

Thursday 23 August 2018

The Speaker, **Ms Hickey**, took the Chair at 10 a.m. and read Prayers.

RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Madam SPEAKER - Honourable members, I draw your attention to the presence in the gallery of grades 5 and 6 from Scottsdale Primary School. Welcome to Parliament.

Members - Hear, hear.

QUESTIONS

Ms Martine Haley - Circumstances of Termination of Employment

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.04 a.m.]

On 6 March you said that your senior adviser, Martine Haley, had offered you her resignation over her central role in trolling Ms Angela Williamson in a clear effort to expose her to her employer, Cricket Tasmania. You said:

Today I have accepted the resignation of Martine Haley, a senior adviser in my office.

Ms Haley offered her resignation following an inappropriate email she sent, which I have made clear was totally unacceptable.

Can you confirm that that statement is correct? Madam Speaker, I will be seeking to table this document at the end of question time.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I have repeatedly said that Ms Haley's behaviour was unacceptable and that her actions cost her the opportunity to continue in her employment with my Government. As I said in Estimates, Ms Haley received the entitlements under her contract, which was not renewed. I find it interesting that Labor is going down this path, notwithstanding what happened in their own patch, for example, as to why staff who resigned after the election and finished their contracts received entitlements under their contract. For example, it was reported on 16 March in the *Mercury* that Labor would shed several advisers including former Southern Cross political adviser, Alex Johnston, who resigned. This is a little awkward for the Leader of the Opposition because yesterday -

Mr BACON - Point of order, Madam Speaker. The first point to make is that Alex Johnston did not resign in disgrace. The question was about whether the Premier accepted Martine Haley's resignation. Did you accept the resignation or not, Premier? Answer the question.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you. Premier, it would be good if you stick to the question, please.

Mr Bacon - Answer the question. Did you accept the resignation?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon.

Mr HODGMAN - This is why I said it is a little awkward for the Opposition. Yesterday their Leader was saying that a resignation would not result in a payout, yet that is exactly what has emerged happened with your staff. It goes to show again that lazy politics -

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Premier, thank you. We have got off to a very bad start. We are only a few minutes into question time and it is already very unruly.

Mr Bacon - Did you accept it or not?

Madam SPEAKER - Mr Bacon, please do not make me have to warn you. You will be my first. Thank you.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, I can see why he is embarrassed on behalf of his Leader. It shows the lazy politics of the Opposition, with no plans or substance, and their hypocrisy has again been exposed. As I said yesterday, the payment of entitlements for staff who do not receive a new contract after an election is calculated -

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 45. The question was quite precise and did not contain a long preamble. It was not a lengthy question. We want to know whether or not the Premier told the truth when he said, 'I have accepted the resignation of Martine Haley, a senior advisor in my office', on 6 March.

Madam SPEAKER - Yes, it was a concise question. Could we have a concise answer please, Premier?

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, if I can conclude the sentence that I was part-way through which goes to this point, as I said yesterday, payment of entitlements to staff who do not receive a new contract after an election is calculated and processed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. I spoke to Ms Haley on 6 March, at which point she advised me of her intention to resign and not seek a new contract. I accepted this, as it accorded with my view that she would not be offered a new contract due to her actions.

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker. This really is beyond the pale. It was a very clear question. From his weasel-type answer he is trying to avoid answering it by throwing up this smokescreen of ministerial and government staffers moving in and out of government or opposition.

Madam SPEAKER - I am going to disallow that because we have had three points of order on the same subject. Premier, I urge you to wind up as soon as you can.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, I am answering the question they asked. They do this thing where they jump up and say, 'You are not answering, you are not answering'. They are not listening to what I am saying.

As I have said very clearly, I spoke to Ms Haley who advised me of her intention to resign and not seek a new contract. I accepted this, as it accorded with my view that she would not be offered a new contract due to her actions. I did not have -

Mr Bacon - So you accepted the resignation.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. You are going to rob yourselves of time today and embarrass the parliament in front of our young students up there if we do not have a bit more decorum, because I will suspend the House for five minutes and rob people of question time. It is important that we get through as many questions as we possibly can.

Ms Martine Haley - Circumstances of Termination of Employment

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.09 a.m.]

On 25 June you told the parliamentary Estimates committee in response to a question about Ms Haley, and I quote:

There was a staff member who it was discovered had behaved inappropriately with respect to the use of social media during the election campaign, but that was an isolated incident. The staff member concerned had made an important contribution to government over many years but her contract was not renewed following the state election.

Can you confirm that statement is correct? It is different from what you said on 6 March. I will be tabling this as well at the end of question time.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I have said very clearly in this place what happened with respect to this matter. I have outlined and was in the process of doing so when subjected to constant interjection about Ms Haley advising me of her intention to resign and not seeking a new contract. I accepted it, as it accorded with my view that she should not be offered a new contract due to her actions, which I considered unacceptable.

I did not have the power to compel Ms Haley to formally resign sooner than the expiry of her contract. My advice is that if I terminated her employment, she would not have been entitled to the same severance pay as under her contract. She was entitled - as were staff whose employment was ceased by Labor and the Greens - as was appropriately calculated by the Department of Premier and Cabinet, not by me.

Recreational Shooting in Protected Areas

Ms O'CONNOR question to MINISTER for PARKS, Mr HODGMAN

[10.10 a.m.]

Yesterday, in yet another sop to the gun lobby, your Minister for Primary Industries and Water announced that recreational shooters would be allowed into protected areas, including the

Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. Do you understand why this announcement has sent a shudder down the spines of Tasmanians who enjoy our national parks and want to feel safe in them? Do you have advice from the Parks and Wildlife Service to support this shooter free-for-all inside protected areas?

What role will the Parks and Wildlife Service play in ensuring public safety and the protection of native species? Why have you not, as Minister for Parks, resisted this redneck move and instead, if you acknowledge feral deer are a problem, implemented a proper Parks and Wildlife Service aerial cull rather than allowing private gun owners in, threatening public safety and native wildlife that have, until now, found sanctuary from shooters inside our protected areas.

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. I welcome the opportunity to speak about how we need to get on with the job of doing something for our state, unlike members opposite, and look to how we better manage deer, game and browsing animals. We are already managing wild deer on farmland and in sensitive and environmental areas outside of the traditional deer range, including in our parks and reserves.

The Parks and Wildlife Service has been providing recreational access to shoot deer on reserve land for some time, including under the Labor-Greens minority government. This was happening when you were in government. If you did not like it so much then, why did you not do something about it? Hunting is allowed on game reserves, some regional reserves and conservation areas. Hunting for deer is now explicitly allowed under the 2016 Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area Management Plan. That went through an unprecedented level of public consultation and was approved by both the Australian Government and accepted by the World Heritage Committee. Similar arrangements already exist in other countries, like New Zealand, and in other states.

Ms O'Connor - Did you hear about that woman in New Zealand who was shot in the head by a shooter in a national park?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr HODGMAN - These permits are, and will only be issued to, appropriately licensed registered shooters. Permits in parks and reserves will be limited to designated areas away from those areas frequented by visitors and informed by the statewide deer population census. The new Tasmanian Game Council and Parks and Wildlife Service will work together to determine which additional parks and reserves are best suited for the issuing of hunting permits.

Our policy and our approach is entirely consistent with the recommendation of the Legislative Council into wild fallow deer; to eradicate deer populations in the World Heritage and other areas classified as conservation land, with consideration given to recreational hunters as a resource. It is a balanced approach. It is supported by farmers, hunters and rural communities. Our new Tasmanian Game Council has been warmly received. It is also being supported by Bob Brown, members might be interested to know.

Members interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - In June 2016, Bob Brown, in his submission to the Legislative Council -

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker, on relevance. The Premier is being misleading. Bob Brown supported aerial culling from helicopters, administered by Parks. Not a shooter free-for-all.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you for that point of order.

Mr HODGMAN - As to the point of order, if I can provide Ms O'Connor with what Bob Brown said, so she is fully informed of what her spiritual leader believes on this matter -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. The Premier will be heard in total silence until we hear the end of his answer, which I hope will be soon.

Mr HODGMAN - It will be, Madam Speaker. In response to the point of order, this is what Bob Brown previously said in relation to the shooting of wild deer. He said, 'Helicopter culling is a best available option for Tasmania,'. By November 2016, Bob Brown, in an ABC news piece, had changed his mind. I am not sure why. Perhaps he had talked to recreational hunters. He said -

They've got a lot of experience and felt that culling deer at ground level would be a more effective way.

It did prove effective in maintaining numbers, reducing numbers in New Zealand once they get into forest country. I think all of those options need to be looked at.

That is what Bob Brown said about what we need to do now to properly manage this issue. I suggest if the Leader of the Greens has any issues, she should take them up with Bob Brown.

Public Sector Wages

Mr BROOKS question to TREASURER, Mr GUTWEIN

[10.15 a.m.]

Can the Treasurer update the House on the Government's position on public sector wages and is he aware of any alternative policies?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member, Mr Brooks, for his question and his interest in this very important issue. The job application from the member that sits opposite is ongoing, it is incessant. You will have to make the move. You are finally starting to hear me on that issue.

Tasmania has exceptional public servants. They are delivering the Government's agenda on jobs, economic growth, infrastructure investment and they are delivering outcomes, including better health education and public safety and other services. They deserve to be paid well and they are.

Since we have been elected, public sector wages have increased well in excess of inflation, on average. Tasmania's public servants have more spending power now than when we were first

elected and the ABS data backs it up. Last week, the ABS released its wages price index and it showed wages in Tasmania rose by an average of 2.5 per cent, both public and private, over the last financial year. That means the economy is growing, jobs are being created, and businesses are more confident. In 2017-18, when assessed under the wage price index, public sector wages grew by 2.6 per cent, on average. That is the second highest growth rate in the country.

There has been no detriment to recruitment with our 2 per cent wages policy. We recruited more than 370 nurses, 90 doctors, 50 ambulance staff and we have nearly 400 more staff in schools, including teachers and support staff. One of the reasons public sector wages are growing this fast is because public sector workers receive the benefit of a guaranteed 2 per cent rise each year, and many receive additional pay rises after each 12 months. These increments mean many public servants receive pay rises well in excess of 2 per cent and even higher than the 2.6 per cent average. We believe a 2 per cent wage policy is the best policy because it is fair, affordable and it is in line with cost-of-living increases.

We understand whilst increases for politicians are set independently, concerns have been raised about the increase of 2.5 per cent in line with the wage price index flagged for this year. Whilst lower than the average increase public servants received last year, it is still higher than government wages policy. There has been public discussion about this. The Government has heard that discussion and we have listened to those arguments. The parliamentary Liberal Party has considered our position and we have decided Liberal members of parliament will only receive a 2 per cent pay rise in line with government policy. While the Government maintains that politicians' pay should be set independently, we believe it is important members of parliament set the example, noting we strongly believe our wages policy of 2 per cent is reasonable, fair and, importantly, it is affordable. This side of the House calls on that side of the House to support this decision and only accept a 2 per cent pay rise.

Ms White - You took more than that last time.

Ms O'Byrne - How much did you take last time?

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr GUTWEIN - I was asked if there were any alternative wage policies. Mr O'Byrne has been listening to me. Complaining is not a policy, whingeing is not a platform. He understands that. Those opposite only believe in bigger deficits, higher debt and the collapse in business confidence. They do not have a wages policy. They understand that every 1 per cent increase above the government wages policy would add to the bottom line an additional \$28 million. That means we would be able to employ fewer nurses, teachers and doctors.

They are prepared to offer the unions a blank cheque on steroids. They have no policy. 'Whatever you want', has been Labor's position. They have no labour policy. That would take us back to the -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Could we have some courtesy for the speaker, please.

Mr GUTWEIN - that would take us back to the days of 2010 to 2014 where we had cumulative deficits of \$1.1 billion across the forward Estimates and the net debt rising to more than

\$400 million. It would take us back into recession. That is what the other side delivered when they were in government.

Labor's blank cheque on wages policy -

Mr O'Byrne - On steroids.

Mr GUTWEIN - I am glad you have heard that because that is exactly the position you have taken. You have no wages policy, which means that you will accept whatever is put to you. That would drive the Budget back into deficit. It would take us back into net debt. It would take us back to those dark days of 2010 to 2014 where business confidence was collapsing.

Ms Martine Haley - Circumstances of Termination of Employment

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.22 a.m.]

Yesterday you told this House in relation to Ms Haley:

There is no doubt that Ms Haley was prepared to resign, offered her resignation, but her contract was not renewed. That is why her employment terminated, as I have told you ...

Is that statement correct? Or do you want to change your statement again?

ANSWER

No, thank you. I want to stick to the facts so that you understand them.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - I will be up and down all day, I do not care. We are all going to behave and we are going to be our best selves.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, I will stick to the facts, as I have said on a number of occasions. Ms Haley did not continue her employment with my Government after behaviour, which I and I am sure all reasonable people would consider totally unacceptable, came to light.

Recreational Shooting in Protected Areas

Ms O'CONNOR question to MINISTER for PRIMARY INDUSTRIES and WATER, Ms COURTNEY

[10.23 a.m.]

Your desire to appease the powerful gun lobby after the backflip on changes to gun laws was evident yesterday with your announcement shooters will be allowed into more national parks and reserves. We understand this is not about invasive species management, it is about hunting.

Mr Gutwein - Bob wants to shoot them from helicopters.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. I remind people that insults are to be traded through the Chair.

Ms O'CONNOR - Bob Brown called for proper invasive species management, not a shooter free-for-all in parks.

Was the announcement made out of concern about feral deer who have escaped from an industry your Government supports and funds, or was it simply to throw shooters a bone? What is your department doing to tackle the real problem here, a Government sponsored deer hunting industry that places the recreational interests of shooters over the protection of Tasmania's national parks and natural environment?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I am somewhat confused by the member's question because we are taking steps to protect our wild areas in Tasmania.

Ms O'Connor - No, you are not. It is about the hunters. It is not invasive species management.

Ms COURTNEY - As was outlined by the Premier earlier, it is consistent with the recommendation of the Legislative Council inquiry into wild fallow deer, which recommended 'eradicate deer populations in World Heritage and other areas classified as conservation land and consideration given to recreational hunters as a resource'. What do you suggest we do? Ignore the recommendations of the upper House?

We discussed this last year. We had a comprehensive response to the inquiry last year. It is a balanced approach that is supported by the wider industry. It is also supported by Bob Brown. An article from the ABC in 2016 says that Dr Brown wants a group set up to look after the problem. That is what I did yesterday: the Tasmanian Game Council. They are responding to what they want so we put in process, science and research. If the Greens do not like the response, they complain. Furthermore, Dr Brown went on to say that we should conduct more research into numbers. Ms O'Connor, that is exactly what we are doing - \$150 000 into a census to have the facts to address this.

Members interjecting.

Ms COURTNEY - They tie themselves in knots over there. We are listening to the facts; we are listening to the science. We know that they do not like it; we know they only like process when it gives them the results they want. This is another example. It has been completely supported by their ideological leader, Dr Bob Brown -

Ms O'Connor interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Ms O'Connor, you have the honour of being the first person warned in my speakership.

Ms COURTNEY - Madam Speaker, the Premier earlier said we want to put some facts on the table. The Parks and Wildlife Service has been providing recreational shooters access to shoot on reserved land for some time, including under them. The rhetoric, the fear and the lies they want to

spread shows they are clearly playing politics because this was something that was allowed under them. Hunting deer is now explicitly allowed under the 2016 Tasmanian World Heritage and Wilderness Area Management Plan that went through consultation. They just do not like it when they do not get the answer they like.

We will do this appropriately. Hunters will only be permitted if they are appropriately licensed and registered. We will work with the Tasmanian Game Council and Parks and Wildlife to determine the most appropriate areas. We are responding to the needs of the environment; we are responding to the needs of farmers, and we are responding to the needs of recreational hunters in Tasmania. It is a legitimate pastime of Tasmanians and we will defend the pastime of Tasmanians. We have seen that in the past few days in what we have announced. We are supporting the game council and our farmers because we understand that farmers across Tasmania have increasing pressure. We have heard that from the TFGA and other stakeholders. The Greens want to ignore what is happening in the community. They want to ignore their stakeholders. We will continue to listen.

Dr Woodruff - We are listening to our stakeholders. We understand what is on your cooked up council.

Ms COURTNEY - I suggest, as Dr Woodruff is yelling out, that she should listen to Bob Brown because we are doing exactly what was called upon by Bob Brown.

Ms Martine Haley - Circumstances of Termination of Employment

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.29 a.m.]

You have now given three different versions of the story in regard to Martine Haley leaving the employment of your Government. Today's new version makes it four. They cannot all be true. Which one is it?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the Leader for the inevitable concluding question to a series of questions on this matter. No matter how much they try to weave and distort anything, the facts are, as I have said, on discovering the conduct of Ms Haley, which was utterly unacceptable, her opportunity to continue employment with the Government ceased. That is what has happened. Those are the facts.

The entitlements to which Ms Haley was entitled to, as I have said on a number of occasions, are the same as those afforded to members of the Labor and Greens staff who were also terminated, separated, resigned or whose contracts were not renewed, in accordance with their entitlements under the law and appropriately determined.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Ms White - You had the power to sack her and not pay her out.

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I cannot hear what the Premier is saying from the noise coming from that side of the Chamber.

Madam SPEAKER - I will uphold that because it is very difficult to hear. I urge those on my left to be a little quieter, please.

Mr HODGMAN - Thank you, Madam Speaker. This matter has been often prosecuted by the Opposition, fully canvassed and explored down every possible avenue that the Opposition can come up with. Tasmanians are seeing the entire lack of substance and depth offered by members opposite. They complain about our position when we take one, then when we ask them what theirs might be they go to water.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. We will hear the rest of the answer, which I hope will be brief, in total silence.

Mr HODGMAN - We have seen this week that when questions are asked of them about their position on policy they are completely hopeless and go to pieces. Yes, they can get on television every night, but as the Treasurer says, that is no substitute for having a position or policy on something Tasmanians care about.

Today we are seeing it again and I believe it is true to say that they are all style and no substance. Look at them - they have all turned up in their costumes today, but we have had questions from the true opposition, the Greens, about a deer shooting policy, we have had a question about wages policy. These are matters that Tasmanians have some interest in. Just turning up in their colourful costumes today certainly does not present them as any credible alternative government.

Government Schools - Intake Areas

Mr SHELTON question to MINISTER for EDUCATION and TRAINING, Mr ROCKLIFF

[10.32 a.m.]

Can the minister please update the House on intake areas for government schools?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for Lyons for his interest in this matter. This Government well recognises that education is a valuable cornerstone of our society. This is why we have invested so much in education. It is why we are extending schools, employing more teachers and investing in significant infrastructure, including new builds. This investment means we can continue to offer quality universal access to education from kindergarten to year 12 for every Tasmanian child right across our highly dispersed population.

Given the excellent results we have seen so far with improving retention and retainment, our plan for education is clearly working. To manage the public school system, we define intake areas around each of our schools and this means that young people who live in an intake area have a legislated right to attend their local school. This Government has enshrined these principles of universal access and choice in an entirely new Education Act which we are now implementing.

Due to the previous Labor-Greens government's attempt to close schools, school intake areas have in the past caused great concern for many communities. We have addressed this through the new Education Act, which requires that school intake areas are published by the secretary of the Department of Education every five years. Given the current maps were produced in 2005 and the previous government failed to successfully review them, it is high time a sensible consultative process was undertaken to update the maps.

Today, the Department of Education will commence a consultation process across the state, inviting feedback from the Tasmanian community and families about government school intake areas. I assure Tasmanians that this process is not about assessing school viability. We are a government that is underpinning public school viability by employing more teachers and support staff and building more schools. Those opposite were closing them; we are building them. This is in stark contrast to those opposite, whose policies to assess school viability, close schools and restrict parents' choice of school were some of the most divisive and destructive policies Tasmanian school communities have seen.

The review process currently being undertaken by the Department of Education will likely result in some small changes to some intake areas; however any changes will not come into effect until 2021. The review will not change the way schools enrol students who live outside the intake area and will not affect students who are already enrolled in a school before 2021. We might have the report into the Labor Party review of the 2018 election maybe by 2021. Further, the review will not affect which high school students are entitled to attend, and if a child has a sibling already attending a school outside their intake area the child can enrol at the same school as their sibling.

I encourage families to engage in the consultation process that will run over the coming months and have their say. Through strong community consultation on this matter, safe in the knowledge that this Government supports choice and universal access, they can continue to support and celebrate Tasmania's wonderful public education system.

Cricket Tasmania - Actions of Premier

Mr O'BYRNE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.36 a.m.]

Yesterday you dodged a very important question about your contact with members of the Cricket Tasmania board in relation to Angela Williamson at the Ricky Ponting Medal event at Wrest Point on 29 March, an event I attended. Did you have a conversation with any member of the Cricket Tasmania board about Angela Williamson at that event on 29 March?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for the question. It is an interesting deflection or handpass from the Opposition Leader, who now seems unwilling to ask the same questions. This is the same question asked of me yesterday and which I have said very clearly is properly answered -

Ms O'Byrne - Remember you are on *Hansard*.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Mr HODGMAN - with a categorical rejection of what Opposition members assert. That is certainly the case when it comes to any suggestion that we have had any conversation with anyone from Cricket Tasmania about Angela Williamson's employment or what Cricket Tasmania should do with respect to it.

This matter, like the other, has been extensively canvassed. It is one which Mr Ferguson and I have provided a response to on a number of occasions. Most importantly, we have made it crystal clear that we have not sought to complain or seek from Cricket Tasmania any action in response to the social media activity of Ms Angela Williamson.

Mr O'Byrne interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne.

Mr HODGMAN - None whatsoever. We have accepted an apology, but made it clear we did not expect it or require anything further. This matter has been subject to a police investigation following a claim from Labor that laws might have been broken. That fatuous claim was dismissed as being without foundation after taking the time of Tasmania Police, who we would rather were helping keep our communities safe. That was an independent inquiry.

Ms O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, going to relevance under standing order 45 that requests that members try to answer the question. It was a specific question: did the Premier have a conversation with any member of the Cricket Tasmania board about Angela Williamson at the Ricky Ponting Medal event on 29 March? I caution the Premier that the Standing Orders talk about the honesty with which we have to say things in this House.

Madam SPEAKER - I accept that point of order.

Mr FERGUSON - On the point of order, that is not a point of order. The first reason is that the Premier is directly answering that question, and the second is that Ms O'Byrne is now repeating the question.

Madam SPEAKER - I accept the fact Ms O'Byrne is repeating the question but I would like the Premier to try to answer it as best he can.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, with respect, I have already done so and I am pointing out as to relevance. Following Labor's claims that there be an independent inquiry into this matter, already assessed by Tasmania Police independently that there was no foundation to the claims from Labor that a law was broken and independently assessed by the secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet, which concluded:

In regard to whether Mr Ferguson's actions -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. This is getting ridiculous. Could we have a little calm? We gave the Deputy Premier a lovely quiet period to give his response. I ask that members allow the Premier to finish this because it is getting very tiring.

Mr HODGMAN - Madam Speaker, it is their normal behaviour in this place when they do not like the answer and do not like us providing additional information that addresses the real issues and responds to questions asked by members opposite.

Police confirmed there was nothing to pursue. The Department of Premier and Cabinet concluded that Mr Ferguson's actions did not constitute a breach of the code of conduct and there is no evidence to suggest Mr Ferguson has misled the public in relation to statements on this matter. Further, there is no evidence to suggest Mr Ferguson has harassed, victimised or discriminated against Ms Williamson, again, under an independent inquiry.

It seems to us Labor is suggesting they might be the ones to independently look into this matter. That is patently absurd. They are, despite the very sensitive nature of this matter and the circumstances of the woman involved, Angela Williamson, prepared to say and do anything, regardless of the sensitivity because they presumably believe it is good for them politically. I can see no other reason for what they are doing.

This matter is also before the Federal Court of Australia. While we have been mindful to respect that process, that this is before the Federal Court, Labor is happy to say and do anything, regardless of that inquiry into this matter.

Ms White - It did not stop you putting out a statement.

Madam SPEAKER - Standing order 148, disorder and suspension. I am under phenomenal pressure to ruin my reputation for being the fairest Speaker I can possibly be. Anyone who has persistently and wilfully obstructed the business of the House, is guilty of disorderly conduct, has used objectionable words, has refused to withdraw or persistently wilfully refused to conform to any Standing Order or otherwise obey the ruling of the Speaker will be warned and will be named and asked to leave the parliament. That is not in the interest of this parliament. Please, a little more decorum.

Premier, could you wind up?

Mr HODGMAN - I will conclude by saying in response to the important question in all of this, did we seek to influence Cricket Tasmania's employment arrangement with Angela Williamson? The answer is, no.

Trust in the Premier

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.42 a.m.]

It has been established you are fundamentally incapable of telling the truth. How can Tasmanians believe you when you say no-one else in your Government was involved in trolling? How can Tasmanians believe you when you say no-one in your Government sought to influence Angela Williamson's employment at Cricket Tasmania? How can Tasmanians believe you when you say Michael Ferguson did not disclose Angela Williamson's termination to her employer?

You said you accepted Ms Haley's resignation and then allowed her to remain on your staff after the state election so she could walk away with \$45 000 - even though it was in your power,

because of her contract, to terminate it because of her appalling conduct. You have confirmed every computer in every minister's office was removed and replaced in the six weeks after the election with computers in your office -

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I am sorry to bring this to your attention. This is not a question. It is speech with a range of assertions. I ask you to direct the member to ask a question.

Madam SPEAKER - I believe, in the latitude I give to those who answer a question, that we will reach that as soon as possible, please, Leader of the Opposition.

Ms WHITE - We shall, Madam Speaker, thank you. You confirmed every computer in every minister's office was removed and replaced in the six weeks after the election, with computers in your office the first to be removed in the first two weeks of May, removing any trace of evidence of how widespread trolling was.

Premier, your behaviour in this sorry affair goes to the fundamental issue of trust. How can Tasmanians trust you?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, it was not a question, it was a series of puerile statements.

Madam SPEAKER - There was a question at the end of it, Premier.

Mr HODGMAN - Each of these matters has been extensively canvassed. What we are seeing today is an Opposition that literally offers nothing at all. Yes, they are good at getting on television each night. It is always complaining or criticising, and the story changes every other day to keep the thing rolling. Yes, bizarrely, they seem to get some media attention out of this.

As I said on Tuesday, at last count there were 139 media releases issued by the Opposition since the election. It would be a little more to date. Six of them related to a policy; six out of 139 or more, relate to an issue of substance or of policy.

What is happening is so obvious and embarrassing: we are heading toward a motion of some sort at the conclusion question time. It will be a stunt, because they have no substance. It will be a motion of no confidence, a censure motion or some other stunt, demonstrating again how shallow they are. I look forward to that because it will be another opportunity to point to the failings of the Opposition. There is no better illustration of it today than this. This is a day when there is a campaign about public sector wages policy because it has been publicised and vividly demonstrated by members opposite today who have all arrived in their red costumes.

Mr Bacon - And you are all in blue.

Mr HODGMAN - We have had no questions on public sector wages.

Mr Bacon - Peter Dutton blue, over there.

Madam SPEAKER - Mr Bacon, could we have some courtesy for the staff of Hansard, please?

Mr HODGMAN - If this is an issue they think they can address by turning up in red costumes they have asked no questions on it. The only question we have had on public sector wages has come from this side of the House. We are the ones who care about public sector wages. You are shown to be without any substance and it is vividly on display.

Trust in the Premier

Ms WHITE question to PREMIER, Mr HODGMAN

[10.46 a.m.]

What has been made clear through the Cricket Tasmania scandal is that you cannot tell the truth. You have told four different stories. Throughout this appalling chain of events, from Martine Haley initiating these events to the eventual sacking of Angela Williamson and the involvement of your Government and Michael Ferguson, your Health Minister, in that, you have proven you are determined to hide the truth.

Tasmanians see a Premier whose legacy will be that he was happy to be dishonest again and again. Tasmanians will remember a sneaky and untrustworthy Premier who would say or do anything to avoid blame and maintain secrecy at any cost. Today, they see a Premier with his already questionable reputation in tatters. They see a Premier with absolutely no credibility.

Seriously, considering your behaviour and your Government's underhanded behaviour and considering the unacceptable behaviour of Ms Haley and the Minister for Health throughout this shocking episode, which has affected and hurt so many people, how can Tasmanians possibly believe anything you say?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the leader of the Opposition for the gratuitous character advice. The Tasmanian people passed their judgment of the trust they have in the Tasmanian Government a few short months ago. When you talk about legacies and what you will be remembered for, people will remember election night 2018 and the speech from the Leader of the Opposition, which has been described as ungracious, to say the least. The Leader of the Opposition's judgment, perspective and lack of any level of grace was on display for all. I do not mind that she would not do the right thing and concede her loss and the defeat she took her party to. That she could not bring herself to express any sympathy on the passing of the former Attorney-General, Dr Vanessa Goodwin, will be long-remembered, and it goes to character. That is the standard she sets and you are all following.

Building and Construction Industry - Government Support

Mr SHELTON question to MINISTER for BUILDING and CONSTRUCTION, Mr BARNETT

[10.49 a.m.]

I am in frequent contact with a number of mates I went to school with who are now involved in the building industry and they tell me they have never been busier. Can you please inform the House of how the Hodgman majority Liberal Government is supporting the booming building and construction industry and how we are helping to build Tasmania's future?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question. He is quite right that there is a booming building construction industry across the state, in every nook and cranny of Tasmania. You can see it on the skylines with the cranes across Hobart, and residential and commercial development in volumes, with more underway. We as a Government are taking very positive steps to help the continued growth. We have been cutting red tape, streamlining the process and investing in infrastructure. We have introduced nation-leading industry-supported legislation and building reforms to make it faster, fairer, easier and cheaper to build in Tasmania.

Earlier this week I tabled an amendment bill that supports the building industry and that will result in a clarified process, working with the stakeholders, streamlining the processes and improving the operation of the legislative and regulatory requirements.

I have mentioned the \$2.6 billion in our Budget for infrastructure - roads, health, schools, hospitals, bridges. Across the board, the construction sector is very much on the way. We have ambitious targets in terms of increasing the number of people in the construction sector by 25 per cent over the next five years and increasing the number of apprentices by 40 per cent by 2025. We are very pleased with those targets.

I would like to refer to recent independent statistics. Yesterday, the latest ABS statistics show that Tasmania has recorded the highest growth rate in the nation for new residential construction work. That is an increase of 22 per cent in the value of new residential work done in 2017-18 compared to the last year, and the amazing thing is that is five times the national average. We are very pleased and proud of that. That is on the back of the March 2018 quarter where dwelling commencements were up 31 per cent compared to the same time last year, also the highest growth rate in Australia. This is something we can be proud of and everybody on this side of the House and Tasmanians across the board are pleased about that, and that was nearly 10 times the national average. The total number of building approvals were 27 per cent higher in the June 2018 year and total value was up 35 per cent over the same period. Housing finance commitments are also up and it has been growing for the seventh month in a row. That is very positive indeed.

The latest jobs figures were 23 200 in the building and construction sector. When we came to government, nearly five years ago, that number was 16 000, so you can see the rise in confidence and investment in the building and construction sector. I am reflecting on the confidence and investment in the sector, and this is delivering jobs, growth and development in all parts of Tasmania, supporting families and their opportunities to grow and achieve their potential.

In June 2018, the Deloitte Access Economics business outlook for building approvals and new housing starts show they have been on the rise since 2016 and the housing construction sector is set to expand further. Deloitte reported that engineering construction work remains elevated, with \$1.8 billion worth of commercial projects under construction and a further \$2.8 billion in planning stages.

Master Builders Australia has forecast that this growth is set to continue with the value of residential building work predicted to have increased by 11.5 per cent last year and a further 8.4 per cent this year. The Housing Industry Association also has a very positive outlook. The Opposition has nothing to say. They should be commending this, congratulating the industry in what they are doing in the nation-leading reforms we have introduced and are implementing. The Housing Industry Association foresees a 4.8 per cent increase in terms of home statistics for this

year. In terms of the Tasmanian outlook, they report that strong building activity has positive knock-on effects for the wider Tasmanian community.

These successes have come to fruition. It is not by chance; it is the strong economy that is benefiting. It is the nation-leading building reforms we have implemented and it is supported by the key -

Ms O'CONNOR - Madam Speaker, point of order, under standing order 48. The minister has had sufficient time to answer a Dorothy Dixier and I ask you to ask him to wind up.

Madam SPEAKER - The minister is about to wind up.

Mr BARNETT - What we are saying is that the building and construction industry has a lot of promise. They have backed in the reforms we have delivered and are now implementing with increasing jobs, development and growth and the outlook is very positive. That is in stark contrast to what happened under the Labor-Greens government when 10 000 jobs were lost and we were in an economic recession.

Frontline Health Services - Government Support

Mr BROOKS question to MINISTER for HEALTH, Mr FERGUSON

[10.55 a.m.]

Can the minister provide an update on new initiatives the Government is taking to take pressure off our health system and how the Government's wages policy allows for more investment in frontline services?

ANSWER

Madam Speaker, I thank the member for his question. The Government has a very strongly supported \$757 million plan to build a better health system, which was recently endorsed by the Tasmanian people. We are investing record amounts, reversing Labor's cuts, and we are backing our frontline staff. We are delivering more of the resources that we know our health system needs. We are opening more beds, recruiting more staff and building the facilities our hospitals need to expand.

We know there is pressure in our system. We know there are times when our hospitals are seeing more demand than they can easily cope with. That follows decades of underinvestment and poor planning and the Royal redevelopment, which ran off the rails. It should have been built two years ago if Labor had not messed it up.

Ms White - How is it going?

Mr FERGUSON - It is in its final stages, Ms White, thanks to the Hodgman Liberal Government which saved that redevelopment. It is now the tallest building in Hobart to date. It is just one year away. The Hodgman Liberal Government rescued the Royal redevelopment. We are also seeing the benefits -

Mr Bacon - Imagine if Frangrance built that massive tower.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Bacon.

Mr FERGUSON - We are already seeing the benefits of the investments we made in our first term.

As for this winter, we have been better prepared than ever before under the Tasmanian Winter Plan. I am really pleased to tell you, Madam Speaker, and members of this House that this year we have seen record numbers of Tasmanians vaccinated against the influenza virus. It has been fantastic, keeping people away from the ED, backed by a brand new program to vaccinate children, which has never been offered before, with the state Government's under-5s flu vaccine program.

New pre-admission clinics and the transit lounge at the Launceston General Hospital to improve patient flow has been warmly embraced by health consumers, and there is also extended lab testing as well so we can do faster diagnosis of flu locally.

Most importantly, we have opened new beds. I heard the Deputy Premier saying that Labor tried to close schools and we are building them; well, we are opening new beds to deal with increased demand. Twenty-two more beds at the Repatriation Centre have just been brought on line. I visited there recently and it has been widely supported by our staff and our patients. There are eight extra beds at the Royal Hobart Hospital and 24 brand-new permanently funded beds on ward 4D, including the five that we recently permanently funded as well. You might hear echoes of ward 4D - yes, that is the ward closed by Michelle O'Byrne and the Giddings government. I know I singled out the previous health minister but many members of the Tasmanian public would not be aware of the role of Ms White in the Labor caucus budget cuts committee which led to \$500 million of cuts to the health system.

We have more than reversed those cuts and are making further investments. That is what the Hodgman Liberal Government has done. The people who wear red cut health, the people who are in office here in this Government, in the Hodgman team, are investing in our health system, including right across the spectrum. Our EDs are very busy; I acknowledge that, the Government sees it and we are providing even more support for our EDs than ever before.

Recently we provided an extra \$1.5 million. This package was developed by the secretary of the department. It should not have been derided by members opposite. That is being rolled out. The package will ensure more Tasmanians can get the care they need with more nurses, improved patient flow and better beds management. It is being supported by key stakeholders.

Key stakeholders are important. They are part of finding solutions for increased demand. We will continue to work closely with our hardworking staff. We thank them for their services. So often, as I visit them, I see they are going beyond what is usually expected of them.

What is underpinning our investments is a budget that is able to deliver. That is what we have been doing. The budget needs to be managed and it needs to have the capacity.

Regarding Mr Brooks' question on wages policy, the Government is committed to a policy of a 2 per cent wage rise every year. It is fair, reasonable, sustainable and affordable. That policy is part of budget management, which means we can invest more in health.

Ms O'CONNOR - Point of order, Madam Speaker. Standing order 48, I draw your attention to it. The minister has had more than five minutes to respond to a self-congratulatory Dorothy Dixier.

Madam SPEAKER - I am going to allow the minister another 30 seconds to wind up.

Mr FERGUSON - Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is an important part of Mr Brooks' question and it has assisted us. Even with the wages policy, we have employed 630 more health staff. I know they do not like it but I will quickly conclude on this point. The ANMF asked the three parties a question before the election. It was a very simple and important question and it went like this -

Mr O'Byrne - What about those nurses protesting outside the LGH?

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Let him finish, please.

Mr FERGUSON - Will the party commit to ensuring no reduction to wages? The Greens said, 'The Greens will not decrease wages'. Tick for the Greens. The Liberal Party said, 'The Liberals commit to not reducing the wages, terms and conditions'. Tick for the Liberal Party. The Labor Party said, 'Labor commit to negotiating with the health workforce in good faith and will consider these matters as part of EA negotiations'. Big cross.

Time expired.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Comments regarding Dr Bob Brown and Hunting in National Parks

Madam SPEAKER - Honourable members, I am allowing the member for Denison, Ms O'Connor, to make a personal explanation under standing order 127, of which she has the same copy as me. There is a later edition I have been given which has a history as to why this should not be allowed. It cannot be set as precedence but I have allowed because I agreed to it. It is because the matter you wish to raise is not a personal one to yourself and you should have taken a point of order at the time, which I believe you did anyway. Normally this would be handled in adjournment. If we can listen to the personal explanation, that would be great.

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, Dr Brown said in February this year:

The spread of deer in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area has increased under the Hodgman Government. The TWWHA is being invaded by feral deer and control lines should be set, with special funding, or the outcome will be costly spread throughout the island's national parks.

Deer control can no more be recreational matter than fire fighting or weed control.

The Liberal policy of open season for recreational hunters in our national parks rather than a disciplined, professional and science-based operation will compound the problem. It is a cheap cop-out and will more likely spread than eradicate the deer.

TABLED PAPERS

Documents relating to Termination of Employment of Ms Martine Haley

[11.04 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Speaker, I seek leave to table documents I referenced during my questions in question time and they have been circulated to other parties.

Mr FERGUSON - Madam Speaker, I would like to speak to the question. I want all members of the House and the Tasmanian public to be aware that Ms White, the Leader of the Opposition, is seeking to table on the public record a document that is already on the public record, that is the transcript of our House from *Hansard*. We are putting *Hansard* on *Hansard*. We also have media lines provided from the Premier's office in relation to a certain matter that is on the public record, so it will be on the public record. We are also seeing another document from Ms White, House of Assembly Estimates *Hansard* so that Ms White can put *Hansard* on *Hansard* on *Hansard*.

We do not have a problem with Ms White wanting to put *Hansard* on *Hansard* on *Hansard*. While she is at it she might also like to table Alex Johnston's resignation letter.

[11.06 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - We are quite comfortable with having these documents tabled because it is important that a comprehensive set of statements of the facts are on the public record together. The statement of 6 March 2018, a statement issued by the Government media office, quoting the Premier, says:

Today I have accepted the resignation of Martine Haley as senior advisor in my office.

What the House needs to be clear about is that once a resignation is accepted, a staff member is not entitled to a payout. We have a contradictory set of events. On one hand the Premier has accepted the resignation of a disgraced staffer and on the other hand apparently not accepted the resignation and allowed a payout of public funds after the election. So having these documents on the public record is therefore worthwhile in the interests of truth and transparency.

[11.07 a.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Madam Speaker, given that the Minister for Health sought to make some mockery of providing this information to the House, I remind people of what each document says and why it is important that they be tabled.

On 6 March we have a statement from the Premier saying that Ms Haley resigned and he accepted it. On 25 June we have a statement from the Premier in Estimates that her contract was not renewed. On 22 August we have a statement saying that she was prepared to resign, but her contract was not renewed. Yesterday the Premier said that she resigned by advising she would not seek to renew her contract - a contract that says 'You may be dismissed for wilful misconduct'.

The Premier also mentioned today - and I do not think we have noticed enough of this - that he had no power to sack someone for wilful misconduct. The Premier may also have misled the House.

Leave granted.

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Speaker, I table the following documents -

- (1) Copy of *Hansard* Uncorrected Proof Issue, Wednesday 22 August 2018, page 3;
- (2) Copy of extract from *Hansard*, Monday 25 June 2018 - House of Assembly Estimates Committee A;
- (3) Copy of email from Vanessa Field dated 6 March 2018.

HEALTH COMPLAINTS AMENDMENT (CODE OF CONDUCT) BILL 2018 (No. 26)
EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 25)

First Reading

Bills presented by **Mr Ferguson** and read the first time.

MOTION

Leave to move a Motion without Notice

[11.11 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Speaker, I seek leave to move a motion without notice for the purpose of moving the suspension of Standing Orders to debate the following motion:

That this House -

- (1) Censures the Premier of Tasmania, the Honourable Will Hodgman for the following reasons -
 - (a) The Premier lied to Tasmanians in a statement on 6 March 2018 when he said, 'Today I have accepted the resignation of Martine Haley, a senior advisor in my office'. This clearly and unequivocally did not happen.
 - (b) Despite admitting to using a fake social media account to attempt to have Angela Williamson sacked by Cricket Australia, Ms Haley walked away with a \$45 000 taxpayer funded payout.
 - (c) If the Premier accepted Miss Haley's resignation, as claimed on 6 March 2018, she would not have been entitled to a severance payment.
 - (d) The Premiers clear and irrefutable lie calls into question everything he has said about this Government's involvement in Angela Williamson's sacking.
 - (e) The Premier has evaded questions about whether he discussed Angela Williamson's employment with anyone from Cricket Australia or

Cricket Tasmania at the Ricky Ponting Medal dinner on 29 March 2018.

- (f) The Premier dismissed allegations that his Minister for Health, Michael Ferguson, breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct by disclosing that Ms Williamson had a surgical termination to her employer and has failed to launch an investigation to discover the truth.
- (g) The Premier has refused to mount an independent investigation into his Government's involvement in Angela Williamson's sacking in an increasingly apparent attempt to cover up his own involvement.

Madam Speaker, this is an urgent motion. We ask that leave be granted and Standing Orders be suspended so we can debate the motion forthwith.

It is increasingly obvious to us there are several variations of these stories and the Premier could not tell us which was the truth. We have heard four different stories regarding the employment of Miss Haley and the cessation of that employment. Did she resign and did the Premier accept the resignation? Was it that her contract was not renewed? Was it that she sought to resign and the Premier found he could not force her to before her contract expired? Why, despite all those arguments from the Premier, did the Premier not terminate her employment in keeping with her instrument of appointment, which clearly allows for the Premier to hold her to the highest conduct and standards you would expect from any employee of the Crown?

The person at the centre of this, the Premier, has failed to uphold his obligations to principles of decency, integrity, transparency in the dealings with Martine Haley; an employee in his office who was found to have trolled using social media accounts under fake names and found to have taken screenshots of a private citizen expressing her political views and sending those screenshots to that citizen's employer. How can the Premier claim his Government has never tried to interfere in the employment of that individual when we know it to be a fact? How can the Premier claim there is not widespread trolling in his office when he failed to launch an investigation? How can the Premier claim the Minister for Health has nothing to answer for, given that he has failed to launch his own investigation using his own ministerial code of conduct? There has been no investigation. The Premier has refused to conduct an independent investigation. The Premier has refused to answer straightforward questions in this House over the last three days regarding his involvement in this matter.

What is becoming increasingly clear is Ms Haley, Mr Ferguson and the Premier are deeply embroiled in this scandal.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that you are seeking leave. You need to be arguing the reasons for seeking leave, not the merits of the actual motion.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The arguments for seeking leave are so we can debate this urgent matter. It is a matter that needs to be resolved and it is a matter the Tasmanian public deserves the truth about.

It is the case that we have heard the fourth story from the Premier today. The longer this saga drags on, the more stories we are likely to hear. The matter needs to be resolved today. Leave needs to be granted by the parliament now so we can suspend Standing Orders to bring on a debate to censure the Premier. It is completely unacceptable that the Premier of Tasmania could stand in

this place and stand in front of the media expressing his views on matters of importance to the public that contradict one another, and not be held accountable for it or be asked to explain how it could be that there are four different stories about one single issue. He has to explain to this House which is the true story.

What concerns me most of all is that this House passed the motion yesterday to implement a code of conduct for members of this parliament by the end of this year. There are already a number of codes that apply to members of this House. One of them is, if you say something that is not correct, you have to correct the record at the earliest opportunity. If what the Premier said on 6 March was not correct, why did he not correct the record? Why has it taken until now, when being asked straightforward questions about this, for him to provide an answer? Why does it take the Opposition to compel the Premier to tell the truth?

If the Premier says that what he said on 6 March was untrue but he endeavoured to correct the record at the earliest opportunity, we would not be in this situation. He did not do that. What he has done is told a different story, another story and today, the fourth story. At no time has the Premier attempted to correct the record of what he said on 6 March.

This is why it is an urgent matter. It needs to be dealt with. It goes to the integrity of the Premier, his ability to act with honesty, and the Tasmanian public's ability to trust him or trust anything he has said with regard to this sordid affair, which has led to the sacking of a woman for expressing her political opinion. That opinion was not welcomed by the Government, a screenshot taken by senior employees in the Premier's own office was sent to her own employer, presumably in an attempt to have her sacked. We know members of the Government have spoken to her employer and that Mr Ferguson disclosed to her employer personal information about her that was not known to her boss at that time, yet the Premier has failed to launch an independent investigation into this matter to find the truth.

The Premier has failed to even launch a ministerial code of conduct investigation. The Premier has had multiple opportunities to clear this matter up, to instil confidence in the people of Tasmania that his Government has acted without impropriety at all times. He has failed to do so.

The parliament has the opportunity to hold him to account and to censure him for acting in a manner inconsistent with how the public believe members of parliament should behave. It is inconsistent with how members of the public believe the Premier should behave and the leadership they expect the Premier of their state to demonstrate, particularly when he has already argued it was completely and utterly unacceptable.

Time expired.

[11.19 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, the Greens support the seeking of leave to debate this censure motion because there remain unresolved questions, as has been made clear in question time this week, as a result of the Labor Party's line of questioning.

I will simply make the point that has already been made but is worth restating because it is at the nub of the issue relating to Ms Haley's employment, subsequent resignation or termination, and payout. If the Premier accepted the resignation of Martine Haley then she was not entitled to a payout. Did the Premier accept Martine Haley's resignation or not?

Mr Bacon - It depends when you ask him.

Ms O'CONNOR - That is right; it depends when you ask him. We know that there is a culture of dishonesty in this Government. We have seen it over the past five years demonstrated time and again. We have had ministers of the Crown lying repeatedly at the Estimates table and receiving no censure. We have had a minister of the Crown between his seat and the dispatch box make a decision to lie - and again, that was all okay.

Mr Hidding - Who?

Ms O'CONNOR - Mr Groom - and he admitted it.

Ms O'Byrne - He said, 'As I walked to the dispatch box I knew what I was saying was not correct'.

Ms O'CONNOR - The important consideration here also is that the decision made by a former staff member of the Premier to take a screenshot of a private citizen's Twitter account and send it through to her employer started a chain of events that led to Ms Williamson's sacking. It is important to place on the record here, certainly as a stakeholder who engaged with Angela Williamson in her role as stakeholder relations manager at Cricket Tasmania, that she was a really good operator.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Ms O'Connor, I remind you this is on the seeking of leave.

Ms O'CONNOR - Mr Deputy Speaker, I understand that, but it is important that it be placed on the record. The *Hansard* needs to have it on the record that there was nothing Ms Williamson did in her role that should have justified her sacking. There has been a sequence of events here that began in the Premier's office that led to a person, a mother of children, losing her employment. That is a very serious issue.

The question here is whether the Premier did not accept Ms Haley's resignation because she was simply doing her job. The culture in the Government Media Office was anything goes and if you want to troll a private citizen who is causing pain to the Government that is okay.

Members interjecting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. This is a debate seeking leave. I ask you to remain relevant to that. Once that is determined we can move on to the motion in the House.

Ms O'CONNOR - Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. I was speaking to the urgency of this, because this involves a private citizen whose life has unalterably been changed as a result of events that began in the Premier's office. I would argue very strongly that the Premier did not accept Ms Haley's resignation because he knew she was just doing her job. He can say whatever he likes about how unacceptable her conduct was in trolling a private citizen, but the fact is he clearly did not accept her resignation, because if Ms Haley had resigned, the taxpayers would not be footing a \$45 000 payout.

That is the truth. You cannot have it both ways. You simply cannot accept a resignation and then give a payout. The Premier has not adequately dealt with the unresolved questions here and therefore we strongly support the seeking of leave to debate this censure motion.

[11.24 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - Madam Speaker, at least we had a bit of passion from Ms O'Connor. The mover of the motion gave a very flat, repetitive and off-topic contribution in speaking to the seeking of leave and I will address it now.

The Government will be supporting the seeking of leave so this matter can be cleared up, put before the House and dealt with. I note there are many statements being made by Ms White who, frankly, is a repeated proven liar to the Tasmanian people and to this House. I will not be withdrawing that because we are having a debate where you accuse the Premier, in writing, of lying.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr FERGUSON - We are on a substantive motion shortly.

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order, Madam Speaker, under standing order 144. That is an offensive comment. You referred to -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. We are on a point of order. I ask the Leader of Government Business to withdraw that comment, please.

Mr FERGUSON - I do not see why I should, but I will.

Madam SPEAKER - I hope that is not a challenge to the Speaker.

Mr FERGUSON - Madam Speaker, I will willingly withdraw that but I will find another opportunity to say it in a substantive motion, if I must, because it is alright for the Leader of the Opposition to grubby our Premier in writing as being a liar -

Members interjecting.

Mr FERGUSON - I am continuing my contribution -

Madam SPEAKER - Minister, we are not on a substantive motion at the moment and you are literally debating me. I ask you to be as parliamentary as you can.

Mr FERGUSON - I certainly shall, Madam Speaker, but I am very passionate about defending our honest and good Premier and the Government's good name in the face of these accusations. We will be supporting this motion of Ms White seeking leave to be able to move a suspension motion.

I will now make some comments on that. Let us be very clear on what has changed since yesterday? Nothing. Yesterday Ms White had an hour and a half in private members' time and chose not to use it for the purpose she is seeking to bring this motion forward today. I will make it clear as well that Ms White has foreshadowed a motion that would throw out the order of business that is on the blue today, which includes important legislation for water and sewerage corporation amendments so we can get on and help Tasmanians get the water and sewerage infrastructure and pricing structure they deserve and have been promised. Labor seeks to cast that aside.

Madam Speaker, I also point out the dishonest comments made by Ms White in her weak contribution. She claimed there had been no investigation. She said there had been no independent

investigation. It was Ms White, the Opposition Leader, her decision, and her choice to make a complaint to Tasmania Police, although she sent out her hapless shadow attorney-general to carry the burden of having to make that media statement. We know that Ms White was gutted when she found that there was no case to answer. To now come into this House and in front of the Tasmanian people use language which would let them think that she does not reckon the Tasmania Police Commissioner is independent enough is an absolute failure by the Labor Party. It is an indirect smear of our Tasmania Police. Furthermore, the language you have been using is a smear on the decision and assessment of the Premier's advice on the code of conduct. Labor is in the gutter on this.

It is not like we did not see this coming. Labor has been egging this all week. They have been talking only about this issue all week; they are not interested in any other issues that concern Tasmanians that they are passionate about, that they want to hear about. That is what we have been doing.

Madam Speaker, I suggest that if the Leader of the Opposition really wants to have this debate we crack on and start making it happen.

Leave granted.

MOTION

Suspend Standing Orders to move Motion Forthwith

[11.29 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition - Motion) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That so much of the Standing Orders be suspended as would prevent a motion of censure of the Premier, of which notice has been given this day, from being brought on for debate forthwith.

Madam Speaker, I am pleased that the Government has agreed that we are able to bring on this motion for debate immediately. It is important that we clear this matter up. I am not sure whether the Government intends to set a time limit for this debate but I am asking that they not gag it. It has been their form in the past that when debates like this are brought on they restrict them to about an hour, which does not allow the speakers who are concerned about this the time to make the arguments. We seek an appropriate length of time and would not support the Government's gag motion, if they put one as they have done in the past. He has not moved one yet.

It is important that we bring on this matter. Given that we are debating the suspension of standing orders, I will not delay too long because we have already had the opportunity from the Leader of Government Business, who said they will be supporting the suspension of leave. Presumably we can take him on his word that we will be able to bring this on and deal with it because he wants to clear the matter up.

There are many a lot of questions left unanswered. We do not know whether the Premier has read the instrument of appointment used to engage members of his staff. If he had he would know that schedule 3:4 conduct 4.1:

The appointee shall maintain a standard of conduct necessary to ensure that the integrity and ethical standards expected of a servant of the Crown are maintained and the appointee is required to, amongst other things, behave honestly and with

integrity, treat everyone with respect and without harassment, victimisation or discrimination, comply with all applicable Australian law, use Tasmanian Government resources in a proper manner, not knowingly provide false or misleading information and not make improper use of information gained in the course of employment or of the status, power or authority derived from the employment in order to gain or seek to gain a gift benefit or advantage for themselves or for any other person.

It could be argued - and indeed proven - that Ms Martine Haley did not uphold the code of conduct in her instrument of appointment. The Premier, as the-

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Leader of the Opposition is obviously not aware of how to speak to the motion to suspend where she is speaking to the substance of the motion that she has foreshadowed that she wishes to have moved through the suspension motion. I ask you to draw her to the point. This is a procedural motion about suspending.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - I uphold the point of order. To clarify for the Leader of the Opposition, the original debate was about seeking leave, which was granted. You now want to suspend standing orders so you need to ensure your argument is on this debate, which is limited to 35 minutes and up to seven minutes each speaker.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. What I am contributing on this debate provides the support for why this is an urgent matter. The Premier has given four different stories. What he has failed to demonstrate at any point in time, despite saying that the behaviour of Ms Martine Haley was completely and utterly unacceptable, is that under her instrument of appointment he could have sacked her and not paid her a \$45 000 golden handshake.

Mr FERGUSON - Madam Speaker, I have an important point of order. Before you resumed the chair, the Deputy Speaker ruled that Ms White should be relevant to the motion. The motion is not the substantive motion to which she is now speaking. The motion before this House is the suspension of standing orders motion. Whatever she has to say would be relevant to that motion.

Madam SPEAKER - Thank you, we will uphold that.

Ms WHITE - Thank you, Madam Speaker. The reason why we need to suspend standing orders in order to bring on this debate on this particular motion forthwith and not gag it is because there are very serious questions that the Premier needs to answer, including whether he has even read the instrument of appointment for the disgraced employee, Ms Martine Haley. Suspending Standing Orders so that we can bring on this motion for debate will help us clear up which story of the four stories the Premier has shared is the true story. Bringing on this motion to debate forthwith and not gagging it allows every member of this parliament to make a contribution.

It will allow us to have the Premier provide a clear answer to the questions that have been asked of him. Did he at the Ricky Ponting medal awards dinner speak to a member of the Cricket Tasmania board about Angela Williamson? He has not answered that question. Has any member of his Government sought to interfere in her employment with Cricket Tasmania? We know that Ms Martine Haley took screenshots of Ms Williamson's private personal tweets and sent them to her employer.

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order. Madam Speaker, this is bordering on the ridiculous. I ask, so that we can facilitate what Ms White wants to have debated, that we get on with that at the appropriate time.

There is a question before this House to suspend Standing Orders. Ms White is in a muddle. She is not able to bring herself to the relevance of the point that it is her motion and I am looking to debate that motion.

Madam SPEAKER - Does the Leader of the Opposition understand the point of order?

Ms WHITE - Forgive me, Madam Speaker. I have been in this place the last four years when the member who just resumed his seat has got to his feet and ridiculed members on this side for not using their full allocation of time to make arguments. Presumably he wants me to sit down now because he is ashamed of, and embarrassed by, his behaviour and his involvement in this matter.

I will not be silenced or ridiculed by him on this matter and I will not be told how to behave in this parliament by him, when his behaviour has been the most appalling behaviour of all, speaking to people who have no knowledge of somebody's private medical information and disclosing that to their own boss. You should be ashamed of yourself. You have no right to come in here and lecture me, so sit quietly and behave yourselves.

What we are talking about here is a matter of integrity, honesty and decency. The member who lectures me has displayed none of those qualities or characteristics.

Time expired.

[11.36 a.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, Standing Orders should be suspended so we can debate this censure motion.

There remain very significant unresolved questions. While the Leader of Government Business can argue that we have other important legislative matters to debate today, neither of those matters are urgent. The Electoral Boundaries legislation could have been brought in by the Government in the last term so the people of Tasmania, when they cast their vote at the state election, were casting their vote for a member who would actually represent them. A political decision was made at the time not to adjust the electoral boundaries on the advice of the Tasmanian Electoral Commission. The Liberals thought it served their purpose to go to the last state election on the old boundaries. The Leader of Government Business cannot argue that is an urgent bill. It is most emphatically not. The House has returned now for some period of time since the state election. A decision was made not to introduce that legislation late last year so there would be clarity for electors at the last state election.

The TasWater bill, too, is not urgent. There are already administrative operational changes in place that this legislation, as I understand it, simply seeks to formalise after the absolute debacle of this Government's handling of the TasWater situation in the last term of government. To argue that this legislation should take priority over a question of whether the Premier of this state has upheld ethical standards does not stand up to scrutiny.

We strongly support the suspension of Standing Orders in order to clarify, if we can. Repeated questioning this week has not provided clarity or a line of sight to the truth. If we can debate

censure, we will have one of the Premier's four versions of events narrowed down, hopefully, and there will some clarity over what the truth is in this very significant matter.

As Ms White pointed out, yesterday we had a debate about a code of conduct and the responsibility of all members to uphold the highest standards of ethical conduct, to tell the truth in this place, particularly in relation to the administration of public funds. This is an urgent matter. It must be debated and it should not be gagged. We need to come close to finding the truth in relation to this significant matter.

[11.39 a.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Leader of Government Business) - Madam Speaker, I have an amendment to Ms White's motion.

The amendment is after 'forthwith' insert -

'and that the debate on the motion be completed by 1 p.m., that the Premier, Leader of the Opposition, the member for Denison, Ms O'Connor, shall speak for no longer than 30 minutes each and other Members speak for not longer than 10 minutes each in speaking to the motion, and that immediately following a vote on the motion the House proceed to the Matter of Public Importance.'

I emphasise that this is absolutely in keeping with past practice -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, we need to hear the explanation.

Mr FERGUSON - I can hear the howls of protest but close to 40 minutes of the House's time today has already been spent, I would suggest wasted, on the procedural motions to reach this next step. Members opposite, who I can hear and are again rudely interrupting, have wasted time arguing over formalities and are trying to debate the substantive motion when they should simply have been working through the procedural motions to bring us to this debate.

I will make one observation in response to Ms O'Connor's contribution. Nobody has said and I have not, that the Constitution Amendment (House of Assembly Electoral Boundaries) Bill is urgent. No one has said that. However, the Water and Sewerage Corporation Amendment (Crown Involvement Facilitation) Bill does need to be considered in a timely fashion today and that is important to the Government.

What the Government is acting to do is to facilitate Ms White's attempt to have a censure motion brought on today in a way that does not interfere with the important business of this House. I commend the motion and the amendment to suspend the Standing Orders subject to the remaining time and any further contributions on this, which are an entitlement of any member to offer now on my amendment motion. Any further contributions on this, self-evidently, are restricting the members' own time to debate the substantive motion.

[11.41 a.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, I speak to the amendment from the Leader of Government Business. It is no surprise he is trying to gag and guillotine the debate on this issue, which is in the public's interest to be had. We know why he is the one working so hard to stifle

debate because he is in lock step in this. He is up to his neck in the deceit and misleading of the public about this most important issue.

The issue goes to the heart of democracy. It goes to the ability of people in our community to freely give their opinion on matters of political importance to them, without fear nor favour that the executive arm of government will use whatever low tactic they find to involve themselves in, to have their job or their career completely ruined. The dead hand of this Government is used on anyone who speaks up against them. They have the glass jaw and they are thin in this. They have used all the tactics and all the power they have to stop dissent, to crack down on people with a difference of opinion. That is what is being debated in this censure motion.

A censure motion is a very serious motion. It goes to Tasmanians' ability to have confidence in this House to debate matters with integrity and openness, and that when the pinnacle of this Government, the Premier, speaks in this House or outside, that he will speak the truth. He will speak the truth about what went on in this very sordid incident he has involved himself in.

It is a matter of public fact that the Premier has made at least four different statements regarding the nature of the termination, the resignation, the separation, or the golden handshake of Ms Haley. It is quoted, when you read in the media about the Premier leading investigations of his own staff, that he is a former lawyer. When he used the words separation, termination or resignation, as a lawyer, as a legislator, he knows what the difference is - or he should know. If he does not, it is misleading, at best. At worst, it is direct dishonesty and misleading of parliament and misleading of the Tasmanian community about the sordid role he has played in the conduct of his own staff and the trashing of a career of a talented, professional and effective public relations and media adviser to his former government.

It goes to the heart of the credibility of an outstanding institution in Tasmania and the Tasmanian Cricket Association. You have questioned that. His conduct, the way he has mercilessly thrown people under a bus to protect his own skin is disgraceful.

In invoking the name of Alex Johnston and, interestingly, none of the other staff separated from his office at the change of government at the election in 2018, throwing them all together, he is protecting Ms Haley but then throwing her under the bus. He is reflecting on every other staff member who left his office, left the minister's office, or left our office. They were simply doing their jobs. By not defining the difference between a troll and the way that troll acted - I was trolled on social media, as were other members of the Opposition, we were all trolled by that person - him being weaselly and pathetic in his non-definition of what a separation, termination or a golden handshake was, he is reflecting on every public servant who works in his office, either a departmental liaison officer, someone engaged as a chief of staff, a deputy chief of staff - it does not matter whether they have gone to Jonathon Duniam's office. He is reflecting on all those because he is grouping them all together.

He spoke on the public record and said, 'This behaviour was unacceptable and I have acted'. Now we know, by his contradictory statements, he did not act. He gave her a golden handshake for a job well done. The Premier and the Health minister, in lock step, chained together at the ankle, have trashed the career and reputation of a professional because she disagreed with them.

In a democracy, across a Westminster system, across the globe, people in the community have a right to express a political opinion. What we have seen from this Government, and when I was out of parliament for the last four years, the countless stories of people saying that they would like

to say something but this Government is vindictive, this Government will bully me, will attack me; I am fearful for my job, my career, my mortgage, my family, if I say something that contradicts them because they pick up the phone very quickly, which we know.

The hypocrisy of the Health minister was amazing. To say in one breath, 'I am Christian, I give forgiveness.' yet, why was he talking about a woman's private medical circumstances to her employer in the context of a private tweet? What gives him the right to raise that? He has no right. We know what has happened. Here is an articulate woman criticising him for an appalling policy led by a biased minister whose personal views are influencing government and public policy to the extent that women have to fly to Melbourne for a surgical procedure. That is what this is about.

It is not only what you have done, it is what people do in your name. It is what Ms Haley did in your name. You can imagine the culture that is created by this. The consequence of trolling, the consequence of actions taken by a staff member that the Premier said is unacceptable, is a \$45 000 golden handshake for a job well done. The message this sends to every other public servant, to every other adviser, is to have a go but do not get caught.

We have a lawyer who cannot define the difference between resignation, termination or separation. He says he has conducted an investigation into this sordid matter and everything is okay because he is a lawyer. I am sorry, mate, that is wafer thin. You are at the peak of this Government. You are the Premier. We all have high standards. We all have to follow them but you know, as we and people in the community of Tasmania know, this is a sordid, awful set of circumstances and you are up to your neck in it. It is no wonder you are raising vexatious points of order.

We do not accept this amendment. Let us debate this because this goes to the heart of your character and your conduct as a government.

The House divided -

AYES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Mr Brooks
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson
Mr Gutwein
Mr Hidding
Mr Hodgman
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton (Teller)

NOES 11

Mr Bacon
Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Dow
Ms Haddad (Teller)
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms Standen
Ms White
Dr Woodruff

PAIR

Mr Jaensch

Ms Houston

Madam SPEAKER - The result of the division is 11 Ayes and 11 Noes. I therefore have to use a casting vote. In accordance with Standing Order 167 I reluctantly cast my vote with the Ayes for the reason that there are two innocent women involved in this who are being named over and

over again. In fairness to these two people I do not want the politics to cloud the fact that we have two individuals who are persistently being named without their approval.

Amendment agreed to.

Motion, as amended, agreed to.

MOTION

Censure of Premier - Motion Negatived

[11.56 a.m.]

Ms O'BYRNE (Bass) - Madam Speaker, I will be careful not to reflect upon your ruling, but had we been given an opportunity we would have been very happy to accept a reasonable time frame to allow debate. We also feel that it is exactly because of the way that an innocent woman was treated that his House needs to deal with this matter appropriately. The history of motions of censure allow an appropriate time of debate.

Madam SPEAKER - I will correct you on that; I have looked at the statistics. Censure motions have, on average, gone between one hour and one and a half hours, unlike no confidence motions.

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Madam Speaker. I have no idea what the basis is for Ms O'Byrne making any contribution at the moment. The House has ruled that the Standing Orders be suspended so as to enable a motion which has been foreshadowed. The House now has only one option and that is to get on with the motion.

Madam SPEAKER - That is what I believe Ms O'Byrne is doing.

Ms O'BYRNE - Given that we have only an hour to discuss the fact that this Premier and potentially this Health minister acted in an immoral and appalling way, I will resume my seat.

[11.58 a.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition - Motion) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That this House censures the Premier of Tasmania, the Honourable Will Hodgman, for the following reasons -

- (1) The Premier lied to Tasmanians in a statement on 6 March 2018 when he said, 'Today I have accepted the resignation of Martine Haley, a senior advisor in my office'. This clearly and unequivocally did not happen.
- (2) Despite admitting to using a fake social media account to attempt to have Angela Williamson sacked by Cricket Australia, Ms Haley walked away with a \$45 000 taxpayer-funded payout.
- (3) If the Premier accepted Miss Haley's resignation, as claimed on 6 March 2018, she would not have been entitled to a severance payment.

- (4) The Premier's clear and irrefutable lie calls into question everything he has said about his Government's involvement in Angela Williamson's sacking.
- (5) The Premier has evaded questions about whether he discussed Angela Williamson's employment with anyone from Cricket Australia or Cricket Tasmania at the Ricky Ponting Medal dinner on 29 March 2018.
- (6) The Premier dismissed allegations that his Minister for Health, Michael Ferguson, breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct by disclosing the fact that Ms Williamson had a surgical termination to her employer and has failed to launch an investigation to discover the truth.
- (7) The Premier has refused to mount an independent investigation into his Government's involvement in Angela Williamson's sacking in an increasingly apparent attempt to cover up his own involvement.

It is appalling that the Government has gagged this censure debate on the Premier to just one hour. Indeed, the Leader of Government Business, the Health minister who himself is implicated and embroiled in this saga, is the one who moved the motion to limit debate and scrutiny of him, the Premier and the Government's involvement.

The reason we are having this debate is because the Premier has now told four different versions of events around one particular scenario, which was the employment of somebody in his office, a senior adviser, who engaged in trolling activity on social media accounts. The Premier called those actions unacceptable and yet that person walked away with \$45 000. Had the Premier accepted the resignation, that person would not have walked away with a severance payment. Had the Premier terminated that person's contract of employment, that person would not have walked away with a \$45 000 golden handshake. Instead, the Premier effectively condoned that behaviour by allowing that person to walk away with their entitlements plus a \$45 000 golden handshake. It speaks volumes about this Premier that he did not apply the instrument of appointment that engaged that employee to terminate under schedule 4, which would have seen that under schedule 5, no severance payment would be payable.

We can only conclude that this was not an isolated instance in the Premier's office. He condoned this behaviour and the fact that no investigation took place speaks volumes about this. We know that the fake social media accounts that were established by this person interacted with other fake social media accounts, and also with members of the Government's own staff. You cannot tell me that fake people talking to fake people online and then interacting with the Government's own staff under their own profiles is a coincidence. This was state-sanctioned trolling; it was widespread and it is connected to the Cricket Tasmania scandal because screenshots were taken of a person sharing their private views about Government policy and then sent to her employer.

You cannot tell me that was not done with the intention of at least getting that person in trouble with their employer, if not getting them sacked.

This affair is incredibly sordid because it demonstrates that private citizens in Tasmania who wish to express political opinions about things now need to be fearful that the Government might go to their employer and raise concerns about their activity, to bring to the attention of the employer statements that person has said in a private capacity about Government policy.

That is what has happened in the case of Angela Williamson. As a private individual, using a private Twitter account, she shared her views about Government policy relating to women's reproductive health rights in Tasmania. She criticised the Government's approach to the fact that women were being forced to fly to Melbourne to access surgical terminations. Screenshots of that were taken by a troll, a staff member of the Premier's office, and sent to her employer. What relevance does that have to her employment? This person was an outstanding employee. What confuses me, given that the letter of termination provided to Ms Williamson stated that her relationship with the Government had broken down, is that a press release issued by the Premier on 1 August said -

The Government has always had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson.

If the Government had always had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson, why was she sacked? That matter has not been answered.

If no member of the Government had ever sought to pressure, complain or seek action from Cricket Tasmania on anything Ms Williamson had published or said publicly, how do you explain Martine Haley sending screenshots of Angela Williamson's tweets to her employer? If they had never attempted to pressure, complain or seek action from Cricket Tasmania about anything Ms Williamson had published or said publicly, why would screenshots of her tweets criticising the Government's reproductive health policy be sent to her employer? Does that not constitute an intention of them to seek some action? Why else would it be sent?

In the press release on 1 August, Premier, you said that Labor lies. Premier, you have lied, not just in this place with the fact that you have given four different answers on different occasions about the employment status of Ms Haley and how it concluded, but also in regard to your Government's, your ministers' engagement with Cricket Tasmania and Cricket Australia regarding Ms Williamson's employment.

The Premier is in a messy situation. It has drawn international media attention. There have been stories published right around the world. Concern has been raised that an individual, in this case Ms Williamson, raising concerns as a private individual on a political matter has had her job terminated.

The first press release I could find issued by the Government was on 30 July by the Health minister, Michael Ferguson, in which he said about the Cricket Australia matter -

The Tasmanian Government understands there are legal proceedings against Cricket Australia by a former employee and is therefore limited in what it can say.

It is inappropriate for the Government to comment on matters before the Fair Work Commission and Labor would do well to show the same respect.

On the morning of the conciliation hearing, 17 August, the Minister for Health puts out a comprehensive press statement. If the matter was so delicate because it was before the court and we were being cautioned about speaking about this issue, why would he put out a comprehensive statement on the morning of the conciliation meeting? Would it not be construed by a reasonable person that the minister was trying to influence matters? The Premier did nothing. It came from

your media unit, Premier. Despite you, as the Premier of this state, saying that because this was a matter before the Industrial Relations Commission we need to be very cautious about things we said, a comprehensive press release was issued by the minister for Police. What was that intended to do? I argue it was intended to influence.

The content of this press release is interesting. The defence the Minister for Health relies upon for sharing personal information about an individual with their employer - private medical information that had nothing to do with her capacity to perform her job - is that there was a specific tweet he was aware of on 28 May, some weeks before he had a phone conversation with the CEO of Cricket Tasmania where Ms Williamson tweeted the following public statement under her own name. Let me ask you if any reasonable person reading this tweet would conclude this individual had a surgical termination in Melbourne. I quote the tweet:

So you share your story, hoping it convinces the Government to act urgently and five months later nothing, no meeting with the Premier, no results. Thanks for helping tell it as it is.

There is nothing in that to make me think that person had a surgical termination. There was a BuzzFeed media article dated 12 March attached to the tweet. That is further proof the Minister for Health believes this demonstrates the individual had a surgical termination and that he was sharing information already on the public record. I say that is not the case. The BuzzFeed media article did not name that individual. It did not name anybody in Cricket Tasmania's employment. It used a pseudonym, Bianca. It did not name Ms Williamson. I do not know how Mr Ferguson's brain works but Ms Williamson and Bianca are not the same. To rely on that as your evidence that Ms Williamson had a termination and it was in the public domain, is very flimsy.

The Premier should have looked at that and thought something was not right. A code of conduct investigation is the appropriate next step. The Premier should have said, 'I uphold the highest ethical standards and expect ministers to act with integrity, honesty and decency at all times. I will undertake a ministerial code of conduct investigation to find out for myself and satisfy myself nothing improper has occurred here'. The Premier did not do that.

Yesterday, when asked if he had questioned Mr Ferguson about when he first knew and whether or not it was because of that tweet that he first found out, the Premier indicated he had never asked him that question. If the Premier has never asked the question of the minister, how can he be satisfied the minister's version of events is true? The Premier should have conducted an independent investigation into this sordid affair when it first became obvious to everybody there was something not quite right.

An individual sharing her private views on a political matter has screenshots of those views sent to her employer by a member of the Premier's staff in an attempt to influence that employment. That is not right. Then that individual loses her employment, with a statement from her employer saying that it was because the relationship with the Government had broken down.

Then the Premier issues a press release saying that the relationship with Angela Williamson had always been strong. That is not right. There is something not right.

The Minister for Health, it has been revealed, had a conversation with this individual's employer where he revealed private and personal medical information about her, completely irrelevant to her ability to do her job. The Premier did not ask him how he found out about the

nature of her health and that particular surgical termination. He apparently believes him. He did not inquire. On 16 August he asked his secretary of DPAC whether a code of conduct investigation was necessary. On 17 August, conveniently - very good turnaround - he gets a response saying it is unwarranted. But again, alarm bells, because the letter provided by the secretary of DPAC does not satisfy me because the evidence relied upon for Ms Gale to make her determination is a letter from the Minister for Health himself. The Minister for Health then provides an explanation of his version of events which informs the secretary's view that no code of conduct investigation is required, and the Premier accepts that.

The Premier did not have to accept that. He could have read the letter provided by the secretary and said, 'I can see, based on the information you provided me, you do not have access to enough information. I can see from the information you provided me in your letter that you did not have access to the tweets because the account was private and you relied upon screenshots taken by minister Ferguson to defend his argument'. Why would the minister have taken screenshots of Angela Williamson's tweets and kept them? That is a bit strange. Did he know he would be facing a code of conduct investigation down the track because his behaviour was inappropriate?

The Premier could have read this letter and thought, 'Well, it looks to me that Ms Gale has done the best job she can possibly do with the information provided to her at the time, but I still remain dissatisfied because it is not clear to me that minister Ferguson did not share information with Ms Williamson's employer that was private in nature. It was not already on the public record and therefore I will undertake a code of conduct investigation'. He did not do that.

In fact at every turn, from the very beginning, the Premier has refused an independent investigation into the role his Government has played in the sacking of Angela Williamson - every single turn.

The Integrity Commission has not gotten involved in this matter but maybe it should. The Premier needs to explain how he can be satisfied that no-one in his Government attempted to influence the employment of Angela Williamson, given that we know a senior member of his staff sent screenshots of her commenting about a public policy matter to her employer. That is a very weird thing to do if you were not attempting in some way to influence that person's relationship with their employer and their ongoing employment, but apparently the Premier turned a blind eye.

The Premier still refuses to acknowledge that this Government had any involvement in the sacking of Angela Williamson, despite the fact that 10 days before she was sacked, the Minister for Health had a conversation with her CEO where he disclosed private medical information about her that was not on the public record, because no reasonable person reading that tweet could conclude that. I shared that Buzzfeed article. Does that mean, by association, that I have had a pregnancy termination, and what right is it of you to judge me if I have and share it with my employer? How dare you think that is even relevant to that person's ability to conduct their job?

There is so much about this that stinks and the Premier has not shown leadership here. He could have conducted an investigation if he had chosen. He could have chosen not to provide a \$45 000 endorsement of Ms Martine Haley's behaviour as she walked out the door. He could have ended her contract without costing the taxpayers that severance payout. It is in her instrument of appointment, unless she has a special contract that means she is not subject to the same clauses as every other employee engaged by you. That would be interesting to learn.

There is so much about this that is really grubby and I worry that if this continues without accountability, it sets a bad precedent for the future.

Ms O'Connor - That horse has bolted, Ms White.

Ms WHITE - Ms O'Connor, you might be right. Here we are in this parliament with this situation before us and this Premier who has failed to take action where it would be considered appropriate by other people to take action.

What are you going to do, Premier? This censure motion is serious. Maybe the House does not have the numbers today to succeed with this censure motion on you, but the arguments stand. The behaviour that has been demonstrated by employees in your office, by ministers on your front bench and yourself is not acceptable and there has to be a consequence for that. There has to be accountability for that and to date there has been nothing. You have given four different stories and you have not been clear about your own involvement in this matter. Indeed my colleague, the member for Franklin, asked you a very straightforward question today as to whether or not you had spoken to members of Cricket Tasmania's board at the Ricky Ponting Medal dinner about Angela Williamson. You did not answer that question. You avoided it today and you avoided it yesterday.

There are so many questions that have not been answered here, and every single time you get to your feet the story changes. It is as though you read the article in the paper yesterday and thought, 'Whoops, someone has found out that I said "didn't renew" as opposed to "accepted the resignation", and that has different implications'. Then today you said that even though the employee in your office who was trolling other people on social media offered their resignation, you could not force that person to resign before her contract ended. I draw your attention again to the instrument of employment under which all employees in your office are engaged, unless this individual had a different contract, in which case she should disclose that. It says quite clearly that there are conduct provisions staff need to uphold and where they are not upheld, the Premier has the ability to terminate that employment without notice. You do not have to give two weeks notice, you can terminate without notice, and in terminating without notice, severance benefits are not provided. That \$45 000 could have been saved from the Tasmanian taxpayers' purse and a condoning of that behaviour could have been demonstrated by you.

What we want to see as an outcome of this debate today is an independent investigation into this sordid affair. We want justice for Ms Williamson, because quite clearly there has been engagement with your Government and Cricket Tasmania regarding her employment with them. Screenshots of her tweets is evidence of that.

Citizens across Tasmania - and across the globe, actually - who have read media articles about this when it was first revealed were very surprised to learn that in Tasmania, if you speak up against government policy or raise a political view in the public sphere, the government of the day might tell your employer about that and do it in a way that results in your getting sacked.

Mr Deputy Speaker, living in a democracy like Australia I thought we had freedom of association and freedom of speech that meant we could comment on matters in the political domain without fear of our jobs being removed from us, being sacked from our employment. It is critical that private citizens are able to share their personal and political views on government policy without fear of repercussion or having their employment terminated. A person should not lose their job for expressing their political views.

While the industrial matters of this will be dealt with by the Federal Court, the accountability of your Government will be upheld by this parliament. Indeed, Premier, it is up to you to show leadership here, to hold your ministers and your staff to account for the role they played in this sordid affair. We know conversations took place regarding Angela Williamson, despite your press release that said you had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson. It is strange timing for that to come out, I have to say, on 1 August 2018. 'The Government has always had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson.'

It is laughable when the Premier has argued that no independent investigation is required and that the code of conduct for ministers has not been invoked in this case because the secretary of the department has determined no investigation is necessary, when the person who is at the centre of all this was not even asked what happened. Ms Williamson was not asked by the secretary of the department when determining whether there had been a breach of the ministerial code of conduct as to her version of events; whether she felt aggrieved by them, whether she knew anything that could help inform the secretary's view about whether an investigation was warranted.

It is laughable to suggest you have a process in place; a process you condone as it is your ministerial code of conduct. You released it in March 2018. It is laughable that is thorough and provides due process when the person who is the victim in this is not even asked for their view. How can that be a thorough and due process? Instead, assumptions are made. You know what they say about assumptions, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is unparliamentary for me to repeat it, but assumptions are made to acquit the minister of any responsibility or any need for him to be investigated under the ministerial code of conduct. That is why only an independent investigation can reach the bottom of this. The Premier has not shown the leadership necessary to apply his own ministerial code of conduct to his ministers. The Premier has failed. He has failed to provide justice and he has failed to provide confidence to the people of Tasmania that they can comment on matters of politics or public policy without fear of having their job terminated.

Your own social media policy put out by the department was a shambles. That came out at the best possible time, trying to restrict people's freedom of speech or to contribute to the public debate if they are employees of the state. We know what you are about. Any dissenting voice shall be quietened. Any dissenting voice shall be threatened and intimidated. It seems like it. If the Premier conducted an investigation into this matter, if he allowed a truly independent investigation, the matter could be cleared up. Right now we can only conclude there is a massive cover up going on. It is because the Premier is deeply implicated in the whole sordid affair. If the Premier has nothing to hide, if the Premier stands by every statement he made in his press release on 1 August 2018, what is he worried about? He said, 'The Government is not responsible for HR decisions made by Cricket Australia.' That is true and those things are being tested in the Federal Court, but he also said -

No member of the Tasmanian Government has sought to pressure, complain or seek action from Cricket Australia or Cricket Tasmania on anything Ms Williamson has published or said publicly.

That does not wash with me, given that screenshots of tweets she had posted were sent to her employer. They were things she had published. If it is true that any suggestion the Government has disclosed private information not on the public record to either Cricket Australia or Cricket Tasmania is false, why not have an independent investigation? What do you have to hide? If it is true the Government has always had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson, why was

she sacked? It does not add up because there are too many conflicting versions of the same story on the public record, perpetuated in many instances by the Premier.

The latest scandal we have seen over the last couple of days of a \$45 000 golden handshake, for work well done to your mind, Premier, is the latest addition in this saga.

I looked at the letter issued to Ms Williamson by her employer. This was attached to the story that first broke the news by Samantha Maiden on 29 July. It says, 'I confirm that concerns about your performance and conduct have come to the attention of Cricket Australia.'. It details a number of tweets, all of which talk about her private views on Government policy.

We have, on the one hand, the Government saying they have always had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson. In her letter of termination it references tweets she has made about Government policy. Let us say, for argument's sake, you have a good working relationship, tick. But in her letter of termination it says that these are the examples of tweets you have made that we are not happy with and have been brought to our attention. They are all relating to Government policy. Therefore, a reasonable person could probably conclude the concern of Angela Williamson's employer was not at all to do with her ability to undertake her job but more in keeping with her personal views on reproductive health rights and how uncomfortable it made the Government feel that she was raising concerns about their inaction to address the fact women had to fly to Melbourne to access a termination.

You have said, Premier, that you had a good working relationship with Ms Williamson. That is not the issue in question. She was not terminated from her employment because her working relationship with you had disintegrated. The things provided as evidence of how her relationship had broken down with the Government are all to do with comments she made about reproductive health services in Tasmania. That is the crux of the matter and that is what is so concerning about this. That is why we do not believe you when you say no-one in your Government has sought to interfere or influence the employment relationship of Angela Williamson and Cricket Tasmania, Australia. It does not stack up. That is why we do not believe you when you say to us that Ms Haley offered her resignation, you did not accept it and did not renew her contract or you terminated it. We do not believe you because we have heard four different versions of the same story. It does not add up.

This is such a messy affair and any reasonable person reading the information before them will conclude the Premier is in this up to his neck and only an independent investigation will reveal the truth.

Time expired.

[12.27 p.m.]

Mr HODGMAN (Franklin - Premier) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I welcome the opportunity to contribute to this debate. I have no doubt members opposite will start to fire up; they have been asleep for the last half-an-hour. I am sure they will start to show some interest in this debate and evidence of what is now occurring.

Members interjecting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. This is a very serious motion. Ms White, the Leader of the Opposition, was heard without interjection and I ask a similar amount of respect be shown to the Premier.

Mr HODGMAN - Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am very conscious of the sensitivities of the issues being canvassed and of the nature of this debate. It is one that should be handled appropriately and respectfully by all members of this place, particularly when it concerns individuals outside of this place and not able to offer their perspective within it.

There is rank politics being played, a lot of assertions made, a lot of dealing in speculation and conspiracy theories, which go to both women who are embroiled in what has become a political affair being pursued with great vigour by the Opposition over the course of this parliamentary week. It was not so much in the Leader's speech but it has been the sole focus of their attention for this first week of parliament on its resumption. It involves two women who are not in this place to provide their views or their perspectives. We have been conscious of this, and yes, we have been respectful of processes underway with respect to Ms Williamson. I have been strong and clear in my statement about Ms Haley's conduct, which as I have said on numerous occasions, had serious ramifications.

Ms Haley apologised not only to me and the Government but also in person to Ms Williamson for her conduct and sought to reconcile, to some extent, as much as possible, with Ms Williamson. It goes to the nature of what has occurred and the sensitivity of the issue that there are two women whose names are being bandied around in this place by Opposition members for purely political reasons, because it is all about getting some sort of political advantage. It shows that you offer little else and have no interest in anything other than politics, and that is well understood by the people of Tasmania.

It is a matter for you as to how you use your time, but I urge members of this parliament, as we have done throughout these matters, to be respectful of the fact that there are other processes underway and have been, and there are rights that I believe members of the community can expect and a code of conduct that should be applied to us whereby we are respectful of that, and to acknowledge and be conscious of the stress that all this is putting on two women, one of whom made a very grave mistake and has paid significant consequences, and another whose personal circumstances have been bandied around in this place and outside it by members for purely political reasons. That is all that this is about.

You have made it clear in all your engagements that this is all about damaging me and the Government. That is your motivation. It is not about the best interests of the people concerned, which you purport to represent. It does not go to the substantive issue or how that might be addressed. It is clearly all about causing political damage to the Government. It is a matter for you as to how you use your time, but with respect to the implications and the additional stress that is placed on these women by your escalating activity, conduct, accusations and assertions, most of which are based on conspiracy theories or rumour or innuendo -

Members interjecting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. I caution Ms O'Byrne. I have asked you to cease interjecting but you were yelling across the Chamber. You are warned and you will not get another warning. The Premier has the call and will continue without interjection.

Mr HODGMAN - You talk about changing stories but your story changes every single day, no matter what we say and how often we outline what has occurred, just to suit yourselves because it gives you another line of attack and in no way does anything to address either the substantive issue or the rights of a member of the public that you purport to represent in this place, or the case

of a former government employee who paid a significant price for her wrongdoing and has apologised for doing so. All of that is by the by if it means you can extract some political pleasure by inflicting a little pain on the Government. It is extremely regrettable, which only escalates the stress on these individuals, and that is a direct consequence of the actions you have taken.

With respect to other individuals who have been mentioned in this place, it goes to nothing that any individual has done or any suggestion of any wrongdoing. It is simply a point we are making central to your attack on this that if a staffer resigns they are ineligible for severance benefits. That has been the argument put by members opposite. If a staffer resigns, then they are ineligible, apparently, for severance benefits, yet in the case of your own staff, who advised media had resigned before the end of the contract, severance benefits were paid. Your own statement of 16 March 2018 advises that your chief spin doctor, so-called, had resigned and had received severance benefits. This is my point to the Leader of the Opposition who claims different stories, but changes hers every single day to make a political point.

Those are the facts. It is no reflection on any former member of your staff but it is a fact that those so-called entitlements are afforded to any person, whoever they are employed by, in accordance with advice received by human resources personnel. The secretary of DPAC confirmed this yesterday in her statement to clarify the erroneous claims in reporting of this matter that anything wrong had been done.

For the record, I state very clearly that I spoke to Ms Haley on 6 March, at which point she advised me of her intention to resign and to not seek a new contract.

Ms O'Byrne interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - I accepted this, as you would appreciate in the context of this discussion, as it accorded with my view that she not be offered a new contract due to her actions.

Ms O'Byrne interjecting.

Mr HODGMAN - There is nothing unusual about that, or the bizarre conclusions that you draw -

Mr FERGUSON - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am reluctant to interrupt the Premier but during Ms White's 30-minute insubstantial contribution that cycled round and round, she was listened to in complete silence. Mr Deputy Speaker, you have already ruled in relation to Ms O'Byrne and said you would not warn her again. I ask that you ensure discipline on the other side to allow the Premier to be heard on this censure motion on him, which is his right.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - I uphold the point of order. Members will cease their interjections. Ms O'Byrne, you are already on a warning. I will eject you if you interject again.

Mr HODGMAN - Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It goes to my point that when I am trying to outline very clearly the facts and the circumstances as they are, the Opposition members do not want to listen. It does not suit them to hear those facts because it denies them the opportunity to roll out again later today, tomorrow or the next day and change their story again and change what are facts to suit their own story. Just because they say it does not make it so. Just because they come up with a new version, a new conspiracy theory, a new rumour, and say it in this place or outside, it does not make it so.

As I would expect with any other separation from employment following the election, whether it be Liberal, Labor or Greens officers, Ms Haley's entitlements were appropriately calculated by the Department of Premier and Cabinet. I again make the point that notwithstanding the serious breach and my expectations of Ms Haley's employment as a result of conduct which I have described as utterly unacceptable, she did express her deep regret at the actions she had undertaken and personally apologised to Ms Williamson. It was a grave error of judgment.

I reflect on the fact that despite what members opposite say, Ms Haley has also had a long professional career. She paid the price for her error. Before that she would have had a reasonable expectation of continuing her employment with the Government, but given that conduct there was no such reasonable expectation of that occurring so her contract was not renewed following the state election and she received only what she was entitled to under her instrument of appointment.

I will say on public record that I consider very sincerely that this Government has had a good working relationship with Ms Angela Williamson in various capacities, including working for the Government for a period of time. As I have said repeatedly in this place, at no time did we endeavour to complain to Cricket Tasmania to in any way influence their decision about their employment of Angela Williamson in relation to her social media activity, far from it. I point members opposite, who seem to think we should now be able to explain or justify Cricket Tasmania's decisions about what it has done, which is patently absurd, to also reflect on the statements that Cricket Tasmania has made publicly about this matter including the interaction with Mr Ferguson. I stand by my statement that I have made on a number of occasions, which goes to the pertinent matter here.

The Opposition will come up with all sorts of avenues to pursue, all sorts of conspiracy theories, all sorts of attempted gotcha moments to embarrass us, to cause political point scoring. That is what they do. That is all they do.

We have made it very clear that we have not sought to complain or seek from Cricket Tasmania any action in response to the social media activity of Ms Williamson. Yes, we have accepted an apology by Ms Williamson. That is a matter that is before the Federal Court and is a matter for Cricket Tasmania. The unreasonableness of members opposite in not only what they say about this matter but what they expect from this shows that no matter what level of inquiry the Opposition seek it will never be enough.

The Opposition has recently called for an independent inquiry. By implication they are saying Tasmania Police in investigating this matter did not do it independently. They did and they found there was no case to answer from the shadow attorney-general about spurious claims that a crime was committed. The police ruled that out after spending time investigating independently. Similarly the independence of the advice given by the secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet in relation to the code of conduct allegations that were made by the members opposite is also called into question. That is highly disrespectful of an individual. We have had repeated instances of that occurring throughout this parliamentary session and the one before it where members opposite are happy to be hypercritical of public servants who perform their duties independently. That is what occurred in this instance. Ms Gale concluded there is no evidence to suggest Mr Ferguson has misled the public in relation to statements on this matter. Further, there is no evidence to suggest that Mr Ferguson has harassed, victimised or discriminated against Ms Williamson, which was asserted by the Opposition. Yet it does not stop them saying it. They go on about people's reputations, but they will do anything and say anything to trash people's reputations. We have come to expect that but they will do that of people who are independently

discharging their functions and have independently looked into this matter. It will be subject to independent inquiry through the Federal Court. That is not enough for the members opposite; they say we need an independent inquiry. The bizarre suggestion that Labor might be the right people to do that is frankly ridiculous.

Noting the very sensitive nature of this matter and the circumstances of the woman involved, Ms Williamson, I reflect on the unsavoury performance of the Opposition in being prepared to say anything and do anything regardless of this sensitivity because they think it is politically a good thing for them. Again, if anyone is genuinely interested, and that includes the media or the Tasmanian public, the critical question, which we have answered repeatedly and will continue to do so, is that at no time did we seek to influence Cricket Tasmania's employment of Angela Williamson. The answer to that is undoubtedly no.

Having answered and addressed these issues -

Ms White - Rubbish. Absolute rubbish.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. Leader of the Opposition, you have been cautioned regarding your interjections. You have had your say. The Premier has the call.

Mr HODGMAN - We have answered questions at great length and have provided information available to us on these matters. We have been more sensitive to the individuals who are being impacted by the escalation of your political activity, which can be described as unfortunate. That does not seem to worry the Opposition members because there is an opportunity for them to secure some political fortune. We have been very cautious over these matters. There is an insatiable demand from members opposite and often reported in the media that we should just say anything and do anything that they want. We will not do that where it concerns the privacy of individuals or the sensitivity of matters that can be handled appropriately, or where it might compromise good process and due process, or where there are matters being assessed and considered by, in this case, the Federal Court.

Noting the time limit available to us on this motion, which is not inconsistent with other motions of this type, noting the time that has already been spent on enquiring into these matters by members opposite I can only question the value for money the members of our community and those who voted for Labor are getting out of this lot.

Ms O'Connor - Have a look at the MPI title today. You want to talk about value for money?

Mr HODGMAN - Yes, I look to the member for Denison, who is defending the Labor Opposition, as the true leader of the opposition. She is the one member of the opposition, with her deputy, who has bothered to enquire of the Government about any matter of substance or policy that will help Tasmania or Tasmanians in need. We used to hear from the Leader of the Opposition that the biggest deal in town, the most important issue to Tasmanians, is our health system. After making that statement she has relieved herself of the responsibility and the burden of being the shadow minister for health and has hardly raised a question or enquiry about what we are doing to fix the health system, which was left in a terrible mess from the Labor-Greens government.

There are a number of issues this Opposition is simply unwilling to pursue or too lazy to progress, whether it be developing an alternative budget, or advocating for policies that they took to the election that they say they stand by but have hardly spoken about since. The Labor Party's

gaming policy is a great example. We know why they might be reluctant to talk about that. There is little wonder why Labor would not want to talk about their health policy. You talk about different versions of things. Tasmanians remember - and it was reflected in the vote in March this year - that Labor had seven versions of their health policy and could not adequately explain any of them. They are good at getting on television with cheap headlines and one line slogans, and they will roll out members of the upper House to complain and carp. There have been more than 140 media releases since the election and only six of them have spoken about policy, about how you can improve Tasmanians' lives, about how you can contribute to public policy debate, about being a constructive and effective Opposition.

You are very effective at getting the news grab and getting on television but it is all style and no substance. It is reflected in the fact that they are presenting so beautifully today in their red outfits - their red costumes - on a day when there are members of the public and community sector unions outside -

Ms White - Protesting on the lawns.

Mr HODGMAN - Yes they are. They are doing their bit to argue a case. What have you done today on that? Not a thing. You will be out there at lunchtime enjoying being part of the action but you did not ask a single question of the Treasurer or me on this today. The only question he received was from our own ranks. It all has to be done -

Mr O'Byrne - Did you do a press conference yesterday? Did any of you go out?

Mr HODGMAN - According to the putative next leader of the opposition this is what is important. Who is out there on the media? That is what is important. What is important to our Government is delivering on the plan contained within our Budget, to keep our economy strong, to keep our Budget - which you left in a billion dollars in deficit - in surplus thanks to the great work of Tasmania's Best ever Treasurer, Peter Gutwein, and to reinvest the dividends of that strong economy and budget back into our health system, back into finding homes for people in housing stress, back into improving our education system, which is so much better than it was when we came into government. We are about keeping our economy one of the strongest performing in the nation, which it is, and pursuing our greatest competitive strengths, whether it be in tourism, hospitality, our energy sector, or the boom we are seeing in our housing and construction sectors, agriculture and aquaculture.

This state has never been in a better position, but you would not know it if you listened to members opposite because they are the only ones talking the place down. They are the only ones who are talking about anything other than Tasmania and the way forward, because they have nothing to offer. We have the most confident business community in the country. We want to keep it that way, but members opposite send out their members and get media - good on you. All you do is complain and whinge and offer nothing by way of a constructive way forward for Tasmania. It is a disgrace and you are a shell of an opposition. It was reflected in the performance by the member opposite who can only resort to silly conspiracy theories, speculation and going through every line of who said what to make some political point. It has no consequence.

Tasmanians reflected that in the vote this year when, for only the second time in the state's history they re-elected a majority Liberal government. They have one that is delivering and will continue to do so and provide good political, stable government in Tasmania and continue to deliver our plan. They also had a good, hard look at the Opposition and came to the conclusion that there

is a bit of style there but no substance whatsoever. They could not stack up policies that made sense or could be delivered, they could not come up with a constructive way forward to deal with some of the challenges we are dealing with, a lot of which were left by the former government, I hasten to add. When push came to shove, it was a risk too big to take to vote Labor because they are out of their depth.

That is what they concluded and it has been well shown in this first sitting week when we have some important legislation to pursue, and now members opposite are saying, 'That legislation, which we always complain there is not enough of, isn't important'. It is, because it helps keep our agenda moving forward and also deals with the issues that will affect and impact on Tasmanian's lives and improve them.

I cannot see what any of this you have done over the last week - and I point to the Labor Party, because at least the Greens have been able to identify other issues of concern to them and their constituencies - is helping Tasmania.

[12.53 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Mr Deputy Speaker, in the short time still available to us on this debate, I indicate that Dr Woodruff and I will support this censure motion because there still is no clarity about the circumstances surrounding the sacking of a Cricket Tasmania employee.

The question remains: why was Angela Williamson sacked but Martine Haley was not? We had an employee of Cricket Tasmania who had conducted herself as an employee promoting the work of Cricket Tasmania in an exemplary fashion and had developed good relationships across the political spectrum in relation to the work of Cricket Tasmania. Yet we had another employee, a government political appointment, Martine Haley, who conducted herself in an appalling fashion yet was allowed to offer her resignation and receive a payout.

As the Premier rightly points out, this matter is going to court and there will be a discovery process. That, undoubtedly, will be an illuminating process of much more breadth and depth than the code of conduct investigation initiated by the Premier and undertaken by the secretary of the Department of Premier and Cabinet.

How can you have a code of conduct investigation that does not speak to key people involved, including Angela Williamson and the management of Cricket Tasmania, a code of conduct investigation that was wholly reliant on the testimony of a Cabinet minister? It beggars belief.

As for the statement that this is a waste of time, I remind the House that between 2010 and 2014 this House allocated more than 50 hours to no confidence and censure motions brought on by the then Liberal opposition. You want to talk about making politics and running this state down on a daily basis but that is exactly what the Liberal opposition did at a time when the previous government was trying to steer this state through a global recession. Fifty-plus hours on no-confidence and censure motions; we have been back and had a look. It was only towards the end, when it became a weekly event, that the gag was used particularly over censure motions.

In this last five years, not once has a no-confidence or censure motion been debated to its full length. That is appalling. We have had only an hour today to question the conduct of the Premier and his ministers and it is not enough time to properly examine this issue. We are in a highly

regrettable situation where two women are being dragged through this place, but it is not about those two women. It is about the integrity of the Premier and the standards that he upholds.

The fundamental question here is if Angela Williamson was doing a good job with Cricket Tasmania, why was she sacked? What pressure was Cricket Tasmania put under in order to terminate her employment? These are critical questions that undoubtedly will be examined by the Federal Court and there will be a discovery process. It will be interesting to determine whether there have been untruths told in response to questions from Labor on this matter or in public statements that have been made.

What we know is that on 28 February this year Martine Haley, under the pseudonym of Alice Wood-Jones, sent a screenshot of a tweet made by Angela Williamson to Angela Williamson's employer. It is a dark day when a member of the Premier's staff seeks to have a private citizen's employment either impacted on or terminated because that person is causing embarrassment to the Government over a failure of public policy in relation to access to surgical terminations in Tasmania.

The code of conduct investigation that has been undertaken is manifestly inadequate. This is no reflection on the secretary of DPAC but a reflection on a poor process that was never going to get to the heart of the issue or examine in any detail the evidentiary questions. If it had been a rigorous and independent code of conduct investigation, all the people involved would have been spoken to and invited to give their version of events. If you do not have the testimony from the sacked employee, Angela Williamson, and you do not ask Cricket Tasmania why they terminated the employment of a competent, capable and respected employee, then you do not have a thorough code of conduct investigation.

We will be supporting this censure motion. This week in the House we have been very reluctant and steered away from asking questions on this matter because of our concern for Angela Williamson, to be honest. I understand why Labor is taking this on. This is no criticism of Labor, but as two Greens women in this House we could not bring ourselves to raise this very personal, delicate matter in the House, yet here we are having this debate.

It does go to the question of the honesty and the integrity of the Premier, to the question of his commitment to accountability and transparency, and it raises serious questions about the political influence that can be brought bear on private citizens who are critical of this Government. The bottom line here is that a woman who went through a surgical termination and was traumatised and angry as a result has been made a victim twice over. On behalf of Dr Woodruff and myself I pass on my best wishes to Angela Williamson. I know she must be highly stressed at the moment. We support the censure motion.

Time expired.

The House divided -

AYES 11

Mr Bacon (Teller)
Dr Broad
Ms Butler
Ms Dow

NOES 11

Ms Archer
Mr Barnett
Ms Courtney
Mr Ferguson

Ms Haddad
Mr O'Byrne
Ms O'Byrne
Ms O'Connor
Ms Standen
Ms White
Dr Woodruff

Mr Gutwein
Mr Hidding (Teller)
Mr Hodgman
Mr Jaensch
Mrs Petrusma
Mr Rockliff
Mr Shelton

PAIR

Ms Houston

Ms Hickey

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - The result of the division is 11 Ayes and 11 Noes. I therefore have to use a casting vote. In accordance with standing order 167 I cast my vote with the Noes.

Motion negatived.

Sitting suspended from 1 p.m. to 2.30 p.m.

MATTER OF PUBLIC IMPORTANCE

Delivering for Tasmanians

[2.31 p.m.]

Mr HIDDING (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the House take note of the following matter: delivering for Tasmanians.

I am delighted to have an opportunity to speak on the matter of public importance in a reflection on the first six months of the second Hodgman Government. It has been an excellent six months. It is lovely to come back from an extended winter break and reflect that so much has happened since the March election.

Immediately after the last election, the Government re-established itself with a new Cabinet and it swung into action like the well-oiled machine it is. All ministers were motivated to continue to deliver on the previous government's promised agenda and to start delivering on the 100 Day Plan over the next four years. It is wonderful to work with a Government that has a clear plan, has the support of the people of Tasmania to deliver that plan and to watch the confidence it has generated around Tasmania. As strong and inspirational as it is, it is being delivered by a Government that can deliver.

I would also like to reflect upon the new funding delivered to support hospital emergency departments and patient flow. Without question, there has been an increased level of activity in our emergency departments in both the LGH and the Royal Hobart Hospital. This is something the Government has not created; it is a result of a complex set of circumstances. One is a growing population. The more people you have, the more people will be accessing hospitals and there have been some epidemics of flus and other bits and pieces. We have been going through that cycle of some pressure on our emergency departments and the Government acted immediately to relieve

pressure on these hospital EDs by delivering more support for frontline staff and improving patient flow.

It was a six-month package and it featured patient flow support teams established at both of those hospitals, led by senior emergency medicine specialists with: additional nurse support; better admission processes, streamlined; increased on-call resources to assist with patient flow during periods of high demand and to provide care faster; extended hours for pathology services; and boosted cleaning capacity to improve bed turnover. It was an excellent response by a Government, supported and advised by a health system that knows what it is doing. It has wonderful staff. For all the complaints we hear from the other side about a bit of ambulance ramping and pressure on the EDs from time to time, what I do see on the doors, out on the road, around the electorate and around the towns and cities of Tasmania when people do present to the emergency departments - regardless of the fact that they might be surrounded by a lot of other people in the same circumstances - we receive unstinting praise for the workers, the staff, emergency staff and clinicians working under those circumstances, triaging and working through patients with care, love and an attitude that is very supportive at a stressful time. I hear nothing but good news and good feedback for our health workers.

I take the opportunity, I am not the minister, and I do not want to be presumptive here -

Ms O'Connor - Pay them properly.

Mr O'Byrne - They were pretty clear about their view, out the front.

Mr HIDDING - I understand that and the Government does. It is not only nurses out there, but we understand they were. Whether they were out there today, I am happy to place on the record they do a cracker job in our hospitals and Tasmanians, after having been there, do not ever feel worse for wear in their health due to the care they received. They might have ongoing challenges, but generally they engage with those challenges in a very cooperative and competent way with the service they are receiving. I want to place on the record our thanks and my thanks to all our staff in our hospitals.

As to law and order, a matter I know a little about, we committed to bring new legislation into this place to deal with the proliferation of outlaw criminal motorcycle gangs and we have done so. We also promised police body cameras. I will deal with police body cameras first. Its time had arrived in Tasmania. It was not always a first choice piece of kit for Tasmanian police officers. It is somewhat unnerving when you are in a pressure situation with the threat to your own health and you need to step in to do something. Everything you say and do is being filmed by a unit that sits on the operational vest but, over a period of time, our fine Tasmanian police officers came to understand it is a protection for them. It is a protection against people making false claims of excessive police force, police enflaming something or operating improperly in the field. The cameras provide wonderful protection for them. It requires those police officers to actively switch the cameras on. They need to do that when they are entering into an operational situation and they know that. If there was a circumstance where somebody made a complaint and the camera was not switched on, the police officer would need to explain why. The explanation could relate to personal matters, you could be anywhere prior to that and you are not required to have it turned on all of the time. They are two matters this state is delivering on and I am very proud of them.

Time expired.

[2.39 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Madam Speaker, one thing the Government is delivering, with respect to the previous member, is a lot of confusion on the issue of guns. We have seen a firearms policy produced before the election that has resulted in a cascading effect of consequences, changes of plans, changes of strategies, and we are still in a state of confusion as to where things are going.

We saw a policy that was hand delivered to interest groups and came to light only a few days before the election, which caused no end of uproar. That resulted in some political issues. The policy put out before the election was in breach of the National Firearms Agreement in a couple of areas at least, the first being the extension of licences from five years to 10 years. The second is creating another category of firearm registration that would allow access to semi-automatic rifles and pump-action shotguns.

The Government got into difficulty politically and in the media. A committee formed in the upper House. That committee went to the public and the public took the time and effort to put forward their opinions on what changes should be made, especially in reference to the Liberal policy. The Government backflipped on their policy a couple of weeks after submissions closed. They did not put a submission to the inquiry. We did. We put forward our policy. Our policy does not breach the National Firearms Agreement, which has been confirmed by Gun Control Australia. Two weeks later, after submissions had closed, the Government withdrew their policy, which made the upper House inquiry untenable. Earlier this week that upper House inquiry was disbanded.

I am not sure how those representations to a committee in the other place can be considered by an as yet to be formed committee in the lower House. There is some confusion there. We should not be confused about whether the member for Lyons, Mr Hidding, would rule out participating in that committee. As the architect of this failed policy, if he was part of the process to consider the representations of the people of Tasmania it could be assumed that he would have a fixed position. It was his policy that created this whole mess in the first place. We would argue that it would be untenable for Mr Hidding to participate in this committee.

There is mass confusion about where the Government's gun policy will go. This arises at a time when there are shootings in Tasmania. Very unfortunate. Pablo's, the bar in Hobart, was shot up with a semi-automatic Chinese military rifle. It is very scary that these weapons are still in the hands of people who should not have them. It was unfortunate that people tried to make light of that situation by creating stubby holders and T-shirts saying 'Shots at Pablo's' which was pretty disgraceful, especially when that person has links directly to members of parliament. I think that that was -

Mr Hidding - You would want to be very careful there, sunshine, because you have family as well. You do not want people to be raising your family.

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Mr Hidding and Dr Broad, I think we leave family outside of it, please.

Dr BROAD - It is in the public domain. Last week we saw the unfortunate incident in the northern suburbs, which is frightening.

Mr Hidding interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Hidding, thank you.

Dr BROAD - The guns policy needs clarification. The Government's policy is all up in the air. They are not delivering any certainty on where the Government's guns policy will be going. We would like to see that certainty. We would like to see parliament go back to a bipartisan or tripartisan position on firearms where we can discuss sensible amendments, not in the heat of an election campaign where a policy is thrown out there with no reference to community consultation, desires or input. That has set back any discussion of sensible minor changes as per our policy to gun laws. There is the appearance of a lack of goodwill because of the guns policy fiasco, with the Government trying work-arounds to get their policy considered or buried. It is a way to get them out of a political hole.

As a result of this confusion we are not sure what is happening with the House of Assembly committee. It would be appropriate for Mr Hidding to rule himself out of being a member of that committee.

[2.46 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, I agree with pretty much everything Dr Broad just said in relation to the gun laws fiasco in Tasmania, particularly since the eve of the election when the Liberals' secretive plan to weaken Tasmania's gun laws in contravention of the National Firearms Agreement was made public by the Greens.

When you have been in this place for a little while you have a jaundiced eye. Yesterday, on the day the Legislative Council inquiry into changes to the guns laws was disbanded and not long after the Liberals had to walk away from weakening the state's gun laws, we had the minister for Primary Industries coming in here with sop to shooters and announcing a plan to allow hunters into national parks and reserves and the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area in what is clearly not invasive species management. It is about hunting. It is not about controlling feral deer populations because if you are serious about controlling feral deer populations, it is like feral cats, you go back to the source. The source of the feral deer problem in Tasmania is the deer hunting industry, which is funded and enabled by significant resources, allocated through the Department of Primary Industries, Parks, Water and the Environment.

When we talk about what the Liberals are delivering for Tasmania, one thing we can be certain of is that the federal Liberals are delivering nothing for Tasmania. They are so caught up in their own culture wars, back-stabbing and knifing of a spineless prime minister that they are paying no attention to Tasmania whatsoever. We have seen a serried rank of right-wingers today walk away from their responsibility to the people of Australia. Cormann has gone, Fifield gone, up to the backbench, and Cash has gone - there is a blessing.

As we know, the Tasmania senators, Eric Abetz, David Bushby and Jonathon Duniam have been part of the rot of undermining the Prime Minister of Australia. This is not about his popularity or how the Liberal Party is tracking in the polls. This is about the culture wars. As Senator Concetta Fierravanti-Wells made clear in her resignation letter to the Prime Minister, there are some in the right wing of the Liberal Party who fear the party is losing touch with its conservative base. That is why they are prepared to back an authoritarian racist like Peter Dutton. This is part of the conservatives march towards authoritarianism and fascism, where you get heartless policies, undermining of human rights, demonisation of public dissent, and demonisation of the free press such as the ABC. It further demonises and marginalises asylum seekers to the point where we are allowing children to suffer in Nauru, where we are allowing children to give up hope and give up on life as a result of policy that is 100 per cent the responsibility of the Liberal Party and the Labor Party federally.

What else have the Tasmanian Liberals delivered for Tasmania? The most corrupt election campaign in Tasmania's history.

Mr Jaensch - What about how well the state is going?

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Ms O'CONNOR - Absolute opacity over donations. We still do not know how much money came from which vested interests and to what explicit purpose, but what we do know, as a result of the flow of that money and a corrupted election campaign -

Mr Jaensch - Anything that doesn't end the way you want must be corrupt.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Jaensch.

Ms O'CONNOR - it is entirely possible that the people of Tasmania, particularly in marginalised areas, will be blighted with poker machines in pubs and clubs until the year 2043.

Again I say it is a stain on the Liberal Party that they would take that money and back in the gambling industry at the expense of Tasmanians living in disadvantaged areas. I am certain that when members such as Mr Hidding, who brought this MPI on, examines his conscience in the quiet of night when he is trying to go to sleep, these sorts of matters would weigh heavily, knowing that he is part of a government who is prepared to back in social misery until the year 2043.

What else have the Liberals delivered? The Office of the Coordinator-General and the red carpet treatment to corporate developers, private developers and foreign governments, with no transparency or accountability and a Government quango attached to the Department of State Growth which is trading in public assets and not engaging with the people of Tasmania.

What else have the Liberals delivered? Hobart has its first proposals for skyscrapers - that is what 'open for business' has delivered to the people of Hobart - as well as a proposal to develop 3185 hectares of beautiful agricultural and coastal land on the east coast of Tasmania into a Chinese enclave, which has the backing of the Chinese Communist Party.

Under the Liberals we have also had an unprecedented level of exploitation of the state's protected areas, including the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area. We are getting favoured developers, through a secretive process through the Office of the Coordinator-General under cover of commercial-in-confidence, being given an entrée into public protected areas to build exclusive developments. We have had the World Heritage Area Management Plan corrupted in order to favour private development and further exploitation of the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area.

Let us not forget that there is no public input, consultation or appeal rights in relation to developments that are approved in the Tasmanian Wilderness World Heritage Area, national parks or other public lands, because of the secretive process that has been set up by the Hodgman Liberals to allow increased exploitation of a world-class wilderness, the only World Heritage property on the list of more than 1000 properties that has the word 'wilderness' in its name.

These places belong to the people of Tasmania. For tens of thousands of years they were nurtured by the Tasmanian Aboriginal people. They are held in trust for the people of the world and future generations. As a state and as a parliament, we are bound to protect them.

[2.53 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to contribute to this MPI. The majority Liberal Government is delivering for Tasmania. We are driving the economy, creating more income and reinvesting that income and gains into essential services such as hospitals, education and housing - and Mr Jaensch is here building more houses. It sends shivers down my spine to think what might have happened if Labor and the Greens had got back in. The investment would have dived in Tasmania.

Ms O'Connor - You know you have the highest unemployment rate in the country.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Ms O'Connor.

Mr SHELTON - The income would have dried up and the only way they could have delivered anywhere near what we are doing in essential services is put up taxes on people. There is no other way. You either drive the economy to increase the level of the economy and therefore income into the state, or in order to provide a level of service that the community expect, you have to pay for it some other way. There is only one other way and that is you put up taxes. That is my fear. You only have to go back to when the Greens were in government with Labor when we saw nurses sacked, wards closed, and attempts to close schools. The economy was at rock bottom.

As I said this morning in a question to the Building minister, when I talk to people in business in Lyons and right across the state, mates or not mates, the people who are out there working for a living are saying they have never been busier. The state's economy is booming and those people are getting the advantages of a strong economy.

More Tasmanians than ever before are in work, according to the latest ABS labour force figures. Almost a quarter of a million Tasmanians are now employed, confirming our long-term plan is delivering and getting more Tasmanians into the workforce. Importantly, the participation rate in Tasmania has also grown to 61.5 per cent, an increase from last month and the highest level in nearly four years. This reflects the increase and confidence that Tasmanians now have when looking for work and businesses taking advantage of the strong economy and favourable business conditions.

The unemployment rate has also remained steady at 6.2 per cent, well below the peak of 8.6 per cent experienced under Labor and the Greens. ABS figures show that 14 700 jobs have been created since 2014. and we will continue to put in place the right economic conditions to create even more jobs for Tasmanians.

The Government has met every single one of its commitments we said we would deliver in the first 100 days since being sworn in for our second term - the 100-Day Plan. In this time we have delivered the 2018-19 Budget, which confirms operating surpluses this year and every year across the forward Estimates, with record investments in health, education and infrastructure. Our Budget also details how the Government will deliver on the election commitments in full and on time.

Joint state and Commonwealth funding has been secured for major projects including the \$576 million for the Bridgewater Bridge and almost \$90 million for the Cradle Mountain precinct.

The Government has reached an historic agreement with TasWater and local government to reform and improve the state's water and sewerage infrastructure, reduce the forecast price increase and accelerate upgrades in infrastructure.

Work has been done on the Tasmania First strategy and we are reviewing our family violence laws to ensure that we continue to offer the greatest protection possible to Tasmanian families at risk. Funding has been brought forward to deliver stages one and two of our Affordable Housing Strategy, representing the largest investment in affordable housing than ever before in Tasmania.

The Hodgman Liberal Government is delivering on our commitments to build infrastructure across our growing state which a growing state needs, with the first-ever detailed 10-year infrastructure pipeline. The pipeline clearly maps out planned infrastructure developments over the next decade from which medium and long-term private investment and employment decisions can be made. The initial Tasmanian infrastructure pipeline includes 247 vital projects, each valued at \$5 million or more and totalling a combined \$13.9 billion over the 10 years of the pipeline. In addition, \$4.1 billion in private construction projects and \$8.1 billion in horizon projects have been identified. These infrastructure projects will help to further underpin growth in our economy, support thousands of jobs, boost business confidence and support our growing population.

With infrastructure expenditure in Tasmania expected to top \$1.5 billion this financial year it is important that we take a long-term coordinated approach. Developed by Infrastructure Tasmania, the pipeline provides government, investors, developers, employers, businesses and communities with a long-term view of the key projects that are underway or on the table. It includes economic infrastructure that helps us grow and prosper such as roads, rail, energy, water and sewerage, irrigation and stormwater -

Time expired.

[3.00 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, self-praise is no praise at all. This is a self-congratulatory motion.

Mr Hidding - It is better than none.

Mr O'BYRNE - It is probably the only one you are going to have. As to this motion and the list of things the member, Mr Shelton, member for Lyons, took credit for, we have to acknowledge there is no doubt that the Tasmanian economy is doing better, as it is in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. Look at the economic conditions the previous government faced with the Australian dollar in the headwind of a global financial crisis. Tasmania is an export oriented economy and the exchange rate, the terms of trade we were facing - the Australian dollar was \$1.10.

Mr Shelton - It was the same for all other states.

Mr O'BYRNE - Yes. We were not that bad compared with other states. Now, with the terms of trade -

Mr Shelton - We were at the bottom of all other states. Now we are on the top.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, Mr Shelton.

Mr O'BYRNE - it has improved so much, by 30 per cent. There is no doubt the Tasmanian economy has improved because global circumstances have improved and Tasmania, being an export oriented economy is back on the rebound because of the work the previous government did to diversify the economy. I will never forget the Premier, in the absence of an agenda or a vision, stood on the Domain and lauded the cranes in the sky. This is what a Liberal government would do. We all know all those cranes, all those projects were commenced under our government: the hospital, Parliament Square, all those projects and all those cranes were initiated under Labor.

Mr Shelton - You spent \$10 million on the hospital before you decided where to put it.

Madam SPEAKER - Mr Shelton, I do expect more from you.

Mr O'BYRNE - Labor had done the hard work of diversifying the economy. We built the irrigation to transform an agricultural sector from medium to low-value to medium to high-value, adding to the value of land, adding to the productivity of the land by delivering water to where it was needed. That was Labor. Labor did the micro-economic reform required to prepare our economy and the Tasmanian agribusiness community for the next century. They are the wheels of the economy rolling forward.

For this motion to say the Liberal Party in Government is delivering - they may be delivering, unless you need a house and a roof over your head. People are sleeping in tents at the Showground. It did not go unnoticed, Minister for Housing, the amazing commitment for hundreds of houses is now a commitment for hundreds of houses and lots. To crab walk away from your commitment, which was 900 houses to be built by the middle of next year, you now say it is houses and lots. I suppose you can put some tents on those lots. That will make you happy.

I am sure it is all going very well unless you are one of the poor, innocent people stuck in an ambulance on the ramp at the Royal Hobart Hospital or, even worse, if you are in an ambulance that cannot even park at the ramp and is continuing to drive around the hospital. This is not a laughing matter. This is very serious.

Mr Jaensch - You are conflating houses, tents and ambulances all in the one thing.

Mr O'BYRNE - This is a litany of the effects of your disastrous Government. This is a list and I am ticking it.

Mr Jaensch - I think you are confused.

Madam SPEAKER - I remind members that I am here to serve a purpose and all discussion is to go through the Chair, thank you.

Mr O'BYRNE - It is appalling that the Minister for Housing cannot keep up with the list of shame for this Government that I am working through. With all the economic circumstances going your way, the uplift you had in the GST, imagine if you had a government with a bit of vision and a bit of ticker to take on the big issues, the structural economic reform the Treasurer has squibbed time and again. Imagine how good the economy would be if you had a government that wanted to lead and wanted to take responsibility. I have never seen a government run away from so many big issues. Anything development, nothing to do with you, it is a council matter; you blame other people on this matter of public importance.

We look at infrastructure and we see the embarrassment of being in government for over four years and could not even put a business case together for Infrastructure Australia for the Bridgewater bridge. It was a draft business case. What did the federal government and the Prime Minister do? They must have received a phone call, and at the same time they pulled you out of jail with the commitment to build the Bridgewater bridge. Infrastructure Australia said we need to apply more rigour to stop this kind of public policy happening to save state governments that have not done the work.

What about the airport roundabout? You had four years and it was a draft business case. We can talk about Macquarie Point. Do you think you have done well there? You had four years. We secured the site, secured the money; Labor did this. We took Toll and TasRail out to Brighton. We set up the corporation for the government to do its job of providing a vision and a plan for that site. What have you done in four years? You have knocked down the cold store and have put up a demountable. You are lauding that as being fantastic. No vision, no plan; absolute chaos! Do the work. This is outrageous. They have an MPI, patting themselves on the back and saying they are delivering.

Time expired.

Matter noted.

THREATENED SPECIES PROTECTION AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 8)
METRO TASMANIA AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 14)

Bills agreed to by the Legislative Council without amendment.

**WATER AND SEWERAGE CORPORATION AMENDMENT (CROWN
INVOLVEMENT FACILITATION) BILL 2018 (No. 24)**

Second Reading

[3.08 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer) - Madam Speaker, I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

This legislation to be introduced today helps facilitate a collaborative strategy developed by the Hodgman Liberal Government, TasWater and local government representatives to find solutions to the longstanding challenges facing the water and sewerage industry.

Earlier this year, the Government commenced discussions with local government representatives and TasWater to develop a new approach to resolve these issues. These discussions culminated in the memorandum of understanding signed by the Government, TasWater and the Chief Owners Representative on 1 May 2018. The purpose of the MOU is to improve water and sewerage outcomes for Tasmanians. The MOU contemplates that the Government will become a minority shareholder of TasWater by providing \$200 million in equity contributions over 10 years. This will allow TasWater to accelerate its infrastructure investment, with a target of \$1.8 billion infrastructure investment to be delivered by 2026. It will also help ensure that TasWater keeps

water and sewerage prices more affordable. As part of the MOU commitments, TasWater has agreed to impose a price freeze for regulated water and sewerage services in the financial year 2019-20. From 2020-21, TasWater has agreed to maximum price increases of 3.5 per cent each year to 2025. Importantly, the Government will receive no dividends from TasWater.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that councils are able to consider, for approval, resolutions that include roles for the state government. The Shareholder Subscription and Implementation Agreement and the amendments to TasWater's Constitution and Shareholders Letter of Expectation require the approval of TasWater's council owners, through the passing of three resolutions about the MOU commitments at a Special General Meeting of shareholders scheduled for 27 September 2018.

The Water and Sewerage Corporation Act 2012 currently prevents the shareholders from passing resolutions that contemplate an entity other than councils owning shares in TasWater because this act only allows councils to be owners of the corporation. This legislation includes a new section in the act to ensure the validity of resolutions passed by councils to change the ownership of TasWater, consistent with the MOU measures. If the resolutions are passed by council shareholders at the Special General Meeting, a second bill can then be introduced later in the 2018 spring session of parliament to amend the Water and Sewerage Corporation Act to allow the Crown to become an owner of TasWater.

The approach, which has been developed in close consultation with TasWater, is for councils to consider for approval the resolutions prepared by TasWater. Subject to councils supporting the resolutions, legislation will be introduced later this year to allow the Government to become a minority owner of TasWater and implement the measures under the MOU. This bill allows councils to make lawful resolutions on these measures.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I commend the bill to the House.

[3.11 p.m.]

Mr O'BYRNE (Franklin) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I indicate to the House that we will be supporting this bill, but in doing so make it very clear that in no way do we support the deal that has been put to the Tasmanian people and the stakeholders of TasWater. We are very concerned about this. We can understand why there is a mood inside local government circles to resolve this sorry tale of dysfunction led by the state Government around TasWater policy. We understand why they want it resolved, but we have a number of fundamental concerns regarding the nature of the agreement, the impacts it will have on the capacity of TasWater to deliver their infrastructure program and therefore the impact that will have on the broader Tasmanian community.

We are here because two years ago the state Government, in the absence of an economic agenda or any vision for the state, decided to start a fight with local government by a hostile takeover of TasWater. It came out of the blue. There was a series of discussions between the Treasurer and local government regarding their infrastructure strategy and their progress in resolving some of the challenges, particularly in regional Tasmania with issues around boil water alerts, and then the Treasurer and the Government launched a very personal and hostile attack on local government to take over TasWater. Whilst there is support in a number of local government areas for this agreement, there is a significant debate that is occurring and I know that TasWater's owners and the councils will be making decisions later in September.

Whilst some people are saying this is the piece that we require, I think it is more of a Treaty of Versailles than any long-lasting resolution of hostilities between the state Government and TasWater. We think this sows the seeds for further discontent. Essentially, we believe that it is the Government kicking the problem down the road and getting over a political problem of their own making. I make that clear - this is a political problem of their own making. They attacked local government, they attacked TasWater, and then when it became clear that TasWater and local councils had beaten the Tasmanian Government out came this MOU and resolution - as I said, I have compared it to the Treaty of Versailles, which we all know was disastrous for Europe - and this could be disastrous for Tasmania.

The Liberals' pre-election policy aims were to take control of Tasmania's water and sewerage to lower prices, freeze bills for one year in delivering permanently cheaper prices, cap price increases, save up to \$700 on water bills over six years, fix infrastructure sooner, and support councils so rates would not rise. We know that whilst they took that policy to the election, under the pomp and ceremony of the first day of parliament, they crab-walked away from their position and announced that an MOU had been reached with TasWater.

We have significant concerns about the MOU. Obviously it is a humiliating backdown for the Government after being so strident for two years, personally attacking the chair and local government, and then in the shadow of an election and the ceremonial opening of parliament to sign and announce the deal. The deal locks in 3.5 per cent annual TasWater bill hikes, well over the expected CPI increases of 2.25 per cent, so customers will be paying higher bills in real terms by year four of the 20-year deal. The associated justification for the Liberal policy of taking over TasWater means the Treasurer, Peter Gutwein, has effectively settled for 10 per cent, creating a government nightmare with a complicated ownership structure.

The deal effectively shuffles around money, so whilst the \$200 million goes in from taxpayers, it essentially goes in to subsidise the rate freeze and the rate capping. It does nothing to bring forward the infrastructure strategy as articulated by TasWater. It does nothing to deal with the challenge of Macquarie Point, or Cameron Bay for Launceston's water and sewerage. It has nothing to do with the emerging challenges in TasWater around Coles Bay, the southern beaches, and a range of regional committees around the state. It does nothing to bring that down. It is not an equity injection; it is an injection to pay for the price freeze and also a price cap, which is not delivering cheaper prices because it is in excess of the expected CPI increases.

Mr Deputy Speaker, we put on the record that while we understand and acknowledge that this is a procedural bill designed to allow local government to make a decision regarding the MOU, the governance structures, we have significant concerns around the capacity of the MOU to deliver what is required for the Tasmanian community. It actually lessens TasWater's financial position and it is a lot of taxpayers' money going into a convoluted management structure that will not deliver certainty on any basis for local communities, but particularly for TasWater.

I believe this is the largest infrastructure challenge facing Tasmania. The Property Council is probably the big loser out of this. Labor has never been against a philosophical takeover of TasWater or creating a GBE. We were not briefed. The hostile nature in which you went about it, the business case, all of the information that would be required to inform a new GBE to allow the capital injection into TasWater's budget to deliver on the needs of the Tasmanian community - none of these things were put out into the public domain or offered as a briefing. It was before my being elected back into the House but it is my understanding from the previous shadow that none of these things were allowed. The Treasurer had staked his reputation on the hostile takeover, lost, and has

now come up with an agreement which delivers none of the things he sought to achieve in terms of policy.

We have grave concerns and I made that very clear. It is before the councils. They consider this in late September. We have made our view clear on the public record.

There will be another opportunity for us once local government has made their decision on the MOU, and then it is up to the Government to respond. We reserve the right, based on that meeting, to form a position for the next round of legislation. We do not want to inhibit the ability of local government to make a decision. It is the reasonable thing to do, but that should not be read that we endorse this agreement.

We definitely do not endorse the way you went about it, personally attacking the chair and the hostile takeover. It was a shabby experience for those people, regardless of whether you think they are doing the best job or not. They are good people, working very hard within TasWater and local councils and government to deliver for their community. They did not deserve the attack you launched on them.

From a conversation that happened after the election, a month later you were announcing an MOU, a number of councils have some serious questions and concerns. No doubt they will go through their process in answering them.

Labor will be supporting this, but that is in no way an endorsement of the policy. We reserve the right to form a position once councils have considered the MOU in full.

[3.21 p.m.]

Dr WOODRUFF (Franklin) - Madam Speaker, the Greens support the intent of this bill to provide the legal machinery for councils to undertake the consultation and make decisions on approaching the next stage in the management of the part of the state's water and sewerage infrastructure that is the responsibility of local councils.

I agree with Mr O'Byrne, that it in no way implies that the Greens have a fixed position on the MOUs that are on the table. A number of councils are comfortable and support that approach; many others have questions that have not been answered. They have questions on the returns to council over the long term, the price paid for the Government's move into this space and the impact on rates.

I put on the record how enduring and disappointing the comments and lack of leadership by the Treasurer have been on this issue over the past 18 months. He has painted a picture of greedy councils that are in there for themselves and not in the best interests of the people they represent; councils that are trying to steal money from people and hoard money from TasWater while not putting in place the operational infrastructure TasWater needs to ensure clean and safe water in Tasmania.

It could not be further from the truth. The dividends that are returned to council have reduced substantially and will continue to reduce over the next 10 years, according to the model that is being proposed. Those dividends do not go into councillors' pockets. They go back into people's roadside rubbish collections. They go back into creating the parks and public open spaces that people use. They go back into patching roads and building new roads. They go back into supporting planning officers to provide advice to people about developments. They go back into all the good work that local councils do on behalf of and for their communities.

This has always been about politics for the Liberal Government. Following the attacks the Treasurer ended up with egg on his face because when the Auditor-General delivered his report in November last year he made it clear that TasWater had inherited a large amount of work that needed to be done over a very short period of time and that progress on that work was significant and substantial.

Contrast that with what the Treasurer said when he talked about a TasWater takeover. He said Tasmania was in an emergency. There was a crisis: a failure of water and sewerage infrastructure management by TasWater. A failure to provide Tasmanians in some places with safe drinking water. It was an attack and it was pure politics. It was an attempt by the Liberals to distract from the mess that was 2017 for them in Government.

We know this was true because when the Treasurer made a direct attack on Miles Hampton in May last year, a ReachTEL poll had asked people how they would vote on the basis of the issue of TasWater. The Liberals were using it to whip up a sense of goodies and baddies. The truth is that the management of water infrastructure was run down for a long time by a lot of small councils because we have the widest range of water infrastructure and assets relative to every other state of Australia.

The Greens are not apologising for Tasmanians being able to have anything other than clean and safe potable water. TasWater appears to have done the job it needed to do when it took over. There are no boil water alerts and, despite what the Treasurer said, Tasmanians are drinking safe potable water. I went to South Australia during the winter break and I passed through Melbourne. Melbourne tap water is disgusting. It got better when I got to Adelaide. We really live in blessed circumstances in Tasmania.

The best thing the Treasurer and Government could do would be to provide leadership on big water infrastructure issues that remain unaddressed. Mr Gutwein, regarding Launceston, you have consistently ignored the responsibility of the state government in putting some serious money on the table or in making an investment that could attract partnership investment from the federal government. It is the role of the state to look at these long-term infrastructure issues. There are a number you left languishing, Macquarie Point and Launceston in particular, whilst you have wasted time attacking TasWater for political purposes over the last 18 months.

We will, with the caveats I mentioned of not endorsing a particular outcome, support this legislation. The machinery is in place for councils to make their own decisions about what a suitable MOU might be.

[3.31 p.m.]

Mr SHELTON (Lyons) - Mr Deputy Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to make a contribution to this TasWater bill. I compliment the Treasurer on the work put into it. All he ever wanted was the best outcomes for the Tasmanian community. That is what the Treasurer has been after and what he is delivering. The Government is working with local government and TasWater to deliver a joint ownership model. Councils will collectively retain majority ownership and the state will become an owner under the new model.

Each year, the Crown will purchase 1 million shares for consideration of the \$20 million invested. At the end of the 10-year term of the agreement, the Crown will own 10 million shares for the \$200 million equity contribution. This will represent 10 per cent of the total shares issued in the corporation. These reforms will deliver the Government's commitment on water and

sewerage: a faster fix for Tasmania's water and sewerage infrastructure, delivering \$1.8 billion in upgrades sooner than planned; action on the cost of living by freezing and capping price growth at no more than 3.5 per cent; greater state Government involvement in infrastructure planning, ensuring a whole of state economy and environmental focus; and ensuring councils are not put in a position that results in an increase in rates.

On 1 May 2018, an historic agreement was reached between the state Government and local government Chief Owners Representative and TasWater to improve water and sewerage services in Tasmania. The MOU will pave the way for a package of reforms that will be presented to council owners and, if supported by councils, tabled in parliament. Tasmania will benefit from the partnership that will see a reduction in forecast price increases, accelerated infrastructure upgrades and a joint focus on major projects such as Macquarie Point and the Launceston combined system. The Government and TasWater will also work together on trade waste and expanding water and sewerage services to parts of the state not currently covered by TasWater's network.

Under the agreement, the Government will inject \$20 million per year into TasWater for the next 10 years and in return will become a shareholder of TasWater. Under the agreement, the local government will retain majority ownership of TasWater and new governance arrangements will ensure the state and local government will work together with TasWater's board to deliver the capital program. As the Government, it is pleasing to see all parties coming together with a clear focus on what is in the best interests of Tasmania -[OK]

Chief Owners Representative and Mayor of the Northern Midlands Council, David Downie said the agreement would allow TasWater to build on the excellent work done to date and Councils will be able to maintain a focus on local economic issues while continuing to have a major say on the direction of TasWater. This is particularly important given the impact of water and sewerage on local communities. Importantly, dividends to Local Government owners will be guaranteed and the State Government will not receive a dividend.

Doug Chipman, President LGAT, and Mayor of Clarence City Council said it was extremely pleasing to see all levels of government come together in partnership on such an important matter for Tasmanians.

The Chairman of TasWater, Miles Hampton, said the Board was pleased that the State Government and Owner Councils had reached agreement to move forward in a cooperative and collaborative manner.

'The reform of the water and sewerage sector is arguably the single most important economic reform that has been undertaken in Tasmania for many decades and we can now focus our entire effort on ensuring the benefits expected from the reform are realised.'

Over recent months, the government has been working collaboratively with the Chief Owners Representative and TasWater to prepare a detailed proposal to put to local government in accordance with the MOU. The proposal was circulated to local government in July as an information memorandum, together with a draft legal instrument and legislation to implement the MOU. A Special General Meeting is scheduled for 27 September, at which TasWater's owners will vote on whether to accept this historic agreement.

The Government has consulted extensively with TasWater in preparation of the bill as part of the implementation strategy for the MOU measures. TasWater has recently notified councils that the bill would be introduced into parliament to facilitate the resolution at the September meeting. Councils have been provided with a consultation draft of the second round of legislation as part of the package of material provided to council in the information memorandum released in mid-July. If councils approve the proposed resolution, the second bill will make the necessary amendments to implement this historic agreement.

The legislation we have put forward in this sitting of the House is simple. It removes the legal impediments that would prevent councils from considering this historic reform. The bill ensures the validity of the decision of councils regarding future ownership of TasWater. Councils, in their capacity as owners of TasWater, are set to vote on the resolution at the upcoming special meeting scheduled for 27 September this year. The resolution proposed changes to governance frameworks at TasWater to allow the Crown to become a shareholder. This was set out in the memorandum of understanding signed by the state Government, TasWater and TasWater Chief Owners Representative on 1 May 2018.

This bill before the House ensures the resolution to be voted on at the special general meeting are valid. The act currently provides that only councils can own TasWater. The bill makes it clear the current council shareholders have the power to make valid resolution to change the ownership arrangements of TasWater.

The TasWater package of reforms, if endorsed by local government owners and supported by parliament, will allow the state government to fulfil its commitment regarding prices and infrastructure investment. These reforms will deliver the government's commitment on water and sewerage: a faster fix for Tasmania's water and sewerage infrastructure, delivering \$1.8 billion in upgrades sooner than planned; actions on the cost of living by freezing and capping price growth at no more than 3.5 per cent; greater state government involvement in infrastructure planning ensuring a whole of state economic and environmental focus; and ensuring councils continue to receive their expected dividends and are therefore not put in a position where they have to increase rates.

The Hodgman Government is working with councils and TasWater to bring forward vital investment in infrastructure. It will be an important economic reform that is also important for Tasmanian's quality of life.

This MOU acknowledges that improved water and sewerage infrastructure is one of the most important economic reforms in Tasmania while at the same time acknowledging government, local councils and TasWater's commitment to affordable water and sewerage pricing. The MOU laid out a path to bring government, council and TasWater together to improve the outcomes for all Tasmanians. If endorsed by the councils and parliament, the Government will become a 10 per cent shareholder of TasWater and inject \$200 million in equity over 10 years. Councils will remain the majority owners of TasWater and continue to receive planned dividends.

Government, councils and TasWater will also work together on issues such as trade waste and major projects. The MOU measures include a target of \$1.8 billion investment in infrastructure projects by 30 June 2026. This target includes accelerated investment in TasWater's current 10-year infrastructure investment program worth \$1.7 billion. TasWater and the state have agreed to work cooperatively to progress major investments in projects of special or environmental importance to Tasmania, including the Launceston combined system, Macquarie Point.

Additionally, the measures will include a mechanism for a community service obligation. This will allow investment projects that are not commercial in their entirety to be considered in the context of the broader benefits to the state and how these projects might be funded. We look forward to continuing working collaboratively to ensure the ongoing delivery of much-needed infrastructure in a timely and cost-effective manner which will meet the needs of Tasmanians well into the future.

The MOU announcement on TasWater will deliver the key commitments of the Hodgman Government's promise at the election - lower prices for consumers and a quicker fix for the states vital water and sewerage infrastructure. Both the state and local government have consistently said that more needs to be done and we are now moving forward together in the interests of all Tasmanians to realise the full agreement and develop legislation to allow the new plans to be implemented.

The new arrangements have already been welcomed by key stakeholders, with the HIA, TasCOSS and the MBA all expressing their support. Labor, on the other hand, has so far refused to support the new proposals and has reverted to form by noisily complaining from the sidelines, although Mr O'Byrne did say earlier that they were voting for this legislation. Labor needs to learn that whingeing is not a policy and complaining is not a platform. Even worse, they are trying to rewrite history and pretend that the MOU announcement is somehow similar to their policy that would have privatised water and sewerage to union-owned superannuation funds and seen significant price rises for the consumer.

All Tasmanian householders and businesses that pay for regulated water and sewerage services are better off if the pricing measures in the MOU are implemented. The Government's equity contribution helps support TasWater to set lower prices to its customers. Under the measures in the MOU, prices will be lower. As part of the MOU measures, TasWater has agreed to impose a price freeze for regulated customers in the 2019-20 financial year. TasWater has committed to ensuring that annual price increases to customers on targeted tariffs will be no greater than 3.5 per cent for the period from 1 July 2020 to 30 June 2025.

TasWater and the state Government have also agreed to ensure that customers who are currently below the targeted tariff will avoid facing significant price shocks. These prices are substantially lower than the 4.6 per cent maximum annual price increase for regulated water and sewerage customers recently determined by the regulator for the three-year regulated period from 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2021.

The MOU was jointly developed with TasWater, which has carefully considered the financial impacts of the measures. The financial impacts of the measures have been explained to all councils as part of the information memorandum to all councils released in mid-July 2018. As detailed in the information memorandum, under the MOU scenario the equity injection supports lower price increases in the early years and accelerated infrastructure investment. The MOU proposal ensures that dividends to councils are maintained. Financial modelling undertaken by TasWater agrees with this. The TasWater board does not expect any reduction in previously forecasts returns to councils. These are currently set at \$20 million per year.

One of the measures to be implemented is the removal of TasWater's obligation to pay income tax equivalents and loan guarantee fees to councils. In future all distributions to councils will be in the form of dividends. Each year the Crown will purchase 1 million shares for consideration of the \$20 million investment. At the end of the 10-year term of this agreement the Crown will own

10 million shares for a \$200 million equity contribution. This will represent 10 per cent of the total share issue in the corporation. The remaining 90 million shares will be owned by the 29 councils. At the end of the 10 years under the MOU, the Crown will retain a minority shareholding of its voting rights and will be limited to 10 per cent.

It is important to note that the TasWater board will continue to be a skills-based board and independently appointed by a selection committee, with the majority of committee members being council representatives. The board will remain responsible for governing the corporation and directors will continue to have judicial duties to make decisions that are in the best interests of the company. It is important the agreement also includes a mechanism for the parties to review the impact of commitments if there are unforeseen events that adversely impact the financial metrics of the corporation in the future.

History is a marvellous thing. I can go back as mayor of Meander Valley Council in 2006-07, 2008, when the then Labor Treasurer, I believe it was Mr Aird, came around councils selling the TasWater reforms saying that this was the future for TasWater. They said the reform process would allow us access into the federal government for funding. The reform process was deemed the mechanism. We could sell that to the Commonwealth to gain extra funding. It was acknowledged then that the sector needed more investment. Labor went out promising that they could get that investment from the Commonwealth but from that point on, Labor left water and sewerage floundering because they never got that extra investment.

The Treasurer is working through the issues and has found a way to support water and sewerage. It is a marvellous opportunity for the state and I fully support the moves of the Treasurer and appreciate the efforts he has put into developing this bill.

[3.50 p.m.]

Mr JAENSCH (Braddon - Minister for Human Services) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I have witnessed the progression of water and sewerage over the last 18 years, from a service provided by the councils that own the infrastructure to a statewide business owned by those local councils. Through a series of changes and reform we have ended up with the current model prior to the MOU which was not designed to be as it is. Water and sewerage assets and services were moved from councils into regional bodies in which councils had equity shareholding. Then those moved to a shared services component and then a statewide business, still with the same council owners but operating in a very different way. In the early days council, elected by local ratepayers, was also the service provider and could shape the provision of services and the way they budgeted and planned for investment in accordance with that group of people's needs.

Fast forward to the situation of the past couple of years. Council are still owners but more as shareholder owners of a business, rather than controlling and planning the quality and purpose of the services it provides to its shareholders.

Our Government has sought to address that. The business was bound by its obligations to make a commercial return on its investments and its members' equity. It was subject to some rulings of an economic regulator but it had to ensure its works program and service provision returned a profit all the time. That made it unable to be as ambitious as we would like with its forward works program. That is the issue the Treasurer honed in on to ensure Tasmania had the water and sewerage infrastructure and services it needed as a rapidly growing, ambitious and prosperous state.

Others have spoken about the argy-bargy which ensued. I congratulate the Treasurer and the local government owners of TasWater for having arrived at a position where we get the least change for them while inserting the state as a part owner, able to participate in strategic planning, and the setting of objectives and priorities of the organisation and other aspects of its governance. This takes the shareholdings from being passive and driven by dividends, to more active and strategic and achieving greater alignment between the strategic plan of the monopoly publicly owned utility and the strategic needs of Tasmania. That is the most important thing to be delivered through this new marriage described in the MOU.

As Minister for Planning and for Housing I see the greatest benefit, apart from the injection of capital and the acceleration of the works program for TasWater over the forthcoming period, is going to be the ability to achieve alignment between TasWater's strategic planning and prioritisation of works and other infrastructure, statutory and settlement planning over coming decades. That has been missing from water and sewerage utilities planning over recent years. It is an element we will be able to inject as a shareholder of the organisation, ensuring that not only do we bring to bear the Government's capacity to invest or borrow to meet infrastructure delivery targets but align priorities with what else Tasmania needs.

Our representatives at that table will be looking to ensure that strategic planning for our future settlement patterns and the participation of TasWater in streamlining the way we design and approve utilities services to support residential development are able to proceed. This MOU is going some way to restoring the linkage between the ownership and the management of and direction of the provision of water and sewerage services that existed when councils were doing both jobs.

This bill is an important component in providing the enabling mechanism for the MOU arrangement to proceed. It will create significant benefits for the TasWater business in the service it provides Tasmanians, the council owners by ensuring their receipts from the company are guaranteed, and the services to the people, which will be improved in accordance with state-wide planning and policy. There will be an alignment between water and sewerage and the other things that are being rolled out state-wide through this period of growth and investment we are seeing in Tasmania.

[3.59 p.m.]

Mr GUTWEIN (Bass - Treasurer) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank all members for their contribution to this machinery bill. As I have explained, and as members in the main have understood, this simply allows councils to vote on the resolutions at the upcoming meeting that will be held and debate wilfully on those resolutions.

The next step will be for a bill that enacts the intent of the MOU and that will be introduced to parliament before the end of the year.

I note a bit of politics is being played but I would have to say I believe there is common ground on a number of issues here. One is that we want to see better environmental outcomes as a result of the investment we make into water and sewerage. I believe we can all agree on that. I know Mr O'Byrne was doing his best to try to point out what he viewed as shortcomings in respect to the plan. The information memorandum that has been provided to councils looks at the remainder of the 10-year plan that TasWater is already a couple of years into and then looks at the further 10 years. Over that period to 2025 in terms of our equity investments and what will occur with

customers, very clearly from that information - that is TasWater's, not mine - customers will pay less and investment will go up. That is a good outcome.

Mr O'Byrne - Investment will not go up. It can't.

Mr GUTWEIN - Investment will go up. If you look at what TasWater is suggesting in that IM you will see that the level of investment increases, they bring forward works into the 10 years, and that is important because one of the concerns we have had, and I think it is shared by local government as well, is that there is a significant backlog of maintenance and investment that needs to occur. In fact before we started on this conversation three years ago, I was raising the fact that there was a backlog at the end of the current 10-year plan of around \$0.5 billion-worth of maintenance that was overdue. It is important to accelerate the investment where we can, and if you look at the information memorandum you will see very clearly that it does bring forward investment. Importantly, customers will pay less than what they were going to.

Mr O'Byrne - It is above CPI.

Mr GUTWEIN - TasWater was never forecasting CPI in their 10-year plan. If you look at the information memorandum, out to the end of the current 10-year plan period under the model we are putting forward revenues, what is paid by customers, is around \$100 million less over that period. That is money that is not coming out of the pockets of Tasmanians, whether it be households or businesses. I suggest you have a look at that IM. It is very well set out.

The MOU now countenances the fact that TasWater and the state Government will work together on the solution for Macq Point and for the base water treatment system there. Already as a result of the City Deal in Launceston the federal government has committed \$47 million, which is included in the Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - That is the federal budget but where is your money?

Mr GUTWEIN - It is included in the State Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - Where in the State Budget?

Mr GUTWEIN - I do not have the page off the top of my head but the federal money is receipted into the State Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - Yes, the federal money.

Mr GUTWEIN - And the state money begins on 1 January. Cash flows begin then. In fact the first stage of the plan that was put together by the experts, the Tamar Estuary Management Taskforce -

Mr O'Byrne - Is that a part of the \$20 million?

Mr GUTWEIN - No, it is over and above that. It is in the State Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - No-one can find it.

Mr GUTWEIN - It is in the Budget. Search it up.

Mr O'Byrne - We have.

Mr GUTWEIN - In the Budget there are two funding streams, one from the federal government and one from the state Government. Regarding the Tamar Estuary Management Taskforce there were two parts to their recommendations. One was for the infrastructure spend and the other was for \$10 million to be spent on river remediation. The river remediation begins on 1 January and that is funded in the Budget, and in terms of the federal funding and the state funding which we contemplated in the MOU, the federal money is receipted into our Budget. It begins, I think, in the 2019-20 year. As we said in the MOU we will work with TasWater because what has to happen -

Mr O'Byrne - Are you paying it out of TasWater's books?

Mr GUTWEIN - No, the federal money is receipted into the Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - But the state money, the state contribution?

Mr GUTWEIN - The state's contribution, which is \$47 million, the same as the Commonwealth's, has \$10 million of remediation.

Mr O'Byrne - That is different.

Mr GUTWEIN - No, that is part of the \$47 million, part of our 50 per cent. That starts on 1 January. As the MOU contemplates, in terms of the investment into the combined system, what has to happen so that we get best value for money -

Mr O'Byrne - So that comes off TasWater's books?

Mr GUTWEIN - No. So we get best value for money TasWater needs to outline the program moving forward for the Launceston sewerage upgrades and then the capital works that are proposed to improve the combined system will be dovetailed into that. That work has not been done.

Mr O'Byrne - So you have or haven't profiled it in the Budget?

Mr GUTWEIN - There is no profile to put it in. We have receipted what the federal government has put into their budget. We started our funding on 1 January, and the remainder of our commitment will be added in a future budget once -

Mr O'Byrne - So it is not in the current Budget?

Mr GUTWEIN - There is nothing to fund in the current Budget.

Mr O'Byrne - In these things you make an allocation.

Mr GUTWEIN - This project takes place over 10 years.

Mr O'Byrne - I get that.

Mr GUTWEIN - I don't think you do.

Mr O'Byrne - Their program is 10 years. You have made an election commitment to fix Launceston and you have not put it in the Budget. It sounds like you are \$30 million short.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. Whilst I appreciate there is some latitude in bills, there are specific questions and you have the ability to go into Committee. I know that may be trying to be avoided at the moment.

Mr GUTWEIN - Mr Deputy Speaker, the state Government funding of \$47 million begins on 1 January in the Budget this year. As TasWater works out its plan for the wastewater treatment plants and where the combined system investment fits with that, then we will fund those projects as that plan is made clear.

Mr O'BYRNE - Point of order. Am I able to ask for clarification on that?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - If it is for clarification, yes.

Mr O'Byrne - You have received the federal money, I get that. You have allocated \$10 million for the remediation of the Tamar and that is in the Budget, but you have not written into the Budget the remainder of the joint commitment between state and federal for the combined cycle in Launceston?

Mr GUTWEIN - Our commitment is \$47 million. We have begun funding that this year from 1 January. What will happen in future budgets is that once the profile of the combined system spend and the wastewater treatment upgrade is established, then we will fund those.

Mr O'Byrne - So the full \$47 million isn't in the Budget; you've just allocated the first year?

Mr GUTWEIN - There is nothing to fund at the moment, so we have begun funding what we can spend.

Mr O'Byrne - So it is unfunded in this year's Budget. You will fund it next year. That is what you are promising?

Mr GUTWEIN - Once we have a project to spend on, once that is allocated.

Mr O'Byrne - With respect, Treasurer, if it's an election commitment you say is funded, you need to point to the number. It is clear what has happened here.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Mr O'Byrne.

Mr GUTWEIN - We are beginning funding on 1 January. We have been clear about this both in the MOU and in respect of the Budget. It surprises me that you are not able to understand that.

In terms of the other claims that have been made and the erroneous one that TasWater is going to have a CPI increase, that was never in their corporate plan.

Mr O'Byrne - That was part of your policy.

Mr GUTWEIN - No, our policy was to provide a cap of up to 3.5 per cent. I am trying to help the member because this debate has been conducted with relative goodwill. At the end of the day

we want a better water and sewerage system and we want outcomes that are going to improve the environment, and that is exactly what local government wants.

I take the opportunity to thank Doug Chipman for working with the state Government in the first instance, post-election, and also Miles Hampton, Mike Brewster and Tony Ferrall for the way they worked to pull together the MOU. I believe it will provide a very good outcome for Tasmania. It enables us to increase the level of investment, provide a lower price pathway for customers than they would have paid and it will ensure we can improve our water and sewerage services quicker, whilst at the same time ensuring we work on those major projects such as the combined system and Macquarie Point and ensure we deliver the outcomes Tasmanians want.

I thank members for their contributions. There will be another bill, subject to local government supporting the resolutions at their upcoming meeting. I hope local government can see there is an opportunity to work with the state Government, that together we can deliver better outcomes and that when considering the resolutions, they will approach them with the goodwill that has been built with TasWater and the owners' representative with Doug Chipman's assistance since the election to ensure we have a pathway forward to improve the outcomes for all Tasmanians.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT (HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY ELECTORAL BOUNDARIES) BILL 2018 (No. 4)

Second Reading

[4.12 p.m.]

Mr HODGMAN (Franklin - Premier - 2R) - Mr Deputy Speaker, I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

The Commonwealth recently reviewed the House of Representatives boundaries in Tasmania. This review was part of an independent redistribution of federal electoral boundaries, required under the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918. The previous redistribution of the federal electoral boundaries in Tasmania was completed in 2009.

The redistribution of electoral boundaries usually reflects population changes to ensure an even and fair allocation of voters among the electorates. Having even electorates is an important element of retaining 'fairness' in our voting system and indeed our democracy.

On 14 November 2017, the Commonwealth-augmented Electoral Commission for Tasmania announced new boundaries for the federal electorates in Tasmania. The augmented commission consisted of the three members of the Australian Electoral Commission; the Australian Electoral Officer for Tasmania, Mr David Molnar; the Surveyor-General of Tasmania, Mr Michael Giudici; and the Auditor-General of Tasmania, Mr Rod Whitehead.

The augmented commission also announced that the division of Denison be renamed to the division of Clark. This name change recognises the role of Andrew Inglis Clark in the creation of

the Australian Federation. The new name and boundary changes will apply from the next federal election. However, these Commonwealth changes do not automatically apply as state electoral boundaries in Tasmania.

In the past, the Tasmanian Parliament has chosen to adopt the Commonwealth House of Representatives boundaries for the purposes of House of Assembly divisions by amending the Constitution Act 1934 to ensure they coincide. Therefore, to avoid any confusion to Tasmanians who are accustomed to voting in the same division at state and federal elections, it is both desirable and practical that identical divisional boundaries continue and the amendments to schedule 4 of the act do this.

I will now summarise the changes to the boundaries of the five divisions.

The division of Bass gained the entirety of the municipality of West Tamar from Lyons. Bass therefore contains the City of Launceston and the municipalities of Dorset, Flinders, George Town and West Tamar.

The division of Braddon gained the entirety of the municipality of Latrobe from Lyons. Braddon therefore contains the cities of Burnie and Devonport and the municipalities of Central Coast, Circular Head, King Island, Latrobe, Waratah-Wynyard and West Coast.

The division of Denison was renamed the division of Clark and the south-western boundary of Denison has moved to the Huon Highway. Clark therefore contains the cities of Glenorchy and Hobart, and part of the municipality of Kingborough.

In relation to the division of Franklin, areas of the municipality of the City of Clarence, including Richmond, have transferred from Franklin to Lyons, and the area north of the Huon Highway, within the municipality of Kingborough, has transferred from Franklin to Clark. Franklin therefore contains part of the City of Clarence, the municipality of Huon Valley, part of the municipality of Kingborough and Macquarie Island.

The division of Lyons gained the entirety of the municipalities of Meander Valley from Bass and Brighton from Franklin. The municipality of West Tamar has transferred from Lyons to Bass, and the municipality of Latrobe has transferred from Lyons to Braddon. Lyons therefore contains part of the City of Clarence and the municipalities of Break O'Day, Brighton, Central Highlands, Derwent Valley, Glamorgan Spring Bay, Kentish, Meander Valley, Northern Midlands, Sorell, Southern Midlands and Tasman.

As a result of these changes, some voters are currently enrolled in a House of Assembly division that is different to their federal division. The Commonwealth electoral role is already maintained on the basis of the new boundaries. The state electoral roll can be similarly maintained as soon as the Constitution Amendment (House of Assembly Electoral Boundaries) Bill 2018 is enacted.

At the commencement of a new parliamentary year, I felt it important to progress these amendments as a matter of priority to provide clarity to Tasmanians about which electorate they belong to moving forward.

I commend the bill to the House.

[4.18 p.m.]

Ms WHITE (Lyons - Leader of the Opposition) - Madam Speaker, I indicate that the Labor Party will be supporting this bill. The Premier spoke incredibly slowly in his contribution then because it is 4.15 p.m. and the Government is just about to run out of business, despite the fact that they argued so intensely earlier today that they had to gag debate on the censure motion because they had so many pressing issues for the parliament to consider.

The order of business paper today has only two matters listed. One was the Water and Sewerage Corporation Amendment (Crown Involvement Facilitation) Bill 2018, which has been dealt with, and the other is this matter, which I would argue is a relatively procedural issue that will not face any trouble getting through the House on any day of the week.

It is important that our boundaries reflect the Commonwealth boundaries because some people living in my electorate of Lyons at the moment are in the electorates of Bass and Braddon for the federal election. It is incredibly confusing for them to be living in electorates that are in different electorates depending on whether you are at a state or a federal election.

This is a matter that was dealt with by the federal parliament in November last year. This was a process undertaken by the Electoral Commission. They made their recommendations. The Labor Party participated in that process. We made submissions to that process. We support the process and it was supported by the federal parliament in November last year. The boundaries were changed accordingly, giving the members who are current sitting members in our federal parliament the boundaries that are reflected, when voters go to the polls in six weeks' time or less. Let us see what happens tomorrow. It depends on how many people put their hand up to be prime minister, what support they receive and who is eligible to be the prime minister.

Mr Hidding - Who do you reckon?

Ms WHITE - It is fascinating. I reckon Sco-Mo is the man coming through the middle. You have Dutton about to fall off the perch because he is in breach of section 44, apparently. It will be interesting to see what advice is received. Julie Bishop -

Madam SPEAKER - Order. Can we remember this is parliament, not a lounge room?

Ms WHITE - We have Julie Bishop, who has been the perpetual Deputy Prime Minister. Irrespective of who the prime minister is, under the Liberals, it has always been Julie who has been there as the loyal deputy, but not this time. Women are rising up and maybe Julie Bishop will be the prime minister of Australia, come week's end.

Ms O'Connor - She is the most competent in the Cabinet.

Ms WHITE - She is capable. She is very strategic and tactical. It will be curious to know what happens tomorrow. What a farce today: the Prime Minister of Australia could not even hold his party room well enough together to have enough people on the front bench to continue with the lower House in session. They had to race off. The Senate is sitting, having a lovely time up there. I was watching some of it on television earlier. The lower House is not in session. The Prime Minister was unable to maintain the confidence of his own party room, unable to keep enough members to make up a front bench of ministers, therefore the parliament was shut down. What a disgrace.

I have no doubt we will be heading to a federal election very soon because it is chaos in Canberra. Bring it on, we deserve better than this. It is a train wreck up there. I have every confidence the next prime minister of Australia after the upcoming election will be Bill Shorten. No doubt about it; ably supported by his united Cabinet and colleagues, delivering good, solid government for Australia, guided by good values.

I am perplexed as to why the Premier did not progress this legislation before the March election and perhaps in his summing up he could give an explanation for why that is the case. It was passed by the federal parliament in November last year. There were sessions of parliament following that, when we could have discussed this legislation and passed it so people who voted at the March election could vote for people who would be continuing to represent them. That would have been a good thing to do. If you can provide an explanation for why you chose not to that, I would appreciate it, and as an explanation to the many voters in those different electorates who will be represented by a different member once this received Royal Assent; a member they did not vote for.

I will be sad to see parts of the Lyons electorate move into Bass and to Braddon.

Ms O'Byrne - I'll take good care of them, Bec.

Ms WHITE - Michelle will take good care of them, that is good, member for Bass.

Ms O'Connor - Surely having Richmond in Lyons is a sweetener.

Ms WHITE - Richmond is a lovely little place and I am happy to have that in Lyons, there is no doubt about that. I am sad to see the West Tamar carved out of Lyons and moved into Bass. The West Tamar is a terrific part of Tasmania; amazing communities, incredible people, very resilient people, very diverse communities and fantastic, enterprising people who live there. The boundary change also sees the other part of Latrobe in Lyons move into Braddon, as well as parts of Port Sorell, a bit around Latrobe. Take good care, Deputy Premier.

Mr Rockliff - Sassafras, Wesley Vale, Moriarty.

Ms WHITE - That is right, your home turf.

Mr Rockliff - I will be back in my electorate.

Ms WHITE - You will finally be back in your electorate. Is that true? I am not sure the member does live in his electorate. You live in Bass.

Mr Rockliff - No, I don't.

Ms WHITE - Are you still enrolled in Braddon?

Mr Rockliff - I was elected in 2002 in Braddon, and Sassafras and Wesley Vale were part of that, but we lost it in 2008.

Ms WHITE - You found it again.

Mr Hidding - Temporarily, he was ours, and now he is back in Braddon.

Ms WHITE - What about the failed mining minister, Mr Brooks? He has a house in Port Sorell. I believe he sold it for a princely sum, a mansion of sorts with a helicopter pad. That will be returning to the seat of Braddon. I am not sure if the failed mining minister lives in Braddon anymore, either. He might be sipping lattes in Salamanca. What a controversial issue. He is hanging his head in shame. He knows that after all of his jibes of the last four years, the tables have turned. If only Mr Green were here to see it.

This bill is uncontroversial. It is a pity it was not introduced and dealt with before the March election. People could then have voted for members of parliament who would continue to represent them. We will not be moving to amend or oppose the bill. We support the bill and look forward to the Premier explaining why it has taken so long for him to progress it.

[4.26 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, I indicate the Greens will be supporting the Constitution Amendment (House of Assembly Electoral Boundaries) Bill 2018.

Premier, why was this legislation not brought into the House of Assembly in the final sitting weeks of last year? The process that led to the redistribution of boundaries and the renaming of the electorate of Denison to Clark began an extended period of time ago. It was well known by the time we went to the state election on 3 March this year that the federal boundaries would have changed. The only rational and honest explanation is because the Liberal Party machine determined it was in their best interests not to go to the state election on altered boundaries. We had no valid explanation at the time from the Premier and he knows that.

Tasmanians went to the polls on 3 March and a number of people in places such as West Tamar, Richmond, north of the Huon Highway, people voted for candidates and members who do not represent them. It was an act of electoral dishonesty, using your power and numbers in this place not to ensure there was absolute integrity around the boundaries before voters went to the state election on 3 March.

The lights are out in the House of Representatives today. They are on here and there is clearly chaos in Canberra. It does point to an unfortunate trend in federal parliament of the major parties particularly, but today the example is the Liberal Party, which operates in a climate of cynical self-interest.

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - We have a bit of chatter going on both sides of the House.

Ms O'CONNOR - On this same day that Peter Dutton is looking for numbers for his second tilt at the prime ministership, another 12-year-old girl on Nauru is fighting for her life. She tried to set herself on fire. As we have discussed in this place in recent days, and was highlighted by the CEO of World Vision, Claire Rogers, there are children who have given up hope and given up on life.

What a puerile state our country has come to when you have federally elected representatives more concerned with petty leadership squabbles, not because there is a problem in the polling for Malcolm Turnbull but because you have a nasty, hard right rump in the federal Liberal Party that wants to take the party even further to the right - if you could imagine that was possible. The next

step to the right is absolute authoritarianism. I am so proud to be a member of the Tasmanian Greens and to have a national leader like Richard Di Natale, who in the Senate today said:

We have kids in a catatonic state because they had given up hope, locked away in those offshore hellholes. What is the Liberal Party doing? Focusing on vengeance, on payback. Focusing on themselves.

He goes on to say in what was a blistering speech in the Senate a short time ago:

There are 100 000 people in this country who are homeless. There are women who fear going home tonight because one woman a week is killed at the hands of a violent partner.

And what have we got? We've got this spectacle. This disgrace ...

Federal politics, the national political scene, is an embarrassment to us globally. We were questioning last night how many other countries in the world recycle or reject their prime ministers and party leaders with the frequency that Australia does and the only one we could come up with was Italy in the time of a corrupt prime minister, Silvio Berlusconi. There is something sick in our national body politic and, in part, it comes from the kind of cynicism that has brought us to this place today where we are debating legislation that should have been brought into this House at the end of last year.

I am on my feet as the current member for Denison and soon to be member for Clark - as are you, Madam Speaker and we have Ms Archer here who will soon be a member for Clark. As members of this beautiful electorate that encompasses greater Hobart we should all be very pleased at the name change from Denison to Clark. Governor Denison was not a son of Tasmania, as Andrew Inglis Clark was. Denison is widely regarded as a person who brutally treated convicts, was a hardliner and he certainly did not play the profound role in the building of our nation that Andrew Inglis Clark did.

I thought to honour one of the founding fathers of our constitution, who we are now honouring by changing the name of this electorate, I would read for members a little bit of Andrew Inglis Clark's remarkable story.

He was born in Hobart Town in 1848 and was a barrister, a politician, a judge and an ardent republican. He stood for this House of Assembly in 1878 and was attacked by the *Mercury* at the time for:

... holding such very extreme ultra-republican, if not revolutionary, ideas that his proper place was among communists.

The Launceston *Examiner* described him as 'a mere fledgling and a stranger from Hobart'. He was elected unopposed in July of that year. Andrew Inglis Clark really was a committed humanitarian and socialist and he wanted to be sure that no government favoured any particular class.

I will read a bit from Justice Michael Kirby's lecture titled 'Reviving the Memory of Andrew Inglis Clark, an Unfinished Federal Project', for the University of Tasmania's *Law Review*. He says:

A I Clark grew up with an antipathy for class divisions -

which made him quite unusual in his day -

a dislike of class-inherited power; and a belief in the 'abolition of every institution that confers political power on personal privilege as an appendage of birth from a particular parentage.'

We can fairly safely assume that Andrew Inglis Clark would not have been a member of the Tasmanian Liberal Party as it is today. I am not sure he would have been a member of the Labor Party but he certainly had some Greens and social justice leanings. Andrew Inglis Clark's family home at Rosebank in Hampden Road, Battery Point, Hobart still stands today. It says in Michael Kirby's lecture:

The gruesome conflict of the Civil War in the United States (US) captured the attention of the British settler communities in Canada and Australia. In each place, they hastened the Federalist movement, stimulated by a belief that divisiveness amongst adjacent English speaking colonies, established in alien soil, might lead to brutality of the type of conflict that had been witnessed in the American Civil War.

Michael Kirby goes on to say Andrew Inglis Clark was one of the first political aspirants to actively support the Hobart Trades and Labor council, so there is a tick potentially for his Labor Party belief set. He goes on to say:

Because the Premier was in the Legislative Council, Clark took a great responsibility for introducing government legislation. He introduced a record number of 150 Ministerial Bills. This was only one less than Sir Henry Parkes had introduced in his long legislative experience.

Clark's legislation bore the mark of his progressiveness and humanitarian values. The laws he sponsored included legalisation of trade unions; the prevention of cruelty to animals; providing allowances to members of parliament; and reforming the laws on lunacy and the custody of children.

In the process of his work, he became part of the federalist movement and the Federal Council, which met to determine the future of Australia and what progress could be made towards a federal union.

A new effort was gathering momentum in the 1890s to breathe life into the earlier desultory endeavours to bring together the Australasian colonies in a federal union.

Andrew Inglis Clark, who had been to America and studied the American Constitution, believed it was a much better model for our constitutional foundation than that of Canada, Switzerland or even Britain.

Clark worked hard to put the stamp of the American Constitution on our document, especially in the draft chapter on the Judiciary. In this respect, and in a manner greatly defensive for the rule of law in Australia, Clark was to prove singularly effective.

...

Clark came to be a representative of Tasmania at the conference on Federation held in Melbourne in 1890 and at the first Sydney Convention held in 1891.

Clark lost office as Attorney-General for Tasmania in the election of 1892. However he returned to that post in 1894 in the government of Edward Braddon. On his fourth attempt, in 1896, he succeeded in amending the *Electoral Act* of Tasmania. This amendment introduced a form of proportional representation that has been known as the Hare-Clark system, after its authors. It introduced a system, still controversial, designed to overcome the fear of the tyranny of electoral majoritarianism that Clark shared. In the 1890s, he had warned that 'power wielded by a majority can be used as oppressively as if [it] were exercised by a despot or an oligarchy'.

As we know, the Hare-Clark electoral system is the fairest electoral system in the country. I will wind up with some more words from Justice Michael Kirby:

Anyone who cares about constitutional law and constitutional rights, about individual liberty and the rule of law, would be drawn powerfully to Andrew Inglis Clark. Clark was a romantic and sometime poet. He was also a man of the world who got things done - as a politician, as Attorney-General of Tasmania, as a Justice of the Tasmanian Supreme Court, as a significant force in the founding, and later as the Vice-Chancellor, of the University of Tasmania, and as an intellectual and a writer. Australians should be especially drawn to Clark because he was one of the great framers of the Australian Constitution. He was also a loyal British subject who believed the Empire would be best served by an Australia which was fundamentally independent though technically part of the Empire.

It is worth drawing the attention of the House to the fact that 88 of the 96 clauses in the Australian Constitution are Andrew Inglis Clark's work and they are retained to this day.

In conclusion, we are debating the Constitution Amendment (House of Assembly Electoral Boundaries) Bill 2018 that resets electoral boundaries for Tasmanian state elections.

Whilst I am on my feet it is an opportunity to remind members that there was a terrible wrong committed against good governance in Tasmania and strong electoral representation where people are given a voice through the Hare-Clark system to a strong and effective parliament that works in the public interest. We are a reduced parliament and that act of electoral perfidy took place 10 years ago. It is unfinished business of this parliament. If you talk to the Tasmanian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, talk to economist Saul Eslake and any other number of enlightened stakeholders in our community, they will agree the numbers need to be restored.

If you talk to members of parliament in this Chamber now in private conversation, across politics there is a consensus that the House is diminished by being only a 25-seat House. I hope that when this House is given the opportunity to correct that wrong, that politics is set aside and we vote on legislation to restore the numbers. That is in the public interest, it is in the interests of good governance in Tasmania, and it will make sure, to the greatest extent possible, that power is held in the hands of the people through their elected representatives.

[4.41 p.m.]

Mr HIDDING (Lyons) - Madam Speaker, the governance is firmly in the hands of the people now under a 25-seat model -

Ms O'Connor - No it is not. It is bought off by corporate interests. Donations reform, anyone?

Mr HIDDING - The previous member has just demonstrated that she is only interested in this place from 10 years ago but she was not here earlier than that. It was 1998 that it was changed -

Ms O'Connor - 1998, 20 years ago. Thanks very much. It was just my brain not functioning fully. Twenty years ago.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr HIDDING - It was 20 years ago when we temporarily reduced the numbers in this House. As the last person in this House that did it, yes I do have views on that.

I welcome the name change to Andrew Inglis Clark. I have never been able to figure out why we express his name in three parts, Andrew Inglis Clark. Inglis was his middle name.

Ms O'Connor - It was his mum's maiden name.

Mr HIDDING - His mum's maiden name.

Ms O'Connor - Yes, and it is obviously his middle name.

Mr HIDDING - But was it his middle name?

Ms O'Connor - It was his middle name. I wanted to change the electorate to Inglis Clark but it does not quite work.

Madam SPEAKER - Order, please.

Mr HIDDING - So you were not in favour of his mum's name being in there? I am just checking; that is all right.

The previous speaker was right: so many clauses in the Australian Constitution were drafted by Andrew Inglis Clark. The one that he did draft and was rejected by the group of MPs from around the nation was the one that has been featuring a lot lately and that is the immigration one. He proposed the measure that exists in Tasmania, that it would be wrong if Barnaby Joyce had sought citizenship from New Zealand. That is the Tasmanian situation; that is how Andrew Inglis Clark wrote it, but it was rejected for the stupid model that is in there now, and it has all these people in a pickle. That is a nod and a wink to old Andrew Inglis Clark, who would be looking down on us, appreciating that we are changing the name of an electorate to recognise that he was an important Tasmanian.

I have been here long enough to have served as a member of parliament for much of Tasmania. When I started I had half of Hadspen, which was kind of weird, seeing it is a little village. We had half of Hadspen, we had all of the west coast and we had all of Latrobe and Port Sorell. I set up my own personally funded office as a young new member in Latrobe, and enjoyed having an office in

Latrobe. I was shocked to find it taken off me later on. It was very difficult to service the west coast when, for instance, I had to be on the west coast for a function and then my very next function was in Nubeena with the Tasman Council. You needed to pull over for a sleep. Back then it was almost a five hour drive from the west coast. It was six or seven hours, and you could not do that in a day.

For people of the electorate of Clark where you struggle to cross your electorate in half an hour on foot, think of us who have slogged around the electorate of Lyons for many years. Early in my career I got involved in the Abt Railway. As a young Cabinet Secretary there was a Cabinet Minute, which I could not possibly speak about, that proposed to do something with the old Abt Railway line that would have blocked the redevelopment of the Abt Railway. I asked Cabinet to consider freezing that for a week or two while I chased down a certain possibility. Within two years I had managed to work up with Warwick Smith, who was a federal member then, and a number of other people a proposal that we put forward for funding for, I think, the Federation Fund. We scored \$21.45 million to rebuild the Abt Railway. That is why it is where it is now.

Just as it was about to be finished there was a change of government. I went down for the opening. Sitting at the back of the room I listened to this magnificent story of this thing being built. I must credit Paul Lennon; he always thought about these things. At the end of the ceremony he stood me up and arranged a standing ovation for me. He did not need to do that but he recognised the work that had been done by the time they came to government. I was therefore delighted four-and-a-half years ago to become minister for Infrastructure and therefore the minister for the Abt Railway. It is great to see it has turned around its business case and is going very well. The current Minister for Infrastructure would be loving that part of his job.

To service that area, however, was difficult because the rest of Lyons was so large. This was prior to us having a vehicle allowance. We had to supply our own vehicles. The famous story I have about servicing the west coast was that every year the Mountain Heights School held its prize giving night. On this terrible day, terrible weather, I battled everything to get to the west coast and so did Ken Bacon, former Labor member for Lyons. Kenny Bacon and I got through the snow and ice to get to this event, at which there were 60 or 70 people. Cruelly the principal of the day stood up and acknowledged everybody who had given apologies but could not be there, therefore spoke at length about Michael Polley and David Llewellyn and did not acknowledge the ones that got through the snow; ignored the fact that we were there. Leaving at about 9.30 p.m., heading back up over the lake into Tullah there was a snow drift on the road. I stopped and pulled over for what the Tour de France riders would call a break naturelle. I saw another set of lights coming behind me. It was Ken Bacon. We stood at this snow drift and worked our way around it. We looked at each other and laughed at how dumb we were. We had gone to all that trouble, not even recognised by the locals at having been there and were in danger of killing ourselves on the way home. This was before we had an electorate allowance that would allow you stay overnight at places like that. All the money was going into travel.

Without question, it was difficult to service that area properly and therefore the mayor of the west coast used to quite openly present a campaign for it to become part of Braddon so he could better service the area.

A member - Darryl Gerrity.

Mr HIDDING - Yes, he was a famous guy. At the big opening of the Abt Railway, somebody rushed in and said that someone had spraypainted some stuff on the side of the building. He asked

if it was spelled correctly and they said, 'Yes, it is.'. 'Well', said Darryl, 'It is not one of the locals.'. He was an absolute rogue, our Darryl Gerrity, and we were sad to say goodbye to him and that part of the Lyons electorate in one way, but happy for them to assume the loving care of the Braddon electorate people and they have looked after them ever since.

The Port Sorell and Hawley Beach area has been an area of great interest and for much of my career I watched the frustration of a growing Port Sorell community. They had everything but a school. Four, five or six buses would pull up to shuttle all of the children to Wesley Vale because they did not have a school. I spoke about that at length in this place and I could tell from the eyes of the then education minister who went on to become premier, he agreed with me but he might have had a department issue or two. I winged it. I moved that we have a joint House inquiry into the need for a primary school at Port Sorell. One thing led to the other. It did not impress the department, and we ended up with a nearly \$12 million primary school, which is still the apple of my eye in my electorate. It is a gorgeous primary school and the same principal is still there. It is a happy school and it has done all the things it promised to do and has been an absolute gem. It will be sad to say goodbye to that community for that reason and many others but I wish them all the best.

It has the most extraordinary community of the University of the Third Age. I know Mr Barnett has been involved with them. The U3A body at Port Sorell, Shearwater and Hawley is a most extraordinary organisation that keeps them very happy. I place on the record my thanks to the U3A and the wonderful people who promote that organisation. They do a wonderful job. I will miss them and I thank them for the honour of serving that community.

We also had Richmond and it will return to the fold. Richmond was inexplicably, for me, part of the south-east, and I was completely puzzled as to why we would lose it. Now there is the little puzzle of how we have it again. That is all part of the black magic that goes into our melting pot. We are delighted. It belongs in the south-east. I have my electorate office in Sorell and I am comfortable to have them back and I look forward so strongly to working with that community.

We had none of Brighton, and when we lost the west coast the swap was to pick up those areas of Brighton that included Bridgewater and Gagebrook. While it has been a challenging change, it was unfamiliar territory, slightly outer-urban but still an urban environment. It fitted well with Lyons and I have enjoyed looking after them. That has expanded with all of the council area of Brighton coming into Lyons, which means we pick up Old Beach. I look forward to that as well.

We are picking up some strange outcomes and those are only based on strange boundaries in local government. That returns to the question of amalgamations, et cetera. We have this strange arrangement in local government. The municipality of Burnie is pretty clear. You have a city, a port, things around it and it is what it is, but the municipality of Meander, for instance, has a big slab of Launceston, which is Prospect. Since I have been a member for Lyons, I have had all of the West Tamar, from Muddy Creek down, not the urban area. Now, they are pulling me out of the bush in Beaconsfield and Beauty Point and parachuting me into Prospect and those areas. Suddenly, here I am, a city-based Launceston member. That is because it was deemed to be propitious to use a council boundary, which is a lovely idea but the council boundary was a created boundary to give enough substance to that municipality.

That is going to be very odd. Of all my 23 years I have never doorknocked or been into the Prospect area, which is a big slab of suburban Launceston. I will look forward to that in the next

month or so. That means I pick up a new supermarket near the casino, Prospect Vale Market Place. I must take some tips from my Bass members on how to work that. I might have to shop there.

Mr Brooks - Of course you support your local electorate businesses, Mr Hidding.

Mr HIDDING - Sorry? You do. I do, indeed. We pick up Richmond, which is part of the City of Clarence and will ensure that we have the full municipality of Break O'Day, full municipality of Brighton, Central Highlands, Derwent Valley, Glamorgan Spring Bay, Kentish, Meander Valley, Northern Midlands, Sorell, Southern Midlands and Tasman within Lyons.

Tasman should have been one local government area, but for one vote yesterday that did not happen either. That is pretty sad. It is a big day for the Lyons electorate. We have things coming back we have had before. We have new areas we would have never dreamt of having to represent. I take it this requires going through the upper House and gaining Royal Assent. We will have to probably arrange a handover doorknock on a Saturday morning.

Mr Ferguson - I will give you a briefing -

Mr HIDDING - Will you? A briefing? That will be nice.

Mr Ferguson - on how to look after Blackstone Heights, Prospect and Hadspen.

Mr HIDDING - I have Blackstone Heights. I have the river and the skiing and all that?

Mr Ferguson - Yes.

Mr HIDDING - I look forward to all that and I thank everybody involved with this process, all the people who made submissions and the commission for their hard work in bringing forward a system that makes complete sense to them. I am not going to try to interpret how and why it all came about. I will wear whatever and look after the new people I have and thank the people I am not going to be representing anymore for the honour of being able to represent them all this time.

Madam SPEAKER - I call Mr Brooks.

Ms O'Connor - We have the filibuster going because it is only 5 pm and we are nearly running out of business.

[4.58 p.m.]

Mr BROOKS (Braddon) - Not at all. This is business. You have the laziest Opposition in the history of the parliament on that side. They cannot even scrutinise a bill -

Members interjecting.

Madam SPEAKER - Order.

Mr BROOKS - let alone do anything else. Those opposite might complain that members on this side and members of the Government want to speak on a bill. They do not like it because they do not understand the scrutiny of bills and talking about bills is part of the job. Anyway, they might work it out one day.

I would like to talk on a couple of things, one Mr Hidding said. One was the west coast, which is tremendous that it is in Braddon. I was concerned that it might not remain in Braddon as part of the review, as we went through the process and the bill developed, which is in accordance with the historical practice of adopting Commonwealth House of Representative electoral boundaries. As it has been stated, it makes complete sense to have the same ones. There is no legislative process in Tasmania for redistribution of House of Assembly boundaries and the normal convention is that we follow the conclusion of previous federal redistributions. State parliament adopted the federal electorate division names and electoral boundaries of the House of Assembly electoral division names and boundaries to ensure consistency.

It is interesting when Mr Shelton and I talk about how many kilometres we manage to get up in our vehicles in a year and how quickly we can reach the 60 000-kilometre mark, normally once every 12 months. Mr Shelton and Mr Hidding probably do a few more than me. For Mr Jaensch, Mr Rockliff and me in Braddon, it is a fairly big electorate. The west coast is a special part of the electorate and I am privileged to be a part of the Braddon team and part of the electorate of Braddon.

I want to talk about some of the changes that will impact the electorate and the voters of Braddon and as has been highlighted, the addition of Port Sorell, Shearwater and Hawley. It is interesting because currently, until this bill goes through, Wesley Vale Primary School, which is now called Andrews Creek, is on the western side of the street in Braddon but on the eastern side of the street in Lyons, so if you are doorknocking for Braddon, not that there are many houses on the western side, you only have to do one side.

Dr Broad - Now you have to do two.

Mr BROOKS - Yes, now we have to do two. It did not help you anyway, Dr Broad, so it probably will not make much difference.

It is a good change for Braddon having the community of Port Sorell, Hawley and Shearwater come into Braddon. It is more of a natural fit for the region. I have constituents from that region coming to see me anyway and it is nothing against any other member. It is because they know me because I resided there for a significant period and was privileged to be the president of the Port Sorell Surf Lifesaving Club for several years and also chair of the Wesley Vale Primary School Association, which was my first introduction to a committee hearing where I fronted the inquiry that Mr Hidding referred to into whether a school should be put in Port Sorell. It was a really interesting debate amongst the community at the time.

Before I was a member of the parliament, I was chair of the Wesley Vale Primary School Association, whose job it was to represent the views of the school community and the parents and teachers association. They saw the great benefit of a school going into Port Sorell. The likes of Mr Hidding, as the local member, and Mr Best were on the committee. I think he said I was a well-regarded and successful businessman at that time. He did not say that when I got in here, but before I got in here he said that.

It was an interesting process for someone who had never been to a committee hearing or seen one representing Wesley Vale, now Andrews Creek, Primary School. We knew there would be an impact from that decision of proceeding with the school at Port Sorell, with Sassafras Primary School, Moriarty Primary School and Wesley Vale Primary School and then a primary school going into Port Sorell. Ultimately the decision was made to merge Moriarty Primary with Wesley Vale Primary with the creation of Andrews Creek Primary School, but the great thing was that the community led that discussion, debate and decision. It was something that was led by schools and

school leaders to combine that school into what is still a tremendous school. I try to get to the assembly each year. My daughters went to that primary school and it is a wonderful little school.

When I was elected as the member for Braddon my eldest was still at primary school, and I had the privilege of awarding something to her, which was a bit funny and weird. I had always promised them that I would not embarrass them, so I told them at the school assembly, 'Don't worry, kids, I won't embarrass you'.

Ms O'Connor - We always embarrass our children, it's part of our job.

Mr BROOKS - That is right, Ms O'Connor, I always thought it was part of my job, so I would stand up and say, 'Now Chelsea made me promise that I would not embarrass her, so Chels, I promise you I won't embarrass you today'.

Ms O'Connor - And then you proceeded to embarrass her.

Mr BROOKS - That normally did the trick, Ms O'Connor, but I always thought it was a bit of fun. As Ms White has pointed out, I did reside in Port Sorell. It seems it is the Labor way, the politics of envy of who has what or whatever she referred to. At the end of the day that was the home where my kids grew up and we were part of the community out there. My youngest daughter's first job was at Woolworths at Port Sorell. She applied and enjoyed working there. I have a lot of friends who live there and it is a wonderful community.

I am really happy that area is now in the electorate of Braddon. That is not to dismiss my friends and colleagues from Lyons, but it is a better natural fit for that community to be in Braddon. When I was helping doorknock in the state campaign with Mr Ferguson, we doorknocked in the Port Sorell/Hawley/Shearwater area.

Mr Ferguson - We sure did. We met some small business operators.

Mr BROOKS - We met some small business operators and some people who said they were going to vote for me, but I was not on the ballot paper so I explained that to them. That is okay; at least they knew who we were. It is a great little community.

The thing about the Port Sorell/Hawley/Shearwater area is the growth out there at the moment. It is seen as a huge area of continued growth and the community out there is doing a great job in services. Mr Hidding also mentioned U3A, which has done a tremendous job in setting up there in the last six or seven years and still continues to thrive. Things like the surf club out there are doing a great job still retaining kids, juniors and members. We are also still seeing investment and growth in that region. It is a wonderful thing.

For the benefit of Ms White, who as usual with her typical weak leadership style cannot help but bring personal matters into debates on bills, I live in Penguin. I know she might find it surprising that I live in my electorate on the north-west coast but I have always lived on the north-west coast since I moved from interstate.

Mr Hodgman - She would ring people up saying that rubbish.

Mr BROOKS - Yes, the robocalls they put out.

Mr Hodgman - Yes, disgraceful.

Mr BROOKS - Typical gutter Labor tactics. It proves that they will stoop to anything and say anything and do anything and attack my family.

Mr Hodgman - Attack your family.

Mr BROOKS - That is right, Premier. They were hell bent on doing whatever they could to do that. Then to have Ms White, the current Leader of the Opposition until the O'Byrne ultimatum happens, which we know is coming, use those tactics, to attack my partner who lives in Hobart. I have a house in Penguin, I live in Penguin. I moved from Port Sorell to Devonport and then to Penguin. Ms White deems it quite appropriate during a bill on electoral boundary changes to again attack my personal circumstances because either she is jealous or angry - I have no idea. It is typical of the gutter Labor tactics that they employ as always because they have no policy structure, they have no strategy. They resort to their type, which is to attack the individual and the circumstances because they have got nothing else to do.

Ms O'Connor - You called Scott Jordan an eco-terrorist. Pot kettle black. Innocent Mr Brooks - not.

Mr BROOKS - I do not think I called him an eco-terrorist. I think I called him an economic terrorist, but anyway.

Ms O'Connor - I rest my case.

Mr BROOKS - What I do not do though is attack his family. I do not attack his partner. I do not attack his kids. What we saw again was the leadership under Ms White attack my partner and attack my family circumstances. It is typical of what they do.

I will finish up on that. I am really happy that Port Sorell, Hawley and Shearwater are part of Braddon. It is a wonderful thing. It is good for the region. That is in no way a criticism of the members who have done a tremendous job, including Mr Shelton who has a property at Port Sorell. I am very happy that we can continue to not only represent the people of the north-west coast but with this legislation we will be able to include that region within the electorate of Braddon. As has been pointed out there are additional windfalls for those in Lyons, where they have picked up some extra areas that they are pretty happy about. There are some strange ones. In particular in the other place there are a few that were surprising. It is an important region of the north-west coast and with the passing of this bill through this Chamber and then without reflecting on what the other place will do I am confident it will get through. It is going to be a good fit because of where the areas are and where they line up. I look forward to officially representing the communities of Port Sorell, Hawley and Shearwater.

[5.14 p.m.]

Mr FERGUSON (Bass - Minister for Health) - Madam Speaker, I want to make a few short remarks on two subjects.

One is the scrutiny of this and other legislation today and some foolish comments that have been made by the manager of opposition business on social media today. I am not sure he has been brave enough to make them in here. Then I want to talk about the bill because it all goes to the importance of having robust and decent scrutiny of bills.

As Leader of the House, when we discuss with our colleagues the allocation of the legislative program we make estimates about what we think will be the level of interest in our legislation and

budget our time accordingly. Usually we are pretty good at estimating the level of appetite from members opposite. I am astonished that the water and sewerage corporation amendment bill went through in that lightning speed time. It is clear that Labor has decided to admit they are too lazy to scrutinise Government legislation. I am astonished that on legislation that is fundamental to how our elections are operating, which is a bill brought forward by the Premier, that the Leader of the Opposition gives a seven-minute contribution and then racks off. I am astonished and have to say if this had been the case when I was a shadow minister, we would have been excoriated for weeks. This is astonishing to me and I cannot believe it.

It is not much different to the health bill that I took through the parliament recently. People had their individual say then again racked off. The person representing the shadow health minister, who had previously said that health was her number one priority, was not willing to be here. That is history, it is on the record. Claims made by Labor that the Government agrees to a certain amount of time to suspend standing orders for another motion during the day was mindful of the importance of the legislation that I have just been talking about.

Madam Speaker, I will make a few important comments for me and my constituency in relation to this bill. I support this bill and make no qualification in my support. This bill ensures that state election boundaries are consistent with those for our federal electorates. I put that on the record so there can be no claim of division within the Government but I disagree with the decision of the augmented tribunal.

I am very disappointed on behalf of my constituency for the way in which these decisions have been made. I hold in great respect the individuals of that augmented tribunal recognising that they have something of a Rubik's cube to have to deal with. They have to try to manage just five, which is not a large denominator to work through how they are going to make sure those five federal electorates somehow have similar population or enrolments, within 3 per cent of the average so that, as much as can be possible, the electorates are about the same size as each other.

We know that with population growth occurring at different levels throughout Tasmania, some electorates over time can have more or less growth than others and they can get out of alignment. It has an impact on our community and that is why I am not happy about it. Some people in Tasmania will feel dissatisfied that the augmented tribunal has made the decision it has in respect of the federal division boundaries.

In the lead-up to the 2010 election, my first time as a candidate for the House of Assembly, Hadspen residents in the Meander Valley local government area were for the first time coming into the electorate of Bass. I would visit the people of Hadspen and they would say 'But are we not in Lyons?' I would say, 'No sir, no madam, you are coming into the electorate of Bass'. Often people thought that was good because Hadspen was not half divided across Bass and Lyons. It makes sense: we are only nine minutes from Launceston, and is that not the centre of Bass? Only one or two streets, Scott Street from memory on the other side of the river was in Bass, whereas the rest of Hadspen was in Lyons.

Recognising that, we are in a situation where that township is now going out of Bass. If you look at the progress of history, where is the common sense behind that?

Ms O'Connor - You are having a whack at the independent umpire.

Mr FERGUSON - I am having a bit of a whack at the decision-making process, because I do not agree with it. From the state's point of view we are perfectly empowered to have our own boundaries if we wanted to. For the sake of reducing confusion within the community by virtue of our Hare-Clark electoral system, which is somewhat unique in Australia, we are the only state in the country that shares its state parliamentary boundaries with the federal Commonwealth Parliament boundaries. It sort of serves our purposes from the Hare-Clark electoral system. Again, I do not quibble with that; it needs to work.

The reason I, and Government, support this bill is because we do not want people in the community to be confused. We would not want the situation where a member of the state electorate of Bass is not a member of the federal electorate of Bass, so it is self-evidently important that we pass this legislation and make sure that we take out any opportunity for confusion.

I feel bad for the people of Prospect Vale, Blackstone Heights and Hadspen, all of whom live within a nine or 10-minute safely driven speed drive from Launceston GPO, who are now going to find themselves in the electorate of Lyons. There is nothing wrong with the Lyons electorate, but when we talk about electoral boundaries and distributions we often talk about communities of interest. There is no question in my mind that people who live in the community of Prospect Vale, such as members of my family, and people who live in Blackstone Heights, such as a great many number of my friends, supporters and non-supporters, and the people of Hadspen, think of themselves as having an association with the City of Launceston. They are in a different council area, which is how we got to this situation.

Madam Speaker, Mt Leslie Drive is now the boundary between Bass and Lyons. It is a street running down the middle of Prospect Vale. It happens to be the street that separates Launceston City Council from the Meander Valley Council. I put it to you and others that is something of an arbitrary line. There is nothing special about one side of Mt Leslie Drive compared to the other as to why they are not the same community of interest.

I know that people in the communities of Prospect Vale, Blackstone Heights and Hadspen will be very well served by their new representatives who are our members for Lyons, people like my friends and colleagues Rene Hidding, Guy Barnett and Mark Shelton. I know they will be very well serviced and cared for and their issues considered and followed through. I do feel, however, that their concern about this has been somewhat lost by the way in which the tribunal arrived at this decision.

Let the record remember that the original recommendation of the augmented tribunal was to take Flinders Island and Dorset Council out of Bass and place them into Lyons, which would have meant Prospect Vale, Hadspen and Blackstone Heights would have stayed in Bass, quite properly, and then adopted West Tamar into Bass, but quite understandably, that upset members of the Flinders Island and Dorset communities. My submission to the augmented tribunal, which I just reread to refresh my memory, was that the Bass population was really not the problem and the augmented tribunal could just as easily have left Bass alone altogether, perhaps with some minor boundary adjustment allowing a small other area to be adopted into Bass from a neighbouring electorate. This is my beef. It seems to me that there has been a greater emphasis placed on local council boundaries where there are 29 councils in determining the boundaries for a very small number of electorates, being Bass, Braddon, Lyons, Denison and Franklin.

I take this opportunity to say to those voters in the community of Meander Valley who are moving out of Bass, that my first election was as a councillor to Meander Valley. That was where

I got my start in my representing the community. I am very sad to see them go from my constituency. I will continue to serve them in any way that I can in the future even though they will not be part of my electorate of Bass, which I hold very dearly.

Equally I am very happy and delighted to be welcoming the whole West Tamar community - not half of it but all of it - north of Muddy Creek Bridge, into my electorate of Bass, communities such as Beaconsfield, Beauty Point and Exeter, where I first taught, and Greens Beach and Kelso - wonderful communities with spirited people who, using the backbone of the West Tamar Highway, still see Launceston as their provincial centre. Together with my friends and colleagues Sarah Courtney and Peter Gutwein, we will give them all of our concern and care as we adopt them as a constituency going forward.

I felt it important to make those points, Madam Speaker, because those people and tribunals who make these decisions are affecting the way in which those communities of interest are materially represented. It is with some sadness and heaviness that you see constituency members like myself recognise there is a large disruption about to take place and relationships which will not continue unchanged, and that is to be regretted.

Having said all of that, it is without any qualification that I say this bill is important and we should agree to it.

[5.26 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Madam Speaker, while there will be some disruption in electorates across the state - and that typically happens with every redistribution - there can be no doubt what we saw in our previous drafts of electoral boundary changes would have caused far more, I would argue, dislocation and so on with areas. One proposal I saw was to include Flinders Island in the seat of Lyons, which would have made things quite difficult if those boundary changes had indeed occurred. Now with the greater alignment to local government boundaries that is something that will be simpler to explain to constituents. We have constituents who are at times confused about which electorates they live in.

Mr Brooks, the member for Braddon, gave examples in Braddon where a member on one side of the road is in and somebody on the other side is out. There is no real rhyme or reason for that. The line had not been drawn along council boundaries so now we are moving to a situation where the entire Latrobe Council area is coming into Braddon. That brings in Port Sorell, Shearwater and Hawley Beach into Braddon. If we look at the community of interest argument then that makes more sense than that being part of Lyons in terms of the current distribution.

This highlights some issues in Tasmania with the growth in population, largely in southern Tasmania. In effect, Lyons is gravitating south and as a result, extra numbers are brought into Braddon. Having said that, we have heard people like the member for Lyons, Mr Hidding, talk about the distribution which was in place in the past where the member for Lyons had to travel through another electorate to get to his electorate. That situation where we had the previous redistribution and the west coast came into Braddon again realigned the community of interest in a much better fashion.

Bringing the west coast into Braddon was a very sensible move but at the other end of that it pushed Port Sorell, Shearwater, Hawley and parts of Wesley Vale and so on into Lyons, so there was that dislocation. Some confusion still remains and as the member for Braddon, Mr Brooks, also said, he has constituents come to him as if they are part of the electorate of Braddon and indeed

they are not, until at least once this bill passes and I imagine it will. It will be reasonably easy now to have those conversations, so if you are in the municipality of Latrobe, then you are in Braddon now.

Where we go down the track I am not sure. If we continue this trend of Tasmania's population heading south, then we might see additions down the track. Hopefully, what I would really like to see is for there to be greater relative population growth in Braddon so that does not need to happen.

We have a disparity even in the way populations are growing within Braddon. We see the western side of the Braddon population declining whereas the eastern side - around Latrobe, Devonport and central coast Ulverstone - is growing and a lot of the growth now is in the Latrobe municipality. That growth will be brought into Braddon and may stave off changes down the track.

It makes sense and we have all known for a while now the changes were to be made. The recent by-election confused a lot of people because the changes had not been enacted. They will be enacted in the next federal election, which could happen at any minute. I have not checked Twitter for a few minutes. It is up to the events of the next few hours or days. The next election will be fought on the new boundaries. That was a confusing situation. People have heard they were coming into the electorate of Braddon, yet they were not able to vote in the by-election.

I am looking forward to Port Sorell, Shearwater and Hawley Beach and the rural areas between Devonport and Latrobe coming into Braddon. They are productive areas, growing areas, and they deserve good representation. I would like to be a good member for them. I have recently set up an office in Devonport, which is closer to that area. Being serviced by members from Braddon will mean an electorate office will be that much closer if we can assist.

The way the boundary changes happened in Braddon makes a lot of sense. Other members talked about the dislocation. It is unfortunate when other members have been in parliament for a long time and have built relationships with communities; seeing those communities being 'ripped from their bosoms' in a way. We saw that with the member for Lyons, Mr Hidding, and the member for Bass, Mr Ferguson. The way people talk about their electorates, politicians from any side, indicates how connected politicians are with their communities, how those relationships develop over time and how important politicians see those relationships.

It is like a family member moving away because you will not have as much contact as you once did. All of those school assemblies and all the grandparents and the children and grandchildren you all know are in another electorate and cannot vote for you again. That must really hurt, especially when you have been in parliament as long as the member for Lyons, Mr Hidding, and seeing his constituents slip away from him through no fault of his own. We have had other members in the past such as Mr Polley, who is the classic example. He would know generations of constituents from various areas.

This is a procedural deal and we need to align with our federal boundaries. It would be silly if we had different boundaries. However, the process is one that is too much at arm's length. The community may have some issues but the process has ended up with good boundaries and a good adjustment for Braddon. It is definitely worthwhile supporting and I look forward to servicing and becoming more familiar with the rest of the Latrobe Municipality as we look forward to the rest of this term.

Mr HODGMAN (Franklin - Premier) - Madam Speaker, I thank members for their contributions and their support of the bill. I will briefly respond to matters raised during the debate. I will commence by noting the bill was developed by the Department of Premier and Cabinet in accordance with the historical practice of adopting Commonwealth House of Representative electoral boundaries as House of Assembly electoral boundaries. There is no legislative process in Tasmania for the redistribution of House of Assembly electoral boundaries. The normal convention is that, following the conclusion of previous federal redistributions, state parliament has adopted federal electoral division names and electoral boundaries as House of Assembly electoral division names and electoral boundaries to ensure consistency between each jurisdiction.

The Department of Premier and Cabinet consulted with the departments of Justice, Primary Industries, Parks, Water and Environment, Surveyor-General, Treasury and Finance and the Tasmanian Electoral Commission. Each stakeholder was invited to comment on the draft bill in accordance with the prescribed legislative process. The Electoral Boundaries Redistribution Committee advertised its draft redistribution proposal for comment. A significant number of submissions were received and follow-up public hearings were conducted in Hobart and Launceston by the augmented tribunal. The Australian Electoral Commission published the final redistribution decision, which included a summary of and treatment of the submissions received. More information is available from the AEC if required.

As to the question of why the bill was not introduced prior to the state election, I refute the suggestion by some members it was done with a view to the March state election. That is not so. The Department of Premier and Cabinet sought advice from the Tasmanian Electoral Commissioner on the House of Assembly divisional changes as well as the divisional name change from Denison to Clark.

On 15 November 2017, the Tasmanian Electoral Commissioner advised that, given the timing, a corresponding change to House of Assembly electoral boundaries prior to the 2018 election could potentially create a significant disruption and be problematic. That was the advice that DPAC received from the Electoral Commission in relation to the change. I will elaborate because they are pertinent issues. I thank the commissioner, who is in the Chamber today, and his office for their assistance with this matter, as I thank DPAC. It is important mechanical reform. It is true but important in the context of our democracy.

The Electoral Commissioner, Mr Hawkey, responded to the request for advice from DPAC late last year and said in his advice -

I believe it is not advisable to adopt the new Federal electoral divisions before the forthcoming state election as it could cause significant elector confusion and would lead to greatly increased costs and logistical risks to conduct the election.

As you are aware, new federal electoral divisions in Tasmania were determined on 13 November 2017. The key changes from the Federal redistribution are -

- the division of Denison has been renamed Division of Clark
- the entirety of the municipality of Latrobe is now located in Braddon
- the entirety of the municipality of West Tamar is now located within Bass

- the entirety of the municipality of Meander Valley is now located within Lyons
- the entirety of the municipality of Brighton is now located within Lyons.
- the South-Western boundary of Denison had moved to the Huon Highway, and
- the Richmond area has moved into Lyons.

While a redistribution of the Legislative Council electoral boundaries is undertaken in accordance with the *Legislative Council Electoral Boundaries Act 1995*, there is no legislative process for undertaking a redistribution of the House of Assembly electoral boundaries. Following the conclusion of previous federal redistributions, state parliament has seen fit to amend schedule 4 of the *Constitution Act 1934* to adopt the federal boundaries for purposes of representation in the House of Assembly.

The adoption of the new electoral boundaries and division name before the state election would create the following issues:

- The change of division name from Denison to Clark would cause considerable elector confusion. Many Tasmanians are aware of the House of Assembly division in which they reside. A name change could lead to disenfranchisement as some Denison electors may be unsure as where to vote or think they may not have to vote.
- The change of division name would have major impact on the cost of the forthcoming election as the following additional tasks would need to be undertaken by the TEC: significant
 - increases in the election advertising campaign to include a range of elements to increase awareness of the new division name and how electors are affected
 - changes to election management systems to readjust the allocation of polling places as the new divisions, which will also lead to other resourcing and logistics planning
 - the design and production roll-out of new election material for all polling places
 - changes to election training and information materials.
- As campaigning for the state election may have already begun for some intending candidates, changes to electoral boundaries - particularly in Latrobe, West Tamar and Meander Valley municipalities - may cause elector confusion, as some of these electors may no longer be in the same division as the candidate.

To add to the possible confusion, while electors are now technically enrolled in the new federal divisions, these divisions cannot be used at an electoral event until the next federal election. In other words, if the federal division of Braddon were to lose its member - due to the uncertainty of the dual citizenship status of the current member - the associated by-election would be conducted on the old Braddon, (current House of Assembly) electoral boundary.

While the new boundaries are established to enable divisions to closely align with the one-vote, one-value principle, the current electoral boundaries are within the 10% variation set out for the Legislative Council electoral boundary redistributions.

As the House of Assembly adoption of these new federal electoral boundaries is only expected to be delayed for around six months, I believe the use of the current House of Assembly electoral boundaries of the 2018 state election will not have any real impact regarding the application of the one-vote, one-value principle.

I again thank the commissioner for that substantive advice which was received by the Department of Premier and Cabinet and is the reason this bill is being debated at this time, without further delay or any further uncertainty, we hope, or confusion amidst the respective divisions.

I do not want to delay the House any further with my contribution to the debate about the significance of the change from Denison to Clark. Needless to say, it would have been a subject of great interest to my father, as a serving member for Denison in this House and the Commonwealth Parliament. I am sure he would have had his own views and would take a lot more of the House's time on this matter but I am personally very supportive of the change from Denison to Clark.

These matters arise from time to time and cause some disruption and potentially confusion within communities. There is never a perfect time you can do this because our democratic processes and the operations of state and Commonwealth parliaments will continue, but it is important there is an equitable distribution of voters amongst our divisions at a state and Commonwealth level. Whilst they can align, it does reduce the confusion for Tasmanian voters across the state.

I thank all members for their contributions and the officers of DPAC for their assistance and particularly the member of the augmented commission, represented on that body from our state and also Mr Hawkey and members of the Tasmanian Electoral Commission for their efforts.

Bill read the second time.

Bill read the third time.

LAND TITLES AMENDMENT BILL 2018 (No. 22)

Second Reading

Ms COURTNEY (Bass - Minister for Primary Industries and Water - 2R) - Madam Speaker,
I move -

That the bill be now read the second time.

The purpose of the bill is to amend the Land Titles Act 1980 by repealing section 146(2) of that act. Section 146(1) of the Land Titles Act 1980 currently provides that a mortgagee, encumbrancee or lessor can make an application to the Supreme Court of Tasmania for an order for possession of the premises. Section 146(2) of the Land Titles Act 1980 provides for a summons that is used to support the process under section 146(1). The summons is directed to the defaulting party to attend the Supreme Court of Tasmania and provide reasons why the court should not give possession of the premises to the applicant.

In the opinion of the former and current Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Tasmania, issuing a summons as part of the section 146 process is unnecessary and, in practice, is disregarded by the person on whom it is served. This is because the application process provides sufficient opportunity for a defaulting party to be heard by the court, and to consider all supporting affidavits and evidence.

No unfairness will result if the subsection is omitted. It will not be possible for mortgagees to obtain orders for possession unless they have filed an application with supporting affidavits, obtained a hearing date, and served the documents on the mortgagor, giving adequate notice of the hearing.

The previous Chief Justice, the Honourable Ewan Crawford, requested the change, and the current Chief Justice, the Honourable Alan Blow, also has requested this amendment.

This minor change to Supreme Court procedure will reduce red tape by removing the requirement for a summons to be issued by that court. Removing the red tape will result in a reduction of legal costs that are imposed by solicitors on their clients, including costs to the defaulting party. Another benefit will be the reduction in the time required of the court's registry staff and use of the court itself. No other jurisdiction in Australia has a statutory provision similar to Tasmania's.

There will not be any negative impact arising from the proposed amendments to the act. Rather, this amendment is expected to be met with positive reaction from members of the Supreme Court of Tasmania, the Law Society of Tasmania and within the legal profession.

The amendments involve the repeal of subsection 2 of section 146, with further consequential amendments made to that section to accommodate the repeal.

The Government fully supports the introduction of this bill.

I commend the bill to the House.

[5.46 p.m.]

Dr BROAD (Braddon) - Mr Deputy Speaker, this bill has all the appearance of a non-controversial bill, there is no doubt about that, but unfortunately we have not had an opportunity to be briefed on this. We were not expecting this to be coming up today. It is not on the blue for today and it seems a bit ironic that we have a bill being brought on with very little notice.

Today we already had the Leader of Government Business in the House talking about how they were quite good at estimating the time taken for bills to be debated and that was obviously the rationale used this morning to gag another debate of importance, the censure of the Premier. The

cover used to guillotine that debate was that there was important business to do and it seems that now we have a situation where the Government is bringing on another bill with very short notice because they have got through the work they were planning to do today so are now scratching around as to what they can bring up and cover themselves to say how very busy they are and they have lots of business to do today. They have run out of business that was on the blue but they will bring something else up and then try to get through to 6 p.m.

It seems like that has been the strategy. On reflection on the debate earlier in the day, I think the Parliament would have got significant value out of hearing the opinions of other members of the House in terms of the Premier and that censure motion. It is a very important -

Quorum formed.

Dr BROAD - This bill just deals -

Members interjecting.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - The business is not on the orders of the day, on the blue.

Ms Courtney - You have had two months to prepare.

Dr BROAD - We have not had the opportunity for a briefing.

Ms Courtney - You had two months to prepare.

Dr BROAD - It would be nice to have a briefing. That is why we have a process of notification of what is coming on today. There are bills listed on the blue.

Ms Courtney - We saw how much you scrutinised the police bill this week.

Dr BROAD - I gave a lot of scrutiny of the police bill, thank you very much.

Ms Courtney - Yes, you went into Committee and into a whole lot of detail about your amendments.

Dr BROAD - This is right. That is a bill of significant importance and it needs to be done appropriately.

Ms Courtney - You tried to throw it out of here. It cannot be that significant when you tried to throw it out.

Dr BROAD - We scrutinised it. We had issues and there remains issue with that bill.

Ms Courtney - Why didn't you try to fix them in Committee. You were too lazy.

Dr BROAD - We know you do not work with the Opposition.

Ms Courtney - You were too lazy to try to fix it in Committee. You tried to throw the bill out.

Dr BROAD - I recall proposing amendments to the Finfish Farming Bill and we had the minister, Mr Rockliff, agree wholeheartedly with one of the amendments but would not pass it in this place. It was only put up when that amendment went to the upper House and was proposed by the Government, word for word with the amendment we proposed in this House. There is a history of the Government not seeking to work with the Opposition to improve bills. They use their numbers to block any amendments and cry out when we do not propose them. If you were listening to that debate there is a significant problem. It would make it hard to amend to insert the appropriate protections and that was what we discussed. We were willing to work with the Government. We wrote to the Government, we were seeking to take that bill forward in a more bipartisan manner. The Government refused and pushed the bill through with their numbers. We will have to see if we can have appropriate amendments included in the upper House, but that is another debate.

We have the information that this was proposed by a previous Chief Justice, Ewan Crawford, who recommended the change because it creates an unnecessary requirement for judges to issue summons. We have no doubt this is a recommendation made by people who are active in the court process. I have no reason to assume malfeasance in this. However, it would have been good to have an opportunity to have broader discussion on the details and given more notice.

Mr Brooks - Once a bill has matured, governments bring bills on all the time; when they want. That is how it works. That is how it worked when we were in Opposition.

Dr BROAD - I am sure you were fantastic in Opposition. We all know, Mr Brooks, you were amazing in Opposition.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - That was probably where you did your best work, Mr Brooks, in Opposition. You could come in every day and simply have a crack at the government.

Mr Brooks - You were not even here. What would you know?

Dr BROAD - I was witness to some of it. I watched it online and you had a lot of fun coming in here day after day. We have seen things have not gone so well since that moment.

Mr Brooks - You do not know what you are talking about, as usual.

Dr BROAD - It is what it is, Mr Brooks, member for Braddon.

The purpose of this bill is to make a simple amendment to the Land Titles Act and repeal one section, which is 146(2), as requested by the Chief Justice. This bill is being caught up in another political play around cover. We would not be in this position if we were given appropriate time.

Ms Courtney - If you scrutinised bills?

Dr BROAD - No, if we were given appropriate time to debate. It is not a good position for us to be in.

Ms Courtney - Two months and you are lazy and unprepared.

Dr BROAD - Why was it not on the blue today, if you knew you were going to run out of time?

Ms Courtney - Your stunt did not work and you are having a sook.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - A censure motion is very serious.

Ms Courtney - You had two months to prepare.

Dr BROAD - Why were we not offered a briefing?

Ms Courtney - Did you ask?

Dr BROAD - Did you offer? Quite often we get offered. We were offered a briefing on all sorts of bills. We are requesting briefings. In fact I requested two briefings today.

Ms Haddad - I was offered and have received a briefing this week for a bill that was tabled this week.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - This week, you see. There is a bit of a process. Obviously what we need to do now is assume that you will not take the niceties and give us time to get those briefings. There are a number of things sitting on there and we have no idea when you will bring them on.

This has the appearance of a non-controversial bill, however -

Ms Courtney - So why do you want a briefing? If you have issues you can raise them now and we can address them during the second reading speech.

Dr BROAD - It is not just about the opinions. We have not had a chance to -

Ms Courtney - To read it. You have not had a chance to read a bill that has been on the -

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order.

Dr BROAD - No, I have read the bill. There is not much to read, it is very small.

Ms Courtney - Why do you need a briefing then?

Ms Haddad - Do you not think it is important enough to be briefed?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order. The interjections seem to be around the Standing Orders. I can and will inform Dr Broad that as per the Standing Orders the Government can bring on a bill after 48 hours maturation.

Dr BROAD - Yes, sitting on the table for 48 hours. Obviously it is a valid point that the Government can bring on bills. The Government can bring on bills. We were given the impression that there was urgent business to be done.

Mr BROOKS - Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. It goes to relevance. I dare the member to mention the bill that is in front of him. This might give him the opportunity to think of something that is relevant to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - That is not a point of order. Dr Broad has the call.

Mr Ferguson - Labor voters are not getting good value for money.

Dr BROAD - The voters probably would have received good value for money if the censure debate was given its time to run. It was guillotined because there was important business to do, so you bring on a non-controversial bill at the last minute with no notice.

Ms Courtney - You have not done the work.

Dr BROAD - I have read the bill.

Ms Courtney - If you have any questions you can raise them in your second reading contribution and I can answer them.

Dr BROAD - I explained what the bill does. I have discussed that.

Mr Brooks - Well sit down then.

Dr BROAD - You are absolute shockers. We have a holier than thou who stands up in discussion of the previous bill and talks about how this side of the House is abusive and then gets up and gives invective for five minutes.

Mr Brooks - I dare you to mention the bill.

Dr BROAD - I have mentioned the bill. I have mentioned how former Chief Justice Ewan Crawford was the one who made the recommendations to change section 146 and that it is about summons and that the summonses may be deemed to be something that wastes people's time, because people ignore the summons.

Ms Courtney - You are wasting time.

Dr BROAD - That is what you said in your second reading speech and that is what it says in the reading notes, but are there any other implications for this? Is it the case that people may object to not being notified via a summons. That is the thing we have not had a chance to quantify.

Section 146(1) of the act -

Ms Courtney - Yay.

Dr BROAD - I mentioned that. It is the third time I have mentioned that, so go back to the *Hansard*. If you want to talk about filibustering let us talk about 40 minutes of three talking points - get to the bottom, go back to the top, get to the bottom, go back to the top. That is what we saw yesterday in private members' time. I was looking at the tedious repetition standing order because that is what that was. Over and over, the same things, the same talking points. You did not even stretch into your normal invective; you seemed to be rather flat.

Mr Brooks - You only have a minute to go, have a drink of water.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER - Order, Dr Broad has the call.

Dr BROAD - I have mentioned the bill.

Ms Haddad - You would be feeling relieved, too, you did not have to find a fourth bill to bring on.

Mr Ferguson - I cannot believe we got three bills through in a day.

Dr BROAD - Maybe you have a fourth bill? Are you bringing on another bill? You can only put three through in a day?

Mr Ferguson - It is an extraordinary lack of scrutiny and you have not done your homework. It is on display.

Dr BROAD - Thank you, Mr Teacher. I can sit in the naughty corner now. Is that what you are saying?

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Building Heights in Hobart

[6.00 p.m.]

Ms O'CONNOR (Denison - Leader of the Greens) - Madam Speaker, one of the pleasures of being an elected representative is the opportunity we have to engage with people from a broad cross-section in the community and engage with young people about the matters that concern them. I want to read into the *Hansard* today an excellent letter from a Taroona High School student, Nina Sadbh Irwin McBrien, who lives in Taroona, written on 17 June this year. It relates to the kind of Hobart we hope for in the future and I believe this voice of young people is very important and that is why I will be reading Sadbh's email and correspondence in to the *Hansard*. It says:

Dear whomever this may concern,

I am writing to you to express my concerns about the height on proposed buildings in Hobart. I have canvassed the opinions of large numbers of students at our school who are united in their opposition of increasing the height of buildings in Hobart.

My concerns relate to the look of the city and the effects on its overall character and the deleterious consequences of it on the city's economy. If tall buildings encroach on our small and beautiful city, Hobart will lose its individuality.

One of the major attractions of Hobart's architecture is its historic cityscape, some of which was established in 1804. Its beautiful sandstone buildings are an important difference from other cities. Tall buildings would make Hobart look like any other big city. I am extremely concerned about the height of the proposed

hotel on the 234-250 site on Elizabeth Street. This building will adjoin heritage buildings and tower over its historic surrounds, including Elizabeth College and the historic brewery across the road, which is only 10 metres high. This would diminish the character of the surrounding historical buildings greatly. Furthermore, a proposal for another hotel, with a height of 120-210 metres to be built on Sullivan's Cove, an area surrounded with historic buildings such as the IXL Jam Factory and the Museum, raise further concern. This hotel will overshadow and distract from the beauty of the Hobart waterfront. The irony of building large, tall hotels for tourists, many of whom come to Hobart for its charm and heritage, has not been lost.

The recent addition of the Icon complex is also deeply worrying. This building is the third-tallest building in Hobart and was opened this year. Are these developments a sign of things to come?

I suggest a reasonable height limit ranging from 40-50 metres in the CBD. This will sit between the current tallest building in the CBD of 63 metres and the second-highest of 45 metres, so my proposal meets somewhere in the middle. This will ensure we can preserve Hobart's natural beauty and the visual appeal of the city and stop the current trend towards taller buildings.

As a young Tasmanian, I have grown up in Hobart. I don't want to see our city our change into a characterless, dark place which has lost its individuality. I will continue to spread my message throughout the community until action is taken. I am happy to discuss and debate these issues.

Kind regards,

Taroona High School student,

Nina Sadbh Irwin McBrien.

Madam Speaker, we should all take that on board. This is a heartfelt expression from our future young people about the kind of Hobart they want to see. We should take heed because if we always bow to the dollars and the wishes of big developers, something precious will be lost.

As we know, there are countless cities in the world that have skyscrapers. There are very few cities of a human scale remaining. If you go to places like Amsterdam or Paris in the old town, they have had intelligent planning that makes sure the fabric of a beautiful medium-rise city is retained. You can have commercial development of a greater scale outside your city, but we have an opportunity here in Tasmania to make sure we are shaping our city so it is a human-scale city and not a city that is blighted by soaring skyscrapers that take the light away from cityscapes and turn our streets into wind tunnels.

I thank Sadbh Irwin McBrien for sending this letter through to me so that I could share it with the House.

The House adjourned at 6.05 p.m.

QUESTION UPON NOTICE

The following answer was given to a question upon notice:

2. LEWISHAM FORESHORE FUNDING

Ms WHITE asked the Minister for Primary Industries and Water -

With respect to funding to improve the Lewisham foreshore -

(1) Of the \$100 000 funding committed in 2017:

- (a) How much has been spent?
- (b) How has the money been spent and for what purpose?

(2) When will the \$85 000 funding promised during the election campaign be used and for what purpose?

Ms COURTNEY replied -

(1) (a) \$42 818.00 GST exc

- | | | |
|-----|--|---------------------|
| (b) | - Okines Beach Clean-up | \$6 300.00 GST exc |
| | - Core Sample Drilling, Testing and Analysis | \$16 849.00 GST exc |
| | - Sand Scraping Report | \$11 719.00 GST exc |
| | - Threatened Species Survey | \$7 950.00 GST exc |

(2) The balance of the \$185 000 in total funding will be used to commission consultant services to develop a master plan to evaluate and cost all mitigation measures for consideration. The plan will be completed by December 2018, with remaining funds used to commence works at the site during the 2018-19 financial year.