then he will stop obsessing over me and my vehicle. That would be great!

As I was saying, the member for Woodridge was a member of the Labor government in 2016 when they brought in the vegetation management laws. We managed to use a crossbench member who left the Labor Party in disgust—

Mr Last: Billy.

Mr BLEIJIE: Yes, Billy Gordon, and we voted down those laws. The first thing the Labor Party did in 2018 was bring back the vegetation management laws to attack the farmers.

Mr Perrett: Jackie Trad.

Mr BLEIJIE: Jackie Trad ain't gone, mate. She is still the puppetmaster for the Labor Party, for the Far Left of the Labor Party. She still controls the member for McConnell and everything they do.

Mrs Frecklington: She'll be around this weekend at the conference.

Mr BLEIJIE: No doubt she will be there at the weekend at the Labor Party conference telling the member for McConnell what to do and how to vote. Big daddy Blocker will be there making sure they vote the right way as well. There is no doubt about that.

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

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, could you please demonstrate your relevance to the bill in the summing-up that you are providing to the House of the second reading debate?

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. So Jackie Trad, who I was talking about, used to be the deputy premier and she introduced vegetation management laws which were an attack on regional communities. We are restoring the rights and protections of landowners and regional communities. I make the point that if Jackie Trad still oversaw the opposition policies that is bad for regional Queensland. I am asserting and making the absolute statement that Jackie Trad still controls the policies of the Labor Party in Queensland. I think it is very scary for regional Queensland and for landowners that Jackie Trad is still in control of their policies. You only have to look, Mr Deputy Speaker, at their policy documents.

Mrs Nightingale: This is shameful. You have nothing better to say about your own government—shameful.

Mr BLEIJIE: I think Jackie Trad is shameful. I take your interjection. I think she is shameful. Yes, I agree.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Inala—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, just pause. Members, we will have order. Deputy Premier, I appreciate your efforts to show relevance to the bill. You have one minute and one second

to go in your summing-up. Could you please continue to remain relevant in that one minute and one second?

Mr BLEIJIE: I took the interjection from the honourable member who was shouting at me from across the way. I agree with her. I do not agree with much the member for Inala says but I agree with her. I think Jackie Trad was a shameful member of parliament. She did terrible things to regional communities.

In a nutshell, in my remaining 44 seconds, I restate our commitment to regional communities and landowners. This bill is about the future of Queensland. We are on the precipice of something great in Queensland when it comes to critical minerals and landowners' rights and protections that we have put in place. Not only is this legislation about critical minerals and the resources sector; but if farmers wanted to do things on their land—if farmers wanted a quarry, if they wanted a feedlot, if they wanted biofuel or biogas—they can utilise this legislation if it is in their interests to do so. That is because the Crisafulli government back the resources sector, we back the primary industry sector and we back regional Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate interrupted.

PRIVILEGE

Parliamentary Procedure

 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (10.06 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. When I sought the call only moments ago, it has come to my attention that the member for Logan jumped prior to the member for Nudgee concluding. That is behaviour that those opposite have conducted before to intentionally disrupt proceedings, and I will be writing to you about the matter.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Thank you, member for Callide. That is a valid matter of privilege. Please write to Mr Speaker in relation to that matter of privilege.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members, including the member for Cairns and the member for Logan.

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

Second Reading

Resumed.

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

In division—

Mr HUNT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. You just called the member for Logan to order for being disruptive. He is on a warning. I just bring that to your attention.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Krause): Thank you, member for Nicklin, for your assistance in governing the affairs of the House. I very much appreciate it.

Mr Mellish interjected.

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

044

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 39:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1—



Mr BERKMAN (10.13 pm): I move amendment No. 1 circulated in my name—

1 Clause 1 (Short title)

Page 14, line 5, 'Critical Minerals'—

omit, insert—

Grabbing Land and Trashing Process

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Mr Michael Berkman's amendments.

With two minutes left in the debate and not having had an opportunity to speak on the second reading debate, I am now moving amendments to the short title so that this act is called what it actually is. It would be referred to as the State Development and Public Works Organisation (Grabbing Land and Trashing Process) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. It should be clear to every member in this House that this bill has very little, if anything, to do with critical minerals. It is certainly not about leading a renewable energy revolution or driving down emissions and electricity prices. This government's title is misleading and deceptive in the extreme.

This bill is a transparent power grab by the LNP on behalf of their vested interests and major donors and specifically by the Deputy Premier who, as Minister for State Development, stands to grant himself absolutely extraordinary powers through the passage of this bill. This Trump wannabe is desperate for his own version of executive orders, although I would say that he has gone a bit further even than Trump by giving himself the power to simply override existing laws for his favoured pet projects.

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

Mr SPEAKER: The member takes personal offence and I ask that you withdraw.

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw. Perhaps he is just harking back to a bygone era closer to home. Maybe he has aspirations to bring in the bulldozers overnight and tear down our built and natural heritage and hand over land to his favourite developers without the pesky public interfering. He is looking more and more like Joh 2.0, as this government does from one year to the next. The LNP talks about efficiency and supposedly slashing duplicative processes—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, I will ask you to withdraw.

Mr BERKMAN: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, it is now 10.15. The time has expired. The next question is that the member for Maiwar's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Division: Question put—That the member for Maiwar's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

AYES, 36:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

NOES, 54:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland,

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the negative.

045 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 call the minister to table the explanatory notes to his amendments and statement of compatibility with human rights.



Mr BLEIJIE (10.21 pm): I table the explanatory notes to my amendments circulated in my name and a statement of compatibility with human rights.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, explanatory notes to Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, statement of compatibility with human rights contained in Hon. Jarrod Bleijie's amendments.

Division: Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 1 to 12, as circulated, be agreed to.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 39:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendments agreed to.

Amendments, as circulated—

1 Clause 13 (Replacement of pt 5 (Prescribed development))

Page 70, line 2, after 'under'—

insert—

section

2 Clause 17 (Insertion of new s 76EB)

Page 78, after line 9—

insert—

- (4) Despite subsection (1), the Minister can not declare a project to be a State strategic project if the project is—
 - (a) development for a solar farm, wind farm or battery storage facility that is prescribed under the *Planning Act 2016*, section 106T to be development for which social impact assessment is required under that Act; or
 - (b) a data centre operated for 1 or more of the following purposes—
 - (i) research and development;
 - (ii) a commercial purpose;
 - (iii) a purpose prescribed by regulation.
- (5) In subsection (4)—

- (a) the terms solar farm, wind farm and battery storage facility have the same meaning they have for the prescription of the development under the *Planning Act 2016*, section 106T; and
- (b) a data centre is a building or other structure used wholly or mainly for providing compute resources, electronic data storage or computer networking services.

3 Clause 22 (Insertion of new pt 5A, divs 3A and 3B)

Page 92, after line 6—

insert—

- (ba) a regional interests development approval under the *Regional Planning Interests Act 2014*;

4 Clause 24 (Amendment of s 79A (Content of approved development scheme))

Page 100, after line 2—

insert—

- (1A) Section 79A(3)(a), 'regulated development'—
omit, insert—
development regulated under the scheme

5 Clause 27 (Amendment of s 84 (Development under approved development scheme))

Page 104, lines 6 to 10—

omit, insert—

- (1) Section 84, heading—
omit, insert—

84 Regulated development not regulated by other laws

- (1A) Section 84(1), from 'identifies'—
omit, insert—

, or a declaration under section 85D, identifies regulated development for the area.

6 Clause 27 (Amendment of s 84 (Development under approved development scheme))

Page 104, after line 13—

insert—

- (4) In this section—
regulated development, for a State development area, means development—
 - (a) that—
 - (i) is in the area; or
 - (ii) is SDA-related development for the area; and
 - (b) identified in the approved development scheme for the area, or a declaration under section 85D, as SDA assessable development or SDA self-assessable development.

7 Clause 31 (Amendment of s 84E (Deciding SDA application))

Page 106, lines 9 to 11, from 'consider'—

omit, insert—

consider—

- (a) the approved development scheme for the State development area to which the application relates; and
- (b) if the application relates to SDA-related development for the State development area declared under section 85D(1)—the matters about how the scheme mentioned in paragraph (a) applies to the development decided by the Coordinator-General under section 85D(4)(aa).

8 Clause 36 (Insertion of new s 85A and new pt 6, divs 1A and 1B)

Page 113, after line 34—

insert—

- (aa) if the development is SDA assessable development—matters about how the approved development scheme for the State development area applies to the development, including, for example, any modifications of the scheme that are necessary to apply the scheme to the development; and

9 Clause 36 (Insertion of new s 85A and new pt 6, divs 1A and 1B)

Page 114, after line 17—

insert—

- (ea) if the development is SDA assessable development—the matters about how the approved development scheme for the State development area applies to the development decided under section 85D(4)(aa);

10 Clause 36 (Insertion of new s 85A and new pt 6, divs 1A and 1B)

Page 116, line 8, 'section 81.'—

omit, insert—

section 81;

- (c) an amendment or revocation of a declaration under section 85D.

11 Clause 44 (Insertion of new s 153EA)

Page 149, lines 27 and 28, ', section'—

omit, insert—

and

12 Clause 58 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 209, after line 17—

insert—

- *regulated development*

Division: Question put—That clauses 1 to 64 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 39:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clauses 1 to 64 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: A division has been called. Ring the bells for one minute.

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 39:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 39:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the affirmative.

046

MOTIONS

Suspension of Standing Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That standing orders 87 and 150 be suspended to allow the Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2026 and the amendments circulated by the minister to be moved and considered.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (10.31 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, the Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games be allowed to immediately move a motion without notice with the following time limits to apply to the debate of the motion—

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

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

AYES, 51:

LNP, 51—Baillie, Barounis, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Camm, Chiesa, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dalton, Dillon, Doolan, Dooley, Field, Frecklington, Gerber, Hatcher, Head, Hutton, Hunt, B. James, T. James, Janetzki, G. Kelly, Kempton, Kirkland, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lee, Lister, Mander, Marr, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Poole, Powell, Purdie, Rowan, Simpson, Stevens, Stoker, Watts, Vorster, Young.

NOES, 35:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Greyhound Racing



Hon. TL MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Minister for Sport and Racing and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (10.36 pm): I move—

That the House supports the long-term future of the greyhound racing industry in Queensland.

Greyhound racing contributes \$350 million to our economy and employs nearly 2,000 people, and around 4½ thousand people regard themselves as greyhound owners. Traditionally, greyhound racing has been regarded as the racing code for the working class. That is what makes it so puzzling

to work out where the Labor Party sits with regard to its support of greyhound racing. The question of this motion is: does the Labor Party support the future of greyhound racing or not?

On one hand we have the shadow minister, who was the architect and the commissioner of the construction of The Q, who during estimates argued strongly for the greyhound track to be rebuilt at Bundaberg. That is a commitment they failed to keep themselves, giving false promises to the community, but we have come through to save the racing track there. The shadow minister is arguing for greyhound racing. On the other hand, we have the member for Ipswich, who has been actively campaigning against greyhound racing, hoping that the 2028 election platform for the Labor Party will include a ban on greyhound racing. She criticises—

Ms HOWARD: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence. It is not true and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw and I table the *Brisbane Times* newspaper article, which includes quotes from the member for Ipswich talking about how she wants greyhound racing—

Tabled paper: Article from the *Brisbane Times*, dated 1 August 2026, titled 'Labor MP urges part to back greyhound racing ban'.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr MANDER: I am going to get to that stage—banned.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the withdrawal from the minister, he withdrew and then attached the word 'and' and then sought to prove the point. I understand there are rulings that consider that not to be an unqualified withdrawal and I would ask you to instruct the member accordingly.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Minister for Racing, the member for Everton, made an unqualified withdrawal and then he tabled a document to which he then referred in relation to direct quotes from the member for Ipswich as I understand it.

Mr SPEAKER: That is what I understood. Would you make the withdrawal again and the apology please?

Mr MANDER: I withdrew. The member is quoted in the article as saying that anybody who said that The Q was a safe track was telling a lie. The person who said The Q was a safe track was the minister at the time, Grace Grace.

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

Mr SPEAKER: I will make my point of order first. There was unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw that, please, Minister.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw.

Ms HOWARD: Mr Speaker, I take personal offence. It is not true and I ask that he withdraw it. It is not true; what he said is not true.

Mr Bleijie: It's quoted.

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

Ms HOWARD: I ask him to withdraw.

Mr Bleijie: Did you withdraw your quote from the paper? Did you tell the journos to withdraw your quote from the paper?

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, my tolerance is very low. Minister, you might have been giving a direct quote, but the member has taken offence and it has always been the tradition to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. This article has at least four or five statements attributed to the member opposing greyhound racing. There is no doubt about that. She attended a rally. Does she have the courage of her convictions to vote against this motion or will the opposition leader or the shadow minister campaign at the Labor Party conference this weekend to support the greyhound racing industry? We support the greyhound industry. We support all three codes of racing. If the member believes that I am misrepresenting her views she has every opportunity to get up and explain what she said. These are direct quotes that she opposes greyhound racing. What do the opposition leader and the shadow minister believe?

(Time expired)



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.42 pm): If you could imagine the LNP going to an even lower place than they have taken this parliament to it is here tonight. Imagine everyone in Western Queensland watching on television the Deputy Premier, the member for Kawana, holding up his car keys saying that we cannot debate this bill that has put the bush—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to start warning members regardless of their position. It is late.

Mr DICK: Imagine people in Western Queensland and regional Queensland who are in absolute pains over the government's approach to property rights.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Bonney—

Mr DICK: Imagine them knowing—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge—

Mr DICK:—that the debate—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge. Member for Bonney, you are warned. I gave a clear direction.

Mr DICK: Imagine them knowing that tonight their LNP government—the people they supported year in, year out and election in, election out for 10 years—truncated the debate on the state development critical minerals bill—

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

Mr DICK:—and then—

Mr SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order?

Mr BLEIJIE: I have two points of order. The first is that the member who is speaking is on a warning. It is twice now you asked him to stop when a point of order was raised and he has kept speaking. He is already on a warning. The second point of order is that the member is not being relevant. He has not mentioned the motion on greyhound racing. He is actually talking about the debate we had in parliament for the last five hours. I ask you to bring him back to whether he supports greyhound racing or not.

Mr SPEAKER: The point of order is relevance. Member, you have heard the motion.

Mr DICK: The context of this stunt this evening is the government truncating debate on a critically important bill for Queenslanders—a bill on critical minerals—and then pulling this stunt. They are taking up the parliament's time and then saying there is 30 minutes for this debate at 10.30 at night. Why are we not debating that bill that was truncated because the Deputy Premier—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Member of Woodridge.

Mr DICK: The Labor government supported—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Woodridge, the motion is around greyhounds.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In relation to the member for Woodridge, he is not being relevant. He has not mentioned greyhound racing at all in his contribution so far. I ask that you draw him back to the motion before the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Could you speak to the motion and could you speak to me and then you will know when I am speaking. Could you speak to the motion, please.

Mr DICK: I was about to say that the former Labor government and the Labor opposition supports greyhound racing. What we do not support is the hour of irrelevance we heard from the Deputy Premier. Now we have this stunt in the House.

When we were in government, we took extreme steps to strengthen the greyhound industry and to lift welfare standards in that sport. We led the country. We supported that industry. We supported those people who work hard in the greyhound racing industry.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel.

Mr DICK: I want to acknowledge the member for McConnel for her work.

Ms GRACE: It was on its knees under you guys.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel.

Mr DICK: I will take that interjection. That industry was on its knees after the Newman government left office. It had collapsed. The member for Broadwater and the member for Kawana were ministers in that government. They put that industry on its knees. Thanks to Labor, greyhound racing came back. We protected those animals, we protected the industry and we protected the people who work in the industry. Every Queenslanders sees this for what it is—a complete and utter stunt, a waste of the parliament's time and something that is absolutely typical of the LNP.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (10.46 pm): It is important that we get this issue and this motion on the record. You have to be able to stand up for your claims. You can make claims in this House—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, you are warned.

Mr BENNETT: Let's talk about Bundaberg. I will take the interjection from the member for McConnel. You can claim you are a champion of greyhound racing all you like, but you closed the track, put no funding into rebuilding it and never took that industry on a journey and actions speak louder than words. These are trainers and strappers. I will give members the numbers of people in Bundaberg who have been let down by the former Labor government and are now being treated with respect and are now getting on with the job of rebuilding the industry. There are 423 direct roles in the Wide Bay and Bundaberg—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel, I put you on a warning. You were still arguing across the chamber. You can leave the chamber for a period of one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for McConnel withdrew from the chamber at 10.47 pm.

Mr BENNETT: Let us put into perspective what these words and actions actually mean for the people around the Wide Bay area. Some 423 direct roles had been in limbo since the Labor Party closed that track. We have started on resurrecting that track. Some 191 owners, 26 breeders, 48 trainers, 37 racing club staff and 72 volunteers were affected by this delay. Anyone who knows the racing industry in Bundaberg knows that the Saturday gallops and Tuesday nights at the greyhounds are events. A lot of people rely on this. They love the industry. What they needed was a government that was going to take them seriously.

It contributes \$10.3 million to our economy every year. That is nothing to be sneezed at. All they ever needed was respect and to be treated properly. That is all they ever asked for. That is why we have already gone to tender on what the new track will look like. We have acknowledged that animal welfare needs to be part of the solution. Nothing like that was done. Those opposite continue to talk down the industry and continue to talk down my region. That does nothing for confidence, investment and, more importantly, the joy that people take out of the racing industry. We have to support the industry. I commend the minister for continuing the support packages for trainers who have been forced to travel to Rocky or Ipswich for training during this diabolical period.

Talking to Racing Queensland we know that they are going to put more money in for travel but, more importantly, for race funds. As we go forward, race meetings will be something we can be proud of. What the industry needs is a government that is committed to greyhound racing and stops playing politics with it. That is exactly what happened under those opposite. They closed that track so brutally and did not do anything to resolve the issue. They went into the last election with no commitment and money for the industry. That tells us everything we need to know about their commitment to greyhound racing. It is all politics. It is all spin. It plays with our community's emotions and the sport of racing in my great city.

048  **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (10.49 pm): I never thought I would have to get up to not only defend the greyhound racing industry in the Scenic Rim electorate but also defend the greyhound racing industry on behalf of the Labor voting members of the public because the shadow minister for racing has been tossed out of the parliament tonight. She is a scratching. She cannot stand there on behalf of the Labor voting members of the Queensland public and defend them because she is gone-ski. She is a scratching. I represent the Scenic Rim electorate where we have a lot of great trainers and dogs and I am across the road from the new Q facility which cost taxpayers \$95 million to build. It would be astounding if members opposite do not support this motion tonight because they are the ones who facilitated the building of The Q at Purga in Ipswich. It was originally budgeted at \$39 million but what

did it end up costing? We had BPIC. We had the blowouts under the minister for blowouts—that one was the former minister for main roads.

An honourable member: The overrun overlord.

Mr KRAUSE: That is right, the overrun overlord. The former minister for racing was also an overrun overlord. That went from \$39 million to—what was it?

Mr MANDER: At least 62.

Mr KRAUSE: He says 62, I heard \$93 million. What a blowout! The Q cost \$93 million when it was originally budgeted at \$39 million. It was an absolute catastrophe of budget blowouts.

The greyhound industry in the Scenic Rim electorate and the state of Queensland contributes so much to our economy: \$2.5 billion overall and \$348.4 million on an annual basis. It has to be supported. It is a code of racing that has survived in Queensland for so long. It has traditionally been strongly supported by members opposite. Over the years, we have seen many policies strongly supported by members of the Labor Party that, when it comes to the Labor-Greens alliance, they are prepared to sacrifice at the altar of political expedience. When it comes to forestry agreements, national parks and vegetation management laws, the Labor Party will sacrifice anything to win an election and secure preferences from the Greens political party, and the greyhound industry is next to be sacrificed on that altar. I have seen the former member for South Brisbane, Amy MacMahon, on the edge of my electorate protesting against the greyhound industry. It is only so long until the members led by the member for Murrumba sacrifice the greyhound industry—

(Time expired)

 **Hon. GJ BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (10.53 pm): I will not be taking anything from the member for Scenic Rim—particularly when it comes to greyhound racing—because there is a saying going around Queensland: ‘bet on the red dog’. Bet on the red dog you can because we are the only party that will ensure the integrity of the racing industry—not only horse racing and harness racing but also greyhound racing—is the pinnacle of what we do in Queensland. Everyone loves to go to their local races. They love to go to their local greyhounds.

Tonight we have seen a party that is desperate to hide the motion that was put forward and the debate that was going on. I am really interested in the member for Callide. I look over and see that the member for Callide has disappeared. Do you know why? He was been guillotined in the previous debate.

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

Mr BUTCHER: You can guillotine me all you like.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Speaker, it is extremely disorderly to refer to the absence of a member and I ask you to so rule.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, we do not usually refer to the absence of members.

Mr BUTCHER: I am seriously concerned at the moment that the government wants to ensure their members do not have a say in a debate in this parliament. Here we are at five minutes to 11 and we have a member who wanted to contribute to the debate on a bill the Deputy Premier of Queensland put forward. The member for Callide is a very good advocate, apparently, for his local region, but cannot have a say—

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to the contribution of the member for Gladstone and his relevance to the motion that is currently before the House.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. We have heard various contributions by those opposite about the importance of greyhound racing to regional Queensland. The member for Gladstone is referring to regional areas of Queensland including the electorate of Callide. I would submit he is being entirely relevant to the motion before the House.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member was referring to the critical minerals bill that the parliament just passed. As the minister, I can assure you we are not digging greyhounds out of critical minerals and it has nothing to do with supporting or not supporting the greyhound racing industry.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the member to be relevant to the motion we are debating, please.

Mr BUTCHER: As the supreme leader of greyhound racing, I appreciate the contribution you just made, but the member for Callide was like a greyhound and fled the scene as quickly as he could.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation again to the contribution by the member for Gladstone. Again he is reflecting on the absence of the member for Callide. There is a longstanding convention around that. You have already provided some guidance in relation to that. He continues to flagrantly disregard your directions.

Mr SPEAKER: Member Gladstone, you will speak to the motion.

Mr BUTCHER: Thank you, Speaker. I will refer then to the Deputy Premier who appears to be the bunny in the chamber. No-one's chasing him down, except the Premier of Queensland who knows he is under attack from the Deputy Premier who wants his job. We have seen it today. He was like a greyhound chomping at the bit knowing full well that the Premier was not in the boxes. As the bunny ran past, the Premier—

Mr SPEAKER: Speak to the motion please.

Mr BUTCHER: I am talking about greyhounds and the bunny that runs past the boxes and Jarrod Bleijie the red dog was there waiting to go and all of a sudden, once all the water weight had been taken out of the dogs—we know what happens—

Dr ROWAN: In relation again to the member for Gladstone's contribution, correct titles is a longstanding requirement of the parliament. I submit to you that it is perhaps time for a warning given he continues to flagrantly disregard a number—

Mr SPEAKER: Your point of order is on relevance and I will decide warnings. Member for Gladstone, if you have nothing to contribute to the debate I will ask you to resume your seat. Do you have anything to offer?

Mr BUTCHER: I have plenty to offer to this debate. The greyhound racing industry in Central Queensland, where I am from, is integral to a lot of workers. A lot of people work in the greyhound industry, particularly in Rockhampton. If the member for Rockhampton and the members for the other electorates around there—Keppel, Mirani, I can name all of them—are sitting here tonight listening to this rubbish debate about the greyhound racing industry and hearing that we do not support it, well that is not true. Central Queensland is the heartland of the greyhound racing industry in Queensland. There are many people here tonight who I would imagine have never been to a greyhound racing meeting. How many have never been to a greyhound race? I do not think there is many.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I move—

That the member be further heard.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

049 **Mr BUTCHER:** Tonight a couple of my colleagues have talked about the greyhound racing industry and the bunnies that go around the track. We heard a little bit of a whisper about one of the members opposite who holds a teddy bear. Maybe the racing industry could have a conversation about whether a bear is more appropriate to chase down. The education minister is the person who carries around a bear with him. I have been to the races with the education minister. He is actually not a bad bloke with a few beers under his belt. The member for Mermaid Beach is a fantastic tipster. He gives tips every week about the greyhounds, the races and the trots. We should be asking the member for Mermaid Beach what his tips are this week so that we can actually make some money and get out of here before these people across from us have a win.

The greyhound racing industry here in Queensland is a fantastic industry. As I said before, there are so many people who are employed in the industry, not only in greyhound racing but also in harness racing and horseracing.

Mr Bleijie: Get him a water! You need to skol a water, I think.

Mr BUTCHER: I am a proud member of this parliament who has owned a racehorse in a syndicate called Honey Toast. Quite a few members opposite have bet on Honey Toast and won money—member for Mermaid Beach!

Mr Bleijie: This is a dog—not a horse—motion! It is a dog motion!

Mr BUTCHER: This is a dog of a motion, member for Kawana, and I am glad you brought that up because there are no dog tracks in your electorate. I thank all of the people in regional Queensland for supporting the greyhound industry in Gladstone. I will sit here and talk all night. Member for Kawana, if you want to bring me a drink of water, bring it on over. Please do that, but make sure that when you do you have nothing in it that will put your integrity in disgrace, because you are an absolute disgrace!

 **Mr SMITH** (Bundaberg—ALP) (11.02 pm): That was a tremendous speech and the member is wearing a wonderful jacket as well. I want to be serious about this motion which was moved by the member for Everton and reply to the member for Burnett. It is very interesting that the member for Burnett spoke about the trainers and the owners but he did not speak about how he hung up on the executive of the Bundaberg Greyhound Racing Club. When he called me, he said it had been a number of weeks since he had promised to call back and never did. Why is that?

Mr BENNETT: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not normally do this. I take personal expense—offence, and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SMITH: I withdraw and I will give him five dollars for his personal expenses as well. The LNP said it would honour our commitment of a two-turn track in Bundaberg. In fact, we worked with the member for Everton. To give him credit, he called me and said that they would deliver the track as promised. A couple of months ago the Bundaberg Greyhound Racing Club stood up with me and the member for McConnel and said that the LNP government had promised them a two-turn track. If the minister is saying that the president, the vice-president and the trainers are speaking mistruths, I will be sure to let them know. I reckon they have a few things to say about this minister. They have a few things to say about the member for Burnett. In the local industry the dogs are bred for turn tracks. They are not bred for a straight track.

Mr Bennett: Now you are an expert?

Mr SMITH: I will take the interjection. I am not an expert, but the trainers and the owners who come and talk to me and everyone who is employed at that racetrack tell me that a straight track will destroy greyhound racing in Bundaberg. Those opposite do not care. They do not want to listen to the owners, to the trainers, to the executive who have said that this means that the tourism element of breeders and trainers bringing their dogs into Bundaberg will no longer be there. There will be no reason or cause for Brisbane trainers to bring their dogs up to Bundaberg. There will be no reason or cause for Rocky trainers to come down to Bundy. They are destroying the local industry. I see the minister smiling. Isn't it funny that he has not spoken to the trainers since the decision was made for a straight track? He is not smiling up in Bundaberg. Why doesn't he come up on Monday? We will see him there. I will bring the trainers. He can bring his smile. We will see how he goes.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Maiwar, you have one minute.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (11.05 pm): I will make it quick—as I have to. At least the Greens are consistent in their position on this. We have been calling for an end to greyhound racing for a long time now. We are increasingly isolated. Almost no-one around the world still tolerates this so-called sport. It is banned in New Zealand as of 31 July. It is banned in the ACT. Tasmania is looking at a ban. Forty-four states of the United States have banned this sport because of the extraordinary cruelty that it inflicts on animals. How many dogs have to die on racetracks here in Queensland before we are going to finally come into the 21st century and ban this shocking sport?

I table some polling that was conducted by DemosAU recently which shows that 66 per cent—two thirds—of Queenslanders think that we should see an end to greyhound racing in Queensland. In 2025 we saw \$54,000 in donations going to both the major parties. This year so far the LNP have already taken \$23,000 in gambling donations. I wonder why it is we are still tolerating dogs dying on racetracks in Queensland and government funding of the industry.

Mr SPEAKER: The time for the debate has expired.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Resolved in the affirmative under standing order 106(10).

ADJOURNMENT

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.11 pm): I move—
That the House do now adjourn.

Domestic and Family Violence Services, Funding; Housing

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (11.11 pm): In the LNP's Queensland, you can keep quiet or you can speak out and have your funding cut. That is the impossible choice facing domestic violence services under the Crisafulli LNP government—services whose funding has been threatened if they publicly criticise the government. Let us be clear that there is much to criticise this government on:

cutting \$40 million in funding from domestic and family violence supports and trying to deny it; burying reports and abandoning critical taskforce recommendations; and refusing to engage with domestic violence victim-survivors and advocates. There are even reports that Minister Camm's office told one victim-survivor that they would hang up on her if she called them again.

Now we hear that the Crisafulli LNP government is reportedly employing standover tactics to stop domestic violence organisations and advocates from speaking out. Organisations have reported having future funding and contracts threatened. Banning public criticism of the government is very LNP coded. It is very Joh and Campbell Newman coded. Premier Crisafulli promised that his government would listen to the experts. How can they silence the very experts they promised they would listen to? The LNP has done all of this as the rates of violence continue to rise. Four women have been killed in 45 days. It is not good enough.

Today in question time, the minister could not suitably answer any questions on children at harm. She had no facts, no figures and no numbers. We know that frontline staff are overrun with domestic violence jobs, with about 15,000 callouts every month across the state. Figures from the federal government's Leaving Violence Program show that there were more than 6,500 applicants from Queensland just in the last year. It is clear that there has never been a greater need for these services. The lives of too many Queenslanders continue to be impacted by domestic and family violence. Whilst the need grows, cutting investment in domestic violence support risks undermining any progress made. These programs deserve increased funding, not budget cuts. Budgets are about priorities. The LNP government's \$50 million wave of government advertising that is blanketing our suburbs proves to Queenslanders exactly where their priorities lie and it is not with domestic violence victims.

However, it is not just domestic violence services that the Crisafulli LNP government has turned its back on. Housing and community organisations are struggling to support an increasing population of vulnerable Queenslanders right across the state. Under the LNP's watch, affordable housing mandates have been scrapped to favour their developer mates. The public housing waitlist has blown out by more than 10,000 and more than \$40 million has been cut from funding for emergency hotel housing accommodation. Ripping away this funding is indefensible.

The veil of secrecy this government and this minister are living under is not good enough. Yesterday in this place, the minister could not say how many women and children had been killed this year as a result of domestic and family violence. Today, the minister continued to keep progress on the important Women's Safety and Justice Taskforce reforms a secret. They sacked the independent progress monitor. They have cancelled reporting. The Premier has gone back on his word. The Premier said the minister would address this at estimates, but we did not see that. When the government turns their back on accountability they also turn their back on victims. We say that is nowhere near good enough. They need to do better for vulnerable Queenslanders.

002

Transport Infrastructure

 **Hon. ST O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Youth) (11.15 pm): For years I have stood in this House with my Gold Coast colleagues to speak about one of the biggest frustrations for the people we represent—that is, how hard it is to move around our city. Under the former Labor government, the Gold Coast was ignored and we were held to ransom for every dollar that we did get, usually through political games being played with Canberra. I have been fighting for an alternative road to the M1 since I became a candidate to be elected to this place in 2017. That is because, for too long, Gold Coasters have had to deal with delay after delay to the Coomera Connector—endless years of planning instead of building and countless cost blowouts, all while congestion kept getting worse.

That changes with our Gold Coast Transport Plan. No more advocacy to deaf ears to even just get projects on the agenda. Our blueprint lays out the biggest ever investment into our city, the most comprehensive collection of projects put forward by a government for the Gold Coast. I will table that beautiful map from the plan with that list of projects, and I acknowledge my good friend the transport minister and thank him for his investment in the Gold Coast.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Gold Coast Transport Plan—Road and Active Transport'.

We are powering ahead with delivering the Coomera Connector, but our alternative road to the M1 cannot just stop at Coomera. We will deliver it all the way north to Yawalpah Road in Pimpama. We are not wasting any time. Expressions of interest are already open for the design of that next section to make sure we can get it done ahead of the 2032 games. This is about finally delivering a proper local

road network for a city on track to have a million people so that Gold Coasters do not have to jump on a national highway to drive between the suburbs of our city.

Our plan also includes long-overdue upgrades to clogged intersections on the Gold Coast Highway, the Norco intersection at Pine Ridge Road and Captain Cook Drive and the AB Paterson intersection at Arundel Drive. I look forward to working with our local councillor, Joe Wilkinson, to help deliver those.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. The plan includes taking the light rail from the hospital to Harbour Town, delivering this world-class public transport to Labrador, Arundel and Biggera Waters, linking these parts of my community into the main light rail line. Across the Gold Coast, it includes our new high-frequency GC Surfer metro style services linking heavy rail, light rail, major centres, the airport and the home of the Gold Coast Suns, People First Stadium.

For the very first time, our city has a clear vision backed by clear commitments to get projects done, instead of playing politics. That is what the Gold Coast has been crying out for—not another decade of announcements without delivery, not transport infrastructure playing catch-up with population growth. Our LNP government's Gold Coast Transport Plan will transform our city, and we cannot wait to get on with the job of delivering it.

Volunteers; Haigslea State School

 **Ms BOURNE** (Ipswich West—ALP) (11.18 pm): One of the greatest privileges of representing Ipswich West is seeing just how much people give back to our community. They are the volunteers who keep our local organisations going, support their neighbours and step up whenever something needs to be done. This month the QCWA Ipswich branch celebrated its 100th anniversary, an incredible century of service. For generations its members have supported local families, schools and students, donated handmade items to nursing homes and provided trauma beds to hospitals and ambulance stations. That proud tradition continues in Ipswich West through the QCWA Rosewood and QCWA Walloon, and I thank their members for everything they continue to do.

Sadly, this year we have also farewelled two remarkable Rosewood locals who embodied that same spirit of service. Trevor Halter gave more than 40 years to his community. He served the Rosewood State School P&C, coached local hockey, volunteered at the swimming pool and ambulance committee and gave countless hours to the Lions Club, Men's Shed and the Rosewood Community Centre. Trevor was someone who saw something that needed doing and got the job done.

003 Bernie Mason shared that same commitment. A Vietnam veteran and former president of both the Rosewood RSL subbranch and the Rosewood Lions Club, Bernie dedicated so much of his life to supporting veterans, their families and the wider Rosewood community. People like Trevor and Bernie remind us that strong communities are built by people willing to give their time and look after one another.

This Saturday we will celebrate another remarkable local legacy at Haigslea State School, which marks its 150th anniversary. For a century and a half, generations of students, teachers, staff, families and volunteers have contributed to the story of this wonderful little school. It is an extraordinary milestone and a chance to celebrate not only the history of Haigslea State School but also the community that has supported it for 150 years. I look forward to joining them this Saturday.

To everyone who has been part of the Haigslea State School story: congratulations on 150 years. To all of the volunteers and community organisations across Ipswich West: thank you for everything that you do.

Barron River Electorate

 **Ms JAMES** (Barron River—LNP) (11.20 pm): It has been 22 months of getting things done for Far North Queensland, and tonight I want to highlight seven things that the LNP Crisafulli government are delivering for Far North Queensland. First, we are taking the next step towards having the strongest bail laws in the country. These reforms will mean that if an offender, or one of these recalcitrants, breaches bail and commits another Adult Crime, Adult Time offence they will face a mandatory minimum sentence of 12 months in jail.

Second, we are investing in police resources. We have recruited 364 new police officers across Far North Queensland, and our investment in the Polair helicopter has been invaluable in responding

to crime and emergencies, including the successful searches for a missing 10-year-old boy in Edmonton and an 87-year-old woman in Kewarra.

Third, we are finally seeing major tourism and recreation projects moving forward. We have celebrated sod turns and our government's first sand turn on Double Island, where a new resort, bar and upgraded jetty will come to life with Chris Morris and the Morris Group after Labor left that island to rot for a decade. Chris, we cannot wait to see what you do with Double Island.

Stage 2 of the Wangetti Trail is also finally underway. The tourism minister and I turned the sod last week and World Trail and Contour Works will deliver stage 2 over the next 12 months, following extensive community consultation. The Smithfield Mountain Bike Park continues towards construction, with the master plan released, and Earl Hill is finally getting its missing link, with a new Trinity Beach trailhead. There are a lot of happy hikers and bikers in Far North Queensland.

Fourth, we are transforming the Cairns Courthouse. The refurbishment and mould remediation is underway, with stage 1 of this \$19.3 million redevelopment delivering dedicated children's and domestic violence courtrooms and safe spaces for victim-survivors. That fresh look reflects our government's fresh focus on reducing crime and getting justice for victims after Labor's neglect on all fronts.

Fifth, we are delivering reforms to live music. Queensland's first Nightlife Economy Action Plan will support venues and performers and cut unnecessary barriers. I am particularly proud that the advocacy of the 900 Cairns musicians, venues and music lovers who signed my petition helped to get sound regulations and other reforms moving. I thank the Attorney-General, Minister O'Connor and the Night-Life Economy Commissioner for their hard work in this space.

Sixth, we are investing \$1 billion in the Cairns Hospital. A new 32-bed ward has opened, with more facilities and staff to come, giving Far North Queensland the hospital it needs and deserves.

Seventh, we have announced that the T20 Gold Clash is coming to Cairns in November. This is Australia's first event of its kind and it will bring sporting stars to our region, including Ash Barty, JT, Uzzy and Joel Selwood.

There are so many other projects, but I do not have time to mention them. I am incredibly proud of what has been committed to, started and delivered in just 22 months, and there is a lot more to do. This is what delivering for Far North Queensland looks like.

National Meals on Wheels Day; Narangba Valley State High School

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (11.23 pm): It is National Meals on Wheels Day. It is not midnight yet, so we have just scraped in. I rise tonight on National Meals on Wheels Day to congratulate the Queensland branch and my local branch—Meals on Wheels Moreton Bay, which operates across Bribie Island, Pine Rivers, Caboolture, Burpengary and Samford and has roots going back to 1974.

As I am a past president of our local Meals on Wheels organisation, it will always hold a special place in my heart. Today they now operate as a Moreton Bay hub. They support 657 clients, with around 370 volunteers helping to deliver more than 154,000 meals a year. Meals on Wheels Queensland is supporting communities in 141 other locations across the state.

I recently spoke in this place about volunteers and the extraordinary contribution they make to our community and to our economy. If anyone watching this at home has time and wants to give back, please consider volunteering for Meals on Wheels. You get to catch up with some amazing people. It truly is more than just a meal. If you do not have time to volunteer but want to support Meals on Wheels, there is a book you can buy or gift featuring volunteer stories and a collection of recipes. Head to the website and find out more at qmow.org.

I know there were gatherings across Queensland today, including in Burpengary, and there is a gala dinner tonight celebrating our 70 years of Meals on Wheels. I had to be here today, so I ask the House to join me in thanking the volunteers of Kurwongbah, and every Meals on Wheels service across all of our electorates, for 70 years of extraordinary community care. I am sure we can all agree that Meals on Wheels transcends politics, making a difference every day with a meal and some community connection and kindness. Our Meals on Wheels would be doing even better if the election commitment from the LNP had been given in a lump sum instead of spaced over four years—which has not really helped them a great deal at all.

I also wanted to provide a quick update on our campaign to get Narangba Valley State High School students home on Wednesday afternoons when school finishes early. We are taking the campaign to the next level, as the sheer volume of students flooding the local shopping centre on

Wednesdays while they wait for buses is causing fear in our community and for our local businesses. It is becoming harder to keep students safe, with some bad eggs causing trouble and intimidating the good kids. Good kids can make bad choices to shoplift or bully when they are bored.

The police bring the police beat whenever they can, but I ask: is that the best use of police resources when a little bit of bus funding could solve the whole problem? I do not think so, and now I want to hear from the wider community. Narangba Valley residents can expect to see a flyer in their letterbox over coming weeks asking them to sign a petition. The minister continues to ignore my calls and those from the school, the police and Kangaroo Bus Lines. Let's see if he can disregard thousands of community voices that we are hearing from as well.

Book Week; Burleigh Heads, Library

 **Mr VORSTER** (Burleigh—LNP) (11.26 pm): Tonight I rise during Book Week, a much loved and cherished event on the Queensland academic calendar when students in junior and senior schools connect with the written word. I want to take the opportunity to thank the Premier for continuing to sow into another tradition, which is of course the Premier's Reading Challenge—one that my youngest son, Maxwell, is quite enamoured with. He takes every opportunity to print as many sheets as he can to try to win the classroom competition. It is not just my son who is passionate about the competition of course. Children right across the Burleigh electorate are doing the same.

I want to take the opportunity to recognise Mr Kerry Sutton from Caningeraba State School. He is a year 4 teacher doing amazing things to engender a love of literature with his students. I have spoken about Mr Sutton before in this place, but I do it again on this occasion to demonstrate and highlight a continuing pattern of wonderful teaching by Mr Sutton.

I find it a little bit ironic though that at the same time I rise to speak about Book Week and the benefits that reading can have for young people my local council has taken the decision to close the Burleigh Heads branch library. They did so without any community consultation. They did so behind closed doors. They did so with what I believe is the most flimsy of arguments. Just prior to the adoption of the City of Gold Coast budget, the city revealed that they would close the Burleigh Heads branch library because it enjoys the lowest patronage in the library network, but of course the Burleigh Heads branch library has been at the epicentre of light rail construction for a number of years. That community deserves some time to recover, to rediscover its library and to see it continue.

Mr Stevens: It's a long way from Burleigh Waters.

Mr VORSTER: I take the interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. I make the point that this is the only branch library on the light rail network, so it is not just the library for Burleigh Heads but the library for so much of the Gold Coast. Council must reverse its decision. I urge all Gold Coast City councillors to back in my petition, a petition that I launched to save the library, not just to save the library but to protect public land in that precinct for the benefit of future generations. I want to thank the 3,400 locals who backed in that petition and local councillors Josh Martin, Nick Marshall and Dan Doran, who are supporting the campaign as well.

005

Tzu Chi Integrative Community Health and Wellness Centre

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (11.29 pm): Tonight I rise to speak about the Tzu Chi Community Integrative Health and Wellness Centre with a hint of sadness at a time when the LNP have been cutting funding to community services, housing and funding to domestic violence services. On a more positive note, we have in my electorate an inspiring initiative and service that fills the gap for disadvantaged community members.

On 7 March 2026 I had the privilege of attending the opening of the Tzu Chi Integrative Community Health and Wellness Centre in Salisbury. I have a longstanding association with Patrick Lu, deputy director of the Brisbane chapter of the Tzu Chi Foundation, and have seen firsthand the meaningful support this organisation provides to our community. Tzu Chi means compassion and relief, values clearly reflected in this remarkable facility. The Salisbury centre is a welcoming hub dedicated to strengthening community resilience. It supports individuals and families experiencing hardship through charitable programs while also fostering connection and wellbeing through activities such as tea ceremonies, flower arranging and yoga. Importantly, the centre works closely with not-for-profit partners, and through an agreement with the Brisbane City Council it will serve as a designated emergency shelter during times of disaster, ensuring it plays a vital role both in everyday community life and in times of crisis.

Operated by the Tzu Chi Foundation Australia, the centre represents an holistic model of care. Under the guidance of principle dentist Dr Alice Lu, it delivers services to vulnerable patients, including children with autism, people with complex needs and older Australians. Dr Alice Lu's leadership is especially inspiring. She has volunteered since the age of 16, and this year marks 30 years of service. At one point she even closed her own dental practice to focus on volunteering. In 2022 she was awarded the Australian Dental Association's Distinguished Service Award. Beyond clinical care, the centre provides wraparound support to improve overall wellbeing. The work is grounded in Tzu Chi's four missions: charity, medicine, education and culture, ensuring that all who enter are met with care, dignity and hope. Tzu Chi's contribution to Queensland is longstanding.

Hendy, Mr L; Hooker, Ms A

 **Mrs POOLE** (Mundingburra—LNP) (11.32 pm): We love sport in Townsville. We love playing sport and we love watching sport. We have produced some of the world's best sports men and women, and I rise to speak tonight about two amazing Townsville para athletes who have just proudly represented Australia at the recent Glasgow Commonwealth Games: Lindsey Hendy and Ainsley Hooker.

Lindsey grew up in Townsville. He was passionate about sport from a very young age. His journey started as a five-year-old when he lined up for the Challenge Games in Townsville. This year more than 1,200 young people came together in Townsville for the annual two-day Challenge Games, celebrating inclusion, participation and friendship for school-age children from prep to year 12 with disabilities and additional needs. This is where Lindsey discovered a love of running and athletics that would go on to shape the rest of his life. He joined the North Star Little Athletics Club in Townsville, and at the tender age of 16 he earned his first spot on an Australian representative team. Lindsey proudly made his Australian Commonwealth Games debut in Glasgow last month, where he completed in the long jump T20, going on to record a best jump of 5.48 metres in wet conditions. Congratulations, Lindsey!

006 Just last Sunday, at the North Queensland Defence Community Sports Expo, I had the pleasure of catching up with Ainsley Hooker. Ainsley is an Australian Army veteran who sustained structural damage to her ankle and foot and after years of unsuccessful surgeries and constant pain made the decision in 2020 to amputate. For Ainsley, her love of sport never died and this was just the start of her journey as a para-athlete. She went on to represent Team Australia in the 2023 Invictus Games, and last month Ainsley also represented Australia in seated shot put, F57, at the Glasgow Commonwealth Games. Both Ainsley and Lindsey are North Queensland para-athletes who turned their disabilities into an opportunity to compete on the world stage.

For the first time under our government, Townsville hosted YouFor2032 para-athlete testing just last month. This gave young people with a disability in North Queensland the opportunity to access face-to-face talent testing close to home. I witnessed the joy and determination on the faces of all who attended, but it will be the pride on the faces of the family members that will stay with me. We heard from our sports minister in the chamber today that our government is providing opportunities for kids with disabilities, with nearly 2,500 clubs signed up to the \$250 Play On! sports vouchers offering disability programs. There has been a 33 per cent increase in the number of children with a disability who have received those vouchers. I have no doubt the achievements will inspire the next generation of homegrown para-athletes to dream big and follow in their footsteps.

Energy, Infrastructure

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (11.35 pm): As the debate on the critical minerals bill was guillotined, I am going to take this opportunity to table our amendments relating to the protection of prime ag land which would have helped to improve that bill.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation (Critical Minerals) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2026, amendments circulated by Mr Robbie Katter.

I want to speak tonight about a recent announcement made by Evolution Mining for the Ernest Henry mine at Cloncurry. APA recently announced an agreement with Evolution for a \$259 million investment to build a 72-megawatt solar farm with a 104-megawatt battery. That is what happens when you do not build CopperString. We have little Eva now building a diesel-fired generator. They have access to base load power, but with the rising cost of diesel and all the risks associated with it, their best option is still a diesel-fired generator for power.

Ernest Henry are now saying that they will have to build a makeshift solar plant. It will be substandard supply for them but they have to do it because the government is not giving them a date for CopperString. They were originally told it would be delivered in 2030, but they have now had to make these plans. This is what happens when the government does not act. It is good that the Premier and the Treasurer have said they are going to build it, but it is a bit useless unless they can say when it will be done. It could be 20 years or 30 years, but we need to know when.

Everyone gets excited about critical minerals. It is a great slogan and it is great to talk about. I am not against critical minerals, but let us not forget what the big ones are in Queensland. Our base metals are copper, silver, lead and zinc, with coal being the biggest brother of them all. There is no doubt that we will find out in five or 10 years that coal royalties are being eroded from the inside. It is like termites in a house. Those coal royalties are eating away at the long-term viability of that industry. We are not seeing the acute issue so much now, but we will really feel it in 10 or 15 years.

We need to look after the coal first, watch that, and the base metals need energy pricing. The grid price the other week was \$60 a megawatt hour. Most offers out in the North West Minerals Province from the baseload station are over \$300 a megawatt hour. I heard a story the other day of someone being offered only \$600 a megawatt hour. We can now see why they are building diesel-fired generators and turning to solar. Those base metal mines do not exist unless we provide cheap, reliable power like through CopperString. We cannot reprioritise Olympic stadiums and other things over that, because we will not be able to pay for it if we do not have the industry still running to do it.

I urge the government to commit not just to if they are going to build it but when it is going to be built. At the moment it is an open-ended timeline that could mean 10 or 20 years. Building it to only Hughenden favours a wind farm; it does not build industry that is critically needed in this state.

007

Rotary Youth Driver Awareness Program

 **Mr BAROUNIS** (Maryborough—LNP) (11.38 pm): I rise tonight to inform the House of a wonderful project that Rotary Clubs across the Fraser Coast organise and run annually in an attempt to save fatalities on our roads. This project is called the Rotary Youth Driver Awareness program, RYDA. The RYDA program has been developed by Road Safety Education and is organised locally by a committee including representatives from the following four local Rotary Clubs: the Maryborough City Rotary Club, the Maryborough Sunrise Rotary Club, Hervey Bay Sunrise Rotary Club and the Hervey Bay City Rotary Club. Of course, there were other facilitators and the Queensland Police Service.

The RYDA program has successfully been held in Maryborough since 2010 at the Maryborough Showgrounds. This is a day-long program comprising six interactive half-hour sessions each day and runs for a full week in early August every year. This year RYDA was attended by 994 year 10 students, 85 teachers, 126 volunteers who contributed over 840 volunteer hours and 12 facilitators who delivered a total of 180 sessions. Overall, just over 66 per cent of year 10 students in the region attended. The RYDA workshop sessions included titles such as Speed and Stopping, Drive SOS, Drive So Others Survive, the 'I' in Drive, Road Choices, Crash Investigators and Mind Matters.

Over recent years, our local police have been adamant that the RYDA program has been a major factor in our area having the state's lowest road fatalities in the under 25 year age group. Grants and sponsorships that RSE and the local Rotary Clubs receive enable RYDA to be offered at no cost to the students or schools. The current funding commitment by the Department of Transport and Main Roads is about to end and the continuation of this program needs to be considered. By working together, this program is actively reducing fatalities and road trauma not just for the under-25s but for the whole community.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.41 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