




Speech By
Robbie Katter

MEMBER FOR TRAEGER

Record of Proceedings, 12 June 2024

MOTION

Emissions Targets

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (4.28 pm): I move—

That this House:

- (a) acknowledges that Queensland contributes less than 0.4 per cent of global emissions;
- (b) acknowledges that recently legislated emissions targets are costing everyday Queenslanders more during a cost-of-living crisis; and
- (c) takes all necessary steps to reverse the 75 per cent emissions targets agreed to by both sides of the House.

KAP stands in this House to reject the view commonly held by both sides of this House that we will save the world through addressing climate change, that it is our responsibility to do that and that it should be done no matter the cost. A \$60 billion plan is a big cost to address an ideological pursuit. Everyone will say, 'Look at the science.' It is an interesting thing to consider, and we have said it before in this House. I was told to look at the science when it comes to vegetation management, but it was completely flawed. We were told to look at the science when it comes to the reef, but two years in a row the science showed there was record coral cover on the Great Barrier Reef. Meanwhile, here we were hearing in debate that we should go and see it before it dies, that we have to rescue it and that we need to do everything possible—sending financial shock waves through the economy and affecting the people who can least afford it to pay—to address this perceived global environmental threat.

A lot of Queenslanders reject this notion. The KAP rejects it. There are a lot of battlers out there who say, 'I'm not sure I buy this. A lot of academics and people in the city keep telling us this is a problem, but I'm not sure I buy it.' Let's assume you are paying a levy or that some component of your power bill is used to pay for this climate pursuit of renewables. The people who can least afford it are the poorer people and the working class. They are saying, 'We're not sure we can afford this.' A rich person can afford the big power bill and to have that wedge on top of them, but everyone is made to pay this.

There is enormous hypocrisy. For over 10 years the KAP has been saying in this House, 'Let's have an ethanol mandate'—to clean the air, to stimulate agricultural production, to give us fuel security—but one of the inadvertent effects of ethanol use is a reduction in tailpipe emissions by 25 to 30 per cent. Pursuing an effective mandate—63 other countries in the world have it—would reduce emissions from petrol cars by 25 to 30 per cent, but when it comes to enforcing that we hear that it is too hard. We are constantly told, 'We can't force drivers. There is a mandate,' but no fines have been issued. We cannot force that, but we can force it when it comes to power prices.

This debate is not about me and my household power bill, but my bill is over 10 grand a year now in Mount Isa. I have a three-acre block. I do not have a bore; I have a pressure pump. Other people in Breakaway pay over 10 grand. In 2019 I was paying about four grand. What has happened in that

period? Did we double the number of Ergon workers in Western Queensland? No, we did not do that. Did we build another big transmission line? No, we did not do that. We have pursued renewables. That is the big thing that has happened—but it has had nothing to do with my power bill going from four grand to 10 grand? You are going to tell everyone in Queensland that is the truth. It is rubbish. It is impacting. It must.

You cannot re-create the generation capacity out there and the transmission powerlines. I will ward off any discussion in this debate. CopperString does a lot more than connect renewables; it connects mining that can pay for it and creates royalties in this state. It does a lot more than just connect renewables, so it does not fit that category. You cannot replicate transmission substations and other infrastructure without it having an impact. It must have an impact.

This is an ideological pursuit, so own it. I accept that the government will own it, but everyone in the room—the opposition and the government—must own it, be honest with voters and say, 'We are pursuing this. It is going to cost you. It will hurt you, but if you want to save the planet, that's good. You're paying for it through your electricity bill.' Let's be honest before this election. Let it be known in this House who stands on which side of the argument. That is the important issue for this debate.

(Time expired)