



Speech By
Hon. Meaghan Scanlon

MEMBER FOR GAVEN

Record of Proceedings, 18 November 2025

GAMING MACHINE AMENDMENT REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Hon. MAJ SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (5.21 pm): I will keep my contribution relatively short, but I did want to start responding to the disallowance motion moved by the member for Maiwar by just calling out some hypocrisy on this. I heard him talk about gambling donors. I think it is important that this House notes that the Greens political party have entered this debate to moralise on an issue on which they do not have a leg to stand on. So far in this year alone, the Greens political party in Queensland have received \$555,000 from a professional gambler. That is just this year alone, so over half a million dollars has flowed directly from people whose income is derived from gambling activity to the Greens political party. The Greens political party come in here and consistently position themselves as the moral compass on gambling reform, lecturing others about harm minimisation and influence, yet their own bank accounts tell a very different story. I should note for the purposes of the House that it is in this year alone that they received that \$550,000; there are other donations in other years.

Everyone in this chamber knows that harm reduction in the gambling space is absolutely vital. It is something that impacts families, communities and individuals right across our state, and that is exactly why I make it a priority to meet and speak with people on the ground who are implementing harm minimisation strategies every single day. Unlike the Attorney-General and the member for Maiwar, neither of whom were at the Relationships Australia launch of Gambling Harm Awareness Week, I actually rocked up and listened to Relationships Australia and all of those community organisations speak about the harm minimisation measures they are rolling out in their communities. If there is one thing we can all agree on it is that harm minimisation, both in this space and, frankly, in other spaces like pill testing and other areas, is incredibly important.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. We are here to debate a disallowance motion in relation to the tax. I ask the member to come back—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McDonald): Thanks, Attorney-General. Member for Gaven, it is a valid point of order. We are here to debate a disallowance motion. If you could confine your contribution to that, it would be appreciated.

Ms SCANLON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The disallowance motion is in relation to a regulation change to extend a trial which does create revenue and some of that revenue is used for harm minimisation measures, so I think that is relevant. I appreciate that the Attorney-General might not think it is relevant, particularly given she was not at that event, but I think it is relevant.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member knows clearly, because she was at the event, that I sent a videorecorded message because I was on leave, so I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Attorney-General. Personal offence has been taken. Member for Gaven, will you withdraw, please.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw. I heard firsthand about the measures that local clubs and communities are implementing in my electorate and in other areas across the state.

An honourable member interjected.

Ms SCANLON: I was not on leave, no; I was there.

Mrs Frecklington: No, I was in Mount Isa.

Ms SCANLON: Apologies.

Mrs Frecklington: Yes, thank you.

Ms SCANLON: I am sorry, and I take the Attorney-General's interjection: she was not on leave, but she was not at that event. Either way, I was the only one at the event listening to clubs—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Given I sent a video message, it could be argued that she was the only one there—and that is not the feedback I heard about her attendance—but I take personal offence and I ask the member to withdraw.

Ms SCANLON: I withdraw. I was the only member of parliament present at the event. I heard firsthand about the measures the local clubs and communities are implementing—practical, real-world strategies designed to reduce harm, to support vulnerable people and to ensure gambling environments are safer for Queenslanders. We heard from a number of people with lived experience as well, and I want to thank them for bravely sharing their stories—quite difficult stories to share with a group of people—in order to ensure they improve harm minimisation in Queensland.

While the Greens political party might choose to come in here with symbolic gestures, I think what we need is actual action and investment in harm reduction measures. That is something we all agree with. While the Greens might come in here and preach about integrity, transparency and the evils of gambling influence, their financial statements tell a story of contradiction and convenience—a story where the Greens' public-facing righteousness is funded by private gambling profits. Frankly, I think Queenslanders deserve honesty and consistency.

The Treasurer has outlined some of the analysis undertaken by Treasury, but I also think it is important to note that this is not increasing the number of authorities that are being provided. This is a trial and so we look forward to seeing the detail of that trial, but what I will not accept is the Greens political party coming in here and being superior over everyone else when in fact they are receiving political donations from people who benefit solely, effectively, from gambling themselves.